

European Archives in an Era of Change

Beyond *Perestroika*: Soviet-Area Archives after the August Coup

PATRICIA KENNEDY GRIMSTED*

About the author: Patricia Kennedy Grimsted is currently a research associate at the Ukrainian Research Institute and a fellow of the Russian Research Center at Harvard University. For an expanded introduction see the Gallery of Contributors at the end of the issue. Abstracts in English, French, German, and Spanish follow the article.

WITH THE COLLAPSE OF THE USSR at the end of 1991 came the demise of the Main

Archival Administration of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers (Glavarkhiv), the all-union archival agency that administered state archives throughout the USSR. The introduction to the last Glavarkhiv report on the fulfillment of the Twelfth Five-Year Plan (1986-1990) claimed that *perestroika* had been achieved in Soviet archives.¹ Yet in fact that report, like so many earlier Soviet statistical reports, belied reality. Soviet-area archives still face many of the problems discussed in the article "*Perestroika* in the Archives?" appearing in the *American Ar-*

*Note: This article is drawn from materials gathered for a supplement to the author's *A Handbook for Archival Research in the USSR* (Washington, D.C.: Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies/International Research & Exchanges Board, 1989) during a lengthy research visit to the Soviet Union in 1991, under the auspices of IREX and the Commission on Archival Cooperation of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), and in connection with collaborative publication projects between the Archeographic Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. In Moscow and Leningrad/St. Petersburg the author was a guest of the Division of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, working with Russian colleagues to establish a collaborative database system for an updated directory and bibliography of finding aids of archives and manuscript repositories in the RSFSR. The author is grateful for the financial support from these many sources, and for the assistance of many friends and archival colleagues who have assisted her over the years. Data in this article not otherwise cited is compiled from the author's interviews with archival leaders. A more detailed version of this article is being distributed by IREX.

¹The report, "Otchet o vypolnenii uchrezhdeniiami Gosudarstvennoi arkhivnoi sluzhby SSSR planov razvitiia arkhivnogo dela na 1986-1990 gg." was published, together with the introduction "Informatsiia o resul'tatakh raboty trudovykh kollektivov uchrezhdenii Gosudarstvennoi arkhivnoi sluzhby SSSR po vypolneniiu planov razvitiia arkhivnogo dela v 1986-1990 gg.," as Glavarkhiv, *Nauchno-informatsionnyi biulleten'*, 1991, no. 4. Before the April 1991 governmental reorganization, the all-union Glavarkhiv was officially under the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

chivist (Winter 1991).² What is more, *perestroika* as a political agenda is dead and archives are encountering new problems they never even knew existed under centralized Glavarkhiv control. Despite increasing access to many previously classified records and to internal reference aids in most archives, the question mark in the article's title still remains apt.

Now that archives are being reorganized within independent republics, they will be trying to cast off the legacy of decades of centralized Glavarkhiv archival practices. Post-Soviet archives in the former union republics are also anxious to overcome the legacy of longtime Communist ideological conformity and operational objectives which had been subordinated to state security priorities. The extent to which Soviet archives and the society whose records they preserve have been cut off in theory and practice from the West and from normal relations with the outside world under Soviet rule will make reform and integration more difficult. Now that the Soviet political and economic order within which Glavarkhiv operated has collapsed around it, the problems left by Glavarkhiv's failure to effect the needed reform in the archival system need to be reexamined.

Archival Reform and the Demise of Glavarkhiv

Efforts to provide a legal structure for all-union archival reform had already reached an impasse by mid-1990. By the end of 1990 Glavarkhiv still refused to make its final draft of an all-union archival law public, but instead issued a pamphlet denouncing the alternative draft law proposed by specialists at the Moscow State Historico-Archival Institute (MGIAI). Glavar-

khiv staunchly defended its final draft as "the only act of law that was appropriate in the interests of *perestroika* and the fulfillment of archival affairs in the country."³ With the demise of Glavarkhiv in the fall of 1991, and of the union itself in December 1991, obviously neither version of an all-union archival law will ever be enacted.

Largely as a result of the resistance to reform and to *perestroika* by Glavarkhiv leadership in the recent years of *glasnost'*, Glavarkhiv lost its last chance to revitalize the archival system and improve archival service on the all-union level. Many archivists were aware of the problems. By mid-1991, archivists at six of the twelve all-union central state archives had called for the resignation of Fedor Mikhailovich Vaganov, the chief of Glavarkhiv, in an effort to promote more fundamental change. Lack of high-level leadership in carrying out *perestroika* may account for the general economic and political situation in the country; it is sadly symptomatic of the difficulties of archival reform on the Soviet scene.

The Transformation of MGIAI. The bitter struggle between Glavarkhiv leadership and the more radical archival reformers at MGIAI unfortunately drained energies from reform efforts in archival education at this, the principal institute for training archivists. Many archival specialists expressed concern that MGIAI rector Iurii Afanas'ev used the conflict regarding archival reform and *perestroika* in historical scholarship to bolster his own political position, despite his early tributes to the importance of "training a new generation of archivists."⁴ During 1991, fears arose that

²Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, "Perestroika in the Archives?: Further Efforts at Soviet Archival Reform," *American Archivist* 54 (Winter 1991): 70-95. Delayed in press, the issue appeared in the fall of 1991.

³"Ob initsiativnom proekte Zakona SSR 'Ob arkhivnom dele i arkhivakh,'" Glavarkhiv, *Nauchnoinformatsiunnyi biulleten'*, 1990, no. 6:20. The critique is partially reprinted in *Sovetskie arkhivy*, 1991, no. 1:17-27. See also Grimsted, "Perestroika in the Archives?" 86-92.

⁴As quoted in Grimsted, "Glasnost' in the Ar-

MGIAI itself was threatened with extinction. When Afanas'ev succeeded in transforming MGIAI into the expanded Russian State University for the Humanities (May 1991) where he now serves as rector, many associated with the archival sectors of MGIAI feared that the basic archival education provided by the institute was being weakened. Protest meetings were held in the fall of 1991 to air complaints that historians with little or no professional archival experience were assuming control of the new university and diverting attention from MGIAI's earlier strong traditions of professional archival education.

New Republic Autonomy. The shift from a centralized all-union authority to republic-based archival control is one of the most revolutionary developments of the new order. In fact, the Soviet-area archival scene was already responding to broader centrifugal political developments long before the August coup, despite Glavarkhiv's effort to keep centralized authority intact.⁵ By the fall of 1990, almost all of the union republics were drafting their own national laws on archives and declaring their independence from the all-union Glavarkhiv. The Association of Archivists of the USSR, founded in the fall of 1990 under Glavarkhiv sponsorship, began publishing a bulletin in 1991,⁶ but the function of the association remained in doubt vis-à-vis the rise of national associations. An April 1991 meeting of republic-level archival administrations called by Glavarkhiv and at-

tended by representatives of all republics except Armenia, Estonia, and Lithuania, addressed the continuing necessity and appropriate revision of functions of an all-union archival authority. For the most part participants agreed on the need for a continued all-union archival authority and for coordination in archival administrative procedures and research and development. Many of the participants, however, expressed the need for major changes in Glavarkhiv's functions, for closer coordination with "agency archives" outside the current state system, and for the proposed all-union archival law to recognize the national laws of individual republics.⁷

RSFSR Leadership and the Rise of Roskomarkhiv

At center stage during 1991, the Russian Federation was forging an aggressive, reform-oriented archival program of its own. The Committee on Archival Affairs of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, or *Roskomarkhiv* in its shortened form, was reconstituted from the earlier Glavarkhiv RSFSR in November 1990, and assumed increasing independence from all-union Glavarkhiv authority. Rudol'f Germanovich Pikhov, a historian of prerevolutionary Russia and former pro-rector of Sverdlovsk (now Ekaterinburg) University, assumed the chairmanship of Roskomarkhiv.⁸ Under his energetic leadership, many pro-

chives? Recent Developments on the Soviet Archival Scene," *American Archivist* 52 (Spring 1989): 216.

⁵See Grimsted, "Perestroika in the Archives?" 92-93; and Peep Pillak, "Reforms in Estonian Archives," *American Archivist* 53 (Fall 1990): 576-581.

⁶*Obshchestva arkhivistov SSSR, Vestnik arkhivista. Informatsionnyi biulleten'*, initial issues of the *rotaprint* bimonthly newsletter published many of the addresses at the founding congress of the society in November 1990 and reports from organizational meetings held in 1991, as well as some of the important presentations at the founding meetings of the Society of Russian Archivists.

⁷See the comments of the meeting's participants in *Sovetskie arkhivy*, 1991, no. 4:10.

⁸"Ob obrazovanii Komiteta po delam arkhivov pri Sovete Ministrov RSFSR," Resolution of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, 5 November 1990. An announcement about Pikhov's appointment was reprinted in *Sovetskie arkhivy*, 1991, no. 1:16. Additional data here is based on my series of interviews with Pikhov and his staff, the first in May 1991. Before December 1991, the Russian Federation was officially known as the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, with both the Russian and English acronym of RSFSR. Roskomarkhiv now is the Komitet po delam arkhivov pri pravipe'l'stve Rossiiskoi Federatsii. Address: ul. Il'inka, 12; 103132 Moscow, Russia.

gressive specialists who had gained archival experience under Glavarkhiv tutelage joined Roskomarkhiv. Initially, Roskomarkhiv, like its predecessor, Glavarkhiv RSFSR, controlled only the state archives of the RSFSR, but already by the spring of 1991, Pikhov, with strong support from Russian president Boris Yeltsin, had plans to take over various central state archives of the USSR, particularly those containing historical records of the prerevolutionary Russian Empire. In December 1991, Roskomarkhiv was reorganized officially as an agency of the Russian executive, and it reports directly to the president, rather than to the Council of Ministers.

Archival developments assumed more revolutionary proportions after the August coup. Most sensational in the archival realm, Yeltsin issued decrees on 24 August 1991 calling for the seizure and nationalization of all Communist Party and KGB archives on Russian territory and their transfer to Roskomarkhiv jurisdiction.⁹ Roskomarkhiv is already opening these records to researchers to an extent never dreamed possible,¹⁰ although their confiscation is being contested on some fronts.

The Nationalization of Party Archives. The general nature of holdings in the Central Party Archive (TsPA) was already known to specialists, although a guide to its holdings was never published.¹¹

Somewhat more liberal access for Soviet as well as foreign researchers had been granted since its March 1991 reorganization, although serious complaints about the lack of access and "continued 'secreto-mania'" abounded.¹²

After Yeltsin outlawed the Communist Party in work places (*departizatsiia*) of the RSFSR in July 1991 there was an additional flurry of exposés about CPSU archives in the press. An interview with the director of TsPA in late July 1991 raised questions about the erroneously-labelled "unneeded documents" that might have disappeared during the "cleaning out process" in Party archives.¹³ Another investigative article on the subject of CPSU archives in *Izvestiia* discussed the extent of Party documents destroyed or hidden, including those that "even in the time of *perestroika* remained behind the door with the most durable lock, . . . namely the archive of the CC CPSU General Department."¹⁴

Since minimal information about the Party Central Committee archives had come to public attention before the August coup, few suspected the extent of "the most important and revealing Party files" that had

⁹"Ob arkhivakh Komiteta gosudarstvennoi bezopasnosti SSSR," and "O partiinykh arkhivakh," RSFSR presidential decrees, 24 August 1991, no. 83.

¹⁰See E. Maksimova, "Arkhiy KPSS i KGB perekhodiat v sobstvennost' naroda," *Izvestiia*, 28/29 August 1991, which consists of statements by Roskomarkhiv deputy chairmen Anatolii Stefanovich Prokopenko, Vladimir Alekseevich Tiuneev, and Valerii Ivanovich Abramov. See also the summary discussion by Vera Tolz, "New Situation for CPSU and KGB Archives," in RFE/RLRI, *Report on the USSR* 3:38 (1991): 1-4, which includes reference to additional interviews with Pikhov by Radio Liberty (Russian service), "V strane i mire," 30 July 1991, and *Rabochaia tribuna*, 4 September 1991.

