

COLONIAL COLLECTIONS COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION

Object

The Banjarmasin diamond NG-C-2000-3



Image: Rijksmuseum Amsterdam

Current owner

The State of the Netherlands

Custodian

Rijksmuseum Amsterdam

Application for restitution from

The Republic of Indonesia represented by *Tim Repatriasi Objek Pemajuan Kebudayaan Dan Pengembalian Cagar Budaya Yang Berada Di Luar Wilayah Republik Indonesia Ke Dalam Wilayah Republik Indonesia*¹ (hereinafter referred to as: Tim Repatriasi)

Date of application for restitution

13 November 2025

Recommendation number

ID-2026-1

Date of recommendation

24 April 2026

The Colonial Collections Committee²
consisting of

Lilian Gonçalves-Ho Kang You (chair), Laura van Broekhoven, Remco Raben, Alicia Schrikker (members)

Secretariat

Jona Mooren, Liesbeth Ouwehand

¹ *Tim Repatriasi Objek Pemajuan Kebudayaan Dan Pengembalian Cagar Budaya Yang Berada Di Luar Wilayah Republik Indonesia Ke Dalam Wilayah Republik Indonesia* consists of Fadli Zon (adviser), Endah T.D. Retnoastuti (person responsible), Ismunandar (chair), Masyitoh Annisa Ramadhani Alkatiri, Anindita Kusuma Listya, Basuki Teguh Yuwono, Agus Aris Munandar, Oman Fathurahman, Bambang Sunarto, Suryadi, Ninie Susanti, Putu Supadma Rudana (members), Raden Usman Effendi (coordinator), Anton Wibisono, Andhini Widyasari, Khanifudin Malik, Fatwa Yulianto (secretary).

² The Advisory Committee on the Restitution of Cultural Objects from a Colonial Context (in short: the Colonial Collections Committee) was established on 6 September 2022 by the Dutch State Secretary for Education, Culture and Science.

1. The application

On 13 November 2025 the Republic of Indonesia submitted an application to the Dutch Minister of Education, Culture and Science for restitution of the Banjarmasin diamond, referred to in the application as 'The Banjarmasin Diamond' with inventory number NG-C-2000-3 from the collection of the Dutch State, which is in the custody of the Rijksmuseum Amsterdam.

2. The object

The Banjarmasin diamond is rectangular in shape and what is known as an 'old mine cut'. The diamond weighs 38.23 carats and measures 21.86 x 17.37 x 13.86 mm (L x W x H). The diamond arrived in the Netherlands in 1862 as an uncut stone weighing 70 carats. It was cut in 1870 by A.E. Daniëls and his son Alexander of Amsterdam diamond cutters A.E. Daniëls & Zoon, who also managed the diamond factory of M.E. Coster.³

The diamond is registered at the Rijksmuseum under inventory number NG-C-2000-3.

3. The policy framework

The assessment of the application for restitution took place within the framework of the *Policy vision on collections from a colonial context* of the Dutch Minister of Education, Culture and Science.⁴ The policy vision is based on the Council for Culture report *Colonial Collection, a Recognition of Injustice*.⁵ Applications for restitution of a cultural object may be made by states where the Netherlands exercised colonial rule or by countries that were colonised by other powers.

The assessment framework set out in the Policy vision can be summarised as follows:

First, the Colonial Collections Committee (hereinafter referred to as: the Committee) determines whether the provenance research is sufficient.

Then the Committee establishes whether involuntary loss of possession occurred. To this end it assesses whether it can be established with a reasonable degree of certainty that a country where the Netherlands exercised colonial rule involuntarily lost possession of the cultural object whose restitution is requested and that the cultural object subsequently came into the possession of the Dutch State. If this is established to be the case, the Committee will recommend unconditional restitution of the cultural object.

If it cannot be established from the provenance history whether involuntary loss of possession occurred, and to the extent that the cultural objects in question are of particular cultural, historical or religious significance for the country of origin, then the Committee will consider the interests involved, whereby the importance of restitution for the country of origin shall be weighed against other relevant interests based on reasonableness and fairness.

³ Appendix 1, pp. 2, 3.

⁴ Policy vision, 29 January 2021, <https://committee.kolonialecollecties.nl/documents/2021/01/01/policy-vision-on-collections-from-a-colonial-context>

⁵ Report of 7 October 2020, <https://www.raadvoorcultuur.nl/documenten/adviezen/2021/01/22/colonial-collection-and-a-recognition-of-injustice>

Relevant interests may include the cultural importance of the cultural object to the country of origin, the communities involved both in the countries of origin and in the Netherlands, the significance to the Netherlands Collection, future storage conditions and public access. Objects may be significant for national and regional traditions as well as for the identity of a country, people, community or individual. A cultural object will often be of different importance to the Netherlands than to the country of origin. Colonial cultural objects in Dutch museums may also be of special significance to Dutch citizens with roots in the countries of origin.

If the object whose restitution is requested originates from a country formerly colonised by another power, then the Committee will similarly consider the interests involved, thereby weighing the importance of restitution for the country of origin against other relevant interests based on reasonableness and fairness. Rectifying injustice must, however, be the basic premise in this assessment. In such a case, whilst the Netherlands did not cause the injustice, as the current holder of the objects only it is in a position to rectify that injustice.

If the Committee recommends restitution to the applicant state then the transfer of title procedure for public collections shall be observed – in accordance with the Dutch Heritage Act and the *Policy vision on collections from a colonial context* of the Minister of Education, Culture and Science – and the Committee's recommendation shall also be regarded as a recommendation on the indispensability and irreplaceability of the object in the sense of article 4.18 of the Dutch Heritage Act.

4. The procedure

On 13 November 2025 the Republic of Indonesia submitted an application to the Dutch Minister of Education, Culture and Science for restitution of the diamond described under 1 above.

On 18 December 2025 the Minister requested the Committee to advise on the restitution application.

In the context of the Pilot Project Provenance Research on Objects of the Colonial Era (hereinafter referred to as: PPROCE) the custodian of the object commissioned research into its provenance history; the provenance report was published in 2022. On 13 January 2026 the Committee asked the Rijksmuseum whether there were any amendments or addenda to the PPROCE report. The Rijksmuseum subsequently provided a cover note on 20 February 2026 in which it endorses the conclusions of the PPROCE report and declares that there are no addenda (*appendix 1*).

The Committee discussed the application for restitution and the report at a meeting on 23 January 2026. The PPROCE report and the cover note were shared with Tim Repatriasi and the Committee enquired whether there were any further questions in relation to the report or the cover note. In a meeting on 6 March 2026 Tim Repatriasi announced that it had no further questions or comments regarding the report or the cover note.

After discussing the restitution application on 24 April 2026 the Committee resolved to recommend as stated below.

5. The provenance research

The provenance research was conducted by Klaas Stutje in the context of PPROCE. The provenance report and the cover note form an integral part of this recommendation.

The provenance report records the following findings.

