

# Regional Archival Development in the USSR: Soviet Standards and National Documentary Legacies

By PATRICIA KENNEDY GRIMSTED

IN ITS MOST significant action to date, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission has unanimously endorsed and recommended to the President and Congress of the United States "a National Historic Records Program which would involve the creation of a National Historic Records Commission and the making of matching grants to assist States, communities, and groups in locating, preserving, and making accessible the Nation's public and private historical records." The program has already won the wholehearted support of major historical and archival associations, which have been adding to the growing public awareness that "the actual situation . . . with regard to the records of our nation's past," in the words of the president of the Society of American Archivists, Charles E. Lee, "comes close to being a national disaster." It is to be hoped that the Congress of the United States, as an appropriate way to celebrate the bicentennial of the American Revolution, will soon approve the means to implement this nationwide program as a "joint Federal-State, public-private endeavor to locate, identify, preserve, and make available the important records of the prena-

The author, currently a Research Associate at the Russian Institute, Columbia University, adapted this article from a paper presented at the national convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, in Dallas, Texas, March 18, 1972. The article stems from the author's research for a directory of regional archives and manuscript repositories in the Soviet Union. She is preparing the directory under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities with matching funds from the Council on Library Resources. Much of the information here was gathered during the fall of 1969 and the summer of 1970 on research visits to the USSR made possible by grants from the American Council of Learned Societies and the International Research and Exchanges Board, whose assistance and support are gratefully acknowledged. Research in the Soviet Union was arranged by the Main Archival Administration and the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and by those of the Ukrainian, Belorussian, Georgian, Armenian, Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian union republics. The author would welcome communications from individuals conversant with the archival resources of any regions of the Soviet Union.

tional beginnings of the United States and of its succeeding two-hundred year history."<sup>1</sup>

As this program goes before Congress, its supporters and those who will be planning its implementation might find it worthwhile to take a serious look at the archival achievement of a similarly large and administratively complex nation on the other side of the globe, an achievement that occurred on the heels of the Bolshevik Revolution little more than fifty years ago. Most aspects of the Soviet archival system obviously remain unsuitable to the current American scene. Nevertheless, Americans should recognize that in archival development—particularly with respect to the systematic organization of local archives and the standardization of archival techniques—the United States has been sorely outstripped by the Soviet Union. Such practical accomplishments consequently deserve the attention of American archival planners in their attempts to provide for the preservation and bibliographic control that our nationwide documentary legacy urgently requires.<sup>2</sup>

The Soviet Union, undoubtedly, has developed the world's most comprehensive and centralized system for the administration of archival materials, with established procedures for the management of records in all governmental agencies; with a regular system of state archives on all administrative-territorial levels; with huge expenditures for archival buildings; with strict guidelines for storage facilities and restoration and preservation techniques; and with standardized formats for internal organization, for arrangement and description of archival materials, and for the publication of finding

<sup>1</sup> The Resolution of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was adopted at Boston on May 16, 1972. The Resolution and the text of the statement to the ARBC of Charles E. Lee (February 10, 1972) are appended to Lee's "President's Page: The Proposed National Historical Records Program," *American Archivist*, 35 (July/Oct. 1972): 368-77.

The enthusiastic support for this program is evidenced in the statements of representatives of various historical organizations at the August 1972 hearings on the ARBC before the Standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays and Celebrations of the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary. In an address to the SAA at the April 1972 meeting of the Organization of American Historians, Frank B. Evans outlined his "Proposal for a National Inventory of Archival Resources," a discussion of which will be printed in the *American Historical Association Newsletter* (February 1973). The deplorable state of local records and their finding aids, from a researcher's point of view, is well suggested by Edward C. Papenfuss, Jr., "The Historian and Local Records: The Need for a Fresh Approach to an Old Problem," *AHA Newsletter*, 9 (May 1971): 24-28.

<sup>2</sup> From an administrative standpoint, the existing organization and condition of state archives in the United States is detailed in the comprehensive report of Ernst Posner, *American State Archives* (Chicago, 1964). An extensive list of recent literature on state and local archival developments in the United States is provided by Frank B. Evans, *The Administration of Modern Archives: A Select Bibliographic Guide* (Washington, 1970), pp. 167-86.

aids. All of these elements are coordinated through high-level centralized planning and are applicable throughout the diverse, multinational and multilingual system. In contrast to what will undoubtedly remain a symbiotic but independent relationship between private and state repositories in the United States, the Soviet Union has extended the jurisdiction of its state archival agency, the Main Archival Administration, to include not only official state records, but also manuscript materials from all types of economic, social, and cultural institutions, and the personal papers of important individuals. Special centralized repositories have been established for literary materials, films, and sound recordings, and for scientific and technical documentation. What is more, the government has set up a special training institute and subsidiary programs for the education of archivists and records management specialists and has recently established a special high-level research and planning institute to study problems related to archival development, records management, and information retrieval systems.<sup>3</sup>

The Soviet archival system is still fraught with inefficiency and serious problems in many areas. Frequent archival reorganizations and changes of nomenclature, institutional transfers, and changes in arrangement and descriptive guidelines have left much confusion for researchers and administrators alike. Successive revamping of administrative-territorial units and their associated archives, and shifts in international boundaries and ensuing documentary migrations have contributed many difficulties that are not yet satisfactorily resolved. Vast accumulations of records in Tbilisi or Kazan or Riga, to say nothing of Moscow and Leningrad, await proper arrangement, adequate inventorying, and the publication of basic finding aids. Countless documents have perished in the face of paper shortages, floods and fires, political vandalism, social upheaval and emigration, and wartime destruction. Access policies are so restrictive in most Soviet archives that American security classifications seem insignificant by comparison. Limitations in research services and inadequacies in cataloging at many Soviet institutions make the National Archives and many state archives in the United States seem a scholar's paradise by contrast. Yet even if the public is not presently allowed liberal access to Soviet repositories and even if those scholars admitted are restricted in their use of documentation and

<sup>3</sup> An introductory discussion of the development of the Soviet archival system is included in my book, *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Moscow and Leningrad* (Princeton, 1972), pp. 23-60. A short survey of the highlights of the central all-union archival organization is contained in my earlier article, "Archives in the Soviet Union: Their Organization and the Problem of Access," *American Archivist*, 34 (Jan. 1971): 27-41.

finding aids, the reality remains that by and large the records of state and society are being effectively preserved.<sup>4</sup>

Nowhere does the contrast between the American and Soviet archival systems stand out more sharply than with reference to regional archival developments and the wide variety of local documentary materials that have been brought into a program of governmental administration, preservation, and ultimate bibliographic control. As Soviet commentators themselves have emphasized, the revolutionary archival changes after 1917 are in large part an outgrowth of Marxist-Leninist ideology. The historical consciousness and revolutionary self-consciousness that so deeply permeated Soviet social theory and practice encouraged fastidious recordkeeping.<sup>5</sup> But changes in the content and administration of archives must also be seen as a reflection of revolutionized patterns of state authority because, with the extension of state control over virtually all social and economic functions within society, records produced by the new Soviet government naturally embrace all aspects of society.

