WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

Archives of Russia Seven Years After: "Purveyors of Sensation" or "Shadows cast to the Past"?

Patricia Kennedy Grimsted

Working Paper No. 20
Part I

Washington, D.C.

September 1998

COLD WAR INTERNATIONAL HISTORY PROJECT

THE COLD WAR INTERNATIONAL HISTORY PROJECT
WORKING PAPER SERIES

CHRISTIAN F. OSTERMANN, Series Editor

This paper is one of a series of Working Papers published by the Cold War International History Project of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, D.C. Established in 1991 by a grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Cold War International History Project (CWIHP) disseminates new information and perspectives on the history of the Cold War as it emerges from previously inaccessible sources on "the other side" of the post-World War II superpower rivalry. The project supports the full and prompt release of historical materials by governments on all sides of the Cold War, and seeks to accelerate the process of integrating new sources, materials and perspectives from the former "Communist bloc" with the historiography of the Cold War which has been written over the past few decades largely by Western scholars reliant on Western archival sources. It also seeks to transcend barriers of language, geography, and regional specialization to create new links among scholars interested in Cold War history. Among the activities undertaken by the project to promote this aim are a periodic *BULLETIN* to disseminate new findings, views, and activities pertaining to Cold War history; a fellowship program for young historians from the former Communist bloc to conduct archival research and study Cold War history in the United States; international scholarly meetings, conferences, and seminars; and publications.

The *CWIHP Working Paper Series* is designed to provide a speedy publications outlet for historians associated with the project who have gained access to newly-available archives and sources and would like to share their results. We especially welcome submissions by junior scholars from the former Communist bloc who have done research in their countries' archives and are looking to introduce their findings to a Western audience. As a non-partisan institute of scholarly study, the Woodrow Wilson Center takes no position on the historical interpretations and opinions offered by the authors.

Those interested in receiving copies of the *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* or any of the Working Papers should contact:

Cold War International History Project
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
One Woodrow Wilson Plaza
1300 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20523

Telephone: (202) 691-4110
Fax: (202) 691-4001
Email: COLDWAR1@wwic.si.edu

CWIHP Web Page: http://cwihp.si.edu

COLD WAR INTERNATIONAL HISTORY PROJECT WORKING PAPERS SERIES
Christian F. Ostermann, Series Editor

#1 Chen Jian, "The Sino-Soviet Alliance and China's Entry into the Korean War"

#2 P.J. Simmons, "Archival Research on the Cold War Era: A Report from Budapest, Prague and Warsaw"

#3 James Richter, "Reexamining Soviet Policy Towards Germany during the Beria Interregnum"

#4 Vladislav M. Zubok, "Soviet Intelligence and the Cold War: The 'Small' Committee of Information, 1952-53"

#5 Hope M. Harrison, "Ulbricht and the Concrete 'Rose': New Archival Evidence on the Dynamics of Soviet-East German Relations and the Berlin Crisis, 1958-61"

#6 Vladislav M. Zubok, "Khrushchev and the Berlin Crisis (1958-62)"

#7 Mark Bradley and Robert K. Brigham, "Vietnamese Archives and Scholarship on the Cold War Period: Two Reports"

#8 Kathryn Weathersby, "Soviet Aims in Korea and the Origins of the Korean War, 1945-50: New Evidence From Russian Archives"

#9 Scott D. Parrish and Mikhail M. Narinsky, "New Evidence on the Soviet Rejection of the Marshall Plan, 1947: Two Reports"

#10 Norman M. Naimark, "'To Know Everything and To Report Everything Worth Knowing': Building the East German Police State, 1945-49"

#11 Christian F. Ostermann, "The United States, the East German Uprising of 1953, and the Limits of Rollback"

#12 Brian Murray, "Stalin, the Cold War, and the Division of China: A Multi-Archival Mystery"

#13 Vladimir O. Pechatnov, "The Big Three After World War II: New Documents on Soviet Thinking about Post-War Relations with the United States and Great Britain"

#14 Ruud van Dijk, "The 1952 Stalin Note Debate: Myth or Missed Opportunity for German Unification?"

#15 Natalia I. Yegorova, "The 'Iran Crisis' of 1945-46: A View from the Russian Archives"

#16 Csaba Bekes, "The 1956 Hungarian Revolution and World Politics"

#17 Leszek W. Gluchowski, "The Soviet-Polish Confrontation of October 1956: The Situation in the Polish Internal Security Corps"

#18 Qiang Zhai, "Beijing and the Vietnam Peace Talks, 1965-68: New Evidence from Chinese Sources"

#19 Matthew Evangelista, "'Why Keep Such an Army?'" Khrushchev's Troop Reductions"

#20 Patricia K. Grimsted, "The Russian Archives Seven Years After: 'Purveyors of Sensations' or 'Shadows Cast to the Past'? "

#21 Andrzej Paczkowski and Andrzej Werblan, "'On the Decision to Introduce Martial Law in Poland in 1981' Two Historians Report to the Commission on Constitutional Oversight of the *SEJM* of the Republic of Poland"

#22 Odd Arne Westad, Chen Jian, Stein Tonnesson, Nguyen Vu Tung, and James G. Hershberg, "77 Conversations Between Chinese and Foreign Leaders on the Wars in Indochina, 1964-77"

#23 Vojtech Mastny, "The Soviet Non-Invasion of Poland in 1980-81 and the End of the Cold War"

#24 John P. C. Matthews, "Majales: The Abortive Student Revolt in Czechoslovakia in 1956"

#25 Stephen J. Morris, "The Soviet-Chinese-Vietnamese Triangle in the 1970's: The View from Moscow"

#26 Vladimir O. Pechatnov, translated by Vladimir Zubok, "'The Allies are Pressing on You to Break Your Will...' Foreign Policy Correspondence between Stalin and Molotov and Other Politburo Members, September 1945-December 1946"

#27 James G. Hershberg, with the assistance of L.W. Gluchowski, "Who Murdered 'Marigold'? New Evidence on the Mysterious Failure of Poland's Secret Initiative to Start U.S.-North Vietnamese Peace Talks, 1966"

#28 Laszlo G. Borhi, "The Merchants of the Kremlin—The Economic Roots of Soviet Expansion in Hungary"

#29 Rainer Karlsch and Zbynek Zeman, "The End of the Soviet Uranium Gap: The Soviet Uranium Agreements with Czechoslovakia and East Germany (1945/1953)"

#30 David Wolff, "'One Finger's Worth of Historical Events': New Russian and Chinese Evidence on the Sino-Soviet Alliance and Split, 1948-1959"

#31 Eduard Mark, "Revolution By Degrees: Stalin's National-Front Strategy For Europe, 1941-1947"

#32 Douglas Selvage, "The Warsaw Pact and Nuclear Nonproliferation, 1963-1965"

#33 Ethan Pollock, "Conversations with Stalin on Questions of Political Economy"

#34 Yang Kuisong, "Changes in Mao Zedong's Attitude towards the Indochina War, 1949-1973"

#35 Vojtech Mastny, "NATO in the Beholder's Eye: Soviet Perceptions and Policies, 1949-1956"

#36 Paul Wingrove, "Mao's Conversations with the Soviet Ambassador, 1953-55"

#37 Vladimir Tismãneanu, "Gheorghiu-Dej and the Romanian Workers' Party: From de-Sovietization to the Emergence of National Communism"

#38 János Rainer, "The New Course in Hungary in 1953"

#39 Kathryn Weathersby, "'Should We Fear This?' Stalin and the Danger of War with America"

#40 Vasiliy Mitrokhin, "The KGB in Afghanistan" (English Edition)

Special Working Papers Series

#1 Mark Kramer, "Soviet Deliberations during the Polish Crisis, 1980-1981"

The following study is based on the experience involved in preparation and the data gathered for the collaborative reference volume,

> *ARCHIVES OF RUSSIA: A Directory and Bibliographic Guide of Repositories in MOSCOW and St. PETERSBURG.*
> English-language edition edited by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted; with a preface by the Russian Editor-in-Chief, Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov (Armonk, NY, and London: M.E. Sharpe Publishers, fall 1998).
>
> Compiled by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, Lada Vladimirovna Repulo, and Irina Vladimirovna Tunkina. Edited by Mikhail Dmitri'vich Afanas'ev, Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov, and Vladimir Semenovich Sobolev.
>
> Sponsored by the Federal Archival Service of Russia (Rosarkhiv), the State Public Historical Library, the Historical–Archival Institute of the Russian State University for the Humanities (IAI RGGU), and the St. Petersburg Branch of the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences (PFA RAN).

A parallel Russian-language edition was published in Moscow, April 1997:

> *ARKHIVY ROSSII: MOSKVA–SANKT-PETERBURG:*
> *Spravochnik-obozrenie i bibliograficheskii ukazatel'.*
> Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov, editors-in-chief, Lada Vladimirovna Repulo, compiler-in-chief (Moscow: "Arkheograficheskii tsentr," 1997) – Tel.: (7-095) 245-83-55; Fax: (7-095) 245-30-98; E-mail: ada@glasnet.ru. Available abroad through "Mezhdunarodnaia kniga."
> – Distributed in the USA by Kamkin.
> – Distributed in Europe by Kuban & Sagnor.

Those publications represent output from the Russian archival directory database known as ArcheoBiblioBase, currently maintained under the jurisdication of Rosarkhiv in collaboration with the American editor, Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, and the Russian programmer, Yuri A. Liamin.

ArcheoBiblioBase On Line:

An expanded version of Appendix 2 of the CWIHP version, listing vital date about major federal archives is available electronically on the IISH World Wide website (http://www.iisg.nl/~abb), maintained by the International Institue of Social History (IISH) in Amsterdam.

A variant Russian version is available from the OpenWeb server in Moscow, at the State Public Historical Library (GPIB):

http://www.openweb.ru/koi8/rusarch – or –
http://www.openweb.ru/windows/rusarch.

The Russian version requires a Cyrillic font for Windows or the KOI8 font (also available in a Macintosh version), which are downloadable from several Internet sites.

Updates of basic data about the repositories, including changes in working hours and newly published guides, will be added regularly when available. Plans call for expansion of coverage to include other archives and libraries, information about recently declassified fonds, and other data, as staff and funding permit. (See more details below in the Bibliographic Note and Ch. 12.)

Table of Contents

Part I

Preface to the CWIHP Edition

Over a year has passed since "Shadows" (as my Dutch colleagues nicknamed my study of Russian archives since 1991) went to press in Amsterdam, but most of the problems set forth still persist. Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov, now at the helm of Rosarkhiv for a year and a half, has found keys neither to Stalin's archive nor to viable archival appropriations from the government budget. Although "Five Years" in the original Amsterdam title has now become seven, changes still are not major enough to merit significant revision at this point! It is nonetheless appropriate, as this American edition goes to press, to mention a few new developments "we are following," particularly as they affect foreign researchers and foreign relations with Russian archives.

Chapter 1—"Why Is Stalin's Archive Still Locked Away?"

April Fool's Day 1998 brought a news release, "Stalin's Archive Opened," datelined Moscow, 1 April (AFP); the *New York Times* and other papers added their variants to suggest sensation, while the BBC interviewed another "privileged" historian who had been permitted to use Stalin's personal archive (fond 45) in the Presidential Archive (AP RF—**C–1**). But it turned out to be another abortive news break rather than a public opening of the archives! Many of the as-yet-unspecified number documents released for publication to Aleksandr Iakol'ev's commission dealing with victims of repression were already in the hands of Memorial, and none were turned over to the public federal archive RTsKhIDNI (**B-12**) where they belong. While Edvard Kadzinskii's biography *Stalin* (English edition 1996; Russian edition 1997) enumerates some 18 files from fond 45 that he consulted, there is not a single footnote, and none of those original documents have been made public (only one has been partially published).

Some copies of AP RF documents are among General Volkogonov's papers deposited in the Library of Congress, but they are among the seven out of thirty-one cartons closed to the public until the year 2000, so we cannot even know if there are any from fond 45. An English-language finding aid for the Volkogonov Papers is available on the LC website: (gopher://marvel.loc.gov/00/.ftppub/mss/msspub/fa/v/volkogon.txt), but gives no indication of what the still restricted cartons contain.

Chapter 2—Archival Legal Reform

Still another declassification commission was to be announced by presidential decree early in 1998, now that the earlier commissions have virtually ceased to function (see Denis Banichenko, "Tret'ia tainaia komissiia: Arhivistami chinovnikam vygodnee samim rassekrechivat' dokumenty," *Segodnia*, no. 271 [10 December 1997]). But as of July 1998, no new commission has as yet been appointed, despite further promises, and declassification remains at a virtual standstill. Promised amendments to the February 1995 law regulating public information (**A-32**) and the restrictive July 1996 law "On Participation in International Exchange of Information" (**A-33**) have also still not appeared. There is still no Russian law comparable to the U.S. Freedom of Information

Act, and there is no law regulating or defining information subject to consideration for personal privacy or commercial secrets, and so declassification issues for documentation within those grey areas remain unresolved.

Chapter 4—Overall Archival Organization and Agency Control

In March 1998, the governing board (Collegium) of the Federal Archival Service of Russia (Rosarkhiv) approved an archival reorganization plan involving no less than six federal-level archives which was expected to be implemented in early April. But after Russian President Boris Yeltsin dismissed his cabinet at the end of March, no one was on hand to prepare and sign the necessary regulations or decrees. The plan is considered part of the broader Russian government measures to cut bureaucratic staff and curtail expenses. According to provisional plans, three pairs of federal archives are to be combined— the Russian State Military Archive (RGVA—**B–8**) is expected to absorb its neighboring Center for Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections (TsKhIDK—**B–15**); consisting of "trophy" archives from European countries brought back to Russia after World War II and the records of the NKVD/MVD Administration for Prisoners of War and Internees. A further restructured and subsequently renamed Russian State Archive of Scientific-Technical Documentation (RGANTD—**B–9**) will absorb the Russian State Archive of Sound Recordings (RGAFD—**B-10**). The combined facility will be known as the Russian State Archive of Technotronic (Technical-Media) Documents (RGATD–*Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv tekhnotronnykh dokumentov*). Also as part of the reform, the new RGATD will receive the sound recordings that are now held in the Vladimir branch of the Russian State Archive of Documentary Films and Photographs (RGAKFD–**B–11**). The Vladimir facility will be henceforth closed down, and its documentary film holdings transferred to RGAKFD in Krasnogorsk. Finally, the former CPSU Central Party Archive, now the Center for Preservation and Study of Records of Modern History (RTsKhIDNI—**B–12**) will absorb the former Komsomol Archive, now the Center for Preservation of Records of Youth Organizations (TsKhDMO—**B–14**). In this case, the combined archive, with its headquarters remaining in the building of the former Central Party Archive (now RTsKhIDNI—**B–12**) will be known as the Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History (RGASPI–*Rossiiskii gosudartsvennyi arkhiv sotsial'no-politicheskoi istorii*). The third former CPSU archive for predominantly post-1953 doccumentation (TsKhSD—**B–13**) will remain a separate archive, but will be renamed the Russian State Archive of Contemporary History (RGANI–*Rossiiskii gosudartsvennyi arkhiv noveishei istorii*). As this study went to press in July, Rosarkhiv officials expected the reform would go through within the next month; but, given the possibility that the reform itself would be further delayed or modified in implementation, the details could not be presented in a further revised Appendix 2. When the reform is enacted, it will be announced on the ArcheoBiblioBase websites, and an updated on-line version of Appendix 2 will be issued accordingly.

Chapter 6—Economic Problems and Preservation

Economic problems have gone from bad to abysmal, not only for the archives in Russia, but for cultural institutions across the board. In early November 1997, the militia walked out of major federal archives in protest over non-receipt of back pay; in December the same crisis hit the Tret'iakov Gallery and other museums. In February 1998, federal archives had to close down for a week, because there were no funds to pay the heat bill, when the temperature dropped to –30° C. Archivists in some federal archives have been refusing to work more than half-time, as their low salaries frequently remain over half unpaid. What more can we say?

Chapter 7—Archival Destruction and Retention Policies

No more documentation has been released about past political destruction of records. But it follows from the lack of government appropriations for archives, that federal archivists will have to opt for more destruction for practical reasons, accordingly to still inadequately liberalized appraisal guidelines. But even that is not going to make room to accession more records of Soviet rule, because of inadequate storage space. For example, records of the state television "Ostankino" were scheduled to be transferred to Rosarkhiv, but they still remain in limbo, under the control of the successor privatized company, because no suitable facilities could be found.

Chapter 8—"Trophy" Archives and Non-Restitution

An updated version of this chapter appears as the cover story in *Problems of Post-Communism* (vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 3–16)—"'Trophy' Archives and Non-Restitution: Russia's Cultural 'Cold War' with the European Community," pp. 3-16. Just after it went to press in April 1998, President Yeltsin finally, but reluctantly, signed the law nationalizing all of the trophy cultural treasures and archives brought back to the USSR following World War II (repassed by both houses of Parliament over his veto in May 1997). Simultaneously, he submitted the law to the Supreme Court, but a hearing is unlikely before the fall of 1998. The archive that houses most of the trophy archives, TsKhIDK (**B–15**), is scheduled for abolition as a separate repository. Once that Rosarkhiv reform goes through, the vast archival holdings from all over the European Continent will become part of the federal archive for pre-1940 military records, RGVA (**B–8**). In the meantime, a CD-ROM guide to those TsKhIDK trophy holdings is in preparation by an outside venture, and at least a preliminary rough listing (albeit with no fond numbers) is available on the Internet (see Ch. 12, fn. 284). When Russia was admitted to the Council of Europe in January 1996, it promised to resolve restitution issues with European countries promptly. Such promises are being blatantly overlooked by the Russian Parliament, and restitution negotiations have made no noticeable progress since the return of the Leichtenstein archives in August 1997.

Chapter 10—Fees for Archival Services

Prices for xerographic copies have gone up again in many archives, putting them still further above world standards, and more out of reach to those on student stipends or academic salaries. Archives are lowering the number of files that can be ordered in one day and charging (or threatening to charge) fees for additional files or faster delivery.

Chapter 11—"Commercialization," Collaborative Projects, and Protecting the "National Legacy"

While the Hoover–Chadwyck-Healey project has been winding down to a virtual halt, Rosarkhiv has signed an initial new agreement with Primary Source Media (the successor to Research Publications International) for a new round of microform offerings from federal archives. GA RF (**B–1**) and RGVIA (**B–4**) are the first slated to benefit, but now only with pre-revolutionary offerings, rather than more revealing documentation from the Soviet period. The new Comintern archive project at RTsKhIDNI (**B–12**), sponsored by the Council of Europe and the International Council on Archives, will soon produce digitized images of some files as well as sophisticated electronic reference access for those important records of the international Communist movement during the interwar period. And a complete microfiche rendition of the records of all Comintern congresses and plenums has been completed by Inter Documentation Company (IDC) with a CD-ROM file-level finding aid soon to be released. Meanwhile, the documentary film archive RGAKFD (**B–9**) has signed a long-term twenty-year contract with Texas-based Abamedia for exclusive international distribution rights for film footage. The project also involves the preparation of an electronic catalogue of the RGAKFD holdings (to be made available on the Internet) and a digitized preservation program for its motion-picture holdings.

Chapter 12—Reference Publications and Intellectual Access

A revised and updated version of the original chapter appears in the Winter 1997 issue of the *Slavic Review*. A further updated version of Chapter 12 has been incorporated here, providing more up-to-date reference data for researchers. While more new printed and electronic resources describe the newly opened Russian archives, it is increasingly difficult to find copies or keep track of the innovations. Funds for library reference facilities and electronic catalogues in Russia have not kept pace with the post-1991 information explosion and the information needs of a more open society. It is a sad commentary on conditions in post-Soviet Russia and future Russian scholarship that major U.S. research libraries and cyberspace networks are often better supplied with Russian reference works, and data about Russian reference developments, than libraries or websites in Russia. Forty years ago, when foreigners were first beginning to work in Soviet archives, the opposite situation prevailed.

Chapter 13—Declassification and Research Access

During the first three and a half decades since Stalin's death, only a handful of Western scholars could even begin to work in Soviet archives. In the most recent decade, and particularly since 1991, Russian archives have been thrown open to the world. However, the traumas of transition to an open society and a market economy, with its accompanying "political cross-fire and economic crisis," continue to paralyze the archives and jeopardize researcher access.

With Russia now a member of the Council of Europe, Rosarkhiv and representatives from other archives have been active in the International Council on Archives and have been directly participating in European-wide discussions of archival declassification and access norms. The spring issue of *Otechestvennye arkhivy* (1998, no. 2) published a Russian translation of the latest European draft declaration on principles and procedures with respect to state archival access, together with the minutes of a round-table discussion on the subject held in Moscow in conjunction with the international conference of historians and archivists in November 1997. Such international dialogue may clarify the issues and provide a sounding board for the complaints of researchers and archivists alike. However, the practical problems of declassification and agency control over the highest level files from the repressive Soviet regime remain unresolved in Russia.

The fact that the promised new declassification commission has not been appointed (as noted above with reference to Chapter 2) means that declassification in federal archives has been at a standstill for over a year. In a more positive vein (or perhaps as compensation for the bottleneck), Rosarkhiv, for the first time in early 1998, officially published a thematic list of recently declassified fonds in federal archives under its juridiction (*Bulleten' rassekrechennykh dokumentov federal'nykh arkhivov i tsentrov khraneniia dokumentatsii* [Moscow: Rosarkhiv, 1998; 160 p. tirazh 300 copies.]). While earlier lists had been prepared they were classified for internal use only. However, since the distribution problems described in Chapter 12 have not been remedied, the new volume, of would-be tremendous interest to researchers at home and abroad, is next to impossible to come by. Since the pressrun was so limited, copies are being circulated to archivists, essentially for internal archival use and are not for sale. As of this writing, none have reached major libraries in Russia or the West (nor major archival reading rooms in Moscow), although Rosarkhiv colleagues have kindly assured the present author that my personal copy is on its way to me!

The independent archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have been satisfying the curiousity of a limited number of researchers, and some new collaborative endeavors have resulted in more open files. But AVP RF (**C–2**) is still not releasing any ciphered or deciphered texts, which severely limits the level of "revelations" possible. Earlier restrictions for other categories of documents, such as "memoranda of conversations" from the Cold War years have also not been lifted. The promised AVP RF guide is making slower progress towards a printed or microform edition than would be desireable, as are the release of *opisi* to researchers. With such issues still unresolved, the International Advisory Committee has reached a stalemate that has not excited prospective funding sources. Post-Cold War MFA-State Department collaborative archival endeavors can point to a good example in the published Kennedy-Khrushchev correspondence that appeared as a special volume in the State Department-sponsored series, *Foreign Relations*

of the United States (Washington, DC, 1996). But a Russian-language counter-part is still not available. For international developments during Cold War years, however, what limited progress is apparent in AVP RF is offset by the continued clamp-down on files of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee in TSKhSD (**B–13**, fond 5) and Politburo files that remain in the Presidential Archives.

Records of, and relating to, Soviet-era security agencies to be sure are among the most seriously affected by the declassification impasse. The publication of the second volume of the catalogue of "special files" addressed to Stalin's security chief Leonid Beriia is still held up in press. As of June 1998, still only 700 of the 20,000 documents involved have been cleared for research—the same number that was reported a year ago (see Chapter 12, fn. 308) by the deputy director of GA RF, which is their archival home (**B–1**). A textbook on the structure and development of the KGB and its predecessor agencies issued for staff training in 1977 is now available abroad, thanks to blanket declassification of Soviet-period archives in the now-independent Baltic republics (see Chapter 12, fn. 306). But the "top secret" stamp still prevails for that publication in Moscow. The 1988 directory of MVD records transferred to state archves also remains classified, and the new one has not been publicly released. While more materials continue to be released to major international publication projects for the FSB Central Archive, access for individual researchers not involved with rehabilitation proceedings continues to remain problematic.

Intelligence history, supported by documentation from the major players, holds the key to many nuances of post-revolutionary, and especially Cold War history. Not suprisingly, the archives involved have been the least forthcoming, although apparently, files still under agency control do not require the intervention of the still non-existent state declassification commission. The Foreign Intelligence Service (SVR) has, to be sure, not released any original documents for public research, even in response to the Venona Files that were released in 1995 by the U.S. National Security Agency. (Those deciphered intercepts of Soviet intelligence reports are now all openly available on the Internet as well as in the National Archives.) Two more volumes have appeared of the SVR's own popularized history of its predecessors' foreign operations through 1941 (see fn. 200), but these do not include archival references. Two new SVR-sponsored books have also appeared abroad, but neither contains significant texts of documents nor results from public accessibility to original files. *Battleground Berlin: CIA vs. KGB in the Cold War*, by David E. Murphy, Sergei A. Kondrashev, and George Bailey (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), is collaboratively written by the spy masters who led the battles, with the assistance of a well-informed Radio Libery journalist. High-quality, well documented research, with revealing newly declassified documents from the CIA as well as KGB archives, along with interviews and published sources from both sides of the Atlantic, results in Cold War intelligence history at its best. The preface offers researchers access to CIA documents cited, but that offer does not expand to the selection of roughly 300 documents released to the authors from SVR sources.

Nigel West and Oleg Tsarev's *The Crown Jewels: The British Secrets at the Heart of the KGB Archives* (London: Harper Collins, 1998), on the other hand, "purveys" the well-trodden ground of Soviet espionage achievements in Great Britain through the 1950s. Referencing highly selected tid-bits from the KGB special files of top-secret Whitehall papers sequestered by Soviet master spys (hence the titled code-name), the Russo-British espionage team were again given privileged archival access to the SVR archive in

Yasenevo in the tradition of *Deadly Illusions* (see Chapter 11, fns. 198-199). The "Acknowledgements" assure the reader that "much of the material in this book has not been declassified in the United Kingdom. . ." and that "[v]ery few of the original documents have been sent to the Public Record Office, . . . and none of the original M15 or Secret Intelligence Service material is ever likely to be." While the resulting volumes may prove commercially successful, and even serve post-Cold War SVR public relations interests, their appearance promises no hope for wider access to the SVR inner sanctum, or that any of the declassified documents involved are about to be released to the public or transferred to public archives in Russia.

Representatives of the international project on collectivization in the Soviet countryside in the 1920s and 30s are being given access to the Presidential Archive, AP RF (**C–1**), and more revealing products from those efforts are appearing in print in both Russia and abroad. However, promises that the entire historical part of that archive would be transferred to public archives and opened to society remain a pipe dream. Presidential spokesman Sergei Iastrembskii (Yastrebmsky) openly admitted on April first, "This archive contains documents still unknown to the public." Not only are there more sensations to be purveyed, but there are still many who are not prepared to open all the shadows of the Soviet regime to the world at any price.

Recently, a prominent Russian member of the Academy of Sciences complained in a Russian newspaper interview that foreigners are "buying" access to new "revelations," while Russians have to go through a lengthy clearance for restricted-access files. The charge seems odd coming from a well-known historian who has had highly "privileged access" both to private archives in the United States and even to highly restricted security-service files in Russia. Such charges and counter-charges, even if inappropriate, only highlight the continuing existence of "privileged access" and allegedly of archives in Russia where sensations may be "purveyed." There is still a long and rocky road ahead for democratic public access, although at least the press is now providing an outlet for want of a viable law on "Freedom of Information" and an appropriate public appeal process within Russia. Meanwhile more of society's records are being destroyed, because there are no funds to preserve them, as archival buildings and budgets are being reduced to a shadow of their Soviet past.

Last fall at a banquet celebrating the ten-year anniversary of the Open Society Institute (Soros Foundation) in Moscow, I proposed a toast with two Russian archival colleagues that we could celebrate a new "Open Society" in the archives. "No," one of my Russian friends replied. "If there were really an 'open society' in the archives, then you would have to retire, since there would be nothing more for you to do. Certainly, we don't want that!"

PKG
Cambridge, MA
May Day 1998, updated July 1998

Preface and Acknowledgments

An initial version of the present essay was prepared in early 1996 as an introduction of the collaborative reference volume *Archives of Russia: A Directory and Bibliographic Guide of Repositories in MOSCOW and St. PETERSBURG*. Because many of the issues explored here involve subjective evaluation, the editors decided that it would be more appropriately presented as a separate essay. The text has been subsequently extensively expanded and enriched as a result of later developments, recent published literature, and the author's extensive consultations in Russia.

A number of Western appraisals of the Russian archival scene have appeared recently, including the "Final Report of the Joint Task Force on Russian Archives" of the American Historical Association and the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies in the summer of 1995. Western press criticism of Russian archives has intensified in the wake of the curtailment of the Rosarkhiv joint project with the Hoover Institution of War, Revolution and Peace in December 1995 and the resignation of Rudol'f Germanovich Pikhoia as Chief Archivist of Russia and Chairman of the State Archival Service of Russia (Rosarkhiv, since August 1996, the Federal Archival Service of Russia) in January 1996. Rather than responding directly to the Task Force report or other published accounts in terms of issues with which I disagree, I prefer to present my own review of the current archival scene, to the extent I am acquainted with its various aspects. Essentially completed by May 1996, the essay was revised later in the fall. Just as revisions were being completed, former Deputy Chairman of Rosarkhiv (and my Russian co-editor for ArcheoBiblioBase) Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov was named Chairman and Chief Archivist of Russia on 24 December 1996. A new period begins for Rosarkhiv. The present survey appropriately takes a retrospective look at archival problems and achievements during the first five years after the collapse of the USSR.

This essay accordingly continues and updates (but does not completely supersede) my earlier series of articles published in *The American Archivist*, which survey Russian archival developments since 1988 (see listings in the Bibliographic Note). The subtitle of the last one written in early 1993 still characterizes the archival scene in 1996. Indeed, perhaps the present essay should be better subtitled "Caught between *Increasing* Political Crossfire and Economic Crisis." Since that 1993 article provides more details about many of the issues discussed, citations here emphasize more recent literature and references that were not cited earlier. Chapter 8 updates my study of displaced archives presented in a 1995 IISH Research Paper and my article that appeared in the March 1997 issue of *Contemporary European History*. It was significantly revised in May 1997 with minor updating at press time. Parts of Chapter 12 draw on and update my earlier essay, *Intellectual Access and Descriptive Standards for Post-Soviet Archives: What Is to be Done?* (Princeton: IREX, 1992). A revised version of the present Chapter 12 appeared in the *Slavic Review* in the winter of 1997.

Seven years have elapsed since work with the collaborative archival directory and bibliographic database system known as ArcheoBiblioBase (ABB) first started in Russia in the spring of 1991. My 1993 essay, and the texts of several important archival-related laws were included in the brief, preliminary English-language version of the *Archives of Russia* directory issued by IREX in 1993. Expanded directory-level coverage in parallel English- and Russian-language versions of holdings and related published finding aids

now extends to over 260 repositories in Moscow and St. Petersburg and close to 3,000 bibliographic entries. Bound page-proofs of the Russian-language edition were displayed at the 13th International Congress on Archives in Beijing in early September 1996 and the printed version appeared in April 1997. The English-language edition will follow in fall 1998. Abbreviated directory-level coverage with a bibliography of published guides to state and former Communist Party archives throughout the Russian Federation is in preparation.

ArcheoBiblioBase has been assembled and edited as a joint project with the Federal (earlier State) Archival Service of Russia (Rosarkhiv), the State Public Historical Library (GPIB), the Historico-Archival Institute of the Russian State University for the Humanities (IAI RGGU), and the St. Petersburg Branch of the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences (PFA RAN), with cooperation of the Ministry of Culture, the Mayor's Office in St. Petersburg, and other agencies. The very fact of the close collaboration with Rosarkhiv and other institutions was never possible before 1991 and, as our senior editor, Vladimir P. Kozlov, now Chairman of Rosarkhiv, pointed out in his preface to the 1993 English edition, that cooperation is itself indicative of the changed context of post-1991 archives of Russia.

Since the present essay is an outgrowth of my experience in working on the larger ABB project, it is important to acknowledge the help of the institutions involved, the many individuals in various archives and participating institutions, and many other friends and colleagues who have generously contributed to improvement of the ABB data files and helped us keep the project going, often under difficult circumstances.

The ABB project has been dependent on the financial support of many sources, which likewise deserve thanks in connection with the present essay. In the United States, the project has been housed and developed during my long association with the Ukrainian Research Institute and (before 1997) the Russian Research Center (now the Davis Center for Russian Studies) at Harvard University. From the spring of 1995 through the fall of 1996, an ABB Internet outlet in gopher format was based with the Russian Archive Project at Yale University.

Moscow-based operations for ABB were started in early 1991 with generous funding from the International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX), under an exchange agreement with the Division of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. IREX funding was continued and, in June 1992, an agreement was signed between IREX and what was then the Committee for Archival Affairs of the Russian Federation (Roskomarkhiv) to continue ABB under Roskomarkhiv sponsorship. Subsidiary agreements continued with the State Public Historical Library (GPIB) and, for St. Petersburg coverage, with the St. Petersburg Branch of the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences (PFA RAN). Subsequent funding for Russian operations has been provided by IREX, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Smith Richardson Foundation, and the International Institute of Social History (IISH/IISG – Amsterdam). The Eurasia Foundation supported a crucial workshop in the United States, which allowed our programmers and coordinators from Russia and Ukraine to become acquainted with American Internet developments and to start an experimental ABB Internet outlet at Yale University. During 1996, the Open Society Institute in Moscow provided a grant to double the pressrun of the Russian edition and to upgrade the ABB computer system.

Initially housed at the State Public Historical Library (GPIB), and with the continuing encouragement of GPIB director Mikhail D. Afanas'ev and the GPIB staff, ABB is now housed at the State Archive of the Russian Federation (GA RF) under Rosarkhiv auspices. The ArcheoBiblioBase project is grateful to the OpenWeb Project at GPIB, sponsored by IREX with USIA funding, for providing a Russian-language Internet outlet for summary ABB data. The growing Russian Federation coverage has been particularly assisted by funding from IISH and, for 1997, by a new grant from IREX. Initially, the Ukrainian phase was supported by the Eurasia Foundation, with some subsequent funding from the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. I am exceedingly grateful for all of this support.

I appreciate the constant assistance from the Moscow ABB coordinator, Lada V. Repulo, and the chief Russian editor, Vladimir P. Kozlov. Irina V. Tunkina has assisted with the St. Petersburg data. The entire ABB project has been exceedingly dependent on the assistance of our Russian programmer, Iurii A. Liamin.

Special thanks are due to the many friends and colleagues who have helped me track down appropriate literature and documentation, clarify many specific issues, or who have commented on earlier drafts. These include Mikhail D. Afanas'ev, Vitalii Iu. Afiani, Kirill M. Anderson, Andrei N. Artizov, Aleksandr O. Chubar'ian, Robert W. Davies, Carol Erickson, Boris S. Ilizarov, Igor N. Kiselev, Harold Leich, Sergei V. Mironenko, Tat'iana F. Pavlova, Nikita V. Petrov, and Evgenii V. Starostin. The text benefits particularly from earlier editorial scrutiny and discussion with Sven Holtsmark, Vladimir P. Kozlov, Mark Kramer, and – particularly in connection with their preparation and editing of a forthcoming Russian-language version of this study – with Nikita G. Okhotin and Arsenii B. Roginskii.

It is a particular pleasure to acknowledge the participation of colleagues at the International Institute of Social History (IISH) in Amsterdam. IISH Director, Jaap Kloosterman encouraged the present publication, did much to assist its realization, and personally prepared most of the English-language ABB Internet coverage. IISH editor Aad Blok most ably coped with the frequent reediting that was required by an ever-changing Russian achival scene and an author that was trying to keep the text up to date. Leo von Rossum took much time from his own work for proofreading and consultations. I also appreciate the participation of colleagues at the Cold War International History Project (CWIHP), whose contribution made this an international collaborative effort

The text of this study has been revised and augmented several times since it was initially drafted over a year ago, but it still retains the character of a “working paper.” While hardly definitive on the many subjects covered, it is my hope that it may provide a basic orientation for prospective Western researchers and interested archival observers. At the same time I hope it will engender professional awareness and discussion about prevailing archival problems and developments in the difficult transitional period for Russian archives. In that connection, together with my sponsors, I would welcome comments and suggestions from readers, along with addenda and corrigenda to the text and appendixes that follow.

PKG, Moscow, May Day, 1996
Revised, Cambridge, Massachusetts, December 1996, minor updating Moscow and Amsterdam, April 1997

Technical Note

Transliteration of Cyrillic throughout the text uses the Library of Congress system (modified with the omission of ligatures). Some commonly used geographic terms, such as “oblast'” and “krai” have been anglicized, and hence do not appear in italics – and in the former case, the final soft sign is dropped. Names such as Yeltsin have been retained in the form most generally known in the West, but most others have been rendered in a more strict LC transliteration.

The term “archives” usually appears only in the plural in English, but the singular form in translation from the Russian has been retained here, where appropriate, since the distinction between singular and plural as in Russian usage is important, particularly with reference to a single repository or the records of a single agency.

The archival term “fond” has been anglicized, rather than using an incorrect or misleading translation, such as “fund” or “collection.” The term came to Soviet Russia from the French “fonds,” but not without some change of meaning and usage. Some writers have rendered it in English as “collection,” but in most instances that is incorrect from an archival standpoint, because a “fond” in both French and Russian is basically an integral group of records from a single office or source, usually arranged as they were created in their office of creation, rather than an artificially assembled “collection.” In Russian archival usage, since all archival materials within a given repository are divided into fonds, the term can also embrace “collections” (i.e. archival materials brought together by an institution or individual without respect to their office of origin or order of creation). American archivists might prefer the more technical American “record group,” which in British usage would normally be “archive group,” but the Russian usage of fond is much more extensive, since a “fond” can designate personal papers and/or collections as well as groups of institutional records.

I likewise usually retain the Russian term *opis'* (plural *opisi*); although it could be often correctly rendered as “inventory” or “register” in English, its function is broader. In Russian archival usage, *opisi* serve both an administrative and descriptive function. *Opisi* are the numbered hierarchical subdivisions within a fond that list all of the files, or storage units (*dela* or *edinitsy khraneniia*). Sometimes they represent rational or chronological divisions within a fond (the “series” or “subgroup” in English and American usage), but often they represent *ad hoc* divisions. At one and the same time *opisi* provide official administrative and security control over all file units in the fond and provide a descriptive inventory as the basic finding aid for the fond.

References to post-August 1991 federal laws and other normative acts regulating archives given in parentheses throughout the text are preceded by the letter “A”; full references will be found in Appendix 1. References to federal-level public archives under Rosarkhiv (preceded by “B”) and other major archives under specific federal agencies that have the right to long-term retention of their records (preceded by “C”) refer to those listed in Appendix 2.

In connection with the governmental structural reorganization outlined in the presidential decree of 14 August 1996, the State Archival Service of Russia (*Gosudarstvennaia arkhivnaia sluzhba Rossii*), commonly known by its official acronym, Rosarkhiv, was renamed the Federal Archival Service of Russia (*Federal'naia arkhivnaia sluzhba Rossii* – see “O strukture federal'nykh organov ispolnitel'noi vlasti”: Ukaz

Prezidenta Rossiiskoi Federatsii (14 August 1996), no. 1177, *Sobranie zakonodatel'stva RF*, 1996, no. 34 [no. 4082]). Likewise, names were changed for other state agencies. In a few cases, and specifically the federal security services, names reverted to their older form as a result of a follow-up decree on 6 September ("Voprosy federal'nykh organov ispolnitel'noi vlasti": Ukaz Prezidenta Rossiiskoi Federatsii [6 September 1996], no. 1326, *Sobranie zakonodatel'stva RF*, 1996, no. 37 [no. 4264]).

1. "Why Is Stalin's Archive Still Locked Away?"

In June 1992 a headline in the official government newspaper *Rossiiskaia gazeta* promised that "Stalin's Personal Archive is Being Made Available to the Public."[1] The implication was that, in honor of the first Russian Independence Day (12 June 1992), the Stalin papers that hitherto remained in the still off-limits Archive of the President of the Russian Federation (AP RF – **C–1**), were to be transferred to the Russian Center for Preservation and Study Documents of Modern History (RTsKhIDNI – **B–12**), which had recently been founded on the basis of the former Central Party Archive (TsPA pri IML TsK KPSS). A few days earlier a news bulletin in *Izvestiia*, announced that "secret documents of former CPSU archives would be opened for public use as of 12 June." "In first order, documents created more than fifty years ago would be open for the use of society."[2] That statement was confirmed by the "Temporary Regulation for Access to Archival Documentation," approved by the Russian parliament a week later (**A–6**), which, in addition to assuring public access to archives, gave federal archives and record centers such as RTsKhIDNI under the State Committee on Archival Affairs (Roskomarkhiv, now Rosarkhiv) the right to declassify records created more than fifty years earlier. Thus hopes were still high in mid-1992, as had been promised a year earlier by the presidential decrees of August 1991 (see **A–1** and **A–2**), that the "Archives of the CPSU and KGB would be transferred to the property of the People."[3]

Those hopes and promises have proved illusory. As a prime example, only a relatively inconsequential part of Stalin's papers is held in RTsKhIDNI, where it was open for research already in 1990.[4] A large part of the well-arranged Stalin fond (a collection of his papers from various sources, including part of his personal library), was transferred to the Central Party Archive from the CPSU Central Committee after his death in 1953, and arranged there in connection with the scholarly edition of his papers by IML. It was openly listed (with its ten *opisi*) in the 1993 published guide to RTsKhIDNI, and is described in more detail in the 1996 guide to personal papers in RTsKhIDNI.[5] Many of

---

[1] "Lichnyi arkhiv Stalina stanovitsia dostoianiem obshchestvennosti," *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, no. 132 (10 June 1992), p. 5. The unsigned article, designated as a notice from ITAR–TASS, does not specifically mention AP RF, lacks precision in name of RTsKhIDNI, and gives no attribution for its source of reference.

[2] Minister of Press and Information Mikhail Poltoranin was quoted in a front-page Interfaks bulletin in *Izvestiia*, no. 132 (6 June 1992).

[3] The decrees were explained in interviews with the directors of the State Committee on Archival Affairs of the RSFSR (Roskomarkhiv), as presented in an article by E[lla] Maksimova, "Arkhivy KPSS i KGB perekhodiat v sobstvennost' naroda," *Izvestiia*, no. 205 (29 August 1991), which includes statements by Roskomarkhiv deputy chairmen Anatolii S. Prokopenko, Vladimir A. Tiuneev, and Valerii I. Abramov. See also the summary analysis by Vera Tolz, "New Situation for CPSU and KGB Archives," in RFE/RL, *Report on the USSR* 3:38 (1991), pp. 1–4.

[4] As announced by the TsPA director in an interview in 1990 – "TsPA: "Million dokumentov dostupen issledovateliam" (interview of I. N. Kitaev by V. V. Kornev), *Voprosy istorii KPSS*, 1990, no. 5, pp. 48–49; the fond was further described by the then TsPA Scientific Secretary, Valerii N. Shepelev, "Tsentral'nyi partiinyi arkhiv otkryvaet svoi fondy (informatsiia dlia issledovatelia)," *Sovetskie arkhivy*, 1990, no. 4, pp. 29–30. Professor Robert Tucker from Princeton University was among the first foreign scholars given access to the TsPA Stalin fond in 1990.

[5] The the comprehensive 1993 guide to RTsKhIDNI (see Appendix 2, **B–12**) lists the ten *opisi* of the personal papers of Iosif Stalin as fond no. 558 (16,174 units – covering the years 1866–1986); the 1996

the most revealing Stalin papers and those of his secretariat, however, were never deposited in TsPA. The extent to which Stalin files may have been destroyed has not been publicly documented, although there have been various allegations. While initial plans for a Stalin museum or centralized collection of Staliniana were never realized, most of Stalin's carefully catalogued archive remained under Central Committee control. Indicative of political hesitations (if not duplicity) regarding further transfers of Stalin papers to RTsKhIDNI, the June 1992 article promising public access is missing from the microfilm edition of *Rossiiskaia gazeta* which is circulated to libraries.[6]

The Archive of the President of the Russian Federation (AP RF – **C–1**), then still housed in the Kremlin, had been formally reestablished by President Boris Yeltsin (see **A–35**), a week after he received its contents from Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in December 1991, to retain the ongoing office records of the President together with many top-secret Politburo files (dating back to 1919) and the personal archives of CPSU General Secretaries and other top Soviet leaders.[7] One of the first newspaper revelations of its existence and content in January 1992 was appropriately entitled "Who Controls the Past Controls the Future."[8] In a Fall 1991 interview published in the Roskomarkhiv journal, *Otechestvennye arkhivy* (significantly revamped from its Glavarkhiv predecessor *Sovetskie arkhivy*), Roskomarkhiv Chairman Rudol'f Germanovich Pikhoia promised Roskomarkhiv efforts to assure transfer to public custody from the Presidential Archive. The February 1992 presidential regulation (**A–36**) that outlined the functions and authority of the archive mentioned nothing about the historical part of its holdings. The extent and importance of that documentation became increasingly clear during the summer of 1992, when sensational archival revelations were being released to the Constitutional Court in a political effort to outlaw the Communist Party. Copies of other selected documents were being carried abroad by Yeltsin and his aids for diplomatic attempts to build new bridges with Eastern Europe and expose more details of various Cold War crises. But such utilization and manipulation of selected archival sources demonstrated the extent to which the archives were "being used or abused," as one journalist put it in 1992, to "load political pistols."[9]

---

guide to personal fonds (also listed there) provides more details about the contents. The unusually detailed *opisi* themselves (although not the documents described) are now available on microfilm from Chadwyck-Healey as part of the Hoover project.

6 That article cited in fn. 1 is missing from page 5 of the 10 June issue (and has not been located in neighboring issues either) in the library microfilm edition held in Widener Library at Harvard University; in its place is a column headed "Chitatel' predlagaet," with the lead story from the pensionneer V. Steinberg (from Makhachkala) recommending a "store for invalids" – "Magazin dlia invalidov"!

7 The secret orders of Gorbachev transferring high-level CPSU documentation to the Archive of the President of the USSR in June 1990, and then transferring that archive, together with documentation from the Politburo archive, to Russian President Yeltsin (23 December 1991), were published in early 1995 (see **A–35**).

8 Evgenii Kuz'min, "Kto kontroliruet proshloe, tot kontroliruet budushchee – 'Sekretnyi arkhiv' Gorbacheva," *Literaturnaian gazeta*, no. 3 (15 January 1992), p. 11.

9 See, for example, Betsy McKay, "Archival Revelations Load Political Pistols," *Moscow Times*, no. 29, (12 June 1992), p. 1, and with more details in Vera Tolz and Julia Wishnevsky, "The Russian Government Declassifies CPSU Documents," *RFE/RL Research Report* 1 (26 June 1992), p. 11. See other citations in Grimsted, "Russian Archives in Transition," esp. pp. 631–32.

A little publicized March 1994 decree pertaining to AP RF (**A–37**) clearly provided for presidential authority over its high-level historical treasures. Criticism about the extent to which key CPSU files dating back to 1919 were inaccessible to the public at large and apparently being guarded for privileged access climaxed with an *Izvestiia* article in July 1994. Entitled "Purveyors of Sensations from the Archive of the President," the article emphasized that the Presidential Archive "remains an oasis of the socialist system of information privileges."[10] General Dmitrii Volkogonov, who was named in the article as one of the privileged few, in a rebuttal several days later, denied that he had been given special access.[11] In fact, Volkogonov apparently did not have full access to the Stalin papers under Politburo control for his biography of Stalin published in 1989 (and/or was not permitted to cite those he had seen), despite his extensive access to many hitherto unavailable sources.[12] Volkogonov became the virtual court historian for the Yeltsin administration and in 1991–1992 headed the presidential commission for transfer of CPSU and KGB records to publicly available archives. The preface to the English translation of his 1992 biography of Lenin brags that the general was "the first researcher to gain access to the most secret archives." Although the preface further claims that all files cited are now available in public archives, in fact, the book cites many files that are still not publicly released.[13] That situation is again indicative of what *Izvestiia* described as "a

---

[10] See the article by Ella Maksimova, "Prodavatsy sensatsii iz Arkhiva Presidenta," *Izvestiia*, no. 131 (13 July 1994), p. 5. See also the subsequent letter by Stephen Cohen, one of the few American scholars to have had access to AP RF, assured readers that he received copies of Bukharin materials without charge – "Na Nikolae Bukharine presidentskii arkhiv deneg ne delal," *Izvestiia*, no. 156 (17 August 1994), p. 5.

[11] See Dmitrii Volkogonov, "Nel'zia vo vsem videt' zloi umysel," *Izvestiia*, no. 135 (19 July 1994), p. 5.

[12] The removal of Stalin papers from military archives after the 20th CPSU congress was confirmed in a 1988 interview by D. A. Volkogonov, but he does not mention those from TsPA or the Presidential Archive – "My obiazany pisat' chestnye knigi," *Krasnaia zvezda* (26 July 1988), p. 2. Although not mentioned in the interview, Volkogonov had just completed his book on Stalin and had been given access to many Stalin files not hitherto available. There are, however, no references to Stalin's personal archive or the archive of his secretariat in his book that first appear in Russian as *Triumf i tragediia: Politicheskii portret I. V. Stalina*, 2 vols. (Moscow: Novosti, 1989); English translation by Harold Shukman (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1991).

[13] Harold Shukman, "Translator's Preface," to Dmitrii Volkogonov, *Lenin: A New Biography*, English translation by Harold Shukman (New York: Free Press, 1994), p. xxv (The two-volume Russian edition first appeared in 1992). The Preface claims that "all the documents cited in this book can be seen at the various locations indicated. Documents from the Archives of the President of the Russian Federation (APRF) have been transferred from the Kremlin to the archives of the former Central Committee (RTsKhIDNI and TsKhSD)," p. xxv. According to Mark Kramer, as explained in his obituary of Volkogonov, those two sentences did not appear in the galley proofs he had been given for review – *Cold War International History Project Bulletin*, no. 6–7 (Winter 1995–1996), p. 93. The fact of their inclusion in the final book indicates that they were taken seriously, but unfortunately they were not fulfilled during Volkogonov's lifetime or subsequently.
In 1996, part of the personal papers of Russian historian and General Dmitrii A. Volkogonov, including his copies of documents from many Russian archives were deposited in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress. However, seven of the thirty-one containers remain classified, and among them Volkogonov's copies of documents from the Archive of the President of the Russian Federation (AP RF – C-1). An English-language finding aid for the Volkogonov Papers is available on the LC website (gopher://marvel.loc.gov/00/.ftppub/mss/msspub/fa/v/volkogon.txt).

dangerous precedent, when alas, not all of society is eager to dig itself out of the prison of lies of its 70-year history."[14]

A presidential decree of September 1994 provided for declassification and increased transfers of CPSU documentation to public repositories. Nevertheless, privileged publication continues, as tantalizing Stalin documents from the Presidential Archive, including his office appointment register, have recently been appearing in various journals and published documentary collections.[15] Meanwhile, however, the editors of the acclaimed Yale University Press edition of *Stalin's Letters to Molotov, 1925–1936* – prepared from the Stalin fond in RTsKhIDNI – had to apologize, even in the 1995 Russian-language edition, that "explanatory documentation relating to many of the questions to which Stalin was referring still remains in secret storage in AP RF."[16] By the end of 1996 no additional Stalin papers nor the archive of his secretariat have been transferred to RTsKhIDNI.

A November 1995 newspaper headline "Shadows Cast to the Past – Why is Stalin's Archive Still Locked Away?" featuring an interview with then Rosarkhiv Chairman Rudol'f Pikhoia, left the real answer as murky as ever. Neither his interviewer nor his archival colleagues were satisfied with Pikhoia's explanation that Stalin's papers were in "an absolutely disarranged condition" that would require several more years of "technical processing" (*nauchnaia obrabotka*).[17] As if to justify the situation, Pikhoia appropriately tried to explain some of the legal and procedural problems currently facing archival declassification in Russia, whereby it is still "much easier to label a document 'secret' than to remove the stamp." Symbolically, during his five years in office, he had failed to break the seal on the Stalin archives. "Archives," Pikhoia suggested, "are the shadows that the state casts out to the Past. In sunshine – one thing, in foul weather – another."[18]

By the time that interview was published, the weather was fouler for Pikhoia himself in terms of his chairmanship of Rosarkhiv. His own term of office was definitively cast out to the past when his resignation was accepted by President Yeltsin effective 20 January 1996, following a unanimous vote in the Rosarkhiv governing Collegium (*kollegiia*) in December to curtail Pikhoia's favored foreign collaborative project with the Hoover Institution and the British microform publisher Chadwyck-Healey, which effectively amounted to a vote of non-confidence in Pikhoia's administration by his archival peers. According to archivists present, who may have had their own reasons to

---

[14] Maksimova, "Prodavatsy sensatsii iz Arkhiva Presidenta," *Izvestiia*, no. 131 (13 July 1994), p. 5. See more details on this matter below, Ch. 13, fns. 444–447.

[15] See, for example, "Posetiteli kremlevskogo kabineta I. V. Stalina: Zhurnaly (tetradi) zapisi lits, priniatykh pervym gensekom, 1924–1953 gg.," *Istoricheskii arkhiv*, 1994, no. 6, 1995, nos. 2–5/6, 1996, no. 1. See also the continuing series of AP RP publications from the Stalin papers in the journal *Istochnik*.

[16] I quote from the preface to the Russian edition, which appeared a year after the Yale English version – *Pis'ma I. V. Stalina V. M. Molotovu, 1925–1936 gg.: Sbornik dokumentov*, compiled by L. Kosheleva, V. Lel'chuk, V. Naumov, O. Naumov, L. Rogovaia, and O. Khlevniuk (Moscow: "Rossiia Molodaia," 1995).

[17] Ella Maksimova, "Ten', otbroshennaia v proshloe: Pochemu arkhiv Stalina vse eshche pod zamkom?" (interview with Rudol'f Germanovich Pikhoia), *Izvestiia*, no. 208 (2 November 1995), p. 5. Rosarkhiv Chairman V. P. Kozlov assured the present author that the Stalin papers in AP RF are all well-processed with thorough finding aids.

[18] Maksimova, "Ten', otbroshennaia v proshloe," p. 5.

push for his resignation, it was the first time in five years that his colleagues succeeded in getting the Hoover project on the Collegium agenda.

"How Much Is Our History Worth?" queried the headline by the same journalist who had interviewed Pikhoia two months earlier, reflecting the continued nationalist political criticism of the unpopular Hoover project, involving the commercial availability abroad of copies of twentieth-century Russian archival materials.[19] There had also been serious criticism of the project within Rosarkhiv from the start, as well as in parliament and the press, involving much broader issues that should not be categorized simply as conservative versus democratic, or Russia versus the West. Pikhoia had personally pampered the Hoover project, often to the exclusion of others and, as pointed out in *Izvestiia*, allegedly without adequate compensation for or consultation with the Russian archives involved. But there was no adequate explanation in the press of the broader professional grounds for opposition to Pikhoia's administration or that he had himself been considering departure from Rosarkhiv for some time.

The fact that the Rosarkhiv decision regarding the Hoover project in December coincided with the resurgence of the Russian Communist Party and further conservative backlash in the Duma elections was largely fortuitous. The coincidence may not have negatively influenced the Collegium action, which was not otherwise reported in print, and hence it was understandably picked up in Western press accounts and retrospective analyses of the abrupt curtailment of the Hoover project. At the time of his departure from office, Pikhoia may have been pictured on Russian television together with other Western, reform-oriented members of the Yeltsin Administration (such as Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev and Deputy Prime Minister Anatolii Chubais), who lost their positions to the resurgent anti-Western and nationalist political forces. Many archivists close to the scene, however, dismiss such political motives in the Rosarkhiv vote to curtail the project or in Pikhoia's departure. The lack of open public explanation, together with the curious attempt to involve American Russia scholars in an electronic-mail letter-writing campaign in support of Pikhoia, led to a host of rumors and speculation at a time when the Russian archival world hardly needed more controversy.[20]

---

[19] See Ella Maksimova, "Skol'ko stoit nasha istoriia? O prichinakh razryva rossiisko-amerikanskogo dogovora po arkhivam," *Izvestiia*, no. 9 (17 January 1996), p. 5. Maksimova is usually much better informed in her coverage of the Russian archival scene than was the case in this article. But apparently, Rosarkhiv officials were not ready for open public comment, especially before Pikhoia's resignation had been accepted by President Yeltsin. See more details about this matter below, Ch. 11, fns. 211–217.

[20] See, for example, James Gallagher, "Scholars in Russia Feel Chill of a Communist Comeback," *Chicago Tribune*, 11 March 1996, p. 1. Gallagher claimed without adequate substantiation, "Russians and Americans involved in the project concede privately that the Communist Party's political comeback played the major role in the cancellation." See also the article by Amy Magaro Rubin, "Russians Threaten to End Project Giving Scholars Access to Soviet Papers," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 9 February 1996, p. A39, which likewise inappropriately places the blame on "the resurgence of the Communist Party." A more balanced account by Charles Hecker, "Hoover Deal for Archives in Jeopardy," *Moscow Times*, 25 January 1996, included statements by Hoover Deputy Director Charles Palm and historical consultant for the project Jana Howlett, as well as the critical views of Kirill Anderson, Director of RTsKhIDNI. The *Moscow Times* story was reprinted by IISH in *Social History and Russia*, no. 4 (1996), p. 1. An appraisal by the American historian J. Arch Getty appeared later in the spring in the newsletter of the American Historical Association – "Russian Archives: Is the Door Half Open or Half Closed?" *Perspectives* 34: 5 (May–June 1996), pp. 19–20, 22–23. Getty's analysis, which was unfortunately marred by several factual errors, was sharply criticized by a number of those involved with the Hoover project in Russia. See the reply by

During his five years as Chief Archivist of Russia, Pikhoia may have presented a reform orientation in some Western circles, but many followers of the archival scene were less impressed with his administration. Despite his favored position in the inner presidential circles from Ekaterinburg (Sverdlovsk) – with his wife a speech writer for the President – Pikhoia was increasingly under fire from the research and archival community within Russia for failing to produce adequate archival reform or sufficient financial provisions for the archives themselves. He was seriously criticized by many in the European Community for not achieving restitution of the vast "trophy" archives in Moscow from a host of European countries. Many of the persisting problems in the archival realm were, to be sure, beyond Pikhoia's means to remedy, given the persisting economic and political crisis within Russia during the period. Nevertheless, despite many setbacks and unfulfilled promises, there were many positive developments and substantial archival reform during Pikhoia's term of office, as he himself points out in a lengthy article published in the recently revived scholarly journal *Istoricheskiie zapiski*.[21]

Indicative of the political importance of the Politburo archives and archival affairs in post-August 1991 Russia, Rosarkhiv headquarters is located in the building on *Staraia Ploshchad'* that previously housed the headquarters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the existence of whose archives before August 1991 was hardly even known to the population at large. But neither Rosarkhiv's symbolic location, nor the fact that the Presidential Archive has since been moved to an adjoining building on *Staraia Ploshchad'*, has assured Rosarkhiv's control or public access to many of the Stalin papers and other "shadows of the past."

Following Pikhoia's departure and the Communist electoral resurgence in December 1995, there were new fears on the part of researchers that many of the gains in archival openness during the past five years would be reversed. Obviously during the bitter pre-election maneuverings in spring of 1996, none of the contenders wanted more ghosts of the past threatening their bids for the presidential post. There were even threats that Rosarkhiv would lose its posh offices in the former Central Committee headquarters. "A worst-case scenario" suggested by one Western journalist in March 1996, "has the victorious Communist Party reclaiming the still largely-unexplored Communist Party archives as their private property and then clamping a lid on them."[22] Subsequently, the press center for presidential candidate Gennadii Ziuganov gave assurances that there were no plans to close any archives if he were chosen president.[23] Apparently, even the CP RF side recognized that such a development would make a mockery of the archival reform

---

Charles Palm, "Hoover Institution Takes Issue with Getty Interpretation of Russian Archive Situation," in a letter to the editor, followed by Getty's reply, *Perspectives* 34: 9 (December 1996), pp. 33–35. See more details below, Ch. 11, section 2.

21 Rudol'f G. Pikhoia, "Arkhivnye strasti," *Istoricheskie zapiski* 1(119) (Moscow: "Progress," 1995), pp. 230–63.

22 See, for example, the tendentious article cited above by Gallagher, "Scholars in Russia Feel Chill of a Communist Comeback," *Chicago Tribune*, 11 March 1996, p. 1. There were to be sure rumors of such threats circulating in Moscow, as Gallagher noted, but they were not substantiated.

23 Such assurances came in a telephone inquiry at the end of May 1996 on behalf of the present study. According to the commentator there, Ziuganov's aide A. A. Shabanov gave an interview to that effect recently to an American journalist, but more details were not available. He also added that efforts would be made to locate some parts of the Central Committee records allegedly missing since August 1991.

which, despite numerous problems (to be discussed below), has at least tentatively established a normative basis for archival affairs.

One long-experienced British historian, Robert W. Davies lauds the extent to which "access to the Russian archives has been miraculously transformed since 1988." But, first in an article published in February 1996, and in more detail in a book appearing in early 1997, after noting the remaining closure of the KGB and Presidential archives, and the recent "reclassification" of archives opened only a few years ago, aptly queries "Is Yeltsin orchestrating the archives?"[24] Just before that article appeared, President Yeltsin himself spoke out at the end of February 1996 against the "real mania" of "hypertrophied secretiveness" of the Soviet regime and the "recent new brakes on declassification of archival documents."[25] But that did not change the list of topics that were to be considered state secrets according to the presidential decree signed at the end of November 1995 (**A–22**). Nor has it led to a more progressive declassification policy or, as will be seen below, any brakes on the continued agency control over key contemporary official records of state and security organs. Davies most appropriately concludes that the "battle for the archives has not yet been won." He quite realistically notes that, by the fall of 1994, and even a year later, "it was abundantly clear that there was no intention of transferring the whole of the historical part of AP RF. In particular, the archives of the successive General Secretaries, including the crucial Stalin archive, were not to be transferred."[26] Given subsequent developments through the end of 1996, there is little hope for researchers or the public at large that his conclusion will soon be proved wrong.

As "political crossfire and economic crisis" increase, an examination of the archival situation five years after the nationalization of the CPSU archives is in order in a broader context. Concentration on the secrets of the Stalin years and the Soviet regime it established is crucial for the Russian public if a more open post-Soviet society is to emerge. But as the continuing political crossfire makes clear, there are many in Russia that are not ready for such an eventuality. There are some who do not appreciate the progress that has been made in the archival realm, while others fear its impending eclipse. Still others remain suspect that regardless of what political factions may be in power, the state will continue to control the sources to be revealed, imperial Russian or Soviet style, through official "white books" or "black books" of selected documents, rather than revealing the whole range of "raw" sources on which more openly democratic historical inquiry should proceed.

Public access is only part of the problem – Other important questions need to be asked as well: Has a legal basis for public access to government records really been established? Are crucial agency records being brought under federal public archival

---

[24] "Russian History: The Battle for the Moscow Archives – With the end of communism in Russia, long-secret archives were thrown open. Or were they?" *The Economist*, 2 March 1996, pp. 88–89. The unsigned article is drawn largely from a section "The Battle for the Archives," in the subsequently published book by Robert W. Davies, *Soviet History in the Yeltsin Era* (London: Macmillan, 1997; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), pp. 81–114. I am in general agreement with Davies' assessment of the archival situation, and especially his concluding concern about the persisting problems limiting access. I particularly appreciate Davies' making a copy of his study available to me in advance of publication.

[25] See the full text of Yeltsin's annual presidential address to the Russian parliament "Poslanie Prezidenta Rossiiskoi Federatsii Federal'nomy Sobraniiu – Kurs preobrazovanie ne ostanovit'," *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, no. 39 (27 February 1996), p. 5.

[26] Davies, *Soviet History in the Yeltsin Era*, p. 114.

control? Have appraisal guidelines been adequately revised to provide for retention and prevent destruction of materials appropriate to documenting the broad history of Russian and Soviet society? Is the new Russian government providing adequate funds from the state budget for archival services so that the records of the Russian past can be adequately preserved for future generations? Is there adequate compensation for qualified staff so that trained archivists are not being drawn off to the commercial sector or being tempted to resort to purveying sensations? Is there adequate intellectual access with newly available directories and finding aids, conforming to new international standards for archival description? Are copying facilities available at prices researchers can afford, and are copying policies in line with international practices? These are questions that a new Chief Archivist of Russia will have to answer and demonstrate if he can do better than his predecessor in prying open the lock on Stalin's archive, within the increasingly uncertain context of post-Soviet political crossfire and economic crisis.

2. Archival Legal Reform

Although there is a pronounced tendency today at home and abroad to interpret archival developments purely in light of the evolving political situation, nevertheless, many important "ups and downs" of archival openness have been affected by new laws and regulations of the Russian Federation. Although the revolutionary changes many anticipated in the euphoria following the abortive August 1991 coup and the subsequent collapse of the USSR have not come to pass, nonetheless, major archival reform has been codified in normative acts, almost all of which are open and available for public consultation (65 recent laws and decrees are listed in Appendix 1). Over the past five years, since the Committee on Archival Affairs of the Russian Federation (Roskomarkhiv) assumed control of the archival administration of the Russian Federation in 1991, its renamed successor Rosarkhiv – most recently in August 1996 renamed the Federal Archival Service of Russia (*Federal'naia arkhivnaia sluzhba Rossii*) – has been trying to establish a reformed, normative, legal basis for Russian archives. Rosarkhiv has been directly involved in the preparation of a series of archival laws and other normative acts, of agreements for the transfer of records from agency archives and for increasing the pace of declassification to insure public access in line with – and in some cases surpassing – other liberal democratic countries in the world. A number of other laws also affect archives, especially those not administered by Rosarkhiv, but which, in some cases, conflict with the basic laws pertaining directly to archives. A helpful brief review of the legal situation affecting archives by a Rosarkhiv specialist has recently appeared.[27] But we need to take a more a critical view of the overall results of archival legal reform, which, at least to an outsider, appear unclear and often contradictory.

Post-1991 reform efforts followed in the wake of the ultimate failure under Glavarkhiv to come up with a satisfactory law on archives – despite considerable discussion of archival reform during the final years of Soviet rule in the context of *glasnost'* and *perestroika*. Recently, more information has been coming to light about the efforts at legal reform under Gorbachev, including hitherto unknown details about the abortive Glavarkhiv draft law.[28] Following the suppression of the attempted August coup in 1991, a number of the reform-oriented archivists who had been earlier involved in the unofficial "alternative" draft (in opposition to the proposed Glavarkhiv law) were directly involved in drafting the new laws providing for archival reform.

As one of the most important first steps, CPSU archives were nationalized and brought under state archival authority in August 1991 (**A–1**); federal "documentary centers" were organized on their basis by October 1991 (**A–4**), at the same time

---

[27] Andrei N. Artizov, "Arkhivnoe zakonodatel'stvo Rossii: sistema, problemy i perspektivy (k postanovke voprosa)," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 4, pp. 3–8. Artizov's article appeared as the present article was in the final editorial stage, so it has not been possible to incorporate all of the materials or discussion presented. Artizov reports that a more detailed review and collection of laws is in preparation.

[28] See the recent article about the preparation of the Glavarkhiv law by Andrei V. Elpat'evskii, "Iz istorii nepriniatogo zakona," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 4, pp. 9–15. The earlier pre-1991 Soviet discussion, with citations to published versions of the alternative law and the controversy it aroused, is characterized in Grimsted, "*Glasnost'* in the Archives?: Recent Developments on the Soviet Archival Scene," *American Archivist* 52 (Spring 1989), pp. 214–21, and *Perestroika* in the Archives?: Further Efforts at Soviet Archival Reform," *American Archivist* 54 (Winter 1991), pp. 85–95.

Roskomarkhiv formally took over the federal archives and archival administration previously under Glavarkhiv SSSR (**A–3**).[29] By June 1992 open access to federal archives and their finding aids was assured in provisional Rosarkhiv regulations (**A–6**), which provided for records to be open for research by citizens and foreigners alike thirty years after their creation, insofar as the information contained "does not constitute a state secret or other type of secret defined by law." Documents "containing information on the private lives of citizens," however, were to be subject to a seventy-five year closure rule. Although there were no provisions for automatic declassification, that regulation included the important authority for federal archives themselves to declassify most records (i.e. those held in state archives) 50 years from the date of their creation, including former CPSU documentation. The Basic Legislation on Culture enacted in October 1992 (**A–9**) legally assured public access for citizens and foreigners alike to archival materials in the cultural sphere, such as those in libraries and museums, without any time limit or formal restrictions mentioned.

A year later in July 1993, the "Basic Legislation of the Russian Federation on the Archival Fond of the Russian Federation and Archives" (**A–12**) became the first legislative-enacted archival law in Russian history. It provided for the organization of federal archives, guaranteed preservation and public access to government records and other holdings in state archives, and assured state responsibility for the archival legacy of the nation. A thirty-year rule for most records, and seventy-five for documents relating to personal privacy, confirmed the 1992 provisions. Archivists enthusiastically endorsed the new law which, they were convinced, would put the operation of archival affairs on a normative basis.[30] But federal ministries and other high-level agencies were less pleased, because they saw in the law a curtailment of their own control over records of their agencies, where many of the Soviet-era *nomenklatura* and procedures still held sway.

The law "On State Secrets" enacted a month later (**A–18**) provided a legal basis hitherto lacking in that realm, aside from the earlier provisional presidential decrees. That new federal legislation, however, belied a step backwards for declassification and public access. The provision of the Rosarkhiv 1992 decree that federal archives themselves could declassify records they held that were over fifty years old was effectively rescinded. The law gave more control to record-creating agencies or their successors, and especially to security organs, whose representatives were to participate in an official State Technical Commission for the Protection of State Secrets, which henceforth was to become the arbitrator of declassification measures. Operations of the Technical Commission were constrained by the lack of permanent staff and an operating budget, and little incentive for

---

[29] See further discussion and citations to relevant literature in Grimsted, "Beyond *Perestroika*: Soviet Archives after the August Coup," *American Archivist* 55 (Winter 1992), pp. 94–124. See the comments on these initial legal developments by the then Roskomarkhiv Chairman Pikhoia, "Arkhivnye strasti," *Istoricheskie zapiski* 1(119) (Moscow: "Progress," 1995), especially pp. 235–42.

[30] See the commentary of those archivists involved in drafting the new law – A. N. Artizov, B. S. Ilizarov, V. P. Kozlov, R. G. Pikhoia, V. A. Tiuneev, S. O. Shmidt, and Ia. N. Shchapov, "Osnovy zakonodatel'stva Rossiiskoi Federatsii ob Arkhivnom fonde RF i arkhivakh: idei, printsipy, realizatsiia," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1993, no. 6, pp. 3–9. See also, for example, the separate commentary of V. P. Kozlov in *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia*, 1993, no. 6, pp. 12–15, following the text of the law itself (pp. 3–11). Kozlov's further analysis appears as a preface in *Archivy Rossii* and the forthcoming Englsih version, *Archives of Russia*. Reactions about the new law were also heard at the Rosarkhiv conference in October 1993, as reported in *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1993, no. 6, pp. 9–16.

frequent meetings. In the case of agencies that had no successors, such as the CPSU, declassification was to be handled by an Interagency Commission with representatives from security organs, although the commission itself was not appointed at that time.

Furthermore, there were no time limits for classified status or automatic declassification. Nor were there provisions for citizen appeal, such as is operative under the Freedom of Information Act in the U.S. Since the new law provided more stringent declassification procedures than had existed during the past two years, almost immediately, researchers found that extensive runs of contemporary documents that were earlier accessible were withdrawn as not having undergone appropriate declassification. In general, as a result of the new law, researchers could expect significant delays and serious gray areas in the declassification process. Subsequent complaints about excessive levels of state secrecy have been rampant in the research community and those monitoring human rights and rehabilitation issues. Rosarkhiv itself, recognizing the conflict between the "Basic Legislation" on archives and the law "On State Secrets," appealed for legal resolution to the Procurator General's office. But the Procurator General's office, as Rosarkhiv Chairman Pikhoia explained in a public interview, was "not prepared to answer that type of question."[31]

With an increasingly hostile parliament in the fall of 1993 and an increasingly nationalistic and conservative legislature after the December 1993 elections, more presidential decrees rather than federal laws defined the legal framework for archives and state secrets. Of particular importance was the March 1994 presidential decree which confirmed revised regulations (*polozhenie*) "On the Archival Fond of the Russian Federation," and "On the State Archival Service of Russia (Rosarkhiv)" (**A–14**). Those regulations effectively rewrote some parts of the 1993 Basic Legislation, and especially clarified the extended content of the "Archival Fond RF" (see below) and the functions of Rosarkhiv as the state archival administrative agency. The March 1994 Regulation also augmented the status of state agency archives, specifically giving a number of federal agencies the right to long-term retention of their records before transfer to public archives under Rosarkhiv.

Several subsequent regulations and presidential decrees have clarified declassification procedures for different types of records in the wake of the law "On State Secrets." The bottleneck which had been created for declassification of CPSU documentation was resolved by a September 1994 presidential decree appointing a new declassification commission for former CPSU files (**A–24**), chaired by Sergei Nikolaevich Krasavchenko, First Deputy Director of the Presidential Administration. This decree came soon after the press outcry about "Purveyors of Sensations from the Archive of the President" (AP RF – **C–1**) in the summer of 1994, and also called for transfer of more CPSU documentation to public archives. Subsequently, the Krasavchenko Commission, as it has come to be known, has been responsible for declassification in the three former CPSU and Komsomol Archives, as well as materials transferred from the Archive of the President (see Ch. 13). Although the Commission lacks supplemental budget and staff, its work was progressing at a significant rate, Rosarkhiv reported that during the first year of its existence, the

---

[31] Sergei V. (interview with R. G. Pikhoia), "Tseny na gosudarstvennye tainy v Rossii po-prezhnemu vyshe mirovykh," *Novaia ezhednevnaia gazeta*, no. 165 (1 September 1994).

Commission had declassified 90,000 files.[32] Undoubtedly in an effort to counter the recent negative public criticism of declassification bottlenecks, reports of the Commission at work during September 1996 were aired on Russian public television.

Another presidential decree in March 1995 confirmed the "Regulation on the Procedure for Declassifying and Extending Classification of Archival Records of the Government of the USSR" (**A–25**), i.e. non-CPSU records of the Soviet government. That regulation conferred upon successor agencies the right to decide on declassification issues affecting their own records, thus again increasing agency control. The Interagency Commission that had been designated by the July 1993 law "On State Secrets" to deal with declassification for records of agencies without successors, was not even created until November 1995 (**A–21**), although the Government Technical Commission established earlier was assuming the authority. By January 1996, the structure and composition of the Commission was formulated and its functions more precisely defined (**A–23**).

A late 1995 presidential decree confirmed a list of topics to be considered state secrets (**A–22**), providing further guidelines for declassification. The list was openly published, although there was a more detailed secret list that was issued at the same time, as had been called for by the 1993 law. It is difficult to appraise the effect of the list on the declassification process, but at least one interpreter was alarmed by the extent of topics listed "coincided with a similar summary in the early 1980s."[33] Although for the future there is a limitation on the number of agencies that could classify their records (approximately 40), there was still no retrospective blanket declassification of earlier records of other agencies that henceforth did not have the right of classification. Rosarkhiv specialists generally saw this decree as providing the needed specificity for declassification issues in many areas. Even before the list was issued, they could boast that during the year 1995, close to 663,000 files had been declassified in Russian state archives.[34]

A separate law for the protection of personal privacy has been under discussion in the legislature, but has not yet been enacted into law. Earlier archival laws and regulations placed a closure period of 75 years from the date of creation on documents containing such personal information, and traditionally records of vital statistics (ZAGS) have observed a 75-year closure. A number of gray areas remain in application, which frequently raise difficult problems for archivists and complaints by researchers. A June 1992 presidential decree provided for the declassification of documents relating to the politically repressed (**A–26**), but that proved to be in conflict with an April 1992 law declaring documents that reveal the names of KGB agents or their informers to be state secrets (**A–38**). The issues involved have still not been satisfactorily resolved. The matter

---

[32] Vladimir Alekseevich Tiuneev, "Ob itogakh deiatel'nosti uchrezhedenii sistemy arkhivnogo dela v 1995 g. i osnovnykh napravleniakh razvitiia arkhivnogo dela v Rossiiskoi Federatsii v 1996 g.," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 3, p. 6.

[33] See, for example, Dmitrii Muratov, "V Rossii deistvuet novyi spisok 'gosudarstvennykh tain:' Odin iz glavnykh tsenzorov stala sluzhba bezopasnosti prezidenta," *Novaia ezhednevnaia gazeta*, no. 9 (14–20 March 1996), p. 1. The initial editorial comment suggests that, "The summary below in principle differs not from the summary of the beginning of the 1980s." The accompanying cariacature of President Yeltsin suggesting the secret nature of the list is hardly in keeping with the fact of its open publication in the official register of laws and in *Rossiiskaia gazeta* (see **A–22**).

[34] Tiuneev, "Ob itogakh deiatel'nosti v 1995 g.," p. 6.

has been particularly important in connection with public access to former CPSU and related records and the countervailing appropriate protection of personal privacy. RTsKhIDNI, as one of the archives most severely affected by this matter produced its own temporary regulation at the end of 1994 in effort to come to terms with this issue.[35] Disputes and gray areas remain, but researchers in contemporary history should be cognizant of the problem.