¹¹As of March 1991 the Central Party Archive was under the Institute of Theory and History of Socialism

of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CC CPSU). Before the March 1991 changes, the controlling institute had been known as the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU. See more details in the preliminary version of Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, "A Handbook for Archival Research in the USSR, Supplement 1: Major Archives and Manuscript Repositories in Moscow and Leningrad" (Princeton, NJ: International Research & Exchanges Board, 1991). Because of further extensive changes in archives following the August coup, formal publication of an IREX supplement has been delayed until Summer 1992.

¹²See, for example, the letter to the editor by D. Stetsura and answer by S. Sokolov, printed under the headline "Konspiratsiia i eshche raz konspiratsiia," *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, 4 June 1991.

¹³V. Chelikov, "Esli arkhivy nichtozhaiut, znachit, eto komu-nibud' nuzhno? Dva vzgliada na 'chistku' partdokumentov," interviews with I. Kitaev and B. Ilizarov, *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, 26 July 1991.

¹⁴S. Kleshov, "Ot kogo zhe sekrety—U partiinykh i vedomstvennykh arkhivov," *Izvestiia*, 30 July 1991.

been retained there.¹⁵ In fact, after the takeover Roskomarkhiv officials estimated that some thirty million files (over seventy-five million documents) were held in top secrecy by the Party Central Committee, while the Central Party Archive (TsPA) itself held only 1.5 million files according to 1991 figures.¹⁶ In addition to the top-secret archive of the Central Committee General Department, eight other separate archives were sealed and seized from CC CPSU headquarters by Roskomarkhiv officials.¹⁷

Central Party Archive officials cooperated willingly with Roskomarkhiv, but Pikhov and his deputies had to get additional special authorization from Yeltsin himself to enter the Party Central Committee buildings. On the final day of the August coup, a Party Central Committee directive went out to destroy compromising files. From all reports, shredders in the archival buildings were working overtime. When the Roskomarkhiv authorities arrived to seal remaining records in the Central Committee building, they found shredded papers everywhere. They needed an armed escort to stop one departing truck overflowing with CPSU financial records. How many com-

promising files were destroyed in the interval between the Party order and the Roskomarkhiv seizure has yet to be determined.

Nor was it known how much CPSU documentation had been deposited in the separate Presidential Archive (the so-called Kremlin Archive), which was then under the immediate control of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. Officially that archive, whom no one admitted existed, was called the Archive of the General Division of the Office of the President of the USSR, and consisted of Politburo and other files from 1919 on. These included records of the Central Committee and personal papers of Stalin, Molotov, Mikoian, Kaganovich, and Trotsky, among others.¹⁸ With the resignation of Gorbachev in December 1991 the older records in this archive are also being transferred to the newly formed CPSU centers, while Yeltsin reportedly appropriated more recent files.

By mid-October 1991 two new research centers were established to take over and administer the CPSU archives.¹⁹ The Central Party Archive (TsPA) itself formally reopened in December as the Russian Depository and Research Center for Documents on Recent History (RTsKhIDNI). The secret archives of the Central Committee and related files from active CPSU sources are being reorganized as the Depository Center for Contemporary Documentation (TsKhSD). Its many sensational documents are to be opened to public access in February 1992. Without new laws on archives and state secrets, however, as a Moscow journalist complained in December 1991, it has not been possible to remove the "top secret"

¹⁵During my visits to TsPA in July 1991, TsPA archivists complained about many files that had not been transferred to their custody. I learned, for example, that TsPA had received only photocopies of protocols of Party congresses, even as far back as the 1930s, for its publication project, and that few records of the top-level State Defense Committee, which coordinated evacuations and wartime planning during the Second World War, had ever reached the archive.

¹⁶Data regarding the takeover of CPSU and KGB archives is compiled from references cited in footnote 10 as well as from the author's interviews with CPSU and Roskomarkhiv leaders.

¹⁷The eight archives seized were all listed as an appendix to the 12 October 1991 resolution establishing the new Depository Center for Contemporary Documentation based on the CPSU archives. These include the separate archives of the Central Control Commission, the Party Membership, the International Division, and the Organizational Division of Foreign Personnel, among others. None of these CPSU archives had been transferred to the TsPA.

¹⁸Evgenii Kuz'min, " 'Sekretnyi arkhiv' Gorbacheva: Kto kontroliruet proshloe, tot kontroliruet budushchee," *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 15 January 1992, p. 11.

¹⁹See the resolution of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, "O Rossiiskom tsentre khraneniia i izucheniia dokumentov noveishei istorii i Tsentre khraneniia sovremennoi dokumentatsii," 12 October 1991, no. 53.

or "secret" stamps from many of their files.²⁰

Roskomarkhiv proposed a cut-off date of 1953 (or possibly 1956) between the two archives, with all earlier pre-1953 records and loose files to be transferred to the former Central Party Archive. That plan, however, has yet to be carried through. From an archival and research standpoint such a physical consolidation is warranted, since in most cases, files held in the secret archives of the Central Committee constituted restricted portions of existing fonds in the former Central Party Archive. Currently neither center has the word "archive" in its name, nor do their names appropriately reflect their actual CPSU holdings or their relationship to other all-union central state archives with holdings from the Soviet period.²¹ In the minds of the Roskomarkhiv founders, however, the names of the archives reflect their aim as research centers with significant publication programs in addition to their more purely archival function.

Roskomarkhiv officials seized local Party archives throughout the RSFSR and additional Party records that had not yet been transferred to archives. These records are being integrated more directly into Roskomarkhiv's existing archival network. As of December 1991, forty-seven centers were organized on republic, *krai* (region), or *oblast* (county) levels on the model of the TsPA center in Moscow. In a few cases, former Party archives were integrated into pre-existing local archives. Available storage space is a factor in most organizational decisions. Where existing Party archival

facilities are adequate for continuing records storage, the records are kept in place and newly accessioned files are added.

The former Moscow Party Archive and additional seized local party records are being reorganized as the separate Central State Archive of Social Movements under the existing Moscow Consolidated Municipal Archives.²² Further reorganization plans may call for consolidation of these city archives with the state and Party archives of Moscow oblast. City and oblast state archives were already united administratively in St. Petersburg, where their administrative agency has been directing the takeover of Party and KGB archives. By October 1991, in both Moscow and St. Petersburg records previously held by local Party archives were open to researchers.

Local Roskomarkhiv officials have taken control of Party archives in other areas of the Russian Federation. Similar patterns are being followed in other former union republics, where Party archives have all been transferred to state authorities and are being reorganized under local state archival administration. In some cases separate new archives along the lines of the Moscow TsPA Center have been created. Some Party archives have been subsumed under the republic-level central state archives, and others—in the case of oblasts—as part of local oblast state archives.

Transfer of KGB Archives. Many more "exceedingly complicated problems" have arisen in the transfer and opening of the massive KGB archives for public research, in the opinion of Vadim Bakatin, KGB chief after the August coup. In his first press interview following his appointment, Bakatin declared categorically that "files concern-

²⁰E. Maksimova, "Predmet tainy—Kogda otkroitsia arkhivy partii i KGB," *Izvestiia*, 21 December 1991.

²¹When I raised the question of the new name for TsPA with the acting director, O.V. Naumov, in October, he jokingly admitted that perhaps it would be appropriate to add "former TsPA" in parentheses. In fact it is still familiarly referred to in Moscow historical and archival circles as "TsPA."

²²Earlier, after the March 1991 Party reorganization, the Moscow Party Archive was under the Scientific and Information Center for the Political History of Moscow. See David L. Hoffman, "A First Glimpse into the Moscow Party Archive," *Russian Review* 50 (October 1991): 484-486.

ing agents would be handed over only over his dead body.”²³ His fears that opening such archives could result in “tragedy for thousands” hardly satisfied an eagerly awaiting and increasingly radicalized public.²⁴ At the same time, the St. Petersburg state archival agency director estimated that it would be possible to accession only half of the local KGB files, and that it would be the end of 1992 before any of them could be opened for research. KGB archives created more than thirty years ago are gradually being turned over to state archival authorities, but not without grave reservations and the holding back of some of the most compromising files.²⁵

Aside from some sensational revelations already reported in the press in Moscow, the extent of important literary or other cultural records still housed in KGB archives is difficult to determine, since many of the newly seized records remain in sealed bags or otherwise as yet unsorted containers. There are continuing pleas to release cultural treasures in the KGB archives, such as the secretly-held Gor’kii-Lenin correspondence, materials that could hardly contribute to personal or national “tragedy.”²⁶ Since the 1930s, many personal papers created by or about the literary and cultural elite had already been transferred from the KGB to existing state archives or other manuscript repositories. Newly-released literary materials will undoubtedly be added

to these already existing fonds in specialized archives, rather than being filed with KGB records themselves.

The extent of KGB destruction of culturally and politically important materials will be difficult to appraise, but now there is a more open attitude to the problem. KGB chairman Vadim Bakatin assured another Moscow journalist that “What some people needed to have destroyed was destroyed long since.” When questioned 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.” When pressed as to who was responsible, he answered, “Those who did it are not to blame, there was an order.”²⁷

In other cases high-interest KGB files may be found enmeshed with top-level Party records or expunged from KGB inventories. For example, questions about documents released in November by the KGB regarding the fate of the Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg prompted Bakatin in another interview to suggest that “more substantial information” would be found in the CPSU Central Committee archives.²⁸ Other Wallenberg documents released “reveal colossal cover-up” in KGB internal logs.²⁹ Such problems of interconnected files and altered registers, while revealing of KGB operations, greatly complicate appropriate archival arrangement and description for research purposes. A parliamentary commission was established in November to deal with the accession of KGB and CPSU rec-

²³Vadim Bakatin, “Nam nuzhno mnogoe drug drugu prosti’,” interview with Viktor Loshak, *Moskovskii novosti*, 8 September 1991.

²⁴For example, a St. Petersburg journalist at the end of September took issue with the slow, secretive process in an article cleverly titled to mimic the Moscow metro—“Liubianka station. Danger, the doors are closing!” See Anna Repina, “Stanitsia Liubianka. Ostorozhno, dveri zakryvaiutsia!” Ukazy El’tina o peredache arkhivov KGB i KPSS v vedie arkhivnykh organizatsii Rossii eshche ne oznachaiut ikh polnogo obnarodovaniia,” *Smena*, 25 September 1991.

²⁵Nikolai Vladimirovich Ponomarev in an October 1991 interview with the author.

²⁶“Otkrytoe pis’mo V.V. Bakatinu,” *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, 29 August 1991.

²⁷Interview with Vadim Bakatin, *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 18 December 1991. See English translation in *Foreign Broadcast Information Service—FBIS-SOV-91-249*, 27 December 1991.

²⁸Vera Tolz, “New Information on Raoul Wallenberg Promised,” *RFE/RL Daily Report*, 27 November 1991.

²⁹Serge Schmemmann, “Soviet Files Show K.G.B. Cover-Up In the Disappearance of Wallenberg,” *New York Times*, 28 December 1991, p. 6.

ords, but public complaints about the slow process often show a lack of appreciation of many of the technical archival problems involved.³⁰ Reportedly the KGB is in litigation with the commission over the release of its archives, and there is also a reluctance to open publicly documents that may be saleable to the West.³¹

"Two of Hollywood's richest producers are both claiming exclusive television rights to several top secret KGB files ranging from the Cuban missile crisis to the case of convicted spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg," according to a recent wire-service release. The contracts were apparently signed directly with the KGB rather than Roskomarkhiv, and the disputed "exclusive" contracts were signed with the agency at different times, to the extent that some confusion remains as to which contract is valid, since the KGB itself has been succeeded as of the first of the year by two successor agencies.³² Such financial perspectives may further explain why the KGB has been reluctant to turn over more of its files to Roskomarkhiv. If the receipts from such sales went to help provide storage facilities and to arrange and describe the archives for research, it would help solve some of the financial shortfall Roskomarkhiv is facing in connection with accessioning KGB records.