With the commitment of Marxist-Leninist theory to the interpretation of history as part and parcel of its ideological justification and its imposition of social and intellectual norms, historians and literary critics needed the records of the past to document their interpretation. At the same time they needed control over all historical materials to insure the viability of their ideological orthodoxy. Such imperatives called not only for the records of the outmoded tsarist governmental administration, but also for all the records of society. Hence in the twenties and thirties archival administrative jurisdiction was extended to include all the national documentary legacy, from medieval charters to factory records and motion-picture films, as well as to provide regulated procedures for the disposition and accession of the noncurrent records of all agencies of state and society.

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion of the problem of access to Soviet archives, particularly as it affects foreigners, see the procedural introduction in my *Archives and Repositories in the USSR*, pp. 70-77. Details about access for Soviet citizens are complex, but normally access is available to those having a legitimate purpose in connection with their work and hence is normally limited to the research establishment for the purposes of approved research.

<sup>5</sup> Soviet archival reform is usually dated from the decree "On the Reorganization and Centralization of Archival Affairs," issued under the signature of V. I. Lenin on June 1, 1918 reprinted in *Sbornik rukovodiashchikh materialov po arkhivnomu delu (1917—iiun' 1941 gg.)* (Moscow, 1961), pp. 12-13. The most thorough commentary on the background of the reform is the one by S. O. Shmidt, "K istorii arkhivnogo stroitel'stva v pervye gody sovetskoi vlasti" [Towards the history of archival development in the first years of Soviet rule], in *Problemy arkhivovedeniia i istorii arkhivnykh uchrezhdenii. Materialy iubileinoi nauchnoi konferentsii arkhivistov Leningrada, 13-14 iunia 1968 g.* (Leningrad, 1970), pp. 19-35.



Archival developments proceeded at a similar pace in local administrative centers of the Russian Federated Republic as well as in the non-Russian areas that now constitute the fourteen other union republics under the USSR. In fact, archives administration became an important component in Soviet nationality policies, because administrative and ideological problems have often been most acute in the non-Russian republics, where the intense and varying exigencies of relating non-Russian nationalities to the Soviet state have been correlated with the imposition of Soviet social and economic norms and the tenets of socialist realism on the cultural front. Consequently, the development and contents of archives in non-Russian republics appear as intriguing mirrors for the changing patterns in both the imposition of Soviet norms and the controlled encouragement of non-Russian national traditions.

Most fundamentally, in the field of history, archives have been a cornerstone for the development of local social and economic history and of local historical research establishments. Throughout all parts of the Soviet Union, collection, institutionalization, arrangement, description, and, where necessary, restoration of local records, most of which were previously neglected, have proceeded with unprecedented activity. Unfortunately, in some areas the archival efforts came too late. Many unique files were targets of political vandalism, and others were scattered abroad by widespread emigration. Untold quantities of records perished in the forced quotas of reprocessable paper which local communities had to fulfill in the early 1920's, and many others perished from the ravages of war, weather and physical neglect. Such trends, however, were largely reversed with the establishment of an extensive system of local archives, the subsequent construction of suitable storage centers, and overall planning for the preservation of local documentation. Although some fonds have been broken apart along territorial or subject-matter divisions, records are being maintained, on the whole, in their previous institutional integrity.

To a certain extent, ideological dogma has meant emphasis on certain types of materials, and cataloging and publication precedence has often been determined by the acceptability and publishability of the contents. Thus records from remote villages were sought to give evidence of social tensions or "revolutionary situations" among the peasantry and "heroic, patriotic" struggles during "fatherland wars." Factory records have been carefully organized so that statistics on strikes and workers' protests can be compiled. And evidence was gathered to demonstrate both the friendship of non-Russian nationalities for the Russian state and the beneficent effects of Soviet rule.

As a result, echoes of standard Soviet themes appear in print in far-flung capitals like Minsk, Baku, and Tashkent, while local historical studies and documentary publications—both in Russian and in local languages—often circumvent materials relating to particularist national political tendencies or local religious development.<sup>6</sup> By the same token, archival access to many types of materials is severely limited, and many intellectually probing historians are excluded from the archives.

Despite intellectual limitations and ideological standardization, the impetus toward extensive historical publication—to say nothing of the training of historical researchers to perform it—has had an overall positive effect on local archival development. Occasional regrettable examples of neglect and destruction of historically significant materials mar the record and elicit deservedly disparaging reactions abroad. Yet there is evidence that, for the most part, even the most sensitive files are being carefully preserved. Publications from the 1920's attest to the significant archival strides made in that period. Again, since the 1950's, when archives became increasingly open to the Soviet research establishment, many local publications have contained much fresh archival data. These publications, with an increasing number of published finding aids and archival source studies, give ample evidence of the tremendous volume of local documentation brought under archival control in the non-Russian republics and in local districts of the Russian Federation.

Archival progress has been related, also, to the development of national literary and cultural traditions in non-Russian republics, resulting in the careful collection and storage of literary papers and manuscript sources in archives or other state repositories. Some republics have established separate literary archives, paralleling the all-union TsGALI (Central State Archive of Literature and Art) in Moscow; the most prominent example is the special Ukrainian republic-level literary archive established in Kiev in 1967 and scheduled to open officially in 1973. In other republics, literary fonds constitute special divisions of republic-level central state archives. Officially sanctioned writers have often inspired the creation of special literary memorial museums, some with libraries or manuscript sections for the author's personal library and papers. Although

<sup>6</sup> Many details about Soviet historical publications on the non-Russian nationalities, together with a highly critical interpretive analysis, are presented in the recent study by Lowell Tillet, *The Great Friendship: Soviet Historians on the Non-Russian Nationalities* (Chapel Hill, 1969), including an extensive bibliography. Tillet has not, however, attempted to deal with the historical publications in non-Russian languages, nor has any other writer tried to survey this field with reference to themes and types of sources used.

much remains to be done in this field, archival fonds in other local museums have received considerable attention. Various libraries, both state and university, have also developed rich manuscript divisions with archival fonds—including personal papers of literary figures—and various manuscript and documentary collections. Some of the larger republic-level libraries under the Academies of Sciences, such as those in Vilna (Vilnius), Kiev, and Lvov (L'viv), are particularly notable in this regard, having taken over strong pre-Soviet collections of their parent institutions. And some of the academies' institutes of literature (prominent are those in Kiev and Vilna) have amassed significant manuscript holdings and archival fonds as an outgrowth of their own research and publication efforts. Many of these materials are not housed in centralized archives, but are retained in state repositories of one type or another, subject to arrangement and description standards and considered legally part of the official republic state archival holdings.