The law regulating public information that was enacted in February 1995 (**A–32**) increases agency control in that area and, accordingly, potentially could limit public access to archives. Despite the guarantee of freedom of information and prohibition of censorship in the new Russian Constitution (§ 29), a provision in this law reinforces the right of creating agencies to determine what information can be made available to the public. The law explicitly gives "organs of state authority" the right to restrict access "to information resources pertaining to the activities of their organs," (§ 13, paras. 1 & 2) which could hence be interpreted to give federal agencies full discretion over their own records and the information content thereof. And, unlike the U.S. Freedom of Information Act (and similar laws in a number of Western countries), for example, there are no effective provisions for free citizen appeal to archives or the controlling agency of the records in question. Provisions for legal appeal have not yet been tested in the courts. Besides, access to the courts for such issues is too expensive in Russia for normal citizens and most researchers even to consider. The effect of this law on open access to information has yet to be seen, because the law itself could be subject to various interpretations.

Much more potentially limiting to the free access to archival information on the international scene, is the new law "On Participation in International Exchange of Information" (**A–33**) signed by President Yeltsin on 4 July 1996. Because of the vague wording in the law, but its potential all-embracing character, it is hard to believe that it was signed the day after the first round of the presidential elections turned in favor of "democracy," or that it was intended to apply to archives. Rosarkhiv and other organizations had aired strong protests when an earlier draft had passed the Duma in December 1995, coinciding with the curtailment of the Hoover project. Those reservations were not taken into account, because the version signed into law in July could be potentially even more limiting for the normal exchange of archival and library information. If implemented as written, the new law would prohibit – without specific government license – the export, sale, and exchange (even of copies) of "information resources," which are defined to include "documents, groups of documents, and information systems," including audiovisual materials. As Rosarkhiv leaders have pointed out, the law could even prevent Russian archives from receiving donations of archival Rossica from abroad. If implemented as written, a separate license would be required for every act of archival exchange or the export of copies of archival documents. Soon after its enactment, the Rosarkhiv Collegium addressed a strong letter of concern to the appropriate government offices. In the meantime, the directors of several federal archives,

---

[35] See the introductory note by Iurii N. Amiantov, "Arkhiv i taina lichnoi zhizni," followed by the publication of the RTsKhIDNI regulation – "Vremennyi reglament ispol'zovaniia dokumentov s informatsiei otnosiashcheisia k taine lichnoi zhizni grazhdan," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 2, pp. 110–12. The RTsKhIDNI regulation (7 December 1994) is also published in *Nauchno-informatsionnyi biulleten' RTsKhIDNI*, no. 6 (1995), pp. 10–14.

incredulous that such a law could be passed, choose to ignore it as applying to the realm of public federal archives. The government endorsed the Rosarkhiv analysis already in September 1996, with the assurance that the parliament would draw up appropriate changes in the law later in the fall, but these have not been enacted.[36]

Another notable archival legal development over the past six years that strongly diverges from Soviet practice reflects the increased sovereignty and new more independent relationship of local regions or "subjects" (*sub"ekty*) of the Russian Federation to central federal authorities. In the three years since the passage of the "Basic Legislation" already fifty of the republics, krais, oblasts, municipalities, and other administrative-territorial entities within the Russian Federation have enacted their own archival laws or regulations governing archives. As of 1996, such laws were already under consideration in an additional twenty regions. Local control over the local archival heritage is provided for in the 1993 "Basic Legislation" (§4, pt. 3), and different regions have started divergent procedures for organizing and financing local archival administration. Local initiative within the Russian Federation is now resulting in regional divergence in the organization and function of archival administrative agencies, nomenclature and designation of local repositories, retention and disposal schedules, and even in new intra-regional information systems. Such developments in some regions conflict with the intentions of the federal archival law and certainly with the possibility of central Rosarkhiv control. Rosarkhiv bureaucrats, schooled in Soviet traditions of a centralized command-administrative system, were not always prepared for such display of regional autonomy, and in many instances the appropriate juridical measures were not provided for in federal archival legislation.[37] Of importance for public access to archival information, such divergent regional developments could potentially obliterate the positive legacy of the Soviet centralized era in terms of descriptive and reporting standards. The fact that Rosarkhiv no longer provided budgetary support, and initially lacked the capacity for technical assistance, meant that different regions were trying to develop their own computerization and divergent information systems. More recently, however, as will be seen below, Rosarkhiv is making strong efforts to reverse such centrifugal tendencies and establish the basis for computerized descriptive and reporting standards throughout the Russian Federation.[38]

Thus, while the 1993 "Basic Legislation" on archives and the March 1994 Regulation did much to assure access and provide for the public status of archives in the Russian Federation, subsequent legal countermeasures are providing for more agency control over archives and their declassification, and, potentially, alarming government control over information resources. Even more important are the similar tendencies in laws and regulations devoted to specific agencies, and especially the security services. Those

---

[36] Reactions to this effect have been expressed to the present author both by the responsible officials in Rosarkhiv and the directors of several federal archives, including RTsKhIDNI and GA RF.

[37] Regional legal developments are well surveyed and explained in the recent article by Artizov cited above, "Arkhivnoe zakonodatel'stvo Rossii," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 4, esp. pp. 5–7, although a more detailed analysis of this matter with citation to specific laws would be desirable.

[38] My comments to this effect at the all-Russian conference on archival administrative problems in early October 1993 were not fully understood or accurately reported in the summary published version – "Obsuzhdaetsia novyi etap arkhivnoi reformy," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1993, no. 6, p. 13. See the discussion of the recent Rosarkhiv archival information program in Ch. 12.

developments, which particularly affect the status of archives with contemporary documentation will be discussed in more detail below (see Ch. 4), following a review of other general elements in the legal and archival organizational framework.

The net result of the often contradictory laws and decrees has led many progressive archivists and academic researchers openly to voice concern that the earlier promised level of archival reform has not been adequately implemented.[39] Two years after passage of the long-awaited law on archives, Aleksandr Oganovich Chubar'ian, the director of the Institute of General History of the Russian Academy of Sciences was still complaining about the "conflict between the laws and archives and state secrets, which very often causes archival directors to close whole masses of documents for users." And "unfortunately," he added, "the tendency is growing."[40] The harshly critical report of the Sector for Archival Researchers presented at the March 1996 conference of the Society of Historians and Archivists suggested the situation was serious enough to merit appeal to the Council of Europe.[41]

[39] Such complaints were aired, for example, in an address by Boris S. Ilizarov (formerly a professor at IAI RGGU and now a Senior Researcher in the Institute of Russian History RAN) to the second annual "Conference on Historical Source Study and Archival Affairs," held at the All-Russian Scientific Research Institute for Documentation and Archival Affairs (VNIIDAD), 12 March 1996.

[40] Aleksandr O. Chubar'ian, "Istoriia XX veka: Novye issledovaniia i problemy," *Istoricheskie zapiski* 1(119) (1995), p. 227.

[41] The report by Mikhail I. Semiriaga (Senior Researcher in the Institute of Comparative Politics RAN), representing the Sector for Archival Researchers of the Society of Historians and Archivists, presented at the Conference of the Society in Moscow, 28 March 1996, was published in abbreviated form in *Vestnik arkhivista*, 1996, no. 2(32)/3(33), pp. 44–48.

3. The Archival Fond of the Russian Federation

The 1993 Basic Legislation and other laws and regulations on archives define and extent the legal concept of the "Archival Fond (or in this context in might well be translated 'Legacy') of the Russian Federation," which in essence is inherited from Soviet archival theory and practice, since such a concept was not known in the pre-revolutionary Russian Empire.[42] The concept first appeared as the Consolidated State Archival Fond (*Edinyi gosudarstvennyi arkhivnyi fond* – EGAF), as formulated in the now famous archival decree of June 1918 signed by Lenin.[43] As subsequently reformulated, the State Archival Fond (*Gosudarstvennyi arkhivnyi fond SSSR* – GAF) provided an institutional and conceptual basis for the nationalization and legal control over all archival materials throughout the Soviet Union.

By virtue of the totalitarian nature of Soviet government, its imperative to control all records of society, and the lack of respect for individual or private rights *vis-à-vis* state power, the "State Archival Fond" in its Soviet conceptualization embraced all types of archival records from economic, social, and cultural spheres that would not be considered state records in non-Communist countries. Thus, the line between state and private property was obliterated as many previously non-state records and other archival materials were nationalized after the Revolution, according to official Soviet archival decrees (and hence legally according to Soviet definition). Many Church manuscript collections had actually come under state control long before 1917. Although initially limited to accumulated records in state institutions and nationalized private institutional archives and manuscript collections, the "State Archival Fond" was gradually extended to include the records of all cultural, religious, and private agencies, commercial institutions and cooperatives, and trade and professional unions. It embraced not only paper records, but also documentary and feature films, photographs, and sound recordings; it extended to medical and scientific records (including those on electronic media), architectural and engineering plans, as well as all types of manuscript collections and personal papers of important personalities.

Such a legal corporate concept of a "state archival fond" – or "state archival heritage" – does not exist in the United States and most Western countries. Quite by contrast in the United States, for example, the National Archives and Records Administration is limited by law to control and custody over records of the Federal Government. There is no concept of state proprietorship over the records involved, which are in fact considered in the "public domain," open for free use by all and not subject to copyright or sale of license rights, even for their "information value." Going to the other extreme in the USA and

---

[42] The Russian term "fond" (from the French) as used for individual groups of records, personal papers, and manuscript collections, within an archive has been explained earlier. The term "fond" in the present context of the entire documentary legacy of the nation is quite a different legal concept. However, since the same Russified word is used in both cases, it is preferable to preserve it likewise in English, and especially to avoid the alternate English "fund" which tends to have financial overtones which would only be confusing here.

[43] For more details, an English translation of the decree, and citations to relevant Soviet literature, see P.K. Grimsted, "Lenin's Archival Decree of 1918: The Bolshevik Legacy for Soviet Archival Theory and Practice," *American Archivist* 45 (Fall 1982), pp. 429–43. See also summary amplification in Grimsted, *Handbook*, pp. 3–8.

many other countries, there is no state regulation of – and rarely state resources to help preserve – records of the private sector or even manuscripts of cultural luminaries of the nation, although some Western European countries, such as Italy, prohibit export of the cultural heritage, similar to the situation now in Russia.

The contrasting Russian juridical concept is a direct continuation of the Soviet concept, and has now been incorporated into law. On the positive side, proponents of the Russian concept laud a desirable degree of state control that provides for public accessibility and state responsibility for protection and preservation of the national archival legacy. Security and open public use, rather than private possession, of archival documents considered part of the "heritage of the nation," are thus assured according to the aims of the July 1993 Basic Legislation and its later extensions. Yet simultaneously, critics point to the potential undesirable degree of state control and intrusion into what in other countries would be considered private property.

Unlike the Soviet concept itself, the components of the current Archival Fond RF as outlined in the 1993 Basic Legislation, and described with more substance in the Regulation of March 1994, are in some respects quite different than was the case under Soviet rule. Provisions for archives of independent organizations and institutions and private collections are now clearly recognized in the strict division between "state" and "non-state" parts of the Archival Fond RF. But such provisions apply only to records created after 1991 and *not* retroactively. And some elements of state jurisdiction extend even to the "non-state" part.

Indeed, the "state" part of the Archival Fond now embraces all archival holdings nationalized during the Soviet period from former religious and other "non-state" societal and commercial organizations, and individuals that are now held in archives, libraries, museums, and research institutes throughout the Russian Federation. As stated in the original 1993 "Basic Legislation" (**A–12**), the "state part" of the Archival Fond RF was defined to include "all archival fonds and archival documents created and to be created by all federal organs of state power and government, . . . as well as archival fonds and archival documents received in established order from societal and religious associations and organizations, juridical and physical individuals." (§6) Under Soviet rule, there was a separate "Archival Fond of the Communist Party," but by virtue of the presidential decree of August 1991, all CPSU archival materials were nationalized and, as defined by the March 1994 decree, they are now considered an essential component of the "state part" of the Archival Fond RF. Thus, in terms of records or collections created prior to 1991, the Archival Fond RF currently extends state control over a much wider range of archival materials than had existed during the Soviet period.

In terms of current records created after 1991, a strict division within the Archival Fond has been made for the "Non-State" (*negosudarstvennyi*) part of the Archival Fond RF. It is nonetheless important to note that the term "private" is not used, and a legal concept of private property in this context, similar to those found in many countries, has not been definitively formulated. This situation is reinforced by other current Russian laws and presidential decrees dismissing the possibility of retrospective claims for nationalized, formerly private, archives and manuscript collections from institutions such as churches and other religious groups, or from dispossessed individuals who are either current citizens or émigrés abroad. Ultimate jurisdiction over the private manuscript legacy thus still rests with the state in terms of retrospective claims. And the Basic

Legislation and 1994 Regulation deny a private individual or organization the right to sell or otherwise alienate abroad documents considered to be part of the "national heritage."

Copyright provisions are dealt with by two other 1993 laws in Russia (**A–54** and **A–55)** and, in accordance with the Russian adherence to the Bern International Copyright Convention, indeed there is a strong assertion of copyright for an individual or his heirs, even for materials on deposit in state repositories. Archives that now acquire materials subject to copyright, especially materials of personal origin, draw up appropriate agreements, because unlike the situation during the Soviet period, state proprietorship in Russia now extends to the repository holding the manuscripts, even in cases where copyright is applicable.[44] Furthermore, when copyright has expired or is otherwise not applicable, an individual museum or archive has the right to assert copyright over its holdings. Thus even state public libraries, archives, and museums, have the right to charge high license fees and grant exclusive rights for the reproduction or use of the archival materials they hold (see **A–53** and **A–57**). Thus the Russian National Library can demand up to $30 a page for the right to reproduce folios from a medieval manuscript, and the Foreign Intelligence Service (SVR) Veterans Association, in cooperation with the SVR Operational Archive was free to sign million-dollar contracts for exclusive publication use of its sensational holdings. And even in disrespect of copyright of individuals, Gosteleradiofond was able to sell exclusive rights to its music recordings to a British firm.[45]

Researchers in public federal archives now receive xerox copies stamped with the words "without the right of publication," and should they want to publish the documents, they are required to negotiate an official license agreement with the holding archive. American researchers understandably react negatively, accustomed as they are in their National Archives to copy themselves or receive copies of government documents that are entirely at their disposal, since in fact all government documents are considered to be in the "public domain." The Russian situation is now more similar to the British system (a legacy of royal and imperial prerogatives) where state documents in the United Kingdom are subject to "Crown copyright." Researchers can order an unlimited number of copies, to the extent that they are willing and able to pay the copying charges (now the equivalent of 25-50 U.S. cents per page). Subsequently, if a recipient decides to publish the full text or a significant portion thereof, permission for publication involves a letter to Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Licenses are not required, and fees are usually involved only for commercial or large library-type microform publication in extensio, which are permitted without restriction, subject to the appropriate payments if commercial distribution is anticipated.

The strong State proprietary rights to the Archival Fond RF, by contrast, leave no room for a concept of the "public domain," as it is known in the United States and some other countries, whereby state records are freely available to all and cannot be subject to copyright or license fees. Other documentation of the heritage of the nation in publicly-supported national libraries is also freely available to all, except in the case of deposits of

---

[44] See the explanation to this effect with regard to practices in the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, which is particularly affected by copyright and proprietorship issues – A. L. Evstigneev, "Ob izmeneniiakh v metodike komplektovaniia gosarkhivov dokumentami lichnogo proiskhozhdeniia," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 2, pp. 112–13.

[45] See more details below, fn. 196.

recent origin from private individuals that may still subject to copyright provisions. Thus the U.S. National Archives or Presidential Libraries could never charge fees and copyright could not be assigned even to sensational state documents about the John F. Kennedy assassination or the Nixon White House tapes, which are considered part of the public record.

Precedents are also being set in Russia, whereby papers and literary manuscripts of repressed writers and artists, to the extent they are being retrieved from the archives of various security organs, are being turned over to state archives or museums, although in some instances recently, they are being given to surviving heirs.[46] The tradition was started already in the Soviet period, when security organs turned over extensive literary manuscripts and related papers – from Mandel'shtam, Akhmatova, and many others – to the State Literary Museum in the 1950s. The Manuscript Division of the Institute of World Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IMLI RAN) also received its share of manuscript materials from "undesignated" sources, whose origin were only vaguely recorded in accession registers, while the Central State Archive of Literature and Art (TsGALI, now RGALI – **B–8**) received materials not only from domestic security organs, but also Russian émigré literary materials that had been purchased or seized in various parts of the world.

When court cases have arisen over the return of archives and personal papers seized by security organs during the Soviet regime, Russian courts tend to favor a proposal that would see important manuscript materials, now deemed part of the national cultural or archival legacy, deposited in public repositories. For example, there was a recent still unresolved case in which a court refused a claim for some Boris Pasternak papers that might have resulted in their alienation to Paris.[47] Yet there is a certain irony today in state claims today that literary manuscripts seized by Soviet authorities on the grounds of earlier "anti-state" activities or proclivities, should remain "state property" and be ipso facto deposited in public repositories. Likewise there is a certain irony in state claims that Russian literary manuscripts or archival materials of the political opposition alienated abroad for the sake of preservation in the face of the repressive Soviet regime should now be returned to the homeland, because the materials are currently claimed to be part of the "cultural heritage of the nation."

Already in a convention signed by archivists of the CIS and ratified by President Yeltsin in July 1992, Russia claimed possession of the entire central archival legacy of the USSR, as the rightful legal successor state to the Soviet Union in an agreement ratified by the directors of archival administrations of the former union republics (**A–8**). Of additional note in connection with potential claims from now independent States that were formerly part of the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union are the noticeable lingering Russian imperial pretensions in recent archival legislation. For example, in the March 1994 Regulation, the Archival Fond RF is legally defined to include "archival fonds and archival records of state institutions, organizations, firms, and government institutions,

---

46 Grigorii Arutiunian, "Sud'ba konfiskata" (interview with the Chief of the Central Archive of the FSB, Vadim Gusachenko), *Novoe knizhnoe obozrenie*, 1996, no. 6, p. 6; see also Iurii Shikhov, "FSB prodolzhaet vozvrashchat' dolgi," *Segodnia*, no. 183 (17 September 1995). See also Ch. 13 below (fns. 418–421).

47 See Ol'ga Martynenko, "Komu prinadlezhit arkhiv Pasternaka?" *Moskovskie novosti*, no. 30 (4–11 June 1995), p. 3.

existing on the territory of Russia in the entire extent of her history."(§I.1) There is no time limit specified, and "Russia" (elsewhere the law uses the term "territory of the Russian Federation") is nowhere distinguished from the even more extensive territory of the pre-revolutionary Russian Empire, or from "Rus'" (now predominantly Ukraine and Belarus') or "Muscovy." And in a subsequent clause, the Archival Fond RF also comprises "archival fonds and archival records of Fatherland [as distinct from Russian or RF] state institutions and military units existing and/or having existed abroad." (§3) Noticeably, in terms of claims from newly independent successor states of the CIS and the Baltic countries, there is no distinction between the "near abroad" (as now used in Russia to refer to former Soviet republics), and the more traditional concept of "abroad."

Claims or pretensions from newly independent states (and other "foreign" countries) for materials now held in Russia are also diminished by the further inclusion within the Archival Fond RF of "archival fonds and archival records (or documents) of juridical and physical entities (persons), which have been received through legal means into state proprietorship, including those from abroad." (§I.1) This conceptualization of Russian pretensions to all archival materials held in public repositories within Russia today, including those of provenance in foreign countries, in the current wording, would now necessarily include those that had been created in the territory of successor states to the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union alike. It also lays the ground for projected legislation nationalizing archival materials seized by Russian authorities in the West at the end of World War II (see below). Much will hinge on interpretation of the phrase "through legal means." Under a Russian imperial or Soviet regime, which essentially did not recognize Western concepts of "law," the state was accustomed to consider an imperial or Soviet "decree," or even an order by a government official, as a de facto legal instrument. This could leave earlier official state seizures open to interpretation as "legal" under the terms of the regime that seized them. As a corollary of such a concept would be the current Russian assertion that affirms the "legality" of nationalization of all previously private and manuscript collections now held in state repositories, including those of academic and religious bodies of newly independent States. These concepts have not been without criticism, even within Russia itself, on the basis of regional as well as religious or private interests.

Given the growing regional role and status of the "Subjects of the Russian Federation" (*sub'ekti RF*) after 1991 (see Ch. 2), the Archival Fond RF is now increasingly paralleled on the local level by regional "archival fonds," which have been legally designated through local legislation. Close to half of the administrative-territorial entities (*sub'ekti)* within the Russian Federation have enacted their local archival laws, establishing their own republic- or krai-level "archival fonds," with the aim of assuring local proprietorship and control over their own archival heritage. The effect of these developments in terms of the general organization and location of local components of the Russian archival legacy is still not clear. Similar to the situation with the successor States of former Soviet republics, as noted above, it is not likely that these laws will result in major relocation of fonds or archival organization. But the current tendency does represent an important theoretical departure from the Soviet period when all archival arrangements were dictated by centralized control from Moscow.

4. Overall Archival Organization and Agency Control

Unusually complicated in Russia is the overall organization and the nature of agency control of archival repositories, which may bewilder the uninitiated. Potential researchers need to understand the general organization and the archival holdings involved, all of which legally constitute part of the Archival Fond RF, so as to know where to expect to find the types of materials that currently remain in the custody of a wide variety of archives and other manuscript repositories under many different agencies. The organization, history, and holdings of over 260 repositories in Moscow and St. Petersburg are presented in the new 1998 ArcheoBiblioBase interagency archival directory, but these do not exhaust the list. A summary, nonetheless, may be helpful here before turning to the problem of agency control.

Present Russian archival organization for federal-level documentation is a direct heir to the bureaucratic tradition as it evolved under Soviet rule as is apparent in the fact that:

(1) there are now sixteen separate federal archives under the direct administrative responsibility of the Federal Archival Service of Russia (Rosarkhiv), each with its own director, bureaucratic apparatus, and many of the other expensive attributes of a modern national archival repository; and

(2) there are at least another eighteen major repositories of federal executive agencies that have the legal right to retain federal government (and in many instances historical) records on a long-term basis in their own agency-controlled archives outside the system of federal archives under Rosarkhiv.

The archives under Rosarkhiv constitute Part B of the 1998 ABB directory, and the major separate federal executive agency archives constitute Part C. (A list of all of the federal archives in Part B and all of the major federal agency archives in Part C are here included as Appendix 2.)

Additional extensive archival materials remain under the jurisdiction of municipal and oblast-level state archives in Moscow and St. Petersburg (Part D in the directory), as well as regional state (including former Communist Party) archives throughout the Russian Federation (to be covered in a subsequent volume). There are independent archives and rich manuscript collections under the Russian Academy of Sciences, other Academies (such as those for Medicine, Education, and the Arts), major research institutes, and universities or other institutions of higher learning (Part E). There are a growing number of independent repositories – such as archives of trade-union organizations, the so-called “People’s Archive,” those under the “Memorial” movement, other social and cultural organizations, and religious institutions (Part F); a complete listing of these has not yet been possible, but representative examples are included. Vast manuscript divisions and other archival wealth are found in many major libraries (Part G) and in over 160 museums under a variety of different, but predominantly state, agencies (Part H). The Ministry of Culture accounts for the largest number of libraries and museums in Parts G and H. Others fall under the jurisdiction of other ministries, academies, universities, local committees on culture, and there are even many factory museums now under private corporations.

Our present concern is primarily focused on repositories in the first two categories (Parts B and C, as listed in Appendix 2). These are in effect the repositories that contain the vast bulk of government records from historical times to the present, together with

other important historical, literary, specialized scientific, and audiovisual materials that had earlier been nationalized and centralized under Soviet rule. Researcher access to records in the other categories of archives and manuscript repositories listed above normally do not raise the same problems as does access to more official federal records. Hence the fact that the archival materials involved remain under different agency control is of less significance than is the case with federal records still retained by some of the federal agencies listed in Part C.

Archival observers at home and abroad immediately note the fact that Russia today does not have the type of consolidated "National Archives" that are found in many countries of the world, and which normally house the records of government administration. (The Rosarkhiv role to this effect will be described in Ch. 5). At the same time in Russia, the official federal archives as presently organized, as heirs to their Soviet predecessors, embrace a vastly more extensive range of historical documentation that would normally not be found in national archives in the non-Communist world. The fact that the Soviet totalitarian state administered all aspects of public life from foreign policy and all-union economic planning to factories, child-care centers, and motion-picture production, means that successor Russian federal archives include the records of agencies involved with all aspects of the body politic, economy, social, and cultural functions that would not normally come under the purvey of "national archives" in the non-communist world. The Russian/Soviet tradition in this respect needs to be understood abroad, because its divergence from international norms requires more effort on the part of uninitiated researchers to identify and address the specific archive within the overall system that may contain the files they seek.

The archival situation immediately after the Revolution was much closer to a consolidated "national archives" than the network of archival repositories that developed subsequently and that persist in new garbs as the network of federal and agency archives of the Russian Federation. The Consolidated State Archival Fond (*Edinyi gosudarstvennyi arkhivnyi fond* – EGAF), which was organized in 1918, simultaneously embraced first, the juridical concept of the "national archival legacy" (similar to the Archival Fond RF today), second, an archival administrative agency (similar in function to Rosarkhiv), and third, a series of actual repositories for the collected government records and other nationalized archives. Divided into sections for different subject category of records, it functioned similarly to the type of unified "National Archives," such as is found in many other countries of the world. But that radical administrative arrangement was superseded already in the early 1920s, as a series of separate archives evolved, which by 1925, or even more definitively by 1930, were distinct from the archival administrative agency. Administratively separate state archives multiplied during the 1940s and 1960s, although under Soviet rule after 1938, they were all tightly controlled by the Main Archival Administration (Glavarkhiv), under the People's Commissariat (and later Ministry) of Internal Affairs (NKVD/MVD), and then after 1960 directly under the Council of Ministers of the USSR. The pattern of decentralized separate archives with a centralized administrative agency that developed during Soviet years remains to this day.

When one contemplates this vast array of archives and manuscript repositories that house the "Archival Fond RF" it is nonetheless worth noting that, with the exception of some current or recently accessioned agency records, the large majority of records of the nation remain physically located in the buildings where they had been housed in the

immediate past under Soviet rule. And, furthermore, most of the archival legacy of the nation remains in the custody of the successor agencies to their prior Soviet custodians. Exceptions are the CPSU and Komsomol archives, which, as designated records of effective state organs of political rule and power, were taken over by Rosarkhiv after the abortive 1991 August coup, and also the records that were transferred to federal or local state archival custody from many other state agencies abolished after 1991. In that connection, unlike the revolutionary situation in 1917, Russian state archives have not used the end of 1991 as a break-off point in the organization of separate repositories. Nor in many cases are they establishing new separate fonds for institutional records from agencies that continue under the aegis of post-Soviet successors.

Federal Archives under Rosarkhiv

The new organization and nomenclature of the federal-level archives under direct Rosarkhiv jurisdiction were defined in a regulation (*postanovlenie*) enacted in June 1992 (**A–7**), at which time there were seventeen federal archives, although several of them are literally called "storage centers" (*tsentr khraneniia,* or perhaps better in English, "centers for preservation") rather than "archives." These include the former eleven publicly-available central state archives of the USSR on the all-union level, which were until the end of 1991 directly administered by the Main Archival Administration under the Council of Ministers of the USSR (Glavarkhiv SSSR) – eight in Moscow, two in Leningrad, and one in Samara (with a branch in Moscow). They also included two formerly secret archives under Glavarkhiv in Moscow – the former top-secret "Special Archive" for foreign captured records (*Osobyi arkhiv* – TsGOA SSSR), which has now been renamed the Center for Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections (TsKhIDK – **B–15**); and the former secret Center for Space Documentation (TsKD SSSR), which was initially a separate facility under Rosarkhiv as the Russian Scientific-Research Center for Space Documentation (RNITsKD). In June 1995, that latter repository was combined with what had under Soviet rule been the Central State Archive for Scientific-Technical Documentation (TsGANTD SSSR) with headquarters in Kuibyshev (now again Samara) and a branch in Moscow. The merger formed what is now called the Russian State Archive of Scientific-Technical Documentation (RGNTDA – **B–9**), with headquarters in Moscow (in the building that formerly housed RNITsKD) and a branch in Samara.

Added to the all-union state archives formerly under Glavarkhiv SSSR are the holdings of the three former central state archives of the RSFSR, which were earlier responsible to the parallel Glavarkhiv RSFSR – (1) the Central State Archive of the RSFSR (TsGA RSFSR), the principal repository for state records of the RSFSR (after the formation of the USSR in 1922), was in 1992 absorbed by the newly amalgamated State Archive of the Russian Federation (GA RF – **B–1**); (2) the Central State Archive of Documentary Films, Photographs, and Sound Recordings of the RSFSR (TsGAKFFD RSFSR), which had been established in Vladimir, in 1992 became a branch of the Russian State Archive of Documentary Films and Photographs (RGAKFD – **B–11**); and (3) the former Central State Archive of the RSFSR for the Far East (TsGA RSFSR Dal'nego Vostoka), has now been reorganized as the Russian State Historical Archive for the Far

East (RGIADV – **B–16**), and is in the process of being transferred from Tomsk to Vladivostok.

Three additional so-called "Centers for Preservation" for CPSU and Komsomol records were established under Roskomarkhiv on the basis to materials nationalized by the presidential decree of August 1991 mentioned above – the first two in October of 1991 – (1) the Russian Center for Preservation and Study of Documents of Modern History, founded on the basis of the former Central Party Archive under the Institute of Marxism-Leninism (RTsKhIDNI – **B–12**) and (2) the Russian Center for Preservation of Contemporary Documentation, founded on the basis of post-1953 Central Committee and other current CPSU archives (TsKhSD – **B–13**); and a third later in 1992 – (3) the Center for Preservation of Documents of Youth Organizations, founded on the basis of the former Central Archive of the Komsomol (TsKhDMO – **B–14**).

Thus there are now thirteen federal archives under Rosarkhiv in Moscow, two in St. Petersburg (RGIA – **B–3** and RGAVMF – **B–5**), and one in Vladivostok (RGIADV – **B–16**). The Center for Preservation of the Security Fond, i.e., preservation microfilm copies (*Tsentr khraneniia strakhovogo fonda*) in Ialutorovsk (Tiumen Oblast) in the Urals is not included in this count, because it is not normally open for researchers. All of these federal archives have been renamed since 1991. As already mentioned, two have been consolidated since their reorganization in 1992. Plans are underway for further consolidation, although it is doubtful they will be finalized before the fall of 1998.

Federal Agency Archives and Archival Control

As another carry-over from the Soviet period, only a fraction of what has now legally been designated the "state" part of the Archival Fond of the Russian Federation is housed in federal repositories administered by – or within the immediate administrative control of – Rosarkhiv, the agency designated to administer and be accountable for the Archival Fond RF. And, even more to the point, when one contemplates the list of major executive agency archives in this category designated as Part C (see Appendix 2), it is clear that many of the most important records of numerous key federal ministries and other agencies have *not* been transferred to the federal system of state archives under Rosarkhiv. Research access problems for agency records will be discussed further in Chapter 13, but here attention is focused on the legal and administrative-organizational framework.

The right of long-term archival retention and control outside of Rosarkhiv by important ministries and other key federal agencies was not clearly specified in the 1993 "Basic Legislation," and the federal agencies involved were not pleased with that situation. The matter was clarified in the March 1994 archival Regulation (**A–14**) and other normative acts, whereby the federal agencies with this right are clearly listed. Under Soviet rule, most of the same predecessor agency archives were likewise excluded from Glavarkhiv control. According to the March 1994 regulation, the length of time and nature of their temporary and/or long-term depository storage rights were to be established in agreement with Rosarkhiv (§7). Rosarkhiv has already enacted formal agreements with

most of the agencies involved, and details of their retention policies and the period of time for which they have the right to control their records have been established.[48]

A number of previous and subsequent normative acts have strengthened federal agency control over their own records and limited the requirements for prompt transfer to federal archives. Although the August 1991 presidential decree provided for Roskomarkhiv control of historical CPSU records, another presidential decree in December 1991 (**A–36**), as mentioned above, formally established the all-important presidential archive – AP RF (**C–1**). A week after the March 1994 general Archival Regulation, a separate presidential decree (**A–38**) established presidential rights to retain the crucial Politburo and other historical CPSU documentation held there (with some files dating back to 1918), representing another step backwards for public accessibility to those records. Despite provisions for the increased pace of transfers to RTsKhIDNI and TsKhSD in the September 1994 decree on CPSU documentation, the March 1994 presidential decree remains in force.

A March 1995 presidential decree gave the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA in English; MID in Russian) the right to retain all of its archival records permanently (**A–46**), which formally confirms the status quo in terms of ministry archives that has existed in that case since 1945. That situation is not unusual for many countries of the world, such as France, Germany, and Poland, among others, whose counterpart foreign ministries likewise maintain their own separate archives. But in Russia the bureaucratic structure is again more complicated, since there are two separate archives under the MFA – one for pre-revolutionary documentation going back to the time of Peter I's formation of the Collegium of Foreign Affairs in 1724 (AVPRI – **C–3**) and a second for post-revolutionary records (AVP RF – **C–2**). A separate department within the MFA (***C–02**), among its other analytic and documentation functions, serves as an umbrella agency for the two repositories. To the credit of the MFA, since 1990, those archives have organized publicly accessible reading rooms and researcher services, and prepared comprehensive guides, similar to those in diplomatic archives in other countries.

The Ministry of Defense has also established a separate umbrella archival agency (***C–04**) to administer the several separate archives under its control, and to handle both research-related inquiries and those involving socio-legal questions and verification of military service records. Although there is no specific regulation governing military archives or giving them the right of permanent custody over their records similar to the case of the MFA, the Ministry of Defense is included in the March 1994 list of federal agencies with the right of long-term retention of their own records (**A–14**). It also now comes under the sweeping 1996 law "On State Protection" (**A–45**) to be discussed further below. In contrast to the MFA, most pre-World War II military and naval records from throughout the Russian Empire and former USSR have been transferred to public archival facilities under Rosarkhiv: the Russian State Military History Archive (RGVIA – **B–4**) houses pre-revolutionary records, including those from outlying regions of the Empire, while the Russian State Military Archive (RGVA – **B–8**) retains all post-revolutionary records through 1940; and the Russian State Archive of the Navy (RGAVMF – **B–5**) in St. Petersburg includes both all pre-revolutionary naval records and Soviet period naval records through 1940. There are now separate archives under the Ministry of Defense for

---

[48] See Igor N. Tarasov and Tat'iana N. Viktorova, "Novye aspekty sotrudnichestva," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 2, pp. 15–19.

post-1940 army records in Podol'sk (Moscow Oblast) (TsGAMO – **C–4**) and post-1940 naval records in Gatchina (Leningrad Oblast) (TsAVMF – **C–5**). Post-World War II General Staff records and military intelligence (GRU) records are likewise maintained separately, but are considered internal agency archives and are not publicly listed as separate repositories by the Ministry. There is also a separate archive for military-medical records as part of the Military-Medical Museum in St. Petersburg.

The increasing long-term control of security and intelligence organs over their archives is particularly significant in terms of the lack of public access to records of these key state agencies, which played such a major repressive role in all phases of political and social life under the Soviet regime. An August 1991 presidential decree called for the transfer of the archives of the former KGB and its predecessors to Rosarkhiv (then Roskomarkhiv) control (**A–5**), but this was never implemented. Although the KGB as such was established only in 1954, at the time of its formation, it took over a large percentage of the records relating to state security, intelligence, and counterintelligence functions from the Central Archive of the MVD and its predecessors, going back to the revolutionary period. By August 1991, the total KGB archival holdings throughout the USSR were estimated as 9.5 million files, including the central as well as regional archives and those in former Soviet union republics. The KGB Central Archive (TsA KGB SSSR) itself had widely dispersed storage facilities, and major groups of records were still held within the creating directorates, or subsections of the agency.[49]

A blue-ribbon presidential Commission to Organize the Transfer and Accession of Archives of the CPSU and KGB SSSR to State Repositories and their Utilization, was appointed in October 1991 (**A–5**), presided over by General Volkogonov. By February 1992, a formal Decision (*Reshenie*) by the Commission resolved that "the policies of KGB directing authorities with respect to archives were criminal." It called for the establishment of a special archival center in Moscow under Roskomarkhiv for KGB documentation and the drafting of a formal regulation for public utilization.[50] But even when the report was released serious questions were already being raised about the extent to which KGB records would be transferred to public archival custody. So far, one analyst suggested, "KGB files were accessible – only theoretically."[51]

---

[49] During the period from 1954 through 1992, many documents refer to the "Central Operational Archive" (*Tsentral'nyi operativnyi arkhiv KGB*) – although today FSB archivists officially use the term Central Archive – without the "operational" designation. KGB archival storage facilities, were located in Omsk, Vladimir, Ul'ianovsk, and Saratov Oblast, as well as Moscow Oblast, in addition to those physically located in the Lubianka.

[50] See the revealing article on the KGB archives by Nikita Petrov, "'Politka rukovodstva KGB v otnoshenii arkhovnogo dela byla prestupnoi ...'," *Karta*: *Nezavisimyi istoricheskii zhurnal* (Riazian'), no. 1 (1993), pp. 4–5. The internal report, "Reshenie," by the presidential Commission, outlining the situation of KGB archives, which was presented to the Supreme Council of the Russian Federation, over Volkogonov's signature in February 1992, was published as an appendix – "Reshenie ob arkhivakh KGB" (pp. 6–7). For a detailed appraisal of the KGB archives as of the fall of 1992, see also the important article by Nikita Okhotin and Arsenii Roginskii, "Die KGB-Archive ein Jahr nach dem Putsch von August 1991," in *Russland heute: von inen gesehen: Politik, Recht, Kultur,* edited by Arsenii Roginskii (Moscow/ Bremen, 1993), pp. 93–116. The unpublished original Russian version is available in the library of "Memorial" in Moscow. An updated English version is in preparation by CWIHP.

[51] See, for example, the interview by Natalia Gevorkian with Nikita Petrov, "Dos'e KGB stanut dostupnee – poka theoreticheski," *Moskovskie novosti*, no. 8 (23 February 1992), p. 10. See additional citations from the press at the time in Grimsted, "Russian Archives in Transition," pp. 629–30.

The projected center was never established. Rosarkhiv may present the excuse that the plan was not realistic, because no suitable building was available for the new federal center. Housing is always a serious problem in Moscow, but it is doubtful that was the principal reason. As evidence of the dissatisfaction of the security services with the Commission recommendation, already by the end of April 1992, on their initiative, a new law "On Operational-Investigatory Activities" (**A–39**) was rushed through the legislature. That law formally established information regarding KGB operational methods, agents, and their informants in the category of state secrets. The law had reportedly been in preparation since the Yeltsin decree of August 1991 declaring public custody of the KGB archives. As one commentator recently phrased it, that law put an end to "the hopes of historians and the public to become acquainted with secret files."[52] Given the fact that the KGB as such was not abolished in Russia – as was the CPSU – but rather transformed into other successor agencies with most of the same personnel, there has been understandable resistance within the agency, and within the Yeltsin administration, for transferring the unusually sensitive records of the repressive security organs to public archival authority.

There were practical reasons for resistance as well: Federal Security Service (FSB) archival authorities today emphasize the need to retain KGB files in the custody of its successor agency, particularly in connection with the legal requirements for rehabilitation. In their new incarnation, FSB archival personnel inherit the experience and reference system for appropriate access to and interpretation of the files, which are being demanded daily by countless relatives and victims of repression. The FSB is better equipped and funded than Rosarkhiv, with better-mechanized communication and reference facilities for the use of its own agency records. Its experience in searching and use of those records could not have easily been transferred to public archives which lacked mechanization and the experienced staff to continue the pressing inquiry service demanded by the public in connection with the newly decreed rehabilitation process. Because the reference and communication facilities developed by the KGB are still needed for ongoing operations by the successor security agency, the FSB was obviously not inclined to turn them over to a public archival authority.

The major bulk of former KGB records are now held by its prime successor agency, in the Central Archive of the FSB (TsA FSB Rossii – **C–6**). In an at least theoretically positive vein, a November 1994 agreement with Rosarkhiv established a new joint commission for arranging the transfer of limited categories of declassified former KGB records to public repositories.[53] In the meantime, the FSB has opened its own archival reading room for servicing requests from victims of repression and limited other researchers. The minimal concrete transfers to Rosarkhiv are not surprising (see Ch. 13), given the April 1995 law "On Organs of the Federal Security Service" (**A–43)**, which essentially gives the FSB and other security agencies the right to long-term control over

---

[52] Nikita Petrov, "Arkhivy KGB (problemy rassekrechivaniia i dostupa issledovatelei k materialam arkhivov spetssluzhb)," pp. 2–3 – unpublished report at a conference on "Archives of the Security Services in Russia and The Netherlands and their Accessibility," International Institute for Social History (Amsterdam), 4 April 1996. Petrov kindly made available to me a copy of his report, which presents a very discouraging picture of developments with respect to the public accessibility of KGB archives over the past five years.

[53] Regarding the agreement with Rosarkhiv, see Tarasov and Viktorova, "Novye aspekty sotrudnichestva," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 2, p. 18. For the effects of this agreement see below, Ch. 13 fn. 427.

their own records and the determination of what files should be declassified for transfer to Rosarkhiv.

Similar wording is found in the May 1996 law "On State Protection" (**A–45**), which pertains to all security and intelligence agencies as well as the armed forces. Article 17 provides for the retention of their own records by all of the agencies covered with no time limit given for their transfer to state archival custody. A separate paragraph within that article, similar to those included in other laws relating to the security and intelligence services, specifies that materials "of historical and scientific value are to be declassified and transferred to archives under Rosarkhiv." But with no time-limit or retention schedules indicated, nor any provisions for outside state archival appraisal or accountability, the *de facto* effect and implication of this law is that the agencies themselves have the right to decide on matters of declassification and transfer. Furthermore, since there are no provisions to the contrary, all of those agencies themselves have the right to their own interpretation "of historical and scientific value" and to the final decision on those files they deem appropriate for destruction, not unlike the situation that existed during the Soviet period that was so sharply criticized by the presidential commission mentioned above. This law is potentially among the most threatening to "openness" in the archival realm, because it embraces so many different state agencies and because it is so vague, devoid of implementation guidelines, and at times even contradictory in possible interpretation.

In addition to the FSB, long-term control over archives is exercised by a number of other MVD/KGB successor agencies. Of highest interest, but least accessible, is the Operational Archive of the Foreign Intelligence Service (OA SVR Rossii – **C–7**). The so-called First Main Directorate (foreign intelligence) of the KGB had for many decades maintained its own archive, separate from that of the Central Archive of the KGB, in its Iasenevo (Yasenevo) headquarters (in the southern outskirts of Moscow). That situation continues today with the archive of the KGB foreign intelligence operations as the province of a now separate federal service. It should be noted, however, that considerable documentation relating to foreign intelligence operations will also be found in the TsA FSB, because reports would have gone to other central offices within the agency.[54] A July 1993 Regulation of the Supreme Soviet established a 50-year closure ruling for documentation relating to foreign intelligence activities (**A–42**), but earlier files have not been publicly released. A May 1995 Rosarkhiv *prikaz* ratified an agreement with the SVR to establish a commission for the transfer of records to federal archival custody, in this case involving limited files to RGVA (**B–8**).[55] The January 1996 law "On Foreign

---

[54] For example, the documents published in the recent volume, *Seketrety Gitlera na stole u Stalina. Razvedka i kontrrazvedka o podgotovke germanskoi agressi protiv SSSR, mart–iiun' 1941 g.: Dokumenty iz Tsentral'nogo arkhiva FSB Rossii*, comp. and ed. by Iu. V. K. Vinogradov et al. (Moscow: Izd-vo ob"edineniia "Mosgorarkhiv," 1995) are all identified as being held by the TsA FSB. Presumably that is also the case with the documentation in the popular English-language CD-ROM production, *Unknown Pages of the History of World War II: Documents from KGB Secret Archives* (Moscow: Progress Publishing Group and Laboratory of Optical Telemetry, 1995), but precise archival citations of documents used are not provided.

[55] "O sozdanom Komissii dlia organizatsii i provedeniia priemno-peredachi na gosudarstvennoe khranenie chasti arkhivnykh materialov SVR Rossii," Prikaz Rosarkhiv/SVR Rossii, no. 39/40, 29 May 1995, as published in [Rosarkhiv] *Informatsionnyi biulleten'*, no. 12 (1995), pp. 8–9. See fn. 430 below regarding the transfers.

Intelligence Services" (**A–44**), with similar wording to the April 1995 law regulating the FSB (**A–43**), gives all of the agencies engaged in foreign intelligence the essential right to long-term control over their own records – with no specific time limitation – and to determine themselves (albeit in consultation) what files could be declassified for transfer to Rosarkhiv. The SVR insistence on the need for such an arrangement was confirmed in the first and only public interview with the current SVR archival chief, Aleksandr Belozero, in December 1995.[56]

Two other now separate agencies that were earlier part of the KGB also maintain their own archives – namely the Federal Border Service (*Federal'naia pogranichnaia sluzhba Rossiiskoi Federatsii*) and the Federal Agency for Government Communications and Information (FAPSI – *Federal'noe agentstvo pravitel'stvennoi sviazi i informatsii pri Prezidente Rossiiskoi Federatsii*). Neither of these archives have been publicly described, but a presidential decree in April 1996 (**A–15**) officially gave them the right to long-term retention of their own records, as a new amendment to the March 1994 archival Regulation list (**A–14**). Pre-1955 records of the Federal Border Service were earlier turned over to TsGASA (now RGVA – **B–8**), but other records remain in the now separate Central Archive of that agency. The Government Communications Service has absorbed some of the domestic and foreign counter-intelligence functions (including ciphers and code-breaking) of the former KGB, but their separate archive is still in the process of formation. The 1993 law establishing FAPSI (**A–41**) mentioned its archival responsibilities, and the more recent 1996 law on the foreign intelligence services (**A–44**) also gave it control over its own records in the intelligence sphere.

The post-1991 legal framework for the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD Rossii) does not specifically provide for its archives, but the MVD is also included in the March 1994 list of federal agencies with the right of long-term retention of their own records (**A–14**). It also comes under the April 1995 law "On Organs of the Federal Security Service" (**A–43**) and it obviously comes under the sweeping 1996 law "On State Protection" (**A–45**). For most of the Soviet period, before the creation of the KGB itself in 1954, state security functions of the KGB predecessor agencies operated within the purview of the Ministry (before 1946 Commissariat) of Internal Affairs (MVD, earlier NKVD) and its predecessors, and so records have to a certain extent been intermingled with MVD records. Major complexes of NKVD/MVD records, particularly those predating 1954, have been turned over to federal archives, many of them to what is now the State Archive of the Russian Federation (GA RF – **B–1**), which now holds major central NKVD/MVD secretariat records, as well the records of the Main Administration for Corrective-Labor Camps (GULAG), among others. The voluminous NKVD/MVD records of Soviet prisoner-of-war and displaced-person camps from the period of World War II and its aftermath under the Main Administration for Affairs of Prisoners of War and Internment (GUPVI – *Glavnoe upravlenie po delam voennoplennykh i internirovannykh*), have been held since 1960 by the former Special Archive (now TsKhIDK – **B–15**). Pre-1955 records of the Internal and Convoy Troops under the NKVD/MVD were transferred to the Central State Archive of the Soviet Army (TsGASA, now RGVA – see **B–8**), while the MVD now also has a separate Central Archive of Internal Troops (**C–8**).

---

[56] Andrei Poleshchuk (interview with Aleksandr Belozerov), "Arkhivy rossiiskoi razvedki: Dostup k nim mozhet poluchit' daleko ne kazhdyi," *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, 20 December 1995, p. 6.

Despite such transfers to publicly accessible state archives, the MVD Central Archive (**C–7**) still remains a significant archival facility with many records dating back to the early decades of Soviet rule, including a crucially important central card registry covering over twenty-five million individuals who were incarcerated or otherwise processed for prison or labor camps under its jurisdiction. Since 1992, the MVD has organized its own archival information agency with an extensive network of what are now called Centers for the Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repression and Archival Information (*Tsentr arkhivnoi informatsii i reabilitatsii zhertv politicheskikh repressii* – TsAIiRZhPR – see **C–8**) to process the millions of inquiries received since the 1991 and subsequent laws providing for rehabilitation (**A–27** and **A–31**).[57] Similar to the situation with the FSB, MVD specialists now claim more experience with the use of their records and communication with other agencies that may hold contingent files (such as courts and procurators), and undoubtedly they are better funded, than Rosarkhiv archivists to handle such inquiries, particularly since they still retain their own reference system for NKVD/MVD records. Such factors have been part of their rationale and may help to explain why such significant quantities of MVD records and finding aids have remained in agency custody.

The Ministry of Atomic Energy by law also has the right to retain its own records on a long-term basis (**C–10**), and more will be said below (Ch. 13) about declassification efforts of its files. The Ministry of Justice, although not named in the 1994 March Regulation or other post-1991 normative act, has its own specialized archival office to administer the vast archival system for records of vital statistics throughout Russia. The centralized system of Civil Registry Offices (ZAGS *Zapis' aktov grazhdanskogo sostoianiia* – **C–11**), a carry-over from the Soviet period, retains vital statistics records for a period of 75 years before transferring them to local state archives. The Baltic republics of Estonia and Lithuania, even during the Soviet period, incorporated their central ZAGS archives more directly into the republic-level state archival system under Glavarkhiv. But in the RSFSR, and the Russian Federation today, ZAGS offices, together with their records, are maintained under the Ministry of Justice rather than Rosarkhiv. ZAGS archives in Russia normally are not open for public research (in respect of regulations covering documentation on personal privacy), but they constantly serve the public free of charge, providing certification of individual official data from their local records of vital statistics.

Another series of centralized archives under federal-level state services and commissions (or their subordinate agencies) preserve and service unique data of a specialized technical character (see detailed revised listings in Appendix 2). These include the Russian Federal Geological Fond (Rosgeolfond – **C–12** – as of August 1996 now under the newly consolidated Ministry of Natural Resources RF), the State Fond of Data on Environmental Conditions (Gosgidrometfond – **C–13**), the Central Cartographic and Geodesic Fond (Karteofond, or TsKGF – **C–14**), and the Central State Fond of Standards and Technical Specifications (TsGFSTU, or Fond standartov – **C–15**). During the Soviet period, these same technical archives remained outside of the control of Glavarkhiv, and according to the Regulation of the Council of Ministers of the USSR in April 1980, they

---

[57] See the report by the Center director, Konstantin S. Nikishkin, "Ob ispolnenii organami vnutrennikh del zakonodatel'stva o reabilitatsii i ob Arkhivnom fonde RF," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 6, pp. 26–29. More details about access and descriptive problems will be discussed in Ch. 13.

were given the right to permanent control over their records, which were nonetheless recognized as part of the State Archival Fond of the USSR. They have a similarly independent status from Rosarkhiv today, although they do not have the specified right of permanent retention of their archives. As a result of required normative agreements with Rosarkhiv – as provided for by the March 1994 archival Regulation – Rosarkhiv is extending its concern and accounting for their archival holdings, as is indicated by the first published survey article covering their organization and holdings, which appeared in the Rosarkhiv professional archival journal in 1996.[58] All of them are included in the 1996 ArcheoBiblio Base directory (see abreviated listings in Appendix 2). These specialized agency archives, it should be noted, are also of crucial importance to all the former Soviet republics, because of the extent to which during the Soviet period, unique specialized archival materials, scientific data, and reference facilities in their specific spheres of competence were centralized in their repositories from throughout the former Soviet Union.

Two major centralized audiovisual archives also remain outside the Rosarkhiv system: the Central Fond of Motion Pictures of the Russian Federation (Gosfil'mofond – **C–16**) houses feature films, including earlier silent ones, many full-length documentaries ("scientific-popular," in Russian), and animated films, along with related archival materials including outtakes and scenarios; the Central Fond for Television and Radio Programs (Gosteleradiofond – **C–17**), maintains extensive archives of state broadcast and television productions, along with related production materials, covering the entire post-World War II period. Neither of these archives were listed in the March 1994 Regulation on Archives, but both are provided for by separate government regulations giving them the right to receive deposit copies of films screened or broadcast in Russia (**A–56**) and to maintain their own archives permanently outside the Rosarkhiv system (see **A–47** and **A–48**). Also of note are the unique archives of the All-Union (now All-Russian) Book Chamber (VKP—**C–18**), which includes a registration copy of all printed books and journals. Many of the related archival records held by that agency have recently been declassified, providing a prime source for the history of publishing and censorship during the Soviet period.

Thus the centrifugal tradition of complex, fragmented archival organization with separate repositories for many major federal agencies continues today, as it existed during the Soviet regime. The Bolshevik seizure of power in October 1917 brought revolutionary change in terms of centralization and state control of the archival system, and of the wide-ranging records of many economic, social, cultural, and scientific organizations and agencies previously not subject to state archival control. The archival legacy of the Soviet system together with many of its legal and administrative elements have been retained today. Yet with the collapse of the Soviet system, successor state agencies and those now in the "non-state" or private sector have strengthened their hands vis-à-vis central authorities. The right of long-term retention of top-level state ministerial and other agency records outside the federal archival system greatly complicates researcher access. It also complicates uniform archival administration, declassification, description, and reference control. Nevertheless, now that this complex pattern has been formulated in laws and

[58] Tat'iana N. Viktorova, "O rabote s dokumentami otraslevykh fondov," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 3, pp. 96–101.

other normative acts, and the repositories themselves at least summarily described for the first time in the ABB directory, the public can become more openly aware of the organization and contents of the vast system of federal agency archives and other repositories that remain outside of Rosarkhiv control.

5. The Role of Rosarkhiv

The resurgent archival control of different federal agencies, and the extent of crucially important archival holdings outside of the immediate control of the Federal Archival Service of Russia (Rosarkhiv), has not obviated the key role of the principle agency charged with the direction of Russian archival affairs. The Committee on Archival Affairs of the Russian Federation (Roskomarkhiv – *Komitet po delam arkhivov pri Sovete Ministrov RSFSR*) was founded on the basis of Glavarkhiv RSFSR in November 1990 and assumed control of archival administration in the RSFSR almost a year before the attempted August coup. According to presidential decree in October 1991, Roskomarkhiv took over the functions and property of its Soviet era predecessor Glavarkhiv SSSR as well. Actual transfer of power, however, was not fully implemented before the collapse of the USSR at the end of the year. By early 1992, Roskomarkhiv had came under the Government of the Russian Federation (*Komitet po delam arkhivov pri Pravitel'stve Rossiiskoi Federatsii*). Renamed the State Archival Service of Russia (Rosarkhiv – *Gosudarstvennaia arkhivnaia sluzhba Rossii*) in the fall of 1992, in August 1996, it was again renamed the Federal Archival Service of Russia (*Federal'naia arkhivnaia sluzhba Rossii*), although it retains the official acronym of Rosarkhiv.

Under the leadership of Rudol'f G. Pikhoia from the fall of 1990 until January 1996, Rosarkhiv brought together a cluster of professional archival leaders and support staff, who had gained their experience in Soviet archival and historical institutions. Their numbers were drawn largely from graduates of the Moscow State Historico-Archival Institute (MGIAI – *Moskovskii gosudarstvennyi istoriko-arkhivnyi institut* – now the Historico-Archival Institute of the Russian State University for the Humanities – IAI RGGU). With the infusion of new blood from historical institutes of the Academy of Sciences and the CPSU, Rosarkhiv gained several historians who had considerable experience in archival-related research and/or who had been active in archival reform in the final years of the Soviet regime. Obviously, it is not possible to train a whole new generation of archivists and archival leaders overnight, but it should nonetheless be noted that relatively few of the highest level Rosarkhiv leaders, department heads, and directors of federal archives today are directly inherited from the former top echelons of Soviet-era Glavarkhiv leadership.

Under Soviet rule, total state control of archives was an essential element in the control of society and the body politic. Ideological control of the archives was an important element in the imposition of ideological orthodoxy. The imposition of archival control was at its height during the Stalinist regime when from 1938 until 1960 the archival administration was part of Beriia's People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs (NKVD) – after 1946, Ministry (MVD), that controlled the secret police and other organs of state security. The reign of secrecy over the national archival legacy was noticeably increased, as was the repression of many archivists. Those who remained, like archivists everywhere, had as their chief function to preserve and process the national documentary legacy. But under the Soviet regime, their aim was not to make archival materials available to the public or the research community – except in limited cases. Rather, especially when Glavarkhiv was subordinated to the NKVD/MVD, archival organs were frequently engaged in the service of repressive security forces, including processing records specifically to identify anti-Soviet elements, "bourgeois nationalists," "enemies of

the Fatherland," and other "operational" requirements of the state.[59] In the process, the Main Archival Administration (GAU, and later Glavarkhiv) under the NKVD/ MVD evolved as a strong, centralized, and well-financed, agency of the administrative command system. Reorganized after 1960 and removed from the structure of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD), Glavarkhiv continued as a separate administrative agency, directly responsible to the Council of Ministers of the USSR.[60]

The centralized command-administrative system and its embracing ideology of archival control has, to be sure, been abandoned in the post-Soviet era. The political and ideological role of Glavarkhiv, to be sure, has likewise been abandoned. Nevertheless, Rosarkhiv necessarily continues many of the administrative functions and bureaucratic procedures of its Soviet-period predecessor. According to the new archival laws and regulations, Rosarkhiv is designated as the state agency of archival administration and control, directly responsible to the highest executive authority of the nation. Inheriting a stronger and more formal tradition of state bureaucratic control and regulation of archival affairs than is usually met in Western countries, Rosarkhiv is accordingly responsible for the preservation and administration of the national archival legacy – the so-called Archival Fond RF. The staff size of the Rosarkhiv bureaucracy as it existed in the Soviet era has been considerably reduced over the past five years, to the point that it is now roughly only one third the size of its Glavarkhiv predecessor. And to be sure its power and effectiveness of control have likewise evaporated radically. The Rosarkhiv subsidiary research institute VNIIDAD still continues its functions within the Rosarkhiv establishment, although it now is financed to a large extent by providing outside contract services. A new reorganization of Rosarkhiv was introduced in the spring of 1996 to streamline operations and reduce overhead bureaucracy, but it is too soon to appraise its effectiveness.

On the top-most federal level Rosarkhiv's essential function is the administration of the sixteen federal archival repositories under its immediate jurisdiction, thus fulfilling the bureaucratic role which in other countries would be institutionalized in a "national archives." Glavarkhiv, as it evolved by the end of the Soviet regime, may have functioned as the administrator of the vast archival legacy of the nation, and was represented at home and abroad as the effective agency of archival administration. But in fact, it effectively controlled only those archives within the state archival system, not unlike the situation of Rosarkhiv today.

---

[59] The massive card files on individuals (both at home and in emigration) that remain today in many state archives are a telling reminder of one of the principal archival functions during the Soviet period. Specialists are only just beginning to appreciate the potential of such sources for genealogical information regarding repressed individuals and other types of analysis, as is revealed in a recent study of the extensive local files remaining in the State Archive of Tula Oblast. See, for example, Irina A. Antonova, "Praktika ispol'zovaniia genealogicheskoi informatsii cherez imennoi katalog byvshego spetskhrana (Na materialakh Gosarkhiva Tul'skoi oblasti)," in *Vestnik arkhivista*, 1992, no. 5(11), pp. 18–22; and I. A. Antonova, "Imennoi katalog byvshego spetskhrana: Istoriia, formuliar, reprezentativnost', vozmozhnosti sozdaniia bazy dannykh (na materialakh Gosarkhiva Tul'skoi oblasti)," *Krug idei: Razvitie istoricheskoi informatiki: Trudy II konferentsii assotsiatsii "Istoriia i komp'iuter"* (Moscow, 1995), pp. 343–49.

[60] See the recent "revisionist" history of archives within the Soviet system, which documents the role and functions of Glavarkhiv within the context of political developments – Tat'iana Khorkhordina, *Istoriia otechestva i arkhivy, 1917–1980-e gg.* (Moscow: RGGU, 1994). A number of related articles have been appearing in recent years, especially in *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, revealing previously undocumented facts about archival operations under Glavarkhiv and its predecessors.

Even for those federal archives under its direct control, Rosarkhiv's control has waned significantly. For example, foreign researchers no longer apply through Rosarkhiv for access to individual state archives. Rosarkhiv's respect and authority has also been reduced, because it has failed to raise adequate funds from the federal budget to provide for many of their needs. Thus Rosarkhiv functions often meet increasing vocal opposition from individual archives, who want more administrative autonomy, especially when they are forced to supplement their federal budgetary income and find their own subsidies for building renovation and publications. Rosarkhiv approval is required for major collaborative projects with foreign partners involving federal archives, but the extent to which Rosarkhiv tried to assume a commanding role was one of the reasons for the collapse of the major microfilming project with the Hoover Institution, as will be discussed further below. Federal archives today insist on the right to negotiate their own arrangements with foreign partners directly.

On the regional level there is even much less continuity for Rosarkhiv as the successor of the Soviet-era Glavarkhiv SSSR and Glavarkhiv RSFSR. National republics, krais, oblasts, and other "subjects" (*sub"ekti*) of the Russian Federation have, since 1991, considerable more autonomy and, together with their own "Archival Fonds," have established archival administrative organs and state archives of their own (including those for the nationalized former CP archives) responsible to their local governments. Regional archival administrations have been reorganized to assume more local archival control in contrast to the previous Soviet centralized command system. Since Moscow is not responsible for financing their operations, economics as well as the new political reality are promoting more autonomy for the "subjects" of the Russian Federation. Regional archival administrations send delegates to Rosarkhiv nationwide conferences in Moscow – although often they cannot afford the travel funds Moscow is no longer able to provide. They still look to Moscow for new methodological guidelines and Moscow-determined declassification instructions, to which they are still supposed to adhere. But they are not always content to sit silently and listen to Moscow recommendations, which often do not conform to their local needs.[61]

No longer in charge of operations, and without the purse strings to dictate, Rosarkhiv nonetheless still plays an important coordinating and methodological role in the entire state archival system. In May 1995, Rosarkhiv formally reestablished the so-called Zonal Scientific Methodological Councils for archival institutions of the Russian Federation (ZNMS), which had been established 25 years earlier under Glavarkhiv RSFSR.[62] What is striking in the reports from the different councils are the complaints about inadequate financing for meetings and discussion forums, inadequate new methodological guidelines from Rosarkhiv in keeping with post-Soviet problems, and the need for improved

---

[61] Such was vividly apparent in reports and interventions in the all-Russian archival conference held in Moscow – *Aktual'nye problemy upravleniia arkhivnym delom i ekonomicheskoi deiatel'nosti arkhivnykh uchrezhdenii Rossii: Materialy nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii 5–6 oktiabria 1993 g., Moskva,* compiled by A. N. Artizov et al. (Moscow: Rosarkhiv, 1994).

[62] "Ob utverzhdenii Polozheniia o Zonal'nom nauchno-metodicheskom sovete arkhivnykh uchrezhdenii Rossiiskoi Federatsii (ZIMS)," Prikaz Rosarkhiv/SVR Rossii, no. 31, (4 June 1995), as published in [Rosarkhiv] *Informatsionnyi biulleten'*, no. 12 (1995), pp. 10–14. Regarding this organization, see the report by Vladimir A. Tiuneev (First Deputy Chairman of Rosarkhiv), "O deiatel'nosti zonal'nykh nauchno-metodicheskikh sovetov arkhivnykh uchrezhdenii Rossiiskoi Federatsii," *Informatsionnyi biulleten'*, no. 12 (1995), pp. 15–30.

communications and publication outlets. Obviously, regional archives are now asking Moscow for updated instructions, descriptive standards, standardized computer programs that could assist administrative and descriptive functions, and other needs. But the current financial, staff, and programming limitations of Rosarkhiv and its research institute VNIIDAD are hindering optimal realization of coordinating methodological functions. Nevertheless, the importance of administrative coordination and the efforts being undertaken to provide reformed methodological guidelines are evident in recent published reports of the Zonal Councils.[63]

As already seen, Rosarkhiv's control over records of many federal record-producing agencies have been severely challenged by more assertive federal agencies that now retain increased control over their own records. Its records-management operations on the federal level have likewise been subject to criticism. New federal regulations establishing retention schedules and the obligations and procedure for the transfer of state records to permanent archives were issued in March 1993 (see **A–11**). Nevertheless, some claim Rosarkhiv – to say nothing of the agencies themselves – has not even succeeded in adequately reforming Soviet-period methodological and appraisal guidelines for federal agencies, given new tendencies for a more open, democratic approach to history and public information.

Under Soviet rule, with its centralized command administrative system, Glavarkhiv had much more say in the regulation of and methodological guidelines for the broader elements of the "State Archival Fond of the USSR" that were housed in repositories outside of its direct jurisdiction, including those in libraries and museums under other agencies. However, similar to Rosarkhiv today, it did not always succeed adequately in including them in its reporting functions and keeping tabs on their archival contents for administrative purposes and public reference services. An upgraded archival reporting and public information system has been another Rosarkhiv mandate over the last five years, the extent of fulfillment of which will be discussed further below (see Ch. 12).

Rosarkhiv continues to play the major role in representing Russia on the international archival front. Gone are the days, however, of the essential Soviet-style official binational agreements for archival cooperation with different countries. Nevertheless, Rosarkhiv has tried to continue that tradition with some countries, even though those types of agreements are less essential in the new era of more normal, open international relations. Rosarkhiv international prestige on the archival front has been compromised by the thorny issue of trophy archives and restitution, as will be discussed later (see Ch. 8). International agreements affecting archives are been flouted on that front, while Russian politicians are willing to bargain with the national legacy of other nations, even while not providing adequate preservation for their own.

Rosarkhiv's status as the key federal archival agency remains intact, but its position in controlling and regulating all of the archival legacy of the nation has been eclipsed by the sheer number and variety of archival repositories outside of its control, by the rise of local regional control over archival administration, by the lack of state budgetary provision for even many of its essential needs, and by the lack of adequate computerization and a

---

63 See the published materials, including reports of various participants, of a meeting of representatives of the ZMNS in 1995, as published in *Informatsionnyi biulleten'*, no. 12 (1995), pp. 31–43. See the summary reports and lists of topics covered for 1995, as published in *Informatsionnyi biulleten'*, no. 14 (1996), pp. 38–65.

computerized communication system that could cut costs and increase efficiency in many areas. By February 1997, its single fax machine (donated by the Soros Foundation six years ago) was not operating: the telephone line had been disconnected for non-payment.

Little wonder that critics question Rosarkhiv's effectiveness as a contemporary, post-Soviet archival regulatory, methodological, and information agency, which appears to many archivists and outsiders as hardly commensurate with its continued Soviet-style bureaucracy. Little wonder that the research community raises questions about the effectiveness of Rosarkhiv as the principal federal agency of archival *service* to the public, despite its achievements over the past five years in terms of archival laws and increased research accessibility to the archives under its own jurisdiction. Since the departure of Rudol'f Pikhoia in January 1996, Rosarkhiv was almost a year without a new permanent Chairman. Its future direction will undoubtedly depend on the archival professionalism, foresight, and political effectiveness of the newly appointed Chief Archivist of Russia vis-à-vis the government administration and other archival-holding agencies, – but even more, on his success in augmenting federal budgetary appropriations.

In a country the size of Russia that lacks a consolidated national archives, a central archival agency is obviously essential for basic administrative and fiscal functions, for relations with federal executive and legislative organs, with regional archival administrations, and for international relations on the archival front. If there is to be accountability and control over the vast Archival Fond of the Russian Federation, a central regulatory agency is still needed to coordinate registration and reporting of holdings; standards for arrangement and descriptive practices; appraisal and retention, security, preservation, and declassification guidelines; and nationwide archival computerization, to say nothing of public information services, among other essential archival operations. Many of the current problems of inefficient bureaucratic procedures come not so much from Rosarkhiv inertia, or the carry-over of the Glavarkhiv role, bureaucratic mind set, and functions from the Soviet regime. Rather they result from the insufficient development within the broader sphere of Russian government and society of a viable contemporary infrastructure to provide efficient and stable banking, judicial, communications, and social services, budgetary responsibility, and other functions on which modern archival administration are dependent.

6. Economic Problems and Preservation: "Closed for *Remont*" and Unpaid Vacation

The post-Soviet Russian government may have enacted the first normative law on archives in Russian history, defined a legal entity constituting the archival heritage of the nation to be preserved and protected for posterity, and provided a high government agency to administer it, but so far the Russian government has failed to provide adequate rubles to preserve the Russian archival legacy for future generations. Researchers, government agencies at home and abroad, and citizens who need documentary attestations, should all be aware of the disastrous economic situation for Russian archives. Aside from the threats to even minimal long-term archival preservation, and to the possibility of accessioning more records already legally scheduled for transfer, the economic crisis has many serious affects on the nature and conduct of immediate public services.

Archives may have been relatively closed to public research under Soviet rule, but there were funds for preservation and even the construction of a number of major new buildings. Now within the reformed post-Soviet legal framework, inflation and the current catastrophic financial crisis has brought only comparatively decreased state budgets for archival operations. Funding is inadequate for appropriate archival salaries, and the government has provided little for major restoration or next to nothing for modernized security and communication systems. Many archival buildings themselves are becoming "shadows of the past." Even centrally placed archives that are renting out parts of their buildings to banks, bars, or other commercial enterprises still often do not have the needed funds to pay their bills for electricity, heating, and needed building repair, let alone up-graded wiring for computer networks, security, and fire-protection systems. Major archives and manuscript collections are being closed to researchers, not because of political sensitivity or lack of declassification, but because there are not enough rubles to repair their roofs or their heating systems.

Summer operating hours were further reduced in many archives for 1996 and 1997, and many federal archives released most of their staff on unpaid vacations. Many archives are functioning only because of the enthusiasm and devotion of those who have given their lives to archival service under various regimes. As the senior head of a major division in the Russian State Archive of Early Acts (RGADA – **B–2**) assured this author at the beginning of July 1996, "Our director just told me I should take two month's vacation (without pay of course), but I'll be here next week if you want to discuss that problem with me, even if the archive is closed. I can't go away that long, because my work in RGADA is my life." An archivist in the State Archive of the Russian Federation (GA RF – **B–1**) stopped to greet this author in the courtyard. "Yes, our reading room is closed until September and I am 'on vacation,' but if you need to verify another file for your publication, do come and see me tomorrow."[64] During September and October 1996, when the three federal archives off *Leningradskoe shosse* reopened after their "vacation leaves," they could barely keep archivists working more than three hours a day. As the weather turned freezing, they still had no money to pay for heat or electricity, and one had

[64] I quote these two specific individuals anonymously, as examples of many I have encountered while working in Moscow. In no instances have the individuals involved asked for any measure of compensation.

to close down their reading room completely, because they could not deliver files from the stacks. A little more funding came through in November, but the unusually cold winter ahead was bleak. An archivist visiting from one of these archives (RGVA – **B–9**) reported to a shocked audience at the conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS) in Boston in November 1996 that her archive was even coping with rats, so how could they begin to think about international guidelines that recommend constant temperature and humidity for archival preservation. Rosarkhiv itself did not receive money for salaries in December, and there were no funds to replenish paper for their fax or repair their xerox machine.

Aid from abroad, including the International Council on Archives (ICA) and UNESCO, has provided some building inspection guidelines, management and declassification seminars, and some limited preservation microfilming, along with foreign travel and practical intern visits for a limited number of Russian archivists. But given a country on the scale of Russia with the thousands of archives operating within its borders, foreign funding sources, or income from foreign royalties and the sale of licenses for publication rights, cannot be expected to provide more than a drop in the bucket in terms of the long-term support needed to sustain the country's extensive archival operations.

Typical of the fiscal uncertainty under which major archives are operating, bank accounts for state archives are no longer provided by the Russian State Bank. Forced to deposit its funds in commercial banks starting in 1993, already by mid-1996, what funds RTsKhIDNI (the former Central Party Archive – **B–12**) had built up for operating reserves from various foreign projects were lost in two successive bank crashes. The collapse of the second, the Tver Universal Bank, which was leasing space for a branch office in the RTsKhIDNI entrance hall, left RTsKhIDNI for several months without the rental income that was helping to pay for its electricity, telephone, and heat, which are not being covered by the federal budget. Rosarkhiv could offer no assistance, and only 34% of the approved amount expected from the state budget for salaries in 1996 was received by the end of June. As another small, but nonetheless symbolic, loss on the downside, RTsKhIDNI had to close down its e-mail account. Several years ago, IREX provided a computer and subsidized an e-mail account, especially so that foreign researchers could contact the archive with research inquiries, but since the IREX subsidy had run out, that service was curtailed as an economy measure.[65] Indicative of the surrealist situation, to be sure, there were still fresh flowers by the statue of Lenin that graces the inner entrance to the archive.

During the spring of 1996, some federal archives had money to pay their staff only 15–25% of the minimal wage now set by law, which hardly covered their public transportation to work. Other months there were no salaries at all, or available state funds could cover only from 30–50% of the minimal salaries designated. Until June 1996, a subsidized cafeteria was operating in the Rosarkhiv archival compound that houses GA RF, RGAE, RGADA, and other archival operations. Although few of the staff could afford to partake in the relatively low-priced meals, since June 1996, the cafeteria has been closed down, because there were no funds for repair or replacement when the refrigerator gave out. No wonder that many of the most talented archival staff are being drawn off to

---

65 Details about these misfortunes were related to the present author by RTsKhIDNI director Kirill Anderson in early August. There was some hope that at least part of the most recent bank loss would be recovered when the Tver Bank's assets were bought out by another, but unfortunately, that proved illusory. RTsKHiDNI e-mail service was reinstated in 1998 (see Appendix 2).

higher and more stable salaries in the commercial sector, accepting what moonlighting jobs they can to try to make ends meet, and/or working below optimal efficiency as a protest against inadequate pay. Western archivists are nonetheless amazed at the large staffs and management personnel in the multitude of archival repositories. Rather than introducing Western management techniques and a more cost-efficient infrastructure, many Russian archives are still burdened with costly Soviet-style bureaucratic procedures, which do not help their financial viability. But even when they find the capital or foreign donations to bring in computers, few have grounded wiring, and there are no funds for systematic backup storage, reserve power-supply maintenance, or technical support.

Even while complaining about low wages and poor working conditions, many devoted archivists worry about the future, because, given such problems, the younger generation is shunning archival service. Russia's main training program for professional archivists, traditionally known throughout the world as the Moscow State Historico-Archival Institute (MGIAI), celebrated its 65th Anniversary in May 1996 in the historic building which in earlier centuries housed the printing office of the Holy Synod. Even during the dark Soviet decades, and, despite various purges, its historical and archival training provided a strong backbone of professional training for archival cadres throughout the former Soviet Union. In the days of *glasnost'* and *perestroika*, with Iurii N. Afanas'ev as rector, MGIAI led the movement for archival reform in bitter opposition to Glavarkhiv leadership. Afanas'ev then called upon historians to speed the process of "awakening from their slumbers," and to seek out "that energy of historical knowledge which is so necessary today for our society's comprehensive renewal." MGIAI itself was slated to become a major proving ground for reform and to follow its rector's call for "training a new generation of historian-archivists." In May 1991, renamed the Historico-Archival Institute (IAI) it was transformed into one of the main components of the new Russian State University for the Humanities (IAI RGGU), where its faculty feared it would face the demise of its traditions for professional archival education.[66]

Today, young people finishing the prestigious institute are "running away from the archives," then IAI Director Evgenii V. Starostin complained in a report to the March 1996 Conference of the Russian Society of Historians and Archivists. He recommended, among other measures, a plan of required internship and a given number years of obligatory archival service in exchange for university stipends.[67] But RGGU Rector Iurii N. Afanas'ev found an alternate solution: Given the new stringency facing Russian universities, already during 1996, several IAI sub-departments (*kafedra*) were eliminated or combined, with their staff reduced by half or more. By the end of November, the heads of five kafedras had been fired, and IAI Director Starostin, who had been duly elected, and was still trying to find means to salvage the prestigious Institute, was himself relieved of his post as director. Now even if promised higher salaries can lure young university graduates to the archives, archivists fear that their professional preparation for archival service will be seriously compromised, as more IAI faculty resign. The newly appointed

---

66 See more details about Afanas'ev and the MGIAI role in archival reform in Grimsted, "*Glasnost'* in the Archives?" pp. 215–22; and "*Perestroika* in the Archives?" pp. 86–91. The quoted passages come from Afanas'ev's inaugural lecture as MGIAI rector, as excerpted in Iu. N. Afanas'ev (Yuri Afanasyev), "Energy of Historical Knowledge," *Moscow News*, 1987, no. 2 (19–25 January 1987), pp. 8–9.