The region around Martapura in the centre of the Banjarmasin Sultanate (in what is now South Kalimantan) has a long history of diamond production. The Sultan of Banjarmasin and certain members of his family held the exclusive rights to key diamond mines. The largest and most distinctive diamonds that were mined in the region were worn by the sultan and his family as a symbol of their power.⁶ Historical sources from the period from 1823 to 1848 mention an uncut diamond weighing around 70 carats that the sultan van Banjarmasin wore on a simple cord around his neck. The diamond belonged to the sultan's regalia and was of great importance: 'A sultan without regalia was unconceivable.'⁷ The provenance report notes that the descriptions in the various sources differ in terms of details such as the colour of the cord and the carat weight of the diamond. Gemologist Suzanne van Leeuwen concludes that, in spite of these differences, the sources were referring to the same diamond, whose restitution is now requested.⁸

The provenance report describes the political developments in Banjarmasin that preceded the confiscation of the diamond by C.J. Bosch (?-?), the Resident of Southeast Borneo. Sultan Adam al-Watsiq Billah (c. 1771-1857) of Banjarmasin died in November 1857 and Tamdjidillah al-Watsiq Billah (1817-1867) was installed as the new sultan two days later. The Dutch colonial rulers had designated Tamdjidillah as the heir apparent in 1856 despite the fact that he was unpopular with the local population. Tamdjidillah had established good relations with the Dutch officials and granted the colonial regime the right to exploit the region's coal mines. However, there were other candidates to succeed the sultan, namely Prabu Anom (?-1869) and Hidayatullah (1822-1903), and the installation of Tamdjidillah consequently sparked great tension among the Banjarese population. Hidayatullah and Sultan Adam's widow initially refused to relinquish certain important regalia in their possession to Tamdjidillah.⁹

Unrest broke out in the years following the installation, with colonial sites being attacked and dozens of Europeans losing their lives.¹⁰ In a bid to end the unrest, government commissioner and colonel A.J. Andresen (1808-1872) decided to consult various prominent Banjarese leaders, who maintained that peace was conditional on the abdication of Tamdjidillah. Andresen subsequently informed Tamdjidillah that he could no longer rely on the protection of the Dutch rulers. As the provenance report states: 'He suggested that the Sultan would resign "of his own free will," offering him and his family safe passage to Batavia, an independent investigation in the affairs, a continuing monthly allowance in accordance with his dignity, and the continued right to carry the title of sultan. Tamdjidillah, knowing that his life was in danger without the protection of the Dutch, had little choice but to "submit to the advice of the Gouvernements Commissaris" under the precondition that

⁶ Appendix 1, p. 3.

⁷ 'Een sulthan zonder rijksieraden was niet denkbaar.' Appendix 1, p. 4.

⁸ Appendix 1, p. 4.

⁹ Appendix 1, p. 5.

¹⁰ Appendix 1, p. 6.

a new sultan would be installed according to the Banjarese adat once the uprising had ended and order was restored. He also agreed to surrender the Banjarmasin's regalia the following day.¹¹

Tamdjidillah was asked to make a public announcement in which he declared that he was abdicating out 'of his own free will and without any coercion'.¹² The next day, 25 June 1859, Dutch colonial officials paid a visit to Tamdjidillah, who tried in vain to renegotiate the agreements made the day before. During this visit C.J. Bosch (?-?), the Resident of Southeast Borneo, confiscated the regalia, including the diamond, and took them to Batavia. While the surrender of the throne and regalia was officially presented as voluntary it is clear from the provenance report that it took place under extreme pressure. Andresen stated that Tamdjidillah had lost the trust of the Banjarese population for failing to follow Islamic rules and violating the adat. He furthermore threatened to hold the sultan responsible for the violence against Europeans, which could have legal implications. He added that the Dutch would withdraw their protection, which would put Tamdjidillah in a very vulnerable position.¹³ In this context the report also refers to the 'Report of confiscation' drawn up at the time of the seizure, 'leaving little doubt about its involuntary character'.¹⁴

The Dutch colonial regime ultimately abolished the Sultanate of Banjarmasin in 1860 and placed it under direct rule. The sultanate's regalia, with the exception of the diamond, ended up with the Bataviaasch Genootschap in 1861. The diamond was dispatched to the Netherlands with the intention of presenting it as a gift to King Willem III. Following its arrival in the Netherlands the Minister of Colonies deliberated the destination of the diamond at length, also seeking the views of the Council of Ministers, museum directors and King Willem III. The options were to offer the diamond to the king as a gift, to place it in a museum as state property or to sell it. Ultimately it was decided in 1869 to put the diamond up for sale, with the proceeds to be added to the *Batig Saldo* – the structural financial surplus generated by the Netherlands Indies which accrued to the Dutch exchequer.¹⁵ When no buyer for the diamond was forthcoming it was decided that the gem should be cut. Subsequent efforts to sell the diamond also proved unsuccessful. In the end the Minister of Colonies gave the diamond on permanent loan to the Rijksmuseum in August 1902 'as a memorial to the subjugation of the Banjarmasin empire'.¹⁶

6. Assessment of the restitution application

6.1 Admissibility of the application

First of all, the Committee examined whether the application by the Republic of Indonesia was admissible. The application for restitution was submitted by a state where the Netherlands exercised colonial rule. The Committee therefore concluded that the application is admissible.

¹¹ Appendix 1, p. 7.

¹² 'uit eigen vrijen wil en zonder eenigen dwang'. Appendix 1, p. 7.

¹³ Appendix 1, p. 7.

¹⁴ 'Proces Verbaal van Afpakking'. Appendix 1, p. 7.

¹⁵ Batig Saldo. Appendix 1, p. 9.

¹⁶ Appendix 1, p. 1.

6.2 Policy framework

The application for restitution concerns a cultural object from a colonial context. The application therefore falls within the scope of the restitution policy, and the *Policy vision on collections from a colonial context* is applicable.

6.3 The provenance research

In order to assess the application for restitution it is important to determine whether the provenance research is sufficient. The Committee is of the opinion that the research was conducted properly and provides sufficient information for a recommendation to be issued. Thorough source research was undertaken, and a critical evaluation was made of the existing information. The report provides sufficient information about the context in which the diamond was acquired.

6.4 Substantial assessment

Next, the Committee assessed whether it has been demonstrated with a reasonable degree of certainty that the loss of the cultural object whose restitution is requested was involuntary.

The provenance report cites various colonial sources which mention a large diamond that the sultan of Banjarmasin wore around his neck on a simple cord. The research shows that the diamond whose restitution is now requested belonged to the sultan of Banjarmasin's regalia. The Committee notes that this means that the diamond was of great symbolic as well as financial importance.