Similar provisions are made for medieval and early modern manuscript books and various oriental manuscripts. Long subject to neglect, these types of materials have benefited from renewed attention, especially since the mid-1950's.<sup>7</sup> Medieval and oriental manuscript collections themselves are usually deposited in manuscript divisions of various libraries, institutes, and museums rather than in state archives. Before his death, the noted medievalist M. N. Tikhomirov started a nationwide project for a complete catalog of Slavic manuscripts in the Soviet Union, and work is still continuing under the auspices of the Archeographical Commission of the Academy of Sciences with the cooperation and participation of republic-level commissions and other institutions.<sup>8</sup> A number of libraries or

<sup>7</sup> Since most medieval manuscript books are religious texts, many were damaged or destroyed in the course of widespread religious persecution after the establishment of Soviet rule. That losses still occur in some areas is suggested by the reports of the fires in the Ukrainica section of the Academy of Sciences library in Kiev in 1964 and in the Vydubetsk Monastery near Kiev in 1969. A basic bibliographical directory of published catalogs and other descriptive literature about medieval Slavic manuscripts, organized according to the institution where they are currently housed, is provided by the volume compiled by Iu. K. Begunov, N. F. Bel'chikov, and N. P. Rozhdestvenskii, *Spravochnik-ukazatel' pechatnykh opisaniï slaviano-russkikh rukopisei* [Handbook-directory of printed descriptions of Slavic-Russian manuscripts] (Moscow and Leningrad, 1963).

<sup>8</sup> A description of this project is presented in the introduction to a preliminary published listing of pre-fifteenth century manuscripts by N. B. Shelamanova, "Predvaritel'nyi spisok slaviano-russkikh rukopisei XI-XIV vv., khraniashchikhsia v SSSR (dlia Svodnogo kataloga rukopisei, khraniashchikhsia v SSSR, do kontsa XIV v. vkluchitel'no)" [Preliminary list of Slavic-Russian manuscripts of the 11th-14th centuries retained in the USSR (for the complete catalog of manuscripts retained in the USSR through the end of the 14th century)], *Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1965 god* (Moscow, 1966), pp. 177-272.

institutes have set up their own "archeographical" or manuscript-locating expeditions. Several republics with rich early cultures have established special repositories for nationalized collections of early manuscripts, with high-quality storage, preservation, and study facilities. Stacks of the Matenadaran—the exceedingly rich republic-level manuscript repository in Erevan—are one of the few places in Armenia with air-conditioning. Both Azerbaijan and Georgia have established special manuscript institutes under the Academy of Sciences as centers for the preservation and study of their early cultural treasures. In Central Asia the Uzbek Academy of Sciences, for example, can boast of an impressive collection of oriental manuscripts in the library of its Institute of Oriental Studies.<sup>9</sup>

Archival attention too has been devoted to regional cinematographic traditions with the establishment of extensive republic-level film archives. For practical reasons storage of artistic films in most areas remains attached to republic motion picture studios (a print of every such film also goes to the centralized archive, Gosfil'mofond, in Moscow), while television studios tend also to retain their own archives of videotapes. For documentary films, most republics have set up specialized film archives or separate divisions in their central state archives, usually combined with facilities for storing sound recordings and photographic collections. Such policies have resulted in the consolidation of the local cinematographic heritage, with adequate provisions for its safe preservation and utilization.

Another field of local archival attention has been that of folklore. The development and promotion of local ethnic traditions have been particularly strong ingredients in Soviet nationality policy, and these efforts have brought with them significant strides in archival development. Particularly impressive are the scope and thoroughness of the Latvian folklore archive in Riga under the Academy of Sciences. The folklore collection under the Estonian Academy of Sciences in the Kreitsvald Literature Museum in Tartu, reputedly one of the largest in the world, dates its origin to 1927; it has been expanded in the Soviet period to include sophisticated catalogs and storage systems of folk song scores and recordings and other types of ethnographic materials. Similar folklore archives have been organized in Lithuania, Belorussia, the Ukraine, and other non-Russian republics.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Details about these institutions and other similar ones, together with an annotated bibliography of available finding aids will be included in my directory of regional archives and manuscript repositories in the Soviet Union, now in preparation.

<sup>10</sup> For a bibliography of folklore materials in the USSR, including some references to non-Russian archival holdings, see M. Ia. Melts, comp., *Russkii fol'klor. Bibliograficheskii ukazatel'* [Russian folklore. Bibliographical directory], vol. 1, 1945-59 (Leningrad, 1961); vol. 2, 1917-1944 (Leningrad, 1966), especially pp. 435-38; and vol. 3, 1960-65 (Leningrad, 1967), especially pp. 291-95.

Everywhere in the Soviet Union the encouragement of national traditions and thus the preservation of national documentary legacies have been accompanied by the imposition of Soviet standards. Such standards may take many subtle political and ideological forms, or they may be more practical devices that come from Moscow more often as a matter of bureaucratic convenience than as a conscious intent to undermine local linguistic preferences or detract from the local national heritage. In the realm of archives administration, many of the methodological standards prescribed by Moscow—whatever the inadequacies of their application—bespeak the values of centralized planning and often lead to progressive archival practices, with relatively uniform organization and adequate storage facilities and with the potential for efficient bibliographical and inventory control.

Patterned after the Main Archival Administration of the USSR in Moscow, a special archival agency directly under the republic-level Council of Ministers (*Arkhivnoe upravlenie pri Sovete ministrov*) serves as the administrative and planning center for the state archives in each republic. As regular functions it administers the republic-level central state archives; coordinates their work with the all-union Main Archival Administration in Moscow and with other local archives; oversees records management in republic-level governmental agencies and institutions; insures the continuity between agency records, temporary archives and storage centers, and the permanent state archives; supervises archival publishing programs for documentary publications, finding aids, and, in a few republics, local professional archival journals; and insures the preservation of the entire documentary legacy of the republic, including holdings in other repositories not under the state system. A special division of the Main Archival Administration of the USSR in Moscow coordinates in turn the activities of republic and local-level archival administrations throughout the USSR with those of the all-union central state archives in Moscow and Leningrad and insures the implementation of technical and organizational standards. In administrative matters, however, in recent years the republic-level archival administrations have reportedly enjoyed an increased measure of local initiative.

