Increasing Reference Access to Post-1991 Russian Archives

Patricia Kennedy Grimsted

If only archival restrictions were the most glaring insufficiency of our archival service. Here we have a whole complex of problems, for which it is insufficient to decide from on high merely to declassify archives. We still need to tell the whole world exactly what is held in them, to publish inventories and catalogues of previously secret documents.

Academician Dimitrii S. Likhachev
September 1989

Crucially important for expanding access to archives is what western archivists often call “intellectual access”—reference facilities that effectively and efficiently assist researchers in preparing for work in the archives, lead them to appropriate documents, and help them understand their archival context. The dramatic opening of Russian archives in the past decade has revolutionized research opportunities and scholarship in many fields. Today, not only are archives being declassified, but the finding aids for previously classified files are available to researchers and new reference facilities are being developed to an extent Likhachev and others never dreamed possible.¹

I am grateful to the sponsors of the larger ArcheoBiblioBase (ABB) project, of which this article is an off-shoot. From the start, generous funding has come from the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), supplemented at various stages with funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Smith Richardson Foundation, the International Institute of Social History (IISG/IISH, Amsterdam), the Eurasia Foundation, and the Open Society Institute in Moscow. Russian sponsorship has come from the Federal Archival Service of Russia (Rosarkhiv) and the State Public Historical Library and, for St. Petersburg coverage, the St. Petersburg Branch of the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Special thanks are due to the many friends, colleagues, and associated Russian compilers who have helped me track down appropriate literature and documentation and clarify many specific issues, or who have commented on earlier drafts of this essay.

Editorial Note: In an exception to Slavic Review style, publishers are included in the notes to this article when locating the reference aid might otherwise prove difficult.

¹. Evgenii Kuz’min, “Blizorukost’—S akademikom D. S. Likhachevym beseduet korrespondent ‘LG,’” Literaturnaia gazeta, 20 September 1989, no. 38:5. Similar sharp comments by Vsevolod V. Tsaplin, by Sarra V. Zhitomirskaya, and by the present author were published the same year in a series of articles and interviews. See citations to such remarks and the earlier discussion by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, Intellectual Access to Post-Soviet Archives: What Is to Be Done? (Princeton: IREX, 1992). Parts of this article update that earlier work. See also the concluding remarks about the Soviet archival arrangement and descriptive system in Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, A Handbook for Archival Research in the USSR (Washington, D.C.: IREX and Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, 1989), chap. 3.
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Unfortunately, the economic crisis in post-1991 Russia with the simultaneous eclipse of Soviet-style archival budgets has wreaked havoc with archival operations and brought new frustrations for researchers and increasing dependence on foreign sources for reference publication. Broader archival developments, the legal context, and issues such as access, declassification, preservation, appraisal, restitution, among others, are the subject of my detailed treatment elsewhere. Here I wish to discuss recent reference developments that are essential to promoting scholarship and providing public access to the sources about Russia's culturally rich, but turbulent and repressive past.

Reference work under Soviet rule was oriented more toward promoting state security and political control than facilitating public research access, but, because of the tremendous importance of archives to the regime, considerable funds were devoted to reference systems and a significant quantity of reference publications. Under Glavarkhiv (the Main Archival Administration under the NKVD/MVD, 1938–1960, and later the Council of Ministers of the USSR) state archives vied with each other in their catalogues of Leniniana and card files identifying prerevolutionary documents about peasant and worker unrest. Their secret divisions were replete with card files on antirevolutionary and alleged anti-Soviet elements, including the White emigration. Even more funds went into Communist Party archives: the vast card catalogues to the Communist Party Central Committee protocols attest to reference efficiency where and when it was needed, and for post-1980 files even in electronic form. Agency archives never organized for public access, such as those of the KGB and the Ministries of Internal Affairs (MVD), Defense (MO), and Foreign Affairs (MID) developed admirable reference systems.

Within the state archival system, the Central Catalogue of Fonds assembled by Glavarkhiv in its heyday put the USSR well ahead of most western countries, which are still trying to computerize fond-level data about their holdings. Now that archival access is open and Rus-


3. The archival term fond has been anglicized, rather than using an incorrect or misleading translation, such as “fund.” The term came to Soviet Russia from the French fonds, but not without some change of meaning and usage. Some writers have rendered fond in English as “collection,” but in most instances that is incorrect from an archival standpoint, because a fond in Russian is an integral group of records from a single office or source, usually arranged as they were created, rather than an artificially assembled “collection.” American archivists might prefer the more technical American “record group,” which in British usage would normally be “archive group,” but the Russian usage of fond is much more extensive, since a fond can designate personal papers or collections as well as groups of institutional records. In Russian archival usage, since all archival materials within a given repository are divided into fonds, the term can also embrace “collections” (i.e., archival materials brought together
sian archives are committed by law to providing public reference access, there is unfortunately almost no Russian government funding to remedy the deficiencies of earlier systems and methodological guidelines. As archivists are struggling to free themselves from the legacy of Soviet ideology and the centralized command system of archival administration, they are simultaneously trying to cope with increasing demands for speedy access to appropriate files within the constraints of staff and reference systems not previously designed for public information.

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

General Directories of Archival Repositories

The first level of reference information about the archives in any country is a general directory of what types of archival materials are located in what repositories with a comprehensive bibliography of available reference works. While the slim 1994 volume mentioned above provides basic data about the federal archives under Rosarkhiv, a comprehensive directory of over 260 archival repositories in Moscow and St. Petersburg published in 1997 includes data about archival materials under all agencies—from the Archive of the President of the

4. Federal'nye arkhivy Rossii i ikh nauchno-spravochnyi apparat: Kratkii spravochnik, comp. O. I. Nezhdanova, ed. V. P. Kozlov (Moscow, 1994). In addition to a more complete bibliographic description of published and unpublished entries, it would have been helpful to include references to those finding aids available in microform editions.
Russian Federation (AP RF) to film studios and factory museums—with close to three thousand bibliographic entries of reference literature. The appearance of this volume—published first in Russia itself—under Rosarkhiv sponsorship is another indication of the revolution that has come to reference information about Russian archives. A forthcoming English-language edition includes another forty repositories and five hundred reference aids. In addition, in the fall of 1997, Rosarkhiv made a formal commitment to the upkeep of the ArcheoBiblioBase (ABB), the electronic database from which the new directories were produced. A quarter century ago, the most extensive interagency archival directory describing a total of seventy archives and manuscript repositories in Moscow and Leningrad (with detailed, annotated bibliography) could only be published abroad. When that volume appeared in 1972, the recommendation of the two well-known Russian archival specialists that a parallel Russian-language directory be published in the USSR was stricken by the editors from the review that appeared in Voprosy istorii.

Although the multiplicity and bureaucratic complexity of archival repositories in Russia make a general repository-level directory of archives and other manuscript collections more essential there than it might be in other countries that have a single National Archives, such a directory was never produced in the Soviet period. Even as late as 1989, the Main Archival Administration of the Council of Ministers turned down the proposals of the International Research and Exchanges Board and the American Council of Learned Societies to assist with such a project. Indeed only scant coverage of archival holdings in many libraries and museums existed before a 1991/1992 directory described for the first time archival holdings in libraries and museums under the all-union and union-republic Ministries of Culture, as well as many of those under the Academies of Sciences. Prepared by the All-Union (now All-Russian) Scientific Research Institute of Documentation and Archival Affairs (VNIIDAD) under Glavarkhiv (now Rosarkhiv), this directory, in terms of Moscow-Leningrad holdings, surveys eight libraries and fifty-four museums, as well as nineteen repositories under the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, two archives of other


6. Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Moscow and Leningrad (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972). A review by Klavdiva Ivanovna Rud’son and Nina Valerianovna Brzhostovskaya appeared in Voprosy istorii, 1973, no. 10. The authors later showed me the original draft of their conclusion, which was dropped from the printed version.

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

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

A lesser-known all-union directory published in western Ukraine a decade earlier actually provides more researcher-oriented annotations of holdings and more extensive bibliography for many archival institutions, including local libraries and museums in the Russian Federation. Without sponsorship from Glavarkhiv, the compilers from the University of L'viv produced what many specialists have recognized as the most helpful interagency directory of archives and manuscript repositories throughout the former Soviet Union. Although uneven in

8. The typescript was registered as an official deposit in the VNIIDAD library in 1992 (no. 104–92): “Arkhivnye dokumenty v bibliotekakh i muzeikakh Rossii: Spravochnik,” comp. I. V. Volkova et al. The typescript is reportedly no longer available to researchers, since the compilers are attempting to find another publisher.

9. An initial version of this directory was also deposited in the VNIIDAD library in 1994 (no. 128–95): “Dokumenty byvshikh partiinykh arkhivov: Spravochnik,” comp. V. G. Larina et al. A published version is expected by spring 1998.
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its coverage of different repositories, inadequately verified in some cases, awkwardly presented from a reference standpoint, and without subject indexing, it was nonetheless a major step ahead of any Glavarkhiv-sponsored directory published before or since, with the most extensive available bibliography of finding aids.

While the VNIIDAD directory described archival holdings in fifty-four museums in Moscow and Leningrad, a new guide to Moscow museums, honoring the 850th birthday celebration in 1997, describes the holdings of close to one hundred museums in the capital city alone.\textsuperscript{11} Although emphasizing museum exhibits rather than archives, oriented for tourists rather than researchers, and lacking bibliography, the well-written essays by staff from each museum nonetheless reveal considerable information about archival holdings that still need to be surveyed in more detail. A companion volume is in preparation for St. Petersburg. For art museums throughout the Russian Federation, with little coverage of archival holdings, but with considerable bibliography, a new directory prepared by a team in the State Russian Museum in St. Petersburg has also appeared recently, while scientific and technical museums are being covered by an in-house directory produced by the Polytechnical Museum in Moscow.\textsuperscript{12} The latter volume covers a number of museums not otherwise surveyed in other Moscow or Petersburg directories, and both include bibliography.