Many KGB archives themselves lack appropriate storage facilities, and in some cases they lack adequate archival buildings of any sort. The KGB archival reference system was never set up for public research access, and in most cases Roskomarkhiv had to retain or rehire the KGB archival staff to decipher and interpret the filing systems used. Considerable time will be required to appraise, arrange, and describe the massive

files, particularly with inadequacies in trained staff, storage and reference facilities, and the lack of funds needed to remedy such deficiencies. The archival placement of KGB holdings in many cases has yet to be finalized, but in general the bulk of KGB records are being accessioned by existing state archives. In some cases the formation of new separate archives for KGB records may be in order, since many of their holdings cannot be dealt with in the same manner as other state records, as a result of factors mentioned above, together with legitimate problems of state security and personal privacy.

Other republics were raising questions as to why the Russian Federation should fall heir to all Central Party and KGB archives after the August coup. As a case in point, Lithuanian demands for extradition of KGB archival files of Lithuanian provenance were turned down outright by Bakatin in public television interviews at the end of August 1991 although negotiations continue.³³

RSFSR Seizure of Glavarkhiv SSSR. Questions regarding Russian primary jurisdiction over the archival legacy of the seventy years of imperial Soviet rule became sharper as other all-union archives were rapidly coming under the control of the RSFSR. The consolidation of Russian archival authority was advanced dramatically on 12 October 1991 when a decree of the RSFSR Council of Ministers transferred Glavarkhiv SSSR and its assets to Russian archival control. Roskomarkhiv assumed responsibility for the "material-technical and financial-economic basis of the stated Main Administration with its subordinate central state archives of the SSSR, scientific-research organizations, and other institutions and enterprises on the territory of the RSFSR."³⁴ Glavarkhiv chief Vaganov re-

³⁰Some of the problems were exposed by Maksimova, "Predmet tainy," *Izvestiia*, 21 December 1991.

³¹See the discussion of the problem of commercialization below.

³²"KGB Files," Associated Press wire-service, 20 January 1992.

³³Tolz, "New Situation for CPSU and KGB Archives," 3-4.

³⁴See the resolution of the RSFSR Council of Min-

fused to sign the transfer documents, claiming with some good reason that the all-union central state archives under Glavarkhiv should be under the jurisdiction of all the republics, and rallied support from the Gorbachev command. Even after Roskomarkhiv chairman Pikhoia signed the order for Vaganov's retirement, Vaganov held a meeting of Glavarkhiv on 30 October 1991 and presented a series of reports on archival developments in various state archives, as if nothing had changed.

Vaganov's actions did nothing to reverse the process, reflecting as it did the ever diminishing stature of all-union organs. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers to which Glavarkhiv was responsible had already been dissolved after the August coup along with a number of all-union ministries. Most of the remaining all-union ministries themselves ceased officially to exist as of 1 November 1991, and their records were in the process of being transferred to state archives. Glavarkhiv itself was soon in a "state of liquidation."

The Fate of All-Union "Agency Archives." By the beginning of December 1991 only a few other all-union archives remained, but with the formal dissolution of the USSR, most of them are slated for takeover by Roskomarkhiv or other Russian authorities. Further archival changes will obviously depend on general political developments.

The two extensive "agency" archives for contemporary (post-1939) records under the Ministry of Defense operated as separate agency archives, independent of Glavarkhiv authority. Because the Ministry of Defense continues under the jurisdiction of the new Commonwealth of Independent States, its archives as of this writing remain independent of Roskomarkhiv. Soviet Army records postdating 1939 are held in the

massive Central Archive of the Ministry of Defense (TsAMO) in Podol'sk, which with its over 19,000,000 file units was the largest archive in the USSR after the CPSU Central Committee archives. Post-1939 naval records (totalling over 2,000,000 file units with over 6,000 fonds) are held in the corresponding but much smaller Central Naval Archive of the Ministry of Defense (TsVMA) in Gatchina. Already in the summer of 1991, the Ministry of Defense, feeling the financial pinch in its extensive archival operations, established a new Historico-Archival and Military-Memorial Center in Moscow with procedures for processing hard-currency archival services. The center continues to operate under the new commonwealth with one division handling memorial and service-record inquiries, and a second handling archival research and photocopy requests.³⁵

Obviously the now former Soviet republics have an even higher personal stake in these archives than in most all-union archives, since they contain the personal records of obligatory military service for every male citizen in the far-flung empire. Inquiries regarding service records for the TsAMO facility alone reached over the million mark in the year 1990, which raises the specter of staggering operation costs and problems processing vital inquiries. As of the summer of 1991, the Ministry of Defense still controlled research access to all postrevolutionary military and naval records in the central state archives of the Soviet Army and Navy, namely TsGASA in Moscow and TsGAVMF in St. Petersburg. Now that these repositories have been transferred to Roskomarkhiv, access rules

isters, "O razvitii arkhivnogo dela v RSFSR," 12 October 1991, no. 531.

³⁵Both of these archives are described briefly in Grimsted, "Handbook-Supplement 1" (IREX, 1991). Inquiries involving all records under the Ministry of Defense were being handled through the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR. The address is Istoriko-arkhivnyi i voenno-memorialnyi tsentr General'nogo Shtaba Vooruzhennykh Sil; ul. Znamenka, 19; 103160 Moscow; Russia.

will presumably change once the Russian thirty-year access rule takes force.

Although the USSR Ministry of External Affairs was taken over by the Russian Federation, the archives that were under its direct jurisdiction still remain independent of Roskomarkhiv. The Archive of Russian Foreign Policy (AVPR) houses diplomatic records of the Russian Empire from the eighteenth century through 1917, and the Archive of Soviet Foreign Policy (AVP SSSR) retains all of the postrevolutionary records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its embassies and other missions throughout the world.³⁶ The prerevolutionary archive has been fully open to foreign scholars for the last few years. The postrevolutionary archive opened its doors in 1990, but sixty percent of its holdings were still classified at the time of the August coup. An open letter to the newspaper *Moscow News* from a Kharkiv professor in December 1991 complained about the excessive restrictions that still plagued researchers in the postrevolutionary Foreign Ministry archives. He also mentioned a third previously little known archive under the Ministry, the so-called "Historico-Diplomatic Archive," wherein are housed "documents of other states, which through various means fell into the hands of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs."³⁷

With the demise of the all-union Ministry of Culture, its many libraries and museums holding rich manuscript repositories are also being shifted to the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation. Claims of other re-

publics for a share of the wealth should be expected, and changes in official names are to be anticipated. Similar problems are arising with other all-union repositories, such as the centralized feature film archive, the All-Union State Fond of Motion Pictures (Gosfil'mofond), the Scientific Pedagogical Archive of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, and other archives under the control of their creating agencies that had not been integrated into the Glavarkhiv system.³⁸ The fate of the rich archival holdings under the Academy of Sciences of the USSR still await definitive resolution. By the end of November, the all-union Academy was formally reorganized into the Russian Academy of Sciences (*Rossiiskaia Akademiia nauk*) but its financing was assured for only three months. Archival restructuring and transfers will undoubtedly follow the expected reorganization and staff cuts in various Academy institutes, many of which hold rich archival materials but lack facilities for their proper preservation.

Legal Reform and Contested Records

The Russian Archival Law. Legal provisions for archives in the Russian Federation, and the more definitive organization of the state archival system must necessarily await the pending enactment of a comprehensive law. A draft "Law on the Archival Fond of the RSFSR and on Archives" was submitted to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in October,³⁹ but, given subsequent political developments, some

³⁶These archives administered by the Historico-Diplomatic Administration of the Foreign Ministry are also described briefly in Grimsted, "Handbook-Supplement 1" (IREX: 1991). All records in AVPR are now open to researchers. AVPR address: Arkhiv vneshnei politiki Rossii; Bol'shaia Sepukhovskaia ul., 15; 113093 Moscow; Russia. AVP SSSR address: Arkhiv vneshnei politiki SSSR; Plotnikov per., 11; 121200 Moscow; Russia.

³⁷Georgii Cherniavskii, "Sud'ba arkhiva MIDA," *Moskovskie novosti*, 22 November 1991.

³⁸These include the all-Union Geological Fond, the Fond of Hydro-Meteorology and Environmental Data, the Cartographic and Geodesic Fond, and the All-Union Registry of Standards.

³⁹I quote from an unpublished draft text of the Russian law given by Pikhoia to James Billington, Librarian of Congress in October 1991. I am following in part an English translation prepared at the Library of Congress. This draft differs from several of the earlier drafts which I had seen. Although the RSFSR is now officially the Russian Federation, I retain the form RSFSR in the text quoted.

redrafting will be in order before the law is enacted.

In its October draft version the law extends "the RSFSR Archival Fond" to include, along with government records, "archives of enterprises, organizations, institutions based on other forms of ownership, of social organizations and unions; and the personal archives of citizens" (§ 8). The law provides for open research access by Russian and foreign citizens alike to most government files within thirty years from the date of their creation, with normal exceptions for state secrets and for proprietary rights of archives in the private sector, including those of commercial interest. Restriction on access to documents relating to individual citizens, with due respect for the protection of privacy, is set at seventy-five years (§ 25). The draft law sets up a sliding scale of permissible retention periods for records by their creating agencies. It requires records of all governmental agencies to be turned over to state archives after fifteen years and it proposes a seventy-five year retention on records of vital statistics and personnel files before deposit in state archives (§ 17). The law guarantees that state archives will "provide adequate conditions to prevent destruction, damage, and other forms of harm to archival materials . . . within the state sector of the RSFSR Archival Fond" (§ 19).

Private, religious, and societal organizations are granted permanent control over their own records, including the rights to restrict access or refuse confiscation without a court order. They are nonetheless under obligation to retain their own records or to negotiate their transfer to state archives if they so choose. The draft law further prohibits secret archives of any sort (§ 7) and requires "the obligatory inventory according to established procedures" of existing archival deposits in the governmental sector, as well as records of non-governmental enterprises and organizations" (§ 20).

While this proposed law puts the protection of the Russian archival legacy and the right of public access to records on a firm legal basis previously unknown in the Russian Empire or the Soviet Union, it cannot begin to solve all archival problems. Its enactment, as was pointed out in the Moscow newspaper *Izvestiia* in December 1991, will undoubtedly have to await a supporting "Law on State Secrets," which has yet to be drafted.⁴⁰ A supporting proposal has not emerged for an American-style "Freedom of Information Act," to say nothing of laws guaranteeing the rights of individual citizens vis-à-vis the state, all of which might come into conflict with some paragraphs of the proposed Russian archival law. For example, if private agency and individual archives are inviolate from state inspection and control, questions may arise as to how provisions for their obligatory retention and inventorying can be enforced. The idea that "information contained in documents in the governmental sector of the RSFSR Archival Fond is the intellectual property of the state" to the extent that "archives have the right to establish conditions for its use by readers by granting licenses" (§ 28) may recall traditions of ideological and intellectual control, and raise the spectre of commercializing access to government documents. Such concepts would appear in direct conflict with principles of the public domain and free usage thereof familiar in Western democracies, despite their mitigation by other paragraphs. More substantive discussion of these and other underlying principles should await the final draft to be enacted by the legislature later in 1992, because many questions of principle will undoubtedly arise. Other issues may prove difficult to implement, interpret, or enforce, and many of the provisions may prove exceedingly difficult to finance from the

⁴⁰See the above-quoted article by Maksimova, "Predmet tainy," *Izvestiia*, 21 December 1991.

public treasury in a market economy. Yet a reading of the draft text cannot help but inspire admiration for the strong and extensive commitment on the part of the Roskomarkhiv authors for the state to maintain and preserve the Russian archival legacy.