As a cardinal principle of Soviet archival organization, documentation is deposited in archives for the administrative-territorial levels or units where it was produced. Thus all-union records are designated for permanent preservation in the eleven all-union central state archives in Moscow and Leningrad, while republic-level documentation is retained by republic-level central state archives. The same principle holds true for lower administrative-territorial units. There are some exceptions, however. Most military records, for ex-

ample, are transferred to the all-union military archives in Moscow or the Central State Archive of the Navy in Leningrad. Disputed claims naturally arise for some groups of records, and compromises are made with the national system. Thus the records of the pre-revolutionary province (*guberniia*) of Livonia, which spanned the territory of the present republics of Latvia and Estonia, have been split between the historical archives in Riga and Tartu. Many of the early Lithuanian court registers relating to areas now comprising the Belorussian republic have been transferred to Minsk, although they are traditionally part of a group of records still stored in Vilna. Such decisions are often difficult in the case of historical records, and many important materials remain in repositories where they have been traditionally stored. Thus most of the records of the administrative bureau that governed the Ukraine during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (*Malorossiiskii prikaz*) remain in the Central State Archive of Ancient Acts (TsGADA) in Moscow.

The centrally inspired system is apparent in the organizational pattern and actual names of the state archives in each union republic, although local variations allow for the specific needs as determined by the pre-Soviet archival structure and the volume and complexity of documentation involved. The current forty-five so-called "central state" republic-level archives serve as depositories for the noncurrent records of almost all Soviet republic-level administrative, legal, economic, social, and cultural institutions and organizations, as well as for pre-Soviet materials deemed to be of republic-wide significance. The actual organization of archival institutions follows the basic pattern found on the all-union level in Moscow, usually with a number of separate specialized institutions for different types of materials bureaucratically centralized under the republic archival administration. However, several of the smaller or younger republics, most notably the Kazakh, Kirghiz, Moldavian, and Turkmen, have a single "central state archive," with internal administrative divisions for different types of documentation.<sup>11</sup>

The most important organizational division is made between the records of the pre-Soviet and Soviet periods. Thus most republics

<sup>11</sup> Descriptions of the thirty-three republic-level, central state archives as they were organized in the mid-1950's can be found in *Gosudarstvennye arkhivy Soiuz SSR. Kratkii spravochnik* [State archives of the USSR. Short handbook] (Moscow, 1956). Since this directory's publication, many changes have occurred both in new archives and in reorganization of earlier ones; consequently, a current list of the republic-level archives is appended to this article. My description of the regional archival organization presented earlier in "Regional State Archives in the USSR: Some Notes and a Bibliography of Published Guides," *Slavic Review*, 28 (March 1969): 94-96, is also out of date now. A more complete description and bibliography will appear in the regional archival directory I am now preparing.



have a separate archive for the records of the Soviet period, invariably called the "Central State Archive of the October Revolution and Socialist Development" (TsGAOR) of the given republic, and an additional "Central State Historical Archive" (TsGIA). In many republics, the present historical archives have taken over en masse the holdings (and often even the buildings) of earlier archival institutions and at the same time have collected whatever archival materials could be found in the area that had previously not been subject to archival storage. Belorussia and the Ukraine each have two historical archives, one in their capitals of Minsk and Kiev, and one consolidating pre-Soviet records in the Western areas that came under Soviet rule after the Second World War—in Lvov for the Ukraine and in Grodno for Belorussia.

There is no separate historical archive for the Russian Federated Republic, since Russian materials predating the formation of the USSR in 1922 are deemed of all-union significance and are consequently consolidated in the central state historical or "October Revolution" archives of the USSR; the Russian Federation does, however, now have two separate central state archives, one in Moscow for the majority of republic-level records, and one in Tomsk, specifically for republic-level records originating in the Far East. It should also be noted that each of the sixteen so-called "autonomous republics" representing non-Russian minority nationalities and forming separate territorial units within the Russian Federation has its own central state archive for local records. The four autonomous republics within other union republics likewise have their own central state archives.

Most of the republics have further subdivided their state archives, making them similar to the specialized archives on the all-union level in Moscow. Special state archives for films, sound-recordings, and photographic documents (TsGAKFFD) are maintained by the Armenian, Belorussian, Estonian, Georgian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Tadzhik, and Ukrainian republics; Azerbaijan, following the 1967 Moscow example, split this repository into two separate archives, one for films and photographs and a second for sound recordings. Separate literary archives have recently been organized in the Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Belorussia, and Lithuania. Plans call for them to consolidate some of the literary archival materials currently stored in museums and smaller libraries. As has been the case in Moscow and Leningrad, however, the literary archives undoubtedly will not appropriate the manuscript holdings of the larger libraries, nor will they take over the extensive literary and folklore archives held by some of the institutes under republic-level academies of sciences. Most recently, and again following the all-union pattern in Moscow,



Belorussia and the Ukraine have organized special archives for scientific and technical documentation; similar repositories in the Uzbek and Azerbaijan republics cover specifically technical and medical documentation. It is to be expected in the future that other republics will follow suit and that other specialized archives will be established on the republic level as the volume and complexity of holdings increase.

Within each union republic, state archives have been organized systematically also for all major administrative-territorial divisions. The larger republics are divided into oblasts usually named after the city that serves as their administrative center; the Ukrainian republic, for example, is divided into twenty-five oblasts and the Belorussian into six. Administrative-territorial divisions in the Russian Federation are somewhat more complicated, with a total of forty-nine oblasts and six *krai* (somewhat larger divisions that often include several oblasts), in addition to "autonomous" regions for non-Russian minority national groups.<sup>12</sup> Throughout the Soviet Union, a permanent state archive for each and every oblast, *krai*, and autonomous region receives records designated for preservation from administrative agencies and other state institutions in the region it serves.

The regional archive system as presently organized dates back to the 1941 archival reorganization, following the uniform introduction of oblasts as administrative-territorial units in the 1930's; a series of earlier systems of name and organization antedated 1941. These past changes have left considerable difficulty and confusion in the internal organization and location of large bodies of records. Since the latest reorganization in the late 1950's and early 1960's, the oblast level archives with few exceptions bear uniformly the appellation starting with the geographic name of the oblast.<sup>13</sup> Both prerevolutionary and Soviet materials produced in the territory of the present oblast are commonly stored together in a single repository. However, in some republics, Belorussia for example, all materials from the period prior to Soviet rule are concentrated together in the republic-level central state historical archives; and in almost all areas, materials predating the nineteenth century have been removed to

<sup>12</sup> In addition to the sixteen "autonomous republics" in the RSFSR mentioned above, there are also five "autonomous oblasts" for smaller minority nationalities (these come under *krai* administration), and ten "national *okrugs*," which are areas reserved for predominately migratory groups, especially in the far north. Three autonomous oblasts located in other republics likewise have their own permanent state archives.

<sup>13</sup> Descriptions of most of the state oblast archives in the Soviet Union are provided in the directory, *Gosudarstvennye arkhivy Soiuza SSR. Kratkii spravochnik*, although in most cases, the word order has been changed in their official names, and there have been some organizational changes.

central republic-level historical archives where they receive special attention and storage facilities.