\textbf{Fond-Level Guides for Individual Archives}

Until the dawn of electronic networks for libraries and archives in Russia, basic fond-level guides will remain the backbone of a researcher-oriented archival reference system within individual archives. Since 1991, an impressive new breed of comprehensive, fond-level guides have already appeared for nine of the sixteen different federal-level archives under Rosarkhiv and for several other archives. Most of them list previously secret holdings, and some of them list and annotate the internal inventories (\textit{opisi}) within individual fonds. Two other federal archives have issued briefer new surveys of their holdings, and another is available in electronic format, pending publication. More are in preparation.\textsuperscript{13}

Of special note are the guides in the Russian Archive Series, edited by a team of American historians and distributed by the Center for Russian and East European Studies (REES) at the University of Pitts-

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Vse muzei Moskvy}: \textit{Spravochnik-putevoditel'}, comp. and ed. E. Galkina et al. (Moscow, 1997), vol. 1 of \textit{Biblioteka zhurnal “Mir muzeia.”}


\textsuperscript{13} As listed below, new published guides or short lists of fonds are now available for GA RF, RGADA, RGI, RGAVMF, RGAE, RGALI, RGVA, RTsKhIDNI, and TsKhIDK. New brief surveys have been issued for RGAKFD and RGAFD.
Two volumes of the projected new comprehensive guide to the State Archive of the Russian Federation (GA RF) have already appeared. The first volume covers prerevolutionary holdings in what was before 1961 the Central State Historical Archive of the USSR in Moscow (TsGIAM) and later the prerevolutionary division of the Central State Archive of the October Revolution of the USSR (TsGAOR SSSR). The 609 fonds covered (an increase of 37 percent over its Soviet-period predecessors) predominantly relate to the revolutionary movement but also include many fonds of personal papers, including those belonging to members of the imperial family, and a galaxy of significant collections. A second volume comprehensively annotates major central government records of the RSFSR, namely the holdings of the former Central State Archive of the RSFSR (TsGA RSFSR), which were never thoroughly described before 1991. Both include English prefaces and helpful indexes. An additional volume providing a complete summary listing of all fonds now held by GA RF is nearing completion, and a comprehensive guide with opis’-level coverage of the fonds from the Soviet period in GA RF is in preparation.15

Another impressive volume in the Russian Archive Series provides brief descriptions of all of the 1,574 declassified (as of 1993) institutional fonds in what is now called the Russian State Archive of the Economy (RGAE), together with a list of the successive creating agencies within each record group. An introductory history and survey of the holdings in English and Russian and extensive indexes add to the reference value. A second volume presents more detailed opis’-level coverage of 315 fonds in the first two priority categories, with an added list of the fonds that were declassified between 1992 and 1995. Other volumes are in preparation, including a separate comprehensive guide to the more than 300 fonds of personal papers.16

The former Central Party Archive (TsPA, now RTsKhIDNI) is the third archive to benefit from a comprehensive new guide in the Russian Archive Series—actually the first to be published—providing an-

14. See the review by Donald J. Raleigh, “The Russian Archive Series,” Russian Review 55, no. 3 (October 1996): 692–98. Since Raleigh provides an extended analysis of each volume, only brief mention follows here. See also the shorter, appreciative review by David L. Ransel in the American Historical Review 102, no. 2 (April 1997): 486–87. The series is distributed abroad exclusively by the Center for Russian and East European Studies at the University of Pittsburgh (REES); in Moscow, they are for sale only at the producing archive.


notated listings of all opisi for all fonds. The Pittsburgh edition includes an English-language version of the introduction and appended English-language annotations for fonds in the western European section of RTsKhIDNI. An alternate purely Russian-language edition omits the English-language introduction and appended annotations, but is otherwise identical. A second volume in the Russian RTsKhIDNI guide series appeared in the fall of 1996 (under German sponsorship); it provides more detailed annotations of the personal papers in the archive, although it does not annotate individual opisi within the fonds. Regrettably, neither volume indicates the availability of many of the opisi in microform editions, as provided by the Hoover–Chadwyck-Healey project. Supplementing these guides, RTsKhIDNI has also been issuing an “Information Bulletin” series with additional in-depth descriptions of holdings and news about archival developments.

Going a step further in analyzing newly opened Communist Party sources is the collection of published documents on Stalin’s Politburo in the 1930s. With helpful introductions concerning the sources and appended reference materials, including lists of participants in various Politburo meetings, this remarkable volume serves as a researcher’s handbook to Politburo record^. Three of the compilers, together with Jana Howlett, consulting editor for the Chadwyck-Healey microfilm collection, have also prepared a brief introductory study of high Communist Party organs and their record-keeping practices for the pre-1953 period. Meanwhile, a new institutional history of the Comintern links its internal structural evolution to archival files available in RTsKhIDNI.


19. Informatsionnyi biulleten’ RTsKhIDNI (Moscow, 1992– ). Publication (under IISG/IIISH sponsorship) is irregular; eight issues have appeared through 1996, although distribution is limited.

20. Stalinske Politiiburo v 30-e gody: Shorniik dokumentov, comp. O. V. Khlevniuk et al. (Moscow: “AIRO XX,” 1995). See the helpful review by TsKhSD Deputy Director Vitalii Iu. Afani in Otechestvennye arkhivy, 1996, no. 2:112–14, which appropriately recommends that similar volumes be prepared for later decades.


The Center for Preservation of Contemporary Documentation (TsKhSD), the corresponding archive for post-1953 CPSU records, is still without a guide. The archive provided a cursory list of fonds (indicating those open to researchers) for inclusion in the 1997 ArcheoBiblioBase directory. Since so many TsKhSD files remain classified, however, a comprehensive guide should not be expected soon. Of special significance in recent years is the publication of an item-level finding aid for one politically important TsKhSD collection, namely the documents that were declassified for the trial against the Communist Party in 1992 (fond 89). This collection includes scattered materials from a number of fonds in different archives, including some top-secret “special files” (osoby papki) from the Archive of the President of the Russian Federation (AP RF). The entire artificially assembled collection of photocopies—or at least that part now publicly available in TsKhSD—has been produced on microfilm as part of the Hoover-Chadwyck-Healey project. Unfortunately, the original fonds and source files for the documents are not identified, even for those documents now held in other fonds in TsKhSD itself.

A basic guide has been prepared for the former Central Archive of the Komsomol, now known as the Center for Preservation of Records of Youth Organizations (TsKhDMO), and a publication subsidy has recently been secured. A preliminary version is available for researchers, and the archive is selling electronic copies pending publication.

Three volumes of the new, long-awaited, four-volume guide to the Russian (earlier Central) State Archive of Early Acts (RGADA) have appeared. Welcome is a lengthy introductory chapter and a masterful concluding chart showing the complicated history of the oldest continuous archive in Russia and the earlier repositories from which it evolved. Coverage of fonds is presented according to the place of their creating agency in the Russian historical bureaucratic structure, rather than their archival evolution as had been the case in the earlier 1945–1946 guide. Unlike several of the other post-1991 guides, how-

23. See the cumulative catalogue—Arkhivy Kremlia i Staroi ploshchadi. Dokumenty po “delu KPSS”: Annotirovanny spravochnik dokumentov, predstavlennykh v Konstitutsionny sud Rossiiskoi Federatsii po “delu KPSS,” comp. I. I. Kudriavtsev, ed. V. P. Kozlov (Novosibirsk, 1995), earlier published serially as Arkhivno-informatsionnyi biulleten’, supplement to Istoriicheskii arkhiv, nos. 12–4 (1993) and nos. 5–6 (1994). A catalogue of the remaining documents in the collection (opisi 53–72) is in preparation. The brief introduction fails to adequately explain the provenance of the documents, nor is there any explanation about the percentage of the documents from the trial that are now available in the TsKhSD collection. Chadwyck-Healey has issued a separate flyer for the microfilm collection under the title “The Trial of the Soviet Communist Party.” The first reel reproduces all of the internal perechen (opis).

24. Putevoditel’ po fondam TsKhDMO, comp. I. V. Volkova et al. (Moscow, forthcoming). Preliminary diskettes of the new guide can be purchased at the archive.
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ever, opis' divisions within fonds are not indicated in the extensive fond-level annotations, the lack of which is not fully compensated for by the appended lists of opisi. The extensive bibliography at the end of the second volume awkwardly brings together several thousand entries for both documentary publications and finding aids; rubric divisions, annotations, and cross-references to the relevant fonds would have greatly enhanced its usefulness. The third volume (in two parts) covers local administrative agencies and monasteries (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries); a fourth volume will cover personal and family archives along with manuscript and early printed books.

The Russian State Military Archive (RGVA), which houses post-revolutionary records, can boast of an impressive new two-volume guide divided into various sections that reflect the military structure in the USSR from 1917 through 1940. The guide has helpful agency histories of the creators of individual fonds or groups of related fonds, including references to creating decrees or regulations. Notably lacking, for each fond, however, are indications of the number or breakdown of opisi. Appendixes include a bibliography of major documentary publications and an index to the military commands, agencies, organizations, and other units covered, although there are no subject, geographic, or personal name indexes. In many instances, cross-references are provided to subsequent parts of fonds held in the Central Archive of the Ministry of Defense (TsAMO), predominantly starting in 1940. A guide to that archive itself is reportedly in the planning stage. Because the RGVA guide was prepared before the latest rounds of declassification, it does not cover fonds or formerly secret opisi within fonds that have been declassified since 1992. Accordingly, a more comprehensive guide is now being finalized. Also of considerable interest in RGVA is a new guide to records of the civil war period, covering previously classified White Army fonds (the so-called White Guards) due in early 1998. Many of these fonds came to Moscow from the Russian Foreign Historical Archive in Prague and other émigré sources.

No new guide has been issued for the corresponding prerevolutionary Russian State Military History Archive (RGVIA), although researchers there at last have access to the relatively detailed, but previously restricted, three-volume 1979 list of fonds and to the earlier restricted 1949 guide, both of which together provide better descrip-


27. Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi voennyi arkhiv: Putevoditel’ po fondam Beloi Armii, comp. N. D. Egorov et al., ed. L. V. Dvoinykh et al. (Moscow, 1998). A copy was not available in time for a review to be included here.
tions of many more fonds than the 1941 guide, which was the last to have been publicly available. Also recently declassified in RGVIA is the 1949 guide to the former Leningrad branch of the archive, which provides coverage of the fonds that were moved to Moscow after its preparation. Microfiche editions of these earlier guides should be a high priority until a new, more comprehensive reference aid can be prepared.

For records from the prerevolutionary imperial period (predominantly late eighteenth century through 1917), the Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA) in St. Petersburg has issued a new, and exceedingly helpful, short list of fonds, including many now-declassified fonds that were not included in the 1956 published guide, together with an extensive list of published finding aids and a description of the internal archival reference system. A California-sponsored firm has assisted in producing a relatively primitive computerized version of the annotated register of opisi that was initially prepared in typescript form in the 1970s; it is now being marketed in a printout paper copy as well as computer diskettes. There is no explanatory preface, and the volume lacks sufficient information about the individual fonds themselves and their creating agencies to be effectively used independently of the earlier TsGIA SSSR guide. Unfortunately, the program that produced the electronic form was inadequate for archival reference, although the available keyword searching mechanism may be helpful for some purposes. The net result for RGIA are two vitally important new reference aids that include considerably expanded data about the holdings and reference literature. Yet even when used together, they do not adequately replace the 1956 guide (still available on microfiche) and its lesser-known typescript second volume. The riches of the RGIA library in terms of official prerevolutionary publications, includ-


32. Tsentral’nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv v Leningrade: Putevoditel’, ed. S. N. Valk and V. V. Bedin (Leningrad, 1956; microfiche—IDC-R-10,722). The second volume, available in typescript in the archive, covers additional smaller unclassified fonds that were not included in the published guide.
ing internal government agency imprints, are being revealed in a new published catalogue series. A new series of reference publications for the Russian State Archive of the Navy (RGAVMF) furnishes helpful machine-readable diskettes to accompany the new guides, thus providing electronic searching in a word-processing system. An impressive new two-volume guide to postrevolutionary fonds (1995) now replaces the 1991 list of fonds. An initial volume describes the records of major naval agencies, and a second volume covers records of individual ships. A more recently released annotated register of opisi for the prerevolutionary holdings was formally published in a handsome edition, in contrast to its RGIA counterpart. But it also lacks sufficient agency histories and other data about the individual fonds to serve as a full-fledged guide. Nevertheless, it is a major step forward from the 1966 “Thematic Guide” to the archive’s prerevolutionary holdings that long remained restricted; in 1991, this “Thematic Guide” was issued in a microfiche edition. Appendixes in the 1995 guide provide alphabetical lists of fonds of personal papers and individual ships, as well as a correlation table for fonds covered by the series of prerevolutionary published and unpublished opisi. Essential subject, name, and geographic indexes highlight the lack of such indexes in the corresponding RGVA guides. A bibliographic guide to prerevolutionary naval agency publications, which also appeared in 1995, indicates some of the riches of the RGAVMF library and provides a full listing for all of the prerevolutionary printed inventories and documentary publications. All of these new reference publications honoring the 300th anniversary of the Russian navy are issued with English-language prefaces and include indexes.