The provenance report describes the circumstances under which the diamond was surrendered. In June 1859 Sultan Tamdjidillah was under great pressure from the Dutch colonial administration to abdicate and surrender the regalia of the Sultanate of Banjarmasin. The Dutch colonial administration had designated Tamdjidillah as Sultan Adam Al-Watsiq Billah's successor in November 1857. This sparked unrest among the local people and within the sultan's family. The years following his installation saw attacks take place in which dozens of Europeans lost their lives. In 1859 Colonel Andresen decided that Tamdjidillah must step down in order to end the unrest. Tamdjidillah agreed to abdicate and on 25 June 1859 the regalia, including the diamond whose restitution is sought, fell into Dutch hands. Although the Dutch colonial rulers had Tamdjidillah declare that he was stepping down out 'of his own free will and without any coercion',¹⁷ the Committee endorses the conclusion drawn in the provenance report that the abdication and the surrender of the regalia happened under enormous pressure and should be deemed involuntary.¹⁸ The Committee sees evidence for this in the fact that Tamdjidillah sought to amend the agreements the day after they were made. The fact that a 'Report of Confiscation' was drawn up and that the diamond was given on loan to the Rijksmuseum 'as a memorial to the subjugation of the Banjarmasin empire'¹⁹ also points to the involuntary nature of the cession.

On the foregoing grounds the Committee is of the opinion that the diamond came into Dutch possession in June 1856 as a result of the great pressure exerted on Tamdjidillah by the Netherlands Indies government. The Committee concludes that the cession of the diamond must be deemed involuntary.

¹⁷ 'uit eigen vrijen wil en zonder eenigen dwang'. Appendix 1, p. 7.

¹⁸ Appendix 1, p. 1 and pp. 6, 7.

¹⁹ Appendix 1, p. 1.

Conclusion

On the grounds of the facts and circumstances set out above the Committee is of the opinion that it is plausible that possession of the Banjarmasin diamond was lost involuntarily.

The Committee was asked to advise on the application of article 4.18 of the Dutch Heritage Act in the event its recommendation means that the requested object must be restituted. It is the opinion of the Committee that rectification of past injustice prevails in this case and that article 4.18 of the Heritage Act is therefore not applicable.

7. The recommendation

The Committee has assessed the application for restitution and recommends that the Minister proceed with the unconditional restitution of the Banjarmasin diamond with inventory number NG-C-2000-3.

The Committee furthermore recommends that the metadata associated with the object, such as archive material, correspondence and other contextual documentation, also be placed at the disposal of the Republic of Indonesia in the context of rectifying injustice.

This recommendation was adopted by the Colonial Collections Committee on 24 April 2026.

Chair

Secretariat

Lilian Gonçalves-Ho Kang You

Jona Mooren, Liesbeth Ouwehand

Appendix

1. Cover note Rijksmuseum and K. Stutje (2022) *Provenance report regarding The Banjarmasin Diamond* (PPROCE provenance reports no. 18). NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies.

Research report The Banjarmasin Diamant

Regarding: The Banjarmasin Diamant,

Date: February 2026

Current location: Rijksmuseum Amsterdam, NG-C-2000-3

Extensive research into the provenance of the Banjarmasin Diamond was conducted by Klaas Stutje as part of PPROCE (Pilot Project Provenance Research on Objects of the Colonial Era). PPROCE was a joint initiative of the NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust, and Genocide Studies, the Rijksmuseum Amsterdam, and the Wereldmuseum, and was carried out between 2019 and 2022 under the leadership of the NIOD on behalf of the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science (OCW). Attached is the PPROCE provenance report on the diamond by Stutje.

The Rijksmuseum endorses the conclusions of this provenance research and has no further additions to make.

Provenance report regarding The Banjarmasin Diamond

Klaas Stutje

	Custodian	Rijksmuseum Amsterdam
	Current possessor	Dutch State
	Inventory number	NG-C-2000-3
	Material/technique	Diamond (mineral); grinding
	Measurements	21.86 x 17.37 x 13.86 mm 38.23 (metric) carat 7.65 grams
<i>Photo: Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, inv.no. NG-C-2000-3</i>		

Summary of findings

Based on the research report below we can draw the following preliminary conclusions: From the pre-1859 period we have a handful of Dutch sources that indicate the existence of a 70 carat diamond in the possession of the Sultan of Banjarmasin, some more reliable than others and the earliest from 1829. Based on Dutch sources found in the archives of the Dutch Ministry of Colonies in The Hague we can also conclude that the Banjarmasin Diamond in the Rijksmuseum was ceded “voluntarily” but under extreme pressure by Sultan Tamdjidillah II (1817-1867) to representatives of the Dutch colonial state on the day after his abdication on 24 June 1859. After two and a half years in colonial depots in Banjarmasin and Batavia, the Gouverneur Generaal sent the diamond to the Netherlands in December 1861, with the intention of offering it to the Dutch King William III. The Council of Ministers decided otherwise, and in the next four decades the Ministry of Colonies tried to find a suitable location for the diamond. The Ministry also tried to sell the diamond three times, for which it was cut to a stone of 38,23 metric carat by A.E. Daniëls (1813-1903) and son in 1869-1870. Finally, in August 1902, the diamond was given on permanent loan to the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, “as a memorial to the subjugation of the Banjarmasin empire.”

Reconstruction provenance

[no date] - 3 November 1857

Sultan Adam of Banjarmasin or his direct family

NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 680, verbaal 29 January 1858 no. 36, copy of a letter of the resident of Southeast Borneo to the Gouverneur Generaal, 4 November 1857.

3 November 1857 - 25 June 1859

Sultan Tamdjidillah II of Banjarmasin or his direct family

Van Rees, De Bandjermasinsche Krijg, part I, 28; NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 680, verbaal 29 January 1858 no. 36, copy of a letter of the resident of Southeast Borneo to the Gouverneur Generaal, 4 November 1857.

25 June 1859 - 7 April 1862

Resident of South-East Borneo

NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 869, verbaal 16 September 1859 no. 29, copy of a letter of the resident to the Gouvernements Commissaris of 26 June 1859.

7 April 1862 - 22 Augustus 1902

Ministry of Colonies in The Hague

NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1173, 24 April 1862 no. 22, receipt note and verbaal 7 April 1862.

22 Augustus 1902 - today

Rijksmuseum Amsterdam

2.02.04 – inv.nr. 5237, Verbaal 19 juli 1902, nr. 35, Minutes Directeur RMA en makelaar Vita Israel, dd. 22 augustus 1902.

Object information

In 1862 the stone arrived in the Netherlands as a rough diamond that weighed 70 carat.¹ Fransen van der Putte (1822-1902), former Minister of Colonies, said in 1897 that before its cut the diamond was “for a layman not pretty, looking like a piece of charcoal.”² Between May and August 1870 the stone was cut by the Amsterdam-based cutters A.E. Daniëls and son, managing directors of the factory of the late M.E. Coster (1791-1849). According to a gemological analysis of S. Van Leeuwen and J.C. Zwaan, the

¹ In 1864 it was remeasured at 69 and 7/8 carat. This is measured in ‘old carats.’ In 1907, the measurement of diamonds was internationally standardised. 1 ‘old carat’ equaled 1,0276 ‘metric carat,’ Klaas Akkerman, “‘Een hart, extraordinair groot,’ De geschiedenis van de grootste diamant in Oranjebezit,” *Antiek* 24 (1989), 290.