Legal disputes will undoubtedly arise with other former Soviet republics and foreign countries over conflicting archival claims. The blanket claim that "the RSFSR Archival Fond consists of all types of documents on the history of Russia from the earliest times down to the present, regardless of their place of preservation and their form of ownership" (§ 8), will obviously be subject to dispute. Émigré communities and foreign archival repositories may well have qualms about the obligation for "state attempts to effect the return of documents on Russian history to the RSFSR Archival Fond"—presumably with reference to repatriation (§ 8). Most pointedly, such a concept of "pertinence to" Russian history as opposed to "provenance in" the Russian Federation will make such issues more difficult to interpret and adjudicate.

Ukrainian and Belarussian Counter Claims. Former union republics are already reacting bitterly to Russian claims to represent their interests and will have growing disputes with other Soviet-area archives as well. According to the new Russian law, most documents of medieval Ukrainian history could be subject to Moscow's claims as part of the "legacy of Russian history." Ukrainian archives will have equally nationalistic counter claims, all the more since vast parts of Ukraine have been subject so long to imperial Russian rule.⁴¹ The new political agreement between Russia, Belarus, and Ukraine as founding

members of a new Commonwealth of Independent States may serve as an initial catalyst for resolving some of these complicated issues, but it is unlikely that these nations could ever agree to a common archival law. Besides, their common archival legacy involves other nations of Eastern Europe as well. For example, immediate disputes arise regarding records from central Ukrainian lands and most of Belarus which were part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and subsequently, until 1795, part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Lithuanian Imperial Claims. The Lithuanian archival law adopted in February 1990, while Lithuania was still a "Soviet Socialist Republic," was one of the most controversial in laying claim to all Lithuanian-related records, including those currently held abroad.⁴² Lithuania declared a "Lithuanian Archival Fond comprising records of the Lithuanian state and its historical heirs . . . including documents and archives taken out of Lithuania presently held in state institutions and societal organizations of other Soviet republics and foreign countries." It further laid claims to "records formed or accumulated in the conduct of business of organizations or individuals located or formerly located in other republics or foreign countries, but that were historically related to Lithuania," all of which were "declared to constitute national property of the Republic and subject to its jurisdiction."⁴³ This becomes particularly complex when one realizes that at its height the Grand Duchy of Lithuania stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea. Does the present republic of Lithuania have the right to claim all of its archival re-

⁴¹See Grimsted, "The Archival Legacy of Soviet Ukraine: Problems of Tracing the Documentary Records of a Divided Nation," *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique* 28 (January-March 1987): 95-108. A Ukrainian law on archives is in draft, but had not been finalized as of December 1991.

⁴²See the resolution "Zakon Litovskoi Sovetskoi Sotsialisticheskoi Respubliki ob arkhivakh," 13 February 1990 (No XI-3687). An accompanying resolution, "Postanovlenie Verkhovnogo Soveta Litovskoi SSR" (No XI-3688), set 1 September 1990 as the date for the law to take effect.

⁴³Ibid.

mains? Such claims could, for example, involve the central chancery records of the former imperial Grand Duchy of Lithuania from the fourteenth century to 1795, the so-called Lithuanian Metrica (official copies of outgoing royal chancery documents). Should all of these records now be returned from Moscow to Vilnius? After 1569 the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was legally part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and most of the documents involved were created and long held in the capitals of Warsaw or Cracow; it was only after the Third Partition of Poland in 1795 that the Lithuanian Metrica was confiscated by Russian empress Catherine II from Warsaw. Hence, obviously Warsaw would also have a claim.

This is but one of the many examples of disputed archival claims in Eastern Europe.⁴⁴ It is undoubtedly one of the most complex and will be among the hardest to resolve fairly according to professional standards and international archival practice. Disputed claims such as these will be repeated many times in the years ahead, as archivists and politicians try to unravel and resolve the archival legacy of the former Soviet republics.

Union Republic Claims. It makes no archival sense for union republic archivists to march in and unequivocally demand all of their share of the archival legacy remaining in Moscow and St. Petersburg archives from the seventy years of Bolshevik-Soviet rule and the centuries of imperial Russian rule that preceded the USSR. There is every reason, however, to restore to non-Russian republics any integral fonds that may have been illegally appropriated, and to return any integral record groups that are wholly of republic-level provenance, in-

cluding portions appropriated by the KGB or other security organs. Prime candidates for return are the prerevolutionary records of local military authorities throughout the former Russian Empire that were forcibly appropriated by Moscow for the Central State Archive of Military History (TsGVIA) in the 1930s and 1940s. Nevertheless, since even these records were arranged, described, and put into scholarly citations as an integral part of that central archive, it may be appropriate at least to keep microform copies and correlated finding aids in Moscow. The exchange of quality microform copies of major groups of records will undoubtedly be the most satisfactory means of resolving many disputed claims. But modern reproductive equipment is sadly lacking, and in many cases existing finding aids are inadequate for filming purposes. In any case an inter-republic archival commission will be needed to deal with disputes and facilitate the flow of reference information.

Archival Rossica Abroad

While the distinction between the provenance and pertinence of records may be a difficult distinction within the former Russian Empire and Soviet Union, it is even more difficult legally to define components of the "Russian Archival Fond" now located in the diaspora. The distinction must be made between archival materials created in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union and then alienated abroad and those created by émigré communities in the diaspora, or those legitimately acquired in the course of business by institutions or individuals abroad. For example, an original charter addressed and sealed by Peter the Great or any other sovereign, while it is indeed "pertinent to" Russian history wherever it may now be located, would normally be considered to be part of the records of (or if an individual the property of) the addressee, not the creator. Questions may also arise about business records or individual

⁴⁴See the discussion in this issue by Charles Kecskeméti, "Displaced European Archives: Is It Time for a Post-War Settlement?" See especially the earlier study by Kecskeméti, *Archival Claims. Preliminary Study on the Principles and Criteria to be Applied in Negotiations* (Paris: UNESCO, 1977).

manuscripts created by foreigners in Russia, or their writings "about Russia" after their return home.⁴⁵

In the case of alienated archival materials of Russian or Soviet provenance, further judicial and jurisdictional distinctions must be made depending on the circumstances of their alienation. Distinctions must be made for records: 1) illegally alienated from the fatherland by theft or wartime looting; 2) legitimately alienated by gifts or official presentations; 3) deliberately alienated by commercial sale by the state or undercover agents; 4) "justifiably" alienated for political or cultural preservation in the face of an alien regime; and 5) taken abroad as private property by émigrés or their families fleeing from oppression or economic catastrophe. The problems involved are not unique to the twentieth century.

Information long known in the West is only recently being made public in the former Soviet Union about the extensive sale of cultural treasures in the 1920s and 1930s—including rare manuscript books—by the Soviet regime or its undercover agents to help support industrialization and the creation of a war machine.⁴⁶ The repression of the intellectual elite that tried to prevent such cultural alienation helped hide

the domestic traces of cultural treasures shipped to Western auction blocks or sold for a fraction of their worth to Western diplomats and collectors.

The long-standing mutual secrecy and conspiratorial suspicion between Soviet authorities and Russian and other émigré communities abroad have grossly impeded the flow of information in both directions. The fact that many of Trotsky's papers, most of which were created in emigration before he was slain in Mexico, are protected in optimal storage conditions and well described in the Houghton Library at Harvard University is a vital triumph of archival preservation. At the same time, the insular possessiveness with which many Soviet archival authorities have tended in the past to view all Russian/Soviet-related archival materials abroad as their just patrimony—regardless of the circumstances of their creation, of their alienation from the homeland, or of the wishes of their legal owners—has aroused negative reactions and thus impeded equitable arrangements for access and photocopying.

Under a new democratic and culturally tolerant regime in the homeland, many émigrés may be more interested in helping to retrieve and return dispersed parts of the "Russian Archival Legacy," along with other Russian cultural treasures in the diaspora. But it will require extensive research and sophisticated treasure hunting, and in many cases significant funds will be required for litigation or purchase of Russian manuscript treasures that reach Western auction houses, or that have already been legally sold or legitimately donated to foreign museums or purchased by private collectors.

In a new age of more sophisticated attitudes towards émigré culture and foreign émigré communities, much may be gained by emphasizing archival preservation and by the professional description of archival materials that have been preserved wherever they may be. As a first step in the

⁴⁵See Grimsted, "Foreign Collections and Soviet Archives: Russian Archaeographic Efforts in Great Britain and the Problem of Provenance," in *The Study of Russian History from British Archival Sources*, ed. Janet M. Hartley (London, New York: Mansell, 1986).

⁴⁶See the recent article by Robert H. Davis, Jr. and Edward Kasinec, "Witness to the Crime: Two Little-Known Photographic Sources Relating to the Sale and Destruction of Antiquities in Soviet Russia during the 1920s," *Journal of the History of Collections* 3, no. 1 (1991): 53-59. The authors cite a number of earlier studies on the subject including, R. C. Williams, *Russian Art and American Money, 1900-1940* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980); A. Mosiakin, "Prodazha," *Ogonek*, no. 6, 7, 8, 4-11 February 1989, 18-22; 11-18 February 1989, 16-21; 4-11 March 1989, 26-29; and P.N. Savitskii, *Razrushaiushchie svoiu rodinu (snos pamiatnikov iskusstva i rasprodazha muzeev SSSR)* (Berlin: Izd. Evraziitsev, 1936).

process, it may at last be possible to prepare a collaborative scholarly directory and locator files for archival documents from and relating to Russia abroad, together with a bibliography of available finding aids. Such an effort is planned as part of the IREX-sponsored computer database archival information project. A parallel project for describing the Ukrainian archival legacy has already started in Kiev.

World War II Records

Captured Records. The Western Allies made concerted efforts after World War II to return most of the Nazi-captured archives found in Western zones of occupation to their appropriate homes, but Soviet authorities refused to participate in similar restitution efforts.⁴⁷ The Soviet government did nevertheless submit various claims according to the international requirements and, by September 1948, over half a million cultural treasures were turned over to Soviet authorities from the American occupation zone alone.⁴⁸ Following extensive publication on microfilm, captured Nazi records taken to England or the United States by the Western Allies were eventually returned to Germany where they are available

for research.⁴⁹ Cold War attitudes and the lack of cultural agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union in those years made it inappropriate for the United States to return those portions of the politically revealing Smolensk Communist Party archives captured by the Nazis; but at least in the U.S. National Archives, they were well-described, microfilmed, and available for research.⁵⁰

In sharp contrast, none of the captured Nazi records and only a fraction of the other looted foreign archival materials brought to Moscow from Eastern Europe at the end of World War II were subsequently returned to their homeland. They were all sealed in the so-called "Special Archive" (*Osobyi arkhiv*) or closed secret divisions of other repositories, where they were opened only for limited political research, and particularly for operational purposes by the KGB and other security organs. Now at last their existence is being admitted, and researchers for some official foreign projects (such as the identification of war criminals) are given access.

Increasing information about this "Special Archive" and its holdings is emerging,

⁴⁷The most detailed analysis—with a generally positive appraisal—of the Western postwar restitution of Nazi cultural plunder, with emphasis on American policies, is the published dissertation by Michael J. Kurtz, *Nazi Contraband: American Policy on the Return of the European Cultural Treasures, 1945-1955* (New York: Garland, 1985). Kurtz notes the issue of Soviet objections and non-participation.

⁴⁸A list of thirteen restitution shipments to the USSR from the United States occupation zone between September 1945 and September 1948 entitled "Restitution of Russian Property" was enclosed with a report from Richard F. Howard, Deputy Chief for Cultural Restitution (MFA&A), Karlsruhe, Germany (20 September 1948), U.S. National Archives, Suitland Federal Records Center, RG 260, Box 291. That list is published in Patricia K. Grimsted, with the collaboration of Gennadi Boriak, *Dolia skarbir Ukrain's'koi kul'tury pid chas druhoi svitovoi viiny: Yynyshchennia arkhiviv, bibliotek, muzeiv* (Kiev: Arkheohrafichna komisiia AN URSS, 1991): 105-107.

⁴⁹See 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*, ed. Robert Wolfe (Athens, Ohio: National Archives and Records Service, 1974):267-76. Other papers in the same volume describe the various intelligence and historical uses of the records and the filming operations as discussed at the National Archives conference devoted to the subject in 1968.