Following systematized records-management guidelines, materials deemed worthy of permanent preservation are channeled at regular intervals to oblast archives from their producing agencies in the oblast; or, in the case of records from lesser administrative-territorial units, they are held in temporary archives or record storage centers established strategically in local administrative centers throughout the oblast. In fact, temporary archives have been established throughout the nation in every *raion*, the local administrative-territorial units into which an oblast, krai, and city may be divided. From these archives, selected materials designated for permanent preservation are transferred periodically to oblast-level archives. In some cases, holdings from several raion archives have been consolidated in a centralized institution and designated as a branch of the oblast archive, giving them the status of a permanent archive.<sup>14</sup> In some areas, city archives also have been given permanent status to provide for special, local archival needs. In this manner, the state archival system has adapted itself to local conditions and archival requirements. At the same time it has provided a uniform program of records management down to the local level of factories, courts, and village councils and has established specialized facilities for adequate care and storage of the varied local documentary legacy of the multinational, multilingual state and society.

Although centralization and uniform state control are undoubtedly hallmarks of the Soviet archival system, vast quantities of documentation and manuscript resources still remain outside the state archival system, not directly under the control of the Main Archival Administration and its local branches. Most important, records of the Communist Party, on both oblast and republic level, are usually maintained in separate Party archives not under the control of the Main Archival Administration. Because of the complicated relationship between Party and state agencies, however, considerable intermingling of records is inevitable, and many Party files, especially from the 1920's, are retained in state archives. Party archives have their own separate, centralized system, at the head of which is the Central Party Archive of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Moscow, although in many of their archival practices, the Party archives follow the standards set by the Main Archival Administration.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Some additional branch oblast archives have been established in the course of oblast reorganization in cities that were formerly administrative centers for other oblasts, where considerable archival material had already been consolidated.

<sup>15</sup> For the history and organization of Party archives, see the booklet by V. V. Mak-

As mentioned above, manuscript collections, as distinct from naturally accumulated records, are usually deposited in libraries, museums, or different research institutes, which may be under various administrative organs such as the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Education, or the Academy of Sciences. Also, manuscript divisions of these institutions often house a variety of personal papers, documentary collections, and other types of archival materials. This fragmentation of archival holdings is a pattern as characteristic in the non-Russian republics as it is in Moscow and Leningrad. Nevertheless, standard arrangement and descriptive formulae and other archival practices laid down by the Main Archival Administration are applicable for these institutions, and even many repositories that had developed their own earlier systems are being required to change to standard Soviet practices.

Generalized standards for Soviet archives cover everything from blueprints for archival buildings or storage areas to specifications for lighting and humidity control, microfilming and preservation techniques, and instructions for reference services and publishing projects. Of particular significance for the purposes of information retrieval, precise guidelines dictate internal archival organization and arrangement and descriptive standards operative in state archives and other manuscript repositories throughout the Soviet Union. With strict adherence to the principle of *provenance*, all holdings in all repositories are uniformly retained in named and numbered fonds. In Soviet usage a *fond* represents, in the case of records, the institution or organization where the records were produced; in the case of personal papers, the individual or family who accumulated them; or in the case of collections, the individual or institution that gathered them.<sup>16</sup> Within each fond, materials are arranged into individual storage units (*edinit'sy khraneniia*). Except for their listing on a master inventory (*opis'*) or series of inventories, there is very little, if any, formal, rational subgrouping other than

sakov, *Organizatsiia arkhivov KPSS (Uchebnoe posobie)* [The organization of the Archives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (textbook)], edited by Iu. F. Kononov (Moscow, 1968).

<sup>16</sup> A "fond" in the Soviet system is *not* exactly equivalent to a "record-group" in American archival terminology, although there may be some similarities in practice, and the term may also be used with reference to personal papers and collections. Hence, to avoid confusion I prefer to anglicize the word with reference to Soviet archives. Detailed instructions regarding the delineation of fonds and their arrangement are given in the textbook used by the archival training institute, G. A. Belov and L. A. Nikiforov, eds., *Teoriia i praktika arkhivnogo dela v SSSR* [Theory and practice of archival affairs in the USSR] (Moscow, 1966), especially pp. 35-63. See also the procedural introduction of my *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR*, pp. 64-67.

that dictated by the natural order of the records themselves. In the case of materials already brought together in archival institutions before Soviet rule, an effort has been made to keep the organization and contents intact, and their original storage places are used if deemed adequate. The arrangement and description system employed within all Soviet repositories is particularly appropriate as a nationwide standard in a country where there have been a wide variety of past administrative patterns; the system provides general guidelines and standardized forms, yet is sufficiently adaptable to accommodate records and other materials in many formats and in many languages.

Also, Soviet state archives follow a standard pattern of internal organization, especially for the purposes of published guides and handbooks. When archives contain materials from several major historical periods or when the region has been under different governing nations (Soviet, prerevolutionary Russian, or other national unit), each usually forms a major division of the archive. Within such major divisions, fonds are usually grouped in broad subject-matter categories. The standardized format for these groups further suggests the breadth of the repositories. For prerevolutionary materials, fonds usually fall into nine major categories, according to the origin of the records: (1) high administrative organs and/or local organs of state administration; (2) organs of city and/or rural government; (3) courts and legal institutions; (4) police and gendarme corps; (5) military institutions or local army units; (6) commercial and economic organizations and institutions, including factories and other businesses; (7) cultural, educational, civic, and welfare organizations and institutions; (8) religious institutions; (9) individual persons and families. Records from the Soviet period are divided into slightly different groups, reflecting the basic changes in patterns of government and social organization; they include, for example, a section for trade-union records. Many archives also have a special section for published documentary materials, local newspapers, etc., and a section for films and photographic documents when these are not housed in separate archives. These divisions, of course, vary according to the extent and requirements of the local accumulation of records.<sup>17</sup>

The imposition of Soviet standards is particularly apparent in the realm of published finding aids. A hierarchy of different types of publications exists, from the cursory survey of holdings (*obzor*

<sup>17</sup> The list of categories for archival guides is given in the text, above, edited by Belov and Nikiforov, pp. 254-58. I have added the category for personal or family fonds to the list given there because, in practice, it usually appears in archival guides.