² *Handelingen der Eerste Kamer, 27^{ste} vergadering, 30 April 1897, p. 384: “De diamant is ongeslepen, voor een leek niet mooi; zij lijkt op een stukje steenkool (...).”*

diamond weighs 38.23 carat. In size, the diamond is 21.86 x 17.37 x 13.86 mm (l x w x h). The diamond is rectangular shaped and can be described as a modified Old Mine Cut.³

Provenance report

Before 1857

The diamond producing industry in the region around Martapura in South-Kalimantan, historically the centre of the Banjarmasin Sultanate and after its abolition part of the Dutch residency of Southeast Borneo, has a very long history. Until the discovery of diamonds in Brazil in the 1725, it was one of the two regions in the world where diamonds were found, and until the twentieth century the region had a small diamond polishing industry.⁴ Although the share of diamonds from the Martapura region on the world market has never been large, they have always played an important role in the local export economy and in the Sultan's tributary power system. The Sultan and prominent members of his family held the exclusive rights over a few mine pits and leased the right to exploit other pits to vassals. Diamonds not only played a role as lubricant in the Sultan's economy, but the largest among them were also carried as jewels and symbols of power.⁵ The diamond in Rijksmuseum Amsterdam was one of them.

Most historians start the provenance history of the diamond in Rijksmuseum Amsterdam in the 1830s, referring to a travelogue of Salomon Müller (1804-1864).⁶ This German zoologist, who travelled in Banjarmasin in 1836 and published his travelogue in between 1839 and 1844, wrote that Sultan Adam Al-Watsiq Billah (ca. 1771-1857) was in possession of a rough diamond of – according to the Sultan himself – 77 carat. The shape of the diamond was an “almost regular octahedron.” It was cast in gold, hung around the Sultan's neck with a simple chord, and belonged to his “most valuable showpieces”. Müller describes this diamond in a section in which he contrasts the Sultan's riches with the dilapidated state of Martapura and the kraton.⁷ According to Müller, the 77-carat diamond was found in a diamond pit near kampong Goenong-lawak that was owned by the Sultan and his son, and the finder “only” received 500 *Spaanse matten* (Spanish dollars) or 1,275 Dutch guilders.⁸

Müller was not the first European to write about a large diamond worn around the neck of the Sultan. The *Nieuwe Amsterdamsche Courant en Algemeen Handelsblad* wrote in 1833 that in 1823 the youngest son of Sultan Sulaiman Saidullah II (1761-1825) wore a diamond of “68, but according to some 72” carat

³ S. van Leeuwen and J.C. Zwaan, “Banjarmasin diamond,” *The Journal of Gemmology* (forthcoming).

⁴ Karin Hofmeester, Ashkan Ashkpour, Katrien Depuydt, Jesse De Does, “Diamonds in Borneo: Commodities as Concepts in Context,” DATeCH2019: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Digital Access to Textual Cultural Heritage, May 2019, pp. 45–50.

⁵ René Brus, “Diamanten uit Kalimantan,” *Orion, tweemaandelijks oriënterend tijdschrift Nederland/Indonesië* 3, no. 5 (September/October 1987); Salomon Müller, *Verhandelingen over de natuurlijke geschiedenis der Nederlandsche overzeesche bezittingen* (Leiden: C.J. Temminck 1837-1844), 420, 423-424.

⁶ Brus, “Diamanten uit Kalimantan,”; Akkema, ‘Een hart, extraordinair groot,’ 286; Caroline Drieënhuizen, “Een ‘lelijk vuil ding’: een diamant in het Rijksmuseum en de doorwerking van koloniaal denken,” <https://carolinedrieenhuizen.wordpress.com> (published 26 september 2017); see also the 2013-2018 information sign of the diamond in Rijksmuseum.

⁷ Müller, *Verhandelingen over de natuurlijke geschiedenis*, 420: “nagenoeg regelmatigen octaëder”, “zijne kostbaarste pronkstukken.”

⁸ Ibidem, 421, 424. Kampong Goenong-lawak was a short distance South-southwest of Kampong Oedjoeng-Moeroeng, which was a few hours walking distance south of Martapura.

on a green chord around his neck.⁹ In 1829, “an inhabitant of Banjarmasin” visited these royal diamond pits and described in the *Javasche Courant* a 77 carat diamond, which was cast in a golden band and worn as a necklace by the Sultan himself with a simple black chord.¹⁰ In 1837, the Dutch botanist P.W. Korthals (1807-1892) also reported about an “almost regular octahedron” from the diamond pits around Goenong Lawak in the possession of the Sultan. In publications he stated that the diamond was 72 carat, but in his diary he reported that it was 76 carat.¹¹ Finally, a diamond of “more than 70 carat” was mentioned in a travelogue of “an official of the Government” in 1838, and a 77 carat diamond by the Dutch agriculturalist M.D. Teenstra (1795-1864) in 1848.¹²

It is remarkable that the accounts differ in details – with diamonds between 68 and 77 carat, with black or green chords, cast in gold or silver, and with various remunerations for the miners – but share a similar narrative in which a large diamond hangs around the neck of the Sultan on a simple chord. A diamond of this size in combination with the shape of a regular octahedron is extremely rare, and the fact that it is mentioned several times leads gemologist Suzanne van Leeuwen to the conclusion that these sources refer to the same diamond.¹³ The repeated appearance of this diamond in Dutch sources between 1823 and 1848 not only indicates that it was a cherished object of subsequent Sultans, but also bears witness to an orientalist fascination of Dutch observers for this diamond, foreshadowing its later confiscation.

A last Dutch source that deserves attention confirms the existence of a 70-carat diamond among the Sultan’s regalia just before the Dutch offensive of 1859. Between 1863 and 1865 W.A. van Rees (1820-1898), a retired major of the Dutch colonial army wrote the voluminous work *De Bandjermasinsche Krijg van 1859 tot 1863* as an homage to his former employer. In a section in which he describes the regular procedure of the coronation and inauguration of a new sultan before the abolition of this position in 1860, he underlines the importance of the state regalia: “A Sultan without regalia [*rijkssieraden*] is unconceivable.”¹⁴ Van Rees then proceeds to describe twenty of the most important items, including two diamonds of 120 and 70 carat. This mention of the 70-carat diamond in combination with a diamond of 120 carat is interesting, because it indicates that Van Rees, who did his research in the Netherlands at the department of the Ministry of Colonies, did not base this description of twenty on the collection that entered the museum of the Bataviaasch Genootschap in Batavia in November 1861 but had other, yet unidentified sources to tell him about the Banjarmasin regalia.¹⁵

⁹ “Het Eiland Borneo (Vervolg en Slot van Nummer 377),” *Nieuwe Amsterdamsche Courant en Algemeen Handelsblad*, January 17, 1833, 4: “68, volgens sommigen van 72 karaat.”