⁵⁰Regarding the Smolensk Archive, see the recent article by J. Arch Getty, "Guide to the Smolensk Archive," in *A Researcher's Guide to Sources on Soviet Social History in the 1930s*, eds. Sheila Fitzpatrick and Lynne Viola (New York, London: M.E. Sharpe, 1989), 84-96. A Russian version was published as "Fondy 'Smolenskogo arkhiva' v SShA," *Sovetskie arkhivy*, 1991, no. 2: 93-101. See also the finding aid produced at the U.S. National Archives, *Guide to the Records of the Smolensk Oblast of the All-Union Communist Party of the Soviet Union, 1917-1941* (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Service, 1980).

even in Russian publications.⁵¹ An interview in *Literaturnaia gazeta* in October 1991 revealed a few more details,⁵² which prompted the former director of the archive to admit the existence of many of the foreign holdings, including the French inter-war intelligence files captured by the Nazis from Paris in 1940 and appropriated by Soviet authorities from an out-of-the-way castle in Czechoslovakia in 1945.⁵³ Two years ago in an initial revelation about the archive, mention was made only of the high-level Nazi records brought back to the Soviet Union from Silesia, but not about the other looted foreign archival materials, including those captured in Czechoslovakia and Germany. In a recent *Izvestiia* interview, the former director, now a deputy chairman of Roskomarkhiv, admitted the extent of other captured records assembled by the Nazis from Masonic, Jewish, and socialist groups from sites all over Europe. The present director of the "Special Archive" also confirmed extensive transfers of captured records to the KGB in the 1950s, including major parts of the French intelligence files, but their present location has not been revealed.⁵⁴ Information is also

coming to light showing that many files from Socialist organs, such as the Second International, as well as personal papers of Socialist leaders were turned over to Communist Party authorities.⁵⁵

The major problem with many of the captured records still held in Soviet area archives is that archival authorities themselves do not know with accuracy the origins or current locations of these holdings because the holdings have been dispersed and their filing order destroyed in the process. Some of these materials were simply brought back after the war and forgotten. Inventories (*opisi*) were prepared for many groups of records, but often by those unprepared to deal adequately with the languages or with the recordkeeping practices involved with the documents themselves. The more politically sensitive records, such as large parts of the French intelligence files, were turned over to the KGB and other intelligence organs, but intelligence specialists were little interested in the origin, history, or adequate description of the materials for research use. The preparation and eventual publication of an authoritative checklist of "captured" records of foreign origin still held in the former USSR would be the most important first step in opening these materials to world scholarship and analysis. Eventually, such records should be returned to their source or country of creation.

Prison Camp Records. Earlier it was thought that the "Special Archive," i.e. the Central State Archive of the USSR, contained only captured foreign records. Recent information has revealed that the foreign records constitute only two-fifths of the archive's five million file units.⁵⁶ Also

⁵¹See the concluding section of the recent article published in Germany by Patricia K. Grimsted, "The Fate of Ukrainian Cultural Treasures during World War II: Archives, Libraries, and Museums under the Third Reich," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 39:1 (1991): 72-79. See also the Ukrainian version published with a lengthy appendix of relevant documents in Grimsted and Boriak, *Dolia skarbiv Ukrain's'koi kul'tury*, especially pp. 23-31. As of 1991 the so-called "Special Archive," officially called the Central State Archive of the USSR, had a sign on the building with its official name.

⁵²Evgenii Kuzmin, "Vyvesti ... Unichtozhit' ... Spriatat' ... Sud'by trofeinykh arkhivov," interview with Patricia K. Grimsted, *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 2 October 1991.

⁵³E. Maksimenko, "Arkhivy frantsuzskoi razvedki skryvali na Leningradskom shosse," *Izvestiia*, 9 October 1991. This article is based on an interview with A.S. Prokopenko, now deputy director of Roskomarkhiv.

⁵⁴V.N. Bondarev, interview with the author, October 1991.

⁵⁵Former TsPA Director I.N. Kitaev admitted that the papers of Frederick LaSalle were deposited in the Central Party Archive. See "TsPA: 'Million dokumentov dostupen issledovateliam!'" interview with TsPA Director I.N. Kitaev by V.V. Korneev, *Vo prosy istorii KPSS*, 1990, no. 7: 48-49.

⁵⁶Details about these holdings were confirmed in

of prime interest are the vast records of the network of Soviet World War II concentration and prisoner-of-war camps, namely the records of the USSR Main Administration for Affairs of Prisoners of War and Internment, which were transferred from the KGB. These files include records of individual camps and even collections of prison writings and other mementos of individual inmates. Now almost half a century after World War II, agreements have been signed recently with the former Axis powers for the release of names, dates, and places of death and burial of the many prisoners who died in these Soviet camps, including 500,000 Japanese and 400,000 Germans. Databases of released information are being compiled using hardware and software furnished by Germany and Japan. A detailed survey of the World War II prisoner-of-war camp records held now in the "Special Archive" might set a precedent for the release of information about the whereabouts of other prison-camp records, and about the prisoners who perished in those camps.

The Legacy of Archival Problems

Accession and Appraisal. Many state archival repositories—particularly those specializing in twentieth-century holdings—continue to acquire additional Party and KGB files, along with records of recently abolished state agencies and organizations. The volume of new accessions will continue to mount, given the pace of government reorganization in process following the dissolution of the USSR. Priorities are usually given to appraising, arranging, and describing the highest interest files among the mass of newly accessioned records. Given the volume of new accessions and diminished budgets, it is unlikely that many archives will have funds for a major

reorganization, rearrangement, or redescription of previously existing fonds.

It will be impossible to retain permanently all the newly acquired files. Appraisal policies are being revamped to cope with the masses of bureaucratic paper. New schedules and appraisal guidelines are also needed to conform with the requirements of more open historical research. Such tasks will not be easy given the technological deficiencies and the lack of well-trained and experienced personnel. Even setting aside the political issues involved, debates over appraisal and accession policies continue to mount. Some democratically-oriented historians and representatives of public-service humanitarian groups such as *Memorial*, the International Red Cross, and Amnesty International are crying out "Save all!"—at least until they have a chance to appraise what might be destroyed.

Declassification Procedures. Many archivists may be sympathetic to the new demand for openness. However, government secrecy rules need revision if creation dates are to be the criteria for opening records rather than adhering to the previous requirement that every file must be read before declassification. To be sure, care also has to be taken to preserve the rights to individual privacy and to safeguard legitimate state secrets. This is especially important because of the Party and KGB files which are being opened for the first time to the public.

Many relevant issues including the right to information on behalf of citizens versus the necessity of protecting state secrets, the past history of excessive preoccupation with secrecy, and restricted access to information were discussed at a three-day conference on "Freedom of Scientific Information and the Preservation of State Secrets" in late September 1991, in St. Petersburg. The published abstracts of the presentations provide many examples of unbridled "secrecy" under Soviet rule and of various examples of archival restrictions and types

interviews conducted by the author with the director V.N. Bondarev in October 1991, following up on earlier interviews in May and July 1991.

of classified materials. While there was a general agreement about opening archives and libraries in the spirit of *glasnost*, appropriate declassification guidelines were nowhere adequately defined nor were participants able to propose viable new procedures or criteria.⁵⁷

Preservation and Security Problems.

Preservation problems and inadequate storage facilities have reached crisis proportions in many repositories. For example, most of the manuscript holdings in the State Historical Museum in Moscow still remain closed because of further delays in the repair of that building. All year, scaffolding enclosed the Pashkov Palace which houses the Manuscript Division of the Lenin Library, where working conditions and preservation problems have been the subject of scandal and abuse for the past decade. The forced closing of the Lenin Library itself at the end of November 1991 is proof that the world-class manuscript collections, and now indeed the entire library as well, need urgent rescue efforts, because of the failure to resolve long-neglected structural problems in its buildings, aggravated by unresolved management and fiscal crises.⁵⁸ By late December, funding was found to keep that library operating marginally. Now renamed the Russian State Library, its future is still unresolved.

Such headline occurrences underscore the growing catastrophic problems in other archival repositories. In St. Petersburg one disaster follows another, and there is little hope on the way. The Manuscript Division

of Pushkinskii dom remained closed to researchers all year, because arrangements for relocation were unresolved, following a burst pipe disaster in the heating system in January 1990. Still another archival tragedy hit St. Petersburg in October 1991, when a burst pipe flooded major parts of the priceless Photographic Archive in the Institute of Material Culture, but so far that disaster was not reported in the outside world.⁵⁹ Almost all of the major archives in the illustrious imperial Russian capital city are housed in potentially disastrous circumstances. Yet the only archival building to have been constructed since the Bolshevik Revolution—and the only one to meet contemporary archival storage standards—is the almost-completed building specially constructed for the Communist Party archives. Negotiations were underway before the August coup to accommodate some of the most threatened manuscript treasures from Pushkinskii dom, but the rent proposed by Party authorities was beyond the means of the Academy of Sciences. Such a solution became less viable by fall, given the additional space needed by newly accessioned Party records. Indeed storage space and preservation deficiencies for all archives in St. Petersburg, as in many other cities, increased to crisis proportions after the coup, given the staggering volume of liquidated agency archives, the demands not to discard inadequately appraised files, and the lack of resources for new buildings.

There are continuing reports of pillage, insider theft, and sale of documents abroad. For example, a British scholar who has been advising a major publication project from the former CPSU archives reported that

⁵⁷See the internally published abstracts of conference presentations, *Svoboda nauchnoi informatsii i okhrana gosudarstvennoi tainy. Tezisy konferentsii 24-26 sentiabria 1991 g. Leningrad*, ed. M.B. Konahev, et al. (Leningrad [sic], 1991).

⁵⁸A telex addressed to "the Directors of National Libraries" from the then Lenin Library director A.P. Volik, dated 13 December 1991, was received that morning at the Library of Congress, to the effect that the dismissal of the entire staff was imminent, because the largest library in the Soviet Union (and indeed in the world) was "brought to the threshold of ruin."

⁵⁹Detailed information about this tragedy came in a personal letter to the author with a report from the archivist whom I had visited there in June 1991. The same unmodernized building houses one of the largest collections of Oriental manuscripts in Russia, along with other parts of the rich archival holdings of the Institute of Material Culture (formerly the Institute of Archeology) of the Academy of Sciences.

"unfortunately a few documents have been removed for sale on the black market."⁶⁰ A front-page story in *The Boston Sunday Globe* in late December claimed that "Less principled KGB colonels discreetly sell off choice items from the archives. British spy Kim Philby's files, for example, are being offered for six figures—in dollars, of course."⁶¹ Other such impending scandals have not had a public hearing.

The soaring financial crisis and desperate need for hard currency have reportedly even led some archival administrators to look the other way or to devise other dubious "exchange" arrangements of their own, evoking memories of the extensive sale of manuscript and other cultural treasures by Stalin's bankrupt regime. In the face of such recent allegations and confirmed past examples of theft and commercialized pillage, the labor-intensive archival "security" practice of counting and recording the folios in and out for every storage unit communicated to researchers appears naively antiquated and continues to delay deliveries in archival reading rooms.

Access, Reference Facilities, and Commercialization

Access Provisions and Working Conditions. Dramatic changes in Soviet archives in the recent years of *glasnost'* have been marked by tremendous progress in ac-

cess and improved working conditions for foreign scholars, including the communication of basic internal inventories (*opisi*) to foreigners to be used in regular state archival reading rooms, along with a multitude of new foreign projects and collaborative ventures. Most of the previously highly restricted archives, such as those under the Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs and the CPSU, as mentioned above, started admitting foreign scholars by 1990, and now more basic information about their holdings, research facilities, and finding aids is available.⁶² Access and research conditions in these high-security contemporary archives, however, still remained limited.