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

Although the text itself remains only in Russian, an efficient transliteration system permits foreign-language users to input search queries in the Latin alphabet with automatic transliteration to the Cyrillic text and provides commands and instructions in English and German as well as in Russian. As the most serious drawback, the search and retrieval system of the new CD-ROM, and most particularly the instructions for its use, have not been perfected to the extent one might expect for a product being marketed in the west at the exorbitant cost of DM 980. To cite but one of the many frustrating examples, the full-text searching mechanism works only on a whole-word (or truncated root) basis, so that most personal names within the annotations, for example, cannot be located in the nominative form. Moreover, the use of the truncated form is not adequately explained in the instructions. I located some personal names of correspondents in several fonds much more easily using the printed editions; the thorough name indexes included there have not been incorporated into the CD-ROM search facility. Institutional names are even less accessible, and it is next to impossible to find them with reference to their common acronyms or abbreviated format, even when RGALI holds the main body of records. It is to be hoped that critical reviews, such as the two that have already appeared, will convince the German publisher that a revised or replacement version should include better instructions, bibliographic data about reference literature, and a more sophisticated search engine. Such reviews may also help avert similar problems for other multimedia electronic reference projects.

The former Special Archive for foreign “trophy” records as well as those from Soviet prisoner-of-war and detention camps during and after World War II—now the Center for Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections (TsKhIDK)—is still without a comprehensive
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This greatly limits reference access for researchers or specialists from various countries who may be anxious to claim their archival materials, many of which were first looted by the Nazis during World War II and subsequently by Soviet authorities. A brief and hastily published German-language "guide" provides a simple list (with dates and number of units) for only approximately half the fonds in the archive (predominantly those of German and Austrian provenance), some of which were earlier returned to East Germany. The archive itself, together with the Institute of General History, has issued a guide to its holdings from Belgium, which was recently reissued in a Flemish edition. A more detailed listing of the Austrian holdings is in preparation in collaboration with Austrian specialists. But not even survey coverage has appeared for displaced archives from France, Poland, and other countries.

Least comprehensive among the new reference offerings from federal-level archives under Rosarkhiv is the brief 1994 pamphlet survey for the Russian State Archive of Film and Photographic Documents (RGAKFD), which houses documentary films and photographs. RGAKFD has also issued a collection of survey articles honoring its seventieth anniversary, several of which serve to extend the 1994 coverage. During the last few years the archive has been progressing with an admirable database that includes scanned images for its photographic holdings. RGAKFD is now proposing an item-level electronic catalogue of its film holdings in collaboration with a western partner. If that materializes, it is to be hoped that it will be correlated with the extensive independent database for feature films (see below), which also already covers some documentaries in RGAKFD. The survey guide to the Russian State Archive of Sound Recordings (RGAFD) contains considerably more detail, but again does not serve as a full guide to the riches of that repository.


44. RGAKFD—70 let: (Shornik statei) (Krasnogorsk: RGAKFD, 1996).

Among independent federal agency archives, more impressive cataloguing data is becoming available for the State Fond of Motion Pictures (Gosfil'mofond), the centralized repository for feature films, than for RGAKFD. Already in the last few years, after a long hiatus at the end of the Soviet period, four new volumes of catalogues have appeared (as of mid-1997), bringing the chronological coverage of individual films up through 1975. The new series is less scholarly than the five volumes issued during the Soviet period, but both are in sharp contrast to the detailed catalogue covering 286 silent films that have been restored and reprinted on 35-mm safety film by Gosfil'mofond with Italian and British collaboration.

Reference coverage of motion pictures has seen tremendous new development in recent years, in contrast to the severe repression during the Soviet period. Now private initiative among film enthusiasts is filling in gaps where state film-research establishments have not trod. A comprehensive database of feature films, compiled by Miroslava Segida and Sergei Zemlianukhin, already covers over 6,100 films produced in the USSR and successor states from 1917 through 1996. An annotated printed compendium from the database, published in 1996, covers over 5,000 films; a large part of the database itself is accessible electronically on the internet. A multimedia CD-ROM produced from the database includes 4,270 feature films produced and released for distribution in the Soviet Union (1918–1991) and in the newly independent states (1991–1996). The CD-ROM includes film clips from 54 films, 550 biographies (and filmographies) with photographs of actors and directors, and 21 articles on different film studios and more specialized subjects covering Soviet film history. Competitors are now preparing rival CD productions, but film researchers will benefit most from the herculean efforts of Segida and Zemlianukhin. Although the database itself includes over forty fields, it has not yet included location data for archival copies in all cases. Since copies of almost all feature films produced in the USSR and in the post-1991 Russian Fed-

49. The multimedia CD-ROM production was released in April 1997: Kinomania 97: Entsiklopediia rossiiskogo kinoiskusstva (Moscow: Cominfo, 1997). CONTACT: http://www.cominf.ru. An extensive bibliography of other newly available reference publications covering motion pictures and cinematography is included in the new ArcheoBiblioBase directory.
eration are held by Gosfil'mofond, a helpful addition for film researchers would be cross-references—or a searchable correlation table—to the published Gosfil'mofond catalogues and, to the extent possible, to the unpublished Gosfil'mofond listings. That facility still lacks a guide, or even comprehensive survey of its extensive archives that includes the papers of many important personalia in the film world, together with graphic materials, editing outtakes from many film productions, and related reference resources.

Revealing many of the “blank spots” in film history, another notable recent reference production (appropriately covered in black) is a slim annotated catalogue of fictional feature films that were produced but not released during the Stalin period. In this case, extensive annotations document available archival copies, screen plays or scenarios, film plans, and other related archival sources for each film.

Among other independent federal agency archives, an impressive new guide appeared in the spring of 1996 for the prerevolutionary Foreign Ministry archive, the Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Empire (AVPRI). Indeed AVPRI was the first Russian archive to produce a guide listing all of the opisi within individual fonds. Initially available in typescript form within the archive itself, that preliminary version was subsequently issued in a commercial microfiche edition four years before the published version was completed. The nicely printed version is augmented by a thorough agency history of the Ministry (before 1802, Collegium) of Foreign Affairs. The postrevolutionary Foreign Ministry archive (AVP RF) now has a preliminary typescript guide to its holdings available in its reading room; this guide updates the earlier typescript list of declassified fonds, while a more definitive version is being prepared for publication.

Other federal ministries and agencies that have the right to retain their own archives have been less forthcoming with public reference information. The MVD archive (now TsA MVD) produced a directory in 1988 for various groups of its own agency records and those of its NKVD predecessor, which indicates the whereabouts of those records that have been transferred to state archival custody but have now been scattered in at least four different federal archives, as well as regional archives throughout the Russian Federation. That guide, issued with

50. Evgenii Margolit and Viacheslav Shmyrov, (Iz*iatoe kino): Katalog sovetshikh igrovikh kartin, ne vypuschnykh vo vosesotniiy prokat po zavershenii v proizvodstve ili iz*yatikh iz deistovushchego fil'mofonda v god vypuska na ekran (1924–1953) (Moscow: “Dubl’-D,” 1995). Data from this publication and others are included in the general database compiled by Segida and Zemlianukhin.


52. Putevoditel’ po Arkhivu vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii” (Moscow, 1995; typescript).
classified status, is still not publicly accessible. Reportedly, a new, expanded fond-level listing for NKVD/MVD records has been produced, which again is not intended for public access. It is to be hoped that decision will be reconsidered so that the hardly security-threatening summary reference aid can be made publicly available, especially for those involved with rehabilitation processing. A popularized history of the NKVD/MVD was issued by the ministry itself in 1996, but, while providing pictures of previous ministers, it makes no reference to archives. A vital agency history for NKVD/MVD records, involving a thorough analysis of the inner agency structure from 1917 to 1960, appeared in late 1997. Based primarily on those portions of the NKVD/MVD records held in GA RF, this revealing work clarifies the complicated bureaucratic transformations of the agency during the Soviet regime.

In an even more open vein, an Archive of Contemporary History series provides item-level annotations for the high-interest “special files” from the NKVD/MVD Secretariat addressed to Iosef Stalin, Viacheslav Molotov, Nikita Khrushchev, and Lavrentii Beria that are held in GA RF. Other volumes in preparation will cover “special files” addressed to Georgii Malenkov and to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, extending coverage through 1959. Earlier “special files” from the pre-1944 period remain inaccessible in the Central Archive of the Federal Security Service (TsA FSB). Regrettably, the MVD still controls the declassification process for records originating in that agency and its predecessors, including those already transferred to federal archives and already described in the published catalogues. The majority of documents listed in the Stalin and the Molotov “special files” catalogues are available for researchers in the GA RF reading room. However, in the case of the Beria catalogue, as the deputy director of GA RF reported in 1995, the MVD “agreed to the declassification of only 700 documents out of 20,000 in Beria’s ‘special files’ for the 1946–1953” period; the lengthy review process greatly delayed that publication, which nevertheless lists the still classified documents.

54. Lubyanka. VChK-OGPU-NKVD-NKBI-MGB-MVD-KGB 1917–1960 gg.: Spravochnik, comp. A. I. Kokurin and N. V. Petrov (Moscow, 1997). An additional publication, Sanitarnaia služba GULAGa (1932–1957 gg.): Spravochnik, was also announced as forthcoming in 1996, but its publication has been sidetracked.
For regional archives outside Moscow and St. Petersburg, economic stringencies have also severely limited the preparation and publication of new guides. In some cases, however, archives under regional administrations are doing better financially than their federal counterparts, and several new guides have appeared since 1991. Extensive funding by the Soros Foundation starting in 1997 promises more published guides to local former Communist Party archives, all of which are now under regional state administration. Details about these developments will be the subject of a subsequent review, as work progresses on the ArcheoBiblioBase directory for state and former Communist Party archives in the Russian Federation outside Moscow and St. Petersburg.