67 Evgenii V. Starostin, "Problemy podgotovki i ispol'zovaniia kadrov istorikov-arkhivistov," *Vestnik arkhivista*, 1996, no. 2(32)/3(33), pp. 4–50.

director is trying to make amends. Given the current crisis situation, however, with the very existence of the Institute itself in question, it is hard to see how IAI can continue the path Afanas'ev had outlined in 1987 to "turn out real historians who enter the archives with a real understanding of the cultural meaning of their profession."[68]

When Rosarkhiv chairman Rudol'f Pikhoia was quoted with alarming comments about the "crisis situation of Russian archives" in the summer of 1994, he had in mind principally the federal archives under Rosarkhiv. Their crisis since has only augmented. In 1995, Rosarkhiv received only 27% of the designated budget needed for major building repair and renovation, and only 9% of its budget for new construction.[69] But even that low percentage was reduced in 1996. The major historical archive for post-eighteenth-century records of the pre-revolutionary Russian Empire – RGIA (see **B–3**), as of the winter of 1996, is still "officially closed" for an as yet indeterminate period. Another in a series of warnings about faulty wiring had been issued by the fire marshal in July 1995, only a month after a major theft of no less than 12,000 documents from its irreplaceable holdings. Three years earlier, that particular archive was singled out as the object of special UNESCO and ICA attention in a major international fund-raising venture for the renovation of its collapsing historic buildings to modern archival standards. Efforts to raise adequate funds abroad hardly kept pace with inflation and other problems within Russia. A government decree in the spring of 1996 authorized a new building for RGIA, but a year later, skeptics wonder if and when funds will actually be appropriated to start construction. Meanwhile, foreign funding sources are losing interest, because the new plan does not involve renovation of the historic buildings on the Neva embankment and because trophy archives from European countries were not returned. Symbolically, RGIA staff were called upon in the fall of 1995 to provide the needed architectural plans and technical documentation for the resurrection of the Church of the Redeemer in Moscow, which was rebuilt in record-breaking time. But the archive that preserved the needed plans, and which houses essential pre-revolutionary documentation for all of the former Russian Empire breathes a sigh of relief that it managed to survive another winter without another collapsed ceiling or a burst in the heating system (which was due for replacement decades ago) or yet another major crisis that will force it to close down completely. When the energetic post-Soviet director resigned from the difficult post, in late 1996, it was difficult to find a replacement. Meanwhile, the dedicated staff continue to serve researchers, although delivery of files is at a minimum, and delays and temporary closures of some fonds are to be expected.

During the same period in St. Petersburg, lack of funds has prevented completion of the long-promised new building for the Russian State Archive of the Navy (RGAVMF – **B–5**), which had already been under construction during the final years of Soviet rule. Even the big celebration for the three-hundred-year anniversary of the Russian Navy could not help raise funds for the construction. Across the city, the local St. Petersburg historical archive has been virtually closed to research for the last few years, because adequate funds have not come through to speed up its essential building renovation. As of

---

68 As quoted in Grimsted, "*Glasnost'* in the Archives?" p. 216.

69 See, for example, Pikhoia's comments quoted in the Moscow English-language newspaper, *Moscow Times*, 23 June 1994. Budgetary deficiencies are noted in the published 1995 report by then Acting Rosarkhiv Chairman Vladimir A. Tiuneev, "Ob itogakh deiatel'nosti uchrezhdenii sistemy Rosarkhiva v 1995 g.," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 3, pp. 7–8.

the winter of 1996, although progress is reported, that archive is still closed indefinitely to the public. The local Communist Party archive was the intended benefactor of the only high-quality archival building to be constructed in St. Petersburg since 1917 (a much more modest 1960s structure for local post-revolutionary records [now TsGA SPb] was the only other one built). However, the now-nationalized CP archive has not moved into its intended new home, while part of the building now houses the local Stock Exchange. Negotiations to use its well-constructed, but still empty, archival storage areas for other disaster-threatened archives, even on an emergency basis, have been unsuccessful.

World-class repositories under the Russian Academy of Sciences have fewer prospects for assuring adequate preservation, but short-term Western aid is hardly a sinecure. A new building constructed under the Soviet regime provides for the Soviet-period records of the Academy of Sciences in Moscow. In the meantime, the long-standing St. Petersburg branch witness the continued deterioration of the building and inadequate fire protection system in the oldest continuous archive in Russia, which dates its establishment to 1728 (three years after the founding of the Academy of Sciences itself). Researcher hours and services have been cut to below minimum, while at one point, devoted staff took time out from moonlighting ventures to fight various potentially fatal archival fungi. The archive has still been unable to accession crucial Academy records covering the last three decades of the Soviet regime.

Fire in the Library of the Academy of Sciences (BAN) in St. Petersburg in February of 1988 already raised worldwide alarms: Many Western sources came to aid the salvage and recovery operation. Fortunately the manuscript collections were not affected. Since burst heating pipes in *Pushkinskii Dom* in the winter of 1990, a new affordable home has still not been found for the irreplaceable manuscript collections of the Institute of Russian Literature. Nor have facilities improved for the unique Photographic Archive of the Institute of Material Culture across the Neva, which was hit by another serious tragedy from water damage in the winter of 1991. During 1995 and 1996, the unique archive of the Russian Geographic Society was closed while that world renown institution copes with the effects of yet another burst water pipe disaster in 1994.[70] More such tragedies, and much worse, are waiting to happen, because funds for renovation with the needed modern plumbing, heating, electrical, and security systems are nowhere to be found.

Meanwhile in Moscow, in the library world, renovation of the Pashkov Palace, which before the Revolution housed the Rumiantsev Public Library and Museum, and subsequently housed the archive and world-class Manuscript Division of the Lenin Library, now known as the Russian State Library (RGB), was stalled for another three years for lack of funds. The exterior scaffold was removed almost two years ago, but the interior is still not prepared to reclaim its archival wealth, as a Moscow newspaper was quick to complain in the summer of 1995 about the "gaping abyss behind the repainted facade."[71] The Manuscript Division was ridden by scandal over repressive policies during the period of *perestroika* in the late 1980s, when access to its riches was more restrictive

---

[70] Newspaper articles and other press accounts in St. Petersburg have been exposing these cultural horror stories, but remedies have yet to emerge.

[71] "Knigi na razvale: Fasad doma Pashkova pokrashen. A za nim – ziiaiushchie dyry," *Obshchaia gazeta*, no. 33 (17–23 August 1995), p. 7.

and discriminatory than that of many state archives under Glavarkhiv.[72] Now it is caught up in the persisting and ever-deepening crisis of the library itself. Even the newer adjoining main library building was closed intermittently during 1994 and 1995, due to lack of heat and/or other physical and budgetary problems, while its public services, its ongoing acquisitions, and cataloguing services are unable to keep pace with new information demands of an increasingly open society.

The first post-Soviet director, Igor Ia. Filippov, and a number of other high administrators were fired in January 1996 with cries of alleged mismanagement, following an investigation by the Ministry of Culture. A bitter law-suit complicated resolution of the crisis. During the lengthy trial, charges and counter charges appeared in the press, while over 250 priceless manuscripts were reported missing. With the case settled in favor of the Ministry of Culture, a new director, Vladimir K. Egorov, was installed at the end of October 1996, but heat was still lacking and library services were again curtailed. With a grossly inadequate operating budget and the legacy of many unresolved problems, the fate of the "Leninka" – the largest library in Russia (if not the largest in the world), along with its priceless archival treasures, remains in serious jeopardy.[73] No one is prepared to estimate when the Manuscript Division can be moved back into its traditional home in the Pashkov Palace and normal services restored for researchers.

The Russian equivalent of Santa Claus, *Ded Moroz* (literally, Grandfather Frost), pays his family visit on New Year's Eve. Although there is no Russian tradition of writing letters to "Santa," as there is in America, New Year's Eve 1996 was nonetheless an occasion for a desparate appeal: The head curators of fonds (*glavnye khraniteli fondov*) of the seventeen federal archives and documentary centers under Rosarkhiv addressed a New Year's Eve letter to President Boris Yeltsin. Their moving characterization of the crisis state of the archival holdings under their care was subsequently published in the Rosarkhiv journal, but it still awaits a satisfactory answer in a country where economic crisis pervades all of society. A few sample sentences characterizes their plight:

> Many, indeed very many, documents in our archives would have an auction price of hundreds, maybe even millions, of dollars each. For us, for the history and culture of our country, they are priceless. But today, we lack even the most elementary means to insure their preservation [...]
>
> During recent years, despite the increase of spreading fungi infections and other potentially threatening biological hazards [...] during recent years all preservation, restoration, and microfilming operations have necessarily been curtailed. [...]

---

[72] Regarding the earlier situation in the Lenin Library, which was the subject of bitter Russian press commentary, see Grimsted, "*Glasnost'* in the Archives?" pp. 228–31.

[73] See, for example, the scathing article about the scandal-ridden library by Iurate Gurauskaite, Liudmila Lunina, and Valeriia Sycheva, "Dom Pashkova v roli nekhoroshei kvartiry: Konflikt v Rossiiskoi Gosudarstvennoi biblioteke," *Kommersant" Daily*, no. 10 (27 January 1996), p. 16. See also the commentary by Oleg Antonov, "Bibliotechnyi rai i ad . . . – minus billingtonizatsiia vsei strany," *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, no. 8 (16 January 1996), p. 8. The author comments on the firing of Igor Filippov, because of his mismanagement, and lambasts two other Moscow library directors Ekaterina Genieva and Feliks Kuznetsov. The author criticizes the latter two for trying to imitate James Billington as Librarian of Congress, and accuses them of financial improprieties with the satirical title which can be roughly translated – "Library Heaven or Hell . . . minus the Billingtonization of the entire Country." As an example of continuing press commentary with the charge of missing manuscripts, see Iuliia Pashlova, "Evreiskie rukopisi goriat," *Kommersant' Daily*, no. 159 (24 September 1996), p. 10.

> Our archives today lack the most essential necessities for documentary storage, such as boxes, file folders, labels, fasteners, and even paper. We can't even begin to contemplate the necessity to replace wooden shelving with fireproof metal shelves. [...]
>
> During 1996, federal archives did not even receive the assigned budgetary provisions for current operations, apart from wages and militia security guards (and those only partially).
>
> We recently heard [...] that Rosarkhiv will receive no more for the year ahead. In that case, as today, we cannot guarantee the preservation of the documents that are entrusted to us.[74]

Instead, in May 1997, Rosarkhiv received word that its annual operating budget for federal archives would be reduced by seventy-two per cent. Given the deeping Russian federal budget crisis, there is little hope in sight. The few foreign Santa Clauses in sight are not likely to make Russian archival preservation a high priority for Christmas or the New Year. As will be seen below, Russian politicians have been clamoring for the nationalization of "trophy" art, books, and archives, and crying out against the alienation of the nation's "paper gold" by the sale of microform copies of Russian archival materials or information resources abroad. But until the Russian parliament can come up with adequate budgetary provisions and fiscal stability for Russian archives, along with tax incentives for contributions from the Russian private sector, the crisis in Russian archives and uncertainties of preserving the archival "gold reserve" of the Russian Federation, will only worsen.

---

74 "Prezident razdeliaet trevogu arkhivistov," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1997, no. 2, pp. 3–5.

7. Archival Destruction and Retention Policies

Among the important questions facing researchers trying to identify the "shadows cast to the past," and the sensations still to be revealed or purveyed, revolve around the issues of archival appraisal and indiscriminate destruction: What shadows have been destroyed that should not have been destroyed? and why? – What types records deserve preservation today for documentating Russian society and culture that were not on the "for permanent preservation" lists under Soviet rule? Those are hard questions to answer when many state archives are seriously overloaded, when they cannot pay rent and maintenance for extra storage space that the federal budget does not provide, and when they have no funds for modernized storage facilities and compact shelving, let alone the costs of accessioning new records.

Given Russia's tumultuous history, many marvel at the extent to which the shadows of the past have been preserved, even if they are all not fully accessible to the public. The reappearance of the paper trail to the Katyn massacre and the secret protocols of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939, after decades of denial, is proof of past Russian imperatives to preserve important documentation even when potentially compromising. Many countries would have gotten rid of such documents long ago. With the opening of Russian archives over the past five years, however, there has still been inadequate published documentation about the extent of past archival destruction. Equally important today are the inadequate budgetary provisions for the continued transfer to federal archives of those records already designated for permanent preservation. Indeed one of the persisting reasons for the triumph of key agency power over the long-term retention of their own records has been the inadequacy of archival storage facilities in public archives under Rosarkhiv. The two problems are mutually interactive.

To be sure, most countries have never been able to provide permanent archival facilities for more than three or four percent of the records of contemporary government, although the figures may go up to ten percent for files relating to foreign relations, and even higher still for court records of all types. Legitimate questions are nevertheless being raised today in Russia about the type and nature of intentional past destruction, and its possible shadow effect on the historical record. Researchers need to be acutely aware of past appraisal guidelines and destruction patterns, so as to evaluate the extent and nature of preservation and not be surprised at the high waste-paper (*makulatura*) figures for many agencies and archives in different periods. A recent history of Soviet archival policies by a representative of the new generation of archival instructors at the Historico-Archival Institute (IAI RGGU) appropriately points to the "'waste-paper' campaign" during the 1929–1938 period as exemplifying "a radical change in government policies in relation to archives," which went hand-in hand with the purges or "cleansing" of archival cadres.[75]

Considerable archival gaps and losses of materials from the 1920s and 30 have been traditionally blamed on Nazi wartime destruction during the World War II. To be sure, damage by the invader was extensive in war-torn areas of the Soviet Union, during the "Great Patriotic War of the Fatherland," as the Soviet-German war (1941–1945) with increased nationalist fervor is still known in Russia. Nevertheless, as an important

---

[75] See the perceptive analysis of this development by Khorkhordina, in *Istoriia otechestva i arkhivy*, pp. 180–204.

component in the "revisionist" history of the war, the extent to which Soviet authorities were ordered to destroy archives during the summer of 1941, when it was possible to evacuate only a small part of the archives on the invasion route, has now been documented in shocking detail. To cite only a few examples from a newly available Glavarkhiv NKVD 1942 report, seven times as many records of the centralized Soviet planning agency Gosplan were destroyed than those evacuated to the East for protection; only 4,980 files from the Supreme Council (*Verkhovnyi Sovet*) were saved, while 748,633 burned, and from the Main Administration of Corrective-Labor Camps (GULAG), 95,714 files were evacuated, while 1,172,388 were destroyed.[76]

A thorough analysis of wartime evacuation and destruction from central state archives in Moscow and Leningrad was published in 1990,[77] and a 1992 article on the post-revolutionary Foreign Ministry archive admits to significant destruction of its files for lack of rolling stock for evacuation.[78] Similar details have not been confirmed regarding numerous other high-level federal agency archives. Nor has there been confirmation of the extent of destruction of CP documentation, although Central Committee proposals for destruction of certain categories of records have been cited recently and archivists suspect that many of the current lacunae in, for example, the records of CC departments, can be attributed to burning in the summer of 1941. Further research is needed to make better known the extensive Soviet forced destruction on the regional level in 1941 – especially in Western regions and Ukraine that came under Nazi occupation, including, in the latter case, virtually the entire Party Archive in Kyiv and several other oblasts, the destruction of which has already been documented.[79] But such revelations are exceedingly unpopular to the resurgent nationalist revival, especially in the context of the fiftieth-anniversary victory celebrations in 1995. All such forced destruction in 1941 and the further brutal destruction of archives and other cultural monuments by Soviet forces when retaking occupied areas in 1943–1944 was later blamed unconditionally on the Nazi invader in official postwar reports. Only gradually is the truth of wartime developments beginning to emerge.

What about the survival of more specific records needed now for the rehabilitation of the victims of political rather than military oppression? Already in 1987 the unofficial Moscow journal *Glasnost'* described the burning of remaining archives relating to

---

[76] The selected figures quoted are from an extensive chart prepared by Glavarkhiv NKVD SSSR (1 April 1942), GA RF, 5325/10/836, fols. 45–46.

[77] Olga N. Kopylova analyzed figures for the central state archives in Moscow and Leningrad in a significant "revisionist" article on the subject, "K probleme sokhrannosti GAF SSSR v gody Velikoi Otechestvennoi voiny," *Sovetskie arkhivy*, 1990, no. 5, pp. 37–44. More details are revealed in the author's dissertation, "Tsentral'nye gosudarstvennye arkhivy SSSR v gody Velikoi Otechestvennoi voiny, 1941–1945 gg." (Moscow: RGGU, 1991). See also the introductory sections in my articles "Displaced Archives on the Eastern Front," (see fn. 90) and "The Fate of Ukrainian Cultural Treasures during World War II," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 39:1 (1991), pp. 53–80.

[78] Vladimir V. Sokolov, "Arkhiv vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii – istorikam," *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia*, 1992, no. 4, pp. 156–65.

[79] The Central Committee proposals for destruction are cited in a recent article by Oleg Khlevniouk, Liudmila Kocheleva, Jana Howlett, and Larissa Rogovaia, "Les sources archivistiques des organes dirigeants du PC(b)R," *Communisme*, no. 42–44 (1995), p. 21. Intentional destruction of Ukrainian CP archives in 1941 is confirmed in the report of Minaeva to Karavaev, "Spravka o sostoianii i rabote oblastnykh partiinykh arkhivov obkomov KP(b)U na 1.III.45 g.," RTsKhIDNI, 71/6/253, fols. 34–53.

individuals who perished during the Stalin purges "under the pretext of 'insufficient space' for current documentation." According to the author, other "records of the USSR Procurator's Office and Ministry of Justice were 'cleansed' of such cases in the 1960s and 1970s."[80] Fortunately, to the contrary, many records of those agencies do still survive, at least in other copies or alternative files. But to be sure many were destroyed, because it was government appraisal policy that only certain categories would be kept for more than 15, 25, or 50 years, as retention policies were determined in part by the amount of storage space available and in part by those categories of records there were deemed of permanent "scientific-historical value." Who would have known when those guidelines were drafted that later laws would be passed providing for rehabilitation? A regime intent on liquidation of millions of "enemies of the people" was hardly a regime to provide storage space to retain all the traces of that liquidation.

Different specialized agencies had their own internal appraisal and retention policies, often determined by "operational" objectives. The extent of KGB destruction of culturally and political significant materials is still impossible to appraise from open sources. An official 1992 report presented to the Supreme Council of the Russian Federation over the signature of General Volkogonov calls the KGB policies with respect to archives "criminal," in citing the internal instructions of Andropov in 1979 and Kriuchkov in 1990, calling for the extensive destruction of KGB operational files.[81] In December 1991, then KGB chairman Vadim Bakatin assured a Moscow journalist that "What some people needed to have destroyed was destroyed long since." In answer about the alleged destruction of 250 volumes of Sakharov-related records, he replied, "More... 580 volumes... Sakharov's diaries, an inestimable treasure. And comparatively recently, in July 1989."[82]

Destruction was also rampant in CPSU files, especially at the time of the attempted coup in August 1991. But the amount that has been saved is also impressive, in comparison to records destroyed in many other countries of the world to save the face of one regime or deface the memory of another. An interview with the last director of the Central Party Archive (now RTsKhIDNI), on the eve of the attempted August coup, presented his defense as to why, for example, personnel files of CPSU members and other internal Party files should be promptly destroyed. His viewpoint was strongly countermanded in print by Boris Ilizarov, a respected reform-oriented professor at MGIAI, who considered such materials permanent records of an institution that was "an essential part of the state apparatus."[83] Ilizarov's statements were given public sanction in Yeltsin's decree in August 1991 that called for the nationalization and preservation of those and

---

80 Dmitrii G. Iurasov, "Unichtozhenie poslednego sudebnogo arkhiva 30-kh – 50-kh godov," *Glasnost': Informatsionnyi biulleten'*, nos. 2–4 (July 1987); republished in English translation, *Glasnost'* (New York), p. 3.

81 See the article by Petrov, "Politika rukovodstva KGB," *Karta*, no. 1 (1993), pp. 4–5. See fn. 50 above. The official report cites the instructions for destruction as nos. 00185/1979 and 00150/1990, and calls for government action to prevent further agency destruction of such records in the future.

82 Interview with Vadim Bakatin, *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 18 December 1991; English translation in *Foreign Broadcast Information Service* (FBIS-Sov), 91–249 (27 December 1991).

83 V. Chelikov, "Esli arkhivy unichtozhaiut, zhnachit, eto komu-nibud' nuzhno? – Dva vzgliada na 'chistku' partdokumentov" (interview with TsPA director, I. Kitaev and reply by B. S. Ilizarov), *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, 26 July 1991.

other threatened CPSU records. Then Chairman of Roskomarkhiv, Rudol'f Pikhoia cites the figure of "6,569,000 files that had been slated for destruction" throughout the Russian Federation in line with the March 1991 CPSU orders. According to his count, of those, less than one-third or in his words, "2,000,324 were actually destroyed," before the presidential decree of 21 August 1991 (**A–1**) and the immediate efforts of Roskomarkhiv to seal off and rescue more current CPSU and local Party records. Elsewhere, Pikhoia also noted the "interesting collection" of documentation from the Russian White House that Roskomarkhiv was able to save.[84] But Pikhoia does not document those figures, or his source for them, and as yet documents have not been released that make it possible to verify the extent of destruction. Others have mentioned the extent to which non-Russian union republics did *not* follow the Moscow destruction orders. Colleagues in Estonia, for example, have assured the author and other Western colleagues, that archivists there made a point to preserve many important files that were ordered to have been destroyed.[85] Clearly the extent of files and documents destroyed as against those "saved" varied in different areas, and the entire matter remains highly controversial.

Indeed, the question of destruction of Party records needs to be investigated in more detail for earlier periods as well, once more relevant documentation has been declassified. In connection with the trial against the CPSU during the summer of 1992, the prosecutor disclosed a document signed by CPSU Central Committee Deputy General Secretary V. Ivashko indicating that "25 million cases from the CPSU archives have been done away with to save the Party's face." The immediate implication in some of the press renditions was that this destruction had just occurred, presumably in 1991. However, the document in question, dated 29 March 1991, has since been made publicly available in TsKhSD. The figure quoted occurs in an undated handwritten note with referencing to much earlier destruction in the 1960's and 1970's.[86]

While Russian archivists today are now openly confirming the results of various earlier agency and archival "cleansing" policies, they are faced with the equally serious problem that "insufficient space" prevents the accession of many potentially significant records. Indicative of the problem for the Russian Academy of Sciences, no records of Leningrad institutes under the Academy of Sciences have been accessioned by the St.

---

84 See Rudol'f G. Pikhoia's account of the CPSU 1991 archival situation and Roskomarkhiv's rescue operations in "Arkhivnye strasti," *Istoricheskie zapiski* 1(119), pp. 239–43. Pikhoia's earlier comments about the August 1991 archival developments were noted in his interview with Sergei Varshavchik, "Tseny na gosudarstvennye tainy v Rossii po-prezhnemu vyshe mirovykh," *Novaia ezhednevnaia gazeta*, no. 165 (1 September 1994).

85 Estonian archivist, Peep Pillak, who headed the Estonian archival administration during the period immediately following independence, was one of those who gave outspoken assurances on this issue, both personally to the present author and in a conference presentation, as noted by Leo van Rosum, *The Former Communist Party Archives in Eastern Europe and Russia* (Amsterdam, 1997) "IISG Research Paper," no. 25, pp. 5-6.

86 TsKhSD, fond 89, opis' 4, d. 21.—"O nekotorykh voporosakh obspecheniia sokhrannosti dokumentov Arkhivnogo fonda KPSS" (29 March 1991); the document is a copy of the preceeding one, and includes an added note made by the General and Organizational Departments of the CC CPSU. The document was quoted at the time in a press release by Interfax, 13 July 1992, and in a brief, but somewhat misleading translated version (with explanation as to the dates of destruction) appeared in *FBIS-SOV*-92-138-S, 17 July 1992, p. 12. I am grateful to Leo van Rossum and to Russian colleagues for help in clarifying this matter. These documents became available to the author after the publication of the Amsterdam edition of this paper, and after the publication of von Rossum's "Research Paper" referred to in fn. 85.

Petersburg Branch of the Archive of the Academy of Sciences since 1953, due to lack of storage space. The same situation pertains in many state agencies, aggravated by the transition to a market economy with high property values, the need to pay rent, and more difficulties in increasing the storage space assigned to archives. The archival storage situation in Russia has reached crisis proportions. But even if there were funds for movable compact shelving as used in many other parts of the world, most of the present buildings could not support the additional weight.

Advocates of human rights and others concerned with a more "open" approach to the history of the repressive Soviet regime are insisting that more records deserve longer preservation. Social historians, freed from earlier Marxist restrictions, are looking for new sources to help document broader patterns of social development. For example, RAN historian Andrei Sokolov's recent appeal to a VNIIDAD conference "to retain a broader range of documentary complexes for social history that earlier would not have been designated for retention" aroused heated discussion from perplexed archivists faced with the crisis of space and contracted resources.[87] With the new respectability and enthusiasm for genealogy and more precise demographic analysis, after a long Marxist historical eclipse, regrets are also being voiced about the past indiscriminate destruction of parish registers and census "name lists," and the need for more attention to such important sources. The Tula archivist making the latter report did not comment on the plight of the latest batch of parish registers transferred to her own State Archive of Tula Oblast from the local ZAGS office, which has been temporarily piled on open flooring in an unheated makeshift attic area, in the former church that serves as the main archival storage building.[88]

The People's Archive in Moscow, founded by enthusiasts of the Moscow State Historico-Archival Institute during the period of *perestroika*, took the matter in hand on its own to provide for the retention of non-traditional sources that were not being accessioned and preserved by official state archives. Now less than a decade after formation, the unique archive is faced with the prospect of closing down, due to lack of adequate permanent space and resources to pay staff, most of whom are presently working on a volunteer basis. Its missionary message has nevertheless been heard in the more official Moscow archival world. A recent proposal from Moscow municipal archives to take over the already rich collections of the People's Archive was rejected, because devotees wanted to preserve their symbolic independent status. From a practical standpoint they well know

---

87 Reference here, by way of example, is to the report of Andrei K. Sokolov, "Sotsial'naia istoriia: Problemy istochnikovedeniia i arkhivovedenia," at the Second All-Russian Conference on Archival Science and Source Study held at VNIIDAD – Vtoraia vserossiiskaia konferentsiia "Arkhivovedenie i istochnikovedenie otechestvennoi istorii: Problemy vzaimodeistviia na sovremennom etape," 12–13 March 1996.

88 Dmitrii N. Antonov and Irina A. Antonova, "O fondirovanii i arkhivnoi evristike metricheskikh knig," at the same VNIIDAD conference cited in fn. 87. See the more detailed published version, "Metricheskie knigi: vremia sobirat' kamni," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 4, pp. 15–28; and no. 5, pp. 29–42. I am grateful to the Antonovs for arranging my visit to the Tula archive, where my photographic documentation of the plight of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century parish registers two years ago has so far not helped to effect a solution.

that the ever increasing offers for new donations would be curtailed if they were to transfer their unique collections to official state custody.[89]

Many Russians today, including politicians in the Duma, are actively seeking the return to the "Fatherland" of archival Rossica abroad, but are space and facilities sufficient for its preservation? If archivists are still justifying the extent of destruction of records of the 1920s and 30s and later purges, and if society is not ready to open what remains in "Pandora's Box," along with other "shadows cast to the past," how safe are the files of "anti-Soviet" émigrés if they were returned to Russia? Scholars should still rejoice in the fastidious preservation of the Trotskii archives at Harvard University and the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam, just as there is good reason to applaud the preservation of part of the Sakharov archives at Brandeis University and Mandel'stam manuscripts in Princeton. By contrast, in Russia itself, we still do not know what Trotskii-related documents are held beneath the "Seventh Seal" in the Presidential Archive or the Operational Archive of the Foreign Intelligence Service, and the Federal Security Service still denies the existence of the many seized Mandel'stam manuscripts specialists hope with good fortune may in fact be preserved among its own still-closed operational files.

[89] Comments here are based on recent conversations with the director, Boris S. Ilizarov, and my own impression of the People's Archive, which I have been following during the years since its establishment. Coverage of the holdings and literature about the archive is included in the 1998 ABB directory.

8. "Trophy" Archives and Non-Restitution

Russian archives may not have adequate space for retention, or funding for preservation, of all the records of Russian provenance that constitute part of the Archival Fond of the Russian Federation. But that has not prevented a nationalist proprietary embargo on the restitution of "trophy" archives from many foreign countries that were brought to the Soviet Union after World War II.[90] Along with the dispute over NATO expansion, the matter of Nazi-looted "trophy art" and archives still held in Russia "has emerged as one of Russia's most vexing foreign policy quandaries." Such was a comment in the *New York Times*, with a striking picture of one of the extensive stack areas in the "Special Archive" for captured foreign archives, on the same day that Russian President Boris Yeltsin left for his meeting with German Chancellor Helmut Kohl with what was announced as a token archival presentation.[91]

European nations feel so strongly about Russia's moral and international legal obligation to return their cultural treasures and archives that, among the commitments Russia was required to make, when it was admitted to membership in the Council of Europe in January 1996, was the specific intent:

> xi. to negotiate claims for the return of cultural property to other European countries on an ad hoc basis that differentiates between types of property (archives, works of art, buildings etc.) and of ownership (public, private or institutional); ...
>
> xiv. to settle rapidly all issues related to the return of property claimed by Council of Europe member states, in particular the archives transferred to Moscow in 1945.[92]

Since that document was signed, Russia's parliamentary bodies have flagrantly disregarded those intents, culminating in May 1997 with a law that provides for the nationalization of all cultural treasures, with no differentiation for archives – passed a second time by both houses of the Russian parliament over President Yeltsin's veto. Although provisions for some categories of restitution or "exchange" are not ruled out for legitimately established claims, especially from those countries who opposed the Nazi regime, the new law so greatly complicates negotiations and adds to the expense that it virtually prevents the settlement (let alone rapid) of many restitution issues.

---

[90] See the revised and updated version of this chapter in *Problems in Post-Communism* (vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 3-16) – "Trophy" Archives and Non-Restitution: Russia's Cultural "Cold War" with the European Community."

For more detailed discussion and documentation of the subject of this chapter, see the article by Grimsted, "Displaced Archives and Restitution Problems on the Eastern Front in the Aftermath of World War II," *Contemporary European History* 6:1 (1997), pp. 27–74 (offprints are available through IISH). An earlier version appeared in October 1995 as IISH "Research Paper," no. 18, and was reprinted in the ICA bulletin, *Janus: Revue archivistique/Archival Review*, 1996, no. 2, pp. 42–77. The commentary here emphasizes more recent developments and related new publications. A Russian version of my IISH Research Paper was submitted to a Russian journal at the editor's request, but one high-placed referee told me that "there was no interest in the subject in Russia."

[91] Michael R. Gordon, "Hot Issue for Russia: Should It Return Nazi Plunder?" *New York Times*, 17 April 1997.

[92] Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly/ Conseil de l'Europe Assemblée parlementaire, Opinion No. 193 (1996) – "On Russia's request for membership of the Council of Europe," adopted by the Assemby on 25 January 1996, when Russia was admitted to membership on its basis. Hearings on the issue were held in the fall of 1995 preparatory to the adoption of the formal "Opinion."

Plunder, Counter-Plunder, and "Compensation"

While the Second World War was at its height in November 1942, a Soviet *Information Bulletin* condemned the Nazi cultural atrocities and looting on the Eastern Front. It reminded the world of Article 56 of the 1907 Hague Convention:

> [which] forbids the seizure, damaging and destruction of property of educational and art institutions [...]. and articles of scientific and artistic value belonging to individuals and societies as well as to the State. But the Hitlerite clique in criminal manner tramples upon the rules and laws of warfare universally accepted by all civilized nations.[93]

But that did not stop a victorious Stalin from ordering the seizure of "compensatory reparations" from Germany, which one estimate put at no less than 400,000 railway freight wagons of loot during 1945 alone.[94] The official Russian position today is similar to Stalin's decreed conception that "to the Victor go the spoils": those "transfers" to the Soviet Union were carried out legally *after* the war as "compensation" to which Russia was legitimately entitled, as opposed to Nazi illegal seizures and destruction of cultural property *during* the war.

The issues today stem not only from different conceptions of law and justice between the Soviet Union and the West. More importantly, the problem stems from the fundamental divisions among the Allies on the broader issue of reparations that manifest itself already in the final years of the war. Many in the West believed that the heavy burden of reparations imposed on Germany by the Versailles settlement after the First World War was a major factor in Hitler's rise to power. Having already flattened Germany to rubble by bombing raids in order to exact surrender, the Western Allies did not want to repeat what they viewed as the mistakes of Versailles. But with the growing Cold War among the Victors over Nazi Germany, there was little possibility to deal with cultural policies. As one American specialist aptly explains, "Serious Allied disagreements on general postwar policy for Germany inhibited the development of a coherent approach to handling cultural objects. Cultural restitution became lost in the maze of other, greater conflicts." Hence, Western specialists admit today, because the victors were unable to operate on a cooperative or unified basis, there were *no* Allied agreements on restitution issue. As a result, cultural restitution, plunder, and/or non-restitution was carried out on a zonal basis by the four occupying powers.[95] Russians carry

---

93 Embassy of the USSR (Washington, DC), *Information Bulletin*, no. 138 (19.XI.1942), p. 6.

94 These figures were documented in the book by Pavel Knyshevskii – *Dobycha: Tainy germanskikh reparatsii* (Moscow: "Soratnik," 1994), p. 20, as coming from a report in the Central Archive of the Ministry of Defense (TsAMO—**C–4**) – "Kratkii otchet o deiatel'nosti Glavnogo Trofeinogo upravleniia Krasnoi Armii v period Velikoi Otechestvennoi voiny" (TsAMO, 67/12020/9). See also Mark Deich, "Podpisano Stalinym: 'Dobycha: tainy germanskikh reparatsii'," *Stolitsa*, 1994, no. 29(191), p. 18.

95 See the presentation of the various Western and Russian legal arguments regarding the restitution issue in *The Spoils of War: World War II and Its Aftermath: The Loss, Reappearance, and Recovery of Cultural Property*, ed. Elizabeth Simpson (New York: Henry N. Abrams, 1997). Most especially, for details of the workings of the Allied Control Council in the immediate postwar Germany, see the presentation by Deputy U.S. Archivist Michael J. Kurtz (pp. 112–16); the quoted passage is from p. 113.

that argument a step further: that further validates the legality of the Soviet postwar transfers for "compensatory reparations."[96]

Fifty years later, President Yeltsin responded to a press inquiry in Baden-Baden in April 1997, that Russia is a "civilized nation and will find a civilized solution" to the restitution issue.[97] But his emphasis on the need for any restitution of cultural treasures brought to the USSR after the war puts him at odds with the "new" Russian parliament and an estimated "eighty percent of the population at large who believe that all cultural treasures should stay in Russia," and are "not about to be convinced otherwise by logic, treaties, or credits."[98] Those deeply ingrained sentiments helped Nikolai Gubenko, former Minister of Culture under Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and now Deputy Head of the Duma Committee on Culture, as he shepherded through the new law to nationalize all of the "Spoils of War" still held in Russia.

Contrary to political claims today, however, most of the *archives* brought home from the wars were not then considered compensation. Soviet predecessors brought home Europe's lost or displaced archives from the various hideouts, intelligence centers, salt mines, and castles, where the Nazis had hidden the cultural treasures they had seized throughout the Continent. The general outline of the story has little changed since the first revelations about captured Nazi records in February 1990 with a Moscow journalist's "Five Days in the Special Archive," and my own fall 1991 revelations about other foreign archives in Moscow.[99] Subsequent research, published accounts, and conference discussions have been explicating the complicated issues and clarifying the details, although all the potential sources needed in Russia are still not open to researchers.

Only a few of the archival trophies brought to Moscow represent the archival heritage and manuscript treasures of the German nation, which had been meticulously evacuated from libraries and archives that were otherwise reduced to rubble. Unlike the case of art and the over ten million library books brought back to Moscow after the war, however, relatively few captured archives had been designated for transport by Soviet "trophy brigades." The Soviet Archival Administration Trophy Team that sifted through the

---

96 For Russian analyses, see especially the papers in *The Spoils of War*, of Nikolai Nikandrov, pp. 117–20, Valerii Kulichov (pp. 171–74), and Mark Boguslavskii (pp. 186–90); for opposing German legal points of view on restitution issues, see the statements of Wilfried Fiedler (pp. 175–78) and Armin Hiller (pp. 179–85).

97 The comment was first reported on Russian television, 18 April 1997, but has been repeated in news presentations several times since.

98 As noted by Boris Piiuk, "Ty mne – Ia tebe," *Itogi*, no. 16(49) (22 April 1997), p. 14.

99 The series of articles by Moscow journalist Ella Maksimova first broke the story with her "Piat dnei v Osobom arkhive," *Izvestiia*, nos. 49–53 (17–21 February 1990), which started with an interview with the then director, Anatoli S. Prokopenko. But it was not until the October of 1991 that Evgenii Kuz'min was able to publish my own revelations about the much more extensive holdings from France and other European countries that were in fact ensconsed in the "Special Archive." See the interview with Grimsted by Evgenii Kuz'min, "Vyvezti ... unichtozhit' ... spriatat' ..., Sud'by trofeinykh arkhivov," *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 39 (2 October 1991), p. 13. A week later, Prokopenko, by that time a deputy director of Roskomarkhiv, publicly confirmed the extent of other displaced foreign archives: "Arkhivy Frantsuzskoi razvedki skryvali na Leningradskom shosse," *Izvestiia*, no. 240 (3 November 1991). See also Prokopenko, "Dom osobogo naznacheniia (Otkrytie arkhivov)," *Rodina*, 1992, no. 3, pp. 50–51. By that time some details had appeared in the earlier Grimsted articles, "Beyond *Perestroika*," *American Archivist* 55, no. 1 (Winter 1992), pp. 94–124, and "The Fate of Ukrainian Cultural Treasures during World War II," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 39:1 (Winter 1991), pp. 72–79.

German archival stores "in the mines of Saxony, totaling over 300 wagons from the period of the 11th to the 20th centuries" chose for transport "only 7 wagons of the most topical fonds presenting interest for Soviet historical sciences and activities of operational organs."[100] Another Soviet trophy commission included several collections of Oriental manuscripts, negatives of art and architecture, folklore recordings, and "a collection of charters and manuscript books from the Magdeburg City Archive" among the "8,850 crates of literary and museum collections" they selected for shipment to Moscow.[101] In words similar to those used by legislators today, Georgii Aleksandrov explained to Georgii Malenkov in December 1945. "[B]ringing them to the USSR might to some extent serve as compensation for the losses wrought by the German occupiers on scholarly and cultural institutions in the Soviet Union."[102]

Some of the "trophy" book and museum transports are documented in a newly published 1996 collection of Soviet documents relating to seizures in German libraries, museums, and private collections, edited by two leading German library specialists.[103] In terms of archives, for example, a 1946 letter, signed by the Director of the Institute of Marx, Engels, and Lenin (IMEL), V. Krushkov, lists seized original materials relating to Marx and Engels and other left-wing socialist leaders, including documents originally housed in the Karl Marx House-Museum in Trier.[104] Other documents recorded the transport of vast collections of manuscript music scores, for example, with indication of which Moscow and Leningrad institutions were the intended recipients.[105] In addition to several well-known German musicalia collections, some of these materials had been

---

100 Golubtsov to I. A. Serov, "Dokladnaia zapiska o rezul'tatakh obsledovaniia dokumental'nykh materialov germanskikh arkhivov, evakuirovannykh i ukrytykh v shakhtakh Saksonii" (Berlin, 24.X.1945), GA RF, 5325/2/1353, fol. 216; an additional signed copy is found in 5325/10/2030, fol. 35. In both cases a list of fonds chosen is attached.

101 G. Aleksandrov, N. Zhukov, and A. Poryvaev to TsK VKP(b) Secretary G. M. Malenkov, RTsKhIDNI, 17/125/308, fol. 41. The letter signed by G. Aleksandrov, N. Zhukov, and A. Poryvaev, accompanied a five-page list of cultural treasures the commission of Soviet experts had chosen – "Spisok khudozhestvennykh i kul'turnykh tsennostei, namechennykh k vyvozu v SSSR iz solianykh shakht vokrug Magdeburga i iz Leiptsiga i ego okrestnostei" (fols. 42–46). See also the additional cover letter to Malenkov with notice of additional copies to Molotov, Beriia, and Mikoian (13.XI.1945), and Malenkov's endorsement regarding the urgency of the matter (23.XI.1945).

102 G. Aleksandrov to TsK VKP(b) Secretary G. M. Malenkov, RTsKhIDNI, 17/125/308, fols. 49–51 (the quote is from fol. 51).

103 *Die Trophäenkommissionen der Roten Armee: Eine Dokumentensammlung zur Verschleppung von Büchern aus deutschen Bibliotheken*, compiled and edited by Klaus-Dieter Lehmann and Ingo Kolasa (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1996); *Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie*, Sonderheft 64. All of the documents are presented only in German translation. Regrettably precise archival signatures for each document are not provided, and a number of the lists are published without what undoubtedly would have been explanatory, accompanying letters and/or identifying handwritten resolutions or endorsements. Nevertheless, this is an extremely important and revealing collection, which provides considerable precise documentation on the origin and destination of book shipments from Germany, including some manuscript materials and other museum collections. See also the earlier article by Ingo Kolasa, "Sag mir wo die Bücher sind...: Ein Beitrag "Beutekulturgüten" und "Trophäenkommissionen," *Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie*, 42:4 (July/August 1995), pp. 339–64.

104 IMEL Director V. Krushkov to G. Aleksandrov (8 June 1946), *Die Trophäenkommissionen der Roten Armee*, pp. 147–48 (document no. 22).

105 *Die Trophäenkommissionen der Roten Armee*, especially pp. 218–33 (documents nos. 37–41).

brought together from France and other Western European countries in the Silesian Castle of Langenau, which after 1943 became the most important depot for the loot of the Sonderstab Musik under the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg.[106]

Still other archival specialists from the NKVD and other agencies were searching elsewhere for émigré fonds. Today these materials are valued by Russia for their historical and cultural content, representing as they do Russia's lost or exiled émigré culture. In the postwar Stalinist decade, however, they were primarily wanted by Soviet secret police and counterintelligence agencies for the identification of "anti-Soviet" or Ukrainian "bourgeois-nationalist" elements abroad.[107] That was the case, to be sure, with the Russian Foreign Historical Archive in Prague (RZIA), which was shipped to Moscow in nine sealed freight wagons from Prague as a highly-prized "gift of the Czech government to the Academy of Sciences of the USSR." As NKVD Security chief Kruglov assured Zhdanov in May 1946, "access for scholars would be closed," and the documents "would be expeditiously analyzed for data on anti-Soviet activities of the White emigration to be used in operational work of organs of the MVD and MGB SSSR."[108]

In fact, the vast majority of *archives* transported to Moscow were brought for obvious "operational" purposes that could hardly be interpreted as cultural "compensation." Foreign archival loot assembled by various Nazis research and analysis agencies were seized for a second time by Red Army counterintelligence units (SMERSH) and special Soviet NKVD archival commandos in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, and other countries, as well as by the newly established Archival Administration under the Soviet Military Administration in Germany (SVAG) in the Soviet occupation zone of Germany itself. Many were shipped to Moscow under personal orders from Lavrentii Beriia, Stalin's Internal Security Chief (NKVD), who headed the agency that also then controlled the Soviet archives. Beriia's red penciled shipping orders appear on numerous top-secret reports. These included twenty-eight freight cars from the Nazi intelligence center where the French intelligence archives were found in Czechoslovakia in a village near Èeská-Lípa (then part of the Sudetenland), and the twenty-five freight-car loads (plus an additional seven shipped via Kyiv) from the Silesian intelligence archival center of the Reich Security Services Headquarters (RSHA – Reichssicherhauptamt) in Wölfelsdorf/ Habelschwerdt (now part of Poland). Many of the thirty freight cars of foreign military records shipped to Moscow came from the Nazi military intelligence center under the Heeresarchiv at Berlin-Wannsee. Indeed, many of the captured records now in Moscow were earlier utilized by Nazi military intelligence, secret police, and racist propaganda units – ranging from national intelligence records, such as the French Dieuxième Bureau and Sûreté Nationale, and Cabinet files of Léon Blum to records of banks and Jewish

---

106 Nazi seizure of music is documented by Willem de Vries, *Sonderstab Musik: Music Confiscations by the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg under the Nazi Occupation of Western Europe* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1996). The author is still researching the subsequent fate of the ERR music loot, including the at least four railroad wagons from Langenau (west of Breslau, now Polish Wroclaw), reportedly seized by the Red Army at the end of the war.

107 Many examples of these activities will be presented in a forthcoming IISH Research Paper by P. K. Grimsted on archival Rossica abroad, following a paper at the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies convention in November 1996.

108 Kruglov to Zhdanov (15.V.1946), GA RF, 5325/10/2023, fol. 46.

rescue organizations, to Masonic lodges from almost all European countries, left-wing Socialist parties, and even Dutch feminist organizations.

In some cases, records of those Nazi agencies themselves were recovered with the large caches of Nazi-captured European archives. Such was the case of the records of the RSHA and the administrative records of the Heeresarchiv now in Moscow, and the records of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (ERR) now in Kyiv. The Nazis in some cases, however, succeeded in destroying their operational records, leaving only the foreign loot. Other Nazi records were seized from a variety of locations – files from the Reich Foreign Ministry, records of secret police and intelligence units, scientific and technical agencies, fragments of the Reich Chancellery, personal papers of Nazi leaders, including more Goebbel's diaries than had been know in the West, records from Auschwitz and other concentration camps. The seizure of Nazi records was specifically ordered by Allied Control Commission laws and paralleled similar seizures by the Western Allies. The only difference was that the Western Allies worked together with seized Nazi records, while Soviet authorities refused to cooperate. Russian legislators may duly justify their retention of their captured Nazi records, but by the 1960s, the Western Allies agreed to returned to West Germany almost all the Nazi records they had seized (with the exception of some military and intelligence files), following analysis and microfilming so that the records could be open for widescale public research.[109] Soviet authorities, by contrast, never even made known what Nazi records they had retrieved. Many earlier German records were returned to East Germany during the Cold War decades, but most of the Nazi records were retained in Moscow, and were all virtually hidden from scholarship for half a century.

The "Special Archive"

The former top-secret "Special Archive," which had been established in Moscow in 1946 to house the foreign archival loot that was being put to "operational" use by Soviet intelligence and internal security agencies, was euphemistically renamed the Center for Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections (TsKhIDK – **B–15**) in 1992. Official TsKhIDK statistics at the time listed 832 "trophy" fonds with the French section alone running to over six and a half kilometers of shelf space. And those statistics did not take into account the fact that some collections, such as several large ones from Masonic lodges, for example, which had never been broken down into fonds according to their institution of provenance. Nor did they reflect the fact that many trophy files and documentation of varying origin and subject had been transferred to many other archives and other institutions. Regrettably, many of the original bodies of records were broken up and scattered in the process. For example, various French police and intelligence files were turned over to other appropriate agencies, especially files involving the Soviet

---

[109] A conference at the National Archives in 1974 heard extensive reports about Anglo-American programs for capture and "utilization" of Nazi records. See the comprehensive published list of captured records filmed by the Western allies in Berlin, England, and the United States, "Captured German and Related Records in the National Archives (as of 1974)," in *Captured German and Related Records: A National Archives Conference*, edited by Robert Wolfe (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1974; "National Archives Conferences," vol. 3), pp. 267–76. See also the series of finding aids produced for the films, *Guides to German Records Microfilmed at Alexandria, VA*.

leadership. Some French files on the Hungarian Communist leadership were even given to Hungary.[110] Some 334 Jewish Torah scrolls were transferred to the State Historical Museum in Moscow (GIM) in 1946, but their subsequent fate has not been determined.[111] Most of the émigré materials of political and historical significance were deposited directly or later transferred to the Central State Archive of the October Revolution (TsGAOR SSSR – now GA RF), where they joined the RZIA collections, before they were further scattered to over thirty different archives and library collections in different parts of the USSR.[112] Many émigré literary files went directly to TsGALI (now RGALI – **B–6**).

A major problem for scholars and for officials and archivists in those countries with official claims or pretensions is the lack of accurate descriptive data about TsKhIDK holdings and about displaced or "trophy" archives in other Russian archives. A number of foreign reports about TsKhIDK holdings have appeared in print, including a relatively complete list published in Germany (based on the TsKhIDK internal list) of predominantly German-language fonds (mostly from Germany and Austria) – including the Nazi records. There has been no published listing, however, nor even survey coverage of the French- and Polish-language divisions. TsKhIDK does have its own "List of French Fonds," which was prepared for internal archival use and is not usually communicated to researchers. Because it was prepared for the most part on the basis of language, rather than country of origin, it includes Belgian materials, as well as a number of fonds from other countries. With adequate consultation from foreign specialists, it could serve as the basis for a more extensive database and an appropriate preliminary publication.[113]

Rosarkhiv has been considering plans to abolish the archive as a separate entity, which makes it harder to justify a normal "guide." Even the founders of the predecessor top-secret "Special Archive" considered "it would probably exist for only three, four, or maybe at most five years." When the establishment of the archive was under debate in August of 1945, Soviet archival director and MGIAI Professor Vladimir V. Maksakov appropriately recognized international standards: "Fonds such as those brought from Czechoslovakia [i.e. the French intelligence records]. . . – we have a right to them only

---

110 Vitalii Iu. Afiani, "Dokumenty o zarubezhnoi arkhivnoi Rossike i peremeshchennykh arkhivakh v fondakh Tsentra khraneniia sovremennoi dokumentatsii," in *Problemy zarubezhnoi arkhivnoi Rossiki: Sbornik statei* (Moscow: Informatsionno-izd. agentsvo "Russkii mir," 1997), p. 96. Precise documentation regarding the transfer is not furnished.

111 Musatov, "Doklad o rabote TsGOA SSSR za 1946 god," GA RF, 5325/2/1640, fols. 80–87.

112 These materials, together with the RZIA materials, were all listed in a "secret" classified guide published in 1952 – *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva: Putevoditel'*, vol. 2, edited by N. R. Prokopenko (Moscow: GAU, 1952). A new comprehensive guide to the now widely dispersed RZIA collections is nearing completion under the editorship of Tat'iana F. Pavlova in Moscow.

113 The "Spisok frantsuskikh fondov" (33 p.) in its present form is hardly a finished finding aid for researcher use, but is an exceedingly helpful starting point. Augmented and hand corrected at various times, it frequently indicates the year of receipt of the fonds listed. Because it provides the most complete listing available, it would be helpful if funding could be found to enter its contents in a simple data base, and even better for a preliminary publication in collaboration with appropriate foreign specialists. See further notes on published finding aids and the current CD-ROM guide project for TsKhIDK in Ch. 12 (for the German guide, see fn. 285). See citations to other relevant publications in my *CEH* article "Displaced Archives" and earlier IISH "Research Paper" (fn. 90).

until such time when the international matters are regulated." Archival leaders at the time excluded scholarly research in the "Special Archive" (TsGOA) and agreed: "There is no need for compiling full inventories (*opisi*), nor is there need for arranging the files [according to archival principles]. The only immediate need is to use the documents there for operational aims."[114] It is little wonder that some of the fonds in TsKhIDK are hardly arranged at all, such as those from the Grand Duchy of Liechtenstein.

Nevertheless, today, in a spirit of openness and professional international cooperation, a database listing of the various fonds and collections (and where possible their component parts) brought together in TsKhIDK, along with other known displaced or "trophy" archives in Russia, would be very much in order as a preliminary step towards appropriate identification. As noted below, an annotated list of the Belgian materials has been issued as a separate publication, which could serve as a model for similar lists for those from other countries. Archivists and other specialists of affected countries and individual institutions, as well as researchers from throughout the world, need more accurate information about just what displaced archives were "rescued by the Red Army" and other Soviet agencies, where they were found, the extent to which their provenance has been identified, known facts about their migration, when and to whom they were transferred, if microfilms or other copies are available, and where the originals are still preserved. Now that TsKhIDK has become a public facility freely open to world scholarship, and now that Russia has agreed "to settle rapidly all issues related to the return of property claimed by Council of Europe member states, in particular the archives transferred to Moscow in 1945," accurate identification of their origin and fate has become more essential than ever. Trophy archives in Russia represent the national heritage and legal record of many European nations and organizations, but until their provenance, migration, and whereabouts has been professionally identified, it will be difficult to settle all potential claims from nations and individuals, or even to prepare appropriate microform copies. (The new CD-ROM guide project for TsKhIDK discussed in Chapter 12 could be a start.)

Such a project would be an ideal candidate for cooperative funding from the European Community, because it is only a pipe dream in the archival world of today's Russia. The principal archive that houses the foreign captured records in Moscow was in 1996 without heat and frequently without electricity until almost the end of the fall. As temperatures reached towards freezing in October, staff could only work a few hours a day, and researchers who ventured in had to keep on their gloves and overcoats. There are few qualified staff left today, with the only token archival salaries, if and when they are paid on time – the TsKhIDK average is about $50 per month, half of which is needed to buy a public transportation pass. Without foreign languages and historical qualifications – which at current commercial rates would command no less than ten times that salary, there is little hope of serious professional work in the archive. Yet a massive dose of foreign aid would be hard to raise given the track record of the archive that holds the records of so many European nations.

---

114 "Protokol soveshchaniia pri zam. nachal'nika Glavnogo arkhivnogo upravleniia NKVD SSSR – Izuchenie voprosa o sozdanii Osobogo Tsentral'nogo gosudarstvennogo arkhiva" (21.VIII.1945), GA RF, 5325/2/3623, fols. 2–3, fol. 8.

Soviet versus Russian Restitution Politics

During postwar decades, and particularly after the death of Stalin, when there was an effort to improve relations within the Communist bloc, Soviet authorities recognized the goodwill and "friendship" engendered by archival and other cultural restitution. Cultural trophies, including many of the paintings brought to Moscow after the war from the Dresden Galley, were displayed in a prominent exhibition at the Pushkin Museum before they were returned to East Germany. Archival "trophies" were likewise utilized for obvious political purposes. When the Soviet Union had political reasons to adopt international standards, several millions of files among the extensive records "rescued by the Soviet Army," were returned to the German Democratic Republic and other Eastern Bloc nations. Published accounts positively portrayed the Soviet role of "helping other countries reunify their national archival heritage."[115] Papers of Miklós Horthy that had escaped destruction were returned to Hungary in 1959. Chinese Communist Party records and some other files were returned to China. Even a few symbolic presentations were made to France and Norway, among other countries, at the time of presidential state visits. As it was officially explained at the time, such restitution was "in strict adherence to international legal norms and respectful of the sovereign law of peoples and their national historical and cultural legacy."[116]

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the new revelations about the extent of captured records (or "displaced archives") in Russia, however, such internationalist motives have been forgotten and now rejected by Russian politicians, including the Russian Communist Party, despite the more open, democratic attitudes towards other aspects of archival affairs. Initially, after the 1991 revelations, in a progressive spirit, Rosarkhiv negotiated agreements with many European countries for the return of the "trophy" fonds in TsKhIDK. In many cases, at Roskomarkhiv insistence, added barter arrangements involved the transfer of original or copies of archival "Rossica" located abroad. As a positive benefit, along with goodwill, there was significant, much-needed technical assistance for Russian archives. The Netherlands was the first to sign an archival restitution agreement in 1992, and Dutch archivists started an extensive program of archival and library assistance in Russia.[117] Bilateral archival agreements were also negotiated with Poland, Belgium, and Liechtenstein. A general cultural restitution agreement with Hungary in November 1992 also extended to archives and manuscript collections, although at the time, the Hungarians did not know all the details about "trophy" Hungarian files and manuscript books remaining in Russia. There was an

---

115 See, for example, E. G. Baskakov and O. V. Shavblovskii, "Vozvrashchenie arkhivnykh materialov, spasennykh Sovetskoi Armiei," *Istoricheskii arkhiv*, 1958, no. 5, pp. 175–79; S. L. Tikhvinskii, "Pomoshch' Sovetskogo Soiuza drugim gosudarstvam v vossozdanii natisional' nogo arkhivnogo dostoianiia," *Sovetskie arkhivy*, 1979, no. 2, pp. 11–16.

116 As stated by the head of the Glavarkhiv Foreign Relations Department, Mikhail Ia. Kapran, "Mezhdunarodnoe sotrudnichestvo sovetskikh arkhivistov," *Sovetskie arkhivy*, 1968, no. 3, p. 33.

117 Regarding the 1992 agreement to return the Dutch materials, see "Scripta Manent," *Bulletin of Central and East-European Activities* (International Institute of Social History), no. 2 (August 1992), pp. 3–4; "Semper Manent," *ibid*., no. 3 (September 1992), p. 4. According to Rosarkhiv, the agreement was subject to confirmation by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, but that confirmation never took place.

agreement that remaining Norwegian files would be transferred to Norway (a few had been returned in the 1970s).

Restitution to Germany had earlier been assured under the mutual friendship pact of 1990. That same year, remaining treasures from the medieval Hanseatic city archives of Bremen, Hamburg, and Lübeck (other parts of these collections had been transferred earlier to East Germany) were finally restored to their proper home in direct exchange for the counterpart Tallinn City Archive that was returned to Estonia from the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz.[118] In 1991, 2,200 music scores and related manuscripts were returned to the University of Hamburg from the Leningrad State Institute for Theater, Music, and Cinematography (now the Russian Institute for the History of Art). Following the bilateral Russo-German cultural agreement in 1992, serious negotiations were underway for the return of captured Nazi and other German records in Moscow, although the Russian side remained more equivocal on that issue. Begrudgingly, the German government even came up with half a million deutsch marks (as the first of three promised installments) for microfilming equipment, when Russian archival authorities insisted that the captured records be filmed before their return, as provided for by a special archival agreement that was negotiated in 1992.

Russian archivists in other repositories – including RTsKhIDNI and GA RF are also now more open about their share of "trophy" archives. In many cases, however, the archives themselves did not have clear records regarding the "trophy" materials they had received, because many of them had been added piecemeal to earlier existing fonds, and transfer documents had no indication of their provenance or the facts of their "migration." Many of the files looted by the Nazis during the World War II from Belgium and the Netherlands that are now held in RTsKhIDNI have been identified by specialists from those countries, and microfilm copies have or are being made available. No originals from RTsKhIDNI have as yet been returned. Some files from France and Hungary, for example, have been identified in GA RF, along with Ukrainian émigré files transferred there in the postwar years, but restitution discussion has not commenced, and the materials involved are much less significant than those held in other repositories. A comprehensive catalogue of the holdings brought to Moscow after the war from the Russian Foreign Historical Archive in Prague (RZIA), a large part of which remains in GA RF, is now in preparation. But since the Prague Russian holdings were officially presented as a "gift" to the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, most Russians, including the archival community, do not consider them among the "trophy" archives. It was only in the late 1980s that the Prague RZIA collections were open for research in the close to thirty archives throughout the USSR to which they were scattered.[119]

---

118 "Vozvrashchenie ganzeiskikh arkhivov," *Sovetskie arkhivy*, 1991, no. 1, p. 111. See also E[vgenii] Kuz'min, "Netrofeinaia istoriia," *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 1990, no. 41 (11 October), p. 10; *Literary Gazette International*, 1990, no. 17 (November, no. 1), p. 6.

119 The catalogue of the Prague collections nearing completion (see fn. 112) covers the holdings in all of the different archives to which they were dispersed, in addition to the core collections in GA RF.

French and Belgian Archives

By the spring of 1997, France was still the only Western country to have received any of its original archives from Moscow since 1991. According to the high-level diplomatic agreement, the French agreed to pay three and a half million francs for TsKhIDK to prepare microfilm copies for their own retention, and additional high fees (approximately US $1 per page) for xerox copies of the preliminary (and hardly adequate) Russian *opisi* of the French materials. As part of the bargain, France also agreed to transfer to Russia several significant groups of Russian-related archival materials held in France. A large part of the fees was already paid, and France had already delivered part of the agreed-upon archival Rossica. France sent their own container trucks for transport – four of the six dispatched were filled in Moscow with approximately ninety percent of the estimated six-and-a half kilometers of French records held in TsKhIDK, including all of the military intelligence (Dieuxième Bureau) files there that Soviet authorities had found in Czechoslovakia in 1945.[120]

But then in May of 1994, an angry Russian parliament put a stop to the archival restitution to France. In the course of debate, one Duma deputy even suggested France should be charged storage fees for the materials held secretly in Russia for fifty years.[121] To make the scandalous situation even worse on the Russian side, the money received from France went into various speculative investments, which persisting law suits have still not recovered for Rosarkhiv. Not only has France not received all of its archives, but TsKhIDK has not received a kopeck for its efforts, and was accordingly only able to film part of the materials that were returned to France before the Duma embargo. Reportedly, the microfilming equipment furnished by Germany to be used for German filming was used to film the French materials.

Belgian specialists, after considerable difficulty and expense, negotiated the right to receive complete microfilm copies of Belgian holdings in TsKhIDK, filmed at Belgian expense, to be sure. But to add insult to injury, in the summer of 1996, in order to complete the project, they had to pay an unexpected (and unbudgeted) $3,000 customs duty to transport the appropriate additional equipment and chemicals to Moscow. A

---

120 According to figures provided by TsKhIDK, of the 1,100,00 French files held there, 995,000 were dispatched to Paris before the Duma action. All of the military intelligence (Deuxième Bureau) records in TsKhIDK were returned to France, but only part of the records of the National Security Agency (Sûreté Nationale). Some of the French personal and family papers were returned, including most of the large fond of Rothschild family and business papers (although curiously 5 folders remain, which had been transferred from TsGAOR SSSR in 1989) and the papers of the historian Marc Bloch. A number of other fonds of personal papers remain, including personal and cabinet office papers of prewar French premier Léon Blum and André Léon Levy-Ullman. Extensive French Masonic records and fonds of French Jewish organizations also remain in TsKhIDK. Also not returned were the archival materials of French provenance that were transferred to other archives, but a thorough inventory of such holdings has yet to be prepared. It should be pointed out that some of the files described as "French" in TsKhIDK were actually of provenance in Belgium or other countries. I appreciate the assistance of TsKhIDK director Mansur M. Mukhmanazhdanov and archivists in verifying details.

121 See the official transcript of the State Duma hearings on the termination of restitution to France, Federal'noe Sobranie, parlament Rossiiskoi Federatsii, *Biulleten'*, no. 34, "Zasedaniia Gosudarstvennoi Dumy, 20 maia 1994 goda" (Moscow, 1994), p. 4, pp. 26–33. See also the later accounts, "Skandal, ne dostoinyi Rossii," with separate articles by Iurii Kovalenko (Paris) and Ella Maksimova (Moscow), *Izvestiia*, no. 172 (8 September 1994), p. 5.

formal press conference in Ghent in April 1997 served as an official presentation for the microform copies now open to the public at the Archives and Museum of the Socialist Labour Movement (AMSAB). Belgian specialists prepared for the occasion a detailed published account of the Nazi seizure of Belgian archives and their recent discovery in Moscow. Further substantiating claims, they uncovered in Kyiv precise Nazi accounts of the seizures in Belgium and were able to document previous unknown details about their migration.[122] Yet the occasion had the aura of an anti-climax. Quality microfiche copies with Flemish translations of the Russian *opisi* are at last open to the public in Belgium, but why do the originals remain in Moscow, with prospects for their return ever more remote?

The Law for Nationalization 1995–1997

Russian legislators, backed by legal specialists, now claim that all cultural treasures (including archives) "rescued by the Soviet Army" or brought to Moscow under government orders were transferred legally: Stalin and later his deputies signed the appropriate orders. This position has been presented widely in the Russian press and parliamentary debates. On the eve of the intense Fiftieth Anniversary Victory celebrations in Moscow, a proposed Russian law – "On the Right of Ownership of Cultural Treasures Transferred to the Territory of the Russian Federation as a Result of the Second World War" – spelling out that legal position, was adopted by the Council of the Federation in March 1995 by an overwhelming majority and sent on for consideration to the State Duma. As stated in the preamble, the new law aims "to establish a firm legal basis for considering those treasures as partial compensation for the loss to the Russian cultural heritage as a result of the colossal looting and destruction of cultural treasures in the course of the Second World War by the German occupation army and their allies." In hearings for this law and in the various drafts and proposed amendments, there has yet to be the recognition that archival materials, and especially the official records of other countries, should be treated differently from artistic masterpieces.

The March 1994 definition of the Archival Fond RF already a year earlier extended the new legal specifications for the Russian archival legacy to include "archival files of foreign origin legally transferred to the Russian Federation." That puts it squarely in line with the new law. Many archivists in Russia are, like their European archival colleagues, committed to professional international archival principles, and affirm that archives should be returned to the countries of their creation, as was clear in the official Rosarkhiv statement to the Duma in April 1995. But their advice was overlooked when the Duma unanimously halted the archival restitution to France in May 1994 and then, on 21 April

---

122 The Belgium fonds in TsKhIDK are described in the brochure *Fondy bel'giiskogo proiskhozhdeniia: Annotirovannyi ukazatel'*, compiled by T. A. Vasil'eva and A. S. Namazova; edited by M. M. Mukhamedzhanov (Moscow, 1995; [Rosarkhiv, TsKhIDK, Institut vseobshchei istorii RAN]), which is the first TsKhIDK reference publication regarding its fonds. Unfortunately, institutional and personal names are cited only in the Russian language without reference to original-language forms. A Flemish translation appeared in April 1997, edited by Michel Vermote et al.: *Fondsen van Belgische Herkomst: Verklarende Index* (Ghent: AMSAB, 1997). See also the Belgian historical account by Jacques Lust, Evert Maréchal, Wouter Steenhaut, and Michel Vermote, *Een Zoektocht naar Archieven: Van NISG naar AMSAB* (Ghent: AMSAB, 1997).

1995, adopted the moratorium on all restitution (**A–59**), which still remains in effect until an appropriate law takes effect. Besides now, if they consider many of their "trophy" archives legally part of the Archival Fond RF, export would be prohibited, however strongly they may endorse "restitution." All of this needs to be seen in the context of broader restitution issues, which have became one of the hottest election issues with the Communist Party and various nationalist factions all joining forces against the Yeltsin administration and its ties with Germany.

Even before the hearings for Russian membership in the Council of Europe, the proposed nationalization law was strongly opposed by the Russian Ministry of Culture. In advocating the restitution of trophy books, libraries under the Ministry know that they have much to gain from their Western colleagues. Rare early German imprints have been of little scholarly interest in Moscow, as evidenced in the fact that millions of them had been left to rot in an otherwise empty church outside of Moscow. They could have been exchanged for much-needed computer hardware and expensive Western contemporary scientific and scholarly literature, which current Russian state budgets do not provide—to say nothing of the goodwill engendered by restitution. This point has been stressed by several Moscow library directors with large "trophy collections," as well as the Library Division of the Ministry of Culture.[123] Indicative of popular sentiment against any restitution, however, Russian Minister of Culture Evgenii Sidorov was burned in effigy during one Moscow demonstration by ultra-nationalists. Six months after the Koenigs Collection of master drawings went on display at the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts in Moscow, Teteriatnikov's new collection of anti-restitution literature argued Russian legal rights to the Koenigs Collection with published captured German documentation on the "sale."[124] To be sure there was no mention of the "Inter-Allied Declaration Against Acts of Dispossession Committed in Territories Under Enemy Occupation or Control" of January 1943, issued in London 5 January 1943, whereby the Soviet Union and 16 Allies declared "null and void" Nazi-style wartime "sales" and seizures.

While across the Continent, others were celebrating restitution in Amsterdam, the "Trojan Gold" exhibit opened at the Pushkin Museum in Moscow, billed by the *New York Times* as "The Last Battle for Troy."[125] The opening of that exhibit was also featured

---

[123] A very forceful presentation of the situation was presented on the Russian public television program "Itogi" by the director of the Library for Foreign Literature, Ekaterina Iu. Genieva, 18 May 1997. See the first revelation about the scandal regarding rotting books in the church under the Academy of Sciences by Evgenii Kuz'min, "Taina tserkvi v Uzkom," *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 1990, no. 38 (18 September), p. 10; English edition – "The Mystery of the Church in Uzkoye," *The Literary Gazette International*, 1990, no. 16 (October, no. 2), p. 20. Kuz'min now heads the Library Division of the Ministry of Culture.

[124] Vladimir Teteriatnikov, *Problema kul'turnykh tsennostei peremeshchennykh v rezul'tate vtoroi mirovoi voiny (dokazatel'stvo rossiiskikh prav na "kollektsiiu Kenigsa"* (Moscow/ Tver, 1996; *Obozrevatel'/ Observer: Informatsionno-analiticheskii zhurnal, special issue*; a joint publication of *Obozrevatel'* and *Tverskaia starina*). Texts of the proposed law and with accompanying endorsements were also included. Ironically, Teteriatnikov, one of the most outspoken opponents of restitution, emigrated to the United States as a Jew (although he is not Jewish) in the early 1975 and is now an American citizen – see Ralph Blumenthal, "A Maverick Art Scholar Pursues a Tangled Case," *New York Times*, 24 September 1996, p. C11, C13, particularly with reference to his writings against Dutch claims to the Koenigs drawings.

[125] There was extensive press coverage around the world. The English-language edition of *Moscow News* had several stories, including an analysis by Tatiana Andriasova, "Priam's Treasure Unearthed Again," and a succinct summary of the legal arguments with quotes from various sides, "Who Owns Troy's Gold?" *Moscow News*, no. 16 (25 April–1 May 1996), p. 12. American author of the *Rape of Europa*, Lynn

several weeks later, during the "Victory Day" celebrations, in the conclusion of a masterful film shown on Russian public television. "By the Right of the Victors" featured revealing interviews with several now elderly individuals who had been involved with the transport, cover-up, and eventual disposition of the "trophy art." All lamented its sad fate and recommended the return of the long-hidden treasure. Given its pro-restitution theme, the film was severely criticized, with a *Pravda* journalist accusing Deputy Minister of Culture Shvydkoi of having written the scenario.[126]

As the legislature turned to its own examination of the proposed law, the fate of the displaced archives became ever more deeply enmeshed in broader anti-restitution discussion. The first issue of *Itogi*, the new Russian version of *Newsweek* magazine, featured a balanced discussion of "Who Owes What to Whom?" – the dilemma for Russia of its ill-fated "trophy art."[127] Patriotic rhetoric was at such a high pitch in the Duma that one deputy saw fit to remind the lawmakers that, "We have gathered in the Duma first of all to consider laws, and not to demonstrate which of us has more or less love for the Fatherland." The Duma passed the law in its first reading on 17 May.[128] Just afterwards, Teteriatnikov produced another full-page nationalistic diatribe against restitution in *Pravda* – "Are the Russian People Being Looted Again?" – tendentiously listing many past acts or proposals for restitution.[129] With many named as offenders in the Yeltsin administration, Deputy Ministry of Culture Shvydkoi sued for slander.

In keeping with the view that all of the trophies were acquired by Russia legally and constituted "compensatory reparations," and just on the heals of the presidential election on 5 July 1996, the Duma adopted the law in its second reading almost unanimously, and sent it back to the Council of the Federation.[130] Reactions in the press in Germany and other European countries were understandable bitter, with considerable commentary by public officials and specialists following the restitution issue. Official diplomatic protests

---

Nicholas criticized the harsh words of the German ambassador and suggested a compromise whereby the Trojan gold would remain in Moscow in exchange for the return of other German cultural treasures – see her letter to the editor under the headline "The Last Battle for Troy" with an appropriate cartoon, *New York Times*, 27 April 1996, p. 23.

126 The film, "Po pravu pobeditelei," was directed by Boris Karadzhev, which is not even mentioned by Vladimir Vishniakov, "'Logika mira' sulit divedendy?" *Pravda*, no. 69 (15 May 1996), p. 4.

127 "Kto chto komu dolzhen?: Spory o sud'be 'trofeinogo iskusstva' prodolzhaiutsia 50 let," with contributions by Konstantin Akinsha, Grigorii Kozlov, Mark Boguslavskii, and Wolfgang Eichwede, among others, together with an interview with Deputy Russian Minister of Culture, Mikhail Shvydkoi, *Itogi*, 1, no. 1 (14 May 1996), pp. 63–74.

128 Passage in the first reading was confirmed by a "Postanovlenie Gosudarstvennoi Dumy – O proekte federal'nogo zakona 'O prave sobstvennosti na kul'turnye tsennosti, peremeshchennye na territoriiu Rossiiskoi Federatsii v resul'tate Vtoroi mirovoi voiny'," 17 May 1996, no. 351-II GD, with a copy of the draft law attached. See the stenographic text of the Duma session, which reveal representative attitudes to the law, – *Gosudarstvennaia Duma: Stenogramma zasedanii, Biulleten'*, no. 27(169) (17 May 1996). The quoted remark was by Vladimir P. Lukin, of the "Apple" fraction, representing the Committee on Foreign Affairs, pp. 36–37.

129 Vladimir Teteriatnikov, "Ograbiat li vnov' russkii narod? Tragicheskaia sud'ba kul'turnykh tsennostei, peremeshchen resul'tate Vtoroi mirovoi voiny," *Pravda*, no. 73 (22 May 1996), p. 4.

130 *Gosudarstvennaia Duma: Stenogramma zasedanii, Biulleten'*, no. 37/(179) (5 July 1996). The textual changes in the law between the first and second reading are explained in the presentation by Nikolai N. Gubenko on 5 July (pp. 51–52), and likewise in his presentation to the Council of the Federation on 17 July (see fn. 132).

were registered in Bonn and Moscow.[131] The foreign reaction, which was reported in the Russian media, may have had a sobering effect on Russian lawmakers. On 17 July, the Russian upper house rejected the law, with representatives from the by then victorious Yeltsin administration emphasizing the extent to which its passage would conflict with numerous international agreements, and would compromise "Russian international prestige" by inciting conflict for Russia "with most of those countries with which it has relations." As one deputy put it, in recommending rejection, "This law would return us to a state of war." Currently, negotiations were underway regarding the Tikhvinskii icon "The Mother of God," which has been identified in Chicago, he explained. "If this law is approved, such a valuable icon of the Russian Orthodox Church will never be returned to Russia." A delegate who was born in western Belarus' reminded the chamber of plunder and counter-plunder in Belarus', Armenia, and Ukraine, agreeing with those who recommended rejection of the law – "We've had enough seizures [grabbing] and nationalization."

Support for the law was nonetheless intense, as apparent when Nikolai Gubenko, who had successfully led the drive for passage in the lower house, passionately spoke out at length, again emphasizing that all were transported "legally," according to Allied agreements. "The law indeed provides justice" and would be supported by "those who perished" in that war and their loved ones – by "the votes of 22 millions, if only they could speak." His position was supported by a third of those who voted (a quarter of the chamber). Lawmakers in both houses again cried out that Russia had received nothing back from Germany that was taken by the Nazi invaders.[132]

Subsequent Russian press commentary emphasized German influence in the final July vote to reject the law, but that was only tangentially apparent in the points raised in the debate. Some stressed the law would be inconsistent with the Constitution. Others emphasized that the government had no right to nationalize materials from private collections and pointed out that the cultural treasures in question belong to many countries, not only Germany and Austria.[133] Archives to be sure were never specifically mentioned in the public debate. At the end of July, historian Igor Maksimychev reasoned that "the thesis 'We owe nothing to no one,' entrails grave unpleasant consequences for our country. We do not live on the moon, but rather surrounded by other countries who always owe us something and to whom we have debts ourselves." His suggestion that

---

131 The intense and bitter German reaction to the Duma passage of the law is portrayed in the report from Germany by Valentin Zapevalov, "Igra v ambitsii: na konu bol'shie kul'turnye tsennosti," *Literaturnaia gazeta*, no. 32 (7 August 1996), p. 9, although it was not published until after the law had been rejected by the upper house.

132 See the text of the deliberations – *Sovet Federatsii Federal'nogo Sobraniia, Zasedanie deviatoe, Biulleten,'* no. 1(107) (17 July 1996), pp. 55–63. Quotations cited are respectively from presidential representative Anatolii Ia. Sliva (p. 61), Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei B. Krylov (p. 61), A. S. Beliakov (p. 58), Chief of the Administration of Rostov Oblast Vladimir F. Chub (p. 62), and Deputy Head of the Committee on Culture of the Duma, Nikolai N. Gubenko (p. 60, 61).

133 For example, the article by Elena Skvortsova, "Zalozhniki obeshchannykh kreditov: Rossiiskie parlamentarii, pokhozhe, igraiut na storone nemtsev," *Obshchaia gazeta*, no. 29 (25–31 July 1996), p. 7, insinuates that, following strong German protests about the law, the Russian legislature was bargaining for increased German credits. The importance of German pressure in the reversal of the law is also emphasized by Alan Cowell, "Heated Bonn-Moscow Debate About Art: Prize or Plunder," *New York Times*, 26 July 1996.