*fondov*) to the detailed inventory (*opis'* or *opisanie*) of a particular body of materials. The most common basic finding aid, which eventually is to be prepared for every state archive down to the oblast level, is the guide, or *putevoditel'*.<sup>18</sup> By the end of 1971, of the forty-three central state archives in the fourteen non-Russian republics, eighteen had published guides (or their equivalent). These figures, however, do not accurately reflect the situation, because of the twenty-five archives for which no guides exist, nineteen are of recent formation or are film archives for which the publication of guides is not a normal procedure.<sup>19</sup> Oblast archives have been much slower to publish guides, except in the Ukraine where guides have been published for nineteen of the twenty-five oblasts.<sup>20</sup> Published guides usually follow the exact same format, with brief descriptions of the major fonds in the different sections of the archive as indicated above. The formal sameness of Soviet archival guides facilitates administrative and reference use, but it also can, and does on occasion, promote a disturbing level of superficiality in the description of contents. Such a limitation, however, is not attributable to the format. Rather, it reflects the frequent low priority given to public research-facilitating functions by Soviet authorities and the consequent reticence to divulge precise, comprehensive data about many of their holdings.<sup>21</sup>

Generalized archival guides provide valuable basic surveys of the holdings of individual repositories, but, to be sure, they are not sufficient finding aids for many research purposes. Soviet state archives, with few exceptions, have been derelict in publishing detailed inventories or comprehensive finding aids for specific groups of ma-

<sup>18</sup> Details, with examples, about the finding aids produced by Soviet archives are given by G. M. Gorfein and L. E. Shepelev, *Arkhiivovedenie* [Archival affairs] (Leningrad, 1971), pp. 33-53; and by L. E. Shepelev, *Arkhiivnye razyskaniia i issledovaniia* [Archival investigation and research] (Moscow, 1971), pp. 48-74; as well as in the text, above, edited by Belov and Nikiforov, pp. 239-70.

<sup>19</sup> Those archives for which guides have been published are indicated by asterisks on the appended list of republic-level central state archives. Unfortunately, many of these guides are already seriously out of date. There are no published guides for the republic-level archives of the RSFSR.

<sup>20</sup> Guides covering several branch oblast archives in the Ukraine have also been published, increasing the total number cited. Two of the six oblast archives in Belorussia have published guides; only one oblast archive in Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan has published a guide, and none in other non-Russian republics. In the RSFSR twenty-six guides have been published for the six krai and fifty-four oblast archives (including five autonomous oblasts); an additional three guides have appeared for autonomous republics under the RSFSR.

<sup>21</sup> This tendency is also apparent in the small number of copies of archive guides printed (*tirage*) and in the failure of many archive guides to provide comprehensive bibliographies of previously published finding aids, especially pre-Soviet publications.

terials.<sup>22</sup> This failure is serious for the researcher because the shelf lists or inventories (*opisi*) that have been prepared for most fonds are frequently not made available to him.

In recent decades, however, Soviet archival planners have devoted considerable attention to the preparation of comprehensive name and subject card catalogs. The immensity of this task and the staff time needed to complete such an ambitious undertaking hardly need comment, but plans call eventually for such catalogs to be tied into nationwide locator services. Standardized formats and classification principles have been developed, and notable progress has been made in the actual preparation of card files in many state archives (although those completed are frequently reserved for staff use).

The use of such standardized formats for archival organization and for internal arrangement and description of materials—from initial inventories to card catalogs and published guides—means to the archivist more efficient and complete administrative control over records. To a researcher such practices mean potentially better information control through standardized finding aids and the eventual possibility of more sophisticated information retrieval systems.

Centralized bibliographic and scientific information services, particularly in libraries and scientific institutes, have been impressively developed in the Soviet Union. In the archival realm, important research and planning efforts are being undertaken in the special division of the recently established archival research institute, VNIIDAD (Vsesoiuznyi nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut dokumentovedeniia i arkhivnogo dela). Plans are underway for the introduction of computerized systems for some limited operations. Needless to say, the Soviets are far from having fully computerized archival systems, yet they are already beginning to use punchcard systems for certain types of central archival operations. And the standardized data forms and descriptive formats now in use in local archives and other repositories throughout the country provide a good basis for and could be easily transformed into machine-readable systems. The use of the same type of arrangement and descriptive formulae in Tashkent as in Vilna and Kishinev makes nationwide finding aids and reference systems much more feasible in the Soviet Union than in the United States where local repositories go their separate ways without national standards or centrally planned systems.

A relatively small, but nonetheless consequential, example of the

<sup>22</sup> A large number of survey articles have appeared covering specific groups of holdings, but only in a few cases have inventory-type publications appeared for state archives outside of Moscow and Leningrad.



type of information control that can be achieved within the Soviet archival system is the ten-year-old, two-volume directory to personal papers in state repositories, for which a supplementary volume is now in preparation. Such a guide would be an invaluable research tool in any country, but, despite some major efforts, few countries can boast a similar achievement in the field of personal papers;<sup>23</sup> the United States has yet to initiate a similar project.

The 1956 directory of state archives throughout the USSR—now badly in need of revision—is another clear indication of the advantages of centralized standards and uniform archival practices. A new short directory of Ukrainian state archives fulfills a basic need for that republic, but unfortunately, as in many countries, insufficient efforts are made to provide such basic reference aids or to keep earlier ones up to date.<sup>24</sup> Considerable effort has been made toward producing location aids for medieval Slavic manuscripts throughout the Soviet Union and most recently in covering materials for theater history.<sup>25</sup> Many other types of fundamental reference literature about Soviet archives are still badly needed; however, the foundation for such enterprises has been laid with the thorough organization of repositories and the standardization of archival practices. Furthermore, the imposition of standardized techniques and the existence of archival communication channels, easily used for administrative and reference purposes, also extend the potentialities of bibliographic control to the large body of archival material remaining outside the formal state archival system.

Demonstration of the beneficial effects of the imposition of Soviet

<sup>23</sup> *Lichnye arkhivnye fondy v gosudarstvennykh khranilishchakh SSSR. Ukazatel'* [Personal archival fonds in the state repositories of the USSR. A directory], 2 vols. (Moscow, 1962–63). Organized alphabetically by personal names, the directory covers more than 10,000 fonds in archives, libraries, museums, and other institutions throughout the Soviet Union, giving the location, size, and years covered by the contents. Much information about personal papers in American repositories is naturally included in the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections and in the *Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States*, edited by Philip M. Hamer (New Haven, 1961), but neither of these, in purpose or in coverage, is comparable to the Soviet volumes and the two-volume directory now available for West Germany.

<sup>24</sup> The 1956 directory is cited above. For the Ukraine, the directory has been published in Ukrainian, O. H. Mitiukov, ed., *Derzhavni arkhivy Ukrains'koi RSR. Kоротkyi dovidnyk* [State archives of the Ukrainian SSR. Short directory] (Kiev, 1972).

<sup>25</sup> The 1956 state archival directory and the catalog of medieval Slavic manuscripts are cited above. A survey of materials for pre-revolutionary theater history is given by I. F. Petrovskaia, *Istochnikovedenie istorii russkogo dorevoliutsionnogo dramaticheskogo teatra* [Source study of the history of Russian pre-revolutionary dramatic theater] (Leningrad, 1971), pp. 33–63, and in the same author's earlier compilation, *Materialy k istorii russkogo teatra v gosudarstvennykh arkhivakh SSSR. Obzory dokumentov XVII vek—1917 g.* [Materials for the history of the Russian theater in state archives of the USSR. Surveys of documents from the 18th century to 1917] (Moscow, 1966).



standards in a matter as central as the archival materials of the many non-Russian areas has implications for nationality policy in the USSR and for subtle administrative trends that—consciously or circumstantially—tend to promote assimilation to Soviet patterns. But even the harshest critics of Soviet policies toward non-Russian nationalities have to recognize that, whatever the implicit purposes behind these archival developments, the Soviet Union has achieved the laudable and hardly unintended effect of promoting the consolidation, retention, and preservation of local documentary legacies on which national identities rely and on which the study of non-Russian national heritages depends. At the practical level, these developments should certainly come to the attention of those abroad undertaking any research in the non-Russian areas of the Soviet Union.