Local archives within Moscow and St. Petersburg have also been devastated by the cutbacks in funding for reference work and publications. Nevertheless, several municipal- and oblast'-level archives have been finalizing new guides and progressing with other internal reference resources. A short list of fonds for the local St. Petersburg Central State Archive of Literature and Art (TsGALI SPb), obviously compiled earlier, appeared in 1991. Those for the St. Petersburg Archive of Scientific-Technical Documentation (TsGANTD SPb) and the State Archive of Leningrad Oblast' in Vyborg (LOGAV) are due to appear in early 1998. A guide to the former local Communist Party archive in St. Petersburg has recently received Soros Foundation funding for publication. The only Moscow municipal repository to have issued a new guide, by contrast, is the archive for audiovisual documentation, now known as the Central Moscow Archive for Documents on Special Media (TsMADSN), which appeared in early 1997—in honor of the city’s 850th anniversary.

Mention should also be made of two new essential lists of archival holdings in institutes under the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, which have also found foreign publication sponsorship. A 1995 short guide to the historically rich Archive of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Russian History (SPbF IRI) lists all of the fonds (institutional records, personal papers, and other collections) together with their published finding aids for both the Russian and western European sectors. To be sure, the depth of coverage does not equal the much more detailed 1958 guide (available on microfiche) to the institute’s archival holdings, which was a model for scholarly archival guides and unusual for the Soviet period. Nevertheless, 100 fonds are listed in the 1995 guide that were not covered earlier.

The first comprehensive list of holdings in the Manuscript Division of the Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkinskii Dom—IRLI [PD]) was published in 1996 in a similar format. It includes all of the fonds of personal papers, institutional records, and other collections, including those in the Depository for Antiquities (Drevlekhranilishche) and the folklore archival holdings (except for the Sound Archive) under the Sector for Poetic Folk Art. In both cases, English- and Russian-language introductions provide histories and surveys of the development of the archival holdings. They both list many more fonds than had been listed in the composite 1979 list of fonds in archival institutions under the Academy of Sciences. That now outdated earlier volume (available on microfiche), however, despite its limitations, still provides the best starting point for holdings in other RAN institutes. Accordingly, it is to be hoped that new guides—or at least similar updated lists of fonds—will follow for other RAN institutes and that they will eventually be combined in electronic form, to further facilitate searching. A similar new guide is being prepared for the extensive archival holdings of the Russian Geographic Society (RGO), but a publication subsidy has not yet been secured.

During the Soviet period, the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library, heir to the world renowned Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg, which in 1992 was renamed the Russian National Library (RNB—Rossiiskaia natsional’naia biblioteka), had an enviable track record in terms of preparing finding aids for its rich archival holdings, as testified by retrospective bibliographies covering such publications, the latest of which appeared in 1996. Unfortunately, most of the listings appeared in in-house, poorly printed editions with limited pressruns of only 100 or 200 copies. The four-volume guide to RNB archival fonds was reissued in a 1994 facsimile edition in New York, but regrettably there was no attempt to update the coverage with a revised edition. Now that other earlier RNB reference publications are brought together in a comprehensive bibliography, many of them deserve reissue in lower-cost microform editions so that they can be more widely available to researchers. New reference publications have

60. [Institut russkoj literatury (Pushkinskii Dom) RAN], Fondy i kolektssii Rukopisnogo otdela: Kratkii spravochnik, comp. V. P. Budaragin and M. V. Rofuukova (St. Petersburg: “Blits,” 1996).
been continuing in the Division of Manuscripts since 1991, and 1995 saw the start of a major new publication series by the RNB Manuscript Division, *Rukopisy pamiatniki*, as an outlet for both published documents and reference work.\(^{63}\)

Meanwhile, in the Russian State Library (RGB—Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka Rossi [former Lenin Library]) in Moscow, reference publications have come to a complete halt since 1991, having fallen victim to the serious administrative problems that have paralyzed that library. As of 1 October 1997, the Manuscript Division itself closed its doors for a thorough reinventory of its holdings, following a negative report by a Ministry of Culture investigating commission that contained allegations of serious operational deficiencies, including many missing manuscripts. In contrast to the new series issued by RNB, regrettably, not a single volume of the distinguished *Zapiski* of the Manuscript Division has appeared since 1991.

Also of note among the new generation of finding aids describing lesser known archival materials in Petersburg, the Hermitage has issued two more brochures describing its own archives, supplementing the guide that was issued in 1988.\(^{64}\) The Russian Institute for the History of Art (RIII) recently issued the long-promised updated edition of its guide, which meets expectations with its expanded coverage of 133 of its personal fonds and collections, particularly rich in theater and music holdings.\(^{65}\)

Likewise in Moscow, the M. I. Glinka State Central Museum of Musical Culture has reissued an expanded first part of a guide to its holdings, with detailed annotations of 64 personal and institutional fonds and collections.\(^{66}\) Unfortunately, however, since the guide was issued in an extremely limited pressrun of only 300 copies, it is not being offered for public sale and hence will immediately be on the rare book list. Meanwhile, however, an extensive guide to archival holdings in the Bakhrushin Theater Museum, completed several years ago, has still not found publication subsidy and is also not being made available to researchers. Likewise the long-promised guide to the rich

\(^{63}\) Published by RNB, four volumes (in five parts) have appeared as of mid-1997. For a full description of these and other new reference publications, see the bibliographic coverage in the forthcoming English edition of *Arkhiy Rossi/i/Archives of Russia*, pt. G-15.


\(^{65}\) *Putesvoditel’ po Kabinetu rukopisei Rossiiskogo instituta istorii iskusstv*, comp. O. L. Dansker and G. V. Kopytova, ed. A. Ia. Al’tshuller, 2d ed. (St. Petersburg, 1996). The new guide considerably expands and updates the 1984 guide to what was then the LGITMiK Cabinet of Archival Fonds.

archival holdings in the Tretiakov Gallery has not yet appeared in print.

Most significant in terms of archival publications among Moscow museums are the handsome new editions from the State Historical Museum (GIM), including an anniversary collection of articles covering many of its holdings in different divisions. After almost fifteen years of renovation, GIM itself formally reopened in September 1997, honoring the 850th Moscow anniversary celebration. At last the rich Manuscript Division has opened in its new facilities in the building of the former Lenin Museum. While long officially closed to scholars, it nonetheless completed a new expanded edition of the survey description of its major manuscript collections. The Division of Written Sources, which houses more traditional archival materials and which had remained open in a more distant location, has issued two recent volumes of surveys and publications based on its holdings—one devoted to Russian science and culture and the other to military history, expanding coverage of the initial collection that appeared in 1978. The publications for these few museums mentioned, it should be pointed out, represent only the tip of the iceberg, in terms of archival materials found in museums throughout the Russian Federation, and particularly in Moscow and St. Petersburg. Few other museums have issued guides describing their archival holdings, although many survey articles and general museum guides have appeared.

Opisi and Other Finding Aids on Microform

Soviet archival practice required all state archives to prepare internal inventories (opisi) listing all of the file units in a given fond; those fonds not processed accordingly could not be made available to readers. Opisi continue as the backbone of internal arrangement and description within individual fonds in post-Soviet Russian archival practice, listing as they do individual file units numbered consecutively within each opis'. At one and the same time opisi provide essential administrative control for all file units, subdivisions for particular

67. Istoricheskii muzei—entsiklopediia otechestvennoi istorii i kul'tury (Zabelinskie nauch-nye chteniia 1993 goda), ed. V. L. Egorov (Moscow: GIM, 1995), issued as Trudy GIM, vol. 87. Includes surveys and source analyses of materials in the Division of Manuscripts and Early Printed Books, the Division of Written Sources, and the Division of Graphic Materials.


69. Pis'mennye istochniki v sobranii GIM, ed. A. K. Afanas'ev, Pt. 2, Materialy po istorii kul'tury i nauki v Rossii (Moscow: GIM, 1993), Pt. 3, Materialy po veroi áll istorii Rossii (Moscow: GIM, 1997). Both volumes were issued in the series Trudy GIM.

70. See other composite listings in Arkhiy Rossi/Archives of Russia, pt. H.
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groups of materials within the fond (although not always rationally divided or designated accordingly), and the primary finding aid for researchers. Normally, opisi can be consulted only after the researcher has been registered to work in the archival reading room. Only starting in 1988 were foreign researchers finally permitted to consult opisi in the state archives administered by Glavarkhiv. Before then, trusted Soviet archivists were expected to provide accepted researchers with only those files that they, the ideologically well-trained archivists, deemed “relevant” to the approved research topic.

Today, by contrast, in many state archives, opisi are being shelved in or near the reading room, where they are immediately available to all researchers. The former Central Party Archive (now RTsKhIDNI) was one of the first to move in that direction and to list all opisi in its published guide. Although opisi are also listed in the new guide to the prerevolutionary Foreign Ministry archive (AVPRI), opisi are still not all openly available for all fonds in its postrevolutionary counterpart because AVP RF, like many Russian archives, still close or black out parts of opisi describing secret files. The newly opened archive of the Federal Security Service (TsA FSB), heir to major central files of the KGB and its predecessors, still does not make inventories available to any researchers. Nevertheless, for foreigners who were forced to work without any opisi at all in almost all central state archives under Glavarkhiv before 1989, there is good reason for emphasizing positive reform.

Even more significant for researchers today, in the case of two of the most politically important contemporary federal archives—GA RF and RTsKhIDNI—a large percentage of the opisi for Soviet-period fonds have been microfilmed as part of the Hoover–Chadwyck-Healey project. Opisi for two fonds in TsKhSD are also included in the project. The high cost of the microfilms offered for sale by Chadwyck-Healey has so far greatly limited the number of libraries that have been able to afford them. Nevertheless, depository copies are now available for consultation at the Hoover Institution and the Library of Congress in the United States, and several library consortia and other libraries have purchased all or part of the collection. Chadwyck-Healey has printed a sales catalogue in English and Russian editions, indicating those fonds for which microform opisi and document series are being offered for sale, and a more complete update is now available on the internet. Regrettably, however, the Chadwyck-Healey catalogue itself

71. See the 1995 Chadwyck-Healey catalogue (in both English and Russian editions): Archives of the Soviet Communist Party and Soviet State: Catalogue of Finding Aids and Documents, introduction by Jana Howlett ([Cambridge, Eng.], 1995); Arkhivy KPSS i sovetskogo gosudarstva: Katalog opisei i dokumentov ([Cambridge, Eng.], 1995). See also the printed 1996 supplement, which lists more of the documentary series available. From TsKhSD, only opisi and files from the Committee for Party Control (fond 6) have been filmed, as well as a complete microfilm edition of fond 89. An expanded 1997 catalogue can be found on the internet. CONTACT: (from the USA): http://www.chadwyck.com; (outside the USA): http://www.chadwyck.co.uk. See also the website of the Hoover Institution.
does not serve as an adequate finding aid for the microfilmed opisi. The English-language edition does not include Russian names of fonds, and neither edition identifies the number of opisi that are available on microfilm. Most regrettably, there has been no coordination between the filming project and the production of the newly published guides to RTsKhIDNI and GA RF. As a result, these otherwise crucial guides do not indicate those fonds for which the described opisi are available on microform. Western libraries that have acquired the collection accordingly face serious difficulties in making the opisi intellectually accessible to researchers, because rarely do they undertake item-level cataloguing within a microform collection of this type. Currently, as a prime example, the Library of Congress microform cataloguing data lists only the collection as a whole.72