In general, access has been greatly relaxed and simplified, especially for foreign scholars. No longer do prospective researchers need to submit detailed lists of every fond needed a year in advance and be worried that they will not be able to adjust their research plans upon arrival. All those attributes of earlier stifling research conditions in Soviet archives are a thing of the past. Now foreign researchers, like their Russian colleagues or those from other union republics, simply need a letter from their sponsoring Soviet-area institution to the director of the archive in question stating their topic and dates, with a few words about their academic qualifications. With such a letter in hand, a prospective reader can expect immediate access, although in some repositories delivery of files may take a day or two, and in others even longer, because of the shortage of staff and other problems.

Many scholars attending conferences or on short-term visits are also being wel-

⁶⁰The Cambridge University historian Jana Hollett was quoted in an article about the CPSU archives by William E. Schmidt, "Lenin to Stalin to Gorbachev! Read All About Them Here!" *New York Times*, 22 January 1992, sec. A. p. 4.

⁶¹Paul Quinn-Judge, *Boston Sunday Globe*, 22 December 1991, p. 1. The source of the information was not indicated. The story also noted that "The head of the KGB reaches into his safe and gives the U.S. ambassador the bugging plans for his embassy." Bakatin was "accused of 'high treason' in the media" as a result of this disclosure which prompted his resignation, according to an interview in *Sovershenno sekretno*, 18 January 1992, as quoted in *RFE/FL Daily Report*, 24 January 1992. Confirmation has not been possible of the alleged sale of archival documents for hard currency from other archives and libraries.

⁶²Grimsted, "A Handbook—Supplement 1" (IREX, 1991). This supplement extended coverage for the first time to central and local Communist Party archives, to the military and naval archives under the Ministry of Defense, and to the postrevolutionary Archive of Soviet Foreign Policy under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, all based on lengthy personal visits.

comed for archival research in many institutions, even if they are not on official academic exchanges, as previously was required. In some cases, an official letter from a home academic or research institution will prove sufficient for visitors on a tourist visa. Even non-academic genealogical searchers on tourist visas are given ready access in many archives. Until the new provisions are enacted into law and implemented with supplemental new printed regulations, however, there can be no guarantees that the "new order" will be universal or that it has come to stay.

It will probably be well into 1992 before the new Russian archival law, with its thirty-year access provisions, will be enacted and before the general situation is clarified with respect to the new archival organization. The frequently chaotic transitional situation in the Russian Federation is similar in other republics. Additional institutional changes will ensue as the details of the fragile new Commonwealth structure unfold. Many archival repositories are considering changes of name to reflect the de-sovietization, decentralization, de-standardization, and *departizatsiia*, but it is unlikely their physical location and storage facilities will change overnight.

Genealogical Inquiries. Family historians and genealogists can delight in the recent willingness of Soviet-area archives to assist their inquiries after long decades of claiming no interest in such "decadent bourgeois pursuits." An agreement to establish a Soviet Archival Genealogical Advisory Service (SAGAS) was signed in Moscow in March 1990 during the visit of the IREX-sponsored delegation of United States genealogical specialists. Glavarkhiv chief Vaganov, however, delayed the project for two years.⁶³ In the meantime, the

RSFSR state archives organized an officially-sponsored genealogical service of their own, as explained in an article in the major Soviet newspaper *Izvestiia* in July 1991, emphasizing the "unknown right" to search for one's forebears.⁶⁴ "AROS Ltd—The Archives of Russia" notes that "Genealogical research promises to be the most profitable, if not the main business" of their new commercial enterprise.⁶⁵ More recently, Roskomarkhiv agreed to assemble a delegation of genealogical specialists from Russia, along with representatives from Belarus and Ukraine, for a visit to the United States in the spring of 1992 under the terms of the agreement for US-USSR archival exchange, to finalize procedures for a genealogical clearinghouse with the U.S. National Archives Volunteer Association.

Other republics, including Estonia, Lithuania, and Ukraine, have likewise been organizing genealogical services to handle foreign inquiries. Hopefully plans for the genealogical clearinghouse can also be coordinated with archives in Canada and other Western nations where large groups of immigrants from Eastern Europe are interested in pursuing the search for their forebears. Interest within the former Soviet area itself is also on the rise. A planned conference to be held in St. Petersburg in early 1992, sponsored by the newly established Russian Genealogical Society, has already brought over three hundred submissions for prospective presentations.⁶⁶

10408. See also Grimsted, "Glasnost' and Babushkas:—New Horizons for Genealogical Research in the USSR," *Heritage Quest* 28 (April/May 1990): 38-43 and 29 (June/July 1990): 35-39.

⁶⁴E. Maksimova, "Neizvestnoe pravo. Chto kazhdyi iz nas znaet o svoikh predkakh," *Izvestiia*, 15 July 1991. The article quotes extensively from the Grimsted article cited in fn. 63.

⁶⁵*New Times (Novoe vremia)*, 1991, no. 25/28:47. The address cited has been changed to the building of the former Central Party Archive: Pushkinskaia ul. 15; 103821 Moscow; Russia. "AROS Ltd—Archives of Russia" is a commercial venture of Roskomarkhiv.

⁶⁶Contact with the new society can be made through

⁶³Project coordinator on the American side is Patricia Eames. The address is: Office of Public Programs, U.S. National Archives, Washington, D.C.

Complaints in the West have been coming through, however, about the high fees that some Soviet-area genealogical consulting groups have been charging. Few amateur family historians can afford or would be willing to pay the excessive \$200 initial fee reportedly being requested by one agency to begin a genealogical search in Belarus with no guarantee of results, and even higher fees have been suggested elsewhere. Genealogical interest may be high but researchers are accustomed to the fact that public archives in the West approach the subject as a form of public service. Blatant commercialization in the former Soviet area may soon discourage Western interest, since family historians in the diaspora can hardly be expected to pay high hourly fees—out-of-keeping with post-Soviet archival salary scales—to compensate state archivists to search for an unspecified number of hours through poorly legible birth and death notations in unindexed parish registers and other sources. The issue of fair prices for services and undue commercialization will need to be a prime topic for discussion.

More openness in the genealogical field in the former Soviet Union is also making it possible for the microfilming of major runs of genealogical sources that will be available for use abroad. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints has been actively negotiating with various state archives in Russia and the other former union republics to film extensive runs of parish registers and other genealogical sources for the Family History Library in Salt Lake City with branch microform offices throughout the world. Ideally, centralized computerized reference facilities and improved finding aids for genealogical-related sources should be developed in connection with this

major filming effort, since such facilities would greatly assist future genealogical searches in Soviet-area archives.

Intellectual Access. Once in the archives, foreigners will find working conditions and access to information greatly improved. Instead of being told, as in the past, that finding aids do not exist or are not available, they will be free to consult internal inventories (*opisi*) and other internal reference aids. But that does not mean that they will find reference facilities sufficient to their needs, or what American archivists would term adequate “intellectual access.”⁶⁷ In the Russian and Soviet archival tradition, item-level description in *opisi* remains a requirement for any files made available to readers, but adequate item-level description takes time and experience. Furthermore, there has never been a tradition in Soviet archives for series-level description such as is common in the West. No published guides link descriptions of fonds to specific *opisi*, so that most researchers are still largely at the mercy of archivists.

There is still no comprehensive directory-level coverage of current archives and other manuscript repositories. The latest Glavarkhiv report lauded the new directory now in press describing for the first time archival holdings in many repositories not administered by Glavarkhiv.⁶⁸ Yet that inadequate volume, compiled from 1986 in-

⁶⁷For an in-depth discussion of this problem, see the study by Patricia K. Grimsted, *Intellectual Access and Descriptive Standards for Post-Soviet Archives: What Is To Be Done?* (Princeton, NJ: IREX, 1992).

⁶⁸*Dokumenty Gosudarstvennogo arkhivnogo fonda SSSR v muzeiakh, bibliotekakh i nauchno-otraslevykh arkhivakh*, compiled under the direction of I.V. Volkova and A.B. Kamenskii. (Moscow: Mysl', 1991—). The directory was scheduled for issue by the Mysl' “publishing house” which went out of business at the end of 1991 before the book appeared. I am grateful to the Archival Affairs reference group in VNIIDAD (the Glavarkhiv institute responsible for its production) for showing me the final typescript of the table of contents, guidelines for description, and sample entries for the directory.

its president, the well-known Russian genealogical specialist, I.V. Sakharov, P/O 228, A/Ia 812, 197228, St. Petersburg; Russia.

formation, will already be out of date before it appears, and it fails to cover many important repositories.

Glavarkhiv statistics about newly issued guides to state archives said nothing about their limited distribution; the fact that none of those finding aids produced during the past five years were available for export abroad; and that few of them had reached the Lenin Library or any other major Soviet research facility. Nor was there any mention of the contradictory fact that the elusive promise of hard currency sales had led several archival directors to peddle their finding aids exclusively to Western publishers. In fact, the only recent guides to such high-interest archives as the Central State Archive of the Soviet Army and the Central State Archive of the Soviet Navy are being sold only abroad, and at high prices; there are no provisions for sale to Soviet-area researchers in rubles or for depository copies in any Soviet-area libraries.⁶⁹ Earlier, it was foreigners who were denied access to finding aids in Soviet archives. Now, unfortunately, in these cases, the reverse is true.

Inter-Republic Reference Needs. With the disintegration of the union, multi-na-

tional, inter-republic archival information needs are greater than ever. There is considerable justification for a democratically-oriented archival agency, or at least some significant form of archival association representing former union republics, to serve as a forum and facilitating organ for resolving common problems and as a means of communication on archival matters. Now that sovereign republics are trying to forge their own archival services and open their archives to the public, they too must reexamine their reference needs in terms of the legacy of decades of Soviet politicized traditions and russified practices. An inter-republic reference system is badly needed, not as a mechanism of control over information and russification but as a promoter of multi-lingual descriptive standards and of regular reporting in order to provide open access to archival information for interested institutions, organizations, and individual researchers at home and abroad.

It will require considerable effort, professional know-how, and stabilized funding to rise above the centrifugal forces and growing commercialization in order to forge a viable centralized reference facility to work together with progressively reformed archival services on the republic level. A crucial second point in the October 1991 decree that brought the twelve all-union-level central state archives under the immediate jurisdiction of Roskomarkhiv "guarantees the possibility of use of documents in state archives located on the territory of the RSFSR to institutions, organizations, enterprises, and citizens of the union republics."⁷⁰ The use of those documents necessitates the development of a contemporary user-oriented, multi-lingual reference system and the distribution to the union republics of its published and/or machine-readable products to facilitate research.

⁶⁹The new TsGASA guide is being published only abroad: *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Sovetskoi Armii. Putevoditel' v 2-x tomakh*, vol. 1 (Minneapolis: East View Press, 1991)—price \$59.95. The second volume is advertised as forthcoming in April 1992 at a "prepublication discount" price of \$49.95. The same publisher recently reprinted the earlier list of fonds in TsGASA, *Annotirovannyi perechen'fondov Tsentral'noi gosudarstvennoi arkhiva Sovetskoi Armii*, 5 vols. (Moscow: Glavarkhiv, 1987; reprint edition: Minneapolis: East View Press, 1991). This publication—originally issued in a press run of fifty copies and restricted—was declassified in 1989. East View Press is selling the five-volume series for \$955 in the facsimile edition and \$475 for the microfiche edition. The new TsGAVMF computer-prepared guide completed in the summer of 1991 was not published in the USSR, *Spravochnik po fondam Sovetskogo Voenno-Morskogo Flota*, compiled by M.E. Maleninskaiia and I. Iu. Efremova (Minneapolis: East View Press, 1991); the microfiche edition is being advertised in the U.S. for \$89.

⁷⁰See the resolution of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, 12 October 1991, no. 531.

Budgetary Problems and Commercialization. During the last few years, archives were relishing their new autonomy from centralized Glavarkhiv control, but the increasing fiscal autonomy that came with the Gorbachev "self-financing" program threatened to compromise public service functions. Reduced state budgetary allotments were forcing archives to adopt various fiscal strategies and to attempt dubious commercial and publishing ventures quite unrelated to their archival functions. Without appropriate banking services or financial experience many state archives were turning to commercial "cooperatives" or other third-party vendors for foreign transactions and reproduction services in hopes of generating hard currency revenues. Some archives were forming so-called "cooperatives" or special "self-financing" groups of their own to engage in commercial activities and the sale of copies and research services to foreigners. Some archives were even prepared to make direct individual exchange arrangements with foreign researchers (including sponsorship of visa and housing arrangements) in exchange for Western equipment or reciprocal visits for their own scholars or archivists.