Russia's "weakened moral authority" would be strengthened and restored by its "adherence to generally accepted norms of international law," and that Russia would only gain from better cultural cooperation with Germany, brought strong counter reaction. The rare book specialist Aleksandr Sevast'ianov, who had written against restitution in the past, once again argued in favor of the law that the Council of the Federation threw out, and bitterly denounced the "anti-patriotic and liberal currents of the 1991–1993 period," which were favoring restitution of the "Spoils of War," which, in his view, for Russia were much "more than trophies."[134] Later in the fall of 1996, Deputy Minister of Culture Shvydkoi won his legal case against the "slander" in the newspaper *Pravda* that he was "selling out" to Germany in advocating restitution. But then he started airing a more compromising tone, stressing Russia's right to "compensation" and the need for a "mechanism" of "equivalent exchange" in cases where other countries have a legitimate claim for displaced cultural treasures.[135]

A conservative archivist representative of the Commission on Restitution, Emina Kuz'mina, a strong proponent of the then defeated law, again reviewed the legal background in a major newspaper account in November. Strongly justifying Soviet cultural reparations and lamenting the action by the Council of the Federation, she called for a new law.[136] Hearings on the slightly redrafted proposed law were held in January 1997. Soon after assuming the chairmanship of Rosarkhiv, Vladimir P. Kozlov opposed the law, but still there was no consideration of treating archives as a special case. Nor were there any proposed exceptions that would permit the long agreed-upon restitution of library books that Russian and German librarians had worked out to the considerable advantage of Russian libraries. Minor editorial changes addressed some of the earlier technical criticism, but the only new article guaranteed ownership rights for the newly independent states on the basis of former Soviet union republics. On 5 February 1997, by an almost unanimous vote of 291 to 1 with 4 abstentions, the Duma again approved the law nationalizing all cultural treasures transported to Russia at the end of the Second World War.[137]

The day before the law came back to the Council of the Federation in early March, Kuz'mina presented another full-page justification, where she tried to demolish the arguments of the opposition. For the first time in press discussion of the law, she specifically raised the example of the French archives which had been cited by Rosarkhiv

---

134 Igor F. Maksimychev, "'Peremechenoe', ne znachit 'nich'e': Nanesti ushcherb natsional'nym interesam mozhno i iz samykh blagorodnykh pobuzhdenii," *Nezavisimaia gazeta* (26 July 1996), p. 2; Aleksandr Sevast'ianov, "Bol'she, chem trofei" – Polemika . . . c Igorem Maksimychevym, *Nezavisimaia gazeta* (14 September 1996), p. 6.

135 Mikhail Shvydkoi, "Sokhranit' ostrov sotsializma v vide kul'tury nevozmozhno" (interview prepared by Aleksandr Gubanov), *Rossiiskie vesti*, no. 204 (26 October 1996), p. 10.

136 Emina Kuz'mina, "Restitutsiia: Politikanstvo i partriotizm: Nuzhen zakon o peremeshchennykh kul'turnykh tsennostiakh, ne ushchemliaiushchii interesov Rossii," *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, no. 212 (12 November 1996), p. 5.

137 See the transcript of the 5 February Duma session with discussion of the law: *Gosudarstavenaia Duma: Stenogramma Zasedanii, Biulleten'*, no. 74(216) (5 February 1997), pp. 19–23, 56. The text of the law itself, as adopted by the Duma and sent to the Council of the Federation with the Duma postanovlenie, was available to me in a preliminary printed version, together with an appended table of the editorial changes for various articles that had been adopted by the Coordinating Commission following its hearings (22 January 1997).

opponents of the law and admitted that they should be treated as "an exception." Having earlier been seized by Nazi Germany, she admitted that the French intelligence archives could hardly be seen as "compensation" for Russian losses. She quite correctly noted that those French archives were brought to Russia not from Germany, but from Czechoslovakia. She even admitted that their seizure could be considered "a provocation," and was basically for "political and military interest," and, she added parenthetically "just exactly like the American seizure of the Smolensk Party Archive." However, "they should not be cited as an example" against the intent of the law, "since their restitution was already permitted in 1993–1994 after French had paid $450,000 for microfilming . . . and 400,000 francs for copies of the finding aids."[138] She neglected to mention that not all of the French intelligence service archives were returned, with a major portion of the Sûreté Nationale still remaining in Moscow. Nor did she mention the archives of French Masonic lodges and Jewish organizations, among many seized community, business, and private archives from other nations that are still held in TsKhIDK. Neither did such details concern the legislators. The next day, 5 March 1997, the Council of the Federation passed the law by a vote of 140 to 0 with a single abstention. Even Moscow Mayor Lushkov joined the political bandwagon in favor of nationalization.[139]

Overriding the Presidential Veto – Yeltsin's Last Stand

Aware of the potential international outcry about the violation of international law and agreements, and undoubtedly with eyes to his upcoming visit to Germany, President Yeltsin vetoed the law on 18 March 1997. In his official message to the Duma, Yeltsin emphasized that the law contradicted the Constitution, and among other points, fails to distinguish "between former enemy, allied or neutral nations, and different categories of individuals in respect of their property rights."[140] His arguments were repeated by the official presidential representative, Aleksandr A. Kotenkov, when the law came back to the Duma on the 4th of April. The specific legal points raised, and the law's more general conflict with international legal norms and Russian agreements, fell on deaf ears. Antagonism between Duma and President was apparent at every turn: even when a Deputy Foreign Minister requested the floor to comment was ruled out of order.

The Duma was much more prepared to listen to the law's chief patron, Nikolai Gubenko, who emphasized the "symbolic significance" of the struggle for "Victory" in adopting the law. This time, he suggested, "It could be appropriately compared to the Battle of Stalingrad." He accused President Yeltsin of being "misinformed" by the "lack of objective information" in his legal arguments, in terms both of international law and

---

138 Emina S. Kuz'mina, "Restitutsiia: Pogibaet tot mir, gde narushaetsia pravo," *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, no. 39 (4 March 1997), p. 5. (Kuz'mina is here identified as a consultatant to the Duma Committee on Culture.)

139 See the transcript of the 5 March session with discussion of the law: *Federal'noe Sobranie, parlament Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Zasedanie vosemnadtsatoe, Biulleten'*, no. 1 (5 March 1997), pp. 26–28.

140 The text of the President's message to the Duma was not available to me. Excerpts were given by Svetlana Sukhova, "Iskusstvo dolzhno prinadlezhat'...," *Segodnia*, no. 54 (19 March 1997), which correctly predicted that the Duma would quickly override the President's veto. Fragments of the presidential response are also quoted in the reports cited after the Duma vote on 4 April 1997 (see fn. 142).

conflict with the Russian Constitution. Fully justifying provisions that "restitution of cultural treasures" to the "aggressor nations" could "be possible only by exchange for Russian cultural treasures," he glossed over other presidential objections. He cited "neutral reactions" to the law in foreign press coverage in Italy, Poland, Estonia, and Denmark. "For the Swiss, the problem has no actual meaning," he claimed. The Duma had no interest in further technical arguments, when the official presidential representative Kotenkov, nevertheless demanded his right to "the final word" as an antidote to "the emotional presentation of Deputy Gubenko." Gubenko carried the day: The Duma overrode the presidential veto by a vote of 308 to 15 (with 8 abstentions).[141] Although that vote represents only 8 more votes than were needed (119 deputies did not vote), "Victory" with a capital "V" was apparent in the press conference, fragments of which were presented on Russian television. But "victory" was still needed in the upper house, as was also apparent in Gubenko's further defense of the law in print.[142] The law came back to the Council of the Federation on a crowded schedule the 16th of April. With dwindling ranks of deputies present, almost on the eve of President Yeltsin's departure for Germany, it was agreed that a full roll-call tally should be recorded, the results of which would be announced when the Council met again in mid-May. Commentators emphasized that such a course would better assure passage.[143]

No one in the Russian parliament has ever heard of extensive postwar restitution programs for cultural treasures carried out by the Western Allies, nor do they want to hear. Deputy Minister of Culture Mikhail Shvydkoi now cites figures about American restitution shipments, and also cites Russia's "international obligations, including our admission to the Council of Europe." That keeps him in bitter conflict with Nikolai Gubenko, who thinks only of "the 27 million who perished and the graves on the Volga" during the Great Patriotic War of the Fatherland, implying that even symbolic restitution to Germany would be like "spitting on those graves." Gubenko's case against restitution, to be sure, has been supported by ultra-nationalists such as Vladimir Zhirinovskii who bitterly complained about any prospective Yeltsin restitution to the German "fascist scoundrels."[144]

Despite the parliamentary prohibition and vocal diatribes against restitution, when President Yeltsin went to Baden-Baden in mid-April 1997, it was announced that he was taking an archival restitution gift for German Chancellor Helmut Kohl. Shying away from more disputed art, Yeltsin was supposed to be presenting Kohl with eleven folders from the papers of Walter Rathenau, the Socialist German Foreign Minister from the 1920s,

---

141 *Gosudarstvenaia Duma: Stenogramma Zasedanii, Biulleten'*, no. 89(231) (4 April 1997), pp. 14–19.

142 See Nikolai Gubenko, "Lozhnyi tezis nemetskoi storony," *Rabochaia tribuna*, no. 64 (9 April 1997), p. 4. See the Associated Press wire service reports by Anna Dolgov (Associated Press), "Russia Duma: Let's Keep Looted Art," and "Russia to Keep Trophy Art," 4 April 1997.

143 Vladimir Shpak, "Senatoram nravitsia otkryvat' dver' levoi nogoi: No tol'ko ne v kabinet konstitutsionnogo sud'i," *Segodnia*, no. 79 (17 April 1997), p. 3.

144 Quotations are from the press conference reported on Russian television, 16 March 1997, fragments from which were reported in the article by Boris Piiuk, "Ty mne – Ia tebe," *Itogi*, no. 16(49) (22 April 1997), pp. 13–14, and also in the above cited article by Gordon in the *NY Times*, 17 March 1997. See also the comments of Shvydkoi and Duma deputy Mikhail Selavinskii in the commentary by Gortenziia Vladimirova, "Mera za meru?" *Kul'tura*, no. 15 (17 April 1997), p. 1. See also the comments of Shvydkoi and Duma deputy Mikhail Selavinskii in *Kul'tura*, no. 15 (17 April 1997), p. 1.

together with some 24,000 frames of microfilm from the former East German Communist Party records.[145] The Russian press announcements and the actual presentations in Baden-Baden proved to be in significant conflict – yet another episode in a vacuous farce: The 910 trophy files (in two *opisi*) of Rathenau papers all still remain safely ensconced in Moscow, as confirmed by the Director of TsKhIDK. According to the President of the German Bundesarchiv, the files presented to Chancellor Kohl came from Soviet Foreign Ministry sources – files relating to Rathenau, but no original "trophy" documents from his papers. And as to the microfilms, by May Day 1997, none had been received in Germany, despite a much earlier Russo-German agreement that the films in question would be returned. Besides, the microfilms were only copies of originals files that are today held in Germany, the films themselves having been placed on deposit in Moscow for safekeeping in the 1970s! Thus the promised new precedent for restitution of World War trophy archives proved an illusion, or else yet another devious political ploy.[146]

The predicted passage of the law nationalizing cultural treasures was reported to the press on the eve of the official announcement of the vote in the Council of the Federation on the 14th of May: 141 out of 178 representatives voted in favor of the bill, 22 more than was needed to override the presidential veto.[147] The law was to take effect when signed by the President within a week. The following day, Germans announced the identification of significant mosaics and other fragments from the long-lost Amber Chamber, which the Nazi invaders had first evacuated from the imperial palace in Tsarskoe Selo to Königsberg (*Russian* Kaliningrad) in 1943. Russian political leaders, including Gubenko, immediately appeared on Russian television, charging that the German announcement had been deliberately delayed. Subsequently, President Yeltsin defied the legislature by refusing to sign the law, which he was required to do within a week. Instead of taking it to the Constitutional Court, according to his earlier announced intent, he simply returned it to the

---

145 Regarding the intended transfer, see for example, Boris Piiuk, "Ty mne – Ia tebe: Boris El'tsin vozvrashchaet 'kul'turnye trofei', ne obrashchaia vnimaniia na dumskii zapret," *Itogi*, no. 16(49) (22 Aprili 1997), pp. 13–14. The ITAR-TASS article "Podarok platezhom krasen: Na bortu prezidentskogo samoleta dostavleno, pokhozhe, i soglashenie s NATO," *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, 19 April 1997, the official government newspaper, does not mention the microfilm, although it does claim that President Yeltsin gave Chancellor Kohl "11 folders from the archive of the former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Germany Walter Rathenau." Associated Press correspondent Mitchell Landsberg filed what turned out to be an incorrect story, "Yeltsin to Take Art to Germany" (15 April 1997).

146 TsKhIDK Director Mansur M. Mukhamedzhanov assured me that none of the Rathenau papers from TsKhIDK had been transferred to Germany. Igor V. Lebedev, Director of the Historico-Diplomatic Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, the umbrella agency that directs MFA archives, claimed not to be informed beyond the official press release. The Chief of the Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation (AVP RF), Elena V. Belevich, assured me that her archive retains no trophy archives. Obviously, resolution of the matter must await further information and more detailed examination of the "eleven files" that actually changed hands and further undivulged assurances President Yeltsin may have made on the restitution issue. German Bundesarchiv President Frederich Kallenberg explained to me the German point of view, although at the time of our conversation (30 April 1997), he had not yet seen the files received from President Yeltsin; the information he gave regarding the presentation, however, diverges considerably from published Russian newspaper accounts.

147 I quote from ITAR-TASS wire service reports dated 13 and 14 May 1997. See the report on the 13th by Michael R. Gordon, "Sap at Yeltsin as Legislators Veto Return of Art Booty," *New York Times*, 14 May 1997, p. 3.

Duma with his refusal, claiming it was contradictory to the Constitution.[148] In the meantime, the politics of restitution in Russia overshadow any hopes for further restitution.

The Liechtenstein "Exchange"

Despite the still prevailing April 1995 moratorium on restitution and its own endorsement of nationalization, in June 1996 the Duma did nevertheless approve provisions for the return of a major group of Nazi-looted archival materials to the Grand Duchy of Liechtenstein, which remained among the Russian trophy archives in Moscow. The special exception by the Duma, reversing its earlier stand against restitution to Liechtenstein, involved not only high diplomatic interventions. Most important, the royal family of Liechtenstein agreed to barter. At the suggestion of the Russian side, they purchased through Sotheby's the personal copy of investigator N. A. Sokolov's original notebooks and assorted pieces of evidence relating to the assassination of the Russian imperial family to be traded for the twice-looted Liechtenstein archives.[149] The official Russian Commission investigating the 1918 assassination of the imperial family was anxious to acquire the Sokolov papers and lobbied to reverse an earlier Duma refusal. As presented in the Duma resolution, the restitution to Liechtenstein is taking place primarily on the basis of "exchange" for "family archives," which "have no bearing on the history of Russia," quite in keeping with the law under consideration.[150] Following an official Government directive (*postanovlenie*) on 30 August (no. 1041), a formal diplomatic agreement for the "exchange" was signed in Vaduz, 3 September 1996, by Russian Foreign Minister Evgenii Primakov and Prince Hans Adam II of Liechtenstein, who

[148] Yeltsin finally did sign the law in April 1998, and at the same time sent it to the Constitutional Court for review.

[149] The Sokolov materials are described in detail with lavish illustrations in the catalogue, *The Romanovs: Documents and Photographs relating to the Russian Imperial House* (London: Sotheby's, 1990), initially offered at auction in London, 5 April 1990, with a reserve price of £350,000. According to Sotheby's press office, the advertised price of £350,000 was not met at the time the collection was first offered at auction, and a private contract sale was arranged with an anonymous buyer several years later. Although newspapers alternatively quote the selling price as $500,000 or £500,000, one Southeby's spokesperson reported it was considerably less.

Nikolai Alekseevich Sokolov (1882–1924) had been an official local court investigator for the fate of the imperial family, but then emigrated abroad. Some of the materials were published in Sokolov's account in French, *Enquête judiciare sur l'assassinat de la famille impériale russe avec les preuves, les interrogatoires et les dépositions des témoins et des accusés, 5 plans et 83 photographies documentaires inédites* (Paris: Payot, 1924; "Collection de mémoires, études et documents pour servir à l'historie de la guerre mondiale") and in Russian, *Ubiistvo Tsarskoi sem'i* ([Berlin]: Slovo, 1925). Four other copies of Sokolov's notebooks were prepared and, in varying degrees of completeness or fragments, are now scattered in various foreign repositories, including Houghton Library at Harvard University; they differ in content and completeness and lack the contingent original pieces of evidence in the collection sold by Sotheby's.

[150] See the transcript of the Duma session of 13 June 1996 (p. 59), and the official "Postanovlenie Gosudarstvennoi Dumy – Ob obmene arkhivnykh dokumentov Kniazheskogo doma Likhtenshtein, peremeshennykh posle okonchaniia Vtoroi mirovoi voiny na territoriiu Rossii, na arkhivnye dokumenty o rassledovanii obstoiatel'stv gibeli Nikolaia II i chlenov ego sem'i (arkhiv N. A. Sokolova)," 13 June 1996 (no. 465–II GD).

reportedly handed over the ciphered telegram from Ekaterinburg (17 July 1918) confirming the fate of the imperial family. In announcing the "exchange," *Izvestiia* inaccurately relied on an unidentified archivist's disparaging description of the Liechtenstein archive as "seven tons of lard [sala] and five tons of candle wax."[151]

A responding outcry, published by no less than the newspaper of the Presidential Administration, accused the government of a "monstrous mistake," whereby "three raw notebooks of Nikolai Sokolov" (six are noted in the Sotheby's catalogue) are being exchanged for "over three tons" of valuable Liechtenstein manuscripts, with historical autographs that would allegedly be "worth a fortune at auction." Besides, the journalist rather inaccurately claimed that "Liechtenstein willingly transferred the archives to the Third Reich," and hence had no right to expect their return. The Liechtenstein materials were of so little interest either to the Soviet security services or Russian historians and archivists that they were never even processed in the Moscow archive and were virtually forgotten for fifty years. Only now that their return has been formalized, Russian patriots are beginning to take interest and demand further investigation of the "ill-conceived exchange," which, the same Moscow journalist charged, involves a "tremendous detriment to Russian security, economy, and prestige."[152]

To be sure, it may be inappropriate to regard the restitution of the archives of the Grand Duchy of Liechtenstein as an equivalent "exchange" for the Sokolov collection. But if it had not been for the principle of "exchange" for a tantalizing tidbit of imperial-related Rossica, deputies of the Duma would have certainly not reversed their initial stand against restitution. Far from the Duma concerns, if they were even aware of its existence, an October 1994 resolution of the 30th International Conference of the Round Table on Archives calls for unconditional restitution of all displaced archives, reaffirming earlier UNESCO resolutions "that archives are inalienable and imprescriptible, and should not be regarded as 'trophies' or objects of exchange."[153] International archival circles nevertheless showed considerable interest in the Liechtenstein "exchange" when it was announced in early September 1996, as perhaps a new ray of hope on the restitution front

---

[151] Boris Vinogradov, "'Sem' tonn sala i piat' tonn svechei' v obmen na arkhivy ob ubiistve Nikolaia II," *Izvestiia*, no. 165 (4 September 1996), p. 3. See more details in Michael Binyon, "Liechtenstein Will Hand Over Report on Tsar's Murder," and another unsigned article, "The Romanov File," in *The Times* (London), 5 September 1996, and the German commentary, "Zum Tausch auf den Tisch: Der Fürst von Liechtenstein bekam aus Moskau einen Schatz zurück durch ein subtil eingefädeltes Gegengeschäft," *Der Spiegel*, 1996, no. 41, pp. 199, 202.

[152] Natal'ia Vdovina, "Prizraki trofeinogo arkhiva: Kniaz' fon Likhtenshtein, shtabs-kapitan Sokolov i deputaty Gosdumy RF," *Rossiiskie vesti*, no. 186 (2 October 1996), pp. 1–2. Current reports suggest that the Liechtenstein archive had been seized by the Nazis in Vienna and taken to Berlin, but Nazi reports suggest it had been transferred to a Nazi archival center in Troppau (now Opava, in the Czech Republic), in 1939. According to TsKhIDK archivists, the Liechtenstein archive was transferred to the former Special Archive from the Library of the Academy of Sciences (BAN) in 1946. It had been found by Soviet authorities in Holleneck Castle in Vienna in 1945, although this author has not seen the report of its seizure or transport to Moscow.

[153] Resolution 1 from the 30th Conference was initially published in the ICA *Bulletin*, no. 43 (December 1994), pp. 14–15; the text is reprinted in Grimsted, *Displaced Archives*, p. 33, fn. 133. The CITRA resolution, which follows a series of earlier UNESCO resolutions, passed almost unanamously, but with a Russian abstention and two others. Coincidently, a notice about the "Swap of Archives" appeared in the English-language *China Daily* (5 September 1996), during the 13th Congress of the International Council on Archives in Beijing, about which many archival leaders from European countries took notice.

in Russia. As of the spring of 1997, Liechtenstein had still not received any of its historical archives. Symbolically, if not entirely by chance, representatives from Liechtenstein were in Moscow in May for a final round of negotiations the same day the "Spoils of War" nationalization law was repassed by the Council of the Federation overriding the presidential veto.

While the fate of the law still remained in abeyance and the Russian parliament was in summer recess at the end of July, a large Russian cargo plane from the Ministry for Extraordinary Circumstances conveyed all of the Moscow-held Liechtenstein archives to Switzerland for transfer to Vaduz. Prince Hans-Adam_II may have had to "'purchase' back his property," as a prominent headline in the Liechtenstein newspaper described the transfer on the 30th of July of archives that had been seized first by the Nazis, then by the Red Army, and then held for half a century in Moscow.[154] Nevertheless, the formal ceremonial delivery by Rosarkhiv Chairman and Chief Archivist of Russia, Vladimir P. Kozlov, despite the expected political outcry in Russia, marked the only recent significant step forward in the much-disputed Russian cultural restitution process with the European Community.

Views from New York and Amsterdam

A week after the April 1997 Russo-German Summit in Baden-Baden the elegantly published proceedings of the 1995 symposium on "The Spoils of War" at the Bard Graduate Center for the Decorative Arts appeared in print in New York City. Essays by lawyers and cultural leaders from throughout Europe including Russia, who had gathered in New York in January 1995, marking the beginning of the fiftieth anniversary year of the end of World War II, bring perspective to many issues in the continuing "Cold War" debate half a century later.

Before the Bard symposium, there was scant public appreciation for the dimension of cultural loss and plunder on the Eastern Front and the bitterness of emotions that now plague discussion of restitution half a century later. Lynn Nicholas' prize-winning book, the *Rape of Europa*, which helped pave the way for the Bard symposium, was in press before the "special repositories" in Moscow hit the headlines.[155] Her coverage of restitution issues and concluding chapter would be quite different had it been written after the Bard symposium.[156] Bard effectively brought together high-level Germans and Russians handling restitution issues, as well as representatives from most other affected

---

154 Patrik Schädler, "Fürstliches Hausarchiv und Sokolov-Archiv / Gestern begann der Austausch: Fürst Hans-Adam 'kauft' sein Eigentum zurück," *Liechtensteiner Vaterland*, no. 172 (31 July 1997), p. 1. An additional background story, with a picture of Prince Hans-Adam and Russian Foreign Minister Evgenii Primakov signing the earlier agreement appeared on p. 3. My information about the transfer comes directly from Vladimir P. Kozlov, who kindly provided me a copy of the Liechtenstein newspaper.

155 See full reference to the published proceedings, *The Spoils of War*, fn. 95.

156 Lynn Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994); also available in a German translation: *Der Raub der Europa (*Munich: Kindler Verlag, 1995); additional translations have appeared in Dutch, French, Spanish, and Portugese (Brazil). Nicholas' chapter on looting from Soviet lands is weak, and in general she does not deal with Soviet cultural plunder and current Russian restitution problems.

European nations. As the volume editor, Elizabeth Simpson, put it well in her introduction, "Not only was this the first public meeting on the subject ever held, but it was also the first time that so many of those involved had been together in one place – in a less formal and more congenial setting than that of the courtroom or negotiating table." Even more important today is her carefully edited volume, which documents the issues as presented from different national of points of view, as well as differing points of view within Germany and Russia. Appended texts of important international agreements and conventions relating to cultural property provide further background for discussion of the law recently passed over presidential veto in Russia.

One case study complete with archeological drawings highlights the Gold of Priam with the rival claims by Germany, Russia, and Turkey.[157] Another case study featured the eleventh-century Samuhel Gospels from Quedlinburg, Germany, which had been stolen by an American GI from Texas, but was retrieved by Germany half a century later, only after the payment of almost three million dollars ransom to his heirs. Many Americans were horrified that the family should be permitted to profit from such a theft under American law. From the Russian point of view, a representative of the Ministry of Culture immediately queried: "How can we explain to the ordinary Russian man in the street why, in the case of the Quedlinburg treasures, Germany raised the necessary funds to buy the works back from an American owner – when Russians for some reason are only blamed or pressured to return art treasures as a 'gesture of goodwill'? And not only that, but give them back with apologies for having retained these things for so long."[158]

Russian legislators have frequently remarked, "Now we are asked to return, according to 1947 documents, what we received from the aggressor. We ourselves, we received nothing that had been taken away."[159] Others have insinuated in Cold War tradition that many of the Nazi-looted treasures from Soviet lands were carried off whole scale to American museums and private collections. A special Bard session that brought together the now elderly directors of the postwar American restitution collecting points and art theft investigating units in Germany providing a taste of their commitment to restitution in the face of postwar American criticism of that policy – facts that have long been hidden from public knowledge in Russia. Ironically, in the discussion, it turned out that the American directors did not recall any of the at least thirteen American restitution transfers to Soviet authorities between 1945 and 1948, comprising over a half million cultural treasures that had been looted from Soviet lands by the Nazis and recovered in the American zone of occupation.[160] Contents of the U.S. Army "Property Cards – Art" that were prepared for

---

157 Elizabeth Simpson, "Introduction," *The Spoils of War,* pp. 12–13. "Case Study: 'The Treasure of Priam'," in *The Spoils of War*, pp. 191–213.

158 "Case Study: 'The Treasure of Priam,'" in *The Spoils of War*, pp. 191–213. "Case Study: 'The Quedlinburg Church Treasures'," in *The Spoils of War*, pp. 148–58. See the color plate of the Samuhel Gospels (p. 23) and the Reliqury Casket of Henry IV (p. 24) from Quedlinburg. I recall Valerii Kulichov making that remark to me after the session. It is now included in the text of his own presentation, "The History of the Soviet Repositories and their Contents" (p. 173).

159 Aleksandr A. Surikov, addressing the Council of the Federation, quoted in the stenographic text, *Soviet Federatsii Federal'nogo Sobraniia, Zasedanie deviatoe, Biulleten',* no. 1 (107), 17 July 1996, p. 59. The same argument was also presented by Nikolai Gubenko, p. 60.

160 See the section "The Immediate Postwar Period," in *The Spoils of War*, pp. 122–47. One official list, "Restituted Russian Property," summarizing thirteen U.S. restitution shipments to the USSR between September 1945 and September 1948, from U.S. Army records in the National Archives (RG 260), is

all of the items returned to the USSR from the Munich Collection Point are now available in a database recently issued on CD-ROM by the Forschungsstelle Osteuropa of the University of Bremen.[161]

Those property cards do not cover the four freight cars with 1,000 packages of "archival material removed by the Germans in 1943 from Novgorod [and Pskov]," found in Berlin-Dahlem, which constituted the first American restitution transfer in Berlin, 20 September 1945.[162] Russian archivists have been unaware of that U.S. transfer, although presumably the materials were eventually returned to Novgorod. Nor do people in Kyiv know about the 25 freight wagons loaded with archives and museum exhibits from Kyiv and Riga that were turned over to Soviet authorities by the U.S. Army near Pilsen, Czechoslovakia, after they had been found in the nearby castle in Tøpisty and the Monastery of Kladruby. Russians and Ukrainians today repeat the Soviet postwar claim (submitted as a document to the Nuremberg Trials) that the Kyiv Archive of Early Acts was taken to Germany and the rest dynamited by the Nazis. Actually, the portions of that archive not evacuated by the Nazis were destroyed when the Red Army retook Kyiv in November 1943.[163] Almost all that the Nazis succeeded in evacuating are now safely back in Kyiv. Approximately a quarter million books, discovered in and around the Monastery of Tanzenberg in the Austrian Tyrol, were returned to the Soviet Union by British authorities – including treasures from imperial palace libraries outside of Leningrad that Russians claim were never returned. Other books restituted from Tanzenberg include a major segment from the IISH in Amsterdam.[164] A large shipment

---

published in facsimile by P. K. Grimsted with H. V. Boriak, *Dolia ukraïns'kykh kul'turnykh tsinnostei pid chas Druhoï svitovoï viiny: Vynyshchennia arkhiviv, bibliotek, muzeïv* (L'viv, 1992), pp. 117–19; the full U.S. restitution files are open to researchers in the National Archives (record group 260), and in the Bundesarchiv-Koblenz (Bestand B-323). The present author made note of this document as an intervention in the Bard symposium; although the published volume does not include discussion transcripts, my discussion of this issue is included in my essay, "Captured Archives and Restitution on the Eastern Front: Beyond the Bard Symposium," in *The Spoils of War*, p. 246.

161 The German-language CD-ROM version of the data files (issued in early 1996) is available from the Forschungsstelle Osteuropa an der Universität Bremen, Universitätsalle GW 1, D-28359 Bremen (fax – 49/421/218-3269). A summary inventory prepared from the property cards (organized by Soviet repository of origin) is available in the Bundesarchhiv (Koblenz) (hereafter BA-K), "Verzeichnis der Treuhandverwaltung von Kulturgut München bekanntgewordenen Restitutioinen von 1945 bis 1962 USSR A–Z," BA-K, B-323/578. Other item-by-item descriptions and photographs of the materials restituted to the Soviet Union are available in the files of the various Collection Centers in the U.S. zone of occupation that are held as part of the records of the U.S. Office of Military Government in Germany (OMGUS), US NA, RG 260 in College Park, MD.

162 A receipt for this shipment, from the U.S. Headquarters, Berlin District, signed by Lt. Col. Constantin Piartzany [sic] in Berlin (20.IX.1945), together with lists of box numbers for the 333 crates in the four numbered railway wagons, is found in US NA, 260, Ardelia Hall Collection, box 40.

163 The American shipment was officially turned over to Soviet Major Lev G. Podelskii, according to the U.S. Army list cited above (fn. 160). Although, outgoing U.S. receipts or inventories have not been located, top-secret Soviet accounts of the transfer have been found. Unlike the situation in Russia, my own accounts of this restitution has been widely published in Ukraine. This example is documented more fully in Grimsted, "Displaced Archives," in *The Spoils of War*, pp. 245–46, and is the subject of a forthcoming case study by Grimsted and Hennadii Boriak.

164 See the official British report by Leonard Wooley, *A Record of the Work Done by the Military Authorities for the Protection of the Treasures of Art & History in War Areas* (London: HMSO, 1946), pp. 39–40; and the report of the British Committee on the Preservation and Restitution of Works of Art,

from Smolensk University Library, specifically intended for the library of Hitler's planned cultural center in Linz, found near Salzburg, Austria, was also returned to Soviet authorities by the U.S. Army.[165] Although archives per se were rarely mentioned in the Bard symposium, the still "Captured Archives on the Eastern Front," found an appropriate place in the published Bard volume, and details about these and other Western restitution to Soviet authorities after the war have been documented elsewhere.[166]

Wolfgang Eichwede, the director of the Forschungsstelle Osteuropa of the University of Bremen assured the Bard symposium that "Germany today holds almost no treasures from the Soviet Union and possesses nothing (or very little) that it could return." Yet he agonizes to find a creative solution to the restitution impasse between Bonn and Moscow:

> It is true that Russia has the German "trophies" to make up for its losses, but at the same time it knows that it is operating outside of international norms.. . . What is needed here is a 'new thinking': gestures of reconciliation instead of a mutual standoff, a willingness to embark upon joint projects, instead of reviving the Cold War on the cultural front.[167]

The Russian representative in the concluding session of the Bard symposium, Ekaterina Genieva, the director of the Library of Foreign Literature in Moscow, followed the same line of reasoning in suggesting that, if restitution issues for art were going to leave the European continent still divided, perhaps the further restitution of library books, such as being planned by her library, could "make us friends."[168] Indicative of the bitterness of alternative Russian attitudes against all restitution, a full-page diatribe on the Bard symposium appeared in the Russian Communist Party newspaper *Pravda* – "The 'Cold War' Behind Museum Blinds." The author considered Genieva's "anti-Russian rhetoric" a disgrace to the Russian delegation.[169]

Proof of the prospective friendship and goodwill engendered for Russia by even small-scale restitution efforts was demonstrated at an Amsterdam symposium a year later (April 1996), to which Genieva was invited to hear a movingly appreciative report on the fate of the 600 books symbolically returned by her library to the University of Amsterdam

---

Archives, and Other Material in Enemy Hands, *Works of Art in Austria (British Zone of Occupation) – Losses and Survivals in the War* (London: HMSO, 1946), p. 4. Materials returned had come from Kyiv, Riga, Voronezh, and other Russian locations, including Tsarskoe Selo.

165 See the "Weekly Report, 25 November to 1 December 1945," of Charles Sattgast, Education, Religion, Fine Arts, and Monuments Office of the U.S. Military Government, Land Salzburg, US NA (Suitland), RG 260, USFA, Reparations and Restitution Branch, General Records, 1945, Box 160. See also, U.S. Military Government Austria, *Report of the U.S. Commissioner*, no. 2 (December 1945), p. 130. Information about the return of the Smolensk materials was also mentioned in a letter of Chief, RD&R Division OMGUS, James Garrish to Chief RD&R Division SVAG, Colonel Borisov (19.IX.1947), BA-K, B323/497.

166 A shortened version of the Grimsted "IISH Research Paper," no. 18, appears as "Captured Archives and Restitution on the Eastern Front: Beyond the Bard Symposium," in *The Spoils of War*, pp. 241–51.

167 Wolfgang Eichwede, "Models of Restitution (Germany, Russia, Ukraine)," *The Spoils of War*, pp. 216–20.

168 Ekaterina Genieva, "German Book Collections in Russian Libraries," in *The Spoils of War*, pp. 221–24; her remarks were widely and appreciatively quoted in American press accounts of the Bard conference, including an editorial in the *New York Times* by Karl E. Meyer, 1 February 1995.

169 Vladimir Teteriatnikov, "'Kholodnaia voina' za muzeinymi shtorami – Kak rossiiskie iskusstvovedy sdaiut v plen shedevry, okazavashiesia v SSSR posle pobedy nad Germaniei v 1945 godu," *Pravda*, 29 March 1995, p. 4. As the only illustration, American soldiers were pictured with paintings in hand with the caption linking them with "trophy art." Regarding Teteriatnikov, who is now an American citizen, see fn. 124.

in 1992. Ironically, the Amsterdam conference "On the Return of Looted Collections," honoring the fiftieth-anniversary of the restitution of Dutch and other European collections from the U.S. Zone of Occupied Germany, opened the same day that the "Trojan Gold" went on display in Moscow. The proceedings of that symposium, focusing on books and archives rather than art, are published in Amsterdam. But there again "unfinished chapters" involving materials still held on the Eastern Front loom large.[170]

The Netherlands was occupied completely by Nazi Germany, and many of the Dutch archives now in Moscow were seized by the Nazis during the period when Stalin was still allied with Hitler. As was reported again at the symposium, the Dutch have returned all of the Nazi archival records found there to Germany. But who in Moscow will ever read, or let alone appreciate, the long-lost records of the Dutch feminist movement that remain sequestered there? Such archival trophies now in the Russian capital hardly serve as "compensation" for Russian historical records destroyed in Pskov or Smolensk.

Even more significant to the identification and retrieval of displaced cultural treasures and archives are the Nazi records in Moscow and Kyiv that describe their cultural plunder. The Nazi Security Services Headquarters (RSHA) files that came to Moscow with the Western European archives held by the RSHA Intelligence Division (VIIth Amt) archival unit in and near Habelswerdt/Wölfesdorf (Silesia) retain numerous files about their seized archives, including, for example, their Berlin archival accession register covering their many receipts, such as the Sûreté Nationale and Trotskii correspondence pilfered in Paris. The large complex of records in Kyiv from the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (ERR) Silesian operations in and near Ratibor (now Polish, Racibórz), include reports from various ERR work brigades in the Netherlands and Belgium, as well as western regions of the USSR. A Belgium report at the symposium referred to the precise descriptions of archival and other cultural seizures from Belgian Masonic lodges.[171] The ERR and RSHA operations in Silesia were the subject of another presentation, based in part on those files still held in Moscow and Kyiv.[172] But those displaced Nazi files are complemented by the even larger groups of ERR and RSHA records in the Bundesarchiv in Berlin (earlier Koblenz), which were much earlier returned to Germany from the United States. Until the still scattered parts of those two important record groups can be brought together, and those in Moscow and Kyiv more professionally arranged and described, many facts and

---

170 See the published proceedings, *'The Return of Looted Collections (1946–1946). An Unfinished Chapter': Proceedings of an International Symposium to mark the 50th Anniversary of the Return of Dutch Collections from Germany*, ed. F. J. Hoogewoud, E. P. Kwaadgras et al. (Amsterdam, 1997). See the report of Frits Hoogewoud, "Russia's Only Restitution of Books to the West: Dutch Books from Moscow (1992)" (pp. 68–86), and Hans de Vries report on Dutch archives in Moscow, "Exploring Western Archives in Moscow" (pp. 87–90). See also the report on the conference by Peter Manasse in *Social History and Russia* (Amsterdam, IISH), no. 5 (1996), available online at http://www.iisg.nl.

171 See the report of Wouter Steenhaut and Michel Vermote, "The Fate of the Archives and Books of the Belgian Socialist Movement," in *The Return of Looted Collections*, pp. 75–86.

172 As examples of the importance of the German records held in Moscow to the identification of displaced cultural treasures from all over Europe, see the Grimsted report, "New Clues in the Records of Archival and Library Plunder during World War II: The ERR Ratibor Center and the RSHA VII Amt Operations in Silesia," in *The Return of Looted Collections*, pp. 52–67. The longer, fully documented Grimsted study from which that report was prepared is being issued as a separate Research Paper by IISH (forthcoming 1999), with more details about the relevant RSHA records in TsKhIDK (fond 500) and the ERR records in Kyiv.

clues they contain about the displacement of archives and other cultural treasures during and after the war will remain hidden from the world.

The View from Moscow – Retrieval of Archival Rossica Abroad

In November 1995, the Duma passed a resolution calling for international negotiations for the return to Russia of three private archives of émigré Russian jurists located abroad. Most of the personal papers involved were not even created in Russia and are now being well cared for in archives in New York, Prague, and Warsaw.[173] But when will Russian politicians be ready to adhere to international agreements, resolutions, and conventions that the unique archives of community, religious, and private bodies now held in Moscow should be restored to their appropriate home? The new Russian law provides a lengthy process for the restitution of personal or family archives, requiring the payment of their "full worth, as well as the costs of their identification, appraisal, storage, restoration, and transfer costs (shipment and others)." (Art. 1, § 2)

Rosarkhiv found Russian money to publish in early 1997 the proceedings of the "archival Rossica" conference staged in Moscow December 1993. Many of the authors emphasize the need to return Russian and/or Russian archival materials from abroad – in copy if not in the original, although the need for identification and description also looms large. As the lead article, my own attempt at a "typology" for archival Rossica abroad might also provide a helpful framework for considering "trophy" archives from other countries as well. The vast majority of archival Rossica abroad is in fact "*émigré* Rossica," taken or kept abroad for its own protection against the potential destruction or suppression by a hostile regime at home.[174]

The only other foreign participant present at the 1993 conference, Jaap Kloosterman, Director of the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam, emphasized that point and the role of IISH in rescuing and preserving many significant records of the Russian revolutionary struggle. (Some of these were seized during the war by the Nazis and are among the "trophy" archives in RTsKhIDNI, the former Central Party Archive, in Moscow.) Microfilms of almost all of the Russian-related IISH holdings have already been exchanged with Russian archives, but some Russians still demand the "return" of the original archives from IISH to Russia. A legal concept such as the "Archival Fond of the Russian Federation" could not exist in the Netherlands, nor could it be recognized under the law of most other Western countries.[175] Most of the foreign "trophy" archives in Moscow, on the other hand, are original records (or in some cases stray files) from official state institutions, from religious, fraternal, social, and religious organizations, or the

---

173 "O vozvrate v Rossiiu nauchnykh arkhivov vydaiushchikhsia russkikh uchenykh-iuristov," Postanovlenie Gosudarstvennoi Dumy Federal'nogo sobraniia RF, 17 November 1995, no. 1339-I GD, *Sobranie zakono datel'stva RF*, no. 49 (4 December 1995), statute 4713.

174 *Problemy zarubezhnoi arkhivnoi rossiki: Sbornik statei* (Moscow: "Russkii mir," 1997). See the Grimsted article, "Arkhivnaia Rossika/Sovetika. K opredeleniu tipologii russkogo arkhivnogo naslediia za rubezhom," pp. 7–43. A variant edition of the Grimsted article is published in *Trudy Istoriko-arkhivnogo instituta [RGGU]*, 33 (1996), pp. 263–86.

175 Jaap Kloosterman, "Rossika za rubezhom: Arkhivy Mezhdunarodnogo instituta sotsial'noi istorii," in *Problemy zarubezhnoi arkhivnoi rossiki*, pp. 121–23.

personal papers of private citizens that were seized by the Nazis during the war. The organizers and promoters of the Rossica conference may want to view the archival trophies in Russia and/or archival Rossica abroad as objects for "exchange." Although that point of view has been denounced by resolutions of the International Council of Archives and by other international agreements as well, "exchange" remains a way of political and diplomatic life, as is apparent in the "exchange" provisions in the new Russian law on cultural treasures and the 1997 Liechtenstein "exchange."

Across the ocean, the United States still holds over 500 files from the Communist Party Archive in Smolensk Oblast, which had been removed from one of the American restitution centers in Germany by U.S. intelligence agents in 1946. Those files are only a small fraction of the archive that had been seized from Smolensk by the Nazis in 1943; 4 railroad freight cars were returned to Smolensk from Silesia in the spring of 1945, although that fact was not published until 1991.[176] The Smolensk files now in Washington also remain a symbol of "non-restitution." They were twice slated for return – first in the early 1960s and then again in 1992. The first time, the CP Central Committee decided it inappropriate to claim them as originals, given their disparaging revelations about collectivization in the 1920s and 30s that had already been published in America. Most recently, the American Senate intervened by linking them to an "exchange" demand from the Schneersohn Hassidic group in Brooklyn to retrieve their collection of books that had been abandoned and then nationalized after their forebears emigrated from Russia in 1918, and that are now held in the Russian State Library (the former Lenin Library) in Moscow. The two cases are hardly similar from a legal standpoint. Because the Schneersohn Collection – not technically an archive – although many of the books bear marginalia – was of Russian provenance, its export would be prohibitted under Russian law. Coincidently it was brought together in the village of Lubavichi, which is now in Smolensk Oblast. Perhaps today, "democratic" American politicians could provide a better example for Russian legislators by returning the symbolic "Smolensk Archive" to its original archival home.[177] Archives deserve to be liberated from the status of "trophies" or prisoners of war, even if in wartime or Cold War, they may have served adversary intelligence, political, or propaganda purposes.

Perhaps Russian legislators who are lobbying to bring home more émigré archival Rossica should consider the "goodwill" and "friendship" that might make such returns more likely, if they took a more generous and internationally viable attitude towards the return of archives legitimately claimed by foreign countries. Indeed such restitution and commensurate "returns" need to be viewed not as "exchange" – which has been ruled in

---

176 Regarding the 1945 return, see RTsKhIDNI Deputy Director V. N. Shepelev's presentation, "Novye fakty o sud'be dokumentov 'Smolenskogo arkhiva' (po materialam RTsKhIDNI)," *Problemy zarubezhnoi arkhivnoi rossiki*, pp. 124–33.

177 See Grimsted, *The Odyssey of the Smolensk Archive: Plundered Communist Records for the Service of Anti-Communism* (Pittsburgh, 1995;= Carl Beck Papers in East European Studies, no. 1201), which presents significant new data about the odyssey of the Communist Party archive from Smolensk Oblast, and addresses the political and legal issues of restitution currently involved. A short summary was presented in Moscow at the 1993 Rosarkhiv Rossica Conference, but was not included in the published proceedings. The present author recently presented a formal plee to U.S. Vice President Albert Gore and Archivist of the U.S. John Carlin strongly recommending reconsideration of this matter. An answer dated 9 April 1997, signed by the Vice President gave no tangible encouragement to resolution of that restitution dilemma.

numerous UNESCO and ICA resolutions. Fortunately, there are some Russian leaders who envisage a "new" and more "open" Russia, that as a member of the European community of nations, recognizes the inalienable right of individuals, organizations, and other governments to the archival records they have created in the course of their life, activities, or functions of state. But today, those voices in Russia have been shouted down by another brand of patriots who are more anxious to promote the "Spoils of War" as symbols of "Victory," rather than to celebrate restitution and the end of war. In the meantime, hundreds of thousands of displaced files from all over Europe still share the former Special Archive (TsKhIDK) in Moscow with the records of Soviet NKVD prisoner-of-war and detention camps from a war that ravaged the world over half a century ago.

9. Socio-Legal Inquiries

Citizens in Western democracies are quite accustomed to paying nominal fees for certified copies of birth certificates or other personal vital-statistics, school, and military service records. They pay search fees or recording taxes for property or land tenure titles. But few such inquiries or socio-legal functions in the United States or Canada, for example, are handled by the National Archives, because the documentation involved is not centralized in federal government archives, as it has been under the Soviet regime. By contrast, socio-legal inquiries make up one of the largest components of state archival functions in Russia, and a significant component in their operating expenses. Just before the collapse of the USSR in 1990, Glavarkhiv published a brief, but exceedingly helpful directory of archival coordinates for those needing socio-legal attestations for pension or various other official purpose. There has not been a new edition since all of the archives involved changed their names and many their addresses.[178]

To their credit, Rosarkhiv and other state archival authorities have been anxious to preserve the traditional Soviet socialist right of individual citizens of Russia and newly independent Soviet successor states to apply to archives in person or by mail for free attestations of school, military service, or work records in connection with pension rights and other official socio-legal functions, despite the growing cost of such services to the archives. A large part of the problem comes from the lack of an efficient national record keeping system for labor personnel service and benefits. The Russian pension system still involves individuals in endless red tape to establish and document their own records for pension benefits, often from various archives, with notarized copies of every document which they have obtained with appropriate certified attestations. In many cases handwritten letters to and from archives have not been replaced by standard computerized or even printed forms. The automated Social Security Administration records such as used in the United States, for example, are light years away from Russian reality.

State archives under Rosarkhiv report increasingly high statistics for socio-legal inquiries from all over the former USSR. In connection with new legislation and the transfer of files from agency archives, inquiries fulfilled by Rosarkhiv during 1995 topped the one million mark, 150% higher than for 1994.[179] But state archives today can ill afford the rising international postal rates for replies to Estonia or Kazakstan. The State Archive of the Russian Federation (GA RF), for example, has been receiving 18–20,000 socio-legal inquiries a year since 1991. Already for the first half of 1996 there were over 12,000, but between February and November they were unable to send out replies, because they had no money for postage. Unlike government systems and franking privileges in some countries, the archive has no standard inquiry forms (although they have recently introduced computerized form letters for response), and has to pay its own postage charges, in addition to the staff searching time. Although they are willing to send replies immediately if the respondent includes return postage, no notice has been

---

178 *Svedeniia o mestakh khraneniia dokumentov, neobkhodimykh dlia navedeniia spravok sotsial'no-pravovogo kharaktera: Spravochnik*, compiled by E. M. Murashova and L. I. Solodovnikova (Moscow, 1990; Glavarkhiv SSSR).

179 As quoted by V. A. Tiuneev, "Ob itogakh deiatel'nosti uchrezhdenii sistemy Rosarkhiva v 1995 g.," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 3, p. 7.

circulated to that effect nor other instructions to prospective inquirers. GA RF and other contemporary archives are also obliged to fulfill many official government reference inquiries from parliament and other state offices, predominantly relating to current political and economic issues.

Some agency archives, and particularly those in the military sector report much higher figures. Official individual socio-legal inquiries were over the one-million mark for the year 1991 in the Central Archive of the Ministry of Defense in Podol'sk (TsAMO – **C–4**). Subsequently, with the collapse of an all-union army, that figure dropped to 600,000 for 1994. But still the cost of such service is staggering for the archives involved. Obviously, inadequately paid pensioners or war invalids in today's Russia cannot be asked to carry the burden. This factor is yet another reason why Rosarkhiv could not afford to take over the holdings of TsAMO, without a substantial subsidy for trained staff and postage fees from the military budget to process inquiries.

Other types of inquiries have increased since the collapse of the Soviet Union, as result of various laws on rehabilitation proceedings for victims of repression (see **A–27**–**A–31**), and the need to establish appropriate archival testimonies and certified documentation. Another category of repression was addressed by the January 1995 presidential decree on the restitution of legal rights for those incarcerated during the war as prisoners of war, or sent by the Nazis to Germany for forced labor (*Ostarbeitery*), and who were subsequently repressed in the forced repatriation process (**A–32**). Millions of citizens were involved. Earlier in 1994 another government regulation established a system of compensation for those victims of Nazi persecution or their surviving families. During the last year two years these types of inquiries have been high on the list of those received for processing by many state archives. Inquiries regarding various categories of rehabilitation, including Nazi detention during World War II, are frequently handled directly through the MVD, the KGB, or other agencies, to the extent that the documentation involved has not already transferred to state archival custody. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, those agency archives are also overburdened, and can not begin to keep up with the demand in the massive work involved in rehabilitating victims of repression.

The network of Centers for Archival Information and Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repression established by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) received over two and a half million inquiries between 1992 and 1994, with a reported fourteen percent increase for 1995, but given the volume and complexity of the task, they have not succeeded in fully processing even half of the requests received, since Russian law provided for rehabilitation starting in October of 1991 (see **A–27**). According to a late 1995 report published on the MVD operations, by the end of 1994, over half a million individuals were given formal rehabilitation certification, following verification of some 1.6 million.[180] Since some MVD records have already been transferred to federal archives, such as GA RF, certain categories of inquiries for certain periods are forwarded or even initially addressed there. But in many cases all of the appropriate records have not been preserved, and in the case of GA RF, their archivists have to work without the central MVD card catalogue files that are retained by the MVD Central Archive.

---

[180] See the revealing report on this operation by the Center director, K. S. Nikishkin, "Ob ispolnenii organami vnutrennikh del zakonodatel'stva o reabilitatsii i ob Arkhivnom fonde RF," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 6, pp. 26–29.

The FSB reports ranging upwards of 3,000 inquiries per year for the last two years. These include requests from courts, procurators, and other agencies, as well as individuals and their families. During 1994 and 1995, the FSB communicated former KGB files relating to repression from their Central Archive to approximately 2,000 persons per year.[181] The so-called KGB "filtration" files on repatriation proceedings for prisoners of war from local former KGB centers have been cleared for transfer to state archives by the FSB in many areas, and many have actually been delivered. A recently published report on receipts of KGB/MVD files in Saratov Oblast, for example, explains many of the archival problems involved. In this case some 13,000 files together with the reference aids (registration journals and alphabetical card files) were accessioned by the Center for Documentation on Contemporary History of Saratov Oblast (TsDNI), which had been established on the basis of the former Oblast Committee (Obkom) Communist Party Archive. Work with these materials has been full of complications for Saratov archivists, with 446 inquiries in 1994 and 645 in 1995, and a marked increase after the new 1994 and 1995 laws mentioned above.[182] By contrast in St. Petersburg, no space has been available for local state archives to take over the extensive filtration files slated for transfer since 1992 from former KGB archives to state custody. Yet in the first six months of 1993 alone, there were 26,000 official inquiries to be processed. The local FSB archivists could not even find a room where individuals could be received, if they requested to see their own files.[183]

Individuals often do not know where to apply in connection with rehabilitation requests. To that effect, in 1994, Rosarkhiv, in cooperation with TsKhIDK (the former "Special Archive"), which houses the bulk of the central NKVD/MVD records relating to Nazi prisoner-of-war and detention camps, published a brochure regarding the location of records relating to Soviet citizens imprisoned or sent to Germany for forced labor.[184] TsKhIDK itself has lost so many staff and is unable to hire replacements in its current budget crisis that it is unable even to open, let alone respond, to the piles of official inquiries from individuals seeking information about the fate of those incarcerated. The archive closed down its reading room completely for two months during the summer of 1996, and it had no heat and only intermittent electricity during September and October, which has hardly helped them deal with the avalanche of socio-legal inquiries. The Memorial network has also been collecting data from both German and Russian sources about Soviet citizens transported to Germany and later repressed after their repatriation (in some cases forced) to the USSR, but they too have been understaffed and underfunded for the magnitude of the demand and the complexity of the operations involved.

---

[181] These figures were furnished to me during a recent meeting with the Deputy Chief of the FSB Directorate for Registration and Archival Fonds, Vladimir Konstantinovich Vinogradov.

[182] V. Ia. Lobanov and Iu. B. Shcheglov, "O rabote s dokumentami KGB v TsDNI Saratovskoi oblasti," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 3, pp. 90–92.

[183] Alla Repina, "Arkhiv – Komu oni nuzhny, eti tainy?" (interview with Sergei Chernov, Deputy Chief of Archival Registration for the St. Petersburg Security Service), *Smena*, no. 231 (12 October 1993), p. 4. See also V. S. Gusev, "Tainy arkhivov FSB," *Bezopasnost' i zhizn*, 1995, no. 2, pp. 175–78.

[184] *Spravochnik o mestakh khraneniia dokumentov o nemetsko-fashistskikh lageriakh, getto, drugikh mestakh prinuditel'nogo soderzhaniia i nasil'stvennom vyvoze grazhdan na raboty v Germaniiu i drugie strany Evropy v period Velikoi Otechestvennoi voiny 1941–1945 gg.*, compiled by T. I. Anikanova, A. L. Raikhtsaum, and L. I. Solodovnikova (Moscow, 1994; Rosarkhiv).

Although Russian state archives are required by law to perform socio-legal inquiry services without charge in the socialist tradition, in most cases, there have been no possibilities to computerize operations, and federal subsidies have been inadequate to cover the costs, especially for those requests that need to be handled by federal archives under Rosarkhiv. Given their legal mandate, the archives themselves have been unable to establish even optional procedures whereby individuals can receive prompt replies, or the documentation needed, if they are willing to pay, as is normally done in many countries of the world. These factors, together with the burden of the rehabilitation program and the experience and reference facilities of the current successor defense and security agencies to handle these requests have been another dominating reason why more of those agency records have not been transferred to the more open public archives under Rosarkhiv.

10. Fees for Archival Services

Archives in the post-1991 period, along with the Academy of Sciences, libraries, and other cultural institutions, have been hard hit by the "market" reforms and sudden lack of Soviet socialist-style funding. When neither the federal government nor Rosarkhiv itself has come up with an adequate budget for their extensive staff, and their now high costs of heat, electricity, and security services, they have been forced to seek new sources of income. Ingenious Russian archivists and museum curators have devised various plans to make ends meet, including renting out offices and the sale of their services to various projects interested in utilizing newly opened archival materials.

While socio-legal inquiries remain a free public service, during the past five years, considerable discussion has arisen over new fees for services in Russian archives that more directly affect researchers. Since fees for many services, including socio-legal services, are normal in state archives in most countries, a distinction needs to be made between what would be considered normal fees and more blatantly "commercial" practices. The controversies aroused over the issues also need to be seen in historical perspective. Under the Soviet regime, private research inquiries, especially those from abroad, were usually ignored. But once foreign researchers were received in the USSR on official exchange programs, or those coming to Moscow from other union republics, there were never charges for ferreting out documents on their officially approved subjects (in those days, foreign researchers were not permitted to consult internal archival finding aids themselves). Reproduction services were minimal, and usually free for Soviet citizens from officially sponsored research institutions. For foreigners, actual fulfillment of desired orders was always problematic and usually delayed, involving lengthy negotiations. Nevertheless, when reproduction agreements were accepted, charges were always reasonable, although some Russian repositories insisted on excessively costly barter arrangements. For Soviet citizens, and especially officially certified students, service charges of any type were rare, and never were there "finder's fees" and other service charges, even for journalists.

Today, in contrast, Russian archives have entered the nascent "market economy" in effort to survive amidst the economic crisis. Fees for copying services and research services of various categories are needed to make up the deficits in state budgets. Despite some speculations abroad, no federal archive under Rosarkhiv, federal agency archive, nor municipal or oblast state archive in Moscow and St. Petersburg is permitted to charge entrance fees for any category of researchers. According to a 1983 UNESCO study, access to archives is regarded as a right of citizens in the laws of most countries, and so it is in Russia. A number of state museums, including the Russian Ethnographic Museum in St. Petersburg, have started charging daily usage fees for archival research, and the Museum of the History of the city of St. Petersburg charges for use of its reference catalogues and consultations. Although such practices are not condoned by Rosarkhiv, Rosarkhiv appears helpless in controlling the situation outside of the federal archives under its immediate control. Many archives, including those under Rosarkhiv, have established a fee schedule for use of equipment (such as editing tables in film archives), for thematic searches, and other related research services performed by their staff. Some archives have started charging for expedited or augmented paging services, when readers require faster than normal delivery, or when they request more than the usually low daily

quota. New regulations dealing with most of such matters are being drawn up by Rosarkhiv, the final version of which was still in preparation at the end of 1997.

State film archives have become exceedingly expensive for researchers, although, to be sure they hold a much more extensive part of the national cinematographic legacy than would be found in Western countries. An American graduate student on a 1995 IREX program reported being able to negotiate an allegedly reduced foreigner's rate of $30 per day to view feature films at Gosfil'mofond, but was forced to view all the seven films needed in one day to avoid paying a second day fee. Rates of $40 per day, and sometime even $25 per reel, for foreign graduate students to view newsreels and documentary films have been reported at the Russian state film archive RGAKFD under Rosarkhiv. Minimal charges for the use of expensive film-editing tables are understandable, when the archive has no government subsidy for equipment, and the state budget does not cover its electric bill. But the same IREX student also reported being charged $40 per album ordered to examine photographs in the archive, many of which were filed in albums. If reproduction of copies were required, an additional charge of $30–$50 a piece was the rate quoted for a foreign graduate student. Upon protest and in deference to graduate student status, a 10% reduction was offered, but a Russian citizen could acquire the same copies at a more reasonable rate of approximately $1 per copy.[185] Some foreign journalists on higher budgets may be able to cope with such rates, when they desperately need film footage or illustrative material for a "hot story." However, there becomes a point where serious academic research stretching over even several days becomes impossible, because foreign student research grants cannot begin to cover such costs. And what is most irksome is the blatant discrimination against foreigners, as if on top of their already high travel costs to visit, a foreigner should be forced to help subsidize Russian archival operating budgets.

There are legal sanctions for such charges in the new Russian archival marketplace. Archivists have the right under Russian law to accept fees for a wide range of research services performed on behalf of the public, and often even individual archivists are permitted to make private arrangements to perform research services. Although such practices are not tolerated in many national archives (including the United States), the 1983 UNESCO study considers "the principle of charging payment for research on behalf of a member of the public perfectly 'acceptable'."[186] If in a few cases there have been abuses, in many cases, researchers – and especially journalists who do not have much time for research themselves – have served to benefit: Qualified archivists are ready and available to assist in research for a fee, and on topics previously completely off-base. But search fees are also applicable in repositories such as TsKhSD, where the payment of a search fee is the only possibility for researchers to request documents that still lie among

---

185 The figures quoted, which have not been verified by archival authorities, were cited in the 1996 file "Reports on Libraries and Archives in Moscow," which was available on the Internet for several months, under the IREX home page – http://www.irex.org. Some private commercial film archives in the West charge comparable rates for the use of equipment and viewing rights, but neither the Bundesarchiv in Germany nor the National Archives in Canada and the United States, nor the Library of Congress in Washington charge for viewing films or picture albums, according to my recent experience in those facilities. In such a case, it would have been advisable for students to submit complaints to Rosarkhiv, because in this particular case, the officials in Rosarkhiv with whom this author raised the issue were unaware of the situation and did not have access to the Internet reports. See further details below, fn. 236.

186 Michel Duchein, *Obstacles to the Access, Use and Transfer of Information from Archives: A RAMP Study* (Paris: UNESCO, 1983), pp. 30–31.

the massive materials that have as yet not been declassified, or for which adequate finding aids are not available to researchers. Thus the *Washington Post* correspondent Michel Dobbs informed his readers in the fall of 1992 that, while some documents relating to Russian decision to invade Afghanistan in 1989 were released by Yeltsin's representatives free of charge, he had to pay a fee of $400 to TsKhSD for additional documents.[187]

As is also normal in other parts of the world, Russian archives and manuscript repositories all now charge fees for reproduction services. The quality and speed of copying services have improved in many Russian repositories. Yet at the same time, in some top-interest archives, prices remain exorbitant, many times above international norms. Russian university and Academy researchers are complaining that they must pay up to $1 per page for xerox copies at TsKhSD (and close to $2 for prints from microfilm). The post-revolutionary Foreign Ministry archive (AVP RF) charges the more normal equivalent of only twenty-five cents for Russians and for foreign students. Nevertheless, to help subsidize the lower rate for Russians, AVP RF has set the price for foreign researchers at $1, which is the minimum rate foreigners now encounter in some other archives under Rosarkhiv, including TsKhIDK and RTsKhIDNI – although in the latter case, additional fetching and service charges are usually added on to augment the total. Russian archivists present the reasonable argument that higher fees for foreigners help subsidize lower fees for Russians and students – as in the MFA case. The State Archive of the Russian Federation (GA RF) had maintained a more democratic approach, with copying fees for all – Russians and foreigners alike – at approximately thirty cents a page (although they are forced to add an excess VAT tax, as now required by Russian law for such services), but more recently, they have been forced to double their rates and lengthen delivery time, due to increased costs and lack of budgetary support for photocopying equipment, service, and supplies.

As if the $1 per page were not high enough in other archives, considerably higher prices for foreigners have aroused even more resentment – now over $2 per page at TsKhSD (with no reduction for students and without the right of publication). RGVA has set the charge for foreigners at slightly less than $1 per page for its interwar military records, but it often requires foreigners to pay up to $5 per page, which includes the right of publication, since they do not want to have to police the situation later. High costs per page are also often met at the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art (RGALI – **B–7**), where prices vary according to the archivists appraisal of the value of their unique literary documents – again, higher fees are charged for publication rights. The National Library of Russia (RNB, formerly GPB) in St. Petersburg charges $30 per folio for photographic reproduction of unique manuscript books, since xerox of such treasures is not permitted. They justify the high charges because they have been allotted no budget for restoration work badly needed for many of their early manuscripts.

In fact, Russian archivists in all repositories justify the higher prices due to the fact that they have to bear the increased cost of service and materials themselves without budgetary subsidy. To be sure, the cost of xerographic toner cartridges and quality paper are now twice as high in Moscow as they are in the USA, and replacement parts,

---

[187] Michel Dobbs' two-part feature "The Afghan Archive" appeared in the *Washington Post*, 15 November 1992, pp. A1 and A32, and 16 November, pp. A1 and A16. Dobbs' report on his archival problems at the time was a separate insert, "The Opening of the Politburo's Archives: Closely Guarded Minutes Made Public, but Access Still Isn't Easy," *Washington Post*, 15 November 1992, p. A32.

especially for older machines are almost impossible to come by. Obviously, budgetary subsidy for more xerox machines and more efficient processing procedures would help, but other issues are also involved, as will become apparent below. Nevertheless, increased fees do not necessarily increase the total income or long-term benefit to the archives. Nor do they contribute to more open and accurate historical research. Indeed, often to the detriment of scholarship, readers are forced to react with smaller orders. Foreigners further resent the Russian attitude that the need for precise copies is not seen as a scholarly attribute. When researchers complain of the discouraging high reproduction charges, they also note the inefficient operations in that sometimes as many as eight individuals in a given archive are involved in the transaction – from the initial request to payment and delivery even of a small xerox order. Rosarkhiv has been defensive about the high charges as, for example, Rosarkhiv Chairman Pikhoia openly admitted in a September 1994 interview that for copying services "our prices are much higher than elsewhere in the world." He emphasized that there was "free access for all citizens, including foreigners" to federal archives, and assured the public that "when the financial situation will be stabilized, then we will be able to offer world level prices of 20 cents per page."[188]

If Duma deputies and other defenders of the national interest complain that Russians are losing out in the archives, the fee schedules being exacted make it impossible for Russian scholars to order many copies and hence work productively. Complaints are also occasionally heard from Russian researchers to the effect that, since foreigners pay higher prices in some archives, archivists tend to provide them preferential treatment in the amount and speed of copying services. Russian students on miserly stipends are simply out of luck in terms of the possibility of completing a research project where copies are needed. Indeed, current reproduction charges in some archives – often augmented by retrieval, inquiry, and servicing fees – now render Russian student orders so prohibitively expensive that, to the detriment of scholarship, they are virtually impossible.[189]

More controversial, most Russian repositories have added stiff licensing or copyright fees for publication rights where commercial royalties are involved, as discussed above (see Ch. 3). Furthermore, with no concept of "public domain," proprietary rights resort to the archives, meaning that the repository housing a given body of records has the right to sell "licenses" for commercial publication or microfilm reproduction. Sale of licenses by archives under Rosarkhiv are not only authorized, but even encouraged, and the practice has been more formally legalized in a specific July 1995 regulation (**A–56**). In the process, Russian archival directors often fail to differentiate between academically-oriented publications undertaken by non-profit university presses – such as the Yale University Press "Annals of Communism" series and those of a more "popular," or indeed "commercial," nature undertaken by commercial publishing houses, such as the much-criticized but now-canceled Crown Publications series involving the SVR archive.

---

188 Sergei Varshavchik, "Tseny na gosudarstvennye tainy v Rossii po-prezhnemu vyshe mirovykh" (interview with Rudol'f Pikhoia), *Novaia ezhednevnaia gazeta*, no. 165 (1 September 1994). The present author actually counted eight people involved in a xerox transaction in TsKhSD in 1994, one of the unusually high-priced repositories.

189 For example, in the spring of 1992, the son of a Moscow colleague – a Russian university student in St. Petersburg – could not obtain a copy of the text needed for a senior thesis from the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art (RGALI), because the copy would have cost him three or four times his yearly stipend.

Archivists and the public may be sincerely interested in revealing the former “blank spots” of history by encouraging responsible, scholarly publication of hitherto suppressed documents, but questions of intellectual integrity arise, when such “revelations” are available only at a high price that grossly limit publication possibilities, force publishers to reduce the scholarly apparatus and footnotes to make them more “popular,” and raise the price to an extent that will not make them publicly available.

11. "Commercialization," Collaborative Projects, and Protecting the "National Legacy"

Archives as "Paper Gold"

In the initial years of the "new Russia," there was much confusion and uncertainty for Russian archivists about how the new "market" economy would affect the archives, what fees could and should be charged, what "marketing" practices were legitimate, or how much "profit" or royalties might be in store for them in return for their newly offered revelations and public services. Economic concerns and the search for new sources of revenue escalated as state budgets and socialist services decreased. At the same time, there were a host of new proposals from abroad and initiatives from within Russia to take advantage of the tremendous interest in the "new revelations," the new opportunities for open research and post–Cold-War foreign collaboration, and making more "shadows" of the Russian past increasingly available to the public.

The foreign appetite for "archival revelations" about the repressive decades of Soviet rule directly led to many new Western-financed scholarly and semi-commercial ventures. Western and research institutions, sometimes in conjunction with international microform publishers, rushed in for the archival "bonanza" – from the inheritors of American Cold War centers of anti-Communist research represented by the traditionally conservative Hoover Institution, to more socialist-oriented research establishments such as the Feltrinelli Foundation in Milan, and those with traditional interest in the history and archives of the labor movement, such as the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam, all three of which have raised major sums for publications, technical assistance, conferences, and travel for Russian archivists and historians. Many other foreign university research centers, to say nothing of the Library of Congress, among others, were quick to react to the new opportunities. There were even newly founded academic consortiums, such as the broadly based Cold War International Historical Project (CWIHP), which provided extensive funding for research and publications, including a major conference in Moscow in January 1993. Support was found for projects to open the Comintern archives, to preserve and describe various émigré archives and those associated with human rights, including the Memorial movement and the Sakharov archives. There is even a project with the Institut für Zeitgeschichte (Munich) to prepare a scholarly edition of the newly found Goebbels diaries. South Korea was willing to pay high fees for documents relating to the Korean War. Even individual Western scholars have been willing to play the game and have found funding for the high costs of copies and research services to increase coverage of the long-hidden truths among the "shadows cast to the past."

Even more remarkable has been the extent of mass-media attention, from popular publishers to television and film producers in many countries, all of whom have wanted to stake out claims in the "archival gold rush" and to profit from the interest and drama in new "revelations." Archival directors were bombarded by a host of foreign agents who, offering various and sundry benefits, wanted exclusive contracts for their services. The high prices they were willing to pay encouraged the Russian expectations of the "archival

marketplace." Most disheartening were the references in the press to archives, not as the cultural heritage of the nation, but as "paper gold," copies of which should be marketed at a price as high as possible in the "archival beriozka." In early 1992, one highly placed Russian archival official was quoted widely abroad with the infamous remark to an American scholar representing a major respected academic project: "Why should I bother to talk to you, when German television will offer us $20,000 for one file?"[190]

Where there have been charges of "commercialism," it has usually been connected with exorbitant research or reproduction fees, with the "sale" of exclusive licenses for publication rights, or with high "finders' fees" that journalists may be tempted to pay for uncovering revealing new revelations for a front-page scoop. The fact that one scholar or broadcaster has *purchased* a publication license agreement for a particular file or document could mean that no other researcher could be given a copy or the right even to quote significantly from the document. The more serious impact has meant that Russian archival directors, and on occasion other archivists, have an understandable financial interest in the sale of rights for exceptional new revelations and foreign collaborative ventures and hence may be tempted to hold them back from ordinary researchers in hopes of a more advantageous deal. In a few scandalous cases archivists have been fired for seeking personal gain, as noted elsewhere.

If such blatantly "commercial" attitudes sometimes came to the fore, many Russian archivists and manuscript curators have nonetheless been anxious to use collaborative projects and publication opportunities to increase their professional experience and enhance their image as respectable scholars, and not just "purveyors of sensations." Even the former Central Party Archive transformed its name into a "Center for Research," as well as archival preservation (**B–12**). As a carry-over from the Communist regime, when selected, politically-oriented documentary publications were an important part of Soviet archival functions, Russian archives are still staffed with many experienced scholars. Like their Soviet predecessors, Russian archives and individual archivists themselves are still encouraged to prepare publications based on their own archival holdings. Given those traditions, Russian archivists are hardly content to be anonymous servants to the scholarly public, but rather want to preserve and enhance their own reputation as scholars in their own right.

In the West, there are few scholarly historical journals that accept edited documents. In the United States, the National Historical Publications Commission has sponsored extensive government-subsidized documentary publications of presidential papers, and the State Department has issued an extensive series of *Documents on the Foreign Relations of the United States*, with a 1996 volume with complete texts of correspondence between Nikita Khrushchev and John F. Kennedy. The U.S. Congress and the CIA have also issued collections of documents on various specialized subjects, usually fulfilling a

---

190 James G. Hershberg, coordinator of the Cold War International History Project (CWIHP) at the Woodrow International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC, was quoted after his return from Moscow in January 1992, where he was negotiating archival access and conference arrangements for CWIHP – see the article by Ellen K. Coughlin, "Newly Opened Archives of Former Soviet Union Provide Opportunities for Research Unthinkable a Few Years Ago," *Chronicle of Higher Education* 30:38 (27 May 1992), p. A8 (the article started on p. 1). The term "paper gold" was first used in the title of an article by Natal'ia Davydova, "Bumazhnoe zoloto partii," *Moskovskii novosti*, no. 8 (23 February 1992), p. 10.

particular public or political aim. But Western academic presses generally frown on documentary publications per se, because of their high cost and usual lack of broad public interest. Archivists – and microform publishers – today tend to prefer "complete" publication in microform of extensive series of archival texts, rather than the subjective selectivity usually associated with published documents in expensive paper editions.

In the Soviet Union, by contrast, the Russian tradition of "archeography" became an important historico-archival discipline, associated almost exclusively with documentary publications. Before the Revolution, it was usually associated with the location, description, and publication of medieval documents.[191] Even then, government-sponsored archeographic activities were often dominated by imperial ideology, as for example, with Russification policies in Ukraine and other non-Russian areas of the Empire.[192] Political ideology to be sure permeated documentary publication during the Soviet period as well, but on the other hand, respected scholars often resorted to documentary publications when they did not want to compromise their intellectual integrity in more blatant political interpretive writing of historical essays and monographs. Archival repositories and research institutes under the Soviet system had large staffs devoted to archeography. A special sector was devoted to archeography in the Moscow Historico-Archival Institute, and in 1956, the Archeographic Commission was revived under the Academy of Sciences.

Defenders of the archeographic tradition argue that the availability of well-edited, full texts of documents serves as a sounder basis for historical understanding than interpretive essays, and that, until a basic corpus of documentary sources are readily accessible in well-published form, historical interpretation will be more difficult and suspect. From a practical standpoint, edited documents, which can be prepared from a single archive, are quicker to prepare for press than a scholarly essay or monograph that would require more extensive acquaintance with related scholarly literature and documentation in other archives. Whatever the scholarly and practical motivation, since the fall of the Soviet system, documentary publications have become even more intellectually respectable in Russia, with several journals and many publication series devoted exclusively to that purpose. In defending participation in a major collaborative publication project, an FSB archival leader recently explained to the present author that their archivists were gaining valuable professional experience by working for the first time with major academic specialists.

---

191 Regarding the tradition of archeography and changing conceptions in its meaning and usage, see Aleksandr D. Stepanskii, "Arkheografiia: termin, ob"ekt, predmet," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 3, pp. 16–25. Although the author does not elaborate on the political and ideological overtones often associated with the discipline, he cites a number of other important traditional Russian and Soviet theoretical and practical writings on the subject. See also Stepanskii's earlier article, "K 225-letiiu russkoi arkheografii," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1992, no. 6, pp. 16–24.

192 See, for example, my analysis of the political ideas involved in the Archeographic Commission in Kiev, Grimsted, "Archeography in the Service of Imperial Policies: The Founding of the Archeographic Commission and the Kiev Archive of Early Record Books," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 17:3/4 (June 1993), pp. 27–44. Similar interpretations have been published recently about the impact of nineteenth-century Russification policies on archeography in Lithuania and Belarus. Interestingly enough, the difficulty of Russian intellectuals in coming to terms with that imperial legacy was seen in a recent editorial decision rejecting a Russian version of my article for publication by the Archeographic Commission in Moscow, because it was perceived as "too political."

Given their meager salary levels, and in many cases non-receipt of full salaries for months at a time, Russian archivists have a financial interest to participate in publication projects, both within Russia and especially abroad. Particularly where their expertise has been involved in ferreting out documents to be included, they want to be included in the by-lines and receive a part of any potential royalties. Unlike the attitudes of archivists in many other countries, Russian archivists now resent the fact that in some projects foreign scholars come en masse supported by large grants and order copies to be prepared for publication abroad, while the archivists who have done the preparatory work are given no credit. A new law gives state employees the right to apply for outside grants for their personal scholarly activities. This may help to alleviate the inadequacy of their current salary levels, and provide incentive for scholarly production, but, on the other hand, it also encourages "moonlighting," and may often conflict with the image of the archivist as an uninvolved servant to the research public, such as is usually the traditional role of the archivist in many Western countries.

Occasional abuses have and may arise in prioritizing in-house publications, or favored publication outlets, such as the "purveyors of sensations" from the Presidential Archive. There have been complaints that on occasion archivists are reserving choice files for publication they hope will eventually be funded, or "collaborative projects" with potential foreign partners, rather than permitting open access to all researchers. The Tolstoi Museum in Moscow and the Russian Museum of Ethnography in St. Petersburg have been among the recent serious offenders in this regard. Many of their archival materials are exclusively reserved for their own publication projects and not openly available to outside scholars. Rosarkhiv has been taking measures to discourage "exclusivity" and to control corruption in these areas, and has even tried to intervene in a few instances on behalf of researchers when complaints have arisen. But Rosarkhiv has generally been unable to control such practices or other "purveyors of sensations" in archives outside its own jurisdiction. Nevertheless, in many archives, declassification priorities are frequently given to files with strong publication potential.

Not unexpectedly, and particularly in the early years, scandals broke out over alleged personal or institutional profits. One prominent archivist was accused of profiting from the release of documents regarding the Communist Party in Finland, published in a sensational collection in October 1992, and Moscow newspapers were requesting further explanation from Rosarkhiv.[193] Indicative of the inappropriate blending of political, intellectual, and commercial aims on the post-Soviet Russian archival scene, the competition for sensations resulted in other archival scandals and dubious publication practices. "Archival Piracy Threatens Freedom of Information," suggested a Moscow journalist in February 1992, after the scandal broke over a 1943 letter of the Italian Communist Party leader Palmiro Togliatti from Comintern records which was illegally published in Italy.[194] In July 1992 yet another scandal erupted over copies of the Goebbels

---

[193] See the editor's query to Rosarkhiv published together with the letter from Anatolii Smirnov, "Sensatsiia ili insinuatsiia?" *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, no. 9 (15 January 1993), p. 7. See also the earlier article by Aleksandr Gorbunov, "Byl li Urkh Kekkonen agentom KGB?" *Moskovskie novosti*, no. 47 (22 November 1992), p. 12.