In the more optimistic mood of 1992, Rosarkhiv (then Roskomarkhiv) announced its readiness, "as financial resources permit, to produce microfilms of opisi and catalogues in other archives for wide distribution."73 Such a program would be a crucial aid and stimulus to scholarship in many fields, both within Russia and abroad, for it would increase researcher awareness of archival holdings and permit efficient planning before undertaking long and expensive trips to the repositories themselves. But a number of international scandals, together with political and patriotic criticism of the Rosarkhiv-Hoover project and other foreign subsidized reference projects, brought a backlash of caution and an attempt at greater control.74

Public criticism unfortunately also contributed to Rosarkhiv's hesitancy to proceed with other foreign-sponsored reference projects. For example, when interest in the newly opened CPSU archives was at a peak in the summer of 1992, Roskomarkhiv turned down a proposal from a western publisher to computerize the massive card files and indexes to major pre-1980 Politburo protocols, which could have greatly improved reference access to major groups of Communist Party records in TsKhSD and RTsKhIDNI. Later that fall, Roskomarkhiv also turned down a proposal for comprehensive filming, including opisi and other reference materials, for "trophy" archives in TsKhIDK, which would also have greatly advanced their identification and research availability. What is nonetheless important for future information systems is the fact that many valuable reference facilities exist in Russian archives, even if they may not always be publicly accessible or up to international professional standards. Because of the obligatory opisi, the level of descriptive information available to researchers in Russian

72. This deficiency, in terms of the documentary series, is being remedied by the Hoover Institution, where specialists are preparing a series of guides to the documents filmed. In the meantime, Hoover archival specialists are prepared to answer reference questions. CONTACT: http://www-hoover.stanford.edu.


74. Many of these issues are discussed in Grimsted, Archives of Russia Five Years After, chap. 11.
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archives under Rosarkhiv, as well as those under many other agencies, is well above that found in many comparable western repositories.

While budgetary shortfalls (inspiring the search for higher profits) and reactionary political outcry may continue to restrict microform or electronic copies of unpublished reference materials in some sensitive contemporary archives, microform reference publication projects are nonetheless progressing. Even in connection with the politically sensitive Comintern archives in RTsKhIDNI, production of microfiche editions of the records of Comintern congresses and plenums has been completed, enhanced by sophisticated multilingual electronic finding aids for the files included.75 An even more sophisticated electronic access system for the Comintern Archive is already underway in RTsKhIDNI under the auspices of the International Council on Archives and the Council of Europe, in this case by providing descriptive titles of individual files and scanned images of opisi and selected documents.76 As an example of increasing reference access in other repositories, an American publisher has filmed the entire card catalogue in the Music Library of the St. Petersburg Rimskii-Korsakov Conservatory, an extensive section of which describes many manuscript music scores and other important music-related archival materials.77

As publishing and reprint costs rise, Russia undoubtedly needs to invest more heavily in microform and electronic media for both unpublished finding aids and new publications alike, to say nothing of reprints of quality finding aids produced in earlier periods. While many archival repositories lack funds for printed editions of new guides, or lack the staff to prepare quality updated editions, microfiche production could be a cost-effective interim solution to immediate reference needs.

Even at the height of the Cold War, the Soviet Union was one of the first countries to be covered with microform editions of out-of-print Archival Finding Aids on Microfiche. The pilot project was produced by Inter Documentation Company (IDC) between 1976 and 1988 in three series and included over 1,250 predominantly published guides, inventories, and Slavic manuscript catalogues for repositories in Moscow and Leningrad, the Baltic countries and Belarus, and Ukraine and Moldavia. All of these were correlated with bibliographic listings in the published Grimsted archival directory series. Presently IDC is plan-


ning an updated, electronic catalogue of those microfiche editions to be coordinated with the new ArcheoBiblioBase directory. Although coverage of subsequent archival publications was not continued, it is nevertheless to be hoped that the project can be revived and even expanded to include previously classified guides, typescripts, and eventually even opisi and other unpublished finding aids on the contemporary model of the Chadwyck-Healey microfiche reference project, National Inventory of Documentary Sources (NIDS), actively underway in the United States and Great Britain.

New Inter-Repository Subject Guides

Among the many more specialized reference aids that have been produced in the last five years, several provide subject-related, interarchival fond-level directory coverage. For example, the Russian Orthodox Church subsidized VNIIDAD coverage of church-related holdings that were taboo under Soviet rule. Two interarchival directories have appeared—one listing fonds in repositories in Moscow and St. Petersburg, and the other covering regional state archives throughout the Russian Federation. Neither is comprehensive, and the latter coverage of regional archives is based only on the incomplete data that were available in Soviet-era published guides. More depth of coverage is presented in the companion Moscow–St. Petersburg directory, but again much of the data have not been verified directly, and only one repository is covered outside the system of federal and local state archives. Two other new church-related reference aids produced by the same VNIIDAD group, locating, respectively, records of Orthodox consistories and monasteries in state archives throughout the Russian Federation.

78. Archives and Manuscript Collections in the USSR: Finding Aids on Microfiche, Series 1, Moscow and Leningrad, ed. Patricia Kennedy Grimsted (Zug, Switzerland: IDC, 1976), correlated with the 1972 Grimsted directory and the 1976 Supplement 1, Bibliographical Addenda, published simultaneously by IDC; Series 2, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Belarus (1981); Series 3, Soviet Ukraine and Moldavia (Leiden: IDC, 1989). Both of the latter collections were correlated with the Grimsted directories published simultaneously by Princeton University Press. The IDC order numbers are also included in the bibliographic listings in the new Arkihiy Rossi i/Archives of Russia directory, and plans call for more of the specialized finding aids available on microfiche to be listed in a separate electronic correlation table.
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eration, have been released in a primitive electronic format. A more sophisticated computer format would make the data more easily accessible in a variety of platforms, and these directories would benefit from updated information and more thorough, scholarly efforts. Yet despite serious limitations, all of these new VNIIDAD directories nonetheless represent important efforts to identify sources in this earlier repressed subject area.

A more ambitious, comprehensive database for Orthodox Church sources is in preparation at the Center for Archival Research of the Historico-Archival Institute of the Russian State University for the Humanities (IAI RGGU). Unlike the VNIIDAD effort, the Historico-Archival Institute survey has amassed fresh data with questionnaires received from archival repositories throughout the Russian Federation. Coverage of holdings in Moscow, much more extensive than the VNIIDAD volume, is being entered in a database. Unfortunately, however, coordination with the VNIIDAD project was not possible, and now lack of adequate staff and funding make it seem unlikely that this potentially valuable new data will soon be available to researchers.

Indicative of the newly declassified materials concerning church history in federal archives is the recent document-level finding aid (the first two parts of a promised series) with annotated lists of documents from files in the records of the Council for Religious Cults under the Council of Ministers of the USSR, which are now held by GA RF.

Comparatively more extensive specialized guides and interarchival directories of Jewish-related materials in many Russian archives have appeared recently or are in preparation. Most extensive and best financed is the Jewish Archival Survey, a systematic survey of Jewish-related sources throughout the former USSR, with a computerized database at IAI RGGU. The survey is part of Project Judaica, undertaken in collaboration with the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research and the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York, with additional support from other foreign sources. An initial brief directory drawn from the database, issued in 1994 in St. Petersburg under sponsorship of the newly established Petersburg Jewish University, lists 938 fonds in ninety-two different repositories in sixty-one cities of the former USSR. A portion of that coverage is now available in an English trans.


81. Since VNIIDAD promised speedier production and had staff ready, the Moscow Patriarchate chose to fund the VNIIDAD project instead.

lation, augmented by listings of other fonds that are included in the Project Judaica database, with a total of 1,034 fonds covering repositories throughout Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus. Although there is considerable overlap between the English and Russian publications, many fonds are listed in only one, and for those included in both, there is some variation in the data provided, thus making it essential for researchers to compare the two separate publications carefully.

A much more extensive Russian-language directory covering materials in Moscow repositories with full annotations of individual fonds from the IAI RGGU database is nearing completion. Research has not been completed for the St. Petersburg counterpart due to the disastrous physical problems in the two Petersburg historical archives (RGIA and the local Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg [TsGIA SPb]). Two initial booklets, published separately but produced with Project Judaica funding, annotate fonds containing Hebraica and Judaica in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Archive of the Academy of Sciences and provide a sample of the depth of coverage being prepared. A copy of the Project Judaica database is also available at YIVO in New York City, but public availability is being delayed pending publication.

Another group of young Russian enthusiasts, centered around the Jewish Heritage Society (Obshchestvo “Evreiskoe nasledie”) in Moscow and with fewer professional resources, has produced some preliminary coverage based on their own independent survey efforts—some of it overlapping, some of it supplementing, the Project Judaica publications. An initial pamphlet lists relevant fonds throughout the former USSR. Other specialized pamphlets annotate selected fonds in RGADA and RGVIA. The society itself has now established a website with information about their projects and publications, where fonds-level listings from several other archives are now available for downloading.


84. While the texts are being prepared for publication, public access to the database is also not available in Moscow. It is to be hoped that access to the data will soon be possible via the database of the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN).


86. The same group has also issued preliminary lists of fonds in several Ukrainian archives. Their pamphlets covering RGADA and RGVIA are indicated in the new ArcheoBiblioBase directory. These and other society pamphlets are all listed on the Jewish Heritage Society’s website. CONTACT: http://www.glasnet.ru/~heritage/. Additional electronic files are available with coverage of RGIA, RTSKhIDNI, and TsKhSD, AVP RF, TsGIA SPb, LOGAV, as well as a number of regional archives throughout the Russian Federation.
In yet another major published survey, the émigré Jewish archivist, Genrikh M. Deych (Deich), who during the Soviet period compiled data about prerevolutionary Jewish-related holdings in RGIA in St. Petersburg, has made his findings available in a volume that also includes lists of Jewish-related fonds in a number of other Russian archives. The Jewish Heritage Society recently issued a supplementary pamphlet containing more of Deych’s memoirs and additional coverage of several fonds in RGIA, based on copies that Deych has acquired since 1991.

What is unfortunate in these days of limited budgets for archival reference work, however, is the lack of coordination among competing groups or institutions preparing various interarchival surveys, which results in variant and overlapping coverage. In the case of Jewish sources, for example, five different publications offer interarchival coverage, providing varying degrees of depth, up-to-date listings (in terms of declassified fonds), and professional accuracy. Researchers would benefit much more if the data collected by the separate surveys could be brought together and integrated in a single database that would be readily available and openly accessible to all.