¹⁰ “Correspondentie,” *Javasche Courant*, 29 October 1829, 2.

¹¹ P.W. Korthals, ‘Aanteekeningen over Borneo’s Zuidoostkust,’ *Algemeene konst- en letter-bode, voor het jaar...* 47 (1837) 245.

¹² “Borneo, Eenige reizen in de Binnenlanden van dit Eiland, door eenen Ambtenaar van het Gouvernement in het jaar 1824,” *Tijdschrift voor Neerland’s Indië* 1, no. 2 (1838), 17: “ruim 70 karaten”; M.D. Teenstra, *Beknopte beschrijving van de Nederlandsch Overzeesche Bezittingen*, vol. 5-6 (Groningen: J. Oomkens, J. Zoon 1848) 447.

¹³ Personal correspondence with Suzanne van Leeuwen, gemologist Rijksmuseum Amsterdam, 4 March 2021. The author wants to thank Suzanne van Leeuwen for sharing early mentions of the diamond.

¹⁴ W.A. Van Rees, *De Bandjermasinsche Krijg van 1859-1863*, part I (Arnhem: D.A. Thieme, 1865), 28: “Een sulthan zonder rijkssieraden was niet denkbaar.” The importance of state regalia for the Sultan’s authority is also demonstrated by the fact that one of the later contenders to the Banjarmasin throne, Pangeran Antasari, made the acquisition of the regalia one of his main strategies to power: *Verzameling der Merkwaardigste Vonnissen gewezen door de kriegsraad te velde in de zuid- en oosterafdeeling van Borneo gedurende de jaren 1859-1864* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1865) 33.

¹⁵ Cf. “Bestuursvergadering 13 Julij 1861,” *Tijdschrift van het Bataviaasch Genootschap* 12 (1862), 122-125; *Katalogus der Ethnologische Afdeeling van het Museum van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* (Batavia: Lange & Co 1868), 95-98.

1857-1862

On 3 November 1857, two days after the death of Sultan Adam, Tamdjidillah al-Watsiq Billah was inaugurated in Martapura as the new sultan. This was not self-evident, but an escalation of a dynastic conflict between several contenders for the Sultan's throne and an interventionist Dutch colonial state. In 1852, the first son of Sultan Adam and heir to the throne, Abdul Rakhman (?-1852), died, allegedly poisoned by one of his younger brothers, Prabu Anom (?-1869). It was unclear who would succeed Abdul Rakhman as the new crown prince. Prabu Anom was supported by his mother Nyai Ratu Kemala Sari (ca. 1765-1864), Sultan Adam's wife who exerted great influence on the governance of the Sultanate and even held the royal seal. However, Kemala Sari and her son Prabu Anom were greatly disliked by the Dutch because of their supposed greed and cruelty and anti-Dutch attitude. The Dutch government preferred Tamdjidillah (1817-1867), the first son of Abdul Rakhman and nephew of Prabu Anom, who had established good relations with European circles in Banjarmasin city and had promised to grant the colonial government the exploitation of all coal mines within the borders of the Banjarmasin sultanate. However, this prince was very unpopular with the Banjarese population, because his Chinese-Dayak mother was not of royal descent, and because he allegedly spent most of his time in European circles in Banjarmasin city. A final candidate was the second son of Abdul Rakhman, Hidayatullah (1822-1903), whose mother was also a niece of Abdul Rakhman. Hidayatullah was thus of double royal descent. Most Banjarese regarded Hidayatullah as the rightful heir to the throne.¹⁶

Sultan Adam was too old to settle this dynastic dispute over his succession, and in 1856 the Dutch made use of their right to appoint a royal successor, which they had acquired in 1787 after the VOC stepped into a previous dynastic conflict. They elected Tamdjidillah as the crown prince, despite the latter's unpopularity with the Banjarese population and court. The lack of support for Tamdjidillah was symbolised by the fact that he did not live in the kraton of Martapura, which for centuries had been the center of the Banjarese court, but preferred to stay in the town of Banjarmasin, near the protection of the Dutch Resident and colonial army.¹⁷

On 1 November 1857, Sultan Adam died, and two days later Tamdjidillah was hurriedly installed by the Resident. This happened against the will of the other claimants to the throne, Praboe Anom backed by his mother Kemala Sari, and Hidayatullah. According to Van Rees, Kemala Sari, as the wife of the late Sultan Adam, held most of the regalia and some others were in use by her nephew kiay Adiphati Danu Redjo and by Hidayatullah.¹⁸ On the day of Tamdjidillah's inauguration Kemala Sari and Hidayatullah refused to hand over a few important regalia in their possession. Only after long deliberations they

¹⁶ Helius Sjamsuddin, "Fighting Dutch Rule in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries: The Social, Political, Ethnic and Dynastic Roots of Resistance in South and Central Kalimantan, 1859-1906" (PhD diss., Monash University, 1989), 86-95.

¹⁷ Ibidem, 111-112.

¹⁸ Van Rees, *De Bandjermasinsche Krijg*, part I, 28.

ceded the regalia and the inauguration of Tamdjidillah could continue.¹⁹ From this moment on we may assume that Tamdjidillah was in secure possession of all of the regalia of Banjarmasin, including the 70-carat diamond.²⁰

With the installation, political and social tensions in Banjarese society were far from resolved. Historians have identified and explored several underlying economic,²¹ religious,²² and socio-political²³ dimensions of the conflict. In the months after Tamdjidillah's accession, Prabu Anom and his mother Kemala Sari were arrested and exiled to Java. Hidayatullah retained some power with his popular support base and in function as *mangkubumi* ('rijksbestierder,' official intermediate between the sultan and resident), but he was greatly distrusted by the Dutch colonial government and Tamdjidillah. Fearing a similar treatment as Prabu Anom, Hidayatullah preferred to keep distance from the Dutch and Tamdjidillah and in June 1859 he even fled from Martapura. Moreover, between 28 April and 11 May 1859, followers of a nativistic movement of Panembahan Aling (?-1860) started attacking Dutch coal mines in the Sultan's lands and Christian missionary outposts of the Rheinische Missionsgesellschaft. In total 33 European civilians were killed. As a reaction, the Dutch colonial government replaced the Resident with a military commander, A.J. Andresen (1808-1872), and sent large numbers of troops to quell the revolt. Moreover, the Dutch tried to regain control over the Banjarese aristocracy by occupying the kraton in Martapura and demanding public loyalty of the many princes and nobility.