[194] Ella Maksimova, "Arkhivnoe piratstvo ugrozhaet svobode informatsii," *Izvestiia*, no. 44 (22 February 1992), p. 7.

diaries held in Moscow, selections from which were published in the *Sunday Times* (London) – initially with inaccurate attribution and without permission of the archives – as rendered by a controversial anti-Semitic British historian, as if he were the one to have made the discovery.[195]

Within the context of the traumatic transition to a market economy and the archival budgetary crisis, the Archival Fond RF itself has been viewed by some in Russia as of potential commercial value, which could be a source of income to the archives holding the materials. The possibilities for profit and abuse are particularly high in major audiovisual archives, which in most Western countries would normally be part of the commercial sector. The fact that Gosfil'mofond has a virtual monopoly on archival copies of all Soviet feature and animated film productions, and that Gosteleradiofond likewise has a monopoly on television, music, and radio productions, have made them targets for commercial wheeling and dealing in the newly opened Russian video and record market. The Russian black market in unauthorized foreign videos has already caused scandal in Hollywood and elsewhere and a boycott of the Moscow Film Festival. But now the tables are turned, and Russian audiovisual archives are under attack. During the spring and summer of 1996, public scandal was being aired about the sale of rights for Russian classical music recordings by Gosteleradiofond to a British firm "Revelation." Enraged Russian musicians, or their heirs are claiming violation of copyright by the archive and the British firm – as, for example, Nina Kondrashina complained, she had "neither concluded any contract with Mr. Tristan Del nor given any permission for a new issue of Maestro Kirill Kondrashin's musical recordings."[196] Such extensive commercial possibilities may be less profitable in most federal archives under Rosarkhiv but, following earlier scandals, control against such practices and respect for copyright has been much tighter.

The noticeably strong state proprietary role over the extensive "national archival legacy," the absence of a concept of "public domain," and the fact that many federal agencies retain control over their own archival records have contributed to the peculiarly

---

[195] See "Goebbels's diaries 'found in Russia,'" *The Times* (London), 3 July 1992, p. 3. Selections of the diaries in the translation of David Irving were published in successive issues of the *Sunday Times*, 5, 12, and 19 July 1992. See the commentaries from London and Moscow under the headline "Originaly dvevnikov Gebbel'sa khraniatsia v rossiiskom MIDe" – Aleksandr Krivopalov, "V Londone utverzhdaiut, shto gotovitsia sensatsiia," and Ella Maksimova, "V Moskve uvereny, shto rech' idet ob izvestnykh dokumentakh," *Izvestiia*, no. 158 (9 July 1992), p. 6. Glenn Frankel, "The Furor Over Goebbels's Diaries – *Sunday Times* Blasted for Deal with Neo-Nazi," *Washington Post*, 11 July 1992. See also Lev Bezymenskii, "Kyda popali dneviki Gebbel'sa," *Novoe vremia*, no. 30 (July 1992), pp. 54–55. See the later commentary by Sergei Svistunov, "Torgovtsy pamiat'iu," *Pravda*, no. 113 (29 August 1992), p. 5; and the earlier article about Irving by Sergei Svistunov, "'Krasnykh' – vidiat, 'korichnevykh' – net," *Pravda*, no. 104 (8 August 1992), p. 4. Contrary to the initial *Times* article, the glass negatives and photostatic copy of the diary held in the Center for the Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections (TsKhIDK) had already been described in several articles, the first by Maksimova in *Izvestiia* in February 1990, and in more scholarly detail by Bernd Wegner, "Deutsche Aktenbestände im moskauer Zentralen Staatsarchiv. Ein Erfahrungsbericht," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 40:2 (1992), p. 316. A scholarly publication of the Goebbels diaries is underway at the Institut für Zeitgeschichte (Munich).

[196] See the account by Grigorii L'vov, "Kak perevoditsia 'Reveleishn'? O kataloge Tristana Dela, kotoryi poluchil ot Gosteleradio ekskliuzivnye prava na fonoarkhivy," *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, no. 161 (30 August 1996), p. 7, with several reprinted letters. A brief account about the scandal, including views of the archive, was also aired on Russian television (Channel 4) on 19 September 1996. During the last two years, the Radio Archive at Gosteleradiofond has refused to receive the ABB compilers, and hence more specific information about the situation is not available.

Russian manner of handling the issues involved. This is hardly the place for commentary on the successes and failures of various collaborative publication ventures. The problems involved are often two-sided. The opportunistic activities and speculative "gold rush" attitudes of some Western representatives that have sought to take advantage of the transitional situation and low archival wages in Russia, have contributed as much to the problem as has the lack of Russian experience in the archival marketplace and the corresponding lack of financial and legal infrastructure for a market economy. What is striking is the extent to which many of the more "commercial" ventures have been aborted, and many of the promises offered by Western agents never panned out. Not only have there been cancellations on the Russian side, but Western publishers are also pulling back or canceling contracts, as they find more difficulties working in Russia and fewer purchasers for the archival gold. Many of the archives that were supposed to be profiting most are now suffering along with the rest in face of the federal budgetary crisis.[197]

Most criticized was the "exclusive" – but now aborted – million-dollar Crown Publications series based on documentation from the former KGB foreign intelligence archives. Scholars and rival potential authors were up in arms, as critics feared the project would effectively close related files to the public and compromise open scholarship. Clearly SVR authorities retained the right to choose what documents should be released, and there was no indication that the project would lead to public access to original documents. A pilot volume produced by Crown (although not formally in the series), with the dramatic title of *Deadly Illusions*, involving intelligence scandals in Great Britain, confirmed the scholarly fears. In a spy versus counter-spy scenario of its own, there were charges of scandal and planted criticism and speculations about who was pocketing how much, but in the end, when the whole Crown-SVR project backfired, profits proved more illusory.[198] Reacting to the much-criticized deal, the current SVR Archival Chief Aleksandr Belozerov, emphasized in December 1995 that the Crown agreement was concluded not with the archive itself, but rather with the Association of SVR Veterans. Confirming the necessary restrictions on access involved, he tried to assure the public that the SVR Archive engages "in no commercial activities whatsoever."[199] By the summer of 1996, Crown Publications had canceled the contract, and the authors of the four volumes nearing completion, content with the declassified files received, were disgusted with the problematic publication negotiations. In the meantime, in other ventures based on SVR archival materials, a Russian firm has issued a multimedia CD-ROM production, and the

---

[197] As an example of the more recent criticism about Western firms taking advantage of the situation and trying to profit from classified and newly opened information, with mention of the Los Angeles-based *Petroleum Intelligence Weekly*, and the Minneapolis publisher, East View Publications, among others, see the article by Ol'ga Gerasimenko, "Zapadnye firmy na rossiiskom rynke informatsii: Zapad vedet v Rossii glubokuiu nefterazvedku," *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, 21 February 1996, pp. 1–2. For more details and documentation regarding issues in this section, see Grimsted, "Russian Archives in Transition," *American Archivist* 56 (Fall 1993), especially pp. 634–51, and the discussion series in the *Slavic Review* (1993–1994).

[198] As an example of the scandals involved and the problems for Russian archives in dealing with Western agents, focusing on the Crown deal, see the article by Evgeniia Al'bats, "Pokhozhdeniia amerikantsa v Rossii," *Segodnia*, no. 112 (17 June 1994), p. 9. See also the tendenious, and later allegedly planted, earlier article by S. Drozov, "Skandal – Sluzba vneshnei razvedki prodaet sekretnye arkhivy," *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, no. 206 (3 November 1992), p. 4. See the Crown volume by John Costello and Oleg Tsarev, *Deadly Illusions: The KGB Orlov Dossier Reveals Stalin's Master Spy* (New York, London: Crown, 1993).

[199] Poleshchuk (interview with Belozerov), "Arkhivy rossiiskoi razvedki," p. 6.

first of a planned six-volume history of Russian foreign intelligence has appeared.[200] The SVR plans further declassification efforts, and there will doubtless be authors and publishers ready to collaborate. But, as will be seen below, serious researchers remain disappointed that so few shadows of the SVR past are being made publicly available in any form (see Ch. 13).

Given the real and alleged abuses in the early years of the new regime, and the continued public outcry against extensive foreign advantages, Rosarkhiv and individual Russian archival directors are continuing efforts to pursue and control "collaborative" projects. They want to be sure to reap their share of the benefits from the "new revelations" that they and their staff are helping to uncover or that may still lay among the "shadows" in their stacks. They want to be an equal party to "collaborative" ventures involving academic and research institutions at home and abroad, and they want to be sure that their names are included in scholarly publications from their archives. Hence there has been a tendency to demand formal agreements, often involving lengthy negotiations, with regulated payment schedules and potential royalty receipts, in return for the use of their paper gold. Thus there is still a greater degree of bureaucratic control over the public use of archival information in Russia than is usually met in other countries.

Westerners, and especially those from countries where government records are considered part of the "public domain," instinctively have difficulty understanding the post-Soviet mentality of regarding archives as would-be components of the market economy, with high fees for publication rights and formal commercial agreements, but many foreigners themselves have been nonetheless anxious to deal with the Russian archival "beriozka." Results from many collaborative projects are already being published, and others are in process from Mongolia to Milan. Many others have fallen by the wayside, when it turned out that their commercial potential was overrated, or when foreign partners were unable to come up with the hefty grant funds required, or discouraged by the unusually high taxes to be paid to Russian state or intermediary agents to the extent that all the grant funds did not always reach the archives or archivists intended. Five years later, the gold rush mentality has significantly subsided and, at the same time, Russian archivists have become more savy about "marketing" practices, and about the problems and pitfalls in foreign collaboration.

---

[200] A presentation of the multi-media CD ROM, "Sluzhba vneshnei razvedki RF: Operatsii, dokumenty, personalii" (Moscow: Ekom-Media, 1996) took place in Moscow in July 1996, and an English version was soon to be released: "The Russian Intelligence Service (RIS) – Operations, Documents, Personalities." The first volume of the projected six-volume history, with now Foreign Minister E. M. Primakov as the editor-in-chief, was released earlier in the year – *Ocherki istorii rossiiskoi vneshnei razvedki*, vol. 1: *Ot drevneishikh vremen do 1917*, compiled by O. K. Ivanov, A. N. Itskov, V. I. Savel'ev, et al. (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnaia otnosheniia, 1996). Although based on archival documentation, there are regrettably few specific citations. See also the documentary publications mentioned above from other KGB foreign sources (fn. 54).

Nationalist Reaction – Restricting Copies of Russian Archival Materials Abroad

While many Russian archivists are still trying to raise income for and from their "paper gold" in pursuing collaborative projects with foreign partners, other projects have faced an alarming nationalist backlash that has been seeking to limit foreign ventures. New opportunities for more normal distribution of high-interest microform of Russian archival materials abroad have been met within Russia itself by zealous Russian nationalism and a public outcry against the "sale of the national heritage abroad." On a higher political level, the criticism reflects the more conservative forces that have been accusing the Yeltsin government of selling Russia out to the West, which climaxed by the firing of Foreign Minister Kozyrev in December 1995.

Public criticism has been particularly vocal about the three-million-dollar joint Rosarkhiv project with the Hoover Institution in California. Even those who earlier led the drive for archival openness and "historical cleansing" in the days of *glasnost'* and *perestroika*, such as RGGU Rector Iurii Afanas'ev, were among those pulling back when the project was announced in 1992 and joining the bandwagon against American "intellectual imperialism." Not only were fears expressed that too many documentary exhibitions abroad and the open production of archival microfilms were somehow threatening the national heritage, and giving foreign scholars an unfair advantage over Russians, but here was also a rather curious blend of more commercial concerns that the national cultural wealth was being proffered too cheaply in the "archival beriozka."[201] The contrasting Western perspective, from which Hoover historian Robert Conquest described the Hoover project as an "Archival Bonanza," and a "service to the scholarly community," is indicative of the seemingly irreconcilable points of view regarding archival microforms.[202] Stanford historian Terence Emmons, presenting a well-argued case against Afanas'ev's criticism – "I Don't Quite Understand You, Gentlemen...," was reminded "of the bad old days when foreign researchers in Soviet archives were systematically refused access to materials that had not been previously used by Soviet researchers."[203]

---

[201] Iurii Afanas'ev, "Arkhivnaia 'Berezka' – Okazyvaetsia, iz nashei istorii mozhno kachat' valiutu," *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, no. 93 (23 May 1992), p. 5. The term "Beriozka" (literally, birchtree) refers to the foreign-currency stores, with choice goods for tourists and other privileged elite, which were found throughout Russia during the Soviet regime. See also Afanas'ev's earlier article against the Hoover Project, when it was first announced, "Proizvol v obrashchenii s obshchestvennoi pamiat'iu nedopustim," *Izvestiia*, no. 58 (10 March 1992), p. 3. See also R. G. Pikhoia's answer to Afanas'ev, which appeared a week later, as a letter to the editor: "Fakty i vymysly o 'Rasprodazhe istoricheskoi pamiati'," *Izvestiia*, no. 65 (17 March 1992), p. 3, and his reply to the later article in an interview with Irina Karpenko, "Vokrug arkhivov idet bessovestnaia torgovlia, schitaet predsedatel' Komiteta po delam arkhivov pri Pravitel'stve Rossiiskoi Federatsii Rudolf Pikhoia," *Rossiiskie vesti*, no. 20 (19 June 1992), p. 2. See also Natal'ia Davydova, "'Delo partii' zhivet i prodaetsia – Shirokaia rasprodazha gosudarstvennykh arkhivov ne mozhet byt' bezrazlichna obshchestvu," *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 19 (10 May 1992), p. 21, and "Arkhivy – Vse na prodazhu," *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, no. 110 (15 May 1992), p. 8. More details about the controversy appear in my 1993 article, "Russian Archives in Transition," especially pp. 642–51.

[202] Robert Conquest, "The Archival Bonanza," *AAASS Newsletter* 32, no. 3 (May 1992), pp. 1–2.

[203] A highly abridged version of Emmons' reply was published with the headline "Eto napominaet durnoe staroe vremia," *Moskovskie novosti*, no. 33 (16 August 1992), pp. 18–19 (but only in the Russian edition).

The bitter 1992 polemics on both sides of the ocean were directed at other targets as well. Unfortunately for the archives, and for would-be researchers at home and abroad, the idea that archives are somehow an attribute of the national wealth, which should be tightly guarded and not widely distributed abroad, had a dampening effect on other projects with foreign publishers that might have made additional high-interest twentieth-century archival materials available at home and abroad. When several other major proposals by foreign library microform firms were turned down by Rosarkhiv Chairman Pikhoia, after they had already been approved (and in some cases with hard currency advances received) by the archives involved, there were understandable complaints that the Hoover Institution and the British microform publisher Chadwyck-Healey were being given an exclusive, monopoly status, not in keeping with democratic free-market archival practices. Complaints were rampant from the Russian archives that served to benefit, and competing foreign publishers were justifiably critical of the insurmountable obstacles to doing business in Russia.

Similar cries of alarm prolonged costly negotiations for other commercially less viable, historically oriented projects. In St. Petersburg, for example, several microfilm publication projects under contract with the Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA, *formerly* TsGIA SSSR), were seriously delayed, including one sponsored by Yale University specialists to make available a series of nineteenth-century provincial governors' reports. Although hardly an undertaking with much potential for profit, opposition among some of the archival staff evoked accusations that they were selling off the national heritage – and much too cheaply at that. A scaled down version of that project is going forward. Similar arguments in the Scholarly Council of *Pushkinskii Dom* in April 1992 squelched a planned project to film literary materials in that repository where urgent preservation efforts are needed. Later that year, Rosarkhiv officials blamed the "current political situation," when they turned down Library of Congress efforts to organize preservation filming efforts with surplus U.S. government state-of-the-art microfilming equipment; many Russian archivists were outspokenly resentful of the provision that, in return for permanent use of the equipment and technical assistance, a copy of the filmed materials would be deposited in Washington, DC. Culturally conscious Russian archival leaders considered that "gross exploitation." The much-needed technical assistance was viewed as an insignificant gain in the face of the "alienation of the national heritage," by the free deposit of copies abroad with no comparable intellectual or cultural return for Russia.[204]

In July 1992, a major scandal and pretext for a parliamentary inquiry erupted over a project for filming the Ginzburg collection of early Hebraic manuscripts in the Russian State Library (RGB – *formerly* the Lenin Library), sponsored by the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem (ENUB). Russian critics claimed that "the agreement inflicts damage to Fatherland science and state interests. The manuscripts will go into the

---

The full Russian text of Emmons' perceptive critique of Afanas'ev's commentary appears as "'Ia ne sovsem ponimaiu Vas, gospoda. . . ' – O soglashenii Roskomarkhiva i Guvera," *Otechestvennye arkihivy*, 1992, no. 5, pp. 100–102. An abridged English version appeared as "I Don't Quite Understand You Gentlemen. . .," *AAASS Newsletter* 32:4 (September 1992), pp. 4–5.

[204] Negotiations continued for a year, but the project was definitively rejected by Rosarkhiv during the visit of Librarian of Congress, James Billington, in December 1992. The Library of Congress is now offering the equipment to other archives, including those under the Russian Academy of Sciences and in Ukraine.

hands of Israeli scholars.... RGB is giving unique information for free,... at the same time that RGB does not have money for reconstruction."[205] Actually, RGB was receiving quality computer equipment and cataloguing software, as well as preservation microfilms of the hitherto long-suppressed Ginzburg collection, to the extent that the then RGB director, Igor' Filippov, with the support of the Ministry of Culture, defended the project as in keeping with normal international library practices. The prospect of a professional, scholarly catalogue of the unique collection, and royalties from the sale of microfilm copies, led even the otherwise conservatively oriented head of the RGB Manuscript Division to admit that the project was a major contribution to Hebraic studies, which have long been neglected in the Soviet Union.[206] Nonetheless, Russian critics, again led by RGGU Rector Iurii Afanas'ev, but this time joined by blatantly anti-Semitic ones, found supporters for an open petition of protest to the Committee on Culture of the Supreme Soviet.[207]

The fervor of right-wing criticism within Russia, reflecting the general political cry of the nationalists against the Yeltsin government, intensified in subsequent years. An article in *Den'*, a weekly newspaper of the far Right, in the spring of 1993, was among the most extreme, but nonetheless illustrative of the political sentiments and continuing rhetoric:

> The Hoover Project... is an act of betrayal of Russia's fundamental national interests by the Yeltsinites, [as part of the] unconditional capitulation of this regime in the face of victorious America which, as a victor country, is taking materials and spiritual values out of the vanquished country in amounts and of a quality sufficient... to preclude any possibility of national resurgence.
>
> As soon as these archives arrive in America, hordes of historians, military intelligence agents, and social engineering specialists will converge on them to extract the precious ferments and to use them for the good of America and as poisons against Russia.[208]

---

[205] Dmitrii Slobodianiuk and Iurii Pankov, "'Leninka' opiat' imeet nepriatnosti s evreiskikh rukopisei – Fond Ginzburga okazalsia rossiiskim dostoianiem," *Kommersant"*, no. 31 (27 July–3 August 1992), p. 26. As Filippov explained to me in October 1992, the *Kommersant"* reporters made it sound as if the library was getting only second-hand equipment and no other benefits, which was hardly the case. The filming project was completed in September 1992.

[206] Viktor Deriagin, "Kak my prishli k soglasheniiu s Ierusalimom" (interview by Glev Kuz'min), *Literaturnaia Rossiia*, no. 23 (5 June 1992), p. 13. In the past, Deriagin has often been accused of conservative leanings, so his support was all the more noteworthy in this case.

[207] RGB director Filippov kindly furnished me with a copy of the open petition addressed to F. D. Polenov, signed by sixteen scholars and scientists. See also, among other critical articles, Dmitrii Slobodianiuk, "Optom i nedorogo," *Rossiskaia gazeta*, no. 93 (22 April 1992), p. 8; Viktor Iurlov, "Okhotniki do chuzhikh rukopisei – Ocherednoi skandal s utratoi natsional'nykh tsennostei iz Rossiiskoi gosudarstvennoi biblioteki," and "Vmesto poslesloviia, Peredaite vashemu ministru [...], Gost' sovetoval, preduprezhdal i dazhe ugrozhal [...]," *Rabochaia tribuna*, no. 67 (9 June 1992), p. 3. Aleksei Timofeeev, "Kliuch upravleniia mirom – Rukopisi ne goriat, no strasti vosplameniaiutsia [...]" (interview with I. V. Medvedev), *Den'*, no. 28 (12–18 July 1992), p. 2.

[208] The article appeared with a byline "*Den'* security services" – Sluzhba bezopasnosti "Den," "Kogda okkupiruiut stranu, vyvoziat ee arkhivy: El'tsinisty vtaine ot naroda prodaiut arkhiv SSSR," *Den'*, no. 14 (11–17 April 1993), p. 1. An unattributed translation was distributred on the Internet in Spring 1993, and then at a session on Russian and American archives at the American Historical Association annual convention in Chicago, January 1994. The earlier controversy during 1992 in the press and other journals is summarized in Grimsted, "Russian Archives in Transition" (pp. 642–51) in a section entitled, "'Bonanza' or 'Beriozka'."

Going a step further in criticism of all American research and collaborative endeavors, in January 1995, were Soviet-style Cold War allegations "that U.S. intelligence agencies were using American politological and sociological centers, universities, non-government funds and social organizations for intelligence purposes and subversive activities on Russian territory." Excerpts of the lengthy report, which was attributed to Federal Counter-Intelligence Service (FSK) sources, appeared under the banner headline – "FSK worries about the active involvement of American researchers in Russia." The report named major organizations and research institutes – from the AAASS, IREX, and the Soros Foundation to the Hoover Institution and Harvard University, among others, which – under the guise of "providing methodological and material assistance... and improving communications between Russian and American institutions," were "actually assisting the foreign policy course of the United States," and were being "actively financed on behalf of its intelligence services." Among other ominous activities, even the "study of materials in Russian archives and libraries," it was suggested, was being used to "increase intelligence information." Although the Yeltsin administration generally, and Rosarkhiv and individual archives in particular, have been actively seeking foreign assistance and U.S. foundation support for collaborative projects, the publication of this report appeared as a slap in the face for foreign researchers, prospective collaborators, and their funding sources.[209] Was the situation in Russia indeed taking a turn back to the "bad old days"? Were such pronouncements simply a journalistic figment of the inherited mind set from the Soviet regime? Or was this in fact the reappearance of shadows that had not been cast far enough into the past?

Alarmed Western reaction has not prevented the continuation of many humanitarian, economic, academic, and publishing ventures. But the attitudes expressed continue to surface from time to time, and remind us that Russia is still far from an "open" society. The report's final recommendation – "To enforce control over the taking abroad of secret information media and the results of scientific activities of individual scholars and scientific-research institutions" – is an especially ominous specter of the previous authoritarian regime. When towards the end of 1996, there were several reports of Soviet-style examination of research papers, and even a new customs regulation requiring the examination of computer files, of departing specialists by Russian customs authorities, that 1995 report immediately comes to mind.[210]

Just before the increased Communist and nationalist triumphs in the December 1995 elections, a new law restricting the international exchange of information passed the Duma. That initial version threatened to regulate foreign access to Russian archival

---

209 "FSK obespokoena aktivnost'iu amerikanskikh issledovatelei v Rossii – Iz doklada Federal'noi sluzhby kontrrazvedki," *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, no. 1 (10 January 1995), p. 3. (The "document" was otherwise unsigned.) As explained earlier, the FSK (now the FSB) was the domestic KGB succcessor.

210 See the final paragraph of the FSK report cited in fn. 209. There have been reports from departing specialists of a new customs regulation authorizing and in some cases actually requiring advance examination of computers before departure, involving Russians as well as foreigners. The present author, who personally experienced this problem in early November 1996, has been unable to obtain a copy of the new customs regulation although its existence has been confirmed by the Russian customs information office at Sheremetovo Airport. Several years ago, Rosarkhiv, with the approval of the Russian customs service, stopped providing official permission papers to accompany copies of archival documents being taken abroad, but IREX is still recommending that researchers obtain official letters of permission from the issuing archives, since several customs incidents involving such problems have occured in recent years.

information and to restrict the international exchange of information from the Archival Fond RF. News of the proposed law, coming as it did simultaneously with the curtailment of the Hoover project, aroused alarm in American university circles with a headline in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* – "Russians Threaten to End Project Giving Scholars Access of Soviet Papers."[211] The actual federal law on the subject (**A–34**) signed in July 1996 is potentially even more restrictive than the December version. As mentioned earlier, Rosarkhiv leaders and Russian archivists are still uncertain how the final draft can or will be implemented in terms of permitting the circulation of copies of Russian archival materials abroad.

According to archivists close to the scene, the new law and the resurgence of the Russian Communist Party had little to do with the Rosarkhiv Collegium vote to cancel the Hoover project in December 1995, and the related January 1996 resignation of Rosarkhiv Chairman Rudol'f Pikhoia. Nevertheless, the uncertain political situation, the lack of open disclosures to the press, and various rumors circulating in archival circles, produced a host of allegations and speculations. With the backdrop of public reaction, the Hoover project remains a pivotal case, exemplifying both divergence in Russian and foreign attitudes about largescale copying of archival materials and the cumbersome administrative problems of conducting foreign collaborative ventures in Russia.

Questions that had been asked in 1992 were again raised about the extent to which the project was more of a "bonanza" for the West than a profitable "beriozka" for Russia. Commercial issues dominated intellectual ones in the January 1996 *Izvestiia* query of "How Much is Our History Worth?" If several years ago, archives were being dubbed "paper gold" – now the idea of "selling 'raw meat' from archives" was compared to "selling crude oil," as *Izvestiia* phrased it all too crudely. American professors would have an unfair advantage over Russian scholars, if they could buy microfilms of Russian archival materials "to use in their studies." It was as if "with many goods on the market, their value – not in dollars, but rather in scholarship, drops, and the competitive edge is lowered." Americans could thereby publish all they want, and "profits would be high," although the correspondent did not seem to realize that few academic journals in the West pay any royalties at all. The reform-oriented RTsKhIDNI Director, Kyrill Anderson, was quoted with more complaints about the conduct and administration of the project and, in terms of exploitation of his archive, went so far in another interview to claim that Hoover and Chadwyck-Healey were "robbing Russia blind."[212] As it turned out, the Western side was hardly to blame in terms of the non-receipt of royalties by his archive; significant

---

211 See the article by Amy Magaro Rubin, "Russians Threaten to End Project Giving Scholars Access of Soviet Papers," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 9 February 1996, p. A39. According to that story the legislation had been "recently passed by the Russian parliament," but in fact, that was only a first reading; the law was not passed and signed by the preseident until later in July (**A–33**). See further discussion of the law in Ch. 2.

212 Maksimova, "Skol'ko stoit nasha istoriia? O prichinakh razryva rossiisko-amerikanskogo dogovora po arkhivam," *Izvestiia*, no. 9 (17 January 1996), p. 5; Charles Hecker, "Hoover Deal for Archives in Jeopardy," *Moscow Times*, 25 January 1996. Some of the criticism of the project on the part of some archivists quoted in the press involved the extent of control and alleged "rake-off" by Rosarkhiv itself, the unrealisically low fees that were budgeted for the actual archival staff and administrative expenses for the archives that were performing the services, and the lack of attention to archival preservation filming needs in the choice of materials to be filmed. Estimates vary about how much money, equipment, and other benefits, such as foreign travel, were actually reaching each of the individual archives involved.

royalties were in fact transferred to the RTsKhIDNI bank account by Chadwyck-Healey, but unfortunately, as explained above, RTsKhIDNI lost all of its assets from foreign projects in the course of two successive bank failures.[213]

What is striking in the various appraisals and interpretations of the situation is the continuing perceptual gap between Russia and the West, and the difficulty of obtaining sufficient or accurate information for those discussing it. One American historian, J. Arch Getty, who better than many understands from the inside the multifaceted Russian opposition to the Hoover project, severely weakened the credibility of his commentary by erroneously suggesting that the project involved "microfilm[ing] virtually the entire collections of the three most important Moscow political archives: GA RF, RTsKhIDNI, and TsKhSD."[214] Indeed at the outset, Cold War oriented research projects and foreign microform publishers, in the gold-rush spirit and fearful that opportunities might not last, would have been prepared to film much more. In fact, however, in the case of the Hoover–Chadwyck-Healy project, only a few complete series of documents in a few selected fonds are involved, as is apparent in the published catalogue and 1996 supplement. A major emphasis in the project has been filming the unpublished file-level finding aids (*opisi*) covering Soviet-period fonds in GA RF and RTsKhIDNI, which, to be sure, is of tremendous reference significance for researchers throughout the world.[215] In a

---

213 See Ch. 6, fn. 65.

214 See J. Arch Getty, "Russian Archives: Is the Door Half Open or Half Closed?" *Perspectives* (May-June 1996), pp. 19–20, 22–23. Getty's misconception about the extent of the project appears on p. 20, where he also claims that "Hoover would also microfilm its entire collection and give it to the Russian side for use in Moscow by Russian scholars." Again, in fact, as Palm also explains in his reply, only the Hoover Russian-related holdings were involved. See Charles Palm's letter to the editor and J. Arch Getty's reply, "Hoover Institution Takes Issue with Getty Interpretation of Russian Archive Situation," *Perspectives* (December 1996), pp. 33–34. Getty's analysis presents many of the factors and repeats some of the rumors circulating in Moscow, which, even if unsubstantiated, are indicative of Russian attitudes and perceptions and the inadequate knowledge of the situation available even to Russian archivists in the institutions involved. Russian critics were quick to point out other factual errors, such as Getty's assertion that there was no archival law (although it had not been passed before the Hoover agreement was signed in April 1992). See more details and other press reaction cited in fns. 19 and 20.

215 See the catalogue and 1996 supplement of the materials already filmed by the Chadwyck-Healey–Hoover project (not cited by Getty), which includes an introductory explanation by the project advisor: *Archives of the Soviet Communist Party and Soviet State: Catalogue of Finding Aids and Documents*, introduction by Jana Howlett ([Cambridge, UK], 1995; Russian State Archival Service (Rosarkhiv); the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace; distributed by Chadwyck-Healey); Russian edition: *Arkhivy KPSS i sovetskogo gosudarstva: Katalog opisei i dokumentov* ([Cambridge, UK], 1995). The 1996 Supplement ([Cambridge, UK], January 1996) lists more of the documentary series available, including some CPSU Central Committee files and complete fonds with records of many Party congresses from RTsKhIDNI, and early NKVD records (1917–1930) from GA RF. From TsKhSD, only *opisi* and files from the Committee for Party Control (fond 6) have been filmed, as well as a complete microfiche edition of fond 89 – the collection of copies of documents from various high-level archives recently declassified – with a separate Chadwyck-Healey flyer – "The Soviet Communist Party on Trial" (1996).
Copies of the catalogue and updated information about the materials available can be accessed on the Internet (from the USA) – http://www.chadwyck.com – (outside the USA) – http://www.chadwyck.co.uk. See also the website of the Hoover Institution – http://www-hoover.stanford.edu. As a member of the American Coordinating Committee formed by IREX and the Library of Congress in the fall of 1991, the present author can attest to early proposals which went so far as to suggest scanning the entire CPSU archives! See Ch. 12 for further discussion of the reference aspects of the project.

separate collection Chadwyck-Healey has also filmed the personal papers of nine "Leaders of the Revolution" from RTsKhIDNI, but this was not part of the Hoover project.[216]

In a recent published critique, Hoover Deputy Director Charles Palm appropriately sought to correct Getty's misconceptions and defend the Hoover project, emphasizing its value to the Russian archives from the Hoover perspective. But, as Getty points out in his follow-up reply, Palm, in playing down the "Moscow political struggles, turf wars, and whisper campaigns" surrounding the conduct of the Hoover project, and by dismissing the "Russian patriotic concerns as 'ill informed' and 'nonsense,'" also reveals the difficulties foreigners frequently have in developing collaborative projects in Russia and in comprehending the seemingly twisted logic, to say nothing of the unfortunately growing chasm between Russian commercial and patriotic perceptions and "*our* conception of *their* self-interest."[217] The often incompatible conceptualization goes well beyond the Hoover project, for which fortunately there is now still hope that microform production will continue under a new agreement.

The January 1996 *Izvestiia* article, taken together with other Western accounts, reflect the broader perceptual gaps among interested parties on both sides of the border. Russian accounts show little understanding of the fact that abroad, library and archival microform projects are not always viewed for their commercial advantages – the U.S. and Canadian National Archives, for example, rarely make a profit on microform sales. Rather microform production is often seen as part of a democratic public service of making high-interest files widely available in their entirety to the research public at reasonable prices, which often do not cover the costs of their preparation. (The Hoover project itself was dependent on extensive subsidies to cover equipment, advisors, and production costs.) Western libraries and archives are usually quite prepared to work with a variety of responsible commercial firms which will assume the costs of preparation and distribution of high-interest materials. The *Izvestiia* interpretation, by contrast, assigns only greedy commercial intent and rejects historical interests and the public service function of opening up politically revealing "shadows of the past" to wide-scale utilization.

Here, on the one hand, was the Russian fear that foreign scholars were going to be "profiting" financially and in scholarship at the expense of their Russian counterparts. Russians do not seem to realize that the price of the Chadwyck-Healey microforms is so high that few university libraries, apart from exceptionally well-endowed research institutes and library consortiums, and certainly no individual scholar, could afford to purchase even a significant part of the collection.[218] From the beginning, the Russian side

---

[216] Chadwyck-Healey issued a separate flyer about this collection which includes the personal papers (together with the *opisi*) of P. B. Aksel'rod, M. I. Kalinin, S. M. Kirov (Kostrikov), Iu. O. Martov (Tsederbaum), V. M. Molotov (Skriabin), G. I. Ordzhonikidze, L. D. Trotskii (Bronshtein), V. I Zasulich, and A. A. Zhadanov. These fonds are noted accordingly in the 1995 Chadwyck-Healey catalogue (fn. 215). It is to be hoped that the new materials for several of these fonds that were recently transferred from the Presidential Archive (AP RF) will be added to the microform collections. The extistence of these additions are mentioned in the appendix to the new guide to personal papers in RTsKhIDNI (see fn. 259).

[217] Palm and Getty, "Hoover Institution Takes Issue," pp. 33–34.

[218] According to the Chadwyck-Healey office in Alexandria, VA, as of November 1996, only one U.S. library (Johns Hopkins) and one library consortium (involving 10 university libraries) have purchased the entire collection, although there have been more library sales abroad, including Japan. Complaints about the lack of library availability of the microforms surfaced at several sessions in the AAASS Boston conference in November 1996.

was seeking higher royalties, and even drove Chadwyck-Healey royalties up an unusually high 27% (normally, the royalty rate would not be over 15%). With inflation, they have been demanding higher operating expenses, but they had little understanding that by driving prices up, they were in fact discouraging sales and grossly restricting foreign scholarship by limiting access, in terms of circulation of "new revelations" from their archives. As it is now, the cost per roll of the Chadwyck-Healey Russian microfilms is three or four times as high as that of films from the U.S. National Archives, which Russian archivists and critics also do not want to understand. In his 1992 reply to Iurii Afanas'ev, Terence Emmons quite correctly cited the figure of $23 per 100-foot (33 meters) roll that the U.S. National Archives then charged for microfilm regardless of content (approximately 23 cents per *foot* or 2 cents per *frame*). Indicative of the rampant misinformation and lack of reality with which Western library and academic market conditions are viewed in Moscow, when part of the Emmons article was translated for publication in *Moscow News*, the figure came out as $23 per *frame*![219] It should be pointed out that because the U.S. National Archives was losing money at that price, the rate was raised in May 1996 to $34 per reel, but that is still between one-third and one-quarter of the price of the Chadwyck-Healey offerings from Russian archives.[220]

On the other hand, the Russian criticism of archival microforms reflects not so much commercialism, as the rejection of potential commercial advantages of receiving more hard currency from foreign sales. Many of the Western projects proposed, including the Hoover project itself, were providing Russian archives with new technology and training, and the expensive equipment that would remain in Russia, along with high-quality preservation microfilms. A number of proposed projects earlier rejected by Rosarkhiv would have provided even more, to say nothing of other, technological advantages, such as computerized finding aids and the equipment to support them. Russians appeared to reject the potential commercial as well as intellectual advantages. Still clinging to traditional "exchange" or "barter" arrangements, they wanted to receive more foreign archival "Rossica" in exchange, although in the case of the Hoover project they were already receiving copies of Hoover's vast Russian-related holdings, and had the offer of microfilms available from other foreign sources, which are openly available for purchase abroad.

Equally important, foreign filming projects were providing for beneficial preservation films for Russian archives, including extra copies that could be used for public archival information centers in other cities. Extensive filming projects, by providing quality master films, would also facilitate making available to former Soviet republics authentic, low-cost copies of groups of records of interest (and in many cases, legitimately due to them). Still uncomfortable with the loss of the "Empire," however, Russians do not want to appreciate the desirability of supplying microform copies of high-interest records to the newly

---

[219] Emmons, "Eto napominaet durnoe staroe vremia," *Moskovskie novosti*, no. 33 (16 August 1992), pp. 18–19.

[220] According to the latest price list and catalogue from Scholarly Resources, the Delaware vendor that markets the National Archives microfilms, the $34 price includes postage; the price for orders to be shipped outside of the USA is $39 because of higher postal charges. Similar pricing is current for microfilms from the Library of Congress, but microfilms that Scholarly Resources has prepared in England, such as the Russian series from the British Foreign Office records, are priced at $85 per reel (plus shipping), because of the higher production costs and lack of subsidy involved. See more details in fn. 238.

independent States. Or in other cases, they want to charge high prices for specific groups of high-interest materials, knowing that the former republics themselves cannot pay but counting on Western sponsors to come to their aid. An example of this tactic was a high charge for files from NKVD/MVD sources relating the Ukrainian Insurrectional Army (UPA), which had been removed to Moscow where the purchase of the microfilms was subsidized by Canadian émigré sponsors; Ukrainian critics were quick to point out that this particular case even involved files that had relatively recently been removed from Ukraine to Moscow.

Some Russian archival leaders cling to the view that if foreigners want to work with Russian archival materials, they should come to Russia. But they do not seem to realize that the availability of a few groups of "raw" archival fonds on film abroad are not going to keep scholars from coming to Russian archives for more. Serious research on most topics demands a broad range of sources from many different fonds. Besides, there is little appreciation of the extent to which the availability of "raw" or even "crude" archival materials on microfilm abroad, such as the "Smolensk Archive" and important émigré collections, have spurred interest in Russian and Soviet history and culture and serve as a training ground for serious scholars who will come better prepared to Russia for further research. The availability abroad of published directories, guides, and especially the copies of unpublished the internal finding aids (*opisi*) such as are being furnished by the Hoover–Chadwyck-Healey project, provides essential information for effectively planning research trips. As will be explained further below, the practice is becoming increasingly common in many countries, especially with the development of more sophisticated electronic information media (see Ch. 12).

Some of the current rhetoric against large-scale copying projects reads as a continuation of Soviet patterns of state intellectual and editorial control. In addition to the nationalist press and political circles, many Russian archivists persist in proprietorship attitudes that the Russian archival wealth indeed should not be widely circulated abroad at any price. In early 1988, the much criticized then Soviet Minister of Culture, V. G. Zakharov, answered an open letter from a distinguished group of Soviet scholars, criticizing the restrictive access and copying policies in the Lenin Library, with the complaint that before imposition of the restriction, "foreign scholars were copying without control large masses of archival materials that often had not been studied and made known by Soviet scholars."[221] The same attitude continues widely today, as was evident in Pikhoia's insistence on limiting electronic circulation of documents for the exhibit of "Revelations from Russian Archives" on the Internet. Added to the persisting concern that "Russians should be the first to study their own history," is the reluctance to authorize circulation abroad of documentation that might reflect adversely on the country's image, even if that documentation was created by an earlier, now supposedly alien regime. Others seem to fear that Russia was somehow losing control of its own history, when copies of entire fonds were being made available, as if circulation of microfilms abroad would limit the archivists control over who could use their archival files and how.

The idea of "unfair competition from foreign scholars" is hardly a reasonable argument, if Russian scholarship is going to maintain its status in the world in the twenty-first century. On the contrary, as recent years have shown, scholarship regarding the

---

221 "Ministr otvechaet na otkrytoe pis'mo," *Sovetskaia kul'tura*, 25 February 1988, p. 2.

Russian past hardly takes place on Olympic tracks with scholars of one country trying to outrun another. Rather international collaboration, enriched by cross-fertilization, has been a hallmark of research and publications in many fields – from literary studies to space sciences – in the post-1991 era. In face of an increasingly impoverished Russian Academy of Sciences and university system, many Russian scholars have been able to continue their profession thanks to Western colleagues and sponsors for grants and collaborative projects.

Many Russian historians and archivists, for reasons discussed above, still prefer selected documentary publications to large-scale filming, such as is apparent in the revival of scholarly journals such as *Istoricheskii arkhiv*, and the new more popular *Istochnik*, as a supplement to *Rodina*. These serials, along with admirable collaborative, scholarly monographic documentary publication series, such as the Yale University Press "Annals of Communism," and many other new significant documentary series are, to be sure, providing a wide-ranging palette of revealing documents, filling in many previous historical "blank spots." Nevertheless, in many cases, for the discerning scholar, they only serve to whet the intellectual appetite with partially digested selections rather than "unedited" complete runs of microform archival files. Nor do not provide the same serious training ground for historical research.

The Russian public has been so cut off from the world with respect to the free circulation of archival information and the sale of microforms that they tend to fear what have become quite normal archival and library practices abroad. At the same time, they completely overlook the benefits. Several other institutions, including the Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkinskii Dom) in St. Petersburg and the All-Russian Library of Foreign Literature (VRBIL) in Moscow have taken advantage of the Library of Congress offer for microfilm cameras and training in preservation microfilming. As of the end of 1996, the VRBIL filming has been limited to published materials long available in the West, but plans call for filming of some original archival materials in the future. The Pushkinskii Dom project has been slow in producing results, but as of the end of 1996, microfilm copies of twenty-seven early Slavic manuscripts (twelfth–eighteenth centuries) from a number of different collections in its Repository of Antiquities are available in the Library of Congress.[222] Another major preservation microfilming project for early Slavic manuscript books in many Russian library and museum collections is being undertaken by the Hilandar Library at Ohio State University – and with much more significant production.[223] The Hilandar project has so far not come under attack, but neither does it involve any new political "revelations." Realizing the benefits involved, more and more Russian repositories are anxious to join that international effort, which can only serve to encourage scholarship and the preservation of unique Slavic manuscript treasures on both sides of the ocean.

---

[222] A two-page finding aid with only brief identifying titles is available for the microfilm collection: "Institut russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii Dom), Drevlekhranilishche im. V. I. Malesheva: Old Russian Manuscripts of the Pushkinskii Dom (IRLAN) Preserved in the Library of Congress," Microform Reading Room Guide No. 439, typescript (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1997).

[223] A report on the project was presented at the AAASS in Boston in November 1996. See also the Russian report by Iulia E. Shustova, "Slavianskie rukopisi v Khilandarskoi issledovatel'skoi biblioteke Gosudarstvennogo universiteta Ogaio," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1997, no. 1, pp. 31–38, which includes references to published and microform catalogues.

Fortunately, some other microform projects have also been continuing quietly without the criticism and uproar surrounding the Hoover project, although negotiations have not been without problems. A major French-based project for filming the Comintern archives in the former Central Party Archive (now RTsKhIDNI – **B–13**) was rejected by Rosarkhiv in 1992. These records include considerable materials of foreign provenance, including Communist Party files from many countries around the world – hence the priority interest abroad. For the last several years, the Dutch microform publisher Inter Documentation Company (IDC) has been filming the complete records of Comintern congresses and plenums, and producing sophisticated multilingual electronic finding aids.[224] After several years of negotiation, an agreement was finalized in June 1996, sponsored by the International Council of Archives and the Council of Europe, for an improved electronic information system for the entire Comintern archives, which will include some scanned images as well as document- or file-level reference data.[225]

Genealogists and family history enthusiasts throughout the world are benefiting from the extent to which the Genealogical Society of Utah (under the Church of Jesus of the Latter Day Saints) has since 1991 been able to negotiate filming rights for parish registers and other genealogical-related files in a number of archives in Russia and other newly independent States. Between 1992–1995, some 43,434 volumes on some 7,061 reels have been prepared in Russia and other NIS. In Russia, Mormon filming units have been operating in Astrakhan, Kazan, St. Petersburg, Tobolsk, Tomsk, Tula, and Tver, and more are planned. Orthodox and other religious groups may question the ethical desirability of their ancestors being rebaptized retrospectively into the Mormon Church in Utah. Nevertheless, these efforts in many cases are resulting in preservation microfilms for previously neglected groups of records, although Russian archivists and genealogy enthusiasts have reason to expect that they will receive the resulting catalogues and data files, once the films have been catalogued in Salt Lake City.[226] Several other religious denominations and ethnic groups have also been permitted to microfilm complete runs of relevant records, including the Mennonities and the Dutch Reformed Church. These have resulted, for example, in important runs of microfilmed documents relating to the Germans

---

224 *Comintern Archive: A look behind the scenes on microfiche*, edited by Kirill M. Anderson (Leiden: Inter Documentation Company – IDC, 1994–). The microfiche series (available as of early 1997) provides the complete files from the records of seven Comintern congresses and thirteen plenums (1919–1935) with sophisticated finding aids. Further information is available electronically on the IDC website: http://www.idc.nl.

225 The agreement was announced in a report by P. A. Smidovich, "O vizite v Moskvu general'nogo sekretaria Mezhdunarodnogo soveta arkhivov Sh. Kechkemeti i spetsial'nogo sovetnika Soveta Evropy Dz. Vitiello," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 4, p. 101.

226 See the recent report by Thomas Kent Edlund, "LDS Microfilming in Eastern Europe," *Newsletter of the Federation of East European Family History Societies* 3:3 (October 1995), pp. 52–58. *The Family History Library Catalog*, compiled by the Family History Library of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Salt Lake City, 1987–), is updated annually, and is available on microfiche and CD-ROM. Copies of the catalogue and the microfilms themselves can be consulted free of charge in the many LDS family history research centers throughout the world. Confirmation of the renewed agreement in April 1996 was published in the journal of the Russian Society of Historians and Archivists – *Vestnik arkhivista*, 1996, no. 2(32) / 3(33), p. 126. CONTACT: Family History Library, Church of Jesus of Latter Day Saints, 35 North West Temple Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84150; Tel.: (801) 240-4756; Fax: (801) 240-5551 or (801) 240-2597; website: http://www.firstct.com/fv/fhlc.html.

from Russia and other Protestant denominations.[227] Copies of some 10,000 documents relating to the Doukhobors and their emigration to Canada have been catalogued at Carleton University, Ottawa.[228] The Holocaust Museum in cooperation with Israeli specialists has been microfilming Jewish-related sources and other documentation about the Holocaust during World War II in a number of archives in Russia and other NIS.[229] In almost all cases, Russian archives have been exacting substantial fees for filming rights and other benefits, but questions frequently arise in Russia as to whether the Russian side is "profiting" sufficiently from the enterprises.

Individual researchers often meet restrictive attitudes and limitations on orders for copies, similar to the criticism launched against other large-scale filming projects, as evidenced by Rosarkhiv official restrictions in archives under its control. The post-Soviet June 1992 Roskomarkhiv "Regulations for the Use of Archives" (**A–6**), continued the earlier Glavarkhiv restriction on orders for copies to no more than 10 percent of a given fond. That restriction has been dropped in the latest Rosarkhiv draft 1996 regulations, but copying a complete file is still not permitted, unless the file consists of a single document. Some archives and manuscript divisions not under Rosarkhiv do not permit copying an entire large document or early manuscript book. Many archives currently impose an annual limit – varying from 200 or 300 copies per researcher per year. The draft 1996 Rosarkhiv regulation imposes a top limit of 500 frames or sheets per year. High reproduction fees (especially for foreigners) also discourage large orders. The Russian National Library (RNB, formerly GPB) is one of the most jealously restrictive, permitting only ten folios per person (and as high as $30 a folio for a medieval manuscript book), but restrictions on quantity are widespread. The attitudes involved are similar to those expressed above that seek to pose limitations on foreign firms that want to offer copies of Russian archival materials on a commercial basis. Such practices in Russian archives, it should be pointed out, hardly coincide with the recommendations of the International Council on Archives, which as early as 1968, recommended "abandoning all *a priori* formal restrictions," and called upon archives "to satisfy all scientifically justified requests for microfilms whatever may be the purpose of the research and even if large-scale operations are involved."[230]

Russian archivists and scholars grew up in a world where the xerox machine hardly existed and was negatively associated with *samizdat* and dissent. Hand-copying manuscripts has a long Russian scholarly tradition, and the world of modern reproductive

---

227 Annual fall issues of the *Journal of the American Historical Society of Germans from Russia* (Lincoln, NE, 1977–) have been reporting about archival materials located in various Russian archives, many of which have been acquired by the Society on microfilm. Information about the Society is available on the Internet: http://www.teleport.com/nonprofit/ahsgr. The Dutch Reformed Church is among other denominations to have made microfilming agreements for copies of their historical records remaining in Russia, although the filming has not yet been completed.

228 See the brief report, "Catalogue of Russian Documents opn the Doukhobors Completed at Carleton University, Ottawa," in *Stalin-Era Research and Archives Project Bulletin*, no. 2 (Fall 1996), pp. 7–8.

229 Data about holdings that have already been catalogued are available in the Holocaust Museum's on-line database of archival and library holdings: http://www.ushmm.org.

230 See "Resolutions Based upon the Report of the Working Group on Liberalization," *Actes du VIè Congrès international des archives* (Madrid, 3–7 septembre 1968), published as *Archivum* 18 (1970), pp. 213–15.

services has hitherto been out of reach. They also did not have to count the time required to copy by hand the needed documents in terms of a market economy, nor did they personally have to pay the high hotel bills foreigners now have to pay in Russia, nor consider the expense required if they later needed to return from abroad to check their hand-copied notes. The idea of self-service copying machines in archival reading rooms and the unrestricted sale of microform copies of archival files on public demand, such as are found in the U.S. National Archives and the Library of Congress, are accordingly still not in keeping with Russian/Soviet archival traditions, which tends to take a much more possessive, proprietorial attitude towards the Archival Fond of the Russian Federation. In recent years the big complaint abroad was the threat of "commercialization," its potential ill effects on individual researchers, and the high cost of copies of archival documents. But with a new law "On Information Exchange," the threat of legal limitation to the open availability and circulation of "information resources" abroad presents new "shadows" of the restrictions of a past regime that many hoped had in fact been cast away to history.

Anti-Commercial and Foreign Complaints

Students, scholars, journalists, and other researchers from Russia and abroad were all understandably crying out against commercial practices when they heard that payments were needed to the archives for declassification requests or major "revelations." Already in the fall of 1991, the Social Science Research Council issued a position paper expressing fears about potential inequities of access and lack of reciprocity in connection with new commercial practices in Russian archives. Such ethical issues are not always clear cut, and some critics took issue with the self-righteous tone of the published version that failed adequately to take into account the catastrophic economic realities in Russia.[231] Visiting foreigners were further understandably distressed to be constantly bombarded with offers for "collaboration." During the summer of 1992, the director of the Russian Research Center at Harvard University found "quite absurd" restrictions in the former local Moscow Party Archive (now TsGAODgM) "more than he had found the summer before (when the Party was still in power)." He was so frustrated after his experience that he has not been back to the archive since:

> Lurking in the background was the issue of *sotrudnichestvo*: ... Cooperation meant essentially me paying, at a grossly inflated price in dollars, for them to do research on my behalf, using of course all the files that I was not allowed to use.[232]

The charges of "commercialization" reached a height in the summer of 1992, when no less a proponent of capitalism than the *Wall Street Journal* in a front page story quipped that "Information is Freer in Russia, but it is Not Free," and the English-language *Moscow Times* echoed the alarm of "Soviet History for Sale: Scholars Lose Out in the

---

231 See Steven Solnick and Susan Bronson, "The Toronto Initiative," *AAASS Newsletter* 32:1 (January 1992), pp. 10-11, and the reply of J. Arch Getty in *AAASS Newsletter* 32:2 (March 1992), p. 10. See also the earlier discussion in Grimsted, "Beyond *Perestroika*," *AA* 55, p. 117 and in "Russian Archives in Transition," pp. 641–42.

232 As quoted in a report by Timothy Colton, director of the Russian Research Center (now the Davis Center for Russian Studies) at Harvard University, a copy of which was furnished to the present author. A copy was submitted to Rosarkhiv for investigation.

Archives."[233] The *Wall Street Journal* story was written partially tongue in cheek, with a humorous opening account of a relatively innocent "thank you" – with a box of "Danish cookies" at tea time for an archivist who pointed the way to newly opened pre-revolutionary police records. More serious were the critical comments about the million-dollar "exclusive" Crown Publication deal involving documents from the former foreign KGB archives. But the initial humor got lost in translation, while the hints of corruption and charges of "commercialization" became blown out of proportion in Russian reaction. Fortunately, the scenario suggested in such headlines has not become predominant on the new Russian archival scene, and indeed the frequent press criticism of questionable commercial practices early on may have aided Rosarkhiv's perseverance in controlling such tendencies. Some even saw the confirmed "tightening up" of access possibilities in 1993 as an outgrowth of the political scandals abroad and the reaction against alleged "corruption," which sought to impose tighter controls. Others more realistically understood that it went hand-in-hand with the tighter controls in the new law "On State Secrets" in July 1993.

The avid public debates on the problem in the Russian press and abroad may have run their course, but not before a series of scholarly sessions abroad and a discussion series in the American academic journal *Slavic Review*. The staging of a conference session at the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies in November 1994 entitled "Open Files and Dollars for Documents" so angered some Russian archival leaders that Rosarkhiv wanted to prevent all Russian archivists from taking part; fortunately one Russian archival director did participate (and several others were present): Sergei Mironenko, director of the State Archive of the Russian Federation (GA RF), presented his case to the packed audience, and even admitted later that he found the presentations quite interesting and the discussion productive.

Meanwhile, the American Historical Association and the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies took the problems seriously enough to issue proclamations and constitute a joint Task Force on Russian Archives.[234] Their "Final Report" addresses issues of declassification, archival ethics, material circumstances, documentary publications and finding aids, and the problem of "commercialization," among other matters. Recommendations include an endorsement of cooperative archival assistance, collaborative publication projects, a call for better dissemination of information about the status of archival developments, and better access to xerox copies and microfilms. The suggestion of funding an extensive program of grants for material assistance from abroad, however badly needed in Russia, sounds completely unrealistic given curtailed U.S. budgets for the National Archives, the threatened eclipse of the National Endowment for the Humanities, cuts in foreign aid, and noticeably reduced

---

[233] Andrea Rutherford, "Information is Freer in Russia, but it is Not Free: Archival Gatekeepers Expect to Be Paid in Cash or Kind for Their Valuable Records," *Wall Street Journal*, 10 July 1992, p. 1; "Soviet History for Sale: Scholars Lose Out in the Archives," *Moscow Times*, no. 28 (9 June 1992), p. 3. See more details and documentation in Grimsted, "Russian Archives in Transition," esp. pp. 627, 638, and 641.

[234] The report appears in the scholarly journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, *Slavic Review* 54:2 (Summer 1995), pp. 407–26; and also appeared in the American Historical Association newsletter, *Perspectives* 33:6 (September 1995), pp. 15–17, 21–22. Earlier in November 1992, a special session devoted to many such problems at the 1992 Phoenix convetion of the AAASS, which formed the springboard for the discussion series on Russian archives in successive issues of the *Slavic Review* (1993–1994).

funding from U.S. government sources for Russian, East European, and Eurasian (NIS) area studies. Besides, foreign reaction is bound to set in: if Russians insist on limiting copies of their archival materials abroad, restricting the free flow of information, and preventing the restitution of captured foreign archives, it is hard to expect that foreign countries will be prepared to donate the vast sums of money needed for assistance to Russian archives.

Part of the appraisal and recommendations appear somewhat naive and not well-informed. For example, although the report rightfully stresses the importance of the recent Russian archival legislation and encourages its implementation, the authors appear to be unaware of the extent to which, as mentioned above, subsequent – and at least partially contradictory – legislation and presidential decrees have given federal agencies the right to retain control over their own archives rather than transferring them to federal archives and other potential restraints on free circulation of archival information. The call for consultations with researchers and more input advice on declassification, sound like unwarranted meddling on the part of the "Ugly American" in what might otherwise be considered internal Russian archival affairs. Several archives are nonetheless attentive to the requests of various publication projects and in some cases individual researcher requests for documentation on specific subjects that has not been declassified. And a foreign consultative commission had already been making some progress and trying to resolve declassification bottlenecks in the post-1917 Archive of the Foreign Ministry of the Russian Federation (AVP RF – **C–2**; see Ch. 12), and in raising funds to assist reference declassification efforts there.

In terms of research input, the American compilers appear unaware of the active "Researcher Response Sector" within the Russian Society of Historians and Archivists, which has been trying to work with Rosarkhiv and, at the same time, lobbying during the past five years to provide a sounding board and alleviate Russian researcher complaints. In March 1996, as head of the Researcher Response Sector and representing the Russian Academy of Sciences, Mikhail Semiriaga, presented a strongly worded public protest statement at the All-Russian Conference of the Society setting forth current researcher complaints about the unnecessary excess of "state secrets" that have delayed the declassification process, the growing control of agency archives, and the high cost of reproduction services that deter academic researchers.[235]

Excesses of commercial preoccupation and complaints about corruption have somewhat tapered off in the last couple of years, although the impact of such problems has unfortunately affected archival affairs in the public image, particularly abroad. More serious are the continuing complaints about reproduction costs and about curtailed research hours and services. A practical forum for American researcher complaints appeared during the summer of 1996 on the IREX World Wide website. For many years IREX had been making excerpts of previous-year research reports available as an informal "research handbook" to its out-going scholars, providing researcher assessments of the current situation in a variety of libraries and archives – from copying services and snack bars (or the lack thereof) to winter heating problems and paging delays. In the initial Internet posting of predominantly 1995 reports, the theme of excessive copying fees and

---

[235] See the earlier reference to the report by Mikhail Semiriaga, who heads this sector in the Society (fn. 41). Reports and resolutions of the March 1996 conference of the Society are published in the journal of the Society, *Vestnik arkhivista*, 1996, no. 2(32) / (33), pp. 44–48.

imposition of access charges in some repositories substantiate the complaints mentioned above, reflecting as they do the increasingly disastrous budgetary situation faced by libraries and archives in Russia.[236]

Researchers and scholarly associations at home and abroad will understandably continue to raise questions about the situation in Russian archives when they feel that major breakthroughs require large projects with formal agreements with the archives, including foreign funds for research and archival assistance, as well as subsidies for declassification requests and publications. Frustrations will remain as long as there is still a lack of clarity about what files were and are now open, and for whom, or at what price. The reign of normalcy, in Western terms, has hardly come to Russian archives when archival directors cannot count on adequate state budgets and are still trying to peddle their wares abroad or hoping for more foreign aid to repair their elevators and patch their roofs.

"Marketing" the Archival Fond RF

"Commercial" practices – and the debate about them – appears to have come to stay in Russian archives and are part and parcel of the post-Soviet economic traumas in institutions that can no longer count on state budget and control. At the end of 1995, the Rosarkhiv research institute VNIIDAD issued a new methodological handbook to "'Marketing' Information of the Archival Fond of the Russian Federation." The aim is to acquaint archivists "as retainers of information" and help them understand "the requirements and dynamics of the information market" and "potential requisites for information wares and services." So reads an advertisement in the professional Rosarkhiv archival journal, which also promises that the publication will "orient archivists as to market prices before concluding commercial agreements."[237] The volume was awarded a "diploma" in the 1995 Rosarkhiv competition of "scientific" works in archival affairs, records management, and archeography for the period 1991–1994.

A full review is hardly in order here, but the slim volume is a rather sad commentary on the attitudes and awareness of at least some elements in the Russian archival community about the practices and the market place for microform publication abroad – with emphasis on the United States. Like many Russian archivists, the authors appear to have had no first-hand experience in the field abroad, and apparently they have had no contact with the directors or representatives of many of the major library microform publishers currently dealing with Russia and other East European archive-related projects. Had they had an opportunity to visit a few foreign library or Slavic convention exhibition displays, consulted with vendors, or had they even requested current free catalogues from principle publishers, they could have acquired a better sense of the market place and the

---

[236] Plans called for the coverage to be resumed in 1997 at the IREX website (http://www.irex.org), but as of spring 1997, it has not appeared. In the initial listing, coverage was most extensive for Moscow and St. Petersburg repositories, although archives and libraries in a number of other cities in the Russian Federation and the NIS were also included. See above fn. 185.

[237] *Marketing informatsii Arkhivnogo fonda Rossiiskoi Federatsii: Spravochno-metodicheskoe posobie* (Moscow: Rosarkhiv/ VNIIDAD, 1995). Quotes are from the advertisement inside the back cover *Otechestven nye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 6.

extent of available archival materials on microform. Appendix 8, for example, lists a few curiously selected "Microcopied Documents on the History of Russia and the USSR on the World Market and their Prices in 1992" – which were already outdated by the time of publication. In fact, the list consists almost entirely of published library materials; only one page out of sixteen includes original archival materials – and there are listed only five even more curiously selected samples among the hundreds of microform collections available abroad.

Had they even discussed the situation with colleagues in federal archives under Rosarkhiv, they might have been able to cite such current major filming efforts, as the Chadwyck-Healey and Inter Documentation Company (IDC) projects mentioned above, among many others then currently underway in a number of archives and libraries in Russia. There is no mention, for example, of any of the wide range of Russian and East European related major microform projects completed abroad by Scholarly Resources, Inc., Research Publications International, and other firms. With their emphasis on published materials, surprising was the failure to mention the most relevant microfiche collections issued by IDC including over 8,000 monograph titles and 1,700 serials listed in three editions of a special catalogue, and now comprising some 64 separate Russian and Soviet-related projects (also listed in a separate catalogue) – many of which include archival materials as well – all of which are readily available for sale throughout the world.[238]

The even more curious appendix characterizing major American centers for Soviet studies was obviously a carry-over from the pre-1991 period, drawn from now long-outdated, Soviet Cold-War-period reports. Had the study showed more awareness of the nature and extent of Russian archival-related microform offerings on the world market, it might have unduly alarmed more of the Russian Duma critics and the nationalistic press discussed above. But at least it might have helped Russian archivists, librarians – and politicians – to have a better appreciation of the realities of potential "marketing" and the extent and variety of offerings already existing in the world library market.

---

[238] Copies of the extensive cumulative *Russia, USSR, Eastern Europe General Catalogue* and the *Eastern Europe and the Former USSR: Catalogue of Catalogues* for the IDC collections, together with catalogues of other IDC projects, are all available free from the publisher in Leiden, or the St. Petersburg office. Copies are readily available in a number of libraries in Moscow and St. Petersburg. The IDC projects are now all listed on the company's website on the Internet. CONTACT: URL: http://www.idc.nl.; Fax: (31 [0]71) 513 17 21; E-mail: info@idc.nl. Scholarly Resources, a licensed distributor for U.S. Library of Congress and National Archives microfilms, also publishes a separate brochure: *Eastern European, Russian, and Soviet Studies: Publications Available from Scholarly Resources* (including documents from the National Archives), which also lists their offerings of Russian-related British Foreign Office records from the Public Record Office. CONTACT: 104 Greenhill Ave.; Wilmington, DE 19805; Tel.: (800)772-8937; (from outside USA): (302) 654-7713; Fax: (302) 654-3871; E-mail: scholres@ssnet.com.

12. New Reference Facilities and Intellectual Access[239]

Crucially important for opening access to archives is what western archivists often call "intellectual access"—reference facilities that effectively and efficiently assist researchers in preparing for work in the archives, lead them to appropriate documents, and help them understand their archival context. The dramatic opening of Russian archives in the past decade has, as would be expected, been accompanied by revolutionary developments in public reference facilities. "If only archival restrictions were the most glaring insufficiency of our archival service," replied Academician Dmitrii S. Likhachev, in September 1989, when asked to respond to foreign criticism that many Soviet archives remained closed:

> "Here there is a whole complex of problems, for which it is insufficient to decide from on high merely to declassify archives. We still need to tell the whole world exactly what is held in them, to publish inventories and catalogues of previously secret documents. . .."[240]

Similar sharp comments were published the same year by Vsevolad V. Tsaplin, by Sarra. V. Zhitomirskaia, and by the present author.[241] Today, not only are archives being declassified, but the finding aids to previously classified files are available to researchers and new reference facilities are being developed to an extent Likhachev and others never dreamed possible. Unfortunately, however, the eclipse of Soviet-style archival budgets has brought new frustrations and increasing dependence on foreign sources for reference production.

Reference work under Soviet rule was oriented more toward promoting state security and political control than facilitating public research access, but, because of the tremendous importance of archives to the regime, considerable funds were devoted to reference systems and a significant quantity of reference publications. Under Glavarkhiv (the Main Archival Administration under the NKVD/MVD, 1938–1960, and later the Council of Ministers of the USSR) state archives vied with each other in their catalogues of Leninana and card files identifying pre-revolutionary documents about peasant and worker unrest. Their secret divisions were replete with card files on anti-revolutionary and alleged anti-Soviet elements, including the White emigration. Even more funds went into Communist Party archives: the vast card catalogues to the Communist Party Central Committee protocols attest to reference efficiency where and when it was needed, and for

---

[239] What follows is a reedited version of the original Chapter 12 in the IISH edition of *Archives of Russia Five Years After* appeared as an article, "Increasing Information Access to Russian Archives," *Slavic Review* 56, no. 4 (Winter 1997): 718–59, and is reprinted here with the permission of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies. The present version incorporates the additional bibliography and data about new websites as of June 1998, but also retains a few of the international comparative sections that were omitted for the *Slavic Review*.

[240] Evgenii Kuz'min, "Blizorukost'—S akademikom D. S. Likhachevym beseduet korrespondent 'LG'," *Literaturnaia gazeta*, no. 38 (20 September 1989): 5.

[241] See the earlier discussion of problems in this chapter by Grimsted, *Intellectual Access to Post-Soviet Archives: What Is to Be Done?* (Princeton: IREX, 1992). The introduction quotes published remarks by V. V. Tsaplin and S. V. Zhitomirskaia, and the present author, among others. Parts of this chapter update that earlier work. See also the concluding remarks about the Soviet archival arrangement and descriptive system in Grimsted, *A Handbook for Archival Research in the USSR* (Washington, DC: IREX and Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, 1989), chap. 3, p. 104.

post-1980 files even in electronic form. Agency archives never organized for public access, such as those of the KGB and the Ministries of Internal Affairs (MVD), Defense (MO), and Foreign Affairs (MID) developed admirable reference systems.

Within the state archival system, the Central Catalogue of Fonds assembled by Glavarkhiv in its heyday put the USSR well ahead of most western countries that are still trying to computerize fond-level data about their holdings. Now that archival access is open and Russian archives are committed by law to providing public reference access, there is unfortunately almost no Russian government funding to remedy the deficiencies of earlier systems and methodological guidelines to make them user friendly. As archivists are struggling to free themselves from the legacy of Soviet ideology and the centralized command system of archival administration, they are simultaneously trying to cope with increasing demands for speedy access to appropriate files within the constraints of staff and reference systems not previously designed for public information.

Indicative of the new openness within the Federal (before August 1996, State) Archival Service of Russia (Rosarkhiv) is a brief directory of reference facilities that appeared in October 1994. This directory describes internal finding aids—card catalogues and other unpublished reference facilities—in each of the then seventeen (now sixteen) federal archives administered by Rosarkhiv.[242] Of special interest to researchers, many of the reference aids listed there (including those prepared under Soviet security service auspices) were never before open to researchers, let alone even known to the public. Published finding aids are also listed for each federal archive, although such listings are not comprehensive, and the bibliographic data is not as complete as would be desirable. This major contribution to open reference information deserves imitation for state archives throughout the Russian Federation and should, eventually, be available in an electronic format with increasingly comprehensive data about reference facilities for all Russian archival repositories.

General Directories of Archival Repositories

The first level of reference information about the archives in any country is a general directory of what types of archival materials are located in what repositories with a comprehensive bibliography of available reference works. While the slim 1994 volume mentioned above provides basic data about the federal archives under Rosarkhiv, a comprehensive directory of over 260 archival repositories in Moscow and St. Petersburg published in 1997 includes data about archival materials under all agencies—from the Archive of the President of the Russian Federation (AP RF) to film studios and factory museums—with close to three thousand bibliographic entries of reference literature.[243] A basic reference work for those using traditional state and CPSU records, medieval

[242] *Federal'nye arkhivy Rossii i ikh nauchno-spravochnyi apparat: Kratkii spravochnik,* comp. O. Iu. Nezhdanova, ed. V. P. Kozlov (Moscow: Rosarkhiv, 1994). In addition to a more complete bibliographic description of published and unpublished entries, it would have been helpful to include reference to those finding aids available in microform editions.

[243] *Arkhivy Rossii: Moskva-Sankt-Peterburg: Spravochnik-obozrenie i bibliograficheskii ukazatel'*, (Moscow: "Arkheograficheskii tsentr," 1997). An updated and considerably expanded English-language edition is forthcoming—*Archives of Russia: A Directory and Bibliographic Guide to Holdings in Moscow and St. Petersburg*, ed. Patricia Kennedy Grimsted (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1998).

manuscripts, and personal papers, the new directory also provides a starting place to locate manuscript maps, folk songs, motion pictures, genealogical data, technical documentation, and architectural drawings, to name only a few among the specialized sources covered. As special features, notes about access and working conditions in each repository augment researcher-orientation. A correlation index links present repositories with all of their previous names and acronyms. Annotated bibliographic entries also cross reference finding aids available in microform.

The appearance of this volume—published first in Russia itself—under Rosarkhiv sponsorship is another indication of the revolution that has come to reference information about Russian archives, as was pointed out by initial Russian reviewers.[244] A forthcoming English-language edition includes another 40 repositories and over 500 more reference aids. In addition, in the fall of 1997, Rosarkhiv made a formal commitment to the upkeep of the ArcheoBiblioBase (ABB), the electronic database from which the new directories were produced. A quarter century ago, the most extensive interagency archival directory describing a total of 70 archives and manuscript repositories in Moscow and Leningrad (with detailed, annotated bibliography) could only be published abroad. When that volume appeared in 1972, the recommendation of the two well-known Russian archivists that a parallel Russian-language directory be published in the USSR was stricken by the editors from the review that appeared in *Voprosy istorii*.[245]

Although the multiplicity and bureaucratic complexity of archival repositories in Russia make a general repository-level directory of archives and other manuscript collections more essential there than it might be in other countries that have only a single National Archives, such a directory was never produced in the Soviet period. Even as late as 1989, the Main Archival Administration of the Council of Ministers (Glavarkhiv SSSR) turned down the proposals of the International Research & Exchanges Board and the American Council of Learned Societies to assist with such a project. That same year, Glavarkhiv issued its own two-volume directory of Russian archives but, prepared by the All-Union (now All-Russian) Scientific Research Institute of Documentation and Archival Affairs (VNIIDAD) under Glavarkhiv, it covered only those that were part of the Glavarkhiv system, and with only minimal bibliography.[246]

Indeed only scant coverage of archival holdings in many libraries and museums existed before a 1991/1992 directory, also prepared by VNIIDAD, described for the first time archival holdings in libraries and museums under the all-union and union-republic Ministries of Culture, as well as many of those under the Academies of Sciences.[247] That directory, in terms of Moscow-Leningrad holdings, surveys archival holdings in eight libraries and fifty-four museums, as well as nineteen repositories under the Academy of

---

[244] See, for example, Dmitrii Volodikhin, "Slovo o rossiiskikh arkhivakh," *Knizhnoe obozrenie*, no. 52 (30 December 1997). Similar comments were aired at the Rosarkhiv presentation in Moscow (11 April 1997).

[245] Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Moscow and Leningrad* (Princeton University Press, 1972). A review by Klavdiia Ivanovna Rudel'son and Nina Valerianovna Brzhostovskaia appeared in *Voprosy istorii*, 1973, no. 10. The authors later showed me the original draft of their conclusion, which was dropped from the printed version.

[246] *Gosudarstvennye arkhivy SSSR: Spravochnik*, comp. N. M. Andreeva, I. V. Volkova et al., ed. V. N. Avtokratov et al., 2 vols. (Moscow: "Mysl'," 1989; Glavarkhiv; VNIIDAD).

[247] *Dokumenty Gosudarstvennogo arkhivnogo fonda SSSR v muzeiakh, bibliotekakh i nauchno-otraslevykh arkhivakh: Spravochnik*, comp. A. B. Kamenskii et al., ed. V. Volkova et al. (Moscow: "Mysl'," 1991 [1992]; Glavarkhiv; VNIIDAD).

Sciences of the USSR, two archives of other academies, and the two archives under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Because of Soviet-style limitations, many other important archives were not included, and only minimal reference literature is listed for a few of the repositories covered. The VNIIDAD directory was completed before the collapse of the USSR, but, unfortunately, by the time it appeared in 1992 without revision, it was already out-of-date in both style and content. Despite such limitations, it nonetheless presents the most detailed (and in some cases the only) published description for many of the repositories covered.

The same VNIIDAD group, starting in the late 1980s and using the same methodology, also compiled descriptions of archival holdings in regional museums and some other repositories throughout the Russian Federation. With no publication funds available in post-Soviet Russia, VNIIDAD signed a contract with a foreign publisher, but the institute lacked the staff initiative and funding for the needed updating and bibliographic efforts to make it a viable post-1991 reference compendium. Although the compilers were disappointed when the foreign publisher decided it was not up to par, it is to be hoped that support and scholarly direction can be found for the significant revision necessary to produce a much needed, comprehensive directory covering the whole range of archival holdings in regional repositories now increasingly open for research.[248]

A directory describing holdings in the former Communist Party archives throughout the Russian Federation has been in preparation by Rosarkhiv and the same VNIIDAD team during the last few years. A signal copy appeared in July 1998. The volume should provide a basic orientation for researchers, but unfortunately, a pressrun of only 500 copies is planned.[249] It is to be hoped that it will soon be followed by a more comprehensive directory and bibliography of guides and other reference literature for all regional state archives, as well as the many other archival repositories outside the two capitals.

Until such comprehensive coverage appears, researchers will still have good reason to consult the all-union directory published in western Ukraine in 1983, which still actually provides the most researcher-oriented annotations of holdings and more extensive bibliography for many archival institutions, including regional libraries and museums in the Russian Federation, than the VNIIDAD volume. Without sponsorship from Glavarkhiv, the compilers from the University of L'viv produced what many specialists have recognized as the most helpful interagency directory of archives and manuscript repositories throughout the former Soviet Union.[250] Although uneven in its coverage of different repositories, inadequately verified in some cases, awkwardly presented from a

---

[248] The typescript was deposited in the VNIIDAD library in 1992 (no.104-92): "Arkhivnye dokumenty v bibliotekakh i muzeiakh Rossiiskoi Federatsii: Spravochnik," comp. I. V. Volkova et al.

[249] *Dokumenty byvshikh partiinykh arkhivov Rossiiskoi Federatsii: Spravochnik*," comp. V. G. Larina, O. Iu. Nezhdanova, et al.; ed. V. P. Kozlov (Novosibirsk: "Sibirskii khonograf," 1998). A pressrun of only 500 copies is scheduled by fall fo 1998. An initial typescript version was deposited in the VNIIDAD library in 1994 (no. 128-95).

[250] Iurii Mironovich Grossman and Vitalii Naumovich Kutik, *Spravochnik nauchnogo rabotnika: Arkhivy, dokumenty, issledovatel',* 2d ed. (L'viv: "Vyshcha shkola," 1983; [microfiche=IDC-R-14,560]). This edition updates the first edition published in L'viv in 1979. See my lengthy review article, Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, *Recent Soviet Archival Literature: A Review and Preliminary Bibliography of Selected Reference Aids*, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Occasional Paper, no. 204 (Washington, D.C., 1986); an abbreviated version appeared in *Slavic Review* 45, no. 3 (Fall 1986): 534–44.

reference standpoint, and without subject indexing, it was nonetheless a major step ahead of any Glavarkhiv-sponsored directory published before or since, with the most extensive available bibliography of finding aids.

While the VNIIDAD directory described archival holdings in 54 museums in Moscow and Leningrad, a new guide to Moscow museums, honoring the city's 850th birthday celebration in 1997, describes the holdings of close to100 museums in the capital alone.[251] Although emphasizing museum exhibits rather than archives, oriented for tourists rather than researchers, and lacking bibliography, the knowledgeable essays written by staff from each museum nonetheless reveal considerable information about the orientation of the museum. Archival holdings still need to be surveyed in more detail. A companion volume is in preparation for St. Petersburg, updating the much briefer 1993 tourist guide to museums in that city.[252] For art museums throughout the Russian Federation, a new directory prepared by a team in the State Russian Museum in St. Petersburg has also appeared recently, again with little coverage of archival holdings, but with considerable bibliography.[253] Meanwhile, scientific and technical museums, not otherwise surveyed in other Moscow or Petersburg directories, are covered by an in-house directory produced by the Polytechnic Museum in Moscow.[254]

Fond-Level Guides for Individual Archives

Until the dawn of electronic networks for libraries and archives in Russia, basic fond-level guides will remain the backbone of a researcher-oriented archival reference system within individual archives. Since 1991, an impressive new breed of comprehensive, fond-level guides have already appeared for eight of the sixteen different federal-level archives under Rosarkhiv and two more are in due in 1998 with preliminary versions already available in electronic format. Most of them list previously secret holdings, and some of them list and annotate the internal inventories (*opisi*) within individual fonds. Three other federal archives have issued briefer new surveys of their holdings, and Internet websites reveal more information about two more.[255] A number of other repositories outside the Rosarkhiv system have likewise issued newly expanded guides, while more are in preparation. The forthcoming Rosarkhiv archival reorganization mentioned at the outset,

---

[251] *"Vse muzei Moskvy": Spravochnik-putevoditel'*, comp. and ed. E. Galkina and Iu. Pishchulin (Moscow, 1997; "Biblioteka zhurnal *Mir muzeia*," vol. 1).