Also unfortunate is that general interarchival coverage of personal papers in Russia has made no progress since 1980. Various recent reference biobibliographic compendia of writers, artists, library specialists, Russian émigrés, and members of various political parties, among others, explicitly list the whereabouts of recently declassified personal papers in Russian repositories. A number of the new archival guides discussed above have greatly expanded coverage of personal papers. Unfortunately, however, there has been no effort to update the three-volume directory of personal fonds throughout the USSR that was issued in 1962–1963 with a supplement in 1980. Presumably

87. Genrikh M. Deych [Deich], Arkhivnye dokumenty po istorii evreev v Rossii v XIX–nachale XX vv.: Putevoditel’, ed., with an introduction, Benjamin Nathans, Russian Archive Series, vol. 4 (Moscow, 1994). Unfortunately, the data presented were compiled before the post-Soviet round of declassification in RGIA, and the American editor was neither able to conduct a thorough review in Russia, nor did he have access to the Project Judaica database (which had already purchased a copy of the Deych data before it was published). Hence the Deych listings omit many of the still extant fonds of importance that are now revealed in the aforementioned finding aids, most of which will be included in the more detailed Project Judaica–sponsored publications in preparation.

88. The supplementary pamphlet appears as G. M. Deich, Zapiski sovetskogo arkhivista. Kollektsiia dokumental’nykh materialov po istorii evreev v Rossii: Pechatnye trudy, ed. Vasiliy Shchedrin (Moscow: “Evreiskoe nasledie,” 1996). The copies Deych has acquired, particularly from RGIA, are now held in his own personal collection in New Jersey.

89. See, for example, Russkoe zarubezh’e. Zolotaia kniga emigratsii pervoi tret’i XX veka: Entsiklopedicheskii biograficheskii slovar’, ed. V. V. Borisov et al. (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1997), and Politicheskie partii rossi, konets XIX–pervaya tret’i XX veka: Entsiklopediia, ed. Valentin V. Shelokhaev et al. (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1996). See other listings in Arkhiivy Rossii/Archives of Russia, pt. A, sec. 5B.

many of the card files that were gathered for the original directory, including data for suppressed individuals, are still preserved and could be transferred to an electronic database. Such a project remains among the high-priority tasks ahead.

In terms of other interarchival fond-level directory projects, mention should be made of suppressed reference works prepared under the Soviet regime that have at last become available to researchers. One such example is a slim volume issued in classified status in 1979, identifying existing archival locations of the records of 1,125 prerevolutionary factories and other business firms, which are found in 1,376 fonds in ninety-two state archives and their branches. The Source Study Sector (Sektor istochnikovedeniia) of the Faculty of History at Moscow State University has recently received funding for a database to update and expand this guide, which has long been virtually unknown and unappreciated by many researchers in economic and social history.

Distribution Problems and Bibliographic Control

What is striking is that, with few exceptions, every major guide, short list of fonds, and more detailed finding aid for Russian archives issued since 1991 has depended on foreign subsidy for publication, and in many cases, on a further foreign subsidy for preparation of the text or microform. Accordingly, in most cases, given the costs of the volumes involved and other factors, distribution is extremely limited within Russia. Even for those produced in Russia at lower cost, there is still no viable distribution or mail-order system. In the vast majority of cases, archives jealously continue to sell their own or their neighbors’ reference publications only on their own premises (where entry passes are usually required), and notice of their availability outside the archive is rare. The new CD-ROM fond-level guide to RGALI (prepared in collaboration with the Lottman Institute of Russian Culture in Bochum, Germany, with the copyright held by the German publisher K. G. Saur) is not available to researchers in RGALI itself—not because it has a foreign copyright, but because, as the RGALI director lamented when the guide was issued, the archive has no computer equipped with a CD-ROM drive.

Foreign-produced guides and other reference publications are usually available only in limited quantity, at a price most Russian researchers could not possibly afford. In some cases, foreign publishers have prohibited the archives from selling the guides at all. In other cases the producing archives have been prohibited from selling the guides to foreigners within Russia because the price abroad is five or six times

91. Perechen' rossiiskikh aktsionernykh torgovo-promyshlennykh kompanii, arkhivnye fondy kotorykh nakhozhatsia v gosudarstvennykh arkhivakh SSSR, comp. A. G. Golikov, ed. V. I. Bovkin and T. N. Dolgorukova (Moscow, 1979). I am grateful to Galina R. Naumova, who heads the Moscow State University project, for making a copy of this publication available to me.
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higher than the Russian price, and the archive and publishers need the profit from foreign sales and fear the competition from speculators (which has already happened in a few instances). In the case of the new CD-ROM guide to RGALI, the archive received twenty copies, which they are offering at approximately one-third of the foreign list price. But these will probably go to foreigners as well, because what Russian research institute or library can afford even the reduced price of $200?

Rosarkhiv requires archives under their administration to provide them with a free presentation copy of all their publications, but that does not always happen promptly, and, when it does, often only means that the copy goes on display in the chairman’s office, where entry, for foreigners, requires two days’ advance application and a staff escort. Rosarkhiv itself has neither a publicly accessible kiosk, exhibit, or ordering system, nor has it established a centralized distribution system for archival publications. Nor is there any bookstore in Moscow or St. Petersburg where archival publications, including those published abroad, can be easily purchased or even ordered by individuals or institutions. Further lessons in marketing and distribution are obviously desperately needed, even as a public service to satisfy library and researcher needs. The Rosarkhiv professional journal, Otechestvennye arkhivy, has proved incapable of keeping up with all of these new reference productions because they rarely receive free review copies, as would be normal in other parts of the world. Often only by chance do the new publications get entered in an ongoing database, such as ArcheoBiblioBase. Some of those published in St. Petersburg can more easily be acquired abroad than in Moscow, because the foreign publishers have restricted sales within the country, and hence have little reason to distribute free review copies within Russia.

Where do researchers need to find new archival reference works? In their local libraries to be sure. But today, underbudgeted Russian libraries cannot keep up with the new information demands of a more open society. Most tragic for Russian researchers is that these fundamental new reference tools are not being acquired by libraries in Russia and other newly independent states for want of subsidies for adequate pressruns and appropriate distribution arrangements. Given the high costs of production and the limited foreign market, foreign publishers cannot afford to provide copies of specialized archival reference publications for library distribution within Russia and are not required to furnish deposit copies. Given the persisting budgetary problems and inadequate book distribution system in Russia, many libraries still cling to Soviet-style exchange arrangements with foreign partners for the acquisition of important foreign publications. But given the rising domestic cost of books, and the lack of funds to acquire expensive new publications for exchange, they are not receiving many of the foreign publications they need, let alone the Russian publications issued collaboratively with priority foreign distribution. And when Russian libraries do acquire them, it often takes over a year or even two for them to be processed and made available to readers.
Even abroad, where information from publishers and libraries is more easily available, increasingly in electronic form, there has been inadequate information about—and inefficient distribution of—many new reference aids for Russian archives. Nevertheless, because so many Russian archives themselves, and the publishers they have found as sponsors, are more concerned about foreign hard-currency sales, new Russian reference publications often appear much more quickly in U.S. library databases or conference exhibition halls than on the shelves or new-book displays in Russian libraries.

Ironically, the situation today is not unlike the last decade of Soviet rule, when archival guides (albeit more limited ones) were being published by Glavarkhiv in small pressruns, as in-house editions. Then, under the Soviet regime, open reference publications were a low priority, and the aim was usually to limit circulation and access to information by outsiders. The official U.S.-USSR archival commission unsuccessfully lobbied for exchange copies of many local archival guides. From the 1960s through 1970s, five out of six guides issued for central state archives of the USSR bore “for service use only” or other restrictions and hence were not openly available to all researchers. In some cases, when guides were restricted after they had been printed, the remaining pressrun was destroyed. Today, such restrictions are gone for the most part, but the guides produced are still not publicly available. Now, ironically, pressruns are even more limited, and the aim is more often to avoid speculators and insure optimal archival income from foreign sales. Because Russian publishers now demand, and necessarily receive, an advance subsidy for most archival reference publications, there is no incentive to enhance distribution, repay loans, or build up capital for other new editions. The unfortunate net result is similar to distribution problems in the Soviet era: the highly commendable new reference efforts underway in many Russian archives are not reaching the researchers in Russia and other newly independent states who need them most and who could potentially benefit from their revelations.

Electronic Information System Developments

The availability of a new breed of printed guides and other finding aids represents tremendous progress on the Russian archival information front, with the increase of comprehensive, up-to-date lists of fonds and fond-level descriptions. Elsewhere in the world, however, electronic formats and cyberspace are swiftly becoming the dominant modes for information access. Researchers in the next century, if not

92. For more details about the situation under Soviet rule, see Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, “Glasnost’ in the Archives? Recent Developments on the Soviet Archival Scene,” American Archivist 52, no. 2 (Spring 1989): 214–36. Many of those earlier restricted guides were listed in Grimsted, A Handbook for Archival Research, appendix 1, since they were declassified in the late 1980s.
already today, will need standardized fond- and opis'-level descriptions in an interarchival system, particularly in a country such as Russia that has so many different and often overlapping major archives and other manuscript repositories. Most essentially, such a system will need to include information about what published or electronic guides and other more specific finding aids are available where—all of which will require more active links between archives and library information systems in Russia and abroad.

A reformed intellectual context in relation to archives and new goals for archival information have appeared in Russia, but the implementation of a national archival information system is only just beginning. Standardization and national planning are more difficult within a transitional, economically chaotic, and only partially democratized political milieu. Rosarkhiv itself, and its VNIIDAD subsidiary, were slow in reacting to the new information needs and possibilities, and the federal budget has provided no assistance. Unfortunately, as a result, over the past five years, much work has occurred on an uncoordinated, ad hoc basis. With the lack of federal resources, many individual archives and regional archival groups have been going their own separate, and often contradictory, ways in efforts to solve their own most immediate administrative and reference problems.

Furthermore, the technological infrastructure is often lacking. Computerization is difficult when buildings lack grounded wiring and are not able to provide overnight current for universal power supplies or backup facilities, and when frequent brown-outs damage files. It is difficult to provide electronic mail and communication systems without the resources needed for modernized telephone circuits. Even the cost of local service can be exorbitant: a local Moscow telephone service demanded several thousand dollars (more than the cost of a new computer) to install a single new telephone line in a government archival building, thus making it impossible for the ArcheoBiblioBase reference project to have direct access to the internet.