In June 1859, more than one month after the first attacks on Dutch positions had occurred, the Dutch Gouvernements Commissaris and Kolonel A.J. Andresen summoned about eighty prominent leaders of Martapura and their followers to listen to their demands, in a desperate attempt to appease the Banjarese population. In Dutch sources from the Ministry of Colonies archive in The Hague we can read that these leaders made clear that the dethronement of Tamdjidillah was a necessary precondition for peace. Therefore, Andresen returned to Banjarmasin to urge Tamdjidillah to step down 'voluntarily,' applying heavy pressure. On 24 June 1859, he confronted the Sultan in the Resident's office by saying that the elite and the population of Banjarmasin had lost faith in him, because of his negligence of the requirements of the Islam and because his accession to the throne was against the *adat* (customary law). Andresen also indirectly blamed Tamdjidillah for the recent attacks on Europeans by saying that

¹⁹ Nationaal Archief, Den Haag [NL-HaNA], Ministerie van Koloniën, nummer toegang 2.10.02, inventarisnummer 869, verbaal 16 September 1859 no. 29, 'Historische Nota over het voorgevallene met de beide mededingers naar de Bandjermasinsche troon' by the gouvernementssecretaris; ibidem, inv.nr. 680, verbaal 29 January 1858 no. 36, copy of a letter of the Resident of Southeast Borneo to the Gouverneur Generaal, 4 November 1857. According to this letter it concerned the Sultan's golden throne and payung, two ancient pikes and two holy krisses.

See also NL-HaNA, Nieuwenhuijzen, 2.21.205.44, inv.nr. 52, 'Resumé der korrespondentie omtrent de aangelegenheden van het Martapoerasche hof, Aanbieding verklaring Pangeran Praboe,' 219-223.

²⁰ Sjamsuddin, "Fighting Dutch Rule," 155. Yet, we have to keep in mind that some of the regalia that ended up in Batavia were inextricably linked to the kraton in Martapura, such as for instance the two coper cannons named Sri/Sari Bandjar which were positioned right in front of the kraton. This suggests that Tamdjidillah, who resided in Banjarmasin, did not have all of the regalia at his immediate disposal. See "Bestuursvergadering 13 Julij 1861, 124; *Katalogus der Ethnologische Afdeeling*, 97.

²¹ For instance, S.C.P. Kreuger, *Zr.Ms. Onrust: Verraad en ondergang in Borneo* (Amsterdam: Van Soeren, 1994).

²² For instance, Karl E. Böhmer, "Violence Begets Violence: Anticolonial Mobilisation of Ressentiment in 19th Century Borneo," *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 45, no. 1 (2019); Helius Sjamsuddin, "Islam and resistance in South and Central Kalimantan in the nineteenth and early twentieth century," in *Islam in the Indonesian Social Context*, ed. M.C. Ricklefs (Clayton, Victoria: Monash University, 1991); Mujiburrahman Al-Banjari, "Historical Dynamics Of Inter-Religious Relations In South Kalimantan," *Journal of Indonesian Islam* 11-1 (2017) 145-174.

²³ For instance, Sjamsuddin, "Fighting Dutch Rule"; Idwar Saleh, "Agrarian Radicalism"; H.G. Mayur S.H., *Perang Banjar* (Banjarmasin, CV.Rapi: 1979)

these were conducted by the population of the Sultan's private lands, for which the Sultan would be held accountable once the criminal investigation was finished. Andresen made clear that the Indies government no longer felt obliged to protect the Sultan against internal opposition, as had been part of the Dutch-Banjarmasin-treaties. He suggested that the Sultan would resign "of his own free will," offering him and his family safe passage to Batavia, an independent investigation in the affairs, a continuing monthly allowance in accordance with his dignity, and the continued right to carry the title of sultan.²⁴ Tamdjidillah, knowing that his life was in danger without the protection of the Dutch,²⁵ had little choice but to "submit to the advice of the Gouvernements Commissaris" under the precondition that a new sultan would be installed according to the Banjarese adat once the uprising had ended and order was restored. He also agreed to surrender the Banjarmasin's regalia the following day.²⁶

The emphasis in Dutch official correspondence on the voluntary character of Tamdjidillah's abdication and surrender of the Banjarmasin regalia probably stems from concerns over the reaction of the Banjarese population and elite. For the same reason they asked Tamdjidillah to write a public announcement in which he declared to resign as a Sultan "out of my own free will and without any coercion."²⁷ Yet, in later sources, when the regalia were already shipped out of Banjarmasin, the official document produced at the moment of surrender was referred to as "the Report of Confiscation," leaving little doubt about its involuntary character.²⁸

On 25 June 1859, the Resident of Southeast-Borneo C.J. Bosch (?-?), together with two lower officials Müller (?-?) and Walbeecken (?-?), went to the Sultan's residence to collect the Banjarmasin regalia. While the Sultan tried in vain to renegotiate some of the agreements of the day before, especially with regards to the conditions of his deportation and his monthly allowance, the state regalia were checked and inventoried by four Banjarese *mantries* and received by Müller and Walbeecken. After this visit the regalia were stored in the Resident's office.²⁹ The sultanate was placed under the temporary government of two princes. Although Tamdjidillah and the Dutch had agreed to install a new sultan after the revolt had ended the Dutch also hinted at the return of Hidayatullah as a new sultan, something that would have been unacceptable for Sultan Tamdjidillah. However, in the course of 1859-1860 Hidayatullah continued to refuse to return from his place in hiding. With no solution in sight and little confidence that a newly appointed sultan would end the revolt, the Netherlands-Indies Government announced on 11 June 1860 to dissolve the sultanate and install a system of direct governance.³⁰ On that same day, the Gouvernements Commissaris sent a letter to the Gouverneur Generaal announcing

²⁴ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 869, verbaal 16 September 1859 no. 29, copy of minutes of 24 June 1859: "(...) uit eigen vrijen wil (...)".

²⁵ Sjamsuddin, "Fighting Dutch Rule", 112; NL-HaNA, Nieuwenhuijzen, 2.21.205.44, inv.nr. 52, 'Resumé der korrespondentie omtrent de aangelegenheden van het Martapoerasche hof', secret letter of 23 February 1858 no. 228 from the Resident to the Gouverneur Generaal, 246.

²⁶ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 869, verbaal 16 September 1859 no. 29, copy of minutes of 24 June 1859: "Dat hij zich ook nu geheel onderwerpt aan den raad van de Gouvernements Commissaris (...)".

²⁷ Ibidem, copy of a translation of the public announcement of Tamdjidillah of 25 June 1859: "(...) uit eigen vrijen wil en zonder eenigen dwang (...)".

²⁸ For instance: "Bestuursvergadering 13 Julij 1861," 122; NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1158, verbaal 10 March 1862, no. 6, minutes of Siedenburg of 14 December 1861: "Proces Verbaal van Afpakking".

²⁹ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 869, verbaal 16 September 1859 no. 29, copy of a letter of the Resident to the Gouvernements Commissaris of 26 June 1859.