The All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Documentation and Archival Affairs (VNIIDAD) under Glavarkhiv was also trying to transform many of its operations to a "self-financing" basis. Its computer specialists were selling database systems to various archives. Its reference group was planning a self-supporting archival reference inquiry service in addition to contracting for the production of archival directories. One of its biggest projects is an army contract for the production of memorial albums for World War II victims in a database system for which over two hundred personal computers were already in operation.

One of the last in-house Glavarkhiv information bulletins was devoted to commercial practices in archives in response to the new "self-financing" fiscal situation in

archives and the lack of adequate state budgetary allotments. Examples were cited from copyright law and commercial practices in the West in an effort to justify new commercial practices and the sale of rights for commercial use by Soviet-area archives.⁷¹ Many of the examples cited, however, were taken out of context and failed to show an understanding of the Western economic context and the overriding public-service principles that prevail in most national and other government archives in Europe and the Americas.

The new higher fees for reproduction and reference services may appear justified to assist archives in acquiring the computers and Western reproduction equipment they so desperately need, but there is cause for alarm when high overhead charges are added by blatantly commercial cooperatives or other dubious, private hard-currency vendors. The barter of Western technology has made it possible for some Western institutions to acquire large runs of microforms, but questions may arise as to standardized rates and preferential treatment. More serious in principle is the addition of staggering charges for the "right to copy" or "information value" of state documents totalling twenty times or more the amount of the actual copying fees. Such new practices are out of keeping with research conditions in Western democratic countries, where all government records and most other public archival holdings are legally in the public domain, meaning that such charges would be prohibited by law. Foreign scholars should be prepared for hard bargaining and should realize that the payment of outrageous fees could set precedents for subsequent researchers.⁷²

⁷¹Glavarkhiv, *Nauchno-informatsionnyi biulleten'*, 1991, no. 5.

⁷²Hence it is little wonder that a distinguished American professor, while delighted with the new open access, refused to make a cash payment of \$120 proposed by the State Archive of Odessa Oblast for fifty-eight xerographic copies.

By the fall of 1991 budgetary problems reached such crisis proportions in line with rapid inflation and the collapsing economy that archival administrators and even dedicated public-service minded archivists were seeking any possible manner of outside support to make ends meet on salaries that could not begin to cover the increased cost of living. Roskomarkhiv itself—as if not to be outdone by third-party Russian and foreign vendors offering their services for archival research—established a commercial venture of its own—“AROS Ltd—The Archives of Russia,” which “will act as a mediator between a customer in need of archive investigation and the archives,” as explained in an awkwardly worded English-language advertisement. In addition to various genealogical and biographical research services, the advertisement offers “joint exhibitions with foreign organizations” and “scientific and research projects together with Soviet and foreign organizations on the basis of historical archive materials.” Western archivists, who are normally prohibited from accepting outside fees related to their archival service, may wonder at the announcement that “The chairman of the Board of AROS is the former director of the Special Archive and now the deputy chairman of the Russian Committee on Archives [Roskomarkhiv].”⁷³

It is to be hoped that the desperate and chaotic search for hard currency and the “anything goes” atmosphere in the newly emerging market economy in this formerly repressed society will not unduly threaten public service and scholarly standards. Many Western academics, even as they delight in the new access possibilities and bemoan the fiscal crisis that is threatening the preservation of archives and research resources, are concerned about the implications of the new commercial practices. For example, the

Social Science Research Council issued a position paper in the fall of 1991 with guidelines dealing with access to research data, reciprocity, the role of scholars, and collaboration. In the words of the authors, the draft guidelines are “intended to discourage practices which could jeopardize fair and equal access to data for the academic community as a whole.” The authors are concerned that foreigner scholars who are providing equipment and monetary payments as a condition of research access or publication rights could affect an abridgment of democratic access and be out of keeping with the principles of reciprocity that Russians and citizens of other former Soviet republics enjoy in Western research facilities.⁷⁴ Discussion of such matters will undoubtedly ensue in the Western academic and archival communities, but the issues need to be viewed within the disastrous economic situation which has arisen for archives and other research centers in the former Soviet area.

Foreign Cooperation and Joint Projects

The Roskomarkhiv leadership is well aware of many of the problems facing Russian archives and, while appropriately trying to capitalize on existing domestic resources, is looking to the West for potential improvements in information facilities and increased communication. Pikhoia has been seeking foreign advice regarding various aspects of archival affairs with an eye to expanding archival access and documentary publication projects. In looking to the outside world, Roskomarkhiv has also been looking for financial and technological help and, particularly, for sources of hard currency that might help the archives over-

⁷³See the advertisement quoted above in fn. 65.

⁷⁴See the published position paper entitled “The Toronto Initiative,” signed by Steven Solnick and Susan Bronson, which grew out of a workshop sponsored by the Social Science Research Council, *AAASS Newsletter* 32:1 (January 1992): 10-11.

come the overbearing problems they face in this chaotic period of economic crisis.

Foreign Projects for the CPSU and KGB Archives. Since the Roskomarkhiv take-over of CPSU and KGB archives, foreign representatives and delegations have been pouring into Moscow. Principal interest centers on these high-profile archives. On behalf of Roskomarkhiv, Pikhoia signed a broadly based "statement of understanding" with Librarian of Congress, James H. Billington, in October 1991 with the aim of promoting "expanded access to archives" and "conditions for researchers to work with previously unknown documents on twentieth-century history."⁷⁵ The agreement also calls for the organization of an international advisory committee for the CPSU archives.

Roskomarkhiv has simultaneously been signing agreements with other foreign institutions which have been anxious to obtain access to or make copies of the sensational newly opened archival materials which will greatly revise our knowledge and understanding of the history and functioning of the Soviet system since 1917. Early in the fall, the American Enterprise Institute, with Vladimir Bukovskii as its advisor, together with the Hoover Institution and Radio Liberty, sent a delegation in hopes of arranging a scanning project of vast high-level CPSU files. Other research institutions including the Institute for Social History (Amsterdam) and the Feltrinelli Foundation (Milan) have been negotiating expanded joint projects. The most extensive agreement thus far is with

the Hoover Institution for a long-term three-million dollar project involving preservation microfilming, which also provides for the availability of copies in the United States. It has become obvious that further international coordination is essential to avoid duplication, ensure reference standards, promote compatibility of the various projects, and provide access for all to the newly-opened archival riches.

Commercial filming is one way of increasing preservation and expanding access to high interest files as well as serving as a major source of income for the archives. However, the specter of uncontrolled commercialization has raised cries of alarm in many circles. Already in the summer of 1991, Pikhoia signed an initial agreement with the British microfilm publisher Chadwyck-Healey, and now the Cambridge firm is starting to film the papers of nine prominent Bolshevik/Communist leaders, including Trotsky, Kirov, Kalinin, Molotov, and Zhadanov. According to a recent press account, the first batch of films to be released next fall will sell for between \$8,000 and \$10,000 (£5,000). The Cambridge publisher paid an up-front fee of "several thousand pounds" and Roskomarkhiv will receive a handsome 25% royalty on sales. Eventually in connection with the Hoover project, films of selected parts of the former CPSU, KGB, and the so-called Kremlin or Presidential Archives will be available for sale in the West and, it is hoped, provided to the successor states that were so long under CPSU domination.⁷⁶ The KGB is apparently not involved in these initial Roskomarkhiv filming sensations, since, as noted above, it was trying to sell film and television rights for its own profit.

⁷⁵As cited in the "Statement of Understanding," signed in Moscow, October 28, 1991. Other archival problems are also mentioned, including archival management, declassification procedures, preservation and storage facilities, computerized information systems, and exchanges of archivists and scholars, with the participation of the United States National Archives and other institutions. Consideration was to be given for mechanisms for the promotion and financing of research projects and documentary publications.

⁷⁶Neil Buckley, "Soviet Archives Coup for UK," *Financial Times*, 22 January 1992, p. 2. See also the variant versions of the story by William E. Schmidt, *New York Times*, 22 January 1992, sec. A p. 4, and in the Associated Press wire release of 22 January 1992. A Cambridge University historian, Jana Howlett, is serving as advisor to the project.

Other Microfilm and Documentary Publications. Several other commercial vendors and interested institutions have been planning microform projects. For example, the U.S. Holocaust Museum hopes to continue its efforts to film archival materials in Moscow and other republics relating to the treatment of Jews during the Second World War. These are among the first documents to have been filmed from the many captured Nazi wartime records held in former Soviet archives.⁷⁷ Other extensive filming projects are under way from other archives, including some less sensational, but nonetheless important historical materials. For example, Inter Documentation Company (IDC) of the Netherlands is microfiching selected nineteenth-century Imperial Russian governors' reports from the major state historical archive in St. Petersburg (formerly TsGIA SSSR), and will soon be fiching the 1937 census files previously under the control of the all-union State Statistical Committee in Moscow.

Repository-Level Directory and Microfiched Finding Aids—ArcheoBiblioBase. With the extensive reorganization and declassification of archives, especially the CPSU archives, researchers now desperately need basic up-to-date information about what archives are where, what records are available, and what existing finding aids describe them. An initial step already under way in the reference field is a collaborative database project under IREX sponsorship to provide an updated, short, comprehensive directory of all archives and manuscript repositories throughout Russia (and eventually other former union republics), together with a brief

identification of their holdings, and other vital information for researchers. Given all the changed institutional names and addresses, such a directory could provide a vital starting point. Plans call for publication of an initial updated English-language directory in the summer of 1992. The new Macintosh program "ArcheoBiblioBase" specially developed for the project combines the facility for directory-level coverage of individual repositories with structured bibliographic descriptions of their published finding aids. The program has an added facility for automatic output of preformatted camera-ready copy, which will greatly reduce publication costs.

An initial Macintosh computer system has been supplied by IREX for the State Public Historical Library in Moscow (GPIB), but more computers are needed. Program refinements are also needed to assure convertibility with other on-going international archival and manuscript information efforts, including RLIN and those being undertaken by various UNESCO affiliates. Plans are under way to expand the project with additional computers for Roskomarkhiv in Moscow and for a corresponding base in St. Petersburg. English-language publication of an initial locator directory is planned for the summer of 1992 with a Russian version to follow. Parallel plans are under way in Ukraine for directory and bibliographic coverage in conjunction with the Manuscript Department of the Vernads'kyi Scientific Library and the new Institute of Ukrainian Archeography of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in coordination with the Ukrainian Glavarkhiv. Once the system has been tested in such initial operations, it could be used to expand coverage of repositories in other former Soviet republics.

It is to be hoped that the production of this updated and expanded directory can be tied into the production of microfiche editions of available guides and other basic finding aids to all of the institutions cov-

⁷⁷The microfilms prepared by the Holocaust Museum are highly selective, unfortunately, since this group was not permitted to film entire series when the project was started several years ago. Given the changed political situation today, many of these high-interest Nazi wartime records might be considered high priority for further comprehensive filming.

ered, so that these important reference materials can be widely circulated to scholars planning research there. This would provide a continuation of the vast collections of finding aids to Soviet archives prepared on microfiche by the Dutch microform publisher Inter Documentation Company (IDC).⁷⁸

Repository-Level Guides. Parallel steps are needed to design a similar system for the publication of new, more sophisticated guides to individual archival repositories and other inter-repository finding aids, with fond- and series-level listings, precise correlations to the creating agencies and sub-agencies, and full bibliographic data for all previous inventories and existing internal finding aids. In terms of content, descriptive standards need to be revised so that eventually archival information available to researchers will come up to international standards and be compatible with database fields used in Western information systems. Whether or not it becomes possible for Russian and other Soviet area archives to conform precisely to the USMARC AMC format, consideration definitely needs to be given to more sophisticated components of fond-level archival description than has hitherto been practiced by Glavarkhiv.