Nevertheless, numerous pilot projects now underway have been providing experience for Russian specialists about developments in other parts of the world. For example, a project—supported by a major grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities—involving Rosarkhiv and the Hoover Institution, together with the California-based Research Library Information Network (RLIN)—has been providing training in a Russified version of the system of machine-readable records for archives and manuscript collections (MARC AMC) that has become a standard for many American manuscript repositories. But the result is extremely limited: by the end of 1997, fond- and opis'-level descriptions for only 2,500 fonds in two federal-level archives in Moscow (GA RF and RTsKhIDNI) and two oblast'-level archives in Tver will be available in RLIN. Many more short descriptions of fonds for GA RF and RTsKhIDNI are available in the new published guides to those archives, which are not included in the RLIN project, and so far there are no cross-references to the opisi available on mi-
crofilm through the Hoover–Chadwyck-Healey project for those fonds that are described in RLIN. Hence, the sophisticated electronic descriptions for such a relatively limited number of Russian fonds produced on a trial basis in the RLIN project will hardly benefit many researchers, nor will they take the place of the more comprehensive guides to individual archives, which as seen above, are already much more extensive and more researcher-oriented for the two federal-level archives covered by the RLIN project.

A more primitive computerized system was used to produce fond-level descriptions for the new series of guides for GA RF and RTsKhIDNI, which already cover most of the fonds in those archives, rather than the selected few covered in the Hoover-RLIN project. But the electronic files produced for those guides are not compatible with the RLIN-destined descriptive records, nor were they conceived as an electronic reference system for immediate researcher access. Considerable time and expense will now be required if the remaining electronic files are to be integrated into a more comprehensive administrative and reference system for the federal archives involved.

Slightly variant MARC AMC–based data files are resulting from the Jewish archival survey mentioned above, which, it is to be hoped, will eventually be uploaded into RLIN. Independently of the YIVO project, cataloguing of Hebrew manuscripts in several repositories continues, and the filming of the Ginzburg Collection of Hebrew manuscripts in the Russian State Library (RGB) sponsored by the Hebrew National and University Library in Jerusalem, is resulting in scholarly printed and computerized catalogues for those previously suppressed manuscript treasures. In this case, cataloguing data are being added to the Collective Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts, compiled by the Jerusalem library, a microfiche edition of which was prepared in 1989 by Chadwyck-Healey. Electronic description of archival materials is also developing in several other specialized fields. For example, fond-level descriptions of physics-related holdings in many Russian scientific archival institutions have been added to the International Database for the History of Physics and are also available electronically in RLIN.


94. See Ronald Doel and Caroline Moseley, “Cold War Soviet Science: Manuscripts and Oral Histories,” CWIHP Bulletin 4 (Fall 1994): 2, 13. See also the Guide to the Archival Collections in the Niels Bohr Library at the American Institute of Physics, International Catalog of Sources for History of Physics and Allied Sciences, report no. 7 (College Park, Md., 1994), comprising a printout from the database at the Niels Bohr Library, with references to a growing number of collections preserved in at least ten repositories in the former USSR. Many of the English-language descriptions of collections from Russia have been uploaded into RLIN. CONTACT: http://www.aip.org/history/bohr.html.
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Several different computerized specifications have been developed for the description of early Slavic manuscript books in different libraries and other institutions. As was apparent at a seminar held by the Archeographic Commission in Moscow in September 1993, no priorities for uniform descriptive standards have been adopted, however, unfortunately resulting in a plethora of different systems, rather than a national database. Increasingly, microform copies of Slavic manuscript books available across the ocean are also shortchanged when it comes to standardized item-level electronic cataloguing. The Hilandar Library has been gradually cataloguing its microfilmed Slavic manuscripts acquired from Russian repositories into the nationwide library database OCLC, but the Library of Congress has so far provided only the briefest possible two-page typescript list of the manuscripts it filmed in the Depository of Antiquities in IRLI (PD) in St. Petersburg, with no plans for more complete cataloguing.

Electronic item-level cataloguing is in progress for the samizdat and other Soviet-period independent and non-traditional press holdings in the State Public Historical Library (GPIB) in Moscow. Several catalogues covering other collections have been published since 1991, and several foreign libraries with rich samizdat holdings, including university libraries in Bremen and Paris-Nanterre and the Library of Congress, have instituted electronic catalogues. Unfortunately, however, resources have not been available to coordinate and fund a comprehensive electronic catalogue covering samizdat and independent press holdings from the pre-1991 period. As yet no plans are underway to coordinate descriptive efforts with the still inadequately catalogued Radio Liberty samizdat collections from Russia and other countries of eastern Europe and Eurasia that were recently moved to the Soros-funded Open Society Archives in Budapest; that archive still lacks cross-references or other electronic correlation to earlier printed catalogues and to the IDC microfiche editions prepared in the 1980s for many of the holdings, which would make them more accessible for research.

All of these projects represent new, experimental reference developments for Russia and continue to help increase intellectual access to Russian archives in different ways and for different types of materials. Yet the fact that all of these recent reference efforts are being largely financed piecemeal from abroad, or by different grants within Russia itself, often reflects interests and priorities made possible by short-term grants and limits the possibilities for overall planning. As prototype projects they may provide experience for Russian participants and information specialists in planning long-term Russian reference needs and possibilities, but it is not clear how their products and methodologies will ultimately be meshed together into a national

95. See the brief report on the 1993 session, with mention of many of the participants, in "Deiatel'nost' Arkhеograficheskoi komissii v 1993 g.," Arkhеograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1993 god (Moscow, 1995), 349.

96. These are all listed, including those published in Moscow, in Arkhivy Rossiil Archivs of Russia, pt. A, sec. 14B.
library and archival information system with Rosarkhiv’s own recent developments. Now that the Soviet model of centralized planning has been abandoned, the informational advantages of that standardization appear to have been abandoned as well. Parliamentary budgets no less than western support for Russian archival operations are still inadequate to provide the top-level hardware and sophisticated programming needed for a comprehensive Russian information system.

Rosarkhiv Program: Archival Fond

Despite such difficulties, a new official Rosarkhiv plan for a computerized fond-level archival information system has now been launched. Much more important than the published plans and reports is the significant practical development already underway in the Rosarkhiv division ably directed by Igor N. Kiselev.97

Database programs are being developed to cover basic reporting functions, administrative control, preservation needs, usage of documents, accessions for ongoing institutional records, and other vital archival functions. Russian specialists have taken into account comparative developments in the United States, the Netherlands, and Denmark, among other countries, although, to be sure, their experience in the operation of foreign archival information systems has been limited. They have tried to preserve the relatively unique archival descriptive system and centralized archival administrative practices within Russia, but at the same time conform to—or even exceed—the latest international standards adopted by the International Council on Archives. Spurred on by the obvious limitations for Russia in the Rosarkhiv-RLIN project, the new program is nonetheless potentially compatible with the MARC AMC format used by RLIN.

The new Rosarkhiv database program Archival Fond (Arkhivnyi fond) has over two hundred fields, corresponding to traditional Russian archival descriptive practices. In 1995 a preliminary version of the database program to automate description on the level of fonds and opisi, together with their available reference systems (nauchno-spravochnyi apparat—NSA) and preservation needs, was circulated for testing throughout the Russian Federation. On the basis of feedback from many archives, a revised version was released in March 1997,
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with free copies given to all state archives. Local archives are required to furnish their own hardware and technical support, but the potential of the new program is obvious. Already a number of archives are reversing earlier tendencies to develop their own local computer systems in favor of the new nationwide standard.

At the initial stage, the program is oriented to archival administrative and reporting requirements. It can output automatic “passport data” for required reports and can also export text files to a variety of word-processing systems to produce user-oriented guides with automatic indexing (subject, name, and geographic). Eventually, as more general computerization within local archives proceeds, the system will be able to provide searchable files for end-user reference use in archival reading rooms. Furthermore, the program will also provide automatic output to augment the Central Catalogue of Fonds for state archives throughout the Russian Federation mentioned above, which had earlier been initiated under Glavarkhiv. Although computerization of that catalogue is still a separate component in the approved computerization plan, the new Archival Fond program will eventually be consolidated with it.

Other Electronic Outlets

The difficulty in establishing a national archival information system in Russia stems from the technological infrastructure as well as from budgetary factors. But in Russia those problems are further aggravated by the enduring bureaucratic fragmentation of umbrella agencies and independent institutions operating archival repositories, without the desirable level of coordination in the information sphere. As the Federal Archival Service of Russia, Rosarkhiv is legally responsible for the entire so-called Archival Fond of the Russian Federation, which embraces all state and private archival materials in the country. However, Rosarkhiv’s practical authority and operating effectiveness in the information sphere do not so far extend to holdings in repositories outside its own administration.

The Ministry of Culture, to take one of the most important examples, has organized its own databases for libraries and museums under its jurisdiction. Both are operated only for administrative purposes and are not open to the public. Neither of them has any separate fields for archival materials. The database for museums has served as the basis for a limited edition of an extensive 1993 published directory of museums. But that does not compare in depth of description to the 1997 tourist directory of Moscow museums mentioned above.

Two new and uncoordinated cyberspace museum information ser-

99. “\textit{Vse muzei Moskvy}.”
vices have recently been launched, independent of the Ministry of Culture, but these primarily provide popular tourist information. The general “Museums of Russia” website provides a multilingual list of museums throughout the Russian Federation; as of fall 1997, the Russian- and English-language listings included full addresses, transportation coordinates, telephone and fax numbers, and website addresses where available. Efforts are underway to verify and update the data, which in some cases are still several years out of date. Several museums have already launched their own websites as part of the program, and others are being developed. Oriented for tourists, with elaborate pictures of the museum buildings, and in some instances, tantalizing views or samples from museum exhibits (which unfortunately greatly increase the access time), these sites provide up-to-date contact information, although there is relatively little data of interest to researchers.100

Although the database in the Ministry of Culture’s Library Division is also not envisioned as a public reference facility, the admirable 1993 directory of St. Petersburg libraries is reportedly being converted to a database system.101 And more elaborate plans are being drafted for a library information network. Several Russian libraries have launched very informative websites. The most efficient for reference use in Moscow are those of the State Public Historical Library (GPIB), the Library for Foreign Literature (VGBIL), Moscow State University Library (MGU), the Russian State Library for the Arts, and the Library of the Russian State University for the Humanities (RGGU). More are underway. The GPIB site provides links to other library websites, as well as e-mail addresses (not always up-to-date, alas) for libraries and archives throughout the Russian Federation. Several additional Moscow libraries, museums, and public organizations that have significant archival resources (such as Memorial), have prepared their own web pages.

Federal agencies that maintain their own archives on a long-term basis all use varying systems of description, although some, such as the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense, use the traditional system

100. The website “Museums of Russia” (http://www.museum.ru), based at the Darwin Museum in Moscow since 1996, is developing versions in a number of foreign languages, including English. A mirror of this website has been established in Detroit for easier access in the United States. Several museums have posted their own websites on the same server, others are available on the OpenWeb server at the State Public Historical Library (http://www.openweb.ru), and some are starting to use other servers. See also the list of Moscow museums (with addresses, phone numbers, hours, transportation directions, and other data) on the Moscow city government-sponsored website “Informplaneta ‘BIS’—Infogorod Moskva”: http://www.mosinfo.com/bis/moscow.

of fonds and opisi. As yet, however, these and other federal agency archives have not adopted the Archival Fond program being introduced by Rosarkhiv. The Archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences have retrospective “passport” data that have been gathered systematically about archival holdings in their subsidiary or outlying institutes. Recent severe budgetary deficiencies have not allowed reporting to be kept up to date, and planning for a public information system is hardly possible.