[252] Iuliia B. Demidenko, *Muzei Sankt-Peterburga: Spravochnik* (St. Petersburg: Izd-vo Bank Petrovskii, 1994).

[253] *Khudozhestvennye muzei Rossii: Spravochnik*, comp. S. V. Biriukova et al., ed. N. M. Kuleshova et al. (St. Petersburg, 1996).

[254] *Nauchno-tekhnicheskie muzei Rossii: Spravochnik*, part 1 (Moscow: Gosudarstvennyi politekhnicheskii muzei, 1992).

[255] As listed below, new published guides or short lists of fonds are now available for GA RF (**B–1**), RGADA (**B–2**), RGIA (**B–3**), RGAVMF (**B–5**), RGAE (**B–6**), RGALI (**B–7**), RGVA (**B–8**), RTsKhIDNI (**B–12**), while a preliminary version is available for TsKhDMO (**B–14**). Websites survey holdings for RGAKFD and list fonds in TsKhIDK (**B–15**). New brief surveys have been issued for RGAFD (**B–10**), and RGAKFD (**B–11**), and a major part of RGANTD (**B–9**). The code numbers reference the listings for these archives in the 1997/1998 ArcheoBiblioBase directories and in the brief ABB on-line listings on the Internet. See Appendix 2.

it should be noted, will in no way affect the value and utility of these guides, although new coordinates will need to be added for the future location of the holdings described.

Of special note for several of the major archives under Rosarkhiv are the guides in the Russian Archive Series, edited by a team of American historians and distributed by the Center for Russian and East European Studies (REES) at the University of Pittsburgh.[256] Two volumes of the projected new comprehensive guide to the State Archive of the Russian Federation (GA RF—**B–1**) have already appeared. The first volume covers pre-revolutionary holdings in what was before 1961 the Central State Historical Archive of the USSR in Moscow (TsGIAM) and later the pre-revolutionary division of the Central State Archive of the October Revolution of the USSR (TsGAOR SSSR). The 609 fonds covered (an increase of 37 percent over its Soviet-period predecessors), predominantly relate to the revolutionary movement, but also include many fonds of personal papers, including those belonging to members of the imperial family, and a galaxy of significant collections. A second volume comprehensively annotates major central government records of the RSFSR, namely the holdings of the former Central State Archive of the RSFSR (TsGA RSFSR), which had never been thoroughly described before 1991. While neither of them list all the *opisi* within every fond, *opis'*-level surveys are provided for some of the larger fonds. Both include English prefaces and helpful indexes. Even more impressive is the newly published third volume, hot off the press is mid-1998 (but not in the Russian Archive Series), which provides comprehensive coverage of 402 fonds from the Soviet period (1923-1991), in many cases with opis'-level descriptions. An additional volume providing a complete summary listing of all fonds now held by GA RF is nearing completionnd.[257]

Another impressive volume in the Russian Archive Series provides brief descriptions of all of the 1,574 declassified (as of 1993) institutional fonds in what is now called the Russian State Archive of the Economy (RGAE—**B–6**), together with a list of the successive creating institutions within each record group. An introductory history and survey of the holdings in English and Russian and extensive indexes add to the reference

---

[256] See the review by Donald J. Raleigh, "The Russian Archive Series," *Russian Review* 55, no. 3 (October1996): 692–98. Since Raleigh provides an extended analysis of each volume, only brief mention follows here. See also the shorter, appreciative review by David L. Ransel in the *American Historical Review*, 102, no. 2 (April 1997): 486–87. The series is distributed abroad exclusively by the Center for Russian and East European Studies at the University of Pittsburgh (REES); in Moscow, they are for sale only at the producing archive. CONTACT: URL:http://www.pitt.edu/~cjp/rees.html; Tel.: (412) 648-7403/7407; Fax: (412)648-2199; E-mail: rees@vms.cis.pitt.edu. Distressingly, current information about these and other volumes in the "Russian Publications Project" is still not accessible at the REES website. A separate Internet RAS listing provides basic information and order instructions, but it is not always up to date, and its bibliographic data is not always complete. CONTACT: URL: http://www.ucr.edu/history/russia/RAS.html.

[257] *Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii: Putevoditel'/State Archive of the Russian Federation: A Research Guide*, 3 vols.: vol. 1: *Fondy Gosudarstvennogo arkhiva Rossiiskoi Federatsii po istorii Rossii XIX–nachala XX vv./ Collections of the State Archive of the Russian Federationon the History of Russia in the 19th and Early–20th Centuries*, comp. A. V. Dobrovskaia et al., ed. S. V. Mironenko and Gregory L. Freeze (Moscow, 1994; "Russian Archive Series," vol. 3); vol. 2: *Fondy Gosudarstvennogo arkhiva Rossiiskoi Federatsii po istorii RSFSR/ Collections of the State Archive of the Russian Federation on the History* L. G. Aronov et al., ed. S. V. Mironenko and Jeffrey P. Burds (Moscow, 1996; "Russian Archive Series," vol. 5); vol. 3: *Fondy Gosudartsvennogo arkhiva Rossiiskoi Federatsii po istorii SSSR*, comp. A. V. Dobrovskaia et al., ed. S. V. Mironenko (Moscow: Redaktsionno-izd. otdel federal'nykh arkhivov, 1998).

value. A second volume presents more detailed *opis'*-level coverage of 315 fonds in the first two priority categories, with an added list of the fonds that were declassified between 1992 and 1995. Other volumes are in preparation, including a separate comprehensive guide to the more than 300 fonds of personal papers.[258]

The former Central Party Archive (TsPA, now RTsKhIDNI—**B–12**) is the third archive to benefit from a comprehensive new guide in the Russian Archive Series—actually the first to be published—providing annotated listings of all *opisi*—for all fonds. The Pittsburgh edition includes an English-language version of the introduction and appended English-language annotations for fonds in the western European section of RTsKhIDNI. An alternate purely Russian-language edition omits the English-language introduction and appended annotations, but is otherwise identical.[259] A second volume in the Russian RTsKhIDNI guide series appeared in the fall of 1996 (under German sponsorship), providing more detailed annotations of the personal papers in the archive.[260] Although it does not annotate individual *opisi* within the fonds, it provides helpful data about their source and acquisition. Regrettably, neither volume indicates the availability of (nor provides coordination for) many of the *opisi* in microform editions, as provided by the Hoover–Chadwyck-Healey project. Supplementing these guides, RTsKhIDNI has also been issuing an "Information Bulletin" series with additional in-depth descriptions of holdings and news about archival developments.[261]

Going a step further in analyzing newly opened Communist Party sources is the collection of published documents on "Stalin's Politburo in the 1930s." With helpful introductions concerning the sources and appended reference materials, including lists of participants in various Politburo meetings, this remarkable volume serves as a virtual researcher's handbook for Politburo records.[262] Three of the compilers, together with Jana Howlett (consulting editor for the Chadwyck-Healey microfilm collection), have also prepared a brief introductory study of high CP organs and their recordkeeping practices

---

[258] *Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv ekonomiki:Putevoditel'/ Russian State Archive of Economy: A Research Guide*, comp. E. V. Derusova et al., ed. Jeffrey P. Burds, E. A. Tiurina, et al.: *v*ol. 1: *Kratkii spravochnik fondov/ A Guide to Collections* (Moscow, 1994; "Russian Archive Series," vol. 2); vol. 2: *Spravochnik fondov RGAE/ A Research Guide to Collections* (Moscow, 1996; "Russian Archive Series," vol. 6).

[259] *Rossiiskii tsentr khraneniia i izucheniia dokumentov noveishei istorii: Kratkii putevoditel'. Fondy i kollektsii,sobrannye Tsentral'nym partiinym arkhivom*, comp. Zh. G. Adibekova et al., ed. Iu. N. Amiantov et al. (Moscow, 1993; "Spravochno-informatsionnye materialy k dokumental'nym fondam RTsKhIDNI," vol. 1). The REES edition has an added English title page: *Research Guide to the Russian Center for the Preservation and Study of Documents (Records) of Modern (Contemporary) History (former Central Party Archive)*, comp. O. V. Naumov et al., ed. J. Arch Getty and V. P. Kozlov (M., 1993; "Russian Archive Series," vol. 1).

[260] *Rossiiskii tsentr khraneniia i izucheniia dokumentov noveishei istorii: Putevoditel' po fondam i kollektsii lichnogo proiskhozhdeniia*, comp. Zh. G. Adibekova et al., ed. Iu. N. Amiantov et al. (Moscow, 1996; "Spravochno-informatsionnye materialy k dokumental'nym fondam RTsKhIDNI," vol. 2).

[261] *Informatsionnyi biulletin' RTsKhIDNI* (Moscow, 1992). Publication (under IISG/IISH sponsorship) is irregular; eight issues have appeared through 1996, although distribution is limited.

[262] *Stalinskoe Politbiuro v 30-e gody: Sbornik dokumentov*, comp. O. V. Khlevniuk et al. (Moscow: "AIRO–XX," 1995). See the helpful review by TsKhSD Deputy Director Vitalii Iu. Afiani in *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 2, pp.112–14, which appropriately recommends that similar volumes be prepared for later decades.

for the pre-1953 period.[263] In a more detailed "source-study (*istochnikovedenie*)" vein, the Russian historian Nikholai N. Pokrovskii analyses available Politburo documentation from the early 1920s.[264] Meanwhile, a new institutional history of the Comintern links its internal structural evolution to archival files available in RTsKhIDNI.[265]

The Center for Preservation of Contemporary Documentation (TsKhSD—**B–13**), the corresponding archive for post-1953 CPSU records, is still without a guide. That archive provided a cursory list of fonds (indicating those open to researchers) for inclusion in the 1997 ArcheoBiblioBase directory, which, while a major step forward, provides only a minimal orientation for researchers. Since so many TsKhSD files remain classified, however, a comprehensive guide should not be expected soon. Nevertheless, publication of a preliminary annotated survey of major fonds with explanation of their breakdown (and corresponding identification of *opis'* numbers) of some of the larger fonds, such as the CC Politburo (fond 3), Secretariat (fond 4), and Apparatus (fond 5), would certainly be a tremendous boon to researchers. Of special significance in recent years is the publication of an item-level finding aid for one politically important TsKhSD collection, namely the documents that were declassified for the trial against the Communist Party in 1992 (fond 89). This collection includes scattered materials from a number of fonds in different archives, including some top-secret "special files" (*osobye papki*) from the Archive of the President of the Russian Federation (AP RF—**C–1**). Most of the entire artificially assembled collection of photocopies—or at least that part now publicly available in TsKhSD—has been produced on microfilm as part of the Hoover–Chadwyck-Healey project.[266] Unfortunately, the original fonds and source files are not identified in either the *opisi* or the published catalogues, even for those documents now held in other fonds in TsKhSD itself. Reportedly, many documents from the trial were not turned over to TsKhSD. And also regrettably, 151 documents in several entire *opisi* and some other individual files were withheld from the microfilm edition, most of which are also still not available to researchers in TsKhSD. An English-language guide to the documents on microfilm has been completed by archivists at the Hoover Institution and is now available

---

[263] Jana Howlett, Oleg Khlevniuk, Liudmila Kosheleva, and Larissa A. Rogovaia, *The CPSU's Top Bodies under Stalin: Their Operational Records and Structure of Command*, with a foreword by Peter H. Solomon, Jr. (Toronto, 1996; Stalin-Era Research and Archives Project, "Working Paper," no. 1). The English version is revised and expanded from their earlier article that appeared in Paris: "Les sources archivistiques des organes dirigeants du PC(b)R," *Communisme*, no. 42/43/44 (1995): 15–34.

[264] N. N. Pokrovskii, "Istochnikovedenie sovetskogo perioda: Dokumenty Politbiuro TsKRKP(b)—VKP(b) pervoi poloviny 1920-kh godov," *Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1994 god* (Moscow, 1996), pp. 18–46.

[265] Grant M. Adibekov et al, *Organizatsionnaia struktura Kominterna 1919–1943* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1997). For electronic reference developments for the Comintern archive, see the text below with footnotes 332 and 333.

[266] See the cumulative catalogue—*Arkhivy Kremlia i Staroi ploshchadi. Dokumenty po "delu KPSS": Annotirovannyi spravochnik dokumentov, predstavlennykh v Konstitutsionnyi sud Rossiiskoi Federatsii po "delu KPSS,"* comp. I. I. Kudriavtsev, ed. V. P. Kozlov (Novosibirsk: "Sibirskii khronograf," 1995; Rosarkhiv), earlier published serially as *Arkhivno-informatsiinyi biulleten'* (*prilozhenie* to *Istoricheskii arkhiv*), nos. 1/2–4 (1993); and nos. 5–6 (1994). A published catalogue of the remaining documents in the collection (*opisi* 53–72) was promised, but not completed. The brief introduction fails adequately to explain their provenance, nor is there any explanation about the percentage of the documents from the trial now available in the TsKhSD collection. Chadwyck-Healey has issued a separate flyer for the microfilm collection under the title "The Trial of the Soviet Communist Party." The first reel reproduces all of the internal *perecheni (opisi)*. See Chadwyck-Healey contact data in fn. 325.

to researchers in typescript there, while eventual publication on CD-ROM is being planned.[267]

A basic guide has been prepared for the former Central Archive of the Komsomol, which still remains a separate facility under Rosarkhiv, now known as the Center for Preservation of Records of Youth Organizations (TsKhDMO—**B–14**), and a publication subsidy recently secured should insure its appearance in print by the end of 1998. A preliminary version of the guide is already available for researchers in the reading room, and the archive is selling electronic copies pending publication.[268] That archive is one of those scheduled for abolition as a separate entity, with current plans calling for consolidation of its holdings with the former Central Party Archive (now RTsKhIDNI—**B–12**). But such a move should not make the new guide obsolete for the fond-level description of its holdings.

Three volumes of the new, long-awaited, four-volume guide to the Russian (earlier Central) State Archive of Early Acts (RGADA—**B–2**) have appeared.[269] Welcome is a lengthy introductory chapter and a masterful concluding chart showing the complicated history of the oldest continuous archive in Russia and the earlier repositories from which it evolved. Coverage of institutional records is presented according to the place of their creating agency in the Russian historical bureaucratic structure, rather than their archival evolution as had been the case in the earlier 1945–1946 guide. Unlike several of the other post-1991 guides, however, *opis'* divisions within fonds are not indicated in the extensive fond-level annotations, the lack of which is not fully compensated for by the appended lists of *opisi*. The extensive bibliography at the end of the second volume awkwardly brings together several thousand entries for both documentary publications and finding aids; rubric divisions, annotations, and cross-references to the relevant fonds would have greatly enhanced its usefulness. The third volume (in two parts), which appeared in 1997, covers local administrative agencies and monasteries (16th–18th cc.); a fourth volume due in 1998 will cover personal and family archives along with manuscripts and early printed books.

The Russian State Military Archive (RGVA—**B–8**), which houses post-revolutionary records can boast of an impressive new two-volume guide divided into various sections that reflect the military structure in the USSR from 1917 until 1940.[270] The guide has helpful agency histories of the creators of individual fonds or groups of related fonds, including references to creating decrees or regulations. Notably lacking, for each fond, however, are indications of the number or breakdown of *opisi*. Appendices include a

---

[267] In connection with their catalogue, Hoover archivists are describing briefly the documents that are missing from the microfilms, which according to their count totals 151 files. Since the entire *opisi (perecheni)* themselves are available on the first reel of microfilm (see fn. 266), it is possible to determine which documents are missing from the films; TsKhSD archivists suggest that further information on this matter is itself classified.

[268] *Putevoditel' po fondam TsKhDMO*, comp. I. F. Astrakhyantseva et al. (Moscow, forthcoming [1998]). The preliminary diskette version of the guide can be purchased at the archive.

[269] *Tsentral'nyi [Rossiiskii] gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov SSSR: Putevoditel'*, comp. M. V. Babich et al., 4 vols. (Moscow, 1991–); the fourth volume is forthcoming in 1998.

[270] *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Sovetskoi Armii: Putevoditel'*, comp. O. V. Brizitskaia et al., ed. M. V. Stegantsev and L. V. Dvoinykh, 2 vols. (Minneapolis: East View Publications, 1991–1993; also available in microfiche edition). For evidence of the revelations from additional newly declassified materials, see the article by Andrea Romano, "L'Armé Rouge, miroir de la société soviétique: Aperçu des sources d'archives," *Communisme*, nos. 42/43/44 (1995): 35–43.

bibliography of major documentary publications and an index to the military commands, agencies, organizations, and other units covered, although there are no subject, geographic, nor personal name indexes. In many instances, cross-references are provided to subsequent parts of fonds held in the Central Archive of the Ministry of Defense (TsAMO—**C–4**), predominantly starting in 1940. (A guide to that archive itself is reportedly in the planning stage.) Because the RGVA guide was prepared before the latest rounds of declassification, it does not cover fonds or formerly secret *opisi* within fonds that have been declassified since 1992. Accordingly, a more comprehensive guide is now being finalized. Also of considerable interest in RGVA is a new guide to records from the Civil War period, covering previously classified White Army fonds (the so-called White Guards) due in 1998.[271] Many of these fonds came to Moscow from the Russian Foreign Historical Archive (RZIA) in Prague and other émigré sources.

No new guide has been issued for the corresponding pre-revolutionary Russian State Military History Archive (RGVIA—**B–4**), although researchers there at last have access to the relatively detailed, but previously restricted, three-volume 1979 list of fonds and to the earlier restricted 1949 guide, both of which together provide much better in depth descriptions of many more fonds than the briefer 1941 guide, which was the last to have been publicly available.[272] Also recently declassified in RGVIA is the 1949 guide to the former Leningrad branch of the archive, which provides coverage of the fonds that were moved to Moscow after its preparation.[273] Some of these have been reorganized since their transfer, but that guide at least gives an overview of the records involved. Microfiche editions of all these earlier guides should be a high priority pending completion of an updated, more comprehensive reference aid. RGVIA is one of the first federal archives slated for inclusion in the new Primary Source Media microform project with initial plans for extensive cover of the pre-revolutionary Military Science Archive (*Voenno-uchenyi arkhiv*—VUA) under the Army General Staff (originally founded in 1797 as the Imperial Map Depot)—one of the major components of RGVIA. A four-volume catalogue of the VUA part of that archive had been published before the Revolution and is now available commercially in a microfiche edition, but the planned expanded electronic catalogue should greatly expand the accessibility of its holdings.

For records from the pre-revolutionary imperial period (predominantly late eighteenth century through 1917), the Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA—**B–3**) in St. Petersburg has issued a new, and exceedingly helpful, short list of fonds, including many now-declassified fonds that were not included in the 1956 published guide, together with an extensive list of published finding aids and a description of the internal archival

---

[271] *Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi voennyi arkhiv: Spravochnik po fondam Beloi Armii*, comp. N. D. Egorov et al., ed. L. V. Dvoinykh et al. (Moscow, "Vostochnaia literatura," 1998). See also the recent article by I. V. Uspenskii surveying RGVA holdings on the Civil War, "Dokumenty Beloi armii v fondakh RGVA," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1998 (no. 2, pp. 26-31).

[272] *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi voenno-istoricheskii arkhiv SSSR: Putevoditel'*, comp. A. P. Gudzinskaia et al.; 3 vols. (Moscow: GAU, 1979); *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi voenno-istoricheskii arkhiv: Putevoditel'*, comp. A. E. Al'tshuller et al., ed. N. P. Shliapnikov and G. I. Volchenkov (Moscow, 1949). For the 1941 guide, see *Putevoditel' po Tsentral'nomu gosudarstvennomu voenno-istoricheskomu arkhivu* (Moscow, 1941; microfiche=IDC-R-11,226). The pre-revolutionary published *opisi* and other specialized finding aids are all available on IDC microfiche.

[273] *Filial Tsentral'nogo gosudarstvennogo voenno-istoricheskogo arkhiva v Leningrade: Putevoditel'*, comp. N. A. Kalinina et al., ed. V. V. Maksakov et al. (Leningrad, 1949).

reference system.[274] A California-sponsored firm assisted in producing a relatively primitive computerized version of the annotated register of *opisi* that was initially prepared in typescript form in the 1970s; Blits is now marketing a printout paper copy as well as computer diskettes.[275] There is no explanatory preface, and the volume lacks sufficient information about the individual fonds themselves and their creating agencies to be effectively used independently of the earlier TsGIA SSSR guide. Unfortunately, the program that produced the electronic form was inadequate for archival reference, although the available key-word searching mechanism may be helpful for some purposes. The net result for RGIA are two vitally important new reference aids that include considerably expanded data about the holdings and reference literature. Yet even when used together, they do not adequately replace the 1956 guide (still available on microfiche) and its lesser-known typescript second-volume.[276] The riches of the RGIA library in terms of official pre-revolutionary publications, including internal government agency imprints, are being revealed in a new published catalogue series.[277]

A new series of reference publications for the Russian State Archive of the Navy (RGAVMF—**B–5**) furnishes helpful machine-readable diskettes to accompany the new guides, thus providing electronic searching in a word-processing system. An impressive new two-volume guide to post revolutionary fonds (1995) now replaces the 1991 list of fonds. An initial volume describes the records of major naval agencies, and a second volume covers records of individual ships.[278] A more recently released annotated register of *opisi* for the pre-revolutionary holdings was published in a handsome edition in contrast to the RGIA counterpart. But, similar to the RGIA product, it also lacks sufficient agency histories and other data about the individual fonds to serve as a full-fledged guide. Nevertheless, it is a major step forward from the 1966 "Thematic Guide" to the archive's pre-revolutionary holdings that long remained restricted, although in 1991, it was issued in a microfiche edition by East View Publications.[279] Appendices provide alphabetical lists of fonds of personal papers and individual ships, as well as a correlation table for fonds covered by the series of pre-revolutionary published and unpublished *opisi*. Essential subject, name, and geographic indexes highlight the lack of such indexes in the

---

[274] *Fondy Rossiiskogo gosudarstvennogo istoricheskogo arkhiva: Kratkii spravochnik*, comp. D. I. Raskin et al. (St. Petersburg: RGIA, 1994).

[275] *Russian State Historic Archives, St. Petersburg: Annotated Register* (St. Petersburg: "Blits," 1994; text in Russian). Information about this publication and others from the Russian Baltic Information Center—Blitz—is available on the Internet. CONTACT: http://feefhs.org/blitz/frgblitz.html. The Blitz/Blits website also lists extensive genealogical documentation in St. Petersburg archives covered by its projects.

[276] *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv: Putevoditel'*, ed. S. N. Valk and V. V. Bedin (Leningrad, 1956; microfiche=IDC-R-10,722). The second volume, available in typescript in the archive, covers additional smaller unclassified fonds that were not included in the published guide.

[277] *Katalog*: *Russkie ofitsial'nye i vedomstvennye izdaniia, XIX–nachala XX veka*, E. K. Avramenko et al., ed. N.E. Kashchenko (St. Petersburg: "Blits," 1995–). As of fall 1997, five volumes are available.

[278] Marina Evgen'evna Malevinskaia, *Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv VMF: Spravochnik po fondam (1917–1940),* ed. T. P. Mazur, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg: "Blits," 1995); added subtitle for vol. 2: *Korabli i suda, 1917–1940 gg.;* a searchable computer diskette version is available at additional cost.

[279] Tamara Petrofina Mazur, *Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Voenno-Morskogo Flota: Annotirovannyi reestr opisei (1696–1917)* (St. Petersburg:"Blits," 1996). A searchable computer diskette version is available at additional cost. See also *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Voenno-Morskogo Flota SSSR. (Dokumental'nye materialy dorevoliutsionnogo flota Rossii): Tematicheskii putevoditel'*, comp. V. E. Nadvodskii, ed. I. N. Solov'eva (Leningrad: TsGAVMF, 1966; microfiche ed., Minneapolis: East View Publications,1991).

corresponding RGVA guides. A bibliographic guide to pre-revolutionary naval agency publications, which also appeared in 1995, indicates some of the riches of the RGAVMF library, and provides a full listing for all of the pre-revolutionary printed inventories and documentary publications.[280] All of these new reference publications honoring the 300th anniversary of the Russian Navy are issued with English-language prefaces and include indexes.

Among all the post-1991 published guides and other reference literature for Russian archives, potentially the most sophisticated in computer implementation is the recently released CD-ROM guide to the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art (RGALI—**B–7**).[281] The CD-ROM combines scanned texts from the six volumes in the previously published TsGALI/RGALI guide series (1959–1986), with the soon-to-be-published seventh volume, part of which appeared in the separate 1994 short guide to recently declassified fonds (published in Paris).[282] Although handsome pictures of many literary luminaries now illustrate fonds of personal papers, there are neither substantive (post-Soviet) additions to earlier descriptions (although a few minor corrections have been incorporated) nor separate listings of *opisi* for individual fonds, as are included in some of the new breed of archival guides for other federal archives described above. Neither are there any bibliographic data about available published finding aids for many individual fonds and related reference literature, many of which are available on microfiche, nor any indication of the rich reference facilities now available to researchers in the archive itself. Nor does it even provide full bibliographic citations for the earlier guides on which the CD-ROM is based and the forthcoming seventh volume.

Although the text itself remains only in Russian, an efficient transliteration system permits foreign-language users to input search queries in the Latin alphabet with automatic transliteration to the Cyrillic text and provides commands and instructions in English and German as well as Russian. As the most serious drawback, the search and retrieval system of the new CD-ROM, and most particularly the instructions for its use, have not been perfected to the extent one might expect for a product being marketed in the West at the exorbitant cost of DM 980. To cite but one of the many frustrating examples, the full-text searching mechanism works only on a whole-word (or truncated root) basis, so that most personal names within the annotations, for example, cannot be located in the nominative form. Moreover, the use of the truncated form is not adequately explained in the instructions. I located some personal names of correspondents in several fonds much more easily using the earlier printed editions, thanks to the thorough name indexes included there that have not been incorporated into the CD-ROM search facility. Institutional names are even less accessible on the CD-ROM, and it is next to impossible

---

[280] N. G. Sergeeva, *Rossiiskii flot 1720–1917 gg.: Bibliograficheskii spravochnik izdanii morskogo vedomstva* (St. Petersburg, "Blits," 1995). The pre-revolutionary published *opisi* and other specialized finding aids are all available on IDC microfiche.

[281] *The Russian State Archive of Literature and Art: The Complete Archive Guide/ Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva: Putevoditel' po arkhivu,* comp. and ed. Natalia B. Volkova and Klaus W. Waschik, CD-ROM Version ([Munich]: K. G. Saur, 1996).

[282] *Kratkii putevoditel' po byvshemu spetskhranu RGALI (po sostoianiiuna 1 oktiabria 1993 g.),* comp. and ed. Sergei Shumikhin (Paris: Institute d' Études Slaves, 1994). The seventh volume has been delayed in press, but is expected later in 1998: *Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva: Putevoditel',* [vol. 7]: *Fondy, postupivshie . . . v 1979–1992,* ed. N. B. Volkova et al. (Moscow: "Bibliograficheskoe obshchestvo," 1998—forthcoming).

to find them with reference to their common acronyms or abbreviated format, even when RGALI holds the main body of records. It is to be hoped that critical reviews, such as the two that have already appeared, will convince the German publisher that a revised or replacement version should include better instructions, bibliographic data about reference literature, and a more sophisticated search engine.[283] Such reviews may also help avert similar problems for other multimedia electronic reference projects.

A multimedia CD-ROM guide is now being prepared for the foreign "trophy" records in the former Special Archive—now the Center for Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections (TsKhIDK—**B–15**). The sponsors promise annotated descriptions of the vast collections of archival materials from almost every country in Europe, most of which were first looted by the Nazis during World War II and subsequently by Soviet authorities. In the meantime, a primitive, but relatively comprehensive English-language list of fonds is now available on the Internet.[284] The elaborate website, established by the Russian "humanitarian foundation" Klassika/Classica in conjunction with the firm Media Lingua, also displays some 65 sample scanned documents from the archive, ranging from Johann Goethe's 1783 Masonic receipt to a page from Adolf Hitler's visitors' book for 20 April 1945. Regrettably a copy of the lists of holdings is not available to researchers in the archive, nor has there been any notice about it posted there. The list of fonds on the MediaLingua website (dated July 1997) is presented in English translation (with numerous rough edges), and most of them with citation to the original name of the creating agency or individual in the language of creation, with only indication of dates of the documentation and country of origin (occasionally incorrectly attributed). Most regrettably, fond numbers within TsKhIDK itself are not provided in the preliminary Internet list, nor are there indications of the size (in terms of number of storage units) or number of *opisi*. Apparently the "guide" so far is being produced by outside Russian researchers without any direct participation of the archival staff, which may explain some of its deficiencies from a professional archival standpoint.

Individual fonds are listed in confusingly random order under a series of subject rubrics that are not always appropriately assigned or distinguished one from another. For example, there is a separate rubric for "Jewish politicians, social, political, military, religious organizations and societies," but most of the individuals whose personal papers are listed in the separate rubric for "Personal Archives" are Jewish, and the "Zionist Society Reconstruction of Palestine Foundation—Karen Hayessod de France," appears as a "State Institution." While there are separate categories for "Masons" and "Paramasons" (although the latter category is hardly distinguished), the collected fond with

[283] See the review by Mark Steinberg and Helen Sullivan in *Slavic Review* 56, no. 2 (Summer 1997): 350–52. A perceptive, and even more critical, review by the Russian literary specialist Nikolai V. Kotrelev appears in *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie,* 27 (1997): 350–56.

[284] "Contents of the Multimedia Guide to Special Archive" can be found at the URL "http://www.archives.ru/," and also accessed through the Media Lingua Company website (http://www.medialingua.ru), where there is also brief information about the company and the "Charitable Foundation CLASSICA" (also described as the "'CLASSICA/KLASSIKA' Humanitarian Foundation, founded by the Institute of World Literature [IMLI] of the Russian Academy of Sciences"), which are developing the CD-ROM guide. According to that announcement (last updated August 1997), the guide annotating the "trophy" archives, was to be released in 1997. In response to my inquiry in April 1998, the Classica director assures me that the guide is still progressing, but he was unable to furnish the names of compilers and editors or an estimated release date.

documentation from Belgian Masonic lodges appears in the "Jewish" category, although it is unlikely that Jews would have been admitted to any of the lodges there included. Despite a separate category for "Religious Organizations," the "Council of Foreign Catholic Missions (Paris)" appears under "Paramasons." Despite the "Personal Archives" rubric (with eight sub-rubrics), some fonds of personal papers are listed under other rubrics, and although there is a subrubric "emigrants," numerous émigrés from different countries are listed under other subrubrics for personal archives. It is to be hoped that feedback from the Internet exposure of the preliminary lists will alert the editors to such problems, so that they can be corrected before the final issue.

Despite the limitations of the initial version, the lists of fonds as presented on the Internet are a major step forward in opening the holdings of this long-classified archive to public research. Previously, a brief, hastily published German-language "guide," issued at the end of 1992, provides a simple list (with TsKhIDK fond numbers, dates, and number of *opisi* and file units) for only approximately half the fonds in the archive (predominantly those of German and Austrian provenance), some of which were earlier returned to East Germany (the transfers, for the most part, are indicated accordingly).[285] The archive itself, together with the Institute of General History, issued a guide to its holdings of Belgian provenance in 1995 (reissued in a Flemish edition in 1997).[286] But the current Internet listings are the first and only coverage publicly available with an indication of the displaced archives from France, Poland, and other countries. According to Rosarkhiv figures, over three-quarters of the French holdings were returned to France in 1994 (according to the high-level 1992 diplomatic agreement), and accordingly, most of the French fonds already returned are not listed (even though in some cases, fragments remain in TsKhIDK). The archive has been subject to considerable controversy in connection with restitution issues involving numerous European countries. Since the archive's priority was always the "operational" use of its holdings, many of its fonds were never properly processed from an archival standpoint, especially for scholarly research purposes, nor were many groups of files even correctly assigned to fonds with respect to their origin, nor identified as to where they had been found, all of which makes the task of preparing an accurate guide more difficult.[287]

---

[285] Götz Aly and Susanne Heim, *Das Zentrale Staatsarchiv in Moskau ("Sonderarchiv"), Rekonstruktion und Bestandsverzeichnis verschollen geglaubten Schriftguts aus der NS-Zeit* (Düsseldorf: Hans-Böckler-Stiftung, 1992). The guide was prepared by two German scholars without verification of the text by archival authorities in TsKhIDK, and hence has a number of inaccuracies. Several other German-language articles describing predominantly the same materials, and some with more detailed annotations, are listed in the ArcheoBiblioBase directories and the Grimsted articles cited in fn. 287.

[286] *Fondy bel'giiskogo proiskhozhdeniia: Annotirovannyi ukazatel'*, comp. T. A. Vasil'eva and A. S. Namazova; ed. M. M. Mukhamedzhanov (Moscow, 1995), is the first TsKhIDK reference publication regarding its fonds. A Flemish translation appeared in April 1997, *Fondsen van Belgische Herkomst: Verklarende Index*, ed. Michel Vermote et al. (Ghent: AMSAB, 1997). See also the historical account of the odyssey of the Belgian materials now in Russia by Jacques Lust, Evert Maréchal, Wouter Steenhaut, and Michel Vermote, *Een Zoektocht naar Archieven: Van NISG naar AMSAB* (Ghent: AMSAB, 1997).

[287] Regarding the formation of this archive and related restitution problems, see my recent article, "Displaced Archives and Restitution Problems on the Eastern Front in the Aftermath of World War II," *Contemporary European History*, 6:1 (March 1997): 27–74, revised and updated from the prepublication version (Amsterdam: International Institute for Social History, 1995; *IISG Research Papers*, no. 18, reprinted in *Janus: Revue archivistique/ Archival Review*, 1996, no. 2: 42–77); and my more recent update, "'Trophy' Archives and Non-Restitution: Russia's Cultural 'Cold War' with the European Community," *Problems of Post-Communism*, 45. no. 3 (May/June 1998): 3–16.

TsKhIDK also holds the massive records of Soviet prisoner-of-war and displaced-person camps from the period of World War II and its aftermath, namely the records of the Main Administration for Affairs of Prisoners of War and Internees (*Glavnoe upravlenie po delam voennoplennykh i internirovannykh*—GUPVI, 1939–1960), under the NKVD/ MVD and its subordinate agencies and individual camps, but these holdings are not mentioned in the present list of fonds. As of the spring of 1998, TsKhIDK is scheduled for abolition as a separate repository, with plans calling for its holdings to be incorporated into the neighboring Russian State Military Archive (RGVA—**B–8**). It is to be hoped that such developments will not delay the issue of the new guide, and that it will emerge with appropriately edited and more user-friendly technical attributes than its RGALI predecessor, as an aid to researchers throughout the world, as well as for specialists from the many countries that are long awaiting the restitution of their legitimate archival legacy.

The specialized Russian State Archive for Scientific-Technical Documentation (RGANTD—**B–9**) since June of 1995 also embraces the formerly separate Russian Scientific-Research Center for Space Documentation (RNITsKD). A survey guide to RNITsKD was produced in electronic form just before the merger.[288] Although not intended for formal publication, RGANTD is prepared to make electronic or printout copies available on special request. The main facility for more traditional scientific-technical documentation (earlier a separate archive), now the RGANTD branch archive in Samara (*formerly* Kuibyshev), produced an extensive guide to its holdings in 1990, updating and significantly expanding an earlier classified 1984 guide that was never widely available.[289] Since the 1995 reorganization, the RGANTD Samara Branch has also issued a promotional pamphlet about its holdings and services.[290] The former RGANTD Branch in Moscow has a typescript guide to its holdings, some of which have been transferred to Samara since the consolidation in June 1995, but this also is not intended for publication, particularly since some of its data has been made obsolete by subsequent consolidation and transfers.[291]

The published survey guide to the Russian State Archive of Sound Recordings (RGAFD—**B–10**) issued in 1991 still does not serve as a full guide to the riches of that repository, nor does it list the several printed catalogues the archive has issued in limited editions.[292] In December 1997, RGAFD celebrated the 50th anniversary of its initial establishment as a separate repository in 1932, which was the occasion of a published interview and a retrospective about the collection of early news broadcasts held by the archive.[293] Between 1934 and 1967 that archive had been combined with the state archive

---

[288] **"**Putevoditel' po arkhivu Rossiiskogo nauchno-issledovatel'skogo tsentra kosmicheskoi dokumentatisii" (Moscow: RNITsKD, 1995; typescript).

[289] *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv nauchno-tekhnicheskoi dokumentatsii SSSR: Kratkii spravochnik*, comp. S. N. Supernova et al., ed. I. N. Davydova, 2d ed. (Moscow: Glavarkhiv, 1990). Although copies are rare in Russian libraries, one is available in the Library of Congress.

[290] *RGANTD: Samarskii filial Rossisskogo gosudarstvennogo arkhiva nauchno-tekhnicheskoi dokumentatsii*, comp. Ol'ga Stepanovna Maksakova (Samara: RGANTD, 1997). A copy is available in the Library of Congress.

[291] **"**Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi naucho-tekhnicheskii arkhiv: Moskovskii filial: Annotirovannyi perechen' fondov, nakhodiashchikhsia v Moskovskom arkhivokhranilishche RGNTA" (Moscow, [1993]; typescript).

[292] *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv zvukozapisei SSSR: Ocherk-putevoditel'*, comp. G. D. Petrov et al., ed.V. A. Koliada (Moscow: TsGAZ, 1991).

[293] L. A. Kobel'kova, "Zvukoletopis' Rossii pervoi poloviny XX v.: Informatsionnye vozmozhnosti Arkhivnogo fonda Rossiiskoi Federatsii," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1998, no. 1, pp. 20–27; and the

for documentary films and photographs. As of the spring of 1998, RGAFD itself is one of the archives scheduled for loss again of its independent status under the Rosarkhiv reform. Current plans call for its holdings to be consolidated with those of RGANTD (**B–9**), which also retains considerable sound recordings and other audiovisual documentation on various special media, especially in the holdings it took over from the earlier separate Russian Scientific-Research Center for Space Documentation (RNITsKD).

Least comprehensive among the published new reference offerings from federal-level archives under Rosarkhiv is the brief 1994 pamphlet survey for the Russian State Archive of Documentary Films and Photographs (RGAKFD—**B–11**), in Krasnogorsk, not far from Moscow.[294] In 1996 RGAKFD also issued a collection of survey articles honoring its seventieth anniversary, several of which serve to extend the 1994 coverage.[295] During the last few years the archive has been progressing with a database catalogue of its photographic holdings that includes thumb-nail scanned images. More recently, an elaborate electronic item-level catalogue is underway for the documentary film holdings in collaboration with a commercial western partner, Abamedia of Fort Worth, Texas, the company that recently secured exclusive international distribution rights to the extensive documentary film footage and photographs held by the archive. The joint "Archive Media Project" involves digitizing many of the documentary film holdings, as part of a long-term preservation effort and international marketing venture. A preliminary in-depth catalogue segment in Russian covering productions from 1938 is already available in the archive with detailed information about the films, shot lists, and digitized thumb-nail photographs. Eventual plans call for cataloguing data to be available on the Internet. In the meantime, Abamedia has established an English-language website with a brief description of the film and photographic holdings in the archive, based on a rough translation of the 1996 published survey.[296] Although appropriate Russian-language titles, references to published catalogues, along with serious substantive and linguistic editing would greatly improve the preliminary descriptions currently available on the Internet, the new website promises improved, in-depth coverage. According to Abamedia, proceeds from the commercial venture and additional hoped-for grant funding are intended to aid the cataloguing and preservation efforts in the archive. If professionally implemented, with parallel coverage in Russian, the Archive Media Project could serve the important purpose of opening reference information about RGAKFD internationally and preserving its historic holdings. It is to be hoped that international commercial aims will not outweigh educational responsibility, but recently, visiting foreign academic researchers have been complaining loudly about high usage and reproduction fees charged by the Krasnogorsk archive. So far, the Abamedia cataloguing data available electronically does not compare with the extensive independent Russian-language database for feature films (see below), which also covers some documentary films held in RGAKFD.

---

interview with the same professor from IAI RGGU, "RGAFD: istoriia i sovremennost'," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1998, no. 1, pp. 79–82.

[294] *Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotodokumentov: (kratkii dokumental'nyi obzor)*, comp. V. N. Batalin, ed. L. P. Zapriagaeva (Krasnogorsk: RGAKFD, 1994).

[295] *RGAKFD—70 let: (Sbornik statei)* (Krasnogorsk, 1996; [RGAKFD; Rosarkhiv]).

[296] The URL for the Abamedia website is http://www.abamedia.com. Licensing and sale of RGAKFD film footage outside Russia and the CIS is handled on an exclusive basis through Abamedia–Archive Media Project with headquarters in Ft. Worth, TX (Tel: [1-817] 336-0777; Fax: 817-338-0858; E-mail: abamedia@abamedia.com.

Among independent federal agency archives, more impressive published cataloguing data is available for the State Fond of Motion Pictures (Gosfil'mofond—**C–16**), the centralized repository for feature films, than is the case for RGAKFD. Already in the last few years, after a long hiatus at the end of the Soviet period, five new volumes of catalogues have appeared (as of the end of 1997), bringing the chronological coverage of individual films up through 1977; a sequel covering the next two years is promised for 1998.[297] The new series is less scholarly than the five volumes issued during the Soviet period, but both are in sharp contrast to the detailed catalogue covering 286 silent films that have been restored and reprinted on 35mm safety film by Gosfil'mofond with Italian and British collaboration.[298]

Reference coverage of motion pictures has seen tremendous new development in recent years, in contrast to the severe repression during the Soviet period. Now private initiative among film enthusiasts is filling in gaps where state film-research establishments have not trod. A comprehensive database of feature films, compiled by Miroslava Segida and Sergei Zemlianukhin, by spring 1998 covers over 6,500 films produced in the USSR and successor states from 1917 through 1997. An annotated printed compendium from the database, published in 1996, covers over 5,000 films. A large part of the database itself is freely accessible electronically on the Internet.[299] A multimedia CD-ROM produced from the database includes 4,270 feature films produced and released for distribution in the Soviet Union (1918–1991) and in the newly independent states (NIS) (1991–1996).[300] The CD-ROM includes film clips from 54 films, 550 biographies (and filmographies) with photographs of actors and directors, and 21 articles on different film studios and more specialized subjects covering Soviet film history. Competitors are now preparing rival CD productions, but film researchers will benefit most from the Herculean efforts of Segida and Zemlianukhin. Although the database itself includes over forty fields, it has not yet included location data for archival copies and related production materials. Since copies of almost all feature films produced in the USSR and the post-1991 Russian Federation are held by Gosfil'mofond, a helpful addition for film researchers would be cross-references—or a searchable correlation table—to the published Gosfil'mofond catalogues, and to the extent possible, to the unpublished Gosfil'mofond listings. Ideally, such electronic cataloguing efforts also need to be correlated, and coordinated, with the new

---

[297] *Sovetskie khudozhestvennye fil'my: Annotirovannyi katalog, 1966–1967 gg.*, and——, *1968–1969 gg.*, comp. E. M. Barykin et al. (Moscow: "Niva Rossii," 1995; [Gosfil'mofond]); ——, *1970–1971 gg.* and——, *1972–1973 gg.* (Moscow, 1996); ——, *1974–1975 gg.* and ——, *1976–1977 gg.* (Moscow, 1997), and ——, *1978–1979 gg.* (forthcoming, 1998)

[298] *Testimonisilenziosi: Film russi, 1908–1919/ Silent Witness: Russian Films, 1908–1919*, comp. Paolo Cherchi Usai ([Pordenone]: Biblioteca dell'Immagine, [1989]), coordinated with an introduction by Iurii Tsivian, with parallel texts in English and Italian. A Russian edition of the original catalogue is being prepared for publication by "Dubl'-D" in Moscow.

[299] Miroslava Segida and Sergei Zemlianukhin, *Domashniaia sinemateka:Otechestvennoe kino, 1918–1996* (Moscow: "Dubl'-D," 1996). An electronic version is available on the Internet: *Elektronyi katalog otechestvennogo kino, 1918–1996*. CONTACT: URL: http://russia.agama.com/r_club/cinema; Tel./ Fax: (7-095) 958-42-87; E-mail: segida@dataforce.net.

[300] The multimedia CD-ROM production was released in April 1997: *Kinomanaia 97: Entsiklopediia rossiiskogo kinoiskusstva* (Moscow: Cominfo, 1997), CONTACT: Tel.: (7-095) 147-13-38; E-mail: cdguide@icominf.msk.su; URL: http://www.cominf.ru. An extensive bibliography of other newly available reference publications covering motion pictures and cinematography is included in the new ArcheoBiblioBase directory.

Abamedia project at Krasnogorsk, particularly since there is some overlap in terms of documentary holdings between the two archives. Gosfil'mofond itself still lacks a guide, or even comprehensive survey of its extensive archival holdings that, in addition to motion pictures, include the papers of many important personalia in the film world, together with film scenarios, graphic materials, editing outtakes from many film productions, and extensive related reference resources.

Revealing many of the "blank spots" in film history, another notable recent reference production (appropriately covered in black) is a slim annotated catalogue of fictional feature films that were produced but not released during the Stalin period.[301] In this case, extensive annotations document available archival copies, screen plays or scenarios, film plans, and other related archival sources for each film.

Among other independent federal agency archives, an impressive new guide appeared in the spring of 1996 for the pre-revolutionary Foreign Ministry archive, now known as the Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Empire (AVPRI—**C–3**).[302] Indeed AVPRI was the first Russian archive to produce a guide listing all of the *opisi* within individual fonds. Initially available in typescript form within the archive itself, that preliminary version was subsequently issued in a commercial microfiche edition four years before the published version was completed. The nicely printed version is augmented by a thorough agency history of the Ministry (before 1802, Collegium) of Foreign Affairs. The post-revolutionary Foreign Ministry archive (AVP RF) (**C–2**) now has a preliminary typescript guide to its holdings available in its reading room. This guide updates the earlier typescript list of declassified fonds, while a more definitive version is being prepared for publication.[303]

Other federal ministries and agencies that have the right to retain their own archives have been less forthcoming with public reference information. The MVD archive (now TsA MVD—**C-8**) produced a directory in 1988 for various groups of its own agency records and those of its NKVD predecessor, which indicates the whereabouts of those records that have been transferred to state archival custody, but have now been scattered in at least four different federal archives, as well as regional state archives throughout the Russian Federation. That guide, issued with classified status (DSP—*dlia sluzhebnogo polzovania*), is still not publicly accessible. Reportedly, a new, expanded fond-level listing for NKVD/MVD records has been produced, which again is not intended for public access. It is to be hoped that decision will be reconsidered, so that the hardly security-threatening summary reference aid can be made publicly available, and especially for those involved with rehabilitation processing. A popularized history of the NKVD/MVD

---

[301] Evgenii Margolit and Viacheslav Shmyrov, *(Iz"iatoe kino): Katalog sovetskikh igrovykh kartin, ne vypushchennykh vo vsesoiuznyi prokat po zavershenii v proizvodstve ili iz"iatykh iz deistvuiushchego fil'mofonda v god vypuska na ekran (1924–1953)* (Moscow: "Dubl'-D," 1995). Data from this publication and others are included in the general database compiled by Segida and Zemlianukhin.

[302] *Arkhiv vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Imperii: Putevoditel'*, comp. and ed. I. V. Budnik et al.; (Minneapolis: East View Publications, 1996). See the favorable Russian press reaction, for example, Iaroslav Leont'ev, "Katalog: Arkhivnyi Vergilii," *Obshchaia gazeta*, 26 September–2 October 1996, no. 38, p. 9; and the earlier notice, which also included mention of the guide for RGVA (B–8), E. Andrea, "Kliuchik tainam proshlogo: Amerikanskie putevoditeli po russkim arkhivam," *Knizhnoe obozrenie*, 1996, no. 35.

[303] "Putevoditel' po Arkhivu vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii" (Moscow, 1995; typescript).

was issued by the ministry itself in1996, but, while providing pictures of previous ministers, it makes no reference to archives.[304]

A vital agency history for NKVD/MVD/KGB records, involving a thorough analysis of the inner agency structure from 1917 to 1960, appeared in late 1997.[305] This revealing work, with several technical appendixes, clarifies the complicated bureaucratic transformations of the agency during the Soviet regime, and includes the full text of agency regulations and instructions for different periods, drawn principally from NKVD/MVD records held in GA RF. Although this volume provides far and away better documented information about the KGB and its predecessors than has been publicly available, it does not approach the level of detail in a textbook that agency itself issued for its training program in 1977. A copy of that still–top-secret publication, with excellent structural charts, a chronological guide, and citations to regulations and other documents in the KGB Central Archive, has recently become available in the West, although it has still not been declassified in Russia and hence not available to the compilers of the Russian 1997 volume.[306] Some basic survey and historical data about the FSB, SVR, and MVD archives has been published in various Russian sources, and more was made available to the compilers of the ArcheoBiblioBase directory, although to be sure that hardly constitutes the depth of treatment researchers need for these repositories that are so central to Soviet history.

In an even more open and revealing vein, an "Archive of Contemporary History" series provides item-level annotations for the high-interest "special files" from the NKVD/MVD Secretariat addressed to Iosef Stalin, Viacheslav Molotov, Nikita Khrushchev, and Lavrentii Beriia that are held in GA RF. These catalogues largely reproduce the internal document-by-document registers within individual bound volumes of files. Other catalogues in preparation will cover "special files" addressed to Georgii Malenkov and to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, extending coverage through 1959.[307] Earlier "special files" from the pre-1944 period remain inaccessible in the Central Archive of the Federal Security Service (TsA FSB). Regrettably, the MVD still controls the declassification process for records originating in that agency and its predecessors, including those already transferred to federal archives and already described in the published catalogues. The

---

[304] Mikhail G. Detkov, Aleksandr V. Borisov, et al. *Organy i voiska MVD Rossii: Kratkii istoricheskii ocherk* (Moscow: Ob"edinennaia redaktsiia MVD Rossii, 1996).

[305] *Lubianka: VChK–OGPU–NKVD–NKGB–MGB–MVD–KGB: 1917–1960: Spravochnik*, comp. A. I. Kokurin and N. V. Petrov, ed. R. G. Pikhoia (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyi fond "Demokratiia," 1997; "Rossiia. XX vek: Dokumenty," ed. A. N. Iakovlev). An additional reference aid, *Sanitarnaia sluzhba GULAGa (1932–1957 gg.): Spravochnik*, was announced as forthcoming in the series *Arkhivnyi-informatsionnyi biulleten'* in 1996, but was side tracked in the publication approval process. See also the earlier volume of normative documents about the organization of the Cheka/GPU, *VChK–GPU*, comp. Iurii Fel'shtinskii (Benson, VT: Chalidze Publications,"1989), drawn from materials found in the Hoover Institution of War, Revolution and Peace.

[306] *Istoriia sovetskikh organov gosudarstvennoi bezopasnosti: Uchebnik*, comp. V. V. Doroshenko et al., ed. V. M. Chebrikov et al. (Moscow,1977; Vyshaia krasnoznamennaia shkola KGB pri SM SSSR im. F. E. Dzerzhinskogo). A copy is available at the Davis Center for Russian Studies, Harvard University.

[307] *Arkhiv noveishei istorii Rossii: Katalog documentov*, ed. V A. Kozlov and S. V. Mironenko (Moscow, 1994–; distributed abroad by REES at the University of Pittsburgh). Vol. 1: *"Osobaiapapka" I. V. Stalina: Iz materially Sekretariata NKVD–MVD SSSR 1944-1953 gg.*; vol. 2: *"Osobaia papka" V. M. Molotova: Iz materialov Sekretariata NKVD–MVD SSSR 1944-1956 gg.*; vol. 3: *"Osobaia papka"N. S. Khrushcheva (1954-1956 gg.)*; and vol. 4: *"Osobaia papka" L. P. Berii*. A second volume of "special files" addressed to Beriia was scheduled to appear by the end of 1997, but had not been cleared for publication.

majority of documents listed in the Stalin and the Molotov "special files" catalogues are available for researchers in the GA RF reading room. However, in the case of the Beriia catalogue, as the deputy director of GA RF reported in 1995, the MVD "agreed to the declassification of only 700 documents out of 20,000 in Beriia's 'special files' for the 1946–1953" period; the lengthy review process greatly delayed that publication, and as of spring 1998, only the first volume covering the Beriia files appeared.[308] But despite the continued secret status of the files, the first volume of the published catalogue includes the still-classified documents, which are carefully wrapped in brown paper in the bound volumes readers are permitted to examine in the special secret-area GA RF reading room.

For regional archives outside of Moscow and St. Petersburg, economic stringencies have also severely limited the preparation and publication of new guides. In some cases, however, archives under regional administrations are doing better financially than their federal counterparts, and several new guides have appeared since 1991. Extensive funding by the Soros Foundation starting in 1997 promises more published guides to local former Communist Party archives, all of which are now under regional state administration. Details about these developments will be the subject of a subsequent review, as work progresses on the ArcheoBiblioBase directory for state and former Communist Party archives in the Russian Federation outside of Moscow and St. Petersburg.

Local archives within Moscow and St. Petersburg have also been devastated by the cutbacks in funding for reference work and publications. Nevertheless, several municipal and oblast-level archives have been finalizing new guides and progressing with other internal reference resources. A short list of fonds for the local St. Petersburg Central State Archive of Literature and Art (TsGALI SPb), obviously compiled earlier, appeared in 1991.[309] Those for the St. Petersburg Archive of Scientific-Technical Documentation (TsGANTD SPb) and the State Archive of Leningrad Oblast in Vyborg (LOGAV) are due to appear in 1998, but regrettably they are being issued in extremely limited pressruns, which will limit their circulation within Russia as well as abroad. A guide to the former local Communist Party archive in St. Petersburg has recently received Soros Foundation funding for publication. While that archive itself has been forced to close its doors to researchers temporarily in the process of moving from its previous home in the Smol'nyi Monastery compound to a new building nearby, at least when it reopens to the public, a new guide should be available to researchers. The only Moscow municipal repository to have issued a new guide, by contrast, is the archive for audiovisual documentation, now known as the Central Moscow Archive for Documents on Special Media (TsMADSN), which appeared in early 1997—in honor of the city's 850th anniversary.[310]

Mention should also be made of two new essential lists of archival holdings in institutes under the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, which have also found foreign publication sponsorship. A 1995 short guide to the historically rich Archive of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Russian History (SPbF IRI) lists all of the fonds (institutional records, personal papers, and other collections) together with their published finding aids for both the Russian and western European sectors. To be sure, the depth of

---

[308] As explained by GA RF Deputy Director Vladimir A. Kozlov and Ol'ga K. Lokteva, "'Arkhivnaia revoliutsiia' v Rossii (1991–1996)," *Svobodnaia mysl'*, 1997, no. 2 (February): 120.

[309] *Kratkii spravochnik po fondam Tsentral'nogo gosudarstvennogo arkhiva literatury i iskusstva Leningrada*, comp. A. K. Bonitenko et al. (Leningrad: LNPP "Oblik," 1991).

[310] *Tsentral'nyi Moskovskii arkhiv dokumentov na spetsial'nykh nositeliakh: Putevoditel'*, comp. L. I. Smirnova et al. (Moscow: Izd-vo ob"edineniia "Mosgorarkhiv," 1997).

coverage does not equal the much more detailed 1958 guide (now available on microfiche) to the institute's archival holdings, which was a model of scholarly archival guides unusual for the Soviet period. Nevertheless, 100 fonds are listed in the 1995 guide that were not covered earlier.[311]

The first comprehensive list of holdings in the Manuscript Division of the Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkinskii Dom—IRLI [PD]) was published in 1996 in a similar format. It includes all of the fonds of personal papers, institutional records, and other collections, including those in the Depository for Antiquities (*Drevlekhranilishche*) and the folklore archival holdings (except for the Sound Archive) under the Sector for Poetic Folk Art.[312] In both cases, English- and Russian-language introductions provide histories and surveys of the development of the archival holdings. They both list many more fonds than had been listed in the composite 1979 list of fonds in archival institutions under the Academy of Sciences. That now outdated earlier volume, despite its limitations, however, still provides the best starting point for holdings in other RAN institutes.[313] Accordingly, it is to be hoped that new guides—or at least similar updated lists of fonds—will follow for other RAN institutes and that they will eventually be combined in electronic form, to further facilitate searching. A similar new guide is being finalized for the extensive archival holdings of the Russian Geographic Society (RGO), but publication subsidy has not yet been secured.

During the Soviet period, the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library, heir to the world renowned Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg, which in 1992 was renamed the Russian National Library (RNB—*Rossiiskaia national'naia biblioteka*), had an enviable track record in terms of preparing finding aids for its rich archival holdings, as testified by retrospective bibliographies covering such publications, the latest of which appeared in 1996.[314] Unfortunately, most of the listings appeared in in-house, poorly printed editions with limited pressruns of only 100 or 200 copies. The four-volume guide to RNB archival fonds was reissued in a 1994 facsimile edition in New York, but regrettably there was no attempt to update the coverage, improve indexing, or add bibliography of related reference works.[315] Now that other earlier RNB reference publications are brought together in a

---

[311] [Sankt-Peterburgskii filial Instituta rossiiskoi istorii], *Fondy i kollektsii arkhiva: Kratkii spravochnik*, comp. G. A. Pobedimova and N. B. Sredinskaia, ed. Iu. N. Bespiatykh and M. P. Iroshnikov (St. Petersburg: "Blits," 1995). Cf. the 1958 guide, *Putevoditel' po arkhivu Leningradskogo otdeleniia Instituta istorii* (Leningrad, 1958; microfiche=IDC-R-10,957).

[312] [Institut russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii Dom) RAN], *Fondy i kollektsii Rukopisnogo otdela: Kratkii spravochnik/ Funds and Collections, Manuscript Department: Directory*, comp. V. P. Budaragin and M. V. Rofiukova; preface by T. S. Tsar'kova (St. Petersburg: "Blits," 1996).

[313] *Kratkii spravochnik po nauchno-otraslevym i memorial'nym arkhivam AN SSSR*, ed. B. V. Levshin (Moscow: "Nauka,"1979). A microfiche edition would be desireable at least until an updated and expanded version can be prepared.

[314] *Izdaniia Rossiiskoi natsional'noi biblioteki (Gosudarstvennoi Publichnoi bibliotekiim. M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina) za 1983–1994 gg.: Bibliograficheskii ukazatel'*, comp. E. V. Tikhonova and E. L. Kokorina, ed. G. V. Mikheeva (St. Petersburg: Izd-vo RNB, 1996), manuscript fonds, pp. 17–28, which also includes analytics for the numerous GPB series of collected articles about the division holdings. A separate 220-page 1990 bibliography covers only the Manuscript Division publications and updates the earlier 1971 edition: *Rukopisnye fondy Publichnoi biblioteki: Pechatnye katalogi, obzory, istoriko-metodicheskie materialy*, comp. N. A. Zubkova, ed. V. D. Chursin, 2d ed. (Leningrad: GPB, 1990).

[315] *Annotirovannyi ukazatel' rukopisnykh fondov GPB im. M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina: Fondy russkikh deiatelei XVIII–XX vv.*, comp. R. B. Zaborova et al., ed. V. I. Afanas'ev, 4 vols. (Leningrad: GPB, 1981–1985; reprint ed.: New York: Norman Ross Publishers, 1994).

comprehensive bibliography, many of them deserve reissue in lower-cost microform or electronic editions so that they can be more widely available to researchers. New reference publications have been continuing in the Division of Manuscripts since 1991 (with greatly improved typography), and 1995 saw the start of a major new publication series by the RNB Manuscript Division, *Rukopisnye pamiatniki*, as an outlet for both published documents and descriptive reference work.[316]

Meanwhile, in the Russian State Library (RGB—*Gosudarsvennaia biblioteka Rossii* [former Lenin Library]) in Moscow, reference publications have come to almost a complete halt since 1991, having fallen victim to the serious administrative problems that have paralyzed that library. As of 1 October 1997, the Manuscript Division itself closed its doors for a thorough re-inventory of its holdings, following a negative report by a Ministry of Culture investigating commission that contained allegations of serious operational deficiencies, including many missing manuscripts. In contrast to the many reference publications and new manuscript series issued by RNB, regrettably, only a single volume of the distinguished *Zapiski* of the GBL/GBR Manuscript Division has appeared since 1991.[317]

Also of note among the new generation of finding aids describing lesser-known archival materials in Petersburg, the Hermitage has issued two more brochures describing its own archives, supplementing the guide that was issued in 1988.[318] The Russian Institute for the History of Art (RIII) recently issued the long-promised updated edition of its guide, which meets expectations with its expanded coverage of 133 of its personal fonds and collections, particularly rich in theater and music holdings.[319]

Likewise in Moscow, the M. I. Glinka State Central Museum of Music Culture has reissued an expanded first part of a guide to its holdings, with detailed annotations of 64 personal and institutional fonds and collections.[320] Unfortunately, however, since the guide was issued in an extremely limited pressrun of only 300 copies, it is not being offered for public sale and hence will immediately be on the rare book list. Meanwhile, however, an extensive guide to archival holdings in the Bakhrushin Theater Museum, completed several years ago, has still not found publication subsidy and is also not being made available to researchers. Likewise the long-promised guide to the rich archival holdings in the Tret'iakov Galley has not yet appeared in print.

---

[316] Published by RNB, four volumes (in five parts) have appeared as of mid-1997. For full description of these and other new reference publications, see the bibliographic coverage in the forthcoming English edition of *Archives of Russia*, under **G–15**.

[317] *Zapiski Otdela rukopisei*, vol. 50, ed. V. I. Losev (Moscow: GBR, 1995); vol. 49 appeared in 1990. None of the promised five-volume series describing Slavonic manuscript collections in the Manuscript Division have appeared since the second part of vol. 1 in1986.

[318] *Lichnye arkhivnye fondy Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha*, comp.G. I. Kachalina and *Fotoarkhiv Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha: Spravochnik-putevoditel'* (St. Petersburg, 1992). See also *Arkhiv Gosudarstvennogo Ordena Lenina Ermitazha: Putevoditel'*, comp. G. I. Kachalina and E. M. Iakovleva (Leningrad,1988).

[319] *Putevoditel' po Kabinetu rukopisei Rossiiskogo instituta istorii iskusstv*, comp. O. L. Dansker and G. V. Kopytova, ed. A. Ia. Al'tshuller, 2d ed. (St. Petersburg, 1996). The new guide considerably expands and updates the 1984 guide to what was then the LGITMiK Cabinet of Archival Fonds.

[320] [Gosudarstvennyi tsentral'nyi muzei muzykal'noi kul'tury im. M. I. Glinki], *Putevoditel' po fondam: Otdel arkhivno-rukopisnykh materialov*, comp. and ed. T. G. Keldysh (Moscow: GTsMMK im. M. I. Glinki, 1997). This updates the earlier and much briefer 1974 edition list of fonds acquired before 1972.

Most significant in terms of archival publications among Moscow museums are the handsome new editions from the State Historical Museum (GIM), including an anniversary collection of articles covering many of its holdings indifferent divisions.[321] After almost fifteen years of renovation, GIM itself formally reopened in September 1997, honoring the 850th Moscow anniversary celebration. At last the rich Manuscript Division has opened in its new facilities in the building of the former Lenin Museum. While long officially closed to scholars, it nonetheless completed a new expanded edition of its survey description of its major manuscript collections.[322] The Division of Written Sources, which houses more traditional archival materials and which had remained open in a more distant location, has issued two recent volumes of surveys and publications based on its holdings—one devoted to Russian science and culture and the other to military history, expanding coverage of the initial collection that appeared in1978.[323] The publications for these few museums mentioned, it should be pointed out, represent only the tip of the iceberg, in terms of archival materials found in museums throughout the Russian Federation, and particularly in Moscow and St. Petersburg. Few other museums have issued guides describing their archival holdings, although many survey articles and general museum guides have appeared.[324]

Opisi and Other Finding Aids in Microform.

Soviet archival practice required all state archives to prepare internal inventories (*opisi*) listing all of the file units in a given fond; those fonds not processed accordingly could not be made available to readers. *Opisi* continue as the backbone of internal arrangement and description within individual fonds in post-Soviet Russian archival practice, listing as they do individual file units numbered consecutively within the *opis'*. At one and the same time *opisi* provide essential administrative control for all file units, subdivisions for particular groups of materials within the fond (although not always rationally divided or designated accordingly), and the primary finding aid for researchers. Normally, *opisi* can be consulted only after the researcher has been registered to work in the archival reading room. Only starting in 1988 were foreign researchers finally permitted to consult *opisi* in state archives administered by Glavarkhiv. Before then, trusted Soviet archivists were expected to provide accepted researchers with only those files that they, the ideologically well-trained archivists, deemed "relevant" to the approved research topic.

---

[321] *Istoricheskii muzei—entsiklopediia otechestvennoi istorii i kul'tury (Zabeinskie nauchnye chteniia 1993 goda)*, ed. V. L. Egorov (Moscow: GIM, 1995; *Trudy GIM*, vol. 87). Includes surveys and source analyses of materials in the Division of Manuscripts and Early Printed Books, the Division of Written Sources, and the Division of Graphic Materials.

[322] Tat'iana Nikolaevna Protas'eva and Marfa Viacheslavovna Shchepkina, *Sokrovishcha drevnei pis'mennosti i staroi pechati: Obzor rukopisei russkikh, slavianskikh, grecheskikh, a takzhe knig staroi pechati Gosudarstvennogo istoricheskogo muzeia*, ed. T. V. Dianova, 2d ed. (Moscow, 1995). Updates the first edition with the same title, ed. M. N. Tikhomirov (Moscow, "Sovetskaia Rossiia," 1958; *Pamiatniki kul'tury*, vol. 30; microfiche=IDC-R-11,018).

[323] *Pis'mennye istochniki v sobranii GIM*, ed. A. K. Afanas'ev, Pt. 2, *Materialy po istorii kul'tury i nauki v Rossii* (Moscow: GIM, 1993), Pt. 3: *Materialy po voennoi istorii Rossii* (Moscow: GIM, 1997). Both volumes were issued in the series *Trudy GIM*.

[324] See other composite listings in *Archives of Russia*, Pt. H.

Today, by contrast, in many state archives, *opisi* are being shelved in or near the reading room, where they are immediately available to all researchers. The former Central Party Archive (now RTsKhIDNI—**B–12**) was one of the first to move in that direction and to list all *opisi* in its published guide. Although *opisi* are also listed in the new guide to the pre-revolutionary Foreign Ministry archive (AVPRI—**C–3**), *opisi* are still not openly available for all fonds in its post-revolutionary counterpart because AVP RF (**C–2**), like many Russian archives, still close or blank out parts of *opisi* describing secret files. The newly opened archive of the Federal Security Service (TsA FSB—**C–6**), heir to major central files of the KGB and its predecessors, does not make inventories available to any researchers. Nevertheless, for foreigners who were forced to work without any *opisi* at all in almost all central state archives under Glavarkhiv before 1989, there is good reason for emphasizing positive reform.

Even more significant for researchers today, in the case of two of the most politically important contemporary federal archives—GA RF (**B–1**), and RTsKhIDNI (**B–12**)—a large percentage of the *opisi* for Soviet-period fonds have been microfilmed as part of the Hoover–Chadwyck-Healey project. *Opisi* for two fonds in TsKhSD are also included in the project. The high cost of the microfilms offered for sale by Chadwyck-Healey has so far greatly limited the number of libraries that have been able to afford them. Nevertheless, depository copies are now available for consultation at the Hoover Institution and the Library of Congress in the United States, and several library consortiums and other libraries that have purchased all or part of the collection, as have a number of libraries elsewhere in the world. Researchers should not expect to find copies of the microfilms available in Russia, however. Under the terms of the original agreement, Rosarkhiv retains the right to distribute free or lower-cost copies within Russia and the CIS, but additional subsidy would still be needed to make this a reality, because libraries or archives in Russia and other newly independent states can hardly afford the cost of the microforms, despite their importance as basic research aids. An extra copy of the microforms is also being furnished for an archival information center in Novosibirsk. Thus far in Russia, however, there are no provisions for distribution of copies to other libraries or archives within the Russian Federation, nor have such possibilities been extended to those in the newly independent States, despite the fact that many of the records of central Soviet institutions described also constitute a part of the "joint archival heritage" of all the former Soviet republics.

Given the specificity of *opis'*-level descriptions, microform publication of *opisi* needs to be combined with appropriate indications in basic guides and/or fond-level descriptive lists (ideally with electronic accessibility), so that researchers will know what *opisi* are (or are not) available and which they may need to access. So far neither Chadwyck-Healey nor the Hoover Institution has addressed this reference need. Chadwyck-Healey has printed a sales catalogue in English and Russian editions, listing the names (and numbers) of fonds for which microform *opisi* and document series are being offered for sale, and a more complete update is now available on the Internet.[325] Regrettably, however, this in

[325] See the 1995 Chadwyck-Healey catalogue (in both English and Russian editions): *Archives of the Soviet Communist Party and Soviet State: Catalogue of Finding Aids and Documents*, introduction by Jana Howlett ([Cambridge, Eng.], 1995); Russian edition: *Arkhivy KPSS i sovetskogo gosudarstva: Katalog opisei i dokumentov* ([Cambridge, Eng.], 1995).

See also the printed 1996 supplement and the 1997 edition on the Chadwyck-Healey website, which list more of the documentary series now available. From TsKhSD, only *opisi* and files from the Committee

and of itself does not serve as an adequate finding aid for the microfilmed *opisi*. The English-language edition does not include the original Russian names of fonds, and neither edition identifies the number of *opisi* within each fond (nor the dates of files included within each *opis'*) that are available on microfilm. Most regrettably, there has been no coordination between the filming project and the production of the newly published guides to RTsKhIDNI and GA RF. As a result, these otherwise crucial guides do not indicate those fonds for which the described *opisi* are available on microform. Western libraries that have acquired the collection accordingly face serious difficulties in making the *opisi* intellectually accessible to researchers, because rarely do they undertake item-level cataloguing within a microform collection of this type. Currently, as a prime example, the Library of Congress microform cataloguing data lists only the collection as a whole.[326] What is needed today for those libraries that purchase the microfilmed *opisi* is a special annotated edition (preferably in electronic form) of the new guides to RTsKhIDNI and GA RF (including the forthcoming list of fonds and Soviet-period coverage), indicating those fonds for which microfilmed *opisi* are available and noting the numbers of any individual *opisi* omitted from the microfilms.

In the more optimistic mood of 1992, Rosarkhiv (then Roskomarkhiv) announced its readiness, "as financial resources permit, to produce microfilms of *opisi* and catalogues in other archives for wide distribution."[327] Such a program would be a crucial aid and stimulus to scholarship in many fields, both within Russia and abroad, for it would increase researcher awareness of archival holdings and permit efficient planning before undertaking long and expensive trips to the repositories themselves. But a number of international scandals, together with political and patriotic criticism of the Rosarkhiv-Hoover project and other foreign-subsidized microform ventures, however, brought a backlash of caution and an attempt at greater control by Rosarkhiv. Since then, it has been much more difficult to launch such projects, and foreign publishers are finding more road blocks in the way of signed agreements.[328]

Public criticism of foreign microform projects from resurgent Russian nationalist sources, along with the "special relationship" developed by then Rosarkhiv Chairman Rudolf G. Pikhoia with the Hoover–Chadwyck-Healey project, unfortunately contributed to Rosarkhiv's hesitancy to proceed with several other proposed foreign-sponsored reference projects, and to turn their back on agreements already underwritten by several individual archives. For example, when interest in the newly opened CPSU archives was at a peak in the summer of 1992, Roskomarkhiv turned down a proposal from a western publisher to computerize the massive card files and indexes to pre-1980 Politburo protocols, which could have greatly improved reference access to major groups of

---

for Party Control (fond 6) have been filmed, as well as a complete microfilm edition of the *opisi (perecheni)* for fond 89. An expanded 1997 catalogue can be found on the Internet. CONTACT: (from the USA): http://www.chadwyck.com; (outside the USA): http://www.chadwyck.co.uk. See also the website of the Hoover Institution.

[326] This deficiency, in terms of the documentary series, is being remedied by the Hoover Institution, where specialists are preparing a series of guides to the documents filmed. Typescript guides are already completed for the documents filmed from fond 89 in TsKhSD and fond 17 (Politburo records) in RTsKhIDNI. Hoover archival specialists are prepared to answer reference questions. CONTACT: http://www-hoover.stanford.edu.

[327] Vladimir P. Kozlov, "Preface," *Archives in Russia, Moscow and St. Petersburg: A Preliminary Directory*, ed. Patricia Kennedy Grimsted (Princeton: IREX, 1992; updated edition,1993), vii.

[328] Many of these issues are discussed above, chap. 11.

Communist Party records in TsKhSD and RTsKhIDNI. The immediate excuse, in this case, was public criticism in a politicized milieu. But Rosarkhiv Chairman Pikhoia's favored status for the Hoover Institution project and his fear of opening the Russian archival market to competing publishers played a large role. Hence even today, since there is only one copy of the unique card files in a lower basement of TsKhSD, they cannot be readily made available to researchers, let alone to archivists in RTsKhIDNI, which now houses the pre-1953 protocols and an increasing number of their appended materials.

Later that fall, Roskomarkhiv also turned down a proposal for comprehensive filming, including *opisi* and other reference materials, for "trophy archives" in TsKhIDK (**B–15**), which would also have greatly advanced their identification and research availability. The reasons there for rejection were somewhat more understandable: A large percentage of the *opisi* were not prepared according to professional standards. Because they covered foreign-language materials and were prepared quickly for intelligence and special police analysis, many of the materials were not even arranged appropriately in fonds according to their creating agencies, which in many cases were not even correctly identified. TsKhIDK specialists and Rosarkhiv itself were accordingly not prepared to release these materials to the international market, and open themselves to even further criticism and uproar from countries that claim the archives described.[329]

What is nonetheless important for future information systems is the fact that many such valuable reference facilities exist in Russian archives, even if they may not always be publicly accessible or up to international professional standards. Even if the obligatory file-level inventories (*opisi*) are still not readily available to all researchers for World War II and postwar occupation records in the Central Archive of the Ministry of Defense (TsAMO—**C–4**), file-level inventories do not even exist at all for comparable military records in the U.S. National Archives. Ironically, most of the comparable American records themselves are much more freely open to researchers who are prepared to take the time to sift laboriously through the boxes upon boxes brought out to them, a few hours after they are ordered, on archival trucks (with up to 20 boxes at a time), in hopes of finding the needed documents within the inadequately described files and frequently inadequately labeled boxes. In most cases today, in the U.S., readers are also free to copy an unlimited number of documents they find, using self-service machines in the reading room for ten cents a page—in radical contrast to the situation in Russian archives. Nevertheless, despite the lingering limitations and higher level of control in Russian archives, Russian archivists can take pride in the fact that, as the Rosarkhiv directory of reference facilities and work on the ABB directory project has shown, the level of descriptive information available in Russian archives under Rosarkhiv, as well as those under many other agencies, is well above that found in many comparable Western repositories.

Long cut off from foreign reference facilities, Russian critics of the Hoover project and other foreign-sponsored reference ventures appear unaware of the fact that widespread production and distribution of archival finding aids on microform has been practiced for

[329] The present author, who served as a consultant for that proposed project, had the opportunity to appraise many sample *opisi* in TsKIDK and had to admit that, in fact, it was not appropriate to circulate them widely abroad without considerable remedial work and better identification, which was not feasible under the circumstances.

several decades in a number of Western countries. In some countries it has been done by the archives themselves as a public service and for preservation purposes, in other cases, with responsible commercial subsidy. For example, earlier Chadwyck-Healey prepared microform copies of almost all the internal finding aids in the Archives Nationales in France, including special sections for personal papers and fine arts, and the catalogues of the Western section of the Manuscript Department of the Bibliothèque Nationale, among many others, all of which are now commercially available to libraries or archives throughout the world. No one has complained that such a project has proved unfair competition for French scholars. Never has there been a complaint that the foreign distribution of such microform finding aids is "harmful to the national interests" of France, or that Chadwyck-Healey is "selling off the national patrimony," such as has been heard in Russia about the Hoover project and other archival reference ventures. Quite to the contrary, they have been highly praised in the library and archival world, and have become models for similar undertakings in other countries.

As a much more ambitious program of microform reference aids for archives and manuscript repositories throughout the United States, Chadwyck-Healey has been underwriting the *National Inventory of Documentary Sources* (NIDS), combining microfiche editions of unpublished (or out-of-print) finding aids for archival repositories (including libraries, museums, and even some private collections) throughout the country with CD-ROM indexes, under the editorship of a leading American archivist, Frank G. Burke, who, after many years directing the National Archives, recently retired from the archival training program at the University of Maryland. A parallel NIDS program has been progressing for nine years in the United Kingdom and Ireland, already embracing some 14,000 unpublished finding aids in 120 record offices, libraries, museums, and private collections.[330]

While budgetary shortfalls (inspiring the search for higher profits) and reactionary political outcry may continue to restrict microform or electronic copies of unpublished reference materials in some sensitive contemporary Russian archives, microform reference publication projects are nonetheless progressing. As an example of increasing reference access in repositories outside of Rosarkhiv, an American publisher has filmed the entire card catalogue in the Music Library of the St. Petersburg Rimskii-Korsakov Conservatory, an extensive section of which describes many manuscript music scores and other important music-related archival materials.[331] And as of April 1998, an initial contract for a new round of archival filming has been signed by the major library publisher Primary Source Media (the successor of Research Publications International—RPI), which

[330] In the case of the U.S. NIDS project, Chadwyck-Healey regularly issues the *NIDS Newsletter*, informing libraries and the research public about continuing additions to the microform collection of finding aids. The latest issue of the *NIDS Newsletter*, no. 18 (October 1996) is available on the Internet. See more information about the forthcoming *ArchivesUSA* project below. Listings of the Chadwyck-Healey catalogue information about microform collections of finding aids from the USA and other countries can be accessed by subject or alphabetically at the website noted in fn. 323. See Michael E. Unsworth, "A Review of the *National Inventory of Documentary Sources* in the United States," *Microform Review* 15:4 (Fall 1986): 232–39. Shorter review notices appeared in the *American Historical Review* 93:1 (1988): 224–25; and the *American Archivist* 50:3 (1987): 420, and 51:1/2 (1988): 154.