³⁰ *Surat-Surat perdjandjian antara kesultanan Banjarmasin dengan pemerintahan-pemerintahan VOC, Bataafse Republiek, Inggeris dan Hindia-Belanda, 1635-1860* (Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, 1965), 264-267.

to send the regalia to the Gouverneur Generaal “because a longer retention [in Banjarmasin] was pointless.” All the regalia would be at the disposal of the Gouverneur Generaal, except the diamond “for which authorisation was requested.” It is not clear what this authorisation implied and who decided that the diamond deserved an alternative treatment, but it is the first time that the diamond was explicitly mentioned as part of the surrendered state regalia and singled out of the larger collection.³¹

We have no actual confirmation of the whereabouts of the diamond in the months after this moment, but when the diamond was boarded to be shipped to the Netherlands, this happened in presence of two officials of the *Directie der Producten en Civiele Magazijnen* [Office of products and civil warehouses].³² This was the depot in Batavia from where all colonial goods and products were transported to the Netherlands or brought to the world market. It is likely that the diamond was temporarily stored by this institution.³³

Two years after the surrender of the Banjarmasin regalia by Tamdjidillah, and one year after their transportation to Batavia, the larger collection was offered to the Bataviaasch Genootschap, which gratefully accepted the donation.³⁴ However, for reasons yet unknown, the 70 carat diamond was again explicitly excluded from the rest of the collection.³⁵ On 26 November 1861 Gouverneur Generaal Sloet (1806-1890) suggested to the Minister of Colonies to give the diamond to Dutch King William III (1817-1890), and to this end, on 16 December 1861, the diamond departed from the harbour of Batavia.³⁶ The diamond was transported with war steamer Ardjoeno, which was the same ship that transported Kolonel Andresen and 150 men to Banjarmasin to quell the revolt, and that had exiled Tamdjidillah to Batavia.

History between 1862 and 1902

On 7 April 1862, at the department of the Ministry of Colonies in The Hague, the Dutch Minister of Colonies Uhlenbeck (1815-1888) unpacked the diamond from its “rotated yellow box,” which was made of boxwood. The diamond was wrapped in paper and cast in heavy silver thread. It was weighed upon departure in Batavia and arrival in The Hague, and both times it measured 70 carat.³⁷ More than four months had passed since the Gouverneur Generaal had announced he would send the diamond to the Netherlands. He asked the Minister of Colonies to consider offering the stone to King William III as a decoration to his royal crown.³⁸ Apparently the minister agreed to have the diamond sent to the

³¹ NL-HaNA, Nieuwenhuijzen, 2.21.205.44, inv.nr. 53, log of correspondence of Governor Commissioner Nieuwenhuijzen, note of an outbound letter of 11 June 1860, no. 176: “vermits een langere aanhouding zonder eenig nut is”. This source also rules out a rumour in Bataviaasch Handelsblad which speculated that Tamdjidillah probably took the ‘famous diamond of the Sultans of Martapura’ with him to Batavia, almost a month after his resignation in June 1859: “Koloniën,” *Rotterdamsche Courant*, October 18, 1859, 1.

³² NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1158, 10 March 1862 no. 6, minutes of C. van Reijn and F.W.H. van Straaten, 14 December 1861.

³³ See also its involvement from 23 June 1860 onwards: NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.30, inv.nr. 7319, Oost-Indische besluiten, 26 November 1861 no. 2.

³⁴ “Bestuursvergadering 13 Julij 1861,” 122-125, 136-137, 219.

³⁵ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.30, inv.nr. 7319, Oost-Indische besluiten, 26 November 1861 no.2.

³⁶ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1158, 10 March 1862 no. 6, letter from the Gouverneur Generaal to the minister of colonies, 26 November 1861.

³⁷ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1173, 24 April 1862 no. 22, receipt note and verbaal 7 April 1862; ibidem, inv.nr. 1437, verbaal 9 February 1864, no. 28, concept minutes.

³⁸ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1158, 10 March 1862 no. 6, letter of the Gouverneur Generaal to the minister of colonies, 26 November 1861.

Netherlands, but was unsure whether the diamond could be donated to the king as a personal gift, or should instead remain property of state.³⁹ On 3 March 1862, while the diamond was on its way to Europe, this question was subject of debate in the Council of Ministers, which decided that it was most appropriate to have the diamond stored in the Museum van Natuurlijke Historie in Leiden as state property.⁴⁰ However, the museum director as well as the director of KKZ in The Hague objected, because they did not have the facilities to guard the diamond properly, and because the gem did not fit in their collections.⁴¹ As an alternative, the Minister of Colonies considered selling the diamond on the market, the revenue of which would be added to the *Batig Saldo*, the yearly sum that the Netherlands Indies had to transfer to the motherland. The Nederlandsche Handel-maatschappij (NHM), the Dutch trading company that had the monopoly to sell colonial products from the Indies to the world market, offered help, suggesting cutting the diamond before bringing it to the market.⁴² However, this time King William III objected against selling the diamond.⁴³ During these months of correspondence, the diamond remained where it had arrived on 7 April 1862: the department of the Ministry of Colonies in The Hague. Pending further decisions about the diamond's destination, the diamond was brought to Dutch national bank, De Nederlandsche Bank, on 22 February 1864 to be stored until further notice. The transfer happened in the presence of diamond broker E. Vita Israel (1831-1915), who examined the gem and determined its weight at 69 and 7/8 carat.⁴⁴

A few years later, in 1869, the Minister of Colonies again proposed the king to sell the diamond and this time the latter approved. The diamond was brought to the NHM on 8 October 1869 and priced 300.000 guilders. The minister and NHM agreed to remain silent about the selling party and the provenance of the object.⁴⁵ Moreover, the NHM advised to have the diamond cut, because "its deviating shape and lesser clarity" would scare off possible buyers.⁴⁶ Buyers were not willing to bear the risk of cutting and possibly ruining the diamond. On 6 May 1870, the minister decided to have the diamond cut by A.E. Daniëls and son, managing directors of the factory of M.M. Coster (1818-1880) in Paris.⁴⁷ The expense for cutting the diamond (2500 guilders) was deducted from the revenue of a 17-carat diamond from Banjarmasin that was sold in 1864.⁴⁸

³⁹ Cf. a debate on the fate of a 17-carat diamond from Banjarmasin which the Gouverneur Generaal suggested to sell to the benefit of veterans' home Bronbeek in the Netherlands: NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1396, 20 October 1863 no. 55.

⁴⁰ NL-HaNA, Ministerraad, 2.02.05.02, inv.nr. 34, Minutes Council of Ministers, 3 March 1862.

⁴¹ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1272, 3 December 1862 no. 23, letter from the Minister of Internal Affairs to the Minister of Colonies.

⁴² NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1278, 22 December 1862 no. 17, letter from the NHM to the Minister of Colonies, 11 December 1862 no. 112 Secret.

⁴³ NL-HaNA, KdK 1841-1897, 2.02.04, inv.nr. 1403, Kabinetsrescript of 26 December 1862 no. 36; Ibidem, inv.nr. 1801, Kabinetsrescript 20 augustus 1869 no. 1, letter from the Minister of Colonies to the king, 12 August 1869 no. 36.

⁴⁴ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1441, verbaal 22 February 1864 no. 9, minutes of transfer between the Minister of Colonies and the DNB. See also *Handelingen der Eerste Kamer*, 27^{ste} vergadering, 30 April 1897, p. 384, interpellation of former Minister of Colonies Fransen van de Putte.

⁴⁵ NL-HaNA, Nederlandsche Handel-Maatschappij (NHM), 2.20.01, inv.nr. 428, minutes of the board meeting, nr. 72, 8 October 1869.

⁴⁶ NL-HaNA, NHM, 2.20.01, inv.nr. 428, minutes of the board meeting, nr. 93, 20 December 1869: "(...) den afwijkenden vorm en van de verminderde zuiverheid (...)".

⁴⁷ NL-HaNA, NHM, 2.20.01, inv.nr. 428, minutes of the board meeting, nr. 93, 9 May 1870; NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 6010, verbaal 6 mei 1870 E5.

⁴⁸ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 2374, verbaal 21 januari 1871 no. 18, letter of the Nederlandse Handel-maatschappij to the minister of colonies, 7 January 1871.

From this moment on, the diamond was no longer 69 and 7/8 carat but was measured at 37 and 3/8 carat.⁴⁹ More importantly, after cutting the cutter had to admit that the it was not as bright as he had hoped and expected but showed a “yellowish tint” that negatively influenced its value.⁵⁰ The price was substantially lowered to 50.000 guilders, but no buyer was found. In 1875, the Minister of Colonies and NHM decided to cancel the sale and await better times. Now that the financial market value of the diamond seemed much lower than expected, according to the minister it no longer weighed up against the historical value of the stone “as a costly memorial of an important event in the history of the Netherlands Indies.”⁵¹

According to a newspaper report from 1883, the diamond was exhibited at the Internationale en Koloniale Uitvoerhandel-Tentoonstelling in Amsterdam, in the showcase of E. Vita Israël (1831-1915). For the occasion, he had borrowed the diamond from the Nederlandse Handel-maatschappij.⁵²

In 1888 it was decided by the government that the diamond would be brought to the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, but awaiting the construction of a special safety showcase the actual transfer was delayed and finally cancelled. The transfer was almost effectuated, but in the closing months of 1897 the Minister of Colonies proposed to put the diamond on sale for a third time, together with a collection of gems from the Lombok treasure. This time, the argument was used that the diamond had lost its historical value after it had been cut and had never been part of the actual Banjarmasin regalia.⁵³ To this end, the diamond was transferred from the Nederlandse Handel-maatschappij to the Amsterdam diamond traders E. and J. Vita Israël, who had examined the diamond in 1864. He tried to auction the gemstone in March 1898. But again without success.⁵⁴ Finally, on 22 August 1902, the diamond was transferred from E. Vita Israel to the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, in permanent loan from the Minister of Colonies.⁵⁵

History since 1902

The diamond, probably because of permanent state of uncertainty concerning its fate, was never officially registered in the inventory of the museum. Between (at least) 1908⁵⁶ and 1918⁵⁷ it was put on display together with another hotly debated collection: the Lombok treasure that was looted from the palaces of the Lombok kingdom in 1894.⁵⁸

⁴⁹ NL-HaNA, NHM, 2.20.01, inv.nr. 6432, minutes of the NHM vault, 26 August 1870; According to a gemmological analysis of S. Van Leeuwen and J.C. Zwaan, the diamond weighs 38.23 carat: S. van Leeuwen and J.C. Zwaan, “Banjarmasin diamond,” *The Journal of Gemmology* (forthcoming).

⁵⁰ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 6013, letter of the Nederlandse Handel-maatschappij to the minister of colonies, 27 August 1870: “(...) een min of meer geelachtigen tint, die van nadeeligen invloed is op de waarde van het juweel.”

⁵¹ NL-HaNA, KdK 1841-1897, 2.02.04, inv.nr. 1801, Kabinetsrescript 20 August 1869 no. 1; NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 2779, verbaal 21 April 1875 no. 19: “(...) een kostbaar gedenkteeken van eene belangrijke gebeurtenis in de geschiedenis van N.I. (...)”

⁵² “De Diamantnijverheid op de tentoonstelling II,” *Nieuwe Amsterdamsche Courant, Algemeen Handelsblad*, May 9, 1883, 5. The author wants to thank Suzanne van Leeuwen for sharing this information.

⁵³ NL-HaNA, KdK 1841-1897, 2.02.04, inv.nr. 2833, Kabinetsrescript 12 April 1888 no. 27; NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 5224, verbaal 2 December 1897 no. 22.

⁵⁴ NL-HaNA, Koloniën / Openbaar Verbaal, 2.10.36.04, inv.nr. 2.10.36.04, Inv.nr. 133, 19 Juli 1902 no. 35.

⁵⁵ NL-HaNA, KdK 1841-1897, 2.02.04, inv.nr. 5237, verbaal 19 July 1902, no. 35, minutes director RMA and broker Vita Israel, 22 August 1902; see also NL-HlMnHA, 476 Rijksmuseum en rechtsvoorgangers te Amsterdam, inv. nr. 1074.

⁵⁶ F. Leviticus, *Geïllustreerde Encyclopaedie der Diamantnijverheid* (Haarlem: De Erven F.Bohn, 1908), 245.

⁵⁷ “Wetenswaardigheden. De Lombokschat in het Rijksmuseum,” *Diamant-Handelsblad, officieel weekblad van de Vereeniging van Kooplieden in Diamant* 21, 7 August 1918.

⁵⁸ Ewald Vanvugt, *De schatten van Lombok: Honderd jaar Nederlandse oorlogsbuit uit Indonesië* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Jan Mets, 1994).

Museum documentation from 1937 indicates that in that year the diamond was brought to a jeweller in Amsterdam, Bonebakker&Zn, probably for maintenance or taxation.⁵⁹ In 1984 the diamond was subject of historical archival research of a Rijksmuseum curator. Only in 2000 was the diamond registered, and in 2013, after a large renovation of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, the Banjarmasin diamond was put on permanent display in a room dedicated to “the Netherlands overseas.”

Suggestions for further research

Archival research in Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia (ANRI) may provide additional documents stored in the archives of the Algemene Secretarie or the Residentie Zuid en Oosterafdeling van Borneo. These documents may shed light on the question why the Gouverneur Generaal selected the diamond, out of all other regalia, as a present to King William III. See for concrete references: NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.30, inv.nr. 7319, Oost-Indische besluiten, 26 November 1861 no.2.

⁵⁹ Objectmap RMA NG-C-2000-3, copy of letter of the conservator of Rijksmuseum to A. Bonebakker, 25 May 1937; NL-AsdSAA, 406 Archief Bonebakker & Zn., inv.nr. 232, Debiteuren Journaalposten 1937, 20 May 1937.