An Electronic Interagency Directory and Bibliography—ArcheoBiblioBase

Parallel with the practical programming efforts for computerized fond-level reporting functions by Rosarkhiv, the ArcheoBiblioBase interagency directory-level database has been developed with Rosarkhiv sponsorship during the past six years with basic repository-level and bibliographic reference data. The 1997 printed directory expands the coverage four-fold over the preliminary English-language printed editions of the ArcheoBiblioBase Moscow–St. Petersburg directory published in 1992/1993. Parallel Russian- and English-language files now cover close to three hundred repositories in Moscow and St. Petersburg under all agencies of jurisdiction, describing archival materials, research conditions, and reference facilities, along with close to 3,500 bibliographic entries and elaborate indexes. Automatically formatted publication output first appeared in Russian, and an expanded parallel English-language edition will follow in early 1998. But those published directories are only temporary steps in what needs to be an ongoing information process.

Printed directories too soon become outdated and are too rapidly overtaken on the information highways of cyberspace. As the twenty-first century approaches, Russian archives, like those of other major countries, need to adopt electronic formats for public reference access and develop sophisticated search engines to increase their accessibility. In April 1997 brief internet coverage of Russian archives, with output from ArcheoBiblioBase, was launched in Russian from the new OpenWeb server at the State Public Historical Library in Moscow. Initial coverage extends only to federal archives under Rosarkhiv and to local state archives under municipal and oblast’ authorities in Moscow and St. Petersburg. A somewhat expanded English-language counterpart has been launched at the website of the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam, and it is already being relayed by a

103. See the website “Arkhivy Rossi” with brief data from parts B and D of ArcheoBiblioBase (http://www.openweb.ru/koi8/rusarch or http://www.openweb.ru/windows/rusarch). The OpenWeb server at the State Public Historical Library and free public assistance from a professional webmaster were established during 1996 under the sponsorship of the International Research and Exchanges Board with funding from the United States Information Agency.
Funding is being sought to extend the internet coverage to other repositories from updated data in ArcheoBiblioBase and to develop a search engine for researcher use of the database itself. Preliminary less detailed data have already been entered in ArcheoBiblioBase files for close to three hundred state archives (including former Communist Party archives) throughout the Russian Federation, together with a full bibliography of their published guides, which will soon be prepared for separate publication and internet coverage, if funding becomes available. Such developments are helping fill a vacuum in the Russian environment that still remains unaccustomed to readily available public information resources.

For obvious reasons, Soviet authorities never saw fit to develop the appropriate technological infrastructure and information services. Increasing access to information about Russian archival holdings and to archival reference publications is exceedingly difficult in Russia, where public outcry is still heard against the circulation of archival data or copies of documents abroad, where laws still try to regulate or limit the freedom of international information exchange, and where even customs authorities sometimes demand to inspect computer files taken abroad and forbid duty-free transport of printed archival directories. Despite such impediments, since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Russian-area archives—previously among the most closed in the world—are nonetheless now becoming among the most open, in terms of expanding reference information. Many interarchival projects, many reference efforts undertaken by individual archives, as well as the ArcheoBiblioBase general directory and bibliographic project, together with Rosarkhiv's own Archival Fond program and coordination efforts are helping open up a wide variety of information about Russian archives to researchers within Russia and abroad.

Nevertheless, questions remain: To what extent will Rosarkhiv, together with the cooperation of Russian libraries, be able to sustain and expand reference facilities in the future? In the summer of 1997, word came through of a 72 percent budget cut for Rosarkhiv and its federal-level archives for 1997, and the former Central Party Archive (now RTsKhIDNI) almost had to close down operations in July because there were no funds to pay the $60,000 owed on their electric bill. As frost set in during October, there was no heat for many federal archives, and they were all forced to close their doors for several days in early November when the militia guards demanded their arrears. National archives of such world-class importance should not have to live from hand to mouth.

A more open society needs expanding library information centers, where researchers can find up-to-date information about archival holdings, copies of all newly published reference works, and microform

104. See "Archives of Russia," the on-line data from the English version of ArcheoBiblioBase (http://www.iisg.nl/~abb/).
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copies of internal or out-of-print finding aids. Instead, library budgets are contracting as well. In the more democratic environment of the post-Soviet era, the remaining information lacunae could best be filled if Rosarkhiv, together with a satellite library network, could serve as a central hub of a reliable and regularly updated reference service for documentary resources in all Russian repositories, regardless of their agency of control—with current data about specific access possibilities and instructions for public inquiries. More and more countries—from Sweden and Latvia to Australia—are making data about their archives and manuscript holdings available on the international information highway of cyberspace, with the encouragement and often technological assistance of the International Council of Archives and UNESCO. The release of Chadwyck-Healey's ArchivesUSA in February 1997 heralds a new dimension in an integrated electronic reference system, starting with repository-level data and ending with microfiche editions of an increasing number of internal finding aids. Russia should not be left behind, so that reference access can continue to grow and reveal the whereabouts and available descriptions of more shadows of its troubled past as prologue to a more open society of the future.

Appendix

Acronyms for archives and libraries appearing in the text are listed below in alphabetical order according to their current names. The code numbers refer to the listings for these archives in the 1997/1998 ArcheoBiblioBase directory and in the brief ABB on-line listings on the internet.

AP RF: Arkhiv Prezidenta Rossiiskoi Federatsii (Archive of the President of the Russian Federation), C-1
AVP RF: Arkhiv vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii (Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation), C-2, formerly AVP SSSR
AVPRI: Arkhiv vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Imperii (Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Empire), C-3, formerly AVPR
GA RF: Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (State Archive of the Russian Federation), B-1, formerly TsGA RSFSR and TsGAOR SSSR
GIM: Gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskii muzei (State Historical Museum), H-1
Gosfil'mofond: Gosudarstvennyi fond kinofil'mov Rossiiskoi Federatsii [formerly SSSR] (State Fond of Motion Pictures), C-16
GPIB: Gosudarstvennaya publichnaia istoricheskaya biblioteka (State Public Historical Library), G-3
IAI RGGU: Istoriko-arkhivnyi institut Rossiiskogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarnogo universiteta (Historico-Archival Institute of the Russian State University for the Humanities), E-52
IRLI (PD): Institut russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii Dom) RAN [formerly AN SSSR] (Institute of Russian Literature [Pushkin House]), E-28
LOGAV: Leningradskii oblastnyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv v g. Vyborge (Leningrad Oblast' State Archive in Vyborg), D-18
MGU: Moskovskii gosudarstvennyi universitet im. M. V. Lomonosova (M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University), E-50 and G-2
RGADA: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov (Russian State Archive of Early Acts), B-2, formerly TsGADA
RGAE: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv ekonomiki (Russian State Archive of the Economy), B-6, formerly TsGANKh SSSR
RGAFD: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv fonodokumentov (Russian State Archive of Sound Recordings), B-10, formerly TsGA FD SSSR
RGAKFD: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotodokumentov (Russian State Archive of Film and Photographic Documents), B-11, formerly TsGAKFD SSSR and TsGAKFD RSFSR
RGALI: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (Russian State Archive of Literature and Art), B-7, formerly TsGALI SSSR
RGANTD: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv nauchno-tekhnicheskoi dokumentatsii (Russian State Archive of Scientific-Technical Documentation), B-9, formerly RNITsKD and RGNTA, and before 1992 TsGANTD
RGAVMF: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Voenno-Morskogo Flota (Russian State Archive of the Navy), B-5, formerly TsGAVMF SSSR
RGB: Rossiiskaia gosudarstvennaia biblioteka (Russian State Library), G-1, formerly GBL (Lenin State Library)
RGBI: Rossiiskaia gosudarstvennaia biblioteka po iskusstvu (Russian State Library for the Arts), G-6, formerly GTsTB
RGGU: Rossiiskogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarnogo universiteta (Russian State University for the Humanities), G-5
RGIA: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (Russian State Historical Archive), B-3, formerly TsGIAL, and after 1960 TsGIA SSSR
RGO: Russkoe Geograficheskoe obshchestvo (Russian Geographic Society), E-19
RGVA: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi voennyi arkhiv (Russian State Military Archive), B-8 formerly TsGASA
RGVIA: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi voenny-istoricheskii arkhiv (Russian State Military History Archive), B-4, formerly TsGVIA
RIII: Rossiiskii institut istorii iskusstv (Russian Institute for the History of Art), E-46, formerly LGITMiK
RNB: Rossiiskaia natsional'naia biblioteka (Russian National Library), G-15, formerly GPB (M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library)
RTrsKhiDN: Rossiiskii tsentr khraneniia i izucheniiia dokumentov novoihii istorii (Russian Center for Preservation and Study of Documents [Records] of Modern History), B-12, formerly TsPA
SPbF IRI: Sankt-Peterburgskii filial Instituta rossiiskoi istorii RAN (St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Russian History), E-24
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TsA FSB: Tsentral'nyi arkhiv Federal'nogo sluzhby bezopasnosti Rossiskoi Federatsii (Central Archive of the Federal Security Service), C-6, formerly TsA KGB

TsAMO: Tsentral'nyi arkhiv Ministerstva oborony (Central Archive of the Ministry of Defense), C-4

TsA MVD: Tsentral'nyi arkhiv Ministerstva vnutrennikh del (Central Archive of the Ministry of Internal Affairs), C-8

TsGAI PD SPb: Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv istoriko-politicheskikh dokumentov Sankt-Peterburga (Central State Archive of Historico-Political Documents of St. Petersburg), D-14, formerly PA Istpart Lenobkoma KPSS

TsGALI SPb: Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva Sankt-Peterburga (Central State Archive of Literature and Art of St. Petersburg), D-15

TsGANTD SPb: Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv nauchno-tekhnicheskoi dokumentatsii Sankt-Peterburga (Central State Archive of Scientific-Technical Documentation of St. Petersburg), D-17

TsGIA SPb: Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Sankt-Peterburga (Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg), D-13

TsKhDMO: Tsentr khraneniia dokumentov molodezhnykh organizatsii (Center for Preservation of Documents [Records] of Youth Organizations), B-14, formerly TsA VLKSM

TsKhIDK: Tsentr khraneniia istoriko-dokumental'nykh kollektii (Center for Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections), B-15, formerly TsGOA SSSR

TsKhSD: Tsentr khraneniia sovremennoi dokumentatsii (Center for Preservation of Contemporary Documentation), B-13

TsMADSN: Tsentral'nyi moskovskii arkhiv dokumentov na spetsial'nykh nositeliah (Central Moscow Archive for Documents on Special Media), D-4, formerly TsGKFFD g. Moskvy

VGBIL: Vserossiiskaia gosudarstvennaia biblioteka inostrannoi literatury im. M. I. Rudomino (M. I. Rudomino All-Russian State Library for Foreign Literature), G-4
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