[331] The Conservatory catalogue (published in New York by Norman Ross), consisting of 312 microfiche, sells for $2,000. CONTACT: http://www.nross.com.

promises to produce high-quality reference aids along with a wide range of documentary sources on microform and/or electronic media.

Even in connection with the politically sensitive Comintern archives in RTsKhIDNI, production of microfiche editions of the records of Comintern congresses and plenums has been completed, enhanced by sophisticated multilingual electronic finding aids for the files included. Now a CD-ROM is in preparation that will bring together all of the *opisi* in German and English translation, as well as Russian.[332] An even more sophisticated electronic access system for the entire Comintern Archive got underway in RTsKhIDNI during 1997 under the auspices of the International Council on Archives and the Council of Europe, in this case by providing descriptive titles of individual files and scanned images of *opisi* and selected documents. Using a state-of-the art computerized technology specially adapted for the Comintern Archive, the project will take a number of years to realize, but the result will be the most advanced archival information retrieval system yet to be introduced in Russia.[333]

As publishing and reprint costs rise, Russia undoubtedly needs to invest more heavily in microform and electronic media for both unpublished finding aids and new publications alike, to say nothing of reprints of quality finding aids produced in earlier periods. While many archival repositories lack funds for printed editions of new guides, or lack the staff to prepare quality updated editions, or the electronic resources for reference productions, microfiche production could be a cost-effective interim solution to immediate reference needs.

Even at the height of the Cold War, and well before NIDS was started in the United States and the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union was one of the first countries to be covered with microform editions of out-of-print *Archival Finding Aids on Microfiche*. The pilot project was produced by Inter Documentation Company (IDC) between 1976 and 1988 in three series and included over 1,250 predominantly published guides, inventories, and catalogues of all kinds of manuscripts for repositories in Moscow and Leningrad, the Baltic countries and Belarus, and Ukraine and Moldova. All of these were correlated with bibliographic listings in the published Grimsted archival directory series. Presently IDC is planning an updated, electronic catalogue of those microfiche editions to be coordinated with the new ArcheoBiblioBase directory.[334] Although coverage of

---

[332] *Comintern Archive: A look behind the scenes on microfiche*, ed. Kirill M. Anderson (Leiden: Inter Documentation Company [IDC], 1994–). Complete files have been reproduced from the records of seven Comintern congresses and plenums (1919–1935) with sophisticated finding aids. Further information is available electronically on the IDC website. CONTACT: URL: http://www.idc.nl; Fax: (31 [0]71) 513 17 21; E-mail: info@idc.nl.

[333] More details of the program have recently been published by RTsKhIDNI director Kyrill M. Anderson, "Novyi oblik Arkhiva Kominterna," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1998, no. 1, pp. 17–20. An initial brochure announcing the project has been released by the ICA, "Les Archives du Komintern: Une Histoire qui intéresse le monde" (Paris, 1997). The agreement was first announced in Russia in a report by P. A. Smidovich, "O vizite v Moskvu general'nogo sekretaria Mezhdunarodnogo soveta arkhivov Sh. Kechkemeti i spetsial'nogo sovetnika Soveta Evropy Dz. Vitiello," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 4, p.101.

[334] *Archives and Manuscript Collections in the USSR: Finding Aids on Microfiche*, Series 1: *Moscow and Leningrad*, ed. Patricia Kennedy Grimsted (Aug, Switzerland: IDC, 1976), correlated with the Grimsted 1972 directory published by Princeton University Press and the 1976 Supplement 1: *Bibliographic Addenda*, published simultaneously by IDC; Series 2: *Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Belorussia* (1981); Series 3: *Soviet Ukraine and Moldavia* (Leiden: IDC, 1989). Both of the latter collections were correlated with the Grimsted directories published simultaneously by Princeton University Press. The IDC order

subsequent archival publications was not continued, it is nevertheless to be hoped that the project can be revived and even expanded to include previously classified guides, typescripts, and eventually even *opisi* and other unpublished finding aids on the contemporary model of the Chadwyck-Healey microfiche reference project, "National Inventory of Documentary Sources" (NIDS), actively underway in the United States and Great Britain.

New Inter-Repository Subject Guides

Among the many more specialized reference aids that have been produced in the last five years, several provide subject-related, inter-archival fond-level directory coverage. For example, the Russian Orthodox Church subsidized VNIIDAD coverage of church-related holdings that were taboo under Soviet rule. Two inter-archival directories have appeared—one listing fonds in repositories in Moscow and St. Petersburg, and the other covering regional state archives through out the Russian Federation.[335] Neither is comprehensive, and the latter coverage of local archives is based only on the incomplete data that were available in Soviet-era published guides. More depth of coverage is presented in the companion Moscow-St. Petersburg directory, but again much of the data have not been verified directly, and only one repository is covered outside the system of federal and local state archives. Two other new church-related reference aids produced by the same VNIIDAD group, locating, respectively, records of Orthodox consistories and monasteries in state archives throughout the Russian Federation, have been released in a primitive electronic format. A more sophisticated computer format would make the data more easily accessible in a variety of platforms, and these directories would benefit from updated information and more thorough, scholarly efforts.[336] Yet despite serious limitations, all of these new VNIIDAD directories nonetheless represent important efforts to identify sources in this earlier repressed subject area.

---

numbers are also included in the bibliographic listings in the new *Archives of Russia* directory, and plans call for more of the specialized finding aids available on microfiche to be listed in a separate electronic correlation table.

[335] *Istoriia Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi v dokumentakh federal'nykh arkhivov Rossii, Moskvy i Sankt-Peterburga: Annotirovannyi spravochnik-ukazatel'*, comp. M. P. Zhukova et al, ed. Arkhimandrit Innokentii (Prosvirnin) and O. V. Kurochkina (Moscow: Izd. Novospasskogo monastyria, 1995; VNIIDAD). A 1993 volume provides schematic coverage of fonds in regional state archives, but only on the basis of earlier listings in already published guides: *Istoriia Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi v dokumentakh regional'nykh arkhivov Rossii: Annotirovannyi spravochnik-ukazatel*', comp. M. P. Zhukova et al, ed. Innokentii Prosvirnin and O. V. Kurochkina (Moscow: Izd. Novospasskogo monastyria, 1993; VNIIDAD). See the review by Evgenii V. Starost in, then director of the Historico-Archival Institute, in *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1994, no. 5, pp.126–27. Unfortunately, the compilers did not even have at their disposal a complete collection of guides to regional archives, nor even access to many of those available only in typescript.

[336] *Eparkhii russkoi pravoslavnoi tserkvi v Rossii: Annotirovannyi ukazatel' fondov dukhovnykh konsistorii po gosudarstvennym arkhivam Rossiiskoi Federatsii*, comp. M. V. Bel'dova et al. (Moscow,1996; typescript deposited in VNIIDAD, no. 164–96) and, for monasteries: *Monastyri russkoi pravoslavnoi tserkvi v Rossii: Annotirovannyi ukazatel' fondov gosudarstvennykh arkhivov Rossiiskoi Federatsii*, comp. M. V. Bel'dova et al. (Moscow: VNIIDAD, 1996; typescript deposited in SIF OTsNTIVNIIDAD, no. 163–96). Both texts are available for sale in electronic format in the Russian word-processing program Leksikon.

A more ambitious, comprehensive database for Orthodox Church sources was started simultaneously at the Center for Archival Research of the Historico-Archival Institute of the Russian State University for the Humanities (IAI RGGU). Unlike the VNIIDAD effort, the Historico-Archival Institute survey has amassed fresh data with questionnaires received from archival repositories throughout the Russian Federation. Coverage of holdings in Moscow, much more extensive than the VNIIDAD volume, is being entered in a database. Unfortunately, however, since Church authorities preferred to subsidize the VNIIDAD project, which promised a quicker, even if much less thorough product, coordination between VNIIDAD and IAI and use of the IAI data was not possible. Now lack of adequate staff and funding for IAI make it unlikely that the potentially valuable new data already gathered there will soon be available to researchers.[337]

Indicative of the newly declassified materials concerning church history in federal archives is the recent document-level finding aid (the first two parts of a promised series) with annotated lists of documents from files in the records of the Council for Religious Cults under the Council of Ministers of the USSR, which are now held by GA RF (**B–1**).[338] While some revealing documentary publications have appeared, yet to be described, however, are the records of the Russian Patriarchate during the Soviet regime and related files relating to the Orthodox Church maintained by the KGB and other security services. A number of foreign researchers who have wanted to work in the archive of the Patriarchate have as yet not been able to obtain even a basic description of what holdings are now available under the Church itself.

Comparatively more extensive specialized guides and inter-archival directories of Jewish-related materials in many Russian archives have appeared recently, and more are in preparation. Most extensive and best financed is the Jewish Archival Survey, a systematic survey of Jewish-related sources throughout the former USSR, with a computerized database at IAI RGGU. The survey is part of Project Judaica, undertaken in collaboration with the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research and the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York, with additional support from other foreign sources. Publications already include a survey listing of Jewish-related fonds throughout the Russian Federation, Belarus, and Ukraine, and a substantial guide to Jewish-related holdings in Moscow.

The most extensive publication to date from Project Judaica is the 1997 Russian-language directory (or guide) covering Jewish-related materials in twenty-nine Moscow repositories with detailed annotations of individual fonds from the IAI RGGU database. The directory appeared in February 1998, opening information access to many previously suppressed materials relating to Jews and Jewish affairs.[339] Coverage extends to 12 federal archives, 2 ministerial archives (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), the Archive of Russian Academy of Sciences (RAN) and two RAN institutes, three municipal archives, and selected holdings in the manuscript division of 1 library (RGB) and 6 museums.

---

[337] Since VNIIDAD promised speedier production and had staff ready, the Moscow Patriarchate chose to fund the VNIIDAD project instead.

[338] *Arkhiv Soveta po delam religioznykh kul'tov pri SM SSSR (1944–1965 gg.): Katalog dokumentov*, comp. M. I. Odintsov, pts. 1 and 2 (Moscow, 1996), published as *Arkhivno-informatsionnyi biulleten'* (Supplement to *Istoricheskii arkhiv*), nos. 11 and 12.

[339] *Dokumenty po istorii i kul'ture evreev v arkhivakh Moskvy: Putevoditel'*, comp. and ed. M. S. Kupovetskii, E. V. Starostin, and Marek Web (Moscow: RGGU, 1997; Project Judaica), with an added English-language title page and introduction, *Jewish Documentary Sources in Moscow Archives: A Guide*.

Indexes of personal, geographic, and institutional names enhance the reference utility. It would have been helpful to include bibliographic data about published guides, surveys, and more detailed finding aids for the materials described, along with notes about the reference facilities covering the materials in the archives themselves, but hopefully such information has been retained in the database. An appendix lists additional fonds not described in detail "due to reasons beyond the editor's control" (preface p. 18), but it is not clear why many of these were not included, or why at least a brief annotation could not have been provided for at least some of those. For example, many of the Jewish "trophy" fonds in the former top-secret Special Archive, now TsKhIDK (**B–15**) have already been surveyed preliminarily by specialists from the U.S. Holocaust Museum in Washington, DC, and copies of Holocaust-related documentation are available there on microfilm. Many of the Jewish holdings in TsKhIDK are also listed in the preliminary lists of fonds in that archive mentioned above that are now available on the Internet. Nevertheless, such omissions should not lessen appreciation for the tremendous efforts that have gone into this first major publication of Project Judaica. Research has not been completed for the St. Petersburg counterpart due to the disastrous physical problems in the two Petersburg historical archives, RGIA (**B–3**) and the local Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg (TsGIA SPb—**D–12**). Two initial booklets published separately but produced with Project Judaica funding, annotate institutional and personal fonds containing Hebraica and Judaica in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Archive of the Academy of Sciences and provide a sample of the depth of coverage being prepared. Plans still call for similar coverage of Ukrainian and Belarussian collections.

An earlier 1994 brief Russian-language list of fonds prepared by Dmitrii A. El'iashevich, one of the scholars who assisted with the Project Judaica database, was issued in St. Petersburg under sponsorship of the newly established Petersburg Jewish University; it includes 938 fonds in 92 different repositories in 61 cities of the former USSR.[340] A portion of that coverage also appeared in an English-language directory prepared from the Project Judaica database, augmented by other listings, with a total of 1,034 fonds covering repositories throughout Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus.[341] Although there is considerable overlap between the English and Russian publications, many fonds are listed in only one, and for those included in both, there is some variation in the data provided, thus making it essential for researchers to compare the two separate publications. The Moscow listings in both cases, to be sure, are now superseded by the 1997 volume.

Now that the initial Moscow Project Judaica guide is out in print, it is to be hoped that there can soon be public access to the database at the Center for Archival Research (IAI RGGU) in Moscow, but no such provisions have been announced. A copy of the Project Judaica database is also available at the YIVO Archive in New York City, where there were earlier plans for uploading of the database of the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN).[342] So far, however, there is no indication of plans to make the database

[340] Dmitrii A. El'iashevich, *Dokumental'nye materialy po istorii evreev v arkhivakh SNG i stran Baltiki: Predvaritel'nyi spisok arkhivnykh fondov/ Documentary Sources on Jewish History in the Archives of the CIS and the Baltic States: Preliminary List of Collections* (St. Petersburg: Akropol', 1994).

[341] *Jewish Documentary Sources in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus: A Preliminary List*, ed. Dorit Sallis and Marek Web (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1996).

[342] Consultations on the basis of database can be arranged at the YIVO Archive in New York City. CONTACT: Marek Web, Chief Archivist; Tel.: (212) 246-6080; Fax: (212) 734-1062).

available electronically, and it is not clear how researchers can access supplemental information.

This is even more regrettable, because survey efforts by other Jewish studies groups now yield a number of sometimes overlapping, but occasionally supplemental listings. Of particular note, a group of young Russian enthusiasts, centered around the Jewish Heritage Society (Obshchestvo "Evreiskoe nasledie") in Moscow earlier produced extensive preliminary coverage based on their own independent survey efforts. An initial pamphlet lists relevant fonds throughout the former USSR, while specialized pamphlets annotate selected fonds in three major Moscow archives—RGADA (**B–2**), RGVIA (**B–4**), and RGALI (**B–7**).[343] The coverage of these pamphlets is now almost completely superseded by the new Project Judaica 1997 guide, which covers even more Jewish-related materials in these and in much more depth. Nevertheless, serious researchers will want to consult the pamphlets as well, since the descriptions of the Jewish materials in some of the fonds diverge with occasional supplemental data, or even whole fonds, not described in the Project Judaica volume. The society itself has now established a website with information about their projects and publications. This site also offers fond-level listings of relevant materials in several other Moscow archives that are now available for downloading—some of them overlapping, some of them supplementing, the Project Judaica database and 1997 Moscow guide.[344]

The Jewish Heritage Society has also been active in Ukraine, and has already produced several pamphlets covering Jewish related holdings in Ukrainian repositories, notably the Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Art, the Manuscript Division of the T. Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in Kyiv, the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in L'viv, and the State Archive of Zhitomyr Oblast, as well as a description of the collections of *pinquasim* (communal record books) in the Manuscript Division of the Vernads'kyi National Library of Ukraine (formerly the Central Scientific Library—TsNB) of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in Kyiv. They have also provided a pamphlet brief coverage of relevant fonds in the State Archive of Hrodno Oblast in Belarus.

In yet another published survey, the émigré Jewish archivist, Genrikh M. Deych (Deich), who during the Soviet period compiled data about pre-revolutionary Jewish-related holdings in RGIA in St. Petersburg (which could not be published then in the USSR), has made his findings available in a volume edited by an American specialist. That volume also lists Jewish-related fonds in a number of other Russian archives.[345] The

---

[343] See the initial pamphlet, *Obzor dokumental'nykh istochnikov po istorii evreev v arkhivakh SNG: Tsentral'nye gosudarstvennye arkhivy, gosudarstvennye oblastnye arkhivy Rossiiskoi Federatsii*, comp. Vasilii Shchedrin et al. (Moscow: "Evreiskoe nasledie," 1994; "Evreiskii arkhiv," no. 1). Separate printed pamphlets in the same series provide preliminary lists and annotations of fonds in RGVIA ("Evreiskii arkhiv," no. 2), RGADA (no. 3), and RGALI (no. 8).

[344] Printed society pamphlets and additional downloadable files are still listed on the Jewish Heritage Society's website. CONTACT: http://www.glasnet.ru/~heritage/.

[345] Genrikh M. Deych [Deich], *Arkhivnye dokumenty po istorii evreev v Rossii v XIX–nachale XX vv.: Putevoditel'*, ed., with an introduction Benjamin Nathans, "Russian Archive Series," vol. 4 (Moscow, 1994). Unfortunately, the data presented were compiled before the post-Soviet round of declassification in RGIA, and the American editor was neither able to conduct a thorough review in Russia, nor did he have access to the Project Judaica database (which had already purchased a copy of the Deych data before it was published). Hence the Deych listings omit many of the still extant fonds of importance that are now

Jewish Heritage Society recently issued a supplementary pamphlet containing more of Deych's memoirs and additional coverage of several fonds in RGIA, based on copies that Deych has acquired since 1991.[346] Recently, part of Deych's archive with his significant collection of copies of Jewish-related documents from Russian archives has been acquired by Harvard College Library, where it is currently being processed.

What is unfortunate in these days of limited budgets for archival reference work, however, is the lack of coordination among competing groups or institutions preparing various inter-archival surveys, which results in variant and overlapping coverage. In the case of Jewish sources, for example, six different publications and an additional Internet compendium now offer inter-archival coverage, providing varying degrees of depth, up-to-date listings (in terms of declassified fonds), and professional accuracy. Researchers would benefit much more if the data collected by the separate surveys could be brought together and integrated in a single database that would be readily available and openly accessible to all. Despite the problems of overlap and limitations of individual publications, it is nonetheless remarkable in the period since 1991 to find so many new reference compendia covering the newly opened field of Jewish studies.[347]

"Russia Abroad," the politics and culture of the exiled and/or émigré Russians throughout the world, is another subject that has come to life in Russia itself since 1991. Naturally outlawed by the regime that provoked the exile (but that tried to keep tabs on and at times control or suppress its manifestations), archival materials relating to that world, and the individuals who contributed to it, were naturally suppressed as well. Since 1991, the retrieval of archival Rossica from abroad, and the study of émigré archives earlier retrieved in secret by Soviet authorities, has become a high priority on the Russian cultural and archival scene. A December 1993 conference in Moscow on "Archival Rossica Abroad," sponsored by Rosarkhiv, set the agenda and heard many reports about "finds" of archival Rossica abroad and newly opened collections at home. Some of the reports were printed in the conference proceedings, published in early 1997.[348] The Rosarkhiv conference followed on the heels of a series of three annual conferences on the culture of the Russian emigration, which brought together many Russian expatriates and specialists on émigé culture, including archives. The published papers from the third conference held in Moscow in September 1993 are particularly rich in treatment of

---

revealed in the aforementioned finding aids, most of which will to be included in the more detailed Project Judaica-sponsored publication now in preparation.

[346] The supplementary pamphlet appears as G. M. Deich, *Zapiski sovetskogo arkhivista. Kollektsiia dokumental'nykh materialov po istorii evreev v Rossii. Pechatnye trudy*, ed. Vasilii Shchedrin (Moscow: "Evreiskoe Nasledie,"1996). The copies Deych has acquired, particularly from RGIA, held in his own personal collection in New Jersey have recently been transferred to Harvard College Library.

[347] See also the appreciative review article by John Klier, "Hunters' Notebooks," *East European Jewish Affairs* 27, no. 1 (1997): 85–95, who concludes with a similar tribute, although obviously written before the appearance of the Project Judaica guide and several other publications mentioned above.

[348] *Problemy zarubezhnoi arkhivnoi Rossiki: Sbornik statei*, ed. V. P. Kozlov et al. (Moscow: "Russkii mir," 1997). See the earlier article by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, "Zarubezhnaia arkhivnaia Rossika i Sovetika: Proiskhozhdenie dokumentov ili ikh otnoshenie k istorii Rossii (SSSR), potrebnost' v opisanii i bibliografii," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1993, no. 1, pp. 20-53, which also appeared in an English version: "Arkhival Rossica/Sovietica Abroad: Provenance or Pertinence, Bibliographic and Descriptive Needs," *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, XXXIV (3), July-September 1993, pp. 431-80. My more detailed treatment of this subject reviewing the 1993 Rosarkhiv conference and more recent developments and publications is in preparation as a forthcoming IISH Research Paper.

archival holdings.[349] A 1996 "encyclopedia" of the "first wave" of the Russian emigration published in Moscow provides listings for many relevant archival holdings now in Russia.[350] There have been a number of other conferences and individual publications relating to the Russian emigration, not all of which can be enumerated here. Now in early 1998, the Russian historian Andrei V. Popov provides the most impressive-to-date monographic treatment of "retrieved" archival Rossica now in Russia, together with an inter-archival compendium listing émigré-related fonds in many Moscow archival repositories.[351]

Now that we have separate listings for many recently declassified fonds of Jews, émigrés, and previously repressed political and cultural figures, it becomes more unfortunate that general inter-archival directory coverage of personal papers in Russia has made no progress since 1980. Various recent reference biobibliographic compendia of writers, artists, library specialists, Russian émigrés, and members of various political parties, among others, explicitly list the whereabouts of recently declassified personal papers in many different Russian repositories.[352] A number of the new archival guides discussed above have greatly expanded coverage of personal papers in specific archives. Unfortunately, however, there has been no effort to update the three-volume directory of personal fonds throughout the USSR that was issued in 1962–1963 with a supplement in 1980.[353] Presumably many of the card files that were gathered for the original directory, including data for suppressed individuals, are still preserved and could be transferred to an electronic database. Such a project remains among the high-priority tasks ahead.

In terms of other inter-archival fond-level directory projects, mention should be made of suppressed reference works prepared under the Soviet regime that have at last become available to researchers. One such example is a slim volume issued in classified status in 1979, identifying existing archival locations of the records of 1,125 pre-revolutionary factories and other business firms, which are found in 1,376 fonds in 92 state archives and their branches.[354] The Source Study Sector (*Sektor istochnikovedeniia*) of the Faculty of History at Moscow State University has recently received funding for a database to update and expand that coverage, which has long been virtually unknown and unappreciated by many researchers in economic and social history.

---

[349] *Kul'turnoew nasledie rossiiskoi emigratsii. 1917-1940-e gg.: Materialy mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferensii (Moskva, 9-12 sentinabria 1993 g.),* ed. E. P. Chelyshev and D.M. Shakhaovskoi, 2 vols. (Moscow: "Nasledie," 1994).

[350] *Russkoe zarubezh'e. Zolotaia kniga emigratsii, pervaia tret'ia XX veka: Entsiklopedicheskii biograficheskii slovar',* ed. V. V. Borisov et al. (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1997).

[351] Andrei Vladimirovich Popov, *Russkoe Zarubezh'e i arkhivy: dokumenty: Rossiiskoi emigratsii v arkhivakh Moskvy: problemy, vyiavleniia* (Moscow: RGGU, 1998); "Materialy k istorii russkoi politisheskoi emigratsii," vol. 4. A more detailed review of this work will be included in the forthcoming Grimsted "Research Paper" mentioned in fn. 348

[352] In addition to other works mentioned earlier, see for example, *Politicheskie partii Rossii, konets XIX–pervaia tret' XX veka: Entsiklopediia,* ed. Valentin V. Shelokhaev et al. (Moscow: ROSSPEN,1996). See other listings in *Archives of Russia,* Part A, section 5B.

[353] *Lichnye arkhivnye fondy v gosudarstvennykh khranilishchakh SSSR: Ukazatel',* comp. E. V. Kolosova et al., ed. S. S. Dmitriev et al.; 3 vols. (Moscow, 1962–1963, 1980; [microfiche=IDC-R-10,655]).

[354] *Perechen' rossiiskikh aktsionernykh torgovo-promyshlennykh kompanii, arkhivnoye fondy kotorykh nakhodiatsia v gosudarstvennykh arkhivakh SSSR,* comp. A. G. Golikov; ed. V. I. Bovykin and T. N. Dolgorukova (Moscow, GAU, 1979). I am grateful to Galina R. Naumova, who heads the MGU project, for calling my attention to this publication.

Distribution Problems and Bibliographic Control

What is striking is that, with few exceptions, every major guide, shortlist of fonds, and more detailed finding aid for Russian archives issued since 1991 has depended on foreign subsidy for publication, and in many cases, on a further foreign subsidy for preparation of the text or microform. Accordingly, in most cases, given the costs of the volumes involved and other factors, distribution is extremely limited within Russia. Even for those produced in Russia at lower cost, there is still no viable distribution or mail-order system. In the vast majority of cases, archives jealously continue to sell their own or their neighbors' reference publications only on their own premises (where entry passes are usually required), and notice of their availability outside of the archive is rare. The new CD-ROM fond-level guide to RGALI (**B–6**) (prepared in collaboration with the Lottman Institute of Russian Culture in Bochum, Germany, with the copyright held by the German publisher K. G. Saur) is not even available to researchers in RGALI itself—not because it has a foreign copyright, but because, as the RGALI director lamented when the guide was issued, the archive had no computer equipped with a CD-ROM drive.

Foreign-produced guides and other reference publications are usually available only in limited quantity, at a price most Russian researchers could not possibly afford. In some cases, foreign publishers have prohibited the archives from selling the guides at all. In other cases the producing archives have been prohibited from selling the guides to foreigners within Russia because the price abroad is five or six times higher than the Russian price, and the archive and publishers need the profit from foreign sales and fear the competition from speculators (which has already happened in a few instances). In the case of the new CD-ROM guide to RGALI, the archive received 20 copies, which they are offering at approximately one-third of the foreign list price. But these will probably go to foreigners as well, because what Russian research institute or library can afford even the reduced price of $200?

Rosarkhiv requires archives under their administration to provide them with a free presentation copy of all their publications, but that does not always happen promptly, and, when it does, it often means that the only Rosarkhiv copy goes on display in the chairman's office, where entry for foreigners requires at least two days' advance application and a staff escort. Rosarkhiv itself has neither a publicly accessible kiosk, exhibit, nor ordering system, nor has it established a centralized distribution system for archival publications. Nor is there any bookstore in Moscow or St. Petersburg where archival publications, including those published abroad, can be easily purchased or even ordered by individuals or institutions. Further lessons in marketing and distribution are obviously desperately needed, even as a public service to satisfy library and researcher needs. But such lessons are difficult to get across, given the persistence of the Soviet mindset emphasizing limited and controlled distribution of essential reference works. The Rosarkhiv professional journal, *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, has proved incapable of keeping up with all of these new reference productions because they rarely receive free review copies, as would be normal in other parts of the world. Often only by chance do the new publications get entered in an ongoing database, such as ABB. Some of those published in St. Petersburg can more easily be acquired abroad than in Moscow, because the foreign publishers have restricted sales within the country, and hence have little reason to distribute free review copies within Russia.

Where do researchers need to find new archival reference works? In their local libraries to be sure. But today, under-budgeted Russian libraries cannot keep up with the new information demands of a more open society. Most tragic for Russian researchers is that these fundamental new reference tools are not being acquired by libraries in Russia and other newly independent states for want of subsidies for adequate pressruns and appropriate distribution arrangements. Given the high costs of production and the limited foreign market, foreign publishers cannot afford to provide copies of specialized archival reference publications for library distribution within Russia and are not required to furnish deposit copies. Given the persisting budgetary problems and inadequate book distribution system in Russia, many libraries still try to cling to Soviet-style exchange arrangements with foreign partners for the acquisition of important foreign publications. But given the rising domestic cost of books, and the lack of funds to acquire expensive new publications for exchange, they are not receiving many of the foreign publications they need, let alone the Russian publications issued collaboratively with priority foreign distribution. And when Russian libraries do acquire new publications, it is often takes over a year or even two for them to be processed and made available to readers. In many cases, they are still entered in handwritten card catalogues. For "new acquisitions" readers still often have to take the time to go through by hand the separate preliminary catalogue drawers that lack subject breakdown.

The one most extensive Russian library electronic database in the social sciences, which should provide a remedy to such problems, is sadly indicative of the insufficient distribution of archival reference works and lack of adequate information about them in Russia. The post-1991 database, developed at the Institute of Scientific Information for the Social Sciences (INION) in Moscow in cooperation with the California-based Research Library Group (RLG) for its Research Library Information Network (RLIN) seeks to consolidate data from the several separate monthly bibliographic bulletins in the social sciences that have been produced by that library during the Soviet period. The database, available to researchers in the Moscow library itself, is now also available throughout the world through the RLIN network, and through internal on-line resources in many universities and research institutes abroad. INION is now also selling segments of the database on CD-ROM, but initial library reviews in the United States have been exceedingly critical of the coverage and search mechanisms involved in the CD-ROM versions.[355] Although most of the pre-1991 listings, which had never been cumulatively indexed, have not been added to the data files, there is more cumulative coverage of both books and articles in recent years. However, researchers report some incongruence between the database and the monthly printed bulletins. The database coverage is apparently limited to those books and periodicals received by INION in Moscow. This has meant, at least in terms of archival-related literature, that it is far from complete. In fact, almost none of the foreign-sponsored archival guides reviewed in the present article could be located in the RLIN version of the database.

The needed full review of the INION databases is hardly possible here, but despite the akwardness in the bilingual subject headings, the time-lag, and limitations in materials

[355] CONTACT: http://eureka.rlg.org/, or through the listings for the "Russian Academy of Sciences Bibliographies (Eureka)" in on-line resources accessible to approved users through many university or research-library networks. Although there is as yet no published review of the INION CD-ROM bibliographies that I am aware of, several Slavic librarians have shared their reports and reactions with me.

covered, researchers many find it helpful for locating literature on may subjects, including archives. For example, a search on the keyword “archives” in English revealed 939 hits in a browse mode. Curiously, the normal Russian equivalent “arkhiv” produced only 183 hits in the index browse list, although there were 1,095 hits when “arkhivy” was entered in the Russian (this figure includes two or three repetitions for numerous entries). As another alternative, the subject heading “arkhivnye materialy” revealed 639 hits, with some additional entries but considerable overlap with “arkhivy”! In the case of these archival entries, there appears to be almost a two-year time-lag in the listings posted, so by early 1998, it is unlikely to find very complete coverage for 1996 imprints, although articles in well-known Russian journals often appear more quickly than books. Articles in journals are displayed in the browse mode with the year of publication, but book (monographic) publications showed the entry “none” in the “date” column (although dates are given in full view). Although the database claims to cover the CIS and Eastern Europe, only a handful of entries under those keywords were from Eastern European countries, and there were no entries at all from Ukraine, although the Ukrainian archival journal *Arkhivy Ukraïny* has been continuing (with reduced frequency) since 1991. Even a title check on the published guides listed in this article revealed only a few for the major Moscow and St. Petersburg archives, predominantly those published early on and without foreign sponsorship. Despite such limitations and delays, the INION bibliography still is the only electronic index that analyzes many of the Russian journals included.

Meanwhile foreign distribution arrangements for Russian publications are trying new, more capitalist-oriented routes. Since Soviet-era international library exchanges can no longer function as effectively as before, foreign libraries have found private library agents, and several foreign library distribution agencies have developed to fill the gap, insuring foreign library receipts. Russian libraries, lacking adequate book purchase budgets, and no longer receiving their share of deposit copies, are left behind. Yet even abroad, where more information from publishers and libraries is more easily available, and increasingly in electronic form, there has been inadequate information about—and inefficient distribution of—many new reference aids for Russian archives. Nevertheless, because so many Russian archives themselves, and the publishers they have found as sponsors, are more concerned about foreign hard-currency sales, new Russian reference publications often appear much more quickly in U.S. library databases or conference exhibition halls than on the shelves or new-book displays in Russian libraries. As an exception to the general post-1991 pattern, the preliminary listings for the new TsKhIDK (**B–15**) guide have been posted on the Internet in advance of publication. However, given the lack of publicity about the project (and the continued attitude of secrecy about the project in the archive itself), the present author became aware of its availability only many months later, as the present revised version of this article was going to press.

Ironically, the situation today is not unlike the last decade of Soviet rule, when archival guides (albeit more limited ones) were being published by Glavarkhiv in small pressrun, as in-house editions. Then, under the Soviet regime, open reference publications were a low priority, and the aim was usually to limit circulation and control access to information by outsiders. During the 1980s, the official U.S.-USSR archival commission unsuccessfully lobbied for exchange copies of many local archival guides. During the 1960s through 1970s, five out of six guides issued for central state archives of the USSR bore “for service use only” or other restrictions and hence were not openly available to all

researchers.[356] In some cases, when guides were restricted after they had been printed, the remaining pressrun was destroyed. Today, such restrictions are gone for the most part, but the guides produced are still not publicly available. Now, ironically, pressruns are even more limited, and the aim is more often to avoid speculators and insure optimal archival income from foreign sales. Because Russian publishers now demand, and necessarily receive, advance subsidy for most archival reference publications, there is no incentive to enhance distribution, repay loans, or build up capital for other new editions and additional pressruns for those still in demand. The unfortunate net result is similar to distribution problems in the Soviet era: the highly commendable new reference efforts underway in many Russian archives are not reaching the researchers in Russia and other newly independent states who need them most and who could potentially benefit from their revelations.

Electronic Information System Developments

The availability of a new breed of printed guides and other finding aids represents tremendous progress on the Russian archival information front, with the increase of comprehensive, up-to-date lists of fonds and fond-level descriptions. Elsewhere in the world, however, electronic formats and cyberspace are swiftly becoming the dominant modes for information access. Researchers in the next century, if not already today, need standardized fond-and *opis'*-level descriptions in an inter-archival system, particularly in a country such as Russia that has so many different and often overlapping major archives and other manuscript repositories. Most essentially, such a system needs to include information about what published and/or electronic guides and other more specific finding aids are available where—all of which will require more active links between archives and library information systems in Russia and abroad.

An ideal information system is not yet available on a comprehensive basis for archival materials in any country, although many are moving in that direction with fast-paced new cyberspace developments. A special collection of survey articles devoted to nationwide archival reference developments that appeared in 1995 deserves attention in this regard, although it is already seriously either out of date or inadequate for many of the countries covered.[357] In many countries, electronic and microform developments in varying combinations are approaching the problem on different fronts, not unlike the situation in Russia. Russian archivists and information specialists are attentive to such developments, although many elements of the Russian infrastructure preclude easy application.

The United States is hardly an appropriate example for Russia, but it is worth noting that the lack of government funding for a comprehensive electronic archival information system has raised some similar problems for both countries. In the 1970s, in contrast to

---

[356] See more details about the situation under Soviet rule in Grimsted, "*Glasnost'* in the Archives? Recent Developments on the Soviet Archival Scene," *American Archivist* 52:2 (Spring, 1989): 232–36. Many of those earlier restricted guides were listed in Grimsted, *Handbook*, Appendix 1, since they were declassified in the late 1980s.

[357] Reference is to Special Supplement no. 13 (June 1995) of the *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*: with the issue title *The National Register of Archives: an International Perspective: Essays in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the NRA*, ed. by Dick Sargent (London: University of London, Institute of Historical Research,1995).

the situation in Russia, which was more advanced on the level of fonds under Soviet rule, the United States had established one of the earliest computerized national archival information systems for brief repository-level directory coverage—Spindex—under the National Historical Publication Commission (NHPC). By the 1980s, Spindex was outmoded by computer developments, and there were no congressional budgetary provisions for a publicly accessible electronic database under the successor National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). The 1988 publication of the *Directory of Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the United States* (DAMRUS), which included 4,225 U.S. repositories was available only in printed format.

On the record-group or collection level (roughly the U.S. equivalent to Russian fonds) of archival description, the *National Union Catalogue of Manuscript Collections* (NUCMUC), based at the Library of Congress, started publishing annual volumes in 1959. Computerization in terms of fond-level, or in NUCMUC usage "collection-level," description developed rather chaotically in the United States, before the adoption of the US MARC AMC format as standard in the 1980s. In 1985, NUCMUC started entering collection-level records in the archival database of the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), but there was no government funding for retrospective electronic conversion. It was only through the commercial initiative of Chadwyck-Healey that retrospective cumulative indexes for proper names (1988) and subjects (1994) in the NUCMUC series were issued. Publication of NUCMUC in printed form ceased entirely with the 1993 volume, but data entry has continued directly into RLIN. Post-1985 NUCMUC records have been available electronically through the major nationwide library database networks, RLIN and OCLC (On-Line Computer Library Center). Today, NUCMUC electronic records, together with other listings in the RLIN Archives and Manuscript Collections (AMC) database, are now also available free of charge, through the Library of Congress web page on the Internet.[358] Normally, access to RLIN, is only by a high annual fee through participating libraries, although many universities and research libraries subscribe and make it available through their internal networks.

The RLIN AMC database, with which the Russian collaborative project mentioned below is now involved, developed primarily out of a library, rather than a strict archival environment, but has nevertheless rapidly spread to the international archival arena as well. The RLIN AMC data files for fond- (collection-) level descriptions, now containing the largest available volume of such data, had by the end of 1996 grown to only some half a million records. A number of state archives are included. In the case of the State of New York, for example, a major state funding effort has encouraged the direct participation of a wide range of archival-holding repositories throughout the state for direct data entry in RLIN. Meanwhile, computerization of record-group level descriptions in the National Archives and the Presidential Libraries system remained only in initial planning stages through the 1980s. The U.S. National Archives is still not included in either of the major nationwide database networks, and inadequate Congressional appropriation even forced the National Archives to scale down implementation of the sophisticated computerized information system initially planned. Nevertheless, the greatly

[358] The NUCMUC electronic records at the Library of Congress can be accessed through the LC website—http://lcweb.loc.gov/coll/nucmuc. See the retrospective article on NUCMUC by the former editor, Harriet Ostroff, "The National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, Special Supplement no. 13 (June 1995): 99–103.

expanded, comprehensive 1995 three-volume guide to record groups held by the National Archives itself was accessible free of charge on the NARA website on the Internet, even before the published version appeared in 1996.[359] But descriptions of only a small fraction of the holdings of the presidential library network are publicly available in electronic form outside those repositories.

Although there is still no comprehensive national archival information system in the United States, neither is there an all-embracing legal entity of a national Archival Fond such as there is in Russia. Private commercial initiative is nonetheless accomplishing what the NHPRC was unable to provide. In addition to RLIN, a major new offering from the private sector is at last overcoming the lack of centralized planning and government funding, which had left the country behind archival information developments in other countries, such as Spain and Sweden. In February 1997 the American subsidiary of the British firm, Chadwyck-Healey, released the first edition of *ArchivesUSA*, a highly sophisticated great leap forward which combines DAMRUS and NUCMUC, as well as the electronic indexes for the NIDS microform series of finding aids mentioned above, now covering over 42,000 collections. By spring 1998, updated DAMRUS data files for close to 4,700 repositories that were gathered by Chadwyck-Healey are combined with electronic data for over 75,000 NUCMUC listings (39 printed volumes and subsequent electronic records) and their retrospective subject and personal-name indexes. A year after its launching, *ArchivesUSA* has a growing number of entries, with many new fond-level records, along with links to online finding aids and repository websites. To be sure, this facility does not include the close to half-million other collection-level archival descriptions that have been entered by repositories independently in RLIN, nor the additional ones, including many item-level descriptions of manuscript books, that are available in the OCLC nationwide database. The NIDS component, while still expanding, remains selective and uneven in its coverage of some 52,000 unpublished finding aids for individual repositories. It still does not provide the user with relational on-line bibliographic description of those and many other published finding aids, all of which are still listed in separate library network databases. Nor are there cross-references to other subject-oriented directories. Nor does it yet include the new three-volume elaborately indexed guide to record groups in the National Archives, which is now available in complete text files (including indexes) free on the Internet. Nevertheless, *ArchivesUSA*—in both CD-ROM and on a subscription basis on the Internet—with planned annual updates, will henceforth provide a unique and sophisticated indexing and retrieval system for a growing number of archival and manuscript repositories, their holdings, and, increasingly, indexing data to the NIDS microform editions of the unpublished finding aids themselves.[360] Given the size and searching potential, this new archival information

[359] The new, greatly expanded electronic version of the three-volume *Guide to the National Archives of the United States*, including the extensive indexes, is now accessible from the NARA website—http://www.nara.gov.

[360] I am grateful to the president and staff of Chadwyck-Healey in Alexandria, VA, for arranging for my Russian coordinator and me to see the CD-ROM version of *ArchivesUSA* in advance of release and to the editor, Frank G. Burke, for discussing the program with us. Chadwyck-Healey is extending the NUCMUC tradition of using the term "collection" for manuscript collections, personal papers, and archival record groups as well, although this conflicts with standard American (and other English-language) archival usage. See also the description of the *ArchivesUSA* project by Frank G. Burke in the *NIDS US Newsletter*, no. 15

system is produced only in electronic format. Although an exclusively electronic form is still premature for Russian needs, and the annual subscription cost of $1,500 is out of the question for Russian and other NIS libraries, the *ArchivesUSA* system deserves serious evaluation by Russian specialists as a potential model for emulation in Russia.

Russian Electronic Developments

A reformed intellectual context in relation to archives and new goals for archival information have appeared in Russia, but the implementation of a national archival information system is only just beginning. Standardization and national planning are more difficult within a transitional, economically chaotic, and only partially democratized, political milieu. Rosarkhiv itself, and its VNIIDAD subsidiary, were slow in reacting to the new information needs and possibilities, and the federal budget has provided no assistance. Unfortunately, as a result, since 1991, much work occurred on an uncoordinated, ad hoc basis. With the lack of federal resources, many individual archives and regional archival groups have been going their own separate, and often contradictory, ways in efforts to solve their own most immediate administrative and reference problems.

Furthermore, the technological infrastructure is often lacking. Computerization is difficult when buildings lack grounded wiring and are not able to provide overnight current for universal power supplies or backup facilities, and when frequent brown-outs damage files. It is difficult to provide electronic mail and communication systems without the resources needed for modernized telephone circuits. Ethernet is still unknown in the Russian libraries and archives that could benefit the most. Even the cost of local telephone hook-ups can be exorbitant: a local Moscow telephone exchange demanded several thousand dollars (more than the cost of a new computer) to install a single new telephone line in a government archival building, thus making it impossible for the ArcheoBiblioBase reference project to have direct access to the Internet.

Nevertheless, numerous pilot projects underway have been providing experience for Russian specialists about developments in other parts of the world. For example, a project—supported by a major grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities—involving Rosarkhiv and the Hoover Institution, together with the California-based Research Library Information Network (RLIN)—provided training for a few Russian archivists in a Russified version of the system of machine-readable records for archives and manuscript collections (MARC AMC) that has become a standard for many American manuscript repositories. But the result is extremely limited: by the end of 1997, fond- and *opis'*- level descriptions for only 2,500 fonds in two federal-level archives in Moscow (GA RF and RTsKhIDNI) and two oblast-level archives in Tver are available in RLIN. Many more short descriptions of fonds for GA RF and RTsKhIDNI that are not included in the RLIN project are available in the new published guides to those archives. So far there are no cross-references to the *opisi* themselves available on microfilm through the Hoover–Chadwyck-Healey project for those fonds that are described in RLIN. Hence, the sophisticated electronic descriptions for such a relatively limited number of Russian fonds produced on a trial basis in the RLIN project will hardly benefit many researchers, nor

---

(October 1995). Introductory information about *ArchivesUSA* is featured on the Chadwyck-Healey website. See the initial capsule review in *College & Research Libraries* 59:2 (March 1998): 179-81.

will they take the place of the more comprehensive guides to individual archives, which, as seen above, are already much more extensive and more researcher-oriented for the two federal-level archives covered by the RLIN project.

A more primitive computerized system was used to produce fond-level descriptions for the new series of guides for GA RF(**B–1**) and RTsKhIDNI (**B–12**), which already cover most of the fonds in those archives, rather than the selected few covered in the Hoover-RLIN project. But the electronic files produced for those guides are not compatible with the RLIN-destined descriptive records, nor were they conceived as an electronic reference system for immediate researcher access within those archives. Considerable time and expense will now be required if the remaining electronic files from the guide production are to be integrated into a more comprehensive administrative and reference system for the federal archives involved.

Slightly variant MARC AMC-based data files are resulting from the Jewish archival survey mentioned above, which, it is to be hoped, will eventually be uploaded into RLIN. Independently of the YIVO project, cataloguing of Hebrew manuscripts in several repositories continues, sponsored by the Hebrew National and University Library in Jerusalem, resulting in scholarly printed and computerized catalogues for those previously suppressed manuscript treasures. In this case, cataloguing data are being added to the on-going catalogues of Hebrew manuscripts throughout the world compiled by the Jerusalem library, a microfiche edition of which was prepared already in 1989 by Chadwyck-Healey, issued as the *Collective Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts*.[361] Since then, the IMHM catalogue is being continued electronically, and has recently become accessible on the Internet.[362] The microfilming of the Gintsburg (Günzburg or Guenzburg) Collection of Hebrew manuscripts in the Russian State Library (RGB) has already resulted in a printed catalogue, as well as electronic cataloguing data.[363] Cataloguing is likewise underway in Jerusalem of the microfilmed Hebrew manuscripts in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies (SPbF IV RAN) and the Russian National Library (RNB) in St. Petersburg, even up-to-date survey descriptions of which were not available before the late 1980s.[364] In contrast to the suppression of Hebrew studies during the Soviet regime, and again thanks to foreign funding and active foreign enterprise, descriptions of Hebrew

---

[361] *The Collective Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts*, from the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts (IMHM) and the Department of Manuscripts of the Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem, microfiche edition with printed introduction in English and Hebrew (Paris: Chadwyck-Healey France, 1989). Approximately 355,000 catalogue cards (on 812 microfiche) cover 262,500 MSS in some 700 collections throughout the world.

[362] Internet access to the catalogue of the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts (IMHM) at the Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem, is now available at the URL http://www2.huji.ac.il/~jnul/imhm/index.html. Access to the on-line catalogue is possible through Telnet: telnet://aleph.tau.ac.il.

[363] See the *Catalogue of the Baron Guenzburg Collection of Hebrew Manuscripts in the Russian State Library in Moscow*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1997), a preliminary printed edition, which covers three-fourths of the collection. Copies of the microfilms are available at Harvard University, and the on-going cataloguing data can be accessed on the Internet from the Jerusalem library.

[364] Major collections of Hebrew manuscripts in the Russian Federation, together bibliographic indications of published catalogues and related reference literature are all referenced in the recent directory by Benjamin Richler, *Guide to Hebrew Manuscript Collections* (Jerusalem: Israeli Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994). Electronic supplements are available at the IMHM website cited in fn. 362.

manuscripts are now among the first for Oriental collections in Russia to be readily accessible throughout the world on the Internet.

Electronic description of archival materials is also developing in several other specialized fields. For example, fond-level descriptions of physics-related holdings in many Russian scientific archival institutions have been added to the International Database for the History of Physics and are also available electronically in RLIN.[365] A major international database for music sources (RISM—Répetoire international des sources musicales) now includes Russian entries, and as of the end of 1997, catalogue data has been entered for 116 manuscript music scores held at the Taneev Music Library of Moscow Conservatory and 7 manuscripts in the Music Library of the St. Petersburg Conservatory.[366]

Several different computerized specifications have been developed for the description of early Slavonic manuscript books in different libraries and other institutions. As was apparent at a seminar held by the Archeographic Commission in Moscow in September 1993, however, neither the Archeographic Commission itself, nor the several libraries and other institutions with descriptive programs underway saw the need for, nor assigned any priority to, uniform descriptive standards that would make information more accessible to scholars throughout the country. Hence, none have been adopted in Russia (and other countries of the former USSR), unfortunately resulting in a plethora of different systems, rather than a national database.[367] The increasing number of microform copies of Slavonic manuscript books available across the ocean are also shortchanged when it comes to standardized item-level electronic cataloguing. The Hilandar Library has been gradually cataloguing its extensive collections of microfilmed Slavic manuscripts acquired from Russian repositories into the nationwide library database OCLC. Regrettably, by contrast, the Library of Congress has so far provided only the briefest possible two-page typescript list of the manuscripts it microfilmed in the Depository of Antiquities in the Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkinskii Dom) in St. Petersburg, with no plans for more complete cataloguing.

Electronic item-level cataloguing is in progress for the *samizdat* and other Soviet-period independent and non-traditional press holdings in the State Public Historical Library (GPIB) in Moscow. Several catalogues covering other collections have been published since 1991, and several foreign libraries with rich *samizdat* holdings, including university libraries in Bremen and Paris-Nanterre and the Library of Congress, have

---

[365] See Ronald Doel and Caroline Moseley, "Cold War Soviet Science: Manuscripts and Oral Histories," *CWIHP Bulletin* 4 (Fall 1994): 2,13. See also the *Guide to the Archival Collections in the Niels Bohr Library at the American Institute of Physics* (College Park, MD: American Institute of Physics, 1994; "International Catalog of Sources for History of Physics and Allied Sciences," report no. 7), comprising a printout from the database at the Niels Bohr Library, with references to a growing number of collections preserved in at least 10 repositories in the former USSR. Many of the English-language collection-level descriptions from Russia have been uploaded into RLIN, and can be accessed free of charge through the Library of Congress/National Catalog of Manuscript Collection (MUCMUC) gateway. CONTACT: Website: http//www.aip.org/history/bohr.html; Address: One Physics Ellipse, College Park, MD 20740; Tel.: (301) 209-3183; Fax: (301) 209-0882; E-mail: nbl@aip.org.

[366] The RISM database can be accessed at http://RISM.harvard.edu/RISM.DB.html.

[367] See the brief report on the 1993 session, with mention of many of the participants, in "Deiatel'nost' Arkheograficheskoi komissii v 1993 g.," *Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1993 god* (Moscow, 1995), p. 349. My own comments to the seminar raising the importance of this issue, and urging more efforts to establish descriptive standards, were not received with much enthusiasm, and there has been no follow-up.

instituted electronic catalogues. Unfortunately, however, resources have not been available to coordinate and fund a comprehensive electronic catalogue covering *samizdat* and independent press holdings from the pre-1991 period. As yet no plans are underway to coordinate descriptive efforts with the still inadequately catalogued Radio Liberty *samizdat* collections from Russia and other countries of eastern Europe and Eurasia that were recently moved to the Soros-funded Open Society Archives in Budapest; that archive still lacks cross-references or other electronic correlation to the series of earlier printed catalogues prepared in Munich and to the commercially available IDC microfiche editions prepared in the 1980s for many of the holdings, which would make them more accessible for research.[368]

All of these projects represent new, experimental reference developments for Russia and continue to help open intellectual access to Russian archives in different ways and for different types of materials. Yet the fact that all of these recent reference efforts are being largely financed piecemeal from abroad, or by different grants within Russia itself, often reflect interests and priorities made possible by short-term grants and limits the possibilities for overall planning. As prototype projects they may provide experience for Russian participants and information specialists in planning long-term Russian reference needs and possibilities, but it is not clear how their products and methodologies will ultimately be meshed together into a national library and archival information system with Rosarkhiv's own recent developments. Now that the Soviet model of centralized planning has been abandoned, the informational advantages of that standardization and planning appear to have been abandoned as well. Parliamentary budgets no less than western support for Russian archival operations are still inadequate to provide the top-level hardware and sophisticated programming needed for a comprehensive Russian information system.

Rosarkhiv "Archival Fond" Program

Despite such difficulties, a new official Rosarkhiv plan for a computerized fond-level archival information system has now been drawn up and approved. Much more important than the published plans and reports is the significant practical development already underway in the Rosarkhiv division ably directed by Igor N. Kiselev.[369]

Database programs have been developed to cover basic reporting functions, administrative control, preservation needs, usage of documents, accessions for various

[368] Earlier catalogues, including those prepared for Russian *samizdat* collections abroad as well as those published in Moscow are all listed in *Archives of Russia*, Part A, sec. A-14.B.

[369] See Kiselev's latest report on these developments, "Informatsionnaia sistemaarkhiva: Model' i voploshchenie," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1997, no. 6, pp. 28–35. The first, formal report outlining the general project appeared in the first 1996 issue of the journal of the Russian Society of Historians and Archivists: Igor N. Kiselev, "Informatizatsiia arkhivnogo dela," *Vestnik arkhivista*, 1996, no. 1(31): 60–82. The subsequent more specific plan was the subject of an interview with Kiselev after its approval in the fall by the Rosarkhiv Expert Commission on Automation: "Programma informatizatsii arkhivnogo dela Rossii (1997–2000 gg.)" (interview with I. N. Kiselev), *Vestnik arkhivista*, 1996, no. 6(36): 55–64. Kiselev, by background an historian of social demography and a specialist in mathematical and computer applications for historical research, now heads the Rosarkhiv Division for the Organization of Scientific-Research Work and Implementation of Automated Archival Technology. I am grateful to him for demonstrations and providing up-to-date information about the programming developments.

ongoing institutional records, and other vital archival functions. Russian specialists have taken into account comparative developments in the United States, the Netherlands, and Denmark, among other countries, although, to be sure, their experience in the operation of foreign archival information systems has been limited. They have tried to preserve the relatively unique archival descriptive system and centralized archival administrative practices within Russia, but at the same time conform to—or even exceed—the latest international standards adopted by the International Council on Archives (ICA). Spurred on by the obvious limitations for Russia in the Rosarkhiv-RLIN project, the new program is nonetheless potentially compatible with the MARC AMC format used by RLIN. Opportunities for international experience and foreign coordination are limited, however. Symptomatic of the economic crisis facing Russian archives, Igor Kiselev, who heads the electronic development in Rosarkhiv, was appointed to a seat on the ICA Committee on Information Technology, but Rosarkhiv could not find money for a ticket for him to attend the 1997 committee meeting in Eastern Europe.

By the end of 1997, use of the new Rosarkhiv database program "Archival Fond" (*Arkhivnyi fond*) was already being implemented in regional archives throughout the country, and adaptations are underway for federal-level archives as well. The database has over 200 fields, corresponding to traditional Russian archival descriptive practices. In 1995 a preliminary version of the database program to automate description on the level of fonds and *opisi*, together with their available reference systems (*nauchnyi-spravochnyi apparat*—NSA) and preservation needs, was circulated for testing throughout the Russian Federation. On the basis of feedback from many archives, a revised version was released in March 1997, with free copies given to all state archives. Local archives are required to furnish their own hardware and technical support, but the potential of the new program is obvious. Already most regional archives are reversing earlier tendencies to develop their own local computer programs in favor of the new nationwide standard.

At the initial stage, the program is oriented to archival administrative and reporting requirements. It can output automatic "passport data" for required reports and can also export text files to a variety of word-processing systems to produce user-oriented guides with automatic indexing (subject, name, and geographic). Eventually, as more general computerization within local archives proceeds, the system will be able to provide searchable files for end-user reference use in archival reading rooms. Furthermore, the program will also provide automatic output to augment the Central Catalogue of Fonds for state archives throughout the Russian Federation mentioned above, which had earlier been initiated under Glavarkhiv. Although computerization of that catalogue is still a separate component in the approved computerization plan, the new "Archival Fond" program will eventually be consolidated with it.

Other Institutional Directories and New Internet Sites

The difficulty in establishing a national archival information system in Russia stems from the lack of technological infrastructure as well as from budgetary factors. But in Russia those problems are further aggravated by the enduring bureaucratic fragmentation of umbrella agencies and independent institutions operating archives, and with the right of long-term (if not permanent) custody of their own records, without adequate coordination in the information sphere. As the Federal Archival Service of Russia, Rosarkhiv is legally

responsible for the entire so-called Archival Fond of the Russian Federation (*Arkhivnyi fond Rossiiskoi Federatsii*), which embraces all state and private archival materials in the country. However, Rosarkhiv's practical authority and operating effectiveness in the information sphere do not so far extend to holdings in the many repositories outside its own administration.

Federal agencies that maintain their own archives on a long-term basis all use varying systems of description, although some, such as the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense, use the traditional system of fonds and *opisi*. As yet, however, these and other federal agency archives have not adopted the "Archival Fond" program being introduced by Rosarkhiv. The Archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences have retrospective "passport" data that have been gathered systematically about archival holdings in their subsidiary or outlying institutes. Recent severe budgetary deficiencies have not allowed reporting to be kept up to date, and planning for a public information system is hardly possible. None of these archival repositories are as yet covered in electronic format, nor is information about their holdings accessible on the Internet.

The Ministry of Culture, to take one of the most important examples of federal agencies heading networks of archival repositories, has organized its own databases for libraries and museums under its jurisdiction. Both are operated only for administrative purposes and are not open to the public. Neither of the databases has any separate descriptive fields for archival materials *per se*. The database for museums has served as the basis for a limited edition of an extensive 1993 published directory of museums.[370] But that coverage does not compare in depth of description to the 1997 tourist directory of Moscow museums mentioned above.[371]

Several uncoordinated new cyberspace museum information services have recently been launched, independently of the Ministry of Culture, and provide more publicly available data, although the coverage of them presented here should not be considered definitive. Users should be warned that URL's for Russian websites change frequently, and not all are accessible on a regular basis for various technical or budgetary reasons. While most museum websites primarily present popular tourist information, some nonetheless provide essential historical background and a general orientation about the museums, and almost all give their vital coordinates, even if they are not always up to date. The general "Museums of Russia" website, operating out of the Darwin Museum in Moscow since 1996, now provides the most serious and extensive coverage of museums throughout the Russian Federation. As of spring 1998, the Russian-language version (with several font variants)—can be searched under different types of museums, names, locations, and key words. For almost all museums it lists full names, addresses, transportation coordinates, telephone and fax numbers. In many instances it provides hot links to more elaborate websites for individual museums where available. English-language versions are available for many of the listings, although some of the translations could benefit from further editing.[372] According to the webmaster, efforts are underway to

---

[370] *Muzei Rossii: Spravochnik*, Pt. 1: *(Khudozhestvennye, iskusstvovedcheskie, arkhitekturnye, literaturnye)*; Pt. 2: *(Kompleksnye istoricheskie, estestvennonauchnye, tekhnicheskie, otraslevye)*, comp. Iu. A. Gavrilov et al., ed. A. V. Kamenets; 4 vols. (Moscow: Minkul'tury Rossii, 1993).

[371] *Vse Muzei Moskvy* (see fn. 251).

[372] The website "Museums of Russia" (http://www.museum.ru/) based at the Darwin Museum in Moscow, has been operating since 1996. It is accessible in several coding systems, and has been developing versions in a number of foreign languages, including English. Some of the English-language translations are

verify, update, and expand the data (which in many cases are still out of date), and to provide more foreign language equivalents (in French, German, and Japanese). Several museums have already launched their own subsidiary websites on the same server, and others are being developed. Hot links have been added to websites for many museums that are operating on other servers.

Another place to start for coverage of museums (again as of spring 1998), is the Russian "Yahoo" website, which provides listings (with hot links) for close to 70 websites, some with composite listings of Russian museums and, in other cases, individual museums operating from a variety of servers. Helpful comments note the extent of coverage, and occasional critical notes even warn the user about websites that are significantly out of date.[373] Among the most extensive (and easy to access) Internet coverage for Moscow museums is now found on the "Welcome to Moscow" website, where 55 separate webpages for Moscow museums are now displayed in Russian (accessible in several different fonts), sometimes duplicating, sometimes supplementing the "Museums of Russia" coverage. English-language versions are available for 14 of them. Most of them were last revised in February 1997. Apparently some descriptions are much older and have not been verified with the museums themselves; even some museum names and other data are inaccurate or out of date.[374] Some museums have websites on other commercial or non-commercial servers, which have been multiplying in Russia in recent years.[375] At the end of its Russian list, the "Welcome to Moscow" website has a purportedly complete list of museums. Although the data found there is somewhat more recent than the list provided at the Moscow municipal government sponsored website, it is much less extensive. The municipal website lists more complete coordinates for many museums under a series of different rubrics. Another less complete list (only with names, addresses, and telephone numbers) is found for several different categories of museums on the "Park-Garant" site under "Moscow–Compact (Directory)."[376] Similar comprehensive

---

sufficiently awkward to be misleading. I am grateful for several meetings with the webmaster to discuss these developments. To the extent information becomes available, the URL's for museum websites are being listed in the English edition of *Archives of Russia*, but often these have been subject to frequent changes in address and access ease.

[373] The Russian "Yahoo" website has a section for "culture and art"—"Kulurai iskusstvo"—which has subsidiary museum listings—"muzei" (URL:http://www.au.ru/). Note the changed URL.

[374] The general URL for the website is "Moscow. lvl.ru"; museums available are listed under the rubric "culture" and then "museum." If one starts with (or returns to) the home page, there are choices for KOI-8, Windows, and other coding systems, and an English-language option is also available. Only a fraction of the Russian list is available in English-language versions. The "lvl" site, at the end of their list of museum websites also has an extensive list of Moscow museums with addresses and telephone numbers. According to the concluding indication, however, as of June 1998, the list, and most of the related webpages, were last updated in early February 1997.

[375] Several museums have posted their own websites on the OpenWeb server at the State Public Historical Library (GPIB)—http://www.openweb.ru, which also provides for several Cyrillic coding systems, including Windows and KOI-8. Websites for a number of museums are now available on other servers, sometimes providing simply duplicate access points, sometimes alternate coverage.

[376] Lists of Moscow museums (with addresses, phone numbers, hours, transportation directions, and some other data) under several categories are provided on the website: "Informplaneta 'BIS'—Infogorod 'Moskva'": http://mosinfo.com/bis/moscow/. There is no indication of when it was "last updated," but data in June 1998 do not reflect a number of changed names and telephone numbers. See also the listings under "Moskva-kompakt (spavochnik)" on the Garant-Park server (http://www.park.ru). The arrangement of that server has recently changed, and now it is not always possible to reach those files directly; the hotlink to the "Yahoo" site currently rpoduces an error message.

lists have not been found for St. Petersburg, although a number of museums there do have websites on the "Museums of Russia" server. Meanwhile, the Hermitage and a few other museums have established their own servers with websites for Internet access, and several more are included on other commercial outlets.[377] Many of the museum websites for both Moscow and St. Petersburg feature elaborate images of the museum buildings, and in some instances, tantalizing views or samples from museum exhibits (which unfortunately increase the access time). Most of these websites provide relatively up-to-date contact information, but only a few of them so far suggest the extent of their archival holdings and other resources of interest to researchers.

Meanwhile, information developments in the Russian library world are resulting in a new round of published library directories and a number of notable electronic resources. Although the database in the Ministry of Culture's Library Division is also not envisioned as a public reference facility, it did produce a preliminary 1992 printed directory of major libraries.[378] That directory was quickly overtaken by an "address book" directory started by the Russian National Library (RNB—**G–15**) in St. Petersburg, the first edition of which appeared in preliminary form in the summer of 1995, with a third edition already available by 1996.[379] The first of a promised three-volume, more detailed, annotated directory appeared later that same year, the first comprehensive directory of Russian libraries since 1979.[380] An additional directory, under the direction of the library specialist who heads the Ministry of Culture's Library Division, Evgenii Kuz'min, also appeared in 1996,presents more details about library administrative structure and the coordinates of personnel who head different divisions of major libraries.[381] The admirably comprehensive 1993 directory of St. Petersburg libraries is reportedly being converted to an electronic database, but this project does not appear to be connected with the RNB directory effort.[382]

Recently, many Russian libraries have launched very informative websites, but URL's tend to change frequently and are not always easy to access. As yet, there is no comprehensive registry of their addresses; and links provided by various library websites are not always up-to-date or comprehensive. Diminished library budgets are not helping advance developing plans for a consolidated library information network. Comprehensive, cooperative results are less visible on the net than a series of different,

---

[377] Brief English-language tourist descriptions of a number of St. Petersburg museums (usually with an attempted humorous twist) appear on the "Fresh Guide to St. Petersburg" http://www.online.ru/sp/fresh/museums. The "Museums of Russia" server has established professional websites for several Petersburg museums, and provides links to websites for many others.

[378] *Obshchedostupnye universal'nye biblioteki Rossii: Nauchnye, iunosheskie, detskie, biblioteki dlia slepykh: Spravochnik*, comp. Iu. A. Gavrilov and A. G. Shevchenko, ed. B. P. Bogatov (Moscow: Minkul'tury Rossii, 1992).

[379] *Biblioteki Rossii: Adresno-spravochnaia kniga*, comp. T. A. Leonova et al., ed. V. R. Firsov, 3d ed. (St. Petersburg: RNB, 1996). Numeric references preceded by "G–" refer to the numbered repositories in the ABB directories. Arkhivy Rossi (1997)/Archives of Russia (1998).

[380] *Biblioteki Rossii: Putevoditel'*, comp. T. A.Leonova et al., ed. V. R. Firsov, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg: RNB, 1996).

[381] *Bol'shie imalye biblioteki Rossii: Spravochnik*, comp. E. I. Kuz'min and N. V. Shakhova (Moscow: Izd-vo "Libereia," 1996;issued as a supplement [*prilozheniiia]* to *Biblioteka*, 1996, no. 6).

[382] See *Spravochnik-putevoditel' po bibliotekam Sankt-Peterburga*, comp. and ed. O. M. Zus'man et al. (St. Petersburg: "Politekhnika," 1993), a detailed guide covering holdings in 1,342 St. Petersburg libraries, including those in archives, museums, and religious institutions. See more details about archival holdings and related library reference literature in the 1997 (and forthcoming 1998) ABB directory.

and often competing more limited library networks. Most helpful in this respect is the Russian "Yahoo" website providing as it does links to over 55 libraries and library networks throughout the Russian Federation.[383] Many of the sites listed (with efficient hot links), such as "Libweb," "Libnet," and "RUSLANet" provide subsidiary links to other library websites. A few are listed in English, and more are promised, on the new website of the International Library Information and Analytic Center (ILIAC). The State Public Historical Library (GPIB—**G–3**), under "colleagues," provides e-mail adresses for libraries and archives throughout Russia, but many of the listings are outdated. Other libraries frequently provide links to additional websites for libraries in Russia and abroad.[384] Websites for libraries in Moscow that are covered in the ArcheoBiblioBase project now include the Russian State Library (GBR—**G–1**—former Lenin Library), Moscow State University Library (NB MGU—**G–2**), the State Public Historical Library (GPIB—**G-3**), the All-Russian State Library of Foreign Literature (VBIL—**G–4**), the Library of the Russian State University for the Humanities (RGGU—**G–5**), and the Russian State Library for the Arts (RGBI—**G–6**). Most provide both English and Russian language versions,and some of them survey manuscript holdings, as well as presenting an historical outline and more general library information. The most detailed library coverage in St. Petersburg is the impressive newly launched website of the Russian National Library (RNB—**G–15**—former Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library), which even has lists of staff and their telephone coordinates for most divisions, and extensive bibliogrpahic announcements of recent and forthcoming publications. The websites for the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences (BAN—**G-16**) and the Scientific Library of St. Petersburg State University (NB SpbGU—**G–17**) are still "under construction" as of spring 1998. Good coverage, including a survey of archival resources, are provided by the new websites of the libraries of the Rimskii-Korsakov State Conservatory (NMB SPbGK—**G-19**) and the St. Petersburg State Theater Library (SPbGTB—**G-21**), with pictures and e-mail coordinates for many of the staff.

An Electronic Interagency Directory—ArcheoBiblioBase.

Parallel with the practical programming efforts for computerized fond-level reporting functions by Rosarkhiv, the ArcheoBiblioBase interagency directory-level database has been developed with Rosarkhiv sponsorship during the past eight years with basic repository-level and bibliographic reference data. The 1997 printed directory expands the coverage four-fold over the preliminary English-language printed edition of the ABB

[383] The Russian "Yahoo" website has a section for "culture and are"—"kultura i iskusstvo"—which has the subsidiary listings—"biblioteki" (URL: http://www.au.ru/). Note the recently changed URL.

[384] Compare the listings under "Libweb"(http://uwh.lib.msu.su/libweb/list_w.html), "Libnet" (http://www.openweb.ru/koi8/histlibnet/libraries.htm). "RUSLANet"-the Regional University and Science Library Advanced Network in North-West Russia (http://www.ruslan.ru:8001/) – centers at the St. Petersburg State Technical University (SPbGTU) under the sponsorship of the Digital Equipment Corporation (DEC). See also the ILIAC website (http:www.iliac.ru) and the auxiliary list of "colleagues" under the website of the State Public Historical Library (GPIB—G–3; http://www.shpl.ru). IREX posted a list of Russian libraries with e-mail facilities several years ago, but it was not kept up to date, and as of spring 1998 is not operative. Websites and e-mail adresses for many individual libraries as of spring 1998 are included n the forthcoming English edition of the ABB directory and hence are not repeated here.

Moscow-St. Petersburg directory published by IREX in 1992/1993.[385] Parallel Russian and English-language files for ArcheoBiblioBase now cover close to 300 repositories in Moscow and St. Petersburg under all agencies of jurisdiction, describing archival materials, research conditions, and reference facilities, along with close to 3,500 bibliographic entries and elaborate indexes. Automatically formatted publication output first appeared in Russian, and an expanded parallel English-language edition will follow in the fall of 1998. But those published directories are only temporary steps in what needs to be an ongoing information process.

Printed directories too soon become outdated and are too rapidly over taken on the information highways of cyberspace. As the twentieth-first century approaches, Russian archives, like those of other major countries, need to adopt electronic formats for public reference access and develop sophisticated search engines to increase their accessibility. In April 1997 brief internet coverage of Russian archives, with output from ArcheoBiblioBase, was launched in the Russian language from the new OpenWeb server at the State Public Historical Library in Moscow. Initial coverage extends only to federal archives under Rosarkhiv and to local state archives under municipal and oblast' authorities in Moscow and St. Petersburg. A somewhat more expanded English-language counterpart has been launched at the website of the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam, and it is already being relayed by a number of other servers.[386] Funding is being sought to extend the internet coverage to other repositories from updated data in ArcheoBiblioBase and to develop a search engine for researcher use of the database itself. Preliminary less detailed data have already been entered in ArcheoBiblioBase files for close to 300 state archives (including former Communist Party archives) throughout the Russian Federation, together with a full bibliography of their published guides, which could soon be prepared for separate publication and for Internet coverage, if funding becomes available. Such developments are helping fill a vacuum in the Russian environment that still remains unaccustomed to readily available public information resources. Funding was provided to launch a parallel ArcheoBiblioBase unit for Ukraine in Kyiv, but unfortunately, staff and resources in Ukraine have not been adequate to keep it going. As of the spring of 1998, initial brief English-language coverage of Ukrainian archives is being launched through the website of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.[387]

For obvious reasons, Soviet authorities never saw fit to develop public information services and the appropriate technological infrastructure. Increasing access to information about Russian archival holdings and to archival reference publications is exceedingly difficult in post-Soviet Russia, where public outcry is still heard against the circulation or transport of archival data or copies of documents abroad, where laws still try to regulate or limit the freedom of international information exchange, where foreign researchers are still on occasion equated with spies, and where even customs authorities sometimes demand inspection of computer files taken abroad and forbid duty-free transport of printed archival

[385]Kozlov, "Preface," *Archives in Russia* (1992), p. vii.

[386] The GPIB website and free public assistance from a professional webmaster has been established during 1996 under sponsorship of the International Research & Exchanges Board with USIA funding. See details about the URL for Russian and English-language versions of "ABB On Line" in the prefatory notice.

[387] "Archives in Ukraine—ArcheoBiblioBase" now provides initial coverage of the national-level state archives of Ukraine, as well as local state archives in Kyiv and L'viv—URL: http://www.sabre.org/huri/abbukr.

directories. Despite such impediments, since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Russian-area archives—previously among the most closed in the world—are nonetheless now becoming among the most open, in terms of expanding reference information. Many inter-archival projects, many reference efforts undertaken by individual archives, as well as the ArcheoBiblioBase directory project, together with Rosarkhiv's own "Archival Fond" program and coordination efforts are helping open up a wide variety of information about Russian archives to researchers within Russia and abroad.

Nevertheless, questions remain: To what extent will Rosarkhiv, together with the cooperation of Russian libraries and other information centers, be able to sustain and expand reference facilities in the future? In the summer of 1997, word came through of a 72 percent budget cut for Rosarkhiv and its federal-level archives for 1997, and the former Central Party Archives (now RTsKhIDNI—**B–12**) almost had to close down operations in July because there were no funds to pay the $60,000 owed on their electric bill. As frost set in during October, there was no heat for many federal archives, and they were all forced to close their doors for several days in early November when the militia guards demanded their arrears. In February 1998, when temperatures dropped to –26c, many of the federal archives were again closed because there were no moneys for their heat bills, while many of the devoted staff were trying to get through the winter with at most minimal pay, which was often delivered with considerable delay. National archives of such world-class importance should not have to live from hand to mouth.

A more open society needs expanding archival information in library information centers, where researchers can find up-to-date information about archival holdings, copies of all newly published reference works, and microform copies of internal or out-of-print finding aids. Instead, library budgets are contracting as well as those for archives. In the more democratic environment of the post-Soviet era, the remaining information lacunae could best be filled if Rosarkhiv, together with a satellite library network, could serve as a central hub of a reliable and regularly updated reference service for documentary resources in all Russian repositories, regardless of their agency of control—with current data about specific access possibilities and instructions for public inquiries. But such a development appears more as a pipe dream in the reality of today's Russia, amidst continued political crossfire and economic crisis.

In other parts of the world, more and more countries—from Sweden and Latvia to Australia—are making data about their archives and manuscript holdings available on CD-ROM and along the international information highway of cyberspace, with the encouragement and often technological assistance of the International Council of Archives and UNESCO. As a prime example close to home, the release of Chadwyck-Healey's *ArchivesUSA* in February 1997 heralds a new dimension in an integrated electronic reference system, starting with repository-level data and ending with microfiche editions of an increasing number of internal finding aids. Russia should not be left behind, so that reference access can continue to grow and reveal the whereabouts and available descriptions of more shadows of its troubled past as prologue to a more open society of the future.

13. Declassification and Research Access

Earlier chapters have dealt with general legal issues establishing a normative basis for archives, declassification, and the increased agency control that have evolved over the past five years. Commercial issues, proprietary attitudes towards the national archival legacy, and preservation problems, have also been discussed to the extent they have an impact on research access. The all-important matter of intellectual access – i.e. the access to and the adequacy of reference facilities and the inadequate distribution of printed guides and finding aids – has also been considered. It is appropriate in conclusion to return our focus more closely to the practical level of actual research access, and especially the affects of declassification policies as they promote or discourage researcher access in contemporary history and for those in trying to understand and rewrite the history of the Soviet regime.

Focus in the press in Russia and abroad has understandably been on aggravated problems for research in the contemporary period and the failure of Russian authorities to effect the level of declassification promised four or five years ago. The intensity of complaints about those problems should not detract attention, however, from the tremendous progress in opening of archives and in facilitating the formal bureaucratic context of archival research in Russia. Living and carrying out research in Russia today still has its anomalies and specific problems that will not normally be encountered in other countries. Some have been mentioned in earlier sections. Nevertheless, researchers familiar with the Soviet archival scene in pre-1991 decades will all admit that access to Russian archives and their finding aids is now much more similar to the situation in other parts of the world than they encountered before the age of *glasnost'* and *perestroika*.[388]

For those dealing with the pre-revolutionary period, and for many Soviet-period topics as well, researchers are most likely to find virtually all archival materials and their finding aids open and available for research in the vast majority of the over 260 archives and manuscript repositories in Moscow and St. Petersburg covered by the new ABB directory, and the hundreds more in local areas of the Russian Federation. In the latter connection, the fact that foreigners no longer need visas for individual cities, and advance approval of their topic from central authorities, has opened research opportunities throughout the entire Russian Federation. Nevertheless, the persisting mixture of "progress and pitfalls," as characterized by one American specialist in Cold War history in 1993, deserves attention.[389] The fact that a Canadian graduate student researching post-1952 diplomatic history in Moscow during the summer of 1996 could report that he painfully found himself "outside the archival window looking in" is cause for concern.[390] Hence it is to these problem areas that we return with the examination of specific cases

---

[388] For a commentary on earlier problems of access to archives and finding aids, see Grimsted, *Handbook* (1989), with its now obsolete Chapter 3, "Access to Archival Materials," pp. 105–51. The internal archival arrangements described in the previous Chapter 2 may still be helpful to those unfamiliar with the Soviet-imposed Russian system, and also of continuing relevance in that *Handbook* the additional bibliography and discussion of reference aids (as of 1988 imprints).

[389] See Mark Kramer, "Archival Research in Moscow: Progress and Pitfalls," *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 3 (Fall 1993), pp. 1, 18–39.