As is the case of the parent archival developments on the all-union level, the comprehensive Soviet regional archival system is part of a larger effort by the State and Party—and the records themselves mirror the tendencies—to establish and insure continuance of political and ideological control over all phases of society and culture. Quite apart from such political implications, however, the Soviet archival system must be appreciated as part of larger efforts to preserve the national heritage and also to provide adequate information services for contemporary science and scholarship in an increasingly complex and paper-ridden society. When we argue that administrative and reference control of archival and manuscript resources is a necessary prelude to any form of contemporary scholarship that seeks documentary information—whether concrete social or geological data, early drafts of literary manuscripts, or local court registers—as the basis for analysis, we are recognizing that the necessity and justification for modern information services force compromise with local peculiarities, linguistic diversity, and regional anomalies. In the United States we do not face the type of linguistic, multinational, and historical administrative complexities involved in the Soviet Union. Yet we have been unable to arrive at anything approaching the extent of administrative and reference control of the nation's documentary legacy, although the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections is a step in that direction.

The development of a comprehensive centralized archival system that can effectively preserve the nation's documentary legacy for posterity and that potentially can promote and facilitate research deserves careful study. The extent to and manner by which such research advantages could be adapted to a country where there are not the same overburdening imperatives for political control and intellectual orthodoxy should be carefully considered. Our own

national goals should undoubtedly include greater attention to making archival materials accessible to the public and to providing comprehensive, well-planned reference aids and computer-based public locator services. Our documentary heritage will never reach researchers at all, however, if it is allowed to rot in basements of county courthouses, to fall into the hands of souvenir hunters or commercial autograph dealers, or to be fed indiscriminately into newfangled paper shredding machines. Researchers, faced with a proliferation of sources, and archivists, faced with the administrative problems of keeping pace with an ever-multiplying quantity of paper and machine-readable records, should need little convincing of the benefits of centralized planning and of the need for liberal capital outlay in the realm of archival, bibliographic, and general information services.

We have much to learn from the Soviets about archives administration, and we applaud the extent to which their standards have contributed to the preservation of local records and manuscript treasures. However, in our own search for methods and means, both administrative and financial, to save this country's rapidly deteriorating documentary resources and to put them under bibliographic control, we must design an archival system compatible with American political thought and organization and with the research needs of American society. If the Soviet example could serve as an incentive to American archival planners and to capitalist funding sources, including the federal government, it would indeed be an ironic and unintended effect of the Soviet archival revolution.

#### APPENDIX

##### REPUBLIC-LEVEL CENTRAL STATE ARCHIVES

Archives are listed first in English translation, followed in brackets by their Russian names and, when available, their local official names. Languages not employing the Roman alphabet are transliterated according to the system used by the Library of Congress. Unless otherwise indicated, the archives are located in the republic capitals, given in parentheses after the name of the republic. Those preceded by an asterisk (\*) have published a comprehensive guide or directory of their holdings. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to include the local language names for archives in the Central Asian republics.

##### Armenian SSR (Erevan [Yerevan])

\* 1. Central State Archive of the October Revolution and Socialist Development of the Armenian SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva Armianskoi SSR / Haykakan SSH Hoktemberyan Heghap'okhowt'yan ew Sots'ialistakan Shinararowt'yan Petakan Kentronakan Arkhiv]

\* 2. Central State Historical Archive of the Armenian SSR [Tsentral'nyi

gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Armianskoi SSR / Haykakan SSH Petakan Kentronakan Patmowt'yan Arkhiv]

3. Central State Archive of Film, Photo-, and Phonographic Documents of the Armenian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotofonodokumentov Armianskoi SSR / Haykakan SSH Kino-Foto-Fono P'astat'gh't'eri Petakan Kentronakan Arkhiv]

#### Azerbaijan SSR (Baku)

\* 1. Central State Archive of the October Revolution and Socialist Development of the Azerbaijan SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR / Azərbaïjan SSR Mərkəzi dövlət Oktiabr ingilaby və sosializm gürüjulughu arkhivi]

\* 2. Central State Historical Archive of the Azerbaijan SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR / Azərbaïjan SSR Mərkəzi dövlət tarikh arkhivi]

\* 3. Central State Archive of Film and Photographic Documents of the Azerbaijan SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotodokumentov Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR / Azərbaïjan SSR Mərkəzi dövlət foto-kino sanadları arkhivi]

4. Central State Archive of Literature and Art of the Azerbaijan SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR / Azərbaïjan SSR Mərkəzi dövlət ədəbiyyat və incəsənət arkhivi]

5. Central State Archive of Sound-recordings of the Azerbaijan SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv zvukozapisei Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR / Azərbaïjan SSR Mərkəzi dövlət səsişazyları arkhivi]

6. Central State Archive of Technical and Medical Documents of the Azerbaijan SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv tekhnicheskikh i meditsinskikh dokumenty Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR / Azərbaïjan SSR Mərkəzi dövlət texniki və tibb sənədləri arkhivi]

#### Belorussian SSR (Minsk)

\* 1. Central State Archive of the October Revolution and Socialist Development of the Belorussian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva Belorusskoi SSR / Tsentrāl'ny dziazhauny arkhiiŭ Kastryznitskaŭ Revaliutsyi i satsyalistychnaha straitel'stva Belaruskai SSR]

2. Central State Historical Archive of the Belorussian SSR (Minsk) [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Belorusskoi SSR (g. Minsk) / Tsentrāl'ny dziazhauny histarychny arkhiiŭ Belaruskai SSR (m. Minsk)]

\* 3. Central State Historical Archive of the Belorussian SSR (Grodno) [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Belorusskoi SSR (g. Grodno) / Tsentrāl'ny dziazhauny histarychny arkhiiŭ Belaruskai SSR (m. Grodno)]

4. Central State Archive of Literature and Art of the Belorussian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva Belorusskoi SSR / Tsentrāl'ny dziazhauny arkhiiŭ literatury i mastatstva Belaruskai SSR]

5. Central State Archive of Film, Photo-, and Phonographic Documents of the Belorussian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotofonodokumentov Belorusskoi SSR / Tsentrāl'ny dziazhauny arkhiiŭ foto-kina-dokumentau Belaruskai SSR]