A number of joint foreign-based publication projects for archival guides are being undertaken already, including the publication in the United States of guides for the Soviet-period military archives TsGASA and TsGAVMF.⁷⁹ A group of American historians, working mainly out of the Center for the Study of Russia and the USSR at the University of California (Riverside) in collaboration with colleagues in Moscow at

the newly formed Russian State University for the Humanities (formerly MGIAI), have signed exclusive agreements with six central archives in Moscow to publish new or reprinted guides in the United States. These archives include the former Central Party Archive, TsGAOR SSSR, TsGANKh SSSR, and the Moscow Consolidated Municipal Archives. The center has already provided several computers to Moscow archives and has helped them establish databases for specific projects. The center is also offering summer archival research opportunities to foreign scholars.⁸⁰

Subject Area Projects. Several more detailed subject-related joint projects are under way. The Russian State University for the Humanities and the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research in New York are collaborating on a description of archival holdings pertaining to Jews in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union, long a taboo subject in the Soviet Union.⁸¹ The project involves archival training and professional fond-level description of holdings in major centers. A Study Group for Russian and Soviet Jewish History and Culture at University College in London is surveying Jewish holdings to develop and maintain an information center in the field.⁸² A new long-term project on the history of the Cold

⁷⁸See the IDC catalogue series, Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, ed., *Archives and Manuscript Collections in the USSR: Finding Aids on Microfiche*, Series 1: *Moscow and Leningrad* (Inter Documentation Company, 1976); *Ibid.*, Series 2: *Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Belorussia* (1981); *Ibid.*, Series 3: *Ukraine and Moldavia* (1988).

⁷⁹See fn. 69.

⁸⁰Information about this project is available from J. Arch Getty, Department of History, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521, and Geoffrey Burds, Department of History, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627. The Russian contact is Nikolai Petrovich Iakol'ev, Drobishev Laboratory for Mathematical Methods in History, Russian State University for the Humanities, ul. Nikol'skaia, 15; 108642 Moscow; Russia.

⁸¹On the American side, the project is being coordinated by Marek Web, Chief Archivist at YIVO. The address is YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, 1048 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10028.

⁸²John D. Klier, Corob Lecturer in Modern Jewish History in the Department of Hebrew and Jewish Studies heads this group, which is starting a database of scholars and current research in the field. The address is Study Group for Russian and Soviet Jewish History and Culture, University College, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT.

War, based at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, is starting a newsletter with plans to include information about new archival sources for Cold War history.⁸³ Several other cooperative international projects are under way to describe music scores, Hebraic manuscript books, Oriental manuscripts, and early Slavic manuscript books which are held in Soviet-area archives.

International Archival Ties and Bi-national Committees. With the breakup of the Soviet Union and the extensive archival reorganization underway, it is obvious that more broadly based archival exchange and cooperative efforts are needed in other former union republics as well as Russia. Prior to the dissolution of the USSR, the all-union Glavarkhiv pursued international relations with the International Council on Archives under UNESCO, but also had an impressive array of bilateral agreements with individual countries. Even before the dissolution of the all-union Glavarkhiv, Pikhov was seeking direct RSFSR participation in the International Council on Archives and bilateral exchanges with other countries. For example, early in the summer of 1991, Roskomarkhiv negotiated a direct agreement with the British Academic Committee for Liaison with Soviet Archives (BALSA), which has had bilateral exchange arrangements with Soviet archives through Glavarkhiv since 1984.

Bilateral exchange activities between Soviet and American archivists were arranged on an all-union basis under the auspices of the Commission on Archival Cooperation between the American Council of Learned Societies and Glavarkhiv SSSR, established in 1987. As that earlier commission structure is now being disman-

tled, negotiations are under way between the International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX) and Roskomarkhiv to continue some of the projects already agreed upon under the Commission, including the establishment of a genealogical clearinghouse, the exchange of archivists, and cooperation in producing a directory of Soviet-area archives. On the American side, broader archival problems and exchange activities are being addressed by a new, nationwide Committee on Archival, Library, and Information Sciences, co-chaired by Billington and Don W. Wilson, Archivist of the United States.⁸⁴ Future exchange activities are being planned by IREX to include the archival administrations of other former union republics to reflect the new multinational political situation in the Soviet area.

The Need for Expanded Western Technical Assistance. *Glasnost'* and democratization in the archival sphere have already made gigantic strides in exposing archival problems and in opening previously restricted records to historical scholarship. Since the August coup, more revolutionary archival reforms are opening long-hidden documentation to world scrutiny. Those developments are still fraught with problems in the face of the political and economic collapse of the Soviet empire and the growing chaos of everyday life. Now the newly opened archival records are themselves in jeopardy because of deficient preservation facilities and the potential for political or economic sabotage. Catastrophes in many archives and manuscript repositories are imminent.

⁸³The project is being funded by the MacArthur Foundation with James Hershberg as coordinator. The address is Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

⁸⁴This committee, administered by IREX, replaces the former IREX-administered Commission on Archival Cooperation, as well as the Commission on Library Cooperation with the Library Council of the USSR, and the Sub-Committee on Information and Documentation Problems of the Commission on the Humanities and Social Sciences with the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. The Committee deals with all countries of Eastern Europe, including all of the former Soviet republics.

Foreign technical assistance and financial aid could help avert such tragedies, particularly now that Roskomarkhiv leaders are prepared to consult and collaborate with Western specialists as never before. Commercial publishers and interested foreign archives and research centers may be able to help with needed equipment and training in contemporary information sciences and reproduction techniques. Expert advice and funding will be required to bring the most disaster-prone repositories up to minimal standards in terms of preservation and storage facilities. Technical assistance could also help develop more viable declassification procedures, security provisions, and efficient management techniques.

Even before one can consider filming or scanning archival holdings, one must realize that more details are needed about what is where and which files have the

highest priorities for preservation and study abroad. Hence the first priority should be assistance in creating reference tools to help provide basic locator files and improved intellectual access to the documentary records of the Soviet regime, together with the remaining archives and manuscript treasures of earlier centuries. With the break-up of the Soviet Union and the formation of a new "Commonwealth of Independent States," it would be a boon to world civilization to assist the de-Sovietized Russian state and the other newly emerging sovereign nations to reestablish their national and cultural identities on the basis of their long-suppressed archival legacy. Simultaneously, such efforts would help to open this vital documentation to international scholarship and enrich our political and cultural understanding.

Beyond *Perestroika*: Soviet-Area Archives after the August Coup:

Abstract: This article traces changes in Soviet-area archives through 1991. Despite increasing evidence of *glasnost* in access to archives and to their internal finding aids, the failure of *perestroika* under Glavarkhiv has left a legacy of problems. The article discusses archival reform during the last months of Glavarkhiv's administration of state archives throughout the Soviet Union and the rise to pre-eminence of the Russian archival service, Roskomarkhiv. Roskomarkhiv has taken over the nationalized Communist Party archives, KGB archives, and most all-union archives on Russian territory. Russia and other republics are drafting archival laws which will open new claims and potential areas of conflict regarding their archival patrimony and jurisdiction over records. At the same time, questions have been opened anew about jurisdiction over Russian records abroad, records captured by the Soviet Union during World War II, and access to Soviet World War II prison-camp records. The article ends by describing the legacy of problems which effect the research use of records and summarizes foreign collaborative assistance.

Au delà de la *perestroïka*: les archives post-soviétiques après le coup du mois d'août

Résumé: Cet article relève les changements archivistiques de l'après-Union soviétique au cours de l'année 1991. Malgré l'évidente croissance de la *glasnost* dans l'accès des archives et de leurs inventaires, l'échec de la *perestroïka* sous Glavarkhiv a laissé en héritage de nombreux problèmes. L'article discute la réforme dans le domaine des archives durant les derniers mois de l'administration Glavarkhiv des archives de l'État à travers l'Union Soviétique, ainsi que du développement du service d'archives de la fédération de la Russie (Roskomarkhiv). Roskomarkhiv s'est emparé des archives nationalisées du parti communiste, des archives du KGB et de la plupart des archives central d'Union sur la territoire russe. La Russie et les autres républiques ébauchent des lois en matière d'archives qui vont créer de nouveaux conflits concernant la patrimoine et la juridiction des fonds. Au même moment, certaines questions ont refait surface, surtout celles qui ont trait à la nouvelle juridiction concernant les documents russes conservés à l'étranger, ainsi que les documents saisis par l'Union Soviétique durant la Deuxième Guerre mondiale, et l'accès aux archives des camps de prisonniers de guerre. L'article se termine par une description de l'héritage des problèmes qui affectent l'utilisation pour fins de recherche des archives et résume l'aide prodiguée par les pays étrangers.

Über die *Perestroïka* hinaus: Die Archive auf dem Gebiet der ehemaligen Sowjetunion nach dem August-Coup

Abstrakt: Dieser Artikel untersucht die Veränderungen in den Post-Sowjetischen Archiven einschliesslich des Jahres 1991. Trotz zunehmender Evidenz von *Glasnost* in bezug auf Zugriffsmöglichkeiten zu den Archiven und ihren Findbüchereien zum Nachschlagen, hinterliess das Scheitern von *Perestroïka* unter Glavarkhiv eine Reihe von Problemen. Der Artikel diskutiert die Archivreformen während der letzten Monate, in denen Glavarkhiv die staatlichen Archive überall in der Sowjetunion verwaltete und den Aufschwung des russischen Archivwesens, Roskomarkhiv. Roskomarkhiv übernahm die verstaatlichten Archive der kommunistischen Partei, des KGB und die meisten der zentralen Allunionsarchive auf russischem Territorium. Russland und andere Republiken sind im Begriff, Gesetze für das Archivwesen auszuarbeiten, die allerdings neue Konfliktbereiche in bezug auf die Herkunft und juristische Zuständigkeit für die Dokumente schaffen werden. Gleichzeitig tauchen erneut Fragen auf, die drei Komplexe betreffen: die juristische Zuständigkeit für russisches Archivgut im Ausland, Archivmaterial das der Sowjetunion im Zweiten Weltkrieg in die Hände fiel, und den Zugang zu den Akten über die Sowjetischen Gefangenenlager des Zweiten Weltkriegs. Der Artikel schliesst mit einer Beschreibung des Erbes an Problemen, die die Forschungsarbeit in den Archiven betreffen, und er gibt eine Zusammenfassung der ausländischen Mitarbeit und Unterstützung.

Más allá de la *Perestroika*: archivos post-soviéticos después del Golpe de Agosto

Resumen: Este artículo traza los cambios en los archivos del área soviética durante 1991. A pesar del evidente incremento del *glasnost'* al acceso a los archivos y a sus guías de ayuda interna, el fracaso de la *perestroika* bajo Glavarkhiv ha dejado un legado de problemas. El artículo examina la reforma archivológica durante los últimos meses de la administración de Glavarkhiv de los archivos del estado a través de la Unión Soviética y el surgimiento a la pre-eminencia del servicio archivológico de la Federación Rusa bajo Roskomarkhiv. Roskomarkhiv se ha hecho cargo de los nacionalizados archivos del Partido Comunista, los archivos de la KGB y la mayor parte de los archivos unificados en el territorio ruso. Rusia y otras repúblicas están diseñando leyes archivológicas que abrirán nuevas reclamaciones y áreas potenciales de conflictos en relación a su patrimonio archivológico y a la jurisdicción de documentos. Al mismo tiempo, se han abierto de nuevo cuestiones acerca de la jurisdicción de documentos rusos fuera del país, documentos capturados por la Unión Soviética durante la Segunda Guerra Mundial y acceso a los archivos de los campamentos de las prisiones de la Unión Soviética durante la Segunda Guerra Mundial. El artículo finaliza describiendo el legado de los problemas que produce la necesidad de investigar los documentos y resume la ayuda de la colaboración extranjera.