[390] Trevor Smith, "'How I spent my summer vacation. . .': The Cold War International History Conference and the Current State of Russian Cold War Archives," *Stalin Era Research and Archives Project Bulletin*, no. 2 (Fall 1996), pp. 6–7.

and specific contemporary archives, where there have been the most vocal recent researcher complaints

On an intellectual level, in connection with the collapse of the Soviet system and the dramatic opening of the archives, many historians, archivists, and others in positions of political power, have had understandably strong concerns about the value of archival declassification in filling in the historical "blank spots" and forging new historiographical directions to replace Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy and repressive control. In many other cases, as is already evident over the past five years, political and intellectual aims coincide in producing scholarly publication projects, reference aids, and documentary exhibits. Yet sometimes, reformed political and intellectual values have sought to impose a new orthodoxy of their own in the practice of selecting documentary revelations most suitable for public consumption. On occasion such aims have become subservient to political needs and more purely commercial considerations. The curious blend of intellectual, political, commercial, and more purely archival factors involved in the opening of the Russian archives has strongly affected access, the pace of declassification, and public information about Russian archives both at home and abroad.

The enthusiasm about "Revelations from Russian Archives" reached its height in 1992 and early 1993. That was before passage of a law on archives and a law on state secrets, when euphoria and confusion in dealing with the newly opened files produced a host of problems and unresolved issues for researchers and archivists alike. A high profile exhibition of original documents with that title opened at the Library of Congress during the Washington, DC, summit meeting between Russian President Boris Yeltsin and U.S. President George Bush in June 1992. Copies of the documents exhibited were deposited in the Library of Congress, and a few samples were made available electronically on the Internet, but researchers and librarians were befuddled by the tight restrictions Roskomarkhiv Chairman Pikhoia sought to impose on their use and copying. Back home, there was considerable disappointment that the full state-of-the-art exhibition never appeared in Moscow, nor was there even a Russian edition of the catalogue.[391] Why instead, did Pikhoia bring back to Moscow from the Hoover Institution the more politically benign exhibition, "Making Things Work: Russian-American Economic Relations, 1900–1930"?[392] After all, the Hoover Institution has many more interesting émigré files, copies of which are being furnished to Russia on microfilm as part of the joint Hoover-Rosarkhiv project. And the Hoover Institution still has part of the original

---

391 A thorough document-by-document catalogue was prepared, but only an English edition appeared: *Revelations from the Russian Archives: A Report from the Library of Congress* (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1993); *Revelations from the Russian Archives: A Checklist. An Exhibit at the Library of Congress, Washington DC. June 17–July 16, 1992* (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1992). The earlier checklist provides precise citations (with archival locations) for the close to 300 documents in the exhibition, all of which are open to researchers in Moscow. Copies of all of the documents from the exhibition are available to researchers at the European Room at the Library of Congress. The catalogues and texts of approximately ten percent of the documents are accessible in searchable text files on the Internet at the LC website: http://lcweb.loc.gov/exhibits/archives. An English translation of all the documents was published: *Revelations from the Russian Archives: Documents in English Translation*, ed. Diane P. Koenker and Ronald D. Bachman (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1997).

392 A bilingual catalogue of that exhibit was published, in contrast to the lack of a Russian catalogue for the much more politically interesting exhibition in Washington. See appropriate citations in Grimsted, "Russian Archives in Transition," esp. pp. 618–19.

Russian Embassy records from the early twentieth century, which were intended to be returned to Russia, "when the political climate was appropriate."[393]

By early 1996, *Pravda*, the newspaper of the resurgent Russian Communist Party was still criticizing Yeltsin's policy of "partnership with the West as valued in two bottles of whiskey," echoing themes discussed above. According to that article, in which archival deals played a significant role, Bush and the Americans were trying to impress on Yeltsin that he should "'reveal all the secrets of Soviet archives to world society,' and in first order those of the so-called Kremlin or Presidential archive and the KGB archives." The 1992 exhibit in Washington, in the words of Russian critics, was yet another example that Russia was revealing abroad "documents not yet available to our own researchers."[394] Contrary to such statements, the documents exhibited and listed with archival attributions in the published catalogue were all openly available in Moscow, although the exhibition itself and the catalogue never appeared in Russia to prove the point.

Political factors, as noted earlier, initially speeded declassification and new archival investigation in some contemporary subjects. For example, the trial against the Communist Party during the summer and fall of 1992 brought release of numerous documents, including many Politburo and KGB "special files," copies of many of which have been eventually opened to the public. The published document-by-document descriptions mentioned above cover approximately two-thirds of the files from the Constitutional Court that were deposited in TsKhSD, and most of the collection there is now available commercially on microfiche.[395] Estimates differ as to what percentage of the documents submitted to the Court were deposited in TsKhSD, but according to some specialists, a conservative estimate is certainly *less* than half, a fact frequently used as an example by those claiming lack of archival openness on the part of the Yeltsin administration.

Focus on other international headline topics during 1992 and 1993 brought forth revealing documents regarding the Katyn Massacre, the Wallenberg case, the Cuban missile crisis, the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, the Korean Airlines flight 007, and the Chernobyl tragedy, to name only a few. As in other "picture opportunities," President Yeltsin personally delivered documents to Budapest involving the 1956 Soviet invasion, but Hungarian archivists complain, for example, that the documents presented did not even include copies of all of those already declassified. According to Kramer, not all the Czech and Polish documents delivered are available in TsKhSD. It was obvious that the highly censored revelations were being used – or sometimes misused – as pawns in the troubled political and diplomatic arena. Such highlights, have hardly meant the opening of

---

393 Concerning the fate of the records of the pre-revolutionary Russian Embassy in the United States, see John H. Brown, "The Disappearing Russian Embassy Archives, 1922–1939," *Prologue* 14 (Spring 1982), pp. 5–13. The corresonding Russian consular records were held for many years in the U.S. National Archives. The formal restitution ceremony took place in Moscow in May 1989, during the meetings and under the auspices of the U.S.–USSR Commission on Archival Cooperation.

394 "Partnerstvo tsenoiu v dve butylki viski," *Pravda*, no. 7 (17 January 1996), p. 3. Although not specifically named as to the institutions involved, there was also critical reference to the Hoover project as a "an agreement with the American side to microfilm records from CPSU archives."

395 See the published catalogue cited in fn. 266.

contiguous files and related documentation in other fonds which would be necessary for definitive historical interpretation of many Cold War developments.[396]

In Russian-American relations, President Yeltsin callously used the high political interest in the fate of prisoners of war and missing-in-action during the Cold War years, in appealing to the American Congress for more foreign aid. His promise to find the missing Americans resulted in the formation of a costly, high-profile binational commission with archival representatives (headed by General Dmitrii Volkogonov on the Russian side and Ambassador Malcolm Toon for the U.S.), and involved many Russian government agencies in the search for and declassification of related documents. The American side, however, was hardly satisfied, as evident already in the U.S. Senate Committee 1993 report:

> The Russian archival material passed to the American side... appears thus far to constitute a carefully-controlled release of information... to convince the U.S. side that the Soviet Union did not capture, detain, interrogate, move or eliminate U.S. POW/MIAs.[397]

As a recent report on new evidence of Soviet interrogation of U.S. prisoners of war during the Korean War reveals, there have been a few breakthroughs in terms of archival materials released by the Russian side.[398] Nevertheless, by early 1996, the American side was still complaining that they are overly-dependent on Russian archivists to filter those documents they receive rather than being permitted to explore the archives and related files for themselves. Cold War attitudes continue on both sides to a certain extent, as Russian archivists resent the high-level political attention to the project, when there was a chance in a million that a live American or more traces of a corpse from Cold War spy planes would be found on Russian soil.

Russian archivists already had enough adverse publicity on the U.S.–Russian POW issue by the time a report on American prisoners of war in Vietnam reached the front page of the *New York Times* in April 1993. How had the document (from TsKhSD—**B–13**) alluded those combing the archives on behalf of the top-level intergovernmental POW-MIA Commission? In the suspicious eyes of Rosarkhiv Chairman Pikhoia, surely the researcher must have been a spy, or else the TsKhSD archival director – who was soon dismissed – must have sold him the document.[399] Even Russian archivists who a year

---

396 See the earlier Grimsted discussion and documentation of all of these matters in "Russian Archives in Transition," *American Archivist* 56 (Fall 1993), especially pp. 616–21, and 625–33. Many of the Western analyses of new documentation for various Cold War crises emphasize the difficulty of interpretation based on the selective Soviet sources released to date, as is apparent in numerous articles in the *CWIHP Bulletin.* See, for example, the discussion by Mark Kramer (fn. 389), his own analysis of documentation on the 1968 Czech crisis in *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 3 (Fall 1993), pp. 2–13, 54–55, and his forthcoming book on the subject, based on newly opened documents.

397 U.S. Congress, 103d Session, *Report of the Select Committee on POW/MIA Affairs*, U.S. Senate, Report 103–1 (Washington, 1993), p. 438. Recent interviews with American specialists working with the Commission suggest scant improvement since.

398 Laurence Jolidon, "Soviet Interrogation of U.S. POWs in the Korean War," *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 5-6 (1995–1996), pp. 123–25.

399 The "Morris Affair" involving the Australian researcher Steven Morris, temporarily based at Harvard University, is well analyzed and documented by Mark Kramer, who was on hand in the TsKhSD reading room when Morris first discovered the document – "Progress and Pitfalls," *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 4 (1993), pp. 28–31. Rosarkhiv Chairman Pikhoia repeated to me his suspicions that Morris was working for the CIA.

earlier might have been lured by the high fees offered by foreign journalists and producers, and promoting well-paying collaborative projects, were anxiously pulling back from what they feared as their waning control and tendentious criticism at home and abroad, and urging more care in declassification and communication of sensitive documents to foreign researchers.

With the financial difficulties facing archives more recently, some access problems have resulted from new commercial demands and expectations, as was discussed above. Starting in 1993, while national-patriotic criticism and more security concerns on the political front put a damper on the euphoria of the immediate post-August 1991 period, a series of dismissals of Russian archival leaders who were alleged to have profited too much from "new revelations" belied more caution on the part of Rosarkhiv. Subsequent ostensibly political revelations have been much less dramatic, although steady progress in declassification can be reported. By the fall of 1994 and during 1995, Cold War researchers still reported "signs of progress mingled with many persistent frustrations."[400]

The post-1953 CPSU-based archive TsKhSD (**B–13**), was particularly hard-hit by scandal – involving documents that had been communicated to readers (in some cases involving high fees) before they had been officially declassified. After the Morris affair, the director and several high-level staff were fired on the grounds of "laxness in enforcing regulations on access to confidential material." The new director Anatolii Prokopenko's "more restrictive approach" was revealed in a comment made to one American researcher in May 1993, in connection with the clamp down on the collection of copies of declassified documents received from the Presidential Archive (fond 89) : "Yes, these documents have been declassified, but that doesn't mean people should be allowed to look at them." The entire archive was closed for several months during the summer of 1993. The requirements of the July 1993 law "On State Secrets" (**A–18**) appeared as legal sanction for the new, more restrictive policies.

Researchers understandably complained that things were considerably "tightened up" by the time TsKhSD reopened in the fall of 1993 with a new director, Natal'ia Tomilina, when, in fact, many previously opened files had already been withdrawn from circulation and an internal memorandum set forth stricter controls.[401] Among the files closed down were records of the Central Committee International Department, which had been opened as part of the records of the CC Apparatus. Starting in the summer of 1995, however, even more fonds that had earlier been available to researchers were again closed for

---

400 Jim Hershberg, "Russian Archives Review," *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 4 (Fall, 1994), p. 86. See also, for example, Brian Murray, "Stalin, the Cold War, and the Division of China: A Multi-Archival Mystery," *CWIHP Working Paper*, no. 12 (Washington, DC, 1995), p. 16 – "The true motivations of the Soviets and the validity of the attached documents, however will not be fully understood until the remaining archives in Moscow are opened and the restrictions on research in the Party and Foreign Ministry archives are lifted."

401 These details are well explained by Kramer, "Progress and Pitfalls," *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 3 (Fall 1993), pp. 1, 18–39. The explanation for the firing of Rem Usikov and the remark of the new director, Anatolii Prokopenko, in conversation with Kramer in May 1993 were quoted on p. 18 (and notes 3–5). Regarding the arrangements and controversy with CWIHP, see pp. 25–26, and especially fn. 71. Prokopenko, who subsequently retired for reasons of health, was replaced in the fall of 1993 by N. G. Tomilina as Acting Director, who became director the following year. See also Markus Wehner's perceptive German analysis of the archival scene during 1993 – "Archivreform bei leeren Kassen: Einige Anmerkungen zur politischen und ekonomischen Situation der russischen Archive," *Osteuropa* 44:2 (1994), pp. 102–24.

"declassification review," joining files of the CC Secretariat and others that were closed in 1993. Archival officials claim it is "temporary," but that does not assuage researcher complaints. In connection with documents already released to the CWIHP by early 1993, which according to the signed agreement were to be open to all scholars, Rosarkhiv officials even tried to place retrospective restrictions and limit publication rights, on the grounds that all of the documents involved had not been subjected to thorough enough declassification review.[402] Symbolically, befuddled scholars point out, "study, or research" (Rus. *issledovanie*) is not part of the new TsKhSD name, as it is for the parallel archive RTsKhIDNI for pre-1953 CPSU documentation.

Complaints continue about research restrictions at TsKhSD, including limited working hours (only three days a week), slow delivery time, and the exorbitant cost of copies. If things were not difficult earlier, in 1995, tightened government security measures made access to the building itself much more difficult, especially for foreigners – now often involving an initial three-day delay (rather costly for those on limited research travel grants), and portable computers are no longer permitted in the reading room. On a more positive note, since 1993, TsKhSD has received over 10,000 files from the Presidential Archive (AP RF), and has also acquired the personal papers of M. A. Suslov, A. Ia, Pel'she, G. M. Malenkov, and N. Zakhariadis. During the last two years, the archive reports that over 13,500 documents have been declassified, totaling close to 2,500,000 folios, including more of the Politburo files transferred from the Presidential Archive. In a recent five-year review of the archive, they also reported considerable progress in arrangement and description.[403] And as another positive development, a full list of fonds held by the archive was released for publication for the first time in the 1997 ABB directory. However, a fuller account prepared by TsKhSD archivists has not been cleared for print.

Complaints are confirmed in several other archives – including RTsKhIDNI and RGVA – that some fonds previously open for research in 1991 and 1992 were closed again for various tightened "security" reasons. Parts of the Comintern archive from the 1930s and some GKO files were among those affected.[404] Fearing more scandals in the wake of the Togliatti episode and other factors, a French-based project for comprehensive scanning of the Comintern archive proposed in 1992 was rejected by Roskomarkhiv Chairman Pikhoia, and *opisi* of the Comintern archive were excluded from the Hoover microfilming project. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, the Dutch microfiche publisher IDC has for several years been filming complete records of the Comintern congresses and plenums from the 1920s. Reports from an international symposium on the Comintern held at RTsKhIDNI in October 1994 appeared immediately, and the full conference

---

402 Fonds that were reclosed include the CC Secretariat (fond 4) and the CC Apparatus or Departments (*Apparat/otdely* – fond 5). Closure affected numerous documents for the January 1993 Cold War International History Project conference, which have still not been declassified in Moscow as of mid-1998. Copies of all of those documents cleared for the use of the conference are available at CWIHP in Washington, D.C.

403 "Tsentr khaneniia sovremennoi dokumentatsii – 5 let," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1997, no. 1, pp. 42–54, especially p. 44 and p. 49.

404 A number of Comintern fonds were in fact withdrawn from the "open" shelf. Deciphered Comintern telegrams, even from the 1930s, were among the documents reclassified. Some previously open GKO files from 1941 and 1942 were also refused to at least one American researcher. GKO files from 1945 that were available under special permission to at least one researcher are still not open to the general public.

proceedings have since appeared in Amsterdam.[405] In June 1996, an agreement was finalized for a project to make Comintern records more accessible in an electronic reference system under the auspices of the European Community and the ICA.

Indicative of progress in newly opened materials was a major "presentation" in February 1995 with the publication of full minutes of Cominform conferences during 1947–1949.[406] Also on a positive note in RTsKhIDNI, increasingly more materials that were received from the Presidential Archive have been declassified, including the "special files" appended to Politburo protocols through 1934.[407] As if to counter current criticism, a brief review of the opportunities for access and use of documentation in RTsKhIDNI appeared in the Rosarkhiv archival journal. While it did not mention the fact that materials earlier open for research were now withdrawn, and it gave no specific examples about the newly opened files or publications, it explained the declassification process with impressive statistics about the utilization of archival files and publications.[408] Even more impressive, the newly released 1996 guide to personal papers in RTsKhIDNI identifies many fonds of high Soviet leaders received in 1995 from AP RF, including those of L. M. Kaganovich, M. M. Litvinov, G. M. Malenkov, A. I. Mikoian, V. M. Molotov, and P. E. Shelest, to name only a few; other personal papers of Soviet leaders are being added to fonds already existing in RTsKhIDNI, although many of these 1995 receipts have not been processed and hence are not yet available to researchers (see **B–13**).

Reform in archives under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been remarkable, particularly from the perspective of those who could not even get inside the door in earlier decades. The pre-revolutionary MID archive (AVPRI – **C–3**) was the first Russian archive to issue a guide listing the contents of *opisi* for its holdings, almost all of which have been open to researchers since 1990.[409] Strong researcher complaints continue, nevertheless, about the slow pace of declassification in the post-revolutionary archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (AVP RF—**C–2**), although again modest progress is evident. Complaints include the lack of clarity about what records have and have not been fully declassified, the "re"-classification of files earlier open to researches (such as the post-World War II memoranda of meetings [*zapisi besed*]), and the complete lack of access to ciphered

---

405 See the reference to the IDC microfiche project in Ch. 11, fn. 224. *Nauchno-informatsionnyi biulleten' RTsKhIDNI*, no. 5 (1994) immediately printed materials from the Comintern conference. Some of the conference papers were published in full in *Centre and Periphery: The History of the Comintern in the Light of New Documents*, ed. Mikhail Norinskii and Jürgen Rojahn (Amsterdam: IISH, 1996).

406 *The Cominform: Minutes of the Three Conferences, 1947/ 1948/ 1949*, edited by Giuliano Procacci, Grant Adibekov, Anna Di Biagio, et al. (Milan: Feltrinelli Editore, 1994; Feltrinelli Foundation, "Annali," vol. 30). A Russian edition has since appeased: *Soveshchaniia Kominforma, 1947, 1948, 1949: Dokumenty i materialy* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1998).

407 *Nauchno-informatsionnyi biulleten' RTsKhIDNI*, no. 6 (1995) reports on the computerization of the Comintern archive and lists recently declassified documents in RTsKhIDNI.

408 Oleg V. Naumov, "Voprosy dostupa, pol'zovaniia i ispol'zovaniia dokumentov RtsKhIDNI," *Otechest vennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 2, pp. 3–9. Much more detail about recent declassification and a full bibliography of RTsKhIDNI publications (1991–1994) appears in *Nauchno-informatsionnyi biulleten' RTsKhIDNI*, no. 6 (1995) cited above, but that limited-circulation publication is not even mentioned in the *Otechestvennye arkhivy* article.

409 See fn. 302 and the listing under **C–3** in Appendix 2.

files.[410] There still has not been a satisfactory solution about what to do with bound volumes containing a few still declassified files that usually still mean that the rest of the contents cannot be made available to researchers. Nonetheless significant, there is more awareness and dialogue about the persisting problems, even if solutions are not always immediately at hand. Thanks to the active participation of the International Academic Advisory Committee and funding from the International Archives Support Fund, based in Oslo, what was a closed internal agency archive before 1990 has been transformed into a major research facility. A preliminary typewritten guide to AVP RF holdings (1995) is already available in its newly enlarged reading room, and a more definitive version is in preparation for publication. Indicative of continuing frustrations in more contemporary research is the lack of declassification reported by the "Carter–Brezhnev Project," regarding the collapse of détente in the late 1970s, sponsored by an international consortium.[411] In defense of AVPR RF in that regard, however, it should be pointed out that the initial law calling for the opening of that archive set up a 30-year rule for the availability of files, while that latter project clearly still falls within the 30-year closed period.

Declassification bottlenecks are most serious, to be sure, in contemporary defense and security archives, to an even greater extent than has been the case with CPSU records. The newly opened "Special Files" of the NKVD/MVD for the 1934–1960 period in GA RF, as mentioned above in connection with the published catalogues, are examples of major strides in declassification, although the continued refusal of the MVD to release the Beriia files clearly demonstrates the persisting major setbacks. At the same time these catalogues show the extent and key importance of the security services in all phases of political and social life, including foreign policy.[412]

Recently in 1996, the MVD has sought a new level of restriction and control over its records that have already been transferred to public archives, namely those that have still not been declassified. Russian citizens are on occasion able to apply and obtain a special security clearance from the FSB, with special permission to work with still classified records, usually for specified projects or for special purposes. Recently, the MVD has required additional referral permission for access to any of their still-secret records, even for those who already have the necessary security clearance to consult them.[413] Obviously this new development only affects Russian researchers, since foreign scholars are not eligible for special clearances of this sort.

---

410 As an example of the complaints, see Brian Murray, "Stalin, the Cold War, and the Division of China," p. 17, while admitting that "the Russian Foreign Ministry archives permit access to both the country '*referen tura*' files and those of the Foreign Minister's office," for the 1945–1948 period he was researching, he noted that "declassification remains problematic for the more sensitive issues in Sino-Soviet, especially Soviet-CCP, relations, and for deciphered telegrams in general."

411 See the initial publication about the project, "The Carter-Brezhnev Project: U.S.-Soviet Relations and the Collapse of Détente in the Late 1970s: What Went Wrong?" *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 5 (Spring 1995), pp. 140–54, 160.

412 See the reference above (fn. 266) to the published document-by-document catalogues and the restrictions on the Beriia files.

413 The new regulation, which had been subject to speculation in some Moscow academic circles, was explained to me by archivists in GA RF.

Early hope that more of the former KGB archives would be open to the public as substantiated in the August 1991 Yeltsin decree, providing for their transfer to Roskomarkhiv, has proved ephemeral. Recommendations to that effect by the presidential commission on their transfer in February 1992, as mentioned above, were followed by a new law in April declaring documents revealing KGB methods and agents as state secrets (**A–39**). Even the rights of the repressed to see their files, as promised by additional laws, have not been uniformly fulfilled.[414] Further hopes were dashed by the end of 1992, when it was apparent that the April 1992 law was in direct conflict with other new laws calling for declassification of documents relating to the politically repressed (**A-29**). Unlike the situation with the Stasi in the former GDR, where the Stasi was dissolved and its personnel not eligible for government service, the KGB retained its power, most of its personnel, and, to be sure, control over its archives, under the restructured security agencies of the post-Soviet period. Already by November 1992, as one Moscow journalist put it, "The Rights of the Repressed and the Rights of History Collide in the Face of Opening the KGB Archives."[415] In fact, as noted above, the very practical reference demands in connection with the rehabilitation process, and the failure to establish an appropriate federal archival center with subsidized staff and budget under Rosarkhiv is a major factor to be considered in the retention of former KGB records under FSB control.

A series of conferences on the KGB in 1993 with widely published proceedings passed a resolution demanding more archival declassification, but so far there has been only symbolic progress.[416] After it became clear that the recommended special center under Rosarkhiv for KGB records was not going to materialize, plans were announced by the Ministry of Security (MB RF) for a public reading room for declassified KGB files, and several Ministry archival chiefs gave newspaper interviews describing the archival holdings and their use, especially in connection with rehabilitation cases.[417] By the

---

414 See especially the insightful early article by Vera Tolz, "Access to KGB and CPSU Archives in Russia," *RFE/RL Report* 1:16 (17 April 1992), pp. 1–17, written in a comparative vein regarding the handling of security service archives in other former Eastern-bloc countries. Additional relevant articles on the issue were cited in the earlier Grimsted article cited above.

415 Ella Maksimova, "Prava zhertv i prava istorii stolknulis' pri otkrytii arkhivov KGB," *Izvestiia*, no. 257 (26 November 1992), p. 3.

416 See, for example, the published collection of reports from the first and second conferences, *KGB: Vchera, segodnia, zavtra: (Sbornik dokladov)*, edited by E. V. Oznobkina and L. Isakova (Moscow/ SPb: Znak, Gendal'f, 1993), which is also available in an English edition – *KGB: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow: (Collected Reports).* See also *KGB: Vchera, segodnia, zavtra: III konferentsiia: Doklady i diskussii*, edited by E. Oznobkina, O. Boiarskaia, and T. Grigor'iants (Moscow: Znak–SP, obshchestvennyi fond "Glasnost'," 1994).

417 Vladimir Snegirev (interview with Chief of the MB Central Archive, Aleksandr Anatolevich Ziubchenko), "Arkhiv Lubianki: Sensatsii ne budet," *Trud*, no. 171–172 (7 November 1992), p. 5; Iurii Znamenskii (interview with the Chief of the MB RF Archival Administration, Anatolii Afanas'evich Kraiushkin), "Chto v arkhivakh KGB?" *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, no. 45 (6 March 1993), p. 9 (English summary in FBIS-USSR-93- 035 [30 March 1993], pp. 1–2); and Aleksei Vorob'ev (interview with Anatolii Kraiuskin), "Lubianka otkryvaet svoi arkhivy," *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, no. 74 (17 April 1993), p. 13. Most extensive was the interview with Kraiuskin by Tat'iana Maksimova and Sergei Kudriashov, "Akhivy spetssluzhb – 'Liudi vprave znat' vse . . .'," *Rodina*, 1993, no. 11, pp. 44–47. See also the more recent interview of FSB archival directorate chief Iakov F. Pogonii—Natal'ia Nikulina, "Tainy Lubianki," *Vek*, 1997, no. 13 (23), p. 12; condensed from *Dos'e na tsenzuru/ Index on Censorship*, 1:1 (1997): 94-100, together with Pogonii's reply.

summer of 1996, a sunny reading room was operating adjacent to the infamous KGB reception headquarters on *Kuznetskii most*. The reading room services requests for documentation from victims of repression and their families, and public access arrangements have understandably been devoted to this important sphere. Researchers can also submit thematic requests within limited subject areas for already declassified categories of files, but there are no available descriptions of holdings, *opisi*, or other types of finding aids. Researchers who have tried, and the fewer who have been admitted, report delays and frustrations, but nonetheless occasional limited success.

As a positive step in terms of access to the record of repression, nevertheless, the FSB has been releasing some significant materials directly to a few scholars and specific projects. Already in the period of *glasnost'*, the KGB started cooperating in a search for files of repressed literary figures, led by the pioneering writer, Vitalii Shentalinskii, whose findings have been resurrected in a remarkable volume, *The KGB's Literary Archive*, or in its American edition, as *Arrested Voices*.[418] A variety of documentation from the FSB Central Archive (TsA FSB) from the files of its KGB and NKVD/MVD predecessors relating to repressed cultural luminaries has recently been released to museums and other state repositories – such as the Mikhail Bulgakov diary presented to RGALI in 1996 and documentation relating to the theater of Konstantin Stanislavskii and Vladimir Nemirovich-Danchenko transferred to the Museum of the Moscow Academic Art Theater (MKhAT). In some cases materials have been returned to surviving individuals or their relatives, such as manuscripts of the philosopher Aleksei F. Losev and the dissident writer Aleksandr Ginzburg.[419] In 1994, a number of documents relating to the heirs of Lev Tolstoi were transferred to the Iasnaia Poliana Estate-Museum.[420] In August 1995, the "Nekrasov file," with four file folders relating to the repressed art historian and critic Aleksei I. Nekrasov that had been seized at the time of his arrest in 1937, was turned over to the Shchusev Museum of the History of Architecture.[421] By contrast, Soviet period transfers from security organs to institutions such as the State Literary Museum (GLM) and the Institute of World Literature (IMLI) in the 1950s went unnoticed, and it was not always precisely recorded from whence the manuscripts were received.

---

[418] Vitaly Shentalinsky, *Arrested Voices: Resurrecting the Disappeared Writers of the Soviet Regime*, translated by John Crowfoot, introduction by Robert Conquest (New York: The Free Press, 1993). The book was first published in French as Vitali Chentalinski, *La Parole Ressuscitée, dans les archives littéraires du KGB* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1993), and was published in Great Britain under the title, *The KGB's Literary Archive*. Since the book was not prepared for a scholarly audience, unfortunately there are no details about the fate of the literary manuscripts uncovered, nor are their archival references to the documentary files on which the author based his account.

[419] See, for example, the most recent brief commentary on the fate of recovered archival materials from repressed literary figures by the Chief of the Central Archive of the FSB, Vadim Gusachenko, in an interview with Grigorii Arutiunian, "Sud'ba konfiskata," *Novoe knizhnoe obozrenie*, 1996, no. 6, p. 5; see also the earlier commentary by Shikhov, "FSB prodolzhaet vozvrashchat' dolgi," *Segodnia*, no. 183 (17 September 1995), mentioned above (fn. 46). There have been a number of other scattered press accounts of this process, although nowhere have all of the specific data about transfers been compiled and publicly available.

[420] Arnol'd Pushkar', "Dokumenty KGB o presledovaniiakh chlenov sem'i Tolstogo peredany v 'Iasnuiu Polianu'," *Izvestiia*, no. 163 (26 August 1994), p. 5.

[421] Mariia Chegodaeva, "'Delo' Nekrasova, Reabilitatisiia: Ischerpana li tema repressii?" *Moskovskie novosti*, no. 54 (13–20 July 1995), p. 18.

Fresh revelations about "The Tragedy of the Soviet Countryside" in the 1920s and 1930s, are resulting from FSB cooperation with an international project headed by Russian historian Viktor P. Danilov, whose earlier studies of such subjects had been banned in the Brezhnev era. Extensive copies of many devastating files from the former OGPU/NKVD Information Bureau (now held by the Central Archive of the FSB – TsA FSB) have been turned over to the international team with historians from Australia, Canada, France, Italy, and the United States. Work has been progressing in several major Moscow archives with a multi-volume documentary series already underway.[422] As evidenced in initial reports, the newly opened files are rich in documentation of local brutality and repression in connection with elimination of the kulaks and exaction of grain reserves from the peasantry during the period of collectivization.[423] Earlier VChK files from the period of the Civil War have also been declassified, along with numerous OGPU materials relating specifically to Ukraine. The newly available archival evidence has led the Italian historian Andrea Graziosi to claim that "the greatest European peasant war of the modern era" should be seen as "the single most important fact at play in prewar Soviet history."[424] A few of the Russian participants in the countryside project have been admitted to the FSB archive itself, and have had a chance to consult directly with FSB archivists, who are formally associated with the project. But since researchers do not have access to *opisi*, they are not able to choose the actual files they may want to consult nor to determine the extent to which they have seen all of what *they* might consider to be the "relevant documentation," which is still in the Soviet tradition prepared for them by FSB archivists.

We can applaud the fact that this important subject can at last be studied by qualified international academic specialists. Public questions are being voiced, nonetheless, because the research arrangements for a particular project such as this requires a special contract and elaborate agreement with the FSB, other archives, and the research institutions involved – and not without the lure of foreign research, travel, and publication grants. Eventually, following completion of the publication series underway, the documentation is supposed to be open for public consultation.[425] The files in question,

---

[422] As recently reported by Lynne Viola, a project representative at the Stalin Era Research and Archives Project (SERAP) at the University of Toronto, *SERAP Bulletin*, no. 2 (1996), p. 1.

[423] See, for example, Viktor Danilov and Alexis Berelowitch, "Les documents de la VÈK-OGPU-NKVD sur la campagne soviétique, 1918–1937," *Cahiers du monde russe* 35:3 (1994), pp. 633–39, with appended sample documents from the OGPU Information Bureau special reports (pp. 640–82). A report on the project by Roberta Manning, "Collectivization – the View from the KGB Archives," was presented in December 1995 at the Russian Research Center, Harvard University. See also the summary report about the newly released archival materials by the Russian project director, V. P. Danilov of the Institute of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, as presented to SERAP and reported in their *Bulletin*, no. 1 (1995), p. 4.

[424] Andrea Graziosi, "Collectivisation, révoltes paysannes et politiques gouvernementales à travers les rapports du GPU d'Ukraine de février-mars 1930," *Cahiers du monde russe* 35:3 (1994), pp. 437–632; —, *The Great Soviet Peasant War: Bolsheviks and Peasants, 1917–1933* (Cambridge, MA: Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University, 1996; "Harvard Papers in Ukrainian Studies"). Graziosi's more recent seminar presentation at Harvard University in February 1997 elaborated on additional findings. See also the confirming report based on the research of Valerii Vasil'ev in local Ukrainian archives, including OGPU materials on the local level – Jean Lévesque, "Collectivization in Ukraine [lecture of Valerii Vasil'ev, Vinnytsya Pedagogical Institute]," *SERAP Bulletin*, no. 2 (1996), p. 4.

[425] The American project coordinator, Professor Roberta Manning (Boston College) shared with me some of her experiences in the complicated negotiations and the terms of the contract arrangements.

however, have not yet been transferred to a public archive under Rosarkhiv. If these records have already been declassified by the agencies themselves and are obviously of prime "historical and scientific value" (**A–42**, §7), then why do major research projects have to make separate contract agreements with the FSB? FSB archival authorities would justify such practices with the answer that, because the materials declassified do not constitute complete fonds, it would not be appropriate to transfer them to public archives. Critics of such tendencies for agency control could appropriately point out a certain conflict with the principles involved in the 1993 "Basic Legislation," since the documentation in this case was created over *sixty* years ago, rather than the more progressive "thirty-year rule" adopted for Russian archives. Similar questions of "preferred access" are frequently raised with regard to Russian archives. For example, why should an independent Canadian researcher interested in the fate of Raoul Wallenberg be told that documents are first being released exclusively to an official Russian-Swedish Commission?[426]

In the meantime, results of the November 1994 FSB-Rosarkhiv agreement for transfer of records to federal archives mentioned above have been disappointing. Of note on the federal level, was the rather delayed – but barely consequential – 1995 transfer to GA RF of pre-revolutionary files relating to surveillance of the imperial family.[427] Apart from that agreement, other limited transfers of original manuscripts and/or copies and related documentation documented in the press would appear to be only the tip of the iceberg. Most recently, in October 1996, the FSB has released (without charge) an important collection of copies of 15,000 pages of documents from the Second World War and postwar Nazi war crimes trials to the Holocaust Museum in Washington, DC.[428] Presumably these materials should now be available for public consultation in Russia.

Some local KGB records have been accessioned by a number of regional state archives, although these have been relatively limited categories of files, such as the so-called "filtration" files mentioned above in connection with socio-legal inquiries in Saratov Oblast and those for which there was no space in state archives in St. Petersburg and Leningrad Oblast.[429] The importance of the materials involved should not be underestimated in terms of rehabilitation and compensation to repressed individuals and their families. However, they are not materials that are open to research for historians, because most of the files involve individual citizens and will hence normally be closed for 75-years. The network of Memorial societies has been compiling a guide to prison-camp

---

426 The Canadian researcher, preparing a report for the government of Canada recently telephoned the present author with such a complaint, claiming that his request for access to materials dealing with that subject had been denied by the FSB and others.

427 Regarding the agreement with Rosarkhiv, see Tarasov and Viktorova, "Novye aspekty sotrudnichestva," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 2, p. 18. See above, fn. 53.

428 Regarding the release, see the report by David Hoffman, "U.S. Museum Gets KGB Files of Nazi Attacks: Pages 'Soaked in Blood' Detail 1940s Slaughter," *Washington Post*, 29 October 1996, p. A12; Alessandra Stanley, "Russia to Give U.S. Museum Files Detailing Nazi Crimes," *New York Times*, 29 October 1996, p. A10; and Gareth Jones, "Russian Presents Archives to U.S. Holocaust Museum," Reuter News Report, 28 October 1996. A preliminary finding aid is available at the Museum: "A List of Copies of Documents Prepared by the FSB of Russia for the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum" (Moscow and Washington, DC, 1997; Typescript). A more complete finding aid is available on the Museum website: http://www.ushmm.org.

429 See above, Ch. 9, fns. 182/183.

and other GULAG-related records throughout the Russian Federation. Although some of the data collected is already available in the Memorial reference centers, a published version has not yet been released. A comprehensive survey of other MVD/KGB materials transferred to local archives is still needed, but even the latest MVD archival directory is still restricted..

In terms of the records of foreign intelligence, in an interview in December 1995, SVR Archival Chief Belozerov confirmed that the SVR Archive is – as it should be – "the most inaccessible of all archives in Russia today," and to be sure, he did not see "any possibility" that foreign researchers would be admitted. Belozerov gave lip service to the 1995 agreement with Rosarkhiv whereby a commission was to be established to negotiate "transfer of part of the SVR archival materials to state repositories," but only a few limited transfers were made in 1995 to RGVA, which would hardly come under the "sensational" category.[430] Belozerov's first and only public interview about the SVR archive is of prime significance, but his emphasis on the necessity of secrecy and tight agency control of foreign intelligence files leaves little hope for significant revelations.[431] General Volkogonov was given copies of a few foreign KGB operational files for his Trotskii study, and a separate volume on the assassination of Trotskii had reportedly been planned by the SVR with Volkogonov before his death. He is one of the few scholars outside SVR circles to have received major "revelations," aside from the authors of the four volumes prepared for the now-aborted Crown series mentioned above, whose products still remain to be assessed. The extent to which selected documents may be available – and at what cost (or under what conditions)– in response to specific research requests can only be determined on a case-by-case basis. Only time will tell the extent to which new SVR "sensations" will be purveyed and by whom, but thus far there is no significant collection of SVR documentation open for research by the general public. Given the crucial role of the former KGB in so many pivotal domestic and foreign operations, comprehensive or definitive study of many sensitive topics, even during the 1920s and 1930s accordingly remains impossible.

The 1995 and 1996 presidential decrees on the FSB and SVR mentioned above reaffirm the right of both those security services to retain control over their own records, and most particularly files revealing intelligence tactics, methods, agents and informers, and agency personnel. Justification for the continued closure of the vast majority of security and intelligence service records was emphasized in Pikhoia's response on that subject in his November 1995 interview.[432] Yeltsin may have complained about the persistence of the Soviet rule of "secretiveness" in February 1996, but there is little evidence that he or his government were ready to open public access to the files of the repressive Soviet security services. The subject of serious "intelligence history" is only

---

430 The Rosarkhiv *prikaz* cited above (Ch. 3, fn. 55) listed specific transfers, principally involving scattered foreign intelligence lettered files, translated materials regarding international relations of various Western countries, translations of working protocols of NATO and materials from from the Foreign Ministries of France, New Zealand, England, and Turkey, among other documentation.

431 Poleshchuk (interview with Belozerov), "Arkhivy rossiiskoi razvedki," *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, 20 December 1995, p. 6.

432 See Pikhoia's long explanation on that subject in Maksimova, "Ten', otbroshennaia v proshloe," *Izvestiia*, no. 208 (2 November 1995), p. 5.

beginning in Russia, and tends to be dominated by sensationalist and newly released commercial instincts in line with the abortive Crown Publications series.

Nevertheless, the Russian situation needs to be seen and evaluated in a comparative context, involving the appropriate handling of police and security records of other repressive regimes, where many compromising files to living individuals are obviously involved. Word has just been received that Polish internal security records have finally been transferred to state custody, and in Hungary, an independent agency has been established to handle declassified records of the repressive Communist-period security agencies. To that effect, a group of experts under the International Council on Archives and UNESCO have been examining these matters in a series of conferences, the results of which are being prepared for publication under ICA auspices. It is to be hoped that those results will be prepared in all of the languages of the United Nations, and that will be more broadly accessible – not only for professional archivists, but also in more popular versions for society at large.

Open high-level research on World War II, let alone "intelligence history" of the war, is also still not possible, even as the fifty-year victory celebration has come and passed. In connection with the anniversary, there were a host of new studies and documentary publications, relating to the "Great Patriotic War of the Fatherland." The archives of the General Staff and military intelligence (GRU) and counter-intelligence (SMERSH) have been entirely closed to all but the most very privileged researchers with special security clearances. Although some files among the records of the State Committee of Defense (GKO) that were transferred from AP RF have been declassified and a computerized finding aid is being prepared, many others records remain inaccessible, as do the records of Soviet Military Administration in Germany (SVAG) for the immediate postwar years. In the latter case, a September 1995 presidential decree calls for the reopening of the SVAG records, but significant limitations apply.[433] The decree itself has still not been openly published, and hence its wording cannot adequately be appraised. Meanwhile, archival revelations are still appearing by those who have special military clearance and "inside access" to files not open to the general public. Such, for example, was the 1994 sensationalist publicist account regarding Stalin's "reparations" policy and the massive "trophy loot" brought back from Germany at the end of the war, with texts of documents from still-classified GKO and Ministry of Defense files.[434] Like the decrees regulating

---

433 Since the decree itself was not openly published it cannot be listed in Appendix 1. According to Rosarkhiv reports, the decree specificially excluded "files relating to property." Yeltsin had closed the SVAG archives, which had earlier been partially opened, in August 1992, in connection with the withdrawal of Russian troops from Germany. By the end of 1995, however, SVAG files were still not available in GA RF, although archivists there promise declassification work is progressing. Regarding available sources on SVAG, see the comments of Norman Naimark, "The Soviet Occupation: Moscow's Man in East Berlin," *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 4 (Fall 1994), pp. 34–45, and the bibliographic introduction in Naimark's *The Soviet Occupation of Germany* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), pp. 475–79.

434 Reference is to the publicist book by the military historian Pavel Knyshevskii, *Dobycha: Tainy germanskikh reparatsii* (Moscow: "Soratnik," 1994). His findings were first revealed in a sensational press account by the Radio Liberty correspondent, Mark Deich, "Podpisano Stalinym: 'Dobycha tainy germanskikh reparatsii,'" *Stolitsa*, 1994, no. 29(191), p. 18. Knyshevskii's publicist account only minimally describes the documents he presents with relatively little commentary. Although some of the documents included are open for research, the GKO files in RTsKhIDNI are still classified, as are those referenced from the Central Archive of the Ministry of Defense (TsAMO), as the present author can testify.

SVAG records, laws and regulations governing military archives are still not publicly available.[435]

Controversies and scandals over archival revelations thus continue, although the archives are still not reaping increased budgets, nor is there optimal declassification of related files. The issue of atomic secrets came to center stage again with the 1994 publication of David Holloway's *Stalin and the Bomb*, for which archival sources had not been openly available.[436] Some documents from foreign KGB files relating to Soviet atomic espionage during the war appeared in a Russian scientific journal in 1992, but because two of the documents were subsequently deemed too technically revealing, the journal issue was withdrawn. That act of Soviet-style government suppression, however, only served to draw attention to the publication, particularly since copies of the journal were already widely circulated abroad. Controversy between the scientific and intelligence communities over the role and effectiveness of Soviet atomic espionage came to a head with the publication of the former foreign KGB chief Sudoplatov's memoirs, *Special Tasks*, and the declassified 1945 KGB special report to Stalin, following the KGB approach to the Danish physicist Niels Bohr.[437] The extensive controversy in the American press may have helped popularize Sudoplatov's book, but the careful analysis of the available documents in the pages of the CWIHP *Bulletin* makes clear that further study of a wider range of archival files is still needed.[438]

Russian authorities understood the necessity of more openness on this subject: A Russian presidential decree in February 1995 calling for further declassification and the publication of an official collection (*sbornik*) of documents on pre-1953 Soviet atomic developments (see **A–33**) may wedge the archival door a bit further open. But "official collections" do not necessarily mean open public research, as the American specialist Mark Kramer points out, commenting on the follow-up May directive appointing a Working Group to choose documents to be included in the collection (to be financed from official government sources), which, in his words fails to "provide for any broader

---

Such an account can hardly be considered definitive before the files involved are opened for public scrutiny and the texts cited are duly explicated.

435 Hence they are not cited in Appendix 1. This situation was confirmed by the director of the Archival Information Center of the Ministry of Defense.

436 See the cover story by David Holloway, "Soviet Nuclear History: Sources for Stalin and the Bomb," in *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 4 (Fall 1994), pp. 1–8.

437 Pavel and Anatoli Sudoplatov, with Jerrold L. and Leona P. Schecter, *Special Tasks: The Memoirs of an Unwanted Witness – a Soviet Spymaster* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1994); the updated paperback edition (1995) contains the translated texts of many of the atomic espionage-related documents and the text of the 1945 KGB report released in GA RF.

438 The Russian 1992 publication published in *Voprosy istorii estestvoznaniia i tekhniki*, 1992, no. 3, pp. 107–34, and Sudoplatov's memoirs are discussed by Holloway in his article cited in fn. 436 (p. 4, and fns. 40–45). See also the discussion of the report on the KGB mission of Niels Bohr by Vladimir Zubok and Yuri Smirnov, "Soviet Espionage and the Bomb," *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 4 (Fall 1994), pp. 50–59. See also the Schecters' response, "The Sudaplatov Controversy: The Authors of SPECIAL TASKS Respond to Critics," *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 5 (Spring 1995), pp. 155–58, and the follow-up response by Yuri N. Smirnov and Viktor Adamskii, "The Sudaplatov Controversy (Cont.)," *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 6/7 (Winter 1995/1996), pp. 178–79.

declassification of items pertaining to the early Soviet nuclear program."[439] To the contrary, according to Rosarkhiv sources, already 5,000 documents have been declassified for the collection by the spring of 1996. Although most of the materials will not be publicly available until the volume appears, a few tantalizing documents have been released.[440] Indicative of often segmented Russian bureaucratic research proclivities, specialists close to the project report that foreign KGB files are apparently not being included. Some privileged Russian researchers with high-level security clearances have recently been permitted to consult and even cite atomic-related documentation at academic conferences, including documentation from Beriia's Special Committee for atomic development.[441] Again indicative that important revelations are coming mainly through privileged access, the Ministry of Atomic Energy – one of the agencies with the right of long-term retention of its records (**C–10**) – was not willing to submit a description of its archival holdings for the new ABB interagency directory. Perhaps a more open approach will be encouraged following the release in 1995 by the U.S. National Security Agency (NSA) of the so-called "Venona Files," containing intercepted Soviet intelligence cables relating to atomic espionage that had been deciphered after World War II by the U.S. Army Signal Intelligence Service.[442]

The Presidential Archive (AP RF – **C–1**), as noted at the outset, in connection with the Stalin papers, also remains one of the most serious bottlenecks for public accessibility. Despite earlier promises, many of the historical holdings in "the most secret of archives," are still not being released. Although the favored British microform publisher, Chadwyck-Healey, was allowed to make a complete microform edition of the Trotskii papers in RTsKhIDNI for sale in the West, along with those of seven other "Leaders of the Revolution," no Trotskii-related papers from AP RF could be included.[443] Although, Volkogonov, in his response to the *Izvestiia* July 1994 criticism, also claimed not to have had access to files in AP RF for his Trotskii book, in the book itself, there is the implication that he did have access to the Presidential Archive, although he was not permitted to cite sources there.[444] In August 1994, the AP RF director A. V. Korotkov

---

439 Mark Kramer, "Documenting the Early Soviet Nuclear Weapons Program," *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 6/7 (Winter 1995–1996), pp. 266–71.

440 G. A. Goncharov, N. I. Komov, and A. S. Stepanov, "Research Notes: The Russian Nuclear Declassification Project: Setting up the A-Bomb Effort, 1946," *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 8/9 (Winter 1996–1997), pp. 410–20.

441 According to a report of colleagues in the Institute of World History RAN.

442 Copies of edited NSA Venona files, the originals of which were turned over to the U.S. National Archives, starting in July 1995, are now accessible on the Internet – http://www.nsa.gov:8080. Many involve Soviet atomic espionage. Declassified Cuban Missile Crisis documents are likewise available there.

443 The Trotskii papers are available from Chadwyck-Healey – on 1,129 microfiche at a total cost of $6,199 – as part of the collection "Leaders of the Russian Revolution."

444 There are no specific citations to AP RF in Dmitrii Volkogonov, *Trotskii: Politicheskii portret*, 2 vols. (Moscow: "Novosti," 1992); see also the English translation by Harry Shukman (New York: Free Press, 1996), although as noted above, he did have access to foreign intelligence files. Volkogonov also comments on that fact – "Nel'zia vo vsem videt' zloi umysel," *Izvestiia*, no. 135 (19 July 1994), p. 5. The fact that Volkogonov did not have access to the Trotskii papers in AP RF is noted in a review of his book on Trotskii by A. Chechevishnikov, "Istoriki i istochniki," *Svobodnaia mysl'*, no. 14 (September 1992), p. 120; so the matter of exactly what he did and did not see remains somewhat uncertain. As to payment for

defended the archive and its publication program as being necessary to the functions of the President and his administration, and the headline in the official *Rossiiskaia gazeta* suggested that "Fewer Kremlin Secrets Remain."[445] The research public has not been convinced. In commentary on the September 1994 presidential resolution regarding further declassification of CPSU materials (see **A–25**), Rosarkhiv Deputy Director V. P. Kozlov bemoaned the fact where by the Politburo records in AP RF had been "accessible only to a trusted circle of individuals," but he was optimistic that the new regulation would remedy the situation:

> Such a status for the archive is a dangerous precedent, retaining the mechanism for the manipulation of archival information about our past. The President agreed to meet the demands of society: During 1994–1995 the historical part of the archive will be transferred to state repositories and will be open to the public.[446]

Such an optimistic prognosis does not jibe with the 1997 reality that major segments of the historical part of the Presidential Archive – including Trotskii- and Stalin-related papers – still remain under lock and key.

In an August 1995 interview, Presidential Archive Director Aleksandr V. Korotkov assured the public that during 1993–1994 already 12,000 files had been transferred to public archives, including the personal fonds of Marshall G. K. Zhukov and A. A. Grechko to the Russian State Military Archive (RGVA – **B–8**). An additional 20,000 files were planned for transfer in accordance with a presidential directive, but he gave no date.[447] Six months later, in an interview in January 1996, Korotkov again discussed the declassification process and mentioned some of the specific categories of documents being declassified. But the total figure he gave for declassified documents then was only 5,000 files and another 1,000 individual documents.[448] Although significant transfers to RTsKhIDNI (**B–12**) and TsKhSD (**B–13**), and a few to RGVA (**B–8**) continue, including many fonds of personal papers, many of the transferred documents have still not been formally declassified nor prepared for open researcher access.[449] Journalists continue to complain that, echoing an earlier quotation, "Almost all the most dramatic disclosures have come out... only when Mr. Yeltsin has chosen to release them for political

---

the materials, see also the reply to *Izvestiia* by Stephen Cohen, one of the few American scholars to have had access to AP RF – "Na Nikolae Bukharine presidentskii arkhiv deneg ne delal," *Izvestiia*, no. 156 (17 August 1994), p. 5. Regarding the Volkogonov Papers in the Library of Congress, see fn. 13.

445 A. Batygin, "Arkhiv Prezidenta – 'Kremlevskikh tain' ostaetsia vse men'she" (interview with A. V. Korotkov), *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, no. 163 (27 August 1994), pp. 1, 2.

446. "Kommentarii zamestitelia rukovoditelia Rosarkhiva V. P. Kozlova," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 1, p. 5.

447 Iurii Rubtsov (interview with Aleksandr V. Korotkov), "Dlia chego otkryvaem 'osobuiu papku'," *Krasnaia zvezda*, no. 179 (9 August 1995), p. 2. Korotkov in that interview referred to my earlier published comments about selective access to documentation in AP RF.

448 Aleksandr Gubanov, "Arkhiv Prezidenta: Kak snimaiut grif "sekretno" (interview with A. V. Korotkov), *Rossiiskie vesti*, no. 13 (23 January 1996), p. 3.

449 Intended transfers for 1995 are cited by I. N. Tarasov and T. N. Viktorova, "Novye aspekty sotrudnichestva Rosarkhiva s ministerstvami i vedomstvami," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 2, p. 18. The fact that many of them have not been declassified as of the end of 1997 was confirmed to me by directors in RTsKhIDNI and TsKhSD. Many personal papers of high-level Communist leaders recently transferred to RTsKhIDNI are listed in the latest guide to that archive (fn. 259), but not all are available to researchers.

reasons."[450] In fact, carefully chosen sensations from the Presidential Archive continue to appear in print, as yet another small, selective, privileged publication series, "Vestnik Arkhiva Presidenta," was added in 1995 as a journal within the popular archival documentary journal *Istochnik*.[451]

To add to the complexity of the contemporary Russian archival scene, yet another "presidential archive" has come to light. Apparently, former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev did not leave all his presidential papers in AP RF when he turned the keys over to President Yeltsin in December 1991. Researchers dealing with the contemporary scene have recently discovered that the Gorbachev Foundation has an archive of its own, with some originals as well as copies of important state and CPSU documentation that Gorbachev had gathered to prepare his memoirs. The Gorbachev associates have been publishing important documents since 1992. And, indicative of the often unexpected and unpredictable archival access possibilities, and divergent agency control operating on the archival scene in Russia, outside researchers have also been admitted.[452] Researchers who have been frustrated by the restraints of AP RF and the slow pace of declassification in TsKhSD have found yet a new source of archival revelations. The selected researchers who have benefited from the "rival" presidential archive are delighted that its holdings are still free from Rosarkhiv state control. But how long the Gorbachev Foundation will survive in the post-1996 election milieu remains uncertain, and those concerned with the preservation of the nation's archival legacy have reason for concern about the fragmentation and dispersal of such important presidential papers.

Secret archives may have been outlawed in new archival legislation, and the real Presidential Archive itself may claim fewer Kremlin secrets, but Russian intellectuals today are increasingly concerned about rising levels of state secrecy, echoing and reinforcing Yeltsin's own public criticism at the end of February 1996. In an interview with the well-known theater director Yuri Liubimov, a correspondent of *Literaturnaia gazeta* worries about the persistence of Soviet ideological preoccupations, whereby "our rulers still restrict from examination many of the gloomiest secrets of the past. Again they start to reclassify the archives."[453] Five years after the Yeltsin regime triumphed over the attempted August coup, the general political situation in Russia portends more caution in opening "Pandora's box" to domestic and world scrutiny. As a *New York Times* headline put it already in April of 1995, "Selectively and Carefully, Russia Closes a Door on Its Past," and even reports that "secret police agents have reappeared at top archives."[454] A similarly negative conclusion was voiced in early 1996 by the Presidential Commission on

---

450 Serge Schmemann, "Selectively and Carefully, Russia Closes a Door on Its Past: A Glimpse of Totalitarianism/ The Soviet Archives," *International Herald Tribune*, 27 April 1995, p. 2.

451 See "Staraia ploshchad': Vestnik Arkhiva Presidenta Rossiiskoi Federatsii – zhurnal v zhurnal," *Istochnik*, 1995, nos. 1–6. The series continues in subsequent issues.

452 Because of the uncertain future of the Gorbachev Foundation, the archive has not been listed in the current abb directory – now held as part of the International Foundation for Socio-Economic and Political Studies, where Vladimir Loginov is in charge of the archive. CONTACT 125468, Moscow, Leninskii prospekt, 49; Tel.: (7-095) 943-99-90; Fax: 943-95-94.

453 Arkadii Vaksberg, "Taganka – Klub bol'shevikov" (interview with Yuri Liubimov), *Literaturnaia gazeta*, no. 52 (27 December 1995), p. 8

454 Schmemann, "Selectively and Carefully, Russia Closes a Door on Its Past," *International Herald Tribune*, 27 April 1995, p. 2.

Human Rights in their "Report on the Situation in the Sphere of Human Rights for 1994–1995," after carefully reviewing current measures limiting freedom of information and archival access, especially to agency archives:

> The Commission points out that the present tendency to limit access to archival information appears not only as a prolongation of the "closed" policies (*politiki "zakrynosti"*) of the power structure, but also as a step towards a new rejection of society from its history.[455]

Open access to Russian archives has, nevertheless, come a long way. As noted earlier, there are virtually no restrictions on pre-revolutionary research, and the range and variety of revealing topics for the Soviet period being pursued would have been unthinkable a decade ago. A host of documentary publications have appeared or are on the way and, as has been seen above, reference publications boast new standards in openness of archival information. At the same time, those who complain about the continuing lack of access in Moscow for contemporary topics should listen to the complaints of those trying to find documents about intelligence history, nuclear development, the Alger Hiss case, or other Cold War episodes in American, British, or French archives. And, as numerous CWIHP researchers have pointed out, the lack of access of Chinese sources also prevents definitive documentation on a number of Cold War issues. As serious researchers recognize, contemporary history is difficult to write conclusively in almost any country, and recent history will undoubtedly continue to be revised as more relevant documents are declassified.

Across the Atlantic, an April 1996 interview with U.S. CIA Director John M. Deutch blamed "'a clash of cultures' inside the C.I.A. pitting cold warriors against open-minded historians" for the Agency's failure to live up to its 1993 public pledge "to release its files on its most important covert actions of the cold war." Another reason for delay, as explained in the *NY Times* story, is the high cost of declassification. After recent public outcry and evaluation, the CIA declassification budget was been doubled to $2 million dollars a year. But in May 1996, the House of Representatives reduced by half the authorized funding for all intelligence agency declassification programs for the fiscal year 1997 to $12.5 million, with criticism of President Clinton's 1995 Executive Order on Declassification.[456] The costs of declassification are high in Russia as well, but there is usually no special budget line-item for that operation, let alone $2 million for even the upkeep of the SVR archive, let alone for declassification. When Russian archives can't afford to repair their roofs, let alone pay their staff, and while the Russian government was spending much more than two million dollars a day trying to resolve its Chechen War and now repair its damage, a corresponding outlay for additional declassification efforts by those high-profile state agencies that still control much of their own declassification does not appear to be the highest priority.

The issue of security and intelligence agency control over their own records, such as was discussed above, and which is at the heart of the problem of archival openness, to be

---

[455] *O sobliudenii prav cheloveka i grazhdanina v Rossiiskoi Federatsii v 1994–1995 godakh: Doklad Komissii po pravam cheloveka pri Prezidente Rossiiskoi Federatsii* (Moscow: "Iuridicheskaia Literatura," 1996), p. 37. The author appreciates the assistance and "openness" of colleagues at Memorial in making the report available in advance of publication. Those words echoed the general appraisal of the Commission with respect to human rights, especially in connection with the war in Chechenia, which led to the subsequent resignation of the Commission itself.

[456] Tim Weiner, "C.I.A. Is Slow to Tell Early Cold War Secrets," *New York Times*, 8 April 1996. See the report "House Reduces Funding for Declassification," *Perspectives* 34:6 (September 1996), p. 36.

sure, still needs to be seen in an international perspective. Transfer to state archives and public access to documentation of security and intelligence organs is a constant battle for historians, archivists, and the agencies themselves in almost every country of the world. An American professor who chairs the State Department's Historical Advisory Committee concluded a recent essay on declassification problems in the United States with "no hope of permanent victory":

> Forcing our own government to open the historical record will be an ongoing struggle, a never-ending process..... If we stay the course, we can swing the balance in favor of the democratic openness that is so essential to our political system.[457]

His recommendation that "we must keep constant pressure on our Government, always pushing for openness whenever and wherever we can," holds true for historians and other researchers in Russia as well. The issue is much more serious in former repressive, totalitarian regimes that are trying to find their own paths to unaccustomed democratization and whose continuing security and intelligence organs insist on control over their own past. First of all, access to those records is crucial for the victims of repression and their surviving heirs. Second, in a broader framework, access to those records is crucial for the academic and intellectual community. Third, it is imperative for society as a whole in the process of forging a more open society for the future – in order to understand and come to terms with its repressive past and with the control exercised by those security agencies.

Legitimate complaints about archival access, and particularly access to high-security records, remain in Russia. The most significant complaint of all is that it is not always clear what is or is not a "state secret," – and for whom, – or what is a "commercial secret," and at what price. The declassification process, according to present Russian laws, is cumbersome and expensive, and there are a limited number of busy state-appointed individuals who have the authority to make the final decisions. Besides, there is a "clash of cultures" in Russia as well, where different views persist about what may prove compromising and to whom. There are those in Russia committed to a more open society, but as the recent presidential elections make clear, there are also many strongly disenchanted with the nascent "democratic" and "free market" process. Confusion abounds as to what factions represent "democracy" or how deeply they are committed to democratic openness. There are also potential "purveyors of sensations," who are looking for publishers, film producers, foreign co-authors, journalists, grants, or collaborative projects to help supplement their salaries or bear the costs of archival services. And there are many still committed to the old attitudes that society, and especially the outside world, should not know too much about all the shadows cast out to the past, some of which still cast their shadows on Kremlin politics.

The evolving political crossfire may continue to determine declassification policies, and financial needs may help determine how many more sensations will be purveyed. More presidential decrees rather than laws may be determining the normative basis for archival developments. But the greatest threat to the archives at present – from reference information services to storage facilities – is the economic crisis that is not being resolved amidst the political crossfire. The Russian parliament may have passed the first archival law in Russian history and another federal law for preserving the nation's cultural heritage. Archival doors may have swung open with millions of declassified files. But

---

[457] Warren F. Kimball, "Classified!" *Perspectives* 35:2 (February 1997), p. 24.

where is the state budgetary support to implement their designated commitment for operations and archival preservation? Those laws are being ignored even more blatantly than the presidential decrees and public statements promising increased access. What "purveyors of sensations" are operating are obviously not producing adequate support for archival operations, and their bank accounts are too easily turning to shadows. Archival staff in many repositories are becoming shadows themselves, and the buildings that house them will not long be able to cast their own shadows in the future. Until there is stable budgetary and fiscal responsibility, and unless there is the necessary reform in the physical, technical, economic, and administrative infrastructure within which archives need to operate, the "shadows cast out to the past" are not going to survive long into the twenty-first century.

Bibliographic Note

The present essay draws on data gathered for the 1997 volume and most particularly on the experience of the American editor over the past five years working in collaboration with Rosarkhiv and other Russian colleagues in preparing that directory, the publication of which brings many archival problems into a new focus:

ARKHIVY ROSSII: MOSKVA–SANKT-PETERBURG: Spravochnik-obozrenie i bibliogra ficheskii ukazatel'. Compiled by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, Lada Vladimirovna Repulo, and Irina Vladimirovna Tunkina. Edited by Mikhail Dmitri'vich Afanas'ev, Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov, and Vladimir Semenovich Sobolev. Moscow: "Arkheograficheskii tsentr," 1997. 1040 p.

A Parallel English-language version is forthcoming in Fall 1998:

Archives of Russia: A Directory and Bibliographic Guide of Repositories in MOSCOW and St. PETERSBURG. English-language edition edited by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted; with a preface by the Russian Editor-in-Chief, Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov. Armonk, NY, and London: M.E. Sharpe Publishers, 1998 (forthcoming).

The directory, an output from the ArcheoBiblioBase database, covers over 260 repositories in Moscow and St. Petersburg and includes over to 3,500 bibliographic entries (general bibliography and finding aids for individual repositories). They are grouped in the following rubrics:

A. A general bibliography, includes
(1) listings of general archival directories and related reference literature, major database facilities, available collections of microform finding aids,
(2) directories for specialized types of sources such as personal papers, early Slavic manuscript books, and Oriental manuscripts,
(3) directories and bibliographies for specialized types of sources—including Russian history, literature, motion pictures, and genealogy, among others.
(4) archival literature, administrative history, archival related journals and series, and related reference aids.
B. The fifteen federal archives and archival centers of the Russian Federation (under Rosarkhiv) in Moscow and St. Petersburg.
C. Archives of the President, major ministries, and other specialized agencies with the right to long-term retention of government records outside the system of federal archives.
D. Archives under municipal and oblast government administration in Moscow and St. Petersburg.
E. Archival holdings under the Russian Academy of Sciences, other academies, universities, and other research institutes.
F. Independent archives of trade and professional unions, social organizations, and religious institutions (such as Memorial, the People's Archive, the Sakharov Archive, etc.)
G. Archival holdings in libraries.
H. Archival holdings in museums.

Includes indexes of authors and compilers for bibliographic entries, personal names, and an extensive subject index, including geographic and institutional names. Specialized indexes correlate previous names and acronyms with current names of repositories.

Preliminary, abbreviated entries for B and parts of C and D (reflecting the June 1997 data in Appendix 2 below) are now available on the Internet through the IISH website (http://www.iisg.nll~abb). Plans call for updated coverage and the addition of selected entries from other parts. A Russian-language website can be accessed on the OpenWeb server at the State Public Historical Library (GPIB) in Moscow (http://www.openweb.ru/koi8/rusarch). Funding is being sought to expand coverage and keep the data updated.

Preliminary English-language directories drawn from ArcheoBiblioBase were issued by IREX in 1992 and 1993 in a loose-leaf notebook format, the latest as

Archives in Russia 1993: A Brief Directory, part 1: *Moscow and St. Petersburg* (Washington, DC: IREX, 1993).

But much of the data are updated and considerably expanded by the 1998 ABB publications.

See also the earlier reference publications by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted:

A Handbook for Archival Research in the USSR (Washington, DC, 1989; [IREX and the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies]).

IREX ceased distribution, since much of the information contained is now seriously out of date. Researchers may nonetheless be interested in consulting this volume in libraries. Its initial chapter gives a explanation of archival organization in the USSR, which accordingly provides historical background. Chapter 2 presents an account of archival arrangement and descriptive practices, most of which still pertain in post-Soviet Russia. The reference bibliography in Chapter 5 may also prove of help in orientation and appraisal of older publications, although it is now updated by the "General Bibliography" provided in Part A of the 1997 directory. The appendixes listing actual archives and bibliography of finding aids are all being updated in ArcheoBiblioBase.

Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Moscow and Leningrad. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972. xxx, 437 p. "Studies of the Russian Institute, Columbia University."

SUPPLEMENT 1: *Bibliographical Addenda*. Zug, Switzerland: IDC, 1976. 203 p., "Bibliotheca Slavica," vol. 9. [IDC-R-11,333]

Now significantly outdated, especially as regards the new names for many institutions, but still useful for basic notes on holdings and comprehensive bibliography of earlier published specialized finding aids through 1975 imprints. The 1976 Supplement extends the bibliographic coverage and provides a correlation table for the IDC microfiche editions of all of the finding aids listed in both volumes. Some of the bibliography has not yet been included in the ABB database.

Major characteristics of the Soviet and subsequent Russian archival scene have been discussed in the author's earlier series of articles on Russian archival developments, which were published in the *American Archivist*.

"*Glasnost'* in the Archives? Recent Developments on the Soviet Archival Scene." *American Archivist* 52:2 (Spring, 1989), pp. 214–36.

"*Perestroika* in the Archives?: Further Efforts at Soviet Archival Reform." *American Archivist* 54:1 (Winter, 1991), pp. 70–95.

Revised from a paper presented at the IV International Slavic Conference, Harrogate, England (July, 1990), published in *Solanus* 5 New Series (1991), pp. 177–98.

"Beyond *Perestroika*: Soviet-Area Archives After the August Coup." *American Archivist* 55:1 (Winter, 1992), pp. 94–124.

An expanded and updated preprint booklet version was published by IREX (January and March, 1992).

"Russian Archives in Transition: Caught between Political Crossfire and Economic Crisis." *American Archivist* 56 (1993), pp. 614–62.

A slightly different version appeared as the introductory essay to the February 1993 preliminary, loose-leaf version of *Archives in Russia 1993* (Washington, DC: IREX, 1993; two earlier versions appear in 1992). A preprint version of the essay was distributed separately as a preprint by IREX (January, 1993). An abridged Russian version (from which many of the newspaper references were deleted) appeared as "Rossiiskie arkhivy v perekhodnyi period: Arkhivy posle avgusta 1991 g.," in *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia*, 1994, no. 1, pp. 63–83.

The present essay serves as a continuation and update of the latest (1993) article in that series, which surveyed developments during the tumultuous year and a half after August 1991. Since that article provides many more details and notes about the contemporary press commentary through January 1993, involving many of the issues discussed here, references there are normally not repeated. Citations emphasize more recent literature and that not cited earlier.

Regarding Russian archival reference facilities and developments, see also

Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, *Intellectual Access to Post-Soviet Archives: What Is to Be Done?* Princeton: International Research & Exchanges Board, 1992.

The Russian professional archival journal *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, published by Rosarkhiv is the best source to follow current archival developments, especially for federal and regional state archives within the Rosarkhiv system. The journal, a welcome contrast to its Glavarkhiv predecessor, *Sovetskie arkhivy*, prints many revisionist articles, and reports on conferences at home and abroad, recently declassified documents, and limited news about new publications.

The new developments and achievements within the context of economic and political crises of the transitional period from the perspective of Rosarkhiv have been set forth in published official reports for 1993 and 1994 by Rosarkhiv Chairman Rudol'f Germanovich Pikhoia in March 1994 and March 1995, and also in Pikhoia's own appraisal of archival developments through the end of 1994. For 1995 the report was prepared by Pikhoia's First Deputy and immediate successor (during 1996) then Acting Rosarkhiv Chairman Vladimir Alekseevich Tiuneev:

Pikhoia, Rudol'f Germanovich. "Ob itogakh raboty uchrezhdenii Gosudarstvennoi arkhivnoi sluzhby Rossii v 1993 g. i zadachakh na 1994 g." *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1994, no. 3, pp. 12–21.

Pikhoia, Rudol'f Germanovich. "Ob itogakh raboty uchrezhdenii Gosudarstvennoi arkhivnoi sluzhby Rossii v 1994 g. i zadachakh na 1995 g." *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 3, pp. 3–13.

Pikhoia, Rudol'f Germanovich. "Arkhivnye strasti," *Istoricheskie zapiski* 1(119) (Moscow: "Progress," 1995), pp. 230–63.

Tiuneev, Vladimir Alekseevich. "Upravlenie arkhivnym delom v Rossiiskogo Federatsii: tseli, formy i metody." In *Upravlenie v arkhivnom dele. Federal'nye, regional'nye i munitsipal'nye arkhivy. Arkhivist kak gosudarstvennyi sluzhashchii: Materialy mezhdunarodnogo seminara 21–23 marta 1995 g. Moskva* (Moscow, 1995), pp. 17–30.

Tiuneev, Vladimir Alekseevich. "Ob itogakh deiatel'nosti uchrezhdenii sistemy Rosarkhiva v 1995 g. i ossnovnykh napravleniiakh razvitiia arkhivnogo dela v Rossiiskogo Federatsii v 1996 g." *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 3, pp. 3–11.

Regarding the current situation of major federal agencies that have the right to long-term deposit/retention of their own records outside federal archives, and specific agency agreements with Rosarkhiv, see:

Tarasov, Igor' Nikolaevich; and Viktorova, Tat'iana Nikolaevna. "Novye aspekty sotrudnichestva Rosarkhiva s ministerstvami i vedomstvami." *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 2, pp. 15–19.

Viktorova, Tat'iana Nikolaevna. "O rabote s dokumentami otraslevykh fondov." *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 2, pp. 96–101.

Also of special note are the series of articles on current archival developments by Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov, who served as Rosarkhiv Deputy Chairman (1991–1996) until his own appointment as Chairman in December 1996. Others are cited in the footnotes.

Kozlov, Vladimir Petrovich. "Arkhivnaia reforma: Voprosy nauchnogo i metodicheskogo obespecheniia." *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1994, no. 1, pp. 7–13.

Kozlov, Vladimir Petrovich. "Publichnost' rossiiskikh arkhivov i problemy rassekrechivaniia arkhivnykh dokumentov." *Vestnik arkhivista*, 1994, no. 1(19) / 2(20), pp. 43–50.

Kozlov, Vladimir Petrovich. "O nekotorykh sovremennykh teoretiko-metodicheskikh problemakh arkhivovedeniia i istochnikovedeniia." *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1995, no. 2, pp. 5–9.

Particularly important for an analysis of legal developments is the recent article by Andrei Nikolaevich Artizov:

Artizov, Andrei Nikolaevich, "Arkhivnoe zakonodatel'stvo Rossii: sistema, problemy i perspektivy (k postanovke voprosa)," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1996, no. 4, pp. 3–8.

See also the additional essay:

Biniuk, Andrei Igorevich. "Sovremennaia arkhivnaia politika: Ozhidaniia i zaprety," in *Istoricheskie issledovaniia v Rossii: Tendentsii poslednikh let*, edited by G. A. Bordiugov, pp. 11–21. (Moscow: "AIRO-XX," 1996).

Among recent foreign reports and articles regarding the Russian archival scene, the following are of particular note:

"Final Report of the Joint Task Force on Archives – American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies and the American Historical Association, 1 April 1995." Compiled by Norman Naimark, William G. Rosenberg, William Taubman, Kathryn Weathersby, Donald J. Raleigh, Gregory Freeze, and David Ransel. *Slavic Review* 54, no. 2 (Summer 1995), pp. 407–26. Also published as "Joint Task Force on Former Soviet and East European Archives Issues Final Report," *Perspectives: American Historical Association Newsletter* 33, no. 6 (September 1995), pp. 15–17, 21–22.

A collective analysis by two major American academic associations, emphasizing the situation in Russian archives since 1991. The report particularly addresses the deteriorating physical situation of archives as a result of reduced budgets and staff, "privatization" or "commercialization" tendencies that may involve restrictions on users, and enterprising "private arrangements" that are inadequately shared with the field. The report also addresses issues of declassification, archival ethics, material circumstances, documentary publications and finding aids, including the problem of "commercialization," and the problem of "special collections." Includes recommendations.

Wehner, Markus. "Archivreform bei leeren Kassen: Einige Anmerkungen zur politischen und ekonomischen Situation der russischen Archive." *Osteuropa* 44 (1994, no. 2), pp. 102–24.

Kramer, Mark. "Archival Research in Moscow: Progress and Pitfalls." *CWIHP Bulletin* 1:3 (Fall 1993), pp. 18–39.

An analysis stressing archival developments during 1993, and particularly those involving access to research materials for contemporary Cold War topics. Extensive footnotes cite a wide range of writings in professional journals as well as the more popular press. See some additional updated comments by Jim Hershberg, "Russian Archives Review," in *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 4 (Fall 1994), pp. 86–88.

"Research, Ethics and the Market Place: The Case of the Russian Archives Discussion Series." *Slavic Review* 52:1–4 (Spring 1993–Winter 1993[1994]).

Ellen Mickiewicz, "The Commercialization of Scholarship in the Former Soviet Union," *SR* 52:1: pp. 87–89;

Mark von Hagen, "The Archival Gold Rush and Historical Agendas in the Post-Soviet Era," pp. 90–95;

J. Arch Getty, "Commercialization of Scholarship: Do We Need a Code of Behavior?" pp. 101–104;

Carole Fink, "Resolution by the AHA Council (30 December 1992)," pp. 105–106;

"The Case of the Russian Archives: An Interview with Iurii N. Afanas'ev," *SR* 52:2 (Summer 1993), pp. 338–52.

Boris N. Mironov, "Much Ado About Nothing?" *SR* 52:3 (Fall 1993), pp. 579–81;

Amy Knight, "The Fate of the KGB Archives," *SR* 52:3, pp. 582–86.

"On Russian Archives: An Interview with Sergei V. Mironenko," *SR* 52:4 (Winter 1993[1994]), pp. 839–46;

"From the Editor," *SR* 53:1 (Spring 1994), pp. viii–x.

Davies, Robert W. "The Battle for the Archvies." In *Soviet History in the Yeltsin Era* (London: Macmillan, 1997; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), pp. 81–114.

An authoratative, sober assessment of archival developments since 1991 by a British historian, based on extensive personal experience, consultaions, and familiarity with Russian published press accounts and relevant academic literature.

Other literature on the current archival scene is listed in the General Bibliography (Part A) in the *Arkhivy Rossii* (1997) and the forthcoming English edition, *Archives of Russia* (1998), and cited in footnote references above.

Bibliographic Post Scriptum (Spring 1997)

An important Russian restrospective appraisal of recent Russian archival developments appeared in the winter and spring 1997. Written predominantly by one of the Deputy Directors of GA RF (B–1), an experienced democratically-oriented historian who has been closely involved with recent archival developments, and another archivist from GA RF:

Kozlov, Vladimir A. and Ol'ga K. Lokteva, "'Arkhivnaia Revoliutsiia' v Rossii (1991–1996)," *Svobodnaia mysl'*, 1997, no. 1 (January): 113–21; no. 2 (February): 115–24; and no. 4 (April): 116–28.

With reference to the first chapter of the present study, the authors note:

> "Files from the Archive of the President RF [AP RF—**C–1**] . . . are continually being transferred from state custody to federal archives, but the historian has no way of evaluating the choice. It is hard to believe, for example, that personal letters of Stalin or in general most of the documents of his personal fond are needed for the work of the presidential apparatus and should be considered state secrets. But even if they are needed, why wouldn't it be possible to transfer copies to federal archives?" (part 2, p. 120).

Relevant to Chapter 13, in the second part the authors cite other telling examples indicative of continued agency control over their archival records and increasing reluctance for declassification by Russian security services.

The third part of the article includes an extensive bibliography of recently published documents from Russian archives relating to various important historical problems.

Another recent book-length bibliography of recently published archival documents likewise deserves attention:

Kondakova, I. A., *Otkrytyi arkhiv: Spravochnik opublikovannykh dokumentov po istorii Rossii XX-veka iz gosudarstvennykh i semeinyh arkhivov (po otechestvennoi periodike 1985–1995 gg.)* Moscow: "Print-Servis," 1997.

Provides an extensive, but regrettably not comprehensive, bibliography of new published archival documents appearing in journals and other serial publications. See the critical review, appraising ommissions and shortcomings, by N. A. Bogomolov in *Novoe literaturnoe obrozenie*, 27 (1997), pp. 402-405.