6. Central State Archive of Scientific and Technical Documentation of the Belorussian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv nauchno-tekhnicheskoi dokumentatsii Belorusskoi SSR / Tsentrāl'ny dziazhauny arkhiiŭ naukova-tekhnichnai dokumentatsyi Belaruskai SSR]

## Estonian SSR (Tallinn)

1. Central State Archive of the October Revolution and Socialist Development of the Estonian SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva Estonskoi SSR / Eesti NSV Oktoobrirevolutsiooni ja Sotsialistliku Ülesehitustöö Riiklik Keskarchiiv]

\* 2. Central State Historical Archive of the Estonian SSR (Tartu) [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Estonskoi SSR (g. Tartu) / Eesti NSV Riiklik Ajaloo Keskarchiiv (Tartu)]

3. Central State Archive of Film, Photo-, and Phonographic Documents of the Estonian SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotofonodokumentov Estonskoi SSR / Eesti NSV Film-foto-fono Riiklik Keskarchiiv]

## Georgian SSR (Tbilisi [Tiflis])

\* 1. Central State Archive of the October Revolution and Socialist Development of the Georgian SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva Gruzinskoi SSR / Sak'artvelos SSR Ok'tombris revoluc'iisa da soc'ialisturi mseneblobis c'entraluri saxelmcip'o ark'ivi]

\* 2. Central State Historical Archive of the Georgian SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Gruzinskoi SSR / Sak'art'velos SSR C'entraluri saxelmcip'o saistorio ark'ivi]

3. Central State Archive of Film, Photo-, and Phonographic Documents of the Georgian SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotofonodokumentov Gruzinskoi SSR / Sak'art'velos SSR Kinop'otop'ono dokumentebis c'entraluri saxelmcip'o ark'ivi]

4. Central State Archive of Literature and Art of the Georgian SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva Gruzinskoi SSR / Sak'art' velos SSR Literaturisa da xelovnebis c'entraluri saxelmcip'o ark'ivi]

## Kazakh SSR (Alma Ata)

\* 1. Central State Archive of the Kazakh SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Kazakhskoi SSR]

## Kirghiz SSR (Frunze)

1. Central State Archive of the Kirghiz SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Kirghizskoi SSR]

## Latvian SSR (Riga)

1. Central State Archive of the October Revolution and Socialist Development of the Latvian SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva Latviiskoi SSR / Latvijas PSR Centrālais Valsts Oktobra Revolūcijas un Sociālistiskās Cēlniecības Arhīvs]

2. Central State Historical Archive of the Latvian SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Latviiskoi SSR / Latvijas PSR Centrālais Valsts Vēsturiskais Arhīvs]

3. Central State Archive of Film, Photo-, and Phonographic Documents of the Latvian SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotofonodokumentov Latviiskoi SSR / Latvijas PSR Centrālais Valsts Kino-fono-foto Dokumentu Arhīvs]

## Lithuanian SSR (Vilnius [Vilna])

1. Central State Archive of the Lithuanian SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Litovskoi SSR / Lietuvos TSR Centrinis valstybinis archyvas]

2. Central State Historical Archive of the Lithuanian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Litovskoi SSR / Lietuvos TSR Centrinis valstybinis istorinis archyvas]

3. Central State Archive of Literature and Art of the Lithuanian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatūry i iskusstva Litovskoi SSR / Lietuvos TSR Centrinis valstybinis literatūros ir meno archyvas]

4. Central State Archive of Film, Photo-, and Phonographic Documents of the Lithuanian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotofonodokumentov Litovskoi SSR / Lietuvos TSR Centrinis valstybinis kino-foto-fono-dokumentu archyvas]

#### Moldavian SSR (Kishinev)

\* 1. Central State Archive of the Moldavian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Moldavskoi SSR]

#### Russian SFSR (Moscow)

1. Central State Archive of the Russian SFSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv RSFSR]

2. Central State Archive of the Russian SFSR for the Far East (Tomsk) [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv RSFSR Dal'nego vostoka]

#### Tadzhik SSR (Dushanbe)

\* 1. Central State Archive of the Tadzhik SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Tadzhikskoi SSR]

2. Central State Archive of Film, Photo-, and Phonographic Documents of the Tadzhik SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotofonodokumentov Tadzhikskoi SSR]

#### Turkmen SSR (Ashkhabad)

1. Central State Archive of the Turkmen SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Turkemenskoi SSR]

#### Ukrainian SSR (Kiev)

\* 1. Central State Archive of the October Revolution and Socialist Development of the Ukrainian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva Ukrainskoi SSR / Tsentrāl'nyi derzhavnyi arkhiv Zhovtnevoi revoliutsii i sotsialistychnoho budivnytstva Ukrain'skoi SSR]

\* 2. Central State Historical Archive of the Ukrainian SSR (Kiev) [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Ukrainskoi SSR (g. Kiev) / Tsentrāl'nyi derzhavnyi istorichnyi arkhiv Ukrain'skoi SSR u m. Kyevi]

3. Central State Historical Archive of the Ukrainian SSR (Lvov) [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Ukrainskoi SSR (g. L'vov) / Tsentrāl'nyi derzhavnyi istorichnyi arkhiv Ukrain'skoi SSR u m. L'vovi]

4. Central State Archive of Film, Photo-, and Phonographic Documents of the Ukrainian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotofonodokumentov Ukrainskoi SSR / Tsentrāl'nyi derzhavnyi arkhiv kinofotofonodokumentiv Ukrain'skoi SSR]

5. Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Art of the Ukrainian SSR [Tsentrāl'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv-muzei literatūry i iskusstva Ukrainskoi SSR / Tsentrāl'nyi derzhavnyi arkhiv-muzei literaturi i mystetstva Ukrain'skoi SSR]

6. Central State Archive of Scientific and Technical Documentation of the Ukrainian SSR (Kharkov) [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv nauchno-tekhnicheskoi dokumentatsii Ukrainskoi SSR / Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi arkhiv naukov-tekhnichnoi dokumentatsii Ukrain'skoi RSR]

Uzbek SSR (Tashkent)

\* 1. Central State Archive of the Uzbek SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Uzbekskoi SSR]

2. Central State Archive of Medical and Technical Documentation of the Uzbek SSR [Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv meditsinskoi i tekhnicheskoi dokumentatsii Uzbekskoi SSR]



## ARCHIVES AND MANUSCRIPT REPOSITORIES IN THE USSR

MOSCOW AND LENINGRAD  
PATRICIA KENNEDY GRIMSTED

This is the first comprehensive, authoritative directory of archives and other manuscript repositories in Moscow and Leningrad. It describes the holdings of over 75 institutions, including state archives, repositories of the Academy of Sciences, the Communist Party, and the Foreign Ministry, and the manuscript divisions of a wide variety of libraries and museums. In each case it gives information about their history, contents, published descriptions and catalogs, and working conditions.

Studies of the Russian Institute, Columbia University

\$22.50

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

Princeton, New Jersey 08540