The
Carl Beck
Papers
in Russian &
East European Studies

Number 1201

Patricia Kennedy Grimsted

The Odyssey of the Smolensk Archive

Plundered Communist Records for the Service of Anti-Communism

REES
THE CENTER FOR RUSSIAN & EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

The
Carl Beck
Papers
in Russian &
East European Studies

Number 1201

Patricia Kennedy Grimsted

The Odyssey of the Smolensk Archive

Plundered Communist Records for the Service of Anti-Communism

REES
THE CENTER FOR RUSSIAN
& EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

Patricia Kennedy Grimsted received her PhD in Russian history from the University of California–Berkeley and is currently a Fellow of the Russian Research Center and an Associate at the Ukrainian Research Institute at Harvard University. She has published widely in history and archival affairs, and has compiled a series of directories and reference handbooks on Soviet-area archives. Her recent work on displaced archives and restitution issues is based on the many newly opened archives in Eastern Europe. At the same time she has been working in collaboration with Russian and Ukrainian colleagues in the creation of ArcheoBiblioBase, a database for directories and bibliographies of archival reference literature, with forthcoming English and Russian volumes, *Archives in Russia: A Directory and Bibliographic Guide to Holdings in Moscow and St. Petersburg*.

No. 1201, September 1995

ISSN 0899-275X

The Carl Beck Papers
Editors: William Chase, Bob Donnorummo, Ronald H. Linden
Managing Editor: Martha Snodgrass
Assistant Editor: Eileen O'Malley
Cover design: Mike Savitski

Submissions to *The Carl Beck Papers* are welcome. Manuscripts must be in English, double-spaced throughout, and less than 110 pages in length, including all notes and supplemental material. Acceptance is based on anonymous review. Mail submissions to: Editors, *The Carl Beck Papers,* Center for Russian and East European Studies, 4G-15 Forbes Quadrangle, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

Acknowledgments

Although there has been no specific funding for this study, research has been carried out as an offshoot of larger projects supported by a series of grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX), and other sources, and hence owes much to their generosity. During 1993, additional research in Germany was supported by the American Council of Learned Societies as part of an ACLS/DAAD German-American collaborative projects grant with the Forschungsstelle Osteuropa of the University of Bremen. Supplemental research in Washington, DC in December 1994 was supported by a stipend from the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies under the Smithsonian Institution. The author is exceedingly grateful for all of these sources of support.

This study is part of a larger study, still in progress, of displaced cultural treasures on the Eastern Front during the Second World War, with emphasis on the plunder and counter-plunder of archives. It is one of several microcosmic studies of specific archival displacements. An initial macrocosmic study discusses the problem in a broader European context—*Displaced Archives on the Eastern Front: Restitution Problems from World War II and its Aftermath* (Amsterdam: International Institute of Social History, 1995; "IISH Research Papers," no. 18). With Ukrainian focus some of the same issues are examined in a chapter on World War II plunder and lack of restitution in *Archival Ucrainica Abroad—International Precedents and Archeographic Initiatives: A Case Study in the Reconstitution of the National Archival Heritage* (Cambridge, MA, 1995; with a Ukrainian-language edition in press in Kiev).

See also the earlier Grimsted study, "The Fate of Ukrainian Cultural Treasures during World War II: Archives, Libraries, and Museums under the Third Reich," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 39:1 (1991): 53-80. A Ukrainian version, translated and edited, together with related published documents, in collaboration with Gennadii Boriak appeared as *Dolia skarbiv Ukrains'koi kul'tury pid chas druhoi svitovoi viiny: Vynyshchennia arkhiviv, bibliotek, muzeiv* (Kiev: Arkheohrafichna komisiia AN URSR, 1991; 2d ed., Lviv, 1992). An updated and further expanded version is scheduled for publication in Kiev.

Issues of restitution that now so dramatically affect the fate of the "Smolensk Archive" were discussed in the Grimsted article, "Archival Rossica/Sovietica Abroad: Provenance or Pertinence, Bibliographic and Descriptive Needs," *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique* XXXIV, no. 3 (juillet-septembre 1993): 431-19, which first appeared in a Russian version, "Zarubezhnaia arkhivnaia Rossika i Sovetika: Proiskhozhdenie dokumentov ili ikh otnoshenie k istorii Rossii (SSSR), potrebnost' v opisanii i bibliografii," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1993, no. 1, pp. 20-53. A short report on the fate of the Smolensk Archive was presented at a conference on "Archival Rossica Abroad" in Moscow in December 1993, sponsored by the State Archival Service of Russia (Rosarkhiv), but it was only subsequently that more of the American documentation presented here was uncovered.

Appreciation is due to colleagues in the many archives and libraries cited for assistance in the course of research and in locating and copying documents in their respective archives—most particularly those in the *Bundesarchiv* in Koblenz (BA-K), the Archival Directorate of the Smolensk Oblast Administration and the Center for Documentation on Modern History of Smolensk Oblast (TsDISO), the Russian Center for the Preservation and Study of Documents on Modern History (RTsKhIDNI), the Center for Preservation of Documents of Contemporary History (TsKhSD), the Lithuanian Central State Archive (LCVA), the Central State Archive of the Highest Organs of Government and Administration of Ukraine (TsDAVO), and the U.S. National Archives (US NA). I am grateful to Arlene Olivero for the production of the map in the computerized cartographic system at the Harvard Map Collection. I am also grateful to Professor Merle Fainsod's daughters for permission to consult their father's papers in the Harvard University Archives (HUA).

Special thanks go to friends and colleagues who commented on earlier drafts of this study—Charles Kecskeméti, Secretary General, International Council on Archives; E.V. Kodrin, Vice-Rector, Smolensk State Pedagogical Institute; Michael Kurtz, Acting Deputy Archivist of the U.S. for the National Archives; E. I. Kuz'min, Chief, Library Division of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation; Roberta Manning of Boston College; Trudy Peterson, Acting Archivist of the U.S.; Thomas R. Pickering, United States Ambassador to Russia; V. N. Shepelev, Deputy Director, Russian Center for the Preservation and Study of Documents on Modern History (RTsKhIDNI); Bradley F. Smith of London, England, and Watsonville, CA; and S. L. Solodovnikova, Chief, Archival Directorate of the Smolensk Oblast Administration.

The Odyssey of the Smolensk Party Archive

Harvard Map Collection, 1995

The Odyssey of the Smolensk Archive

Half a century after their removal from Smolensk by Nazi authorities in 1943, over five hundred files from the former Archive of the Smolensk Oblast Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (*Vsesoiuznaia Komunisticheskaia Partiia(b)*—VKP[b], later KPSS, or in English, CPSU) are today still held in the U.S. National Archives in Washington, DC. A much larger portion (three and a half railway freight cars) of the interwar Smolensk Party archive that was seized by the Nazis was retrieved in Silesia by Soviet authorities in March 1945, although information about that recovery was first published only in 1991.[1] American authorities were prepared to return the Smolensk files in the 1960s, but then in the height of the Cold War, the CPSU Central Committee decided against reclaiming them for fear of the propaganda implications. Agreement for their return was finalized in 1992. But then the U.S. Congress stepped in and treated the "Smolensk Archive" as an object of exchange. The refusal of the U.S. Congress in 1992—and now the Vice-President's Office—to permit the legitimate return of the Smolensk files to Russia remains a serious blight on the American image on the international archival front. Russia itself has been under much more serious criticism for its failure to return well over a million files of captured records held in Moscow from all over the European Continent, but in 1994, half a century after their capture, the first trucks of Russian-held French archives started restitution to France. When the Russian parliament put the brakes on the restitution process in May 1994, they cited the "Smolensk Archive" held in the U.S. National Archives in justification.

We now know that American intelligence officers arranged for removal of the Smolensk files from the U.S. Army American restitution center near Frankfurt, where they were being held in the pipeline for restitution to the USSR in October 1946. Half a century later, the current American refusal for restitution means that once again the "Smolensk Archive" has become a glaring symbol of the political use of archives that goes against historical principles, international archival precedents, and inter-governmental agreements. The issues involved deserve consideration today

because they reflect serious deficiencies in the international restitution process for displaced archives—archives which represent after all the raw historical legacy, as the official vital and inalienable records of the nations, organizations, or individuals that created them.

World War II—the most disastrous war in human history—was also the most disastrous ever in the history of displaced European archives. Yet because a totalitarian victor triumphed over the totalitarian invader on the Eastern Front, and because the Cold War between that victor and its erstwhile Western Allies followed so immediately in its wake, many of the wartime Allied agreements and previous international conventions outlawing cultural booty were forgotten. Many archives that might have revealed to the world various shades of historical truth of wartime tragedies and archival as well as human losses on both sides have been suppressed as well, as the archival restitution process among the Allies and between the victor and the vanquished were subjected to political and intelligence expediency. Many of the recently opened archives in Eastern Europe hold new clues regarding wartime archival plunder and counter plunder, supplementing data that have earlier been available among Nazi records long opened in the West.

The "Smolensk Archive" now held in Washington is symbolic as a microcosm—one of many examples of wartime captured records and displaced archives. Yet its unique status as the only collection of Communist Party files to have reached the West heightens the interest in its fate. Its odyssey is particularly revealing of a much broader and little-known wartime story of displaced archives that needs to be more openly discussed and understood. In this case archives intentionally seized for political and intelligence purposes, first by the Nazi enemy, and then by a Cold War American adversary.

The borderland city of Smolensk itself, as reflected in its archives—and exemplified in its fortress, historically has suffered from many conquerors. The "key and gateway to Rus'" as it was referred to in the medieval Nestor chronicle, Smolensk has stood for many centuries as the embattled frontier outpost on the banks of the Dnieper River. A trading center on the route "from the Vagarians to the

Greeks," it was subordinate to Kievan Rus' before 1054, and then later to medieval Novgorod. Besieged by Muscovites and Tatars in 1340, Smolensk subsequently came under the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It reached its greatest prosperity in the sixteenth century after it was captured by Muscovy in 1514, but then fell to Poland in 1611 and was part of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth until it was recaptured by Muscovy (1654) and ceded by treaty in 1667. Almost entirely burned to the ground as Napoleon advanced to Moscow, Smolensk again rose to prominence as a major guberniia center during the late nineteenth century, particularly resulting from its position as an important junction on the main railroad line from Warsaw through Minsk to Moscow.

With records at the center of a rich agricultural region, which was embattled by Stalin's collectivization drive in the 1930s, the Smolensk Party Archive reflects the political, economic, and social traumas of not only the city and postrevolutionary Smolensk Guberniia (1917–1929), but the entire Western (*Zapadnii*) Oblast (14.I.1929–1937), with a population of over six and a half million (as a result of the absorption of Briansk and Kaluga guberniias and parts of the present oblasts of Pskov and Kalinin). Even after the dissolution of the Western Oblast, Smolensk Oblast (established in 1937) was considerably larger than it is today, since it was only after the war that it lost major territories to the newly established Kaluga and Briansk oblasts, in addition to northern territories to other oblasts.

As in earlier wars, Smolensk was on the major battle line during the Second World War. Hitler's advancing armies captured the city on the 16th of July 1941, but the stiff resistance they met there considerably slowed their advance to Moscow and convinced the invader to turn South. The city was again in the front line of fire when Smolensk was liberated by the Red Army the 25th of September 1943, but by that time over half its archives had been removed by the Nazis and others destroyed in bombing raids.

Revelations from the small part of the Smolensk Party Archive that reached the West have brought international attention to the area. The only CPSU files that were captured from the Nazis by the Western Allies were first highlighted in the

book by Merle Fainsod, *Smolensk Under Soviet Rule*, published in 1958 under sponsorship of the Rand Corporation.[2] Through Fainsod's masterful analysis of a microcosm of the traumatic transformation of Russia to Stalin's communist regime, the archive has proved a gold mine and schooled subsequent Cold War generations of Soviet-area specialists in the West. As American fodder for the Cold War, within Fainsod's study, the archive provided the Western world with rich, but fragmentary, data about the organization, functions, and controls of the Party apparatus at the local level. It demonstrated the mechanism and problems of the CPSU and NKVD in implementing collectivization and the resulting terror and disaffection at the regional level in the Western (and later Smolensk) Oblast under Soviet rule during the 1920s and 1930s.

The Smolensk files remaining in Washington have been thoroughly analyzed by the CIA and have long been available in their entirety for public purchase on microfilm, with card descriptions prepared by American intelligence specialists. The Smolensk files have been indexed (albeit with minimal keyword descriptors) in a guide published by the National Archives.[3] Today in Smolensk, many other much more revealing files—and other contiguous documentation—from the former Party Archive of Smolensk Oblast from the 1920s and 1930s are open to researchers from throughout the world. American historians are among those who have been taking advantage of the new openness in working there. Similar Party records are open to researchers in regional archives throughout Russia.

Nothing has been known, however, about how those scattered Smolensk files reached Washington and why they were not returned to Smolensk. Fainsod and others who used the so-called "Smolensk Archive" in the West were not aware of the contextual archival origin of the miscellaneous collected files represented there. Nor did they know about the seizure of the Party Archive in 1943 under the direction of the respected German archivist Dr. Wolfgang Mommsen, under command of the so-called *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg* (*hereafter* ERR), the Nazi supra-ministerial Special Command Force for Occupied Territories, headed by Hitler's ideological henchman, Reichsleiter Alfred Rosenberg. Nor did Fainsod or others recognize—as

will be explained later—that some scattered files in the "Smolensk Archive" in the National Archives are not even of provenance in Smolensk, but were rather seized by the ERR from Kiev or other places. We now know that those selected Smolensk files held in Washington represent only a small portion of the Oblast Party Archive that was seized from Smolensk in January and April of 1943 by Mommsen and the ERR for utilization by Nazi ideologists for anti-Communist purposes.

Many of the Party files from Smolensk in Washington are hardly of highest interest or priority. We still do not know how or why that those particular files came to be grouped together or why they were the ones to have reached the West. Some may have been selected for "operational" or "exploitation" purposes by the Nazi secret police and sent ahead to various central agencies well before the end of the war. Some of those files may have been selected for specific research purposes from the thousands from Smolensk under ERR command in Vilnius and later Silesia. Or else they represent those few crates that ERR specialists were able to send West before the Nazi retreat or that they succeeded in dispatching at the last moment when the Red Army was closing in on their anti-Bolshevik research center in Silesia and when transportation to the West was at a premium. We still do not know where Western Allied forces found the Smolensk files at the end of the war, nor have we found the U.S. order not to return them with the Russian materials to Soviet authorities from the Offenbach Archival Depository near Frankfurt.

Nevertheless, the general outline of their remarkable odyssey is clear. The odyssey of the "Smolensk Archive" illuminates important aspects of wartime archival developments on the Eastern Front. It simultaneously illuminates Nazi political and ideological imperatives with respect to archival seizures from conquered lands, and it throws interesting light on Western Allied postwar policies with respect to captured records and restitution—in the context of the burgeoning Cold War.[4]

When news came of the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941, Soviet authorities ordered the evacuation from the expected war front of designated records that they did not want to fall into enemy hands.[5] Subsequent orders, at least in many areas, called for the destruction of the most compromising files that it was

not possible to evacuate.[6] Recent records of Communist Party organs were naturally among those assigned high priority. Given the speed and unexpectedness of the invasion, the lack of prior evacuation plans and of adequate transportation facilities, and the general unpreparedness of Soviet authorities and society for war, it is little wonder that not every locality was able to carry out such orders, or to evacuate all their high-priority files.

Archival authorities in Smolensk were able to evacuate more than many other areas in the western war front. Available reports confirm that a quarter of a million high-priority files (approximately seven railroad freight cars) from state archives in Smolensk were dispatched inland to Kuibyshev (now Samara).[7] Party authorities in Smolensk succeeded in evacuating only six "auto car (*avtomashin*) loads," first to Iukhnov (Smolensk Oblast) and then, by order of the CPSU Central Committee, to Ural'sk in far away Kazakhstan. According to a 1945 report, evacuated Party records (approximately one freight car), which were returned after the city was liberated, arrived in Smolensk the 28th of December 1944.[8] Details as to what files from what fonds were evacuated have not been found, because such documentation was inadequate in that period, and it would now be virtually impossible to establish retroactively. That most of the finding aids were evacuated or destroyed (to the extent they existed) is confirmed by the few remaining inventories found by Nazi archivists. Apparently no attempt was made to destroy remaining holdings of potential strategic interest in the rich Party Archive of Smolensk Oblast, although that was the practice in many areas of the war zone.[9] Undoubtedly many current Party agency records that had not been transferred to the archive itself were intentionally destroyed by Soviet authorities in the Smolensk area as they were elsewhere, since there are significant gaps in local Party files from the late 1930s to 1941. The Nazis found considerable damage when they arrived in Smolensk, but initial reports on the archives confirmed they were all intact.[10]

At the beginning of 1941 (before evacuation), according to its official report for 1940, the Party Archive contained 121,590 files and was housed in the building of the former All Saints Church (*Vsesviatskaia tserkov'*) that had been closed for

worship under Soviet rule.[11] The quite separate State Archive of Smolensk Oblast was housed at that time in the building of the former Orthodox Ecclesiastical Consistory, the Avramievskii Monastery, and buildings of the former Polish, Peter and Paul (*Petropavlovskii*), and the Pokrovskii (Protection of the Virgin) Churches; the latter held the archive of the Registry of Vital Statistics (ZAGS).[12]

Nazi authorities were interested in all of the Smolensk archives and evacuated a total of seven or eight railway freight car loads from the city. Their prize trophy was the remaining archive of the Smolensk Oblast Party Committee (Obkom), which was rich in local Party and Komsomol records from the entire western region during the postrevolutionary period. Fifty years ago in January and April of 1943, some 1,500 linear meters—i.e. virtually all of the Communist Party archives that remained in Smolensk—were evacuated to Vilnius by the ERR and Nazi archivists. As Soviet authorities had feared they might be, those records were seized for ideological use to discredit the Communist regime. The Smolensk Party Archive, destined as it was for their main anti-Bolshevik study center in Silesia, was the only group of Smolensk records that the ERR command sent further west when they retreated from Vilnius in 1944.

Anti-Bolshevik Research under the ERR and the Ratibor Center

At the time the Party archive was discovered by the Nazi invaders, and when it was first removed from Smolensk, the ERR had its headquarters in Berlin. Cultural goods were plundered from all over Europe were being taken to various different centers or depositories in the Reich. The so-called *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg* (ERR), the Special Command Force for Occupied Territories, headed by Hitler's ideological henchman *Reichsleiter* Alfred Rosenberg, was the Nazi agency most directly and extensively involved with the plunder of all types of cultural treasures

in Soviet lands—as was the case in the West. This peculiar Nazi organization was a curious outgrowth of Rosenberg's ideological and propaganda functions within the Nazi party. The ERR developed in the course of the war in the East to embrace a vast bureaucracy for ideological and propaganda research as well as cultural—and especially library plunder—and the administration of plundered cultural goods in conjunction with, and often in service to, other Nazi agencies working in the field.

Rosenberg's own testimony at the Nuremberg Trials and the well-documented case developed against him by the Allies provide insights into his ideological orientation and cultural plans and activities of his elite agency—albeit retrospectively—for the occupied Eastern territories, similar to their operations elsewhere in Europe.[13] Born in Tallinn of Baltic German background, Rosenberg lived through the 1917 revolutions and Civil War in Moscow, and was fluent in Russian and Eastern Slavic ways before emigrating to Germany. From the time of his early association with Hitler and the Nazi Party in the 1920s, Rosenberg nurtured strong anti-Communist as well as anti-Semitic preconceptions and avidly encouraged Hitler's "drive to the East" to rid those lands of the vilified Bolshevik tyrant. In his *Myth of the Twentieth Century* and other writings Rosenberg viewed the Soviet Union in terms of the "Jewish-Bolshevik conspiracy" against which National Socialism must fight on ideological as well as political and military planes.

After the Nazi seizure of power, Rosenberg was appointed to supervise Nazi ideological development with the pretentious title of Plenipotentiary of the Führer for the Supervision of the Entire Intellectual and Ideological Training and Education of the NSDAP (*Beauftragter des Führers für die Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Schulung und Erziehung der NSDAP*). In the following years, Rosenberg was able to build up a significant bureaucracy around this office, which later formed the basis of his other ideological, political, and cultural operations.[14] Rosenberg was often scorned and politically out-rivaled by Joseph Goebbels as Minister of Propaganda and Heinrich Himmler as Chief of the Security Services, among other Nazi leaders. Although not distinguished for his administrative abilities, he nevertheless found an important niche for himself as head of the ERR, which had

been established in July of 1940 for cultural clean-up operations in the West, while Stalin was still allied with Hitler. By catering to Hermann Göring, and helping him through the ERR to secure his coveted art collection in the West, Rosenberg was nonetheless able to enlist the military power of the Wehrmacht for many ERR operations. As a loyal member of Hitler's inner circle, he was able skillfully to carve out a major role for the ERR in support of Nazi ideological and cultural goals. Subsequently on the Eastern Front Rosenberg's command, and consequently the ERR, was strengthened in conjunction with Rosenberg's parallel and more formal bureaucratic function as head of the Reich Ministry for Occupied Eastern Territories (RMbO—*Reichsministerium für die besetzten Ostgebiete*) that complemented and supplemented the civil administration of German-occupied parts of the Soviet Union.

ERR activities on the Eastern Front deserve more extended treatment than can be given here, but a few remarks may help explain the context for the Nazi seizure and preoccupation with the Smolensk Party Archive. In Western Europe, it was the ERR in the early years of the war who was principally responsible for the vast train-loads of art and museum exhibits of all types, as well as many library materials—especially those from abandoned Jewish institutions, families, and individuals. Those activities have been well documented in published accounts in addition to the Nuremberg trials.[15] An additional important element in Soviet lands, for which Rosenberg was uniquely qualified, was anti-Bolshevik research and propaganda activities to aid the war effort on the Eastern Front that complemented and supplemented ERR anti-Semitic activities, which were already well established in the West.

The *Hohe Schule*

Already in 1939, Rosenberg projected and won the Führer's approval for an immense Nazi research and ideological training center which, after the war, was to be organized as the so-called *Hohe Schule* (Higher, or Supreme, School) in the Bavarian

Alps.[16] In a decree at the end of January 1940, the Hitler endorsed the plan for the *Hohe Schule*, which "should become the principle center for the study of ideology and the education of National Socialists." He therewith ordered Rosenberg to direct preparatory operations, including assembling a library.[17] During the war itself, preliminary operations were underway through the ERR and other organizations with various think-tanks throughout the Continent, dealing with specific research goals to assist the war effort, and with substantial efforts in building library reserves for the *Hohe Schule*. Thus the Rosenberg plunder operations began as a direct outgrowth of his ideological research and propaganda functions.

In the early years of the war on the Eastern Front, securing goods for preservation was emphasized as the first priority, since the Nazi regime had plans for a long life in Eastern Europe. As reemphasized in Hitler's orders of March 1942, the ERR was instructed "to register all cultural goods in libraries, archives, and lodges in connection with the fight against Jews and Freemasons who initiated the war against National Socialism." The ERR was also given authority for confiscation, in cooperation with the Wehrmacht and with civilian administrative institutions under the RMbO,

> to search libraries, archives, lodges, and other ideological and cultural establishments of all kinds for the identification of appropriate materials, and to confiscate them for the fulfillment of the tasks of the NSDP in the ideological sphere and their use for scholarly research work of the *Hohe Schule*. The necessary measures within the Eastern Territories under German administration will be taken by Reichsleiter Rosenberg in his capacity of Reichsminister for Occupied Eastern Territories.[18]

Because of its high status in the Third Reich, the ERR usually had its way when it came to relations with other Nazi agencies and sequestering cultural goods of all categories, including library and archival materials needed to stock their study centers and libraries. In occupied Soviet lands, the ERR was organized into three

Main Task Forces, literally "Main Work Groups" (*Hauptarbeitsgruppe*—hereafter HAG), organized along geographic lines—for the Baltic (HAG-Ostland), central areas of Russia and Belorussia (HAG-Mitte), and for Ukraine (HAG-Ukraine), with sub-units in local areas. In the early years of the war there is no evidence of an ERR unit operating in the Polish General Government, although later after the war turned on the Eastern Front, and ERR units were retreating from occupied Soviet lands, there was a coordinating ERR office in Cracow. Most particularly, the ERR was delegated to take advantage of wartime opportunities to build up well-stocked libraries for the *Hohe Schule*, and hence HAG units in occupied Soviet lands were particularly active in collecting books and periodicals, as well as archives.

The Central Library—ZBHS

Many ERR book shipments from Soviet lands were destined for the Central Library (*Zentralbibliothek*—ZB or ZBHS), which was first established in Berlin (Behrenstrasse 49) early in 1939 as a central research facility of the *Hohe Schule,* directed by Dr. Walther Grothe. Moved to the Austrian Tyrol in October 1942, it was first housed in the Grand Hotel Annenheim (near St. Andrä bei Villach), with a depot for duplicates in the confiscated Monastery of Tanzenberg (near Villach and Klagenfurt, in Carinthia [*German* Kärnten]), which after September 1944 became the central facility.[19] Extensive library holdings in many shipments were directed there from Soviet lands, including the exceptionally valuable library holdings from the imperial palaces outside of Leningrad and those from the Central Library of the Academy of Sciences in Kiev that had earlier been pillaged by the Künsberg commandos.[20] Looted collections from Western Europe included parts of the Rothschild Library, the library of the Rabbinical School (*École Rabbinique*), and other private collections from Paris. Other collections and individual volumes had been purchased by ERR scouts or special library dealers for the Central Library throughout Europe.[21] Indicative of its labor-oriented social science interests, the

Central Library also took over a significant part of the library of the International Institute of Social History (IISH) that the ERR had pillaged from Amsterdam.[22] After the war, over half a million books were discovered in the Monastery of Tanzenberg and neighboring depots, including many from the USSR, and returned to the Soviet Union by British authorities.[23]

Additional books from Soviet lands plundered by the ERR for the *Hohe Schule* and shipped to Austria were apparently deposited in a separate ERR cache in Villa Castiglione, Grundlsee, that was specifically intended for the library of Hitler's planned cultural center in Linz. A large shipment from Smolensk University Library was found there and the House of Nature (*Haus der Natur)* in Salzburg and returned to Soviet authorities by the U.S. Army after the war.[24]

The Institute for Study of the Jewish Question and Other Research Operations

In line with the primacy of Nazi anti-Semitic policies, the Study of Jewish issues was an immediate priority with a special section of the *Hohe Schule*—the Institute for Study of the Jewish Question (*Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage*)—officially opened in Frankfurt in March 1941. In the course of the war the institute library was stocked with appropriate books and archival materials seized from major Jewish collections and Masonic lodges throughout the Continent, including the Rothschild collections from Paris and Frankfurt and the Rosenthaliana collection from Amsterdam, among others.[25] At least 100,000 volumes of Judaica and Hebraica from Kiev.[26] Even larger extensive library and archival materials from the Jewish Scientific Research Institute (YIVO) in Vilnius, and other Jewish institutions in Latvia, Lithuania, and Belorussia were sent to the Frankfurt institute.[27] As danger from bombing in Frankfurt mounted at the end of 1943, significant collections from the Institute building in Frankfurt (Bockenheimerlandstrasse 68) were removed to a more remote location in nearby Hungen, some seventy kilometers northeast of

Frankfurt. A storage depository and several related ERR research units were functioning there in the Castle of Solms-Braunfels earlier, and as more units were moved to Hungen and more shipments came in from the East, other buildings in the Hungen area were taken over. Two freight-train wagons of Judaica from Minsk were dispatched there in February 1944.[28] Operations continued there until March of 1945 with estimated holdings totaling between 1,500,000 and 2,500,00 volumes from Jewish and Masonic collections all over the Continent, along with archival materials and extensive newspaper runs.[29] The Frankfurt headquarters building itself was bombed, although many of its other prize collections survived in the basement.

Other separate institutes that were intended as parts of the *Hohe Schule* were established elsewhere in the course of the war for specific types of research—including the Institute for Biology and Racial Teaching (*Institut für Biologie und Rassenlehre*) in Stuttgart, the Institute for Religious Studies (*Institut für Religionswissenschaft*), header by Dr. Brachmann in Halle/Saale, and an Institute for German Folklore (*Institut für Deutsche Volkskunde*). They also received plundered archives as well as library collections.[30] Rosenberg's research units, it should be noted, were part of a vast network of pseudo-scholarly and propaganda forces—often competing with one another—mobilized in occupied areas subordinate to and providing intellectual support for the Nazi regime. On an intellectual level, the ERR activities were generally more oriented towards ideological and propaganda work than the so-called *Publikationsstelle*, which was associated with the Nazi archival authorities, and other more scholarly research units that were supported by other Reich agencies in addition to the ERR.[31] Materials collected by the ERR were nonetheless being distributed to many different library and research organizations, although priority was for the *Hohe Schule*.[32]

Research in the East

The turn of the war in the East after the Battle of Stalingrad brought a curtailment of many *Hohe Schule* operations in the West, except for the Jewish institute in Frankfurt and Hungen, and the Central Library in the Austrian Tyrol. But on the Eastern Front, there was a reaffirmation of Nazi goals and their strengthened implementation in ERR research programs, as apparent in a conference devoted to such problems in Minsk in mid-June 1943. The Rosenberg command had from the beginning broad intellectual and propagandistic goals in occupied Soviet lands, since in Nazi ideological terms, the war in the East was not only a drive for "living space," or a fight against the Red Army, but "an ideological struggle against Bolshevism." In order to win the war against the enemies of the Reich—Jews, Freemasons, and in the East especially, Bolsheviks—the German people "need to be more aware of the intellectual sphere and world outlook of the enemy." As explained in a high-level circular addressed to the Rosenberg command in June 1943, after two years of war in the East, it was more apparent than ever that "the Germans need to know more about Bolshevism to fight against it." The struggle against Bolshevism, as it was explained, would be in three stages:

> 1) To end the war and triumph over the enemy, Germans need to know more about Bolshevism, its influence and its propaganda in the East.
> 2) The German people have to be immune to Bolshevism in the future, and hence need to know more about it...
> 3) Even after winning the war, the Germans have to be able to deal with the consequences of Bolshevism for many decades to come.[33]

Although there is no evidence of a formal anti-Bolshevik research institute within the purview of the *Hohe Schule*, special units for the study of Bolshevism were established in Berlin soon after the foundation of the ERR itself, which employed trusted German academic specialists to research and prepare propaganda

tracts on various aspects of the "Bolshevik menace." The ERR had already been preparing themselves for that politico-ideological struggle since the beginning of the war, and ERR study centers had already been organized for analyzing Bolshevism and preparing the propaganda battle against the reigning Soviet ideology. Aside from cultural plunder, the ERR carried out extensive research and propaganda efforts in occupied areas of Eastern Europe, including the USSR. The extent to which the ERR had been carrying on such studies in Ukraine from the outset is apparent in an inventory of their research reports prepared by the head of HAG-Ukraine in March of 1943. Of particular importance as examples are the inner ties between the Jews and Bolshevism, the involvement of Jews in the Soviet state and Party, the extent to which Stalinism represents a "new teaching," the components of "world revolution or national state" in Bolshevism, and the political and intellectual outlook of the Bolshevik Party, to name only a few of the ERR research preoccupations. This and other ERR reports merit more thorough analysis in terms of their ideological conceptions and preoccupations with Bolshevism.[34] Each of three primary ERR Task Forces, in addition to other activities, had special pseudo-research and propaganda units operating within their own areas and commissioned local native specialists to prepare German-centered and anti-Bolshevik tracts and analyses of various types. Many lists of the studies underway are found in ERR reports.[35]

The *Ostbücherei*

At the heart of the ERR anti-Bolshevik research operations was the so-called *Ostbücherei Rosenberg*, a special library founded in Berlin (Gertraudenstrasse) by the Rosenberg command already in 1941 to gather materials for the study of eastern lands and especially for the study of Bolshevism. As the Nazi armies rolled eastward, ERR and associated military and secret police units were on the lookout for appropriate sources for its vast network of research and study centers and in the East especially for the *Ostbücherei*, which formally was considered part of the *Hohe*

Schule library system. Although confiscation was authorized of materials needed for immediate ERR propagandistic research and study operations, the largest ERR archival and library archival seizures did not take place before the war had turned against the aggressor in the East.[36] Nevertheless, in the early years of the war, Rosenberg forces evacuated over half a million library books, and many newspapers and periodicals from occupied parts of the Soviet Union to stock the *Ostbücherei* Rosenberg in Berlin. The library was continuing to expand in Berlin throughout the summer of 1943, as substantiated by main extant Nazi reports of the library operation.[37]

The ERR Ratibor Center

After a wave of bombings in Berlin in the spring of 1943, during the summer and fall of that year, the ERR moved its headquarters to the relatively quiet and isolated city of Ratibor (*Polish* Racibórz) 80 km SW of Katowice on the Odra River in Silesia. (Silesia was then immediately part of the Reich, along with the neighboring Sudetenland that had been annexed to the Reich in 1938.) An ERR office was already operating in Ratibor by the end of May 1943.[38] An advance command group headed by Herbert Lommatzsch left Berlin at the end of August.[39] By early September they were already moving in and some sections were already operating in their new home.[40] Over the next year and a half, ERR operations expanded in the Ratibor area, and more buildings were added to house its library and archival loot from throughout the Continent (art and museum exhibits looted by the ERR were for the most part directed elsewhere).

Major ERR units involved in the study of Bolshevism were likewise moved to the Ratibor area, with an avid Nazi scholar of Bolshevism, Dr. Gerd Wunder, in charge of operations there.[41] Separate buildings within the city and surrounding area housed different ERR units. Headquarters were set up in the Franciscan Monastery (Sudetenstrasse 27).[42] Many of the captured holdings from the East were initially

placed in a former synagogue (Niedertorstrasse) and another building (Schulbankstrasse).

The *Ostbücherei* was moved from Berlin to Ratibor, starting in the summer of 1943, with the last shipment of nine freight cars the first week of March 1944.[43] Facilities for the main ERR library was found in a former cigar factory in nearby Kranstädt (*Polish* Krzanowice), including the Berlin *Ostbücherei* collection.[44] Other parts of the *Ostbücherei* were housed in various ERR buildings within Ratibor itself, with library operations there headed by Haupteinsatzführer Dr. Harry Thomson. One of the most important ERR depositories in the Ratibor area was located some seventy kilometers to the East in the elegant medieval castle of Count von Pless, on the outskirts of a town by the same name Pless (*Polish* Pszczyna). When there was not room for the current newspaper collection in Ratibor, Wunder suggested moving it to Pless.[45] During 1944 the major division of the *Ostbücherei* for newspapers and contemporary periodicals from the East expanded in Pless. It was there that they brought the Smolensk archive that summer.

With the Nazi army in retreat from Soviet lands, the ERR brigades were likewise pulling back and increasing the pace of evacuations. The HAG-Mitte and HAG-Ukraine joined forces in Białystok in early 1944. When HAG-Mitte was forced to close its office in Białystok at the beginning of July (6.VII.1944), they moved to the ERR research center of Frauenberg, in the Austrian Tyrol, near the Central Library for the *Hohe Schule* in Tanzenberg. Most of the evacuated library materials they had with them in Białystok, however, were sent in seven freight cars to Pless in the Ratibor area. Another freight car was sent in September (14.IX.1944).[46]

The Ratibor center reached its zenith in the summer and fall of 1944. To give some idea of the extent of the undertaking at that time, from one report, the Ratibor center employed close to three hundred and fifty specialists.[47] The products of their research, some of which survives, deserve separate intellectual analysis. The *Ostbücherei* and other library facilities in Ratibor served the various high-level study groups operating there for analyzing Bolshevism and preparing studies of various

other subjects of Nazi ideological and practical concern. One general report, presumably from 1944, suggests that at its height the *Ostbücherei* totaled some one million volumes, but it is not clear if these were all held in Ratibor.[48] But our present study focuses on the sequestered archival materials that were utilized for the operation.[49]

Archival Plunder

The ERR forces worked closely with the archival professionals sent by the state archival system in tracking down those most politically and ideologically-sensitive materials most appropriate for their research units, including their anti-Bolshevik research in Ratibor. Military archival reconnaissance on the Eastern Front as in the West was directed by the Military Archives (*Heeresarchiv*) centered in Potsdam, and the ERR never saw their loot, unless they later found it inappropriate for their operational and military historical priorities. Professional archival authorities under the Ministry of the Interior supervised administration, preservation, and plunder for other Nazi political and ideological aims. These functions were institutionalized in the General Directorate of State Archives (*Generaldirektor der Staatsarchive*), the Reich Command for Archival Preservation (*Reichsarchivschutz*), and the State Archives themselves (*Reichsarchiv*), centered in Potsdam and/or Berlin-Dahlem, all of which were headed by Dr. Ernst Zipfel, the *bête noire* of Nazi archival administration.

The city of Troppau (*Czech* Opava), less than one hundred kilometers by rail or road across what is now the Czech-Polish border from Ratibor, was the main center for more historical archival evacuations from Soviet lands directed by the Nazi archival administration. The few highly politically and ideologically relevant archival loot that the Nazi archivists (both military and civilian) were able to find in Soviet lands was turned over to the ERR or other agencies. Yet before the fate of the war

in the East turned in 1943, the ERR had generally decided not to evacuate most of the archival and museum treasures they had found in the East.[50]

Once ERR archival plunder started full-scale in 1943, high priority archival materials for the study of Bolshevism were taken to the ERR center in Ratibor, especially after it was firmly established there during 1943. A special collection center for archival materials relating to the labor movement (*Archiv der Arbeiterbewegung*) was headquartered in Ratibor (Oberwallstrasse 28), where archival collections from Paris and Brussels had already been brought.[51] Details have not been found as to what materials they were holding there, or whether or not the ERR Ratibor center had received any materials collected for the German Labor Front (*Deutsche Arbeitsfront*), part of whose collections were also reportedly sent to Silesia. At least part of the IISH collections from Amsterdam were also reportedly destined for Ratibor.[52]

The ERR operation was obviously vying for loot with the much larger socialist and labor movement archives, collected from all over Europe by the ERR and other Nazi agencies, that by then were being held by the infamous 7th Division of the Reich Security Command Headquarters (*Reichssicherheitshauptamt*—RSHA), farther west in the Silesian castle of Count von Althann—Schloss Wölfelsdorf (*Polish* Wilkanów), near Habelschwerdt (*Polish* Bystrzyca-Kłodzko). But many of the RSHA holdings had actually been seized by the ERR, who turned them over to police authorities when more serious "operational" activities were involved. The Seventh Division constituted the so-called "research and evaluation" arm of the RSHA, and its aims were clearly those of "enemy control" in what would appear to give it much higher political priority than the ERR, whose efforts remained more purely propagandistic and ideological, with fewer practical applications. Nevertheless, there appear to be considerable overlap in the type and nature of archival materials collected by both organs, and no clear distinction as to which agency got which materials.

Accordingly, it is not surprising to find that the ERR had various other archival materials relating to "enemies of the regime," in its Ratibor center, along

with materials relating more directly to "the Bolshevik menace." Apparently, the ERR had in hand a wide variety of scattered archival materials collected in Western Europe—particularly France and Belgium, relating to Jewish, Masonic, and a variety of other social organizations and personal papers of individuals, including some fragments of the Rothschild papers and fragmentary papers of French and Belgium writers and journalists. These were found by Soviet authorities with the ERR records that had been accumulated in Ratibor.[53] Further study of ERR operations in connection with such collections is in order, as to whether they were actually being used by the ERR or intended for transfer to the more systematic archives of the RSHA. There was also a separate photographic archive in Ratibor, with some 8,000 photographs from the USSR and some 4,000 Soviet sound recordings, although most of the extensive films and photographic archival collections plundered from Soviet lands had been sent earlier to Berlin for other centers in the Reich and were not transferred to Ratibor.[54]

Plunder of Ukrainian CP Archives

Even before the Smolensk Archive reached the Ratibor area in the summer or early fall of 1944, the ERR, working together with professional Nazi archival authorities, had collected significant fragments of four or five other regional Communist Party archives—all of them from Ukraine. Most important were the fragments from the Party Archive in Dnipropetrovs'k that arrived in Ratibor a year before the Party records from Smolensk. Senior Prussian archivist in Ukraine, Dr. Georg Winter, who had earlier directed Nazi archival activities in France during the first year of Nazi occupation, was sent in Ukraine in the fall of 1941. He was at that time officially representing the ERR for archival matters in Ukraine, but also had direct ties to the *Reichsarchiv* Potsdam. Later in 1942 he was also appointed as director of the Provincial Authority for Archives, Libraries, and Museums under the Reichskomissariat of Ukraine. Winter first visited Dnipropetrovs'k in May 1942,

and in June reported that there he found "the only Party archive they had discovered so far, although one third of the archive had been evacuated or burned by Soviet authorities."[55] Winter was so impressed with its importance that, as he reported to his ERR superiors, he "personally spent some time putting the archive in order."[56] In mid-July another ERR specialist, Erich Lüddeckens, who had been trained as an Orientalist and with knowledge of Russian and Ukrainian, reported in more detail on the 120 bundles from the secret division of the Oblast Party Archive, which Soviet authorities had left behind, including part of the Oblast Party Committee records.[57]

While working in the Dnipropetrovs'k archive, Lüddeckens also found and translated the evacuation order from Soviet NKVD authorities dated 18 July 1941, with the concluding paragraph ordering that all secret and top priority materials, including finding aids, that archival authorities were not able to evacuate "were to be destroyed unconditionally."[58] Fortunately for Nazi researchers—and for posterity—local authorities did not have time before retreat to destroy the archive. Given the fate of the Smolensk and the Dnipropetrovs'k archives, such an order is well understood, and it explains why the Nazis did not find more Party archives in occupied territories and especially, in the case of Dnipropetrovs'k, why they did not find more of the Party archive there. Retrospective reports by Party authorities of the evacuation efforts in Ukraine confirm the extent of intentional destruction of oblast Party archives in 1941.[59]

Similar to procedures adopted simultaneously for the Smolensk Party Archive, the ERR HAG-Ukraine posted Lüddeckens in Dnipropetrovs'k for a longer working visit, where he prepared a detailed inventory of the Oblast Party Committee files before evacuation.[60] Three copies of the German inventory produced by Lüddeckens (completed in February 1943) remain among ERR files in Kiev.[61] The Nazis also prepared a summary list of remaining fonds in the Dnipropetrovs'k Oblast State Archive, which included a list of additional Party fonds they found in the city.[62] Apparently the Nazis did not have room to evacuate all they found there, and only the main fond of the Oblast Party Committee was shipped to Ratibor.[63] We can follow the shipment of the Dnipropetrovs'k Party archival materials in a single freight

car, which left Dnipropetrovs'k October 3rd 1943 and arrived in Cracow on the 11th.[64] The shipment forwarded to Ratibor the 5th of November consisted of "29 crates, 64 cardboard boxes and 343 document packages."[65] In December 1944 the Dnipropetrovs'k Party files were being held in Ratibor in the same building with the Russian-language part of the *Ostbücherei* (Niedertorstrasse), but there is no available indication of the specific use ERR researchers were making of the materials.[66] Before the ERR retreated from Ratibor, they had ordered many of the ERR holdings transported to Castle Banz near Staffelstein (Marsh) or destroyed, but most of the *Ostbücherei*, and apparently the Dnipropetrovs'k materials in the same building, were abandoned in Ratibor.[67] Soviet authorities found parts of the Dnipropetrovs'k Party Archive in Silesia, but details are not available as to precisely where or when the materials were found.[68] In 1946, 10,453 units, including "Party chronicles," were transferred first to Minsk and then to Kiev.[69] Further confirmation of that transfer has recently come to light in Dnipropetrovs'k, but not all the plundered files were recovered and returned to Dnipropetrovs'k.[70]

According to various operational reports in Ukraine, the ERR also found and confiscated records from three or four other Communist Party Archives in Ukraine. "The uniqueness and importance" of the Kirovohrad Party files discovered by the ERR is stressed in a report dating from June 1942, but their shipment by the Nazis has not been documented.[71] Some Raion Party Committee records from Kirovohrad Oblast were also found in Silesia by Soviet authorities in 1945, but we do not know if they were ever in Ratibor.[72] In fact, nineteen crates with recovered files from Party and Komsomol committees from six different raions from Kirovohrad Oblast, found in the Habelschwerdt archival repository of the Seventh Division of the Reich Security Headquarters (RSHA), and which were initially transferred to the Special Archive in Moscow, were returned to Ukraine in July 1946. Although the Kirovohrad files are not listed in the initial rough lists of archival materials found in Habelschwerdt, their transport to Moscow with the other RSHA materials would suggest that the ERR had turned this collection over to the RSHA rather than keeping them with the Dnipropetrovs'k and Smolensk materials in the ERR Ratibor center.[73]

The Kirovohrad materials recovered included some Party files from one raion that was then part of Odessa Oblast, which undoubtedly accounts for the fact that Odessa was named in the Soviet reconnaissance report.[74]

Seizure and shipment of Party records from Uman is noted in ERR reports by Dr. Walter Modrijan, dated in Cracow in October 1943, but we have no confirmation that they reached Ratibor or that they were recovered.[75] As of the fall of 1942, Lüddeckens (the ERR specialist working in Dnipropetrovs'k) was also supervising "the organization and listing of fonds" in the Party Archive in Zaporizhe.[76] Available ERR operational reports examined thus far, however, do not mention shipment or receipt of Zaporizhe Party files in Ratibor, nor were any files from Zaporizhe found in the Special Archive in Moscow with materials from the RSHA. Further research on the subject may well yield more results both about Nazi research efforts and the fate of the Party records involved, but no mention has been found that any Ukrainian Party files reached the West.[77]

Hence, the information we have about the odyssey and utilization of Smolensk files first by the Nazis and later by the Americans for anti-Communist purposes is unique. In terms of politically and ideologically relevant archives for Nazi anti-Bolshevik research, the prize Rosenberg haul was the voluminous shipment of records from the Smolensk Oblast Party Archive, with files dating from 1918 through 1937/1938, representing those portions of the archive that Soviet authorities had failed to evacuate or destroy before their retreat in 1941.

From Smolensk to Vilnius to Ratibor

The first Nazi archival report from Smolensk came from a Künsberg Commando unit that was accompanying front-line troops that reached Smolensk 17 July 1941. They found some contemporary maps, agricultural statistical materials, and other scattered documentation that merited the despatch of a courier and a truck, but there is no

indication that they found the local Party Archive or other important archival records, since they reported that Soviet authorities had packed and taken such materials with them.[78] A military archival commando unit from the Heeresarchiv headed by von Waldenfels, surveyed the situation in Smolensk during the week of 14–21 September 1941. In terms of civilian archives, he noted that the Historical and October Revolution archives in Smolensk were intact, as was the ZAGS archive in the Pokrovskii Church, confirming the locations that had been described in prewar reports. Waldenfels reported that the Party Archive "near Molotov Place, was being monopolized by the SD, and was already been worked through by them," but there were no plans for removal at that time.[79] Waldenfels carefully listed materials he was removing from various Soviet archives, but he did not include any files from the Smolensk Party Archive in his shipments. Waldenfels also reported contacts in Smolensk with a Russian archivist, I. A. Morozov, who we know from other sources had been repressed by Soviet authorities in 1931, but by 1941 was back in Smolensk and found favor with Nazi archivists.[80]

Further provisions for the security of archives in Smolensk were reported in December 1941, but there is no evidence of removal, or that either the ERR or the Nazi archival command were working in the Party Archive at that point.[81] In May 1942 an ERR Special Command attached to the military reported "a particularly important" archival reconnaissance in Smolensk, which is perhaps the first, or at least "one of the very few cities where the local Communist Party archive is preserved almost in its entirety."[82] When he received the report in June, Dr. Gerd Wunder, one of the division directors of ERR operations in the East (and who later headed the ERR Ratibor center), immediately notified the Prussian archival director in the Baltic, Dr. Wolfgang Mommsen, then in Riga, regarding the Smolensk archive. Wunder noted that from reports he had received, much had been burned in Smolensk, but the archives were well preserved. He was particularly anxious at that point that everything necessary be done to provide top security for the archive and assure its preservation in Smolensk itself.[83]

Unlike the situation in Ukraine and the Baltic countries, where professional German archivists were assigned to work permanently in coordination with civilian occupation authorities, the "HAG-Mitte"—covering Western parts of Russian and Belorussia—had no resident top-level German archivists. Hence the ERR arranged tours of inspection for their most trusted archivists headquartered in the Baltic capitals. Mommsen, a veteran of the Prussian *Geheimes Staatsarchiv* in Berlin-Dahlem and the *Reichsarchiv* Potsdam, was then directing Nazi archival operations in Riga and simultaneously working with the Baltic Archival Commission (and after the war he was later president of the *Bundesarchiv*).[84] He made an initial visit to Smolensk in mid-August of 1942, but his extant reports from that visit do not include coverage of his archival investigations.[85] At that point apparently the Nazis were not planning immediate evacuation of the Party Archive from Smolensk, particularly before they had made a thorough survey of its contents. During the summer and fall of 1942, the local ERR-Mitte command had a special task force in Smolensk working in four major archives under the direction of Dr. Gustav Mücke, who later directed a major ERR section in Ratibor.[86]

By December of 1943, however, the ERR command was worried by the relative proximity of Smolensk to the war front and increased bombing raids, and sent Mommsen back with the provisional plan to bring major archives from Smolensk and Minsk to Riga. Plans for research and appropriate work with the important archives discovered would be postponed until later, but for the present, preservation was of prime importance.[87]

The Initial 1943 Shipment to Vilnius

Mommsen visited Smolensk in January 1943, as part of an archival tour that took him first to Vitebsk. In Smolensk he planned and supervised the initial major evacuation of the Party Archive. At that point he reported approximately 1,200 linear meters of Party records located in the former church that had been taken over

by Party archival authorities in the late 1930s.[88] Mommsen was impressed that "for Soviet conditions the Party records were being kept in unusually good condition. Not unlike the manner used in the Privy State Archive in Berlin-Dahlem, they were tied with string into packages, which bore clear identifying signatures." As he explained, based on his observations and consultations with the Russian archivist Morozov, who was working with the Nazis in the Smolensk archives, especially with the Nazi specialist Alfred Pastor:

> The holdings included records of the various Communist Party organizations of the entire Smolensk Oblast. Of particular important are the records of the CP Control Committee of Smolensk Oblast, [one of] the highest Party organs in the oblast, and the records of the Communist Central Authority of the former Smolensk Gubernia. In addition records of various other Party authorities, including uezd and raions, and especially for the city of Smolensk itself, there were records of other lower and subordinate agencies. Clearly only a very small portion of local records from more distant raions made it to Smolensk, as the Russian archivist Morozov told us.[89]

Several variant German-language lists of fonds (348 central fonds and an additional 191 local fonds) found among ERR records in Koblenz show the organization and arrangement of fonds that were held in the Smolensk Oblast Party Archive at the time of the German evacuation.[90] As indicated on the title page, the lists were prepared for the ERR by Dr. Mücke and [Alfred] Pastor. Mommsen correctly assumed that some of the most important holdings of the Party Archive had been evacuated by Soviet authorities, along with other reference materials, including most of the inventories. They found, nevertheless, "an old register in the form of several card files," which Mommsen "packed extremely carefully." He ordered Russian archivists to produce a register of the records of the Party Control Commission, which was to be "sent to me by the Smolensk ERR Task Force."[91] Apparently he did find some other inventories, because in discussing shipping arrangements, he ordered that

> All inventories of the Communist Party Archive and the records of the [Commission on Party Control] from the Party Archive are to be stored separately in freight cars for transport. These should also be stored separately in Vilnius, since they will need to be used most quickly.[92]

Four German file-level inventories (*opisi*) are also extant in Koblenz covering the records of the Trans-Dnieper Raion for the early 1920s prepared in January 1943. Possibly these were based on card files or "old inventories," the Germans had found in the Smolensk archive itself or simply translations of earlier Russian ones that had been found there.[93]

Mommsen had prior orders, as noted above, to evacuate the Smolensk Party Archive. Interestingly enough, when in Smolensk, he was given a pretext for evacuation based on the need by local authorities to use the church in which the archive was housed for religious purposes.[94] He then justified to local authorities evacuation of the Party archive from Smolensk, based on concern with archival preservation, rejecting the warehouse proposed by local Nazi authorities. As Mommsen explained in his official report:

> Since the 'Winter Church' of the Orthodox community in Smolensk had been hit by a high-explosive bomb and rendered unfit for religious services, local headquarters had proposed to use the church in which the archives of the Smolensk Communist Party were housed for divine services, and hence remove the archives from the building. There was no other undamaged church available. Since at that time it was not possible to retrieve what was then the regular archival building for archival purposes, and since there were no other dry rooms available, I decided to transport the archive to Vilnius, where there was sufficient space for it in the extensive rooms of the State Archive. When the Smolensk secret police heard about our intended clearing of the church, they alternatively planned to place the archive in a warehouse that they had located.

On Mommsen's urging, however, secret police authorities "agreed to the removal to Vilnius, above all because they had already utilized the archives themselves for their own purposes."

Mommsen also inspected other archives remaining in Smolensk, finding "things there as they were before, that is to say broken windows and damaged buildings. However, I have seen to it that the in-blowing snow is constantly removed."[95] In terms of Party records, he found:

> Additional documents of the Communist Party (about 300 linear feet) are located in the Revolutionary Archive, among them also are records of the CP Control Committee. In order to have all the files of this fond together, I have asked the Smolensk ERR Task Force to transport this group of records to Vilnius or, if this should run into difficulty, at least the Control Committee files.[96]

There is no evidence that he evacuated other archives besides Party records from Smolensk in January, although he did take along "all duplicate inventories of the historical archive and the Revolutionary Archive." He was also on the lookout for archival materials related to German communities in Russia—one of the high Reich archival priorities—but these were for other German-oriented archival projects he directed in Riga, rather than for the ERR anti-Communist research operation. He had competitors from other Nazi agencies who had their own interests in those materials:

> I had intended to bring parish registers (three units) from the German community church in Smolensk to Riga, but I found they were being used in analysis of the *Volksdeutsch* in Smolensk, as proof of their German origin. I was not able to take up the matter with the Secret Police (SD), but I am trying to determine if this utilization is such that necessitates their remaining there.[97]

Mommsen himself was not able to stay in Smolensk to supervise the January shipment, as is clear from his report:

> Loading of the records onto freight cars was somewhat delayed because of technical reasons. Since I did not, and could not, overly extend my stay in Smolensk, I had to refuse personally to direct and supervise the loading operation. But I did give all necessary instructions and am sure that the ERR will carry out the removal in accordance with my instructions.
> Unfortunately, since the available support workers were simple transport laborers, and because of the necessary hurry, it was not possible to number the individual document folders, or to stack them in freight cars according to their arrangement in the archive. However, since the individual folders do bear clear labels with catalogue numbers and descriptions of their origin, they can be put back into their original order without too much difficulty. Those folders whose cords are worn thin, as well as those documents of the Control Committee which are of particular importance, have been placed in cardboard boxes. I have had them retied with a thick cord and have asked that during the loading process, extra cord is ready for use and that the personnel are prepared immediately to repackage any folders that might burst. It should be noted that I have also ordered the essential Bolshevik library of the archive (with countless periodicals) be taken along as well.[98]

Since his memorandum was written before he knew the details of the shipment, it does not note the number of freight cars involved, and another shipping list has not been found.

With due sense of the value of the archive he was intent on saving, Mommsen hastened to make appropriate arrangements for accommodations for the Party Archive in Vilnius:

> On the basis of my discussions in Vilnius, the evacuation to the State Archive in Vilnius will be directed by the ERR Task Force located there, who will enlist the help of representatives of the State Archive and other

support workers. Chief of Staff [*Stabsführer*] Lackner of the Vilnius Area Commissariat also promised to assist with the evacuation if necessary. Any costs that may be incurred by loading in Vilnius I have asked to be reimbursed by the Reichskommissariat.

The records should be stored in a special room of the State Archives and the room should be duly sealed. I have promised written instructions to that effect.

It should be finally mentioned that the Secret Police in Vilnius gave notice of their interest in these records. I mentioned, however, that the document packages in disarray will initially be unusable, and besides the Secret Police in Smolensk had already examined the documents. Under these circumstances, the Secret Police in Vilnius has declined to survey the documents.[99]

Mommsen was duly appreciative of the role of his Vilnius ERR colleagues in accommodating and assisting with the reception of the Smolensk archive, addressing them a special note of thanks in March 1943.[100]

The April 1943 Shipment to Vilnius

In April 1943, Dr. Mommsen made a second tour to arrange further archival evacuations from Russia and Belorussia to Vilnius under ERR auspices. Departing Riga March 30, he spent four days in Vitebsk, four days in Smolensk, one in Briansk, and reached Homel' the 12th of April. His subsequent report confirms the dispatch at that time of an initial freight car from Vitebsk with pre-revolutionary materials primarily of genealogical interest from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[101] By early May 1943 it was rumored that they were shipping another forty freight cars of archival materials from Vitebsk; twenty-seven were in fact shipped the following November, but there were no Party materials were listed among them.[102]

In Smolensk, Mommsen found that the situation he had described in previous visits had not changed. Improvements had not been effected, but there had not been further loss as a result of bombing raids. Nevertheless, he deemed that further evacuation was necessary "because air attacks were becoming more frequent and were intensifying and, although less so than before, the city was still quite close to the war front." Technical problems made evacuation difficult, but these were overcome. More difficult were the objections of the Russian City Administrator (Mayor Menschagen), who, as Mommsen explained, feared that evacuation would produce further unrest among the population, since rumors that the front was being pushed back would gain credibility. In addition, he did not feel that evacuation of archives was necessary, since Vilnius was in just as much danger of bombing as Smolensk. Only after an hour-and-a-half discussion in the company of Field Commander Röhr did Mayor Menschagen agree to evacuation. I clearly explained that after careful evacuation, the materials would all definitely be returned to Smolensk.[103]

Since the materials from the Smolensk Party Archive itself had already arrived in Vilnius as a result of his January visit, most of Mommsen's efforts there were devoted to shipments from the Smolensk Oblast State Archive, which then occupied the building of the "Abramievskii" Monastery.[104] Nevertheless, still politically important there for the ERR in Smolensk was "the remainder of the Communist Party records in the 'Aabranskii [sic]' Monastery (ca. 150 meters)." It is not clear if any of the 300 linear meters Mommsen had found there in January had gone out earlier, but in the context of his report and a separate extant list of fonds, apparently they had not. It would appear that they decided not to send all: As if justifying such a decision, Mommsen quoted a report of the Smolensk archive director Morozov, to the effect that the Roslavl' and Viaz'ma records represented only raion archives, and hence were of little importance. "Much more important was the raion [Party Committee] archive from Krasnyi (southwest of Smolensk), with countless older files." Extant today among the ERR files in the *Bundesarchiv* (Koblenz) is a typewritten list of sixteen Party fonds that were then housed in a

special room in the monastery building earlier used only by the State Archive. Presumably, these were the remaining Party fonds which were forwarded to Vilnius.[105]

More voluminous than Party records among the six freight cars sent out of Smolensk in April and early May were various pre-revolutionary records and genealogical materials that Mommsen and his advisors decided it was important to save from what they feared would be devastation of the war front. Among fonds sent from the historical archives in Smolensk were 40 linear meters from the chancery of the pre-revolutionary Smolensk Governor, 570 meters from the pre-revolutionary Smolensk Guberniia Administration, 240 meters of parish registers from the historical archive, records from the German church in Smolensk, and duplicate archival registers and parish registers (starting in 1869) from the ZAGS archive, including some Jewish community registers.[106] There were also two creates of Russian imperial autograph charters and manuscript books dating from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries from the State Library (at least part of which was then located in the Cathedral palace), and the Tenishev Museum.[107] The archival shipments from Smolensk were dispatched in several installments, starting April 12; according to a report addressed to HAG-Ostland, Riga, "the remainder of the Party Archive in the 'Aabranskii [sic]' Monastery (ca. 150 meters)" was forwarded to Vilnius on April 30.[108]

Ironically, here, as in several other cities, it was the archives that the Nazis evacuated that were saved intact during the war. Some five hundred fonds left behind in Smolensk, namely those in the former Peter and Paul Church, were destroyed during the last year of the war. Local authorities attribute that loss to deliberate destruction by the Nazis, but details have not been established as to when or how this occurred. Obviously, the destruction took place after Mommsen left with the April shipment, most probably from bombing.[109]

The Smolensk Archive in Vilnius

By early May the Smolensk Party Archive was safely housed in the former Benedictine Convent (St. Iguanas, 3 [*German* Ignazstrasse; *Russian* ul. Ignoto]) in Vilnius, according to an ERR report dated 8 May, which listed in the first place "four freight car loads from the Smolensk Party Archive."[110] This would confirm the arrival of the additional one freight carload send in April together with the three that had been dispatched in January. At the end of July 1943 the Smolensk Party Archive was being intensively arranged and described there with a special group of ERR specialists headed by Einsatzführer Dr. Robert von Berg. Reporting from the Vilnius ERR Office to the HAG-Ostland, Berg listed five major sections of the Smolensk archive, as then organized:

I. Records of Smolensk guberniia (central authorities), including:
    a. Smolensk Guberniia Committee CP
    b. Smolensk/Western Front (records from the Polish-Russian War, 1920-1920
    c. Smolensk Komsomol
    d. Smolensk CP Control Commission

II. Records of District Organization of Smolensk, Kaluga and Pskov Guberniia records of 23 district committees

III. Records of the Western (Smolensk) Oblast Organization, 1929-1937 (central authorities)
    a. Western (Smolensk) Oblast Committee
    b. Smolensk Komsomol
    c. Smolensk CP Control Commission

IV. Records of the Raion Organization of Smolensk Oblast records of 42 raion committees of Smolensk Oblast and 4 raions of Smolensk

V. Various records of CP establishments and organizations
    a. *Pravda* editorial records
    b. Higher Communist Preparatory Courses

c. Institute for Mass Courses for Improvement of [Party] Qualifications
d. Political Division of Machine Tractor Stations
e. Political Division of Western Railroads
f. Political Section of 199 rifle regiments of the 64 Division.[111]

Berg further explained that he feared the archive had not been fully preserved, as was revealed by the careful analysis undertaken by the Polish Professor Łowmiański in Vilnius. The numeration in the documentary folders revealed considerable gaps in different years: for example, from the year 1922, only folders 7, 10-12, and 14-18 were on hand. Without card files or inventory-registers available, it was not possible to determine with what number a given year ends and if additional folders are missing."[112]

According to Berg's report,

1) Professor Łowmiański had made recommendations four weeks earlier for the further arrangement and description of the Smolensk Party records in Vilnius, to the effect that central and district records were to be considered first.
2) The cataloguing under the direction of Professor Łowmiański was to be carried out by ten Jews (earlier four), but that it might take more than a month.
3) Simultaneously, they were checking the contents of documents, from which would be produced formulations of specific subjects for further research. It would not be advisable to go through the entire archive systematically because of the available work force and the immensity of the contents. It would be better to start with the formulation of specific points from which more intensive research could then be broadened.
4) Because of the impossibility of taking subjects point by point for discussion given the nature of the materials with significant variety, we must consider those documents that are the most interesting and prepare

> abstracts of the contents, from which it will then be possible to determine which special project can best be instigated. We will begin with documents from central authorities from the most recent years. The Polish historian Professor Zajączkowski is being considered as a co-worker. We are also considering two or three Lithuanian students who know Russian to go over the contents of the archive.[113]

Some ERR leaders were apparently considering sending the Smolensk Party records on further west from Vilnius immediately, but others were reluctant to move them again. Soon after the last shipment from Smolensk and others arrived in Vilnius in early May 1943, HAG-Mitte leader Langkorf expressed concern about keeping so many "valuable archives from four cities (Vitebsk, Smolensk, Briansk, and Homel') in Vilnius, and turning them over to civilian archival authorities, particularly with the worsening war situation." Yet given the technical problems of dealing with the all-important Smolensk Party Archive, he strongly recommended that "it could not be ready to move before the end of July or early August." He recommended bringing in the German archivist Dr. Latzke (then the director of headed the archival center in Troppau), who knew Russian and could speed up the necessary organizational work with that all-important archive.[114]

The principal work with the archive in Vilnius under Nazi direction was initially performed by two Polish professors mentioned in Nazi reports—both of whom knew Russian well and who became well-known scholars in Poland after the war—Professor Henryk Łowmiański, an historian specializing on western areas of the USSR, and Professor Stanisław Marian Zajączkowski, a medievalist.[115] Given the availability of adequate space and good working conditions with trained Russian-language specialists in Vilnius, ERR authorities decided to continue the arrangement and description of the Smolensk Party archive there, rather than further disrupting the process by sending the archive to Ratibor.

Five additional experienced ERR staff members from the ERR HAG-Ukraine joined the Vilnius Task Force in October, including Fraulein Elisabeth Pirson, who

had worked with the ERR in Belorussia in 1942 and subsequently in Ukraine, where she headed work in one of the main libraries in Kiev and organized evacuation there for the *Ostbücherei*. According to the ERR October report, "Ms. Pirson began her work with an analysis of the role of the supervisory role of the Communist Party in the industrial labor force." An additional Russian specialist by the name of Tamara Naiarnikova from Orel was also assigned to work with the Party Archive.[116]

Pressure for intensified work on the Smolensk Party Archive is also apparent in the report that during November the local ERR command brought in the Baltic archival director Dr. Dülfer from Riga for further organizational work and that two more assistants, Nikolai Orlov and Boleslaus Perlejewski were assigned to the project. They were busily "organizing the files for the Smolensk city raion Party committees," and Perlejewski was "on the files of the Commission on Party Control." Pirson's analysis of Party coordination and control in the industrial sphere continued during the month of November.[117] In November the Rosenberg command also brought Morozov to Vilnius to assist with work in the Party Archive, but his role is not indicated in existing reports.[118] Mommsen had earlier dealt with him as the director of the Archival Bureau in Smolensk, but it is not clear how long he remained in Vilnius. According to another report, Morozov was also working on a study of Bolshevik religious policy in the Baltic republics.[119]

Pirson's "Report on the status of the Smolensk Party Archive"[120] from the spring of 1944 shows the progress made through mid-March—by which time they had prepared content abstract cards for more than 16,739 documents—and provides a break-down of the major groups of records (probably corresponding to original Russian fonds) for which they Germans had abstracted documents:

	no. of documents
Smolensk Guberniia Committee (1919-1928)	3,753
Western Oblast Committee (1929-1934)	1,446
Mass Agitation Division (1929-1934)	174
Division of Cadres (1929-1934)	122

Cultural Propaganda Division (1930-1936)	433
Sanitary Commission (1929-1936)	109
General Division (1931-1935)	187
Organizational-Instructional Division (1930-1933)	266
Special Sector of the CP (1931, 1935-1936)	130
Industrial Division (1930-1935)	263
Industrial-Transportation Division (1930-1933, 1936)	191
Secretariat (1930, 1932-1935)	139
Division of Leadership of Party Organization (1934-1936)	79
Agricultural Division (1933-1935)	433
Division of Soviet Trade (1932-1935)	164
School Division (1935-1936)	43
Women's Division (1932-1933)	38
Supply Division (1930/33)	70
Komsomol (1929-1933)	1,496
Komsomol–Special Section (1930/34-1939)	133
Pedagogical Institute (1919/24-1936)	138
Law School (1930-1934)	45
Materials Regarding Party Cleansing [Purges] (1929)	87
Higher Communist Preparatory Courses for the Western District (1930/32-1937)	318
Institute for Mass Higher Qualification Courses (1927, 1932-1938)	616
Party Control Commission (Personnel Documents) (1929-1936)	3,869
Party Control Commission (General Records, Correspondence) (1930-1934)	293
Central (main) Smolensk City Raion Committee (1920-1926)	1,704
Bariatinsk Raion	485

Pirson reported that the pace of work in the archive could be increased 100 percent through more thorough and frequent oversight on her part. She further noted that there was some duplication of cards and imprecision in rendering and filing, but that she was giving orders to avoid such duplication in the future. As to use of the

materials for propaganda or political analysis, Pirson recommended Professor Zajączkowski's proposed study "Party-Political education and training of school students in the Western areas of the RSFSR," with the following topics:

I. General Duty to learn the reigning ideology
II. The Communist Party in supervisory control of educational life
III. Organization and methods of Party political educational work in
    a) public and middle schools
    b) higher educational institutions
IV. Party organization and its role in the life of schools
V. Teachers and their social background, Party affiliation, and role in the Party-political education of the students
VI. Specialized Party political schools.[121]

From available reports, the most immediate ERR work with the Smolensk Party Archive in Vilnius was devoted to arrangement and detailed file and/or document-level description that would enable them ultimately to use the archive for various anti-Bolshevik research and propaganda publications. However, little time was lost in putting the materials to politically-relevant use. The research work of Elisabeth Pirson mentioned above, which was already underway in the fall of 1943, was one such priority. Zajączkowski's proposal presented another line of ideological analysis. Still another—and politically more important subject—of anti-Communist research and analysis centered on agricultural collectivization and the elimination of the kulaks. That all-important subject proved to be the essence of the Stalinist revolution in the countryside in 1929–1931, simultaneously evoking as it did strong social opposition, as a result of the accompanying high number of deportees, loss of life, and eventual famine. Accordingly, the subject was of key interest to Nazi anti-Bolshevik research.

The importance the ERR attached to that subject is evident in remaining abstract notes and a few stray pages of what was undoubtedly a draft of a major ideological-propagandistic production. Although research on collectivization and

dekulakization was not mentioned in extant ERR reports from Vilnius, a 14-folio (30-page) German-language segment of detailed ERR notes, abstracts, and translations of predominantly top-secret Smolensk Party documents on the "Liquidation of the Kulaks," dating predominantly from early 1930, remains among ERR files in Vilnius. Brought together were documents with evidence of the negative effects of collectivization and details of specific deportations, several of which are either signed by or addressed to Smolensk Party Secretary I. P. Rumiantsev. Further evidence of an extensive subject-oriented effort is a fragmentary "page 15" from a draft essay on the Kulaks reflecting what was undoubtedly a Nazi anti-Bolshevik research tract.[122] These samples of Nazi use of the Smolensk Archive anticipate Fainsod's later analysis of collectivization based on the Smolensk files, which became a chapter of his comprehensive, scholarly monograph.[123] Interestingly enough, none of the documents abstracted in the fragmentary undated Vilnius segment (all of which are cited by date and name of signatory and/or addressee) were later cited by Fainsod, nor can they be identified among remaining files within the "Smolensk Archive" in Washington. The Nazis had no time in Vilnius or elsewhere to complete their more immediate political wartime utilization of the Smolensk materials, and the results of all their efforts came to naught.

ERR Evacuation from Vilnius

By the spring of 1944, with Nazi forces on increasing retreat from Soviet lands, plans were already underway for ERR evacuation from Vilnius. That transport of the Smolensk Party Archive was being contemplated is evident from Pirson's additional recommendations and calculations in her March report cited above. Although she reported that only about a quarter of the archive had been abstracted and arranged by March 1944, in the event of evacuation, priority was to be given to those files previously abstracted (ca. 17,000), as those were of primary importance.[124] These were the files from central Party control organs of the Western District, which

she considered provided the most important data about the whole area. For those portions of the Smolensk Central-City Raion Party Committee (about 6,000 documents), about 90–100 crates would suffice for shipment. The rest of the Smolensk Party Archive, she explained, which was not yet abstracted, contains records of raion committees, with documents of more or less local significance. About 300 crates would be needed for packing these:

> As to the local personnel involved with the archive, above all Professor Łowmiański should be considered for further use in the eventuality of evacuation, because along with his factual knowledge of archival methods also has an excellent awareness of duty. Professor Zajączkowski possesses the intellectual capacity for the assignment in question, but displays significantly less interest and endurance.

As the Nazi retreat continued west from Soviet lands, already at the end of April 1944, there were more definite plans to move at least some of the archives and museum materials the Nazis had assembled in Vilnius further west. The "*Smolensker-Bolschewistisches Parteiarchiv in Wilna*" was at the top of the list in a memorandum setting forth priority evacuation plans resulting following discussions with the ERR Ostland commanders Dr. Nerling and Dr. Speer in Riga. The Smolensk Party Archive was being prepared for evacuation from Vilnius to Liepaja (*Russian* Libava; *German* Libau), a Baltic port on the coast of Latvia. The "archivist" I. A. Morozov was involved in the plans, since reference was made to his report dated the 20th of April. Professor V. J. Muschketow [sic], his wife Natalie and secretary Alexej A. Rozanelski, were also being sent to Liepaja accompanying the Smolensk shipment, although there is no evidence that they had been involved with work with the archive. Also on that apparently priority evacuation list, some of the exhibition materials evacuated from the Tenishev Museum in Smolensk and ten crates from the Karaim Museum in Vilnius (under the direction of Professor Schapschal) were to be forwarded to Riga, although some of the Karaim materials

were planned for shipment on to the Reich. The ERR was also preparing a major shipment of Bolshevik-related library materials—books and other published materials, periodicals, and newspapers from Vilnius University Library (and duplicates if needed from the Academy of Sciences Library) for the *Ostbücherei* (or "*für die Ostlandbibliothek in Berlin*"), and a lesser collection of inscriptions from tombstones and crosses in the Vilnius Lutheran-Evangelical Cemetery, which they considered "important for family histories."[125] Later ERR reports from the HAG-Vilnius that reference shipment of the Smolensk Party Archive or any actual shipping papers confirming the routing have not been found. A Lithuanian NKVD archival report to Moscow from August 1944, quoting two archivists who were in Vilnius at the time, confirms that the Smolensk Party Archive was dispatched to Liepaja in June 1944. Left behind were "15 bundles from the Iartsevo Raion Committee RKP(b) of Smolensk Oblast."[126]

HAG-Mitte first evacuated its offices to Vilnius at the end of June. But by that time, HAG-Ostland was also evacuating from the Baltic. The third of July was already set as the ERR deadline for the evacuation of Vilnius. HAG-Mitte then set up headquarters in Białystok, but time was short in Białystok as well. Most of the evacuated library and other research materials the ERR HAG-Mitte and the Vilnius contingent had with them in Białystok were sent on to Pless. Some of the Vilnius staff and holdings were forwarded to Białystok, although two particularly valuable freight cars were dispatched to Brest. Ten freight cars with Bolshevik journals and newspapers went directly from Vilnius to Pless, while a number of trucks went from Vilnius through East Prussia to Königsberg.[127]

Most of the ERR archival loot remained behind, however, for want of sufficient rolling stock. Many of the vast archival holdings that Nazi archivists had evacuated to Vilnius, including the less politically relevant archival materials from Vitebsk and Smolensk, were abandoned in Vilnius. In addition to the Iartsevo Raion Party Committee bundles from the Smolensk Party Archive, returning Lithuanian archivists found in the same monastery building "materials from the Vitebsk Oblast State Archive to the extent of 30 wagons, the Smolensk Oblast State Archive to the

extent of 4 wagons, and approximately 60 file units from the Political Division of the Western Railroad."[128] Other archival materials brought to Vilnius had been sent further north to Riga, although some materials were shipped to East Prussia. Soviet postwar archival reports from these areas provide details of what materials were found where and subsequently returned to their points of origin.[129]

The Smolensk Archive in Pless

By at least October 1944 most—if not all—of the Smolensk Party Archive from Vilnius was being held by the ERR command in the castle of Pless, which as noted above, was one of the main depositories for the ERR Ratibor center, about 70 kilometers on a major railroad line to the east (25 km. west of Auschwitz [*Polish* Oświęcim] and about two-thirds of the way between Cracow and Ratibor).[130] The exact shipping route has not yet been determined, nor do we have confirmation that the Smolensk archive did go from Vilnius via Liepaja. Nor do we know exactly when it arrived in the Ratibor area.

The first ERR report from the Ratibor area available that specifically mentions the Smolensk archive there is an ERR monthly report for work during November, datelined Pless at the beginning of December. Dr. Hans Müller, who had earlier been working with the ERR in Smolensk and Riga, was then in charge of the ERR newspaper division in Pless, and also reported on the archive then located under his control. Work "continued with the arrangement of the former Smolensk Party Archive," suggesting that it had arrived there earlier. Furthermore, "on the basis of work earlier done by the archivist Morozov a commission headed by von Krusenstjern was working on a study of Bolshevik control policies."[131] Although no figures are given, from the rough quantitative data in subsequent reports from various sources (see below), it is apparent that ERR authorities did manage to bring virtually all of the local Party records from Vilnius to Pless. As noted above, by the time the Smolensk Party records reached the Ratibor area, they were not unique in terms of

CPSU archival materials looted by the ERR, although from available Nazi reports, the Smolensk archive was the only Party archive from the Russian Federation that the Nazis found. And most important, the Smolensk Party records evacuated by the Nazis to Pless were much more valuable than any of the others in terms of their size, number and variety of fonds, and depth of contents.

Nazi Evacuation Efforts

By mid-December 1944, the Nazis were preparing to move the Smolensk archive from Pless. According to a report dated 13 December, ERR specialists had sorted out those portions of the general Smolensk fonds needed most urgently for research in their anti-Bolshevik center in Ratibor (sections 1-23), for which they readied two freight cars. At the same time, they planned to ship the rest of the Party Archive (ca. three freight cars) west to Karlsbad (*Czech* Karlovy Vary). (Note that the total of five freight cars equals one more than the number they had removed from Smolensk to Vilnius in January and April of 1943, but since other materials were to be included in the shipment, the freight-car loads are not a reliable measure of quantity.) The same report projects a total of three freight cars from Pless to be forwarded to Ratibor, and seven to be sent further West to Karlsbad, but it is not clear what other materials were included in the totals.[132] The usual Nazi shipping lists are not available for either shipment, so it is impossible to determine the quantity of Smolensk files sent out from Pless and whether or not any of them reached their destination. No reports have been discovered from the Karlsbad region, nor has any location been found of a ERR research or storage center there, although some government offices from Berlin had been evacuated to that region. The report dated 13 December is the last Nazi ERR communication found thus far that specifically mentions the Smolensk archive.

As it turned out, Nazi German authorities managed to evacuate only minimal selected files from the Smolensk archive further west. Over a month later, the last

available ERR report covering the situation in Pless and Ratibor—prepared by ERR chief Utikal for Rosenberg himself (dated 25 January 1945)—notes that it had only been possible to evacuate approximately 600 kilos of the most important ERR office materials (*Dienstgut*) from Pless by rail to Berlin. Since the reference was specifically to *Dienstgut*, it is unlikely that this shipment included fragments of the Smolensk Archive. Utikal explained further that an ERR representative (Serrin) was still in Pless at that time trying to obtain at least one more freight car. If evacuation was not possible, "he was prepared to destroy the materials there with gasoline and canisters readied for the task." The same report said that many of the most important materials from Ratibor itself had already been evacuated, and they still hoped "it would be possible to take more on open wagons to Castle Banz in Marsch." They were preparing other Ratibor office files for destruction, as was the case in Pless. They decided not to destroy the *Ostbücherei*, as there was still some hope of evacuating it from Upper Silesia. If that was impossible, they assumed the abandoned materials would be "captured by the Bolsheviks."[133]

Soviet Retrieval of the Smolensk Archive in Poland

We now know that approximately three-and-a half to four freight-car loads of the Smolensk archive were abandoned at the railroad station in Pless by retreating Nazi forces and found intact by Soviet troops. When the Red Army arrived in the Ratibor area in the winter of 1945, they identified a large part of the looted archival and library materials that the Nazis had brought to the Castle of Pless. A report by the Chief of the Main Political Administration of the Red Army intelligence service (RKKA), I. V. Shikin, dated 1 March 1945—but published only in 1991—describes the Smolensk archival materials found at the Pless station, along with an even larger quantity of library books and periodicals from Smolensk, Novgorod, Pskov, Vitebsk, Brest, and Pinsk:

> Among the documents are the archives of Smolensk and the Western Obkom VKP(b) and VLKSM, and also Raikom, Ukom, and Volkom VKP(b), together with report card files on members and candidate members of the Party. Also found were many archival materials of Soviet and trade organizations of those oblasts.[134]

A second and more detailed report by Shikin together with G. F. Aleksandrov, the then Chief of the Central Committee Agitation and Propaganda Administration, dated 15 March 1945, lists more details about the archival materials that were "packed in large crates the transport of which would require three railroad freight cars." According to that report, which was published in 1991:

> (a) The Party Archive of the Western and Smolensk VKP(b) Obkoms, dating from 1916 through 1941, consisting of protocols of Obkom bureau meetings, reports of Obkom workers, Obkom correspondence with oblast and raion organizations, reporting materials regarding the composition and movement of Party organizations, reports of political sectors of MTS (Machine Tractor Stations), state and collective farms, private and personal files of Communists, stenograms of congresses and conferences, accounting books of the Obkom, work plans of Obkom bureaus, and files of protocols of NKVD Party organizations;
> (b) Party archives of VKP(b) city and raion committees of [27 cities and raion centers listed with the types of materials found];
> (c) Archives of the Western and Smolensk VLKSM [Komsomol] Obkoms from 1922 to 1940, consisting of protocols of Obkom bureau meetings, files with official petitions and acceptance in the Komsomol, files with reports from local Komsomol organizations, general correspondence, and materials from oblast Komsomol conferences.

The report mentions in conclusion "approximately 100,000 books in 580 crates...predominantly from Riga, Reval, Pskov, and Vilnius"; "...about 80,000 volumes of journals packed in 660 crates from the libraries of the Belorussian

Academy of Sciences and the Lenin Library of the BSSR; and some museum exhibits and other materials from Pushkin collections, the transport of all of which would require some ten to twelve railroad freight cars." The report proposes the sending of the CP and Komsomol archives to the Lviv Oblast Party Committee "for analysis and forwarding as appropriate."[135] A subsequent report notes that all the rescued materials were forwarded to Minsk.[136]

Apparently, the Smolensk materials were returned directly from Poland to Smolensk (although Minsk would have been an intermediary railway junction), rather than via Lviv. No traces have been found in 1945 local Party Archive reports from Lviv to suggest that the Party archives were ever shipped there; in fact what 1939-1941 records there were in the newly established Lviv Oblast Party Archive "had been totally destroyed on site" in 1941, when evacuation was not possible.[137] Even more convincing, 1945 reports from the Smolensk Party Archive confirm that three-and-a-half or four railroad carloads taken by the Germans were returned to Smolensk in April 1945 from "Drezdetse"; undoubtedly the Cyrillic reference is to Czechowice-Dziedzice, a railway junction six kilometers south of Pless. The mid-1945 report further explains that because "*opisi* of prewar fonds have not been found, it is not known how much has survived."[138]

There also is no indication of any more files from Smolensk that were found by Soviet authorities in Ratibor itself, but other Red Army reports from this area have not yet surfaced. No later-arriving shipments are mentioned in reports from the Smolensk Party Archive available in Moscow. A major group of ERR records, in particular operational records and reports to Ratibor headquarters by HAG-Ostland, -Mitte, and -Ukraine, most of which had been evacuated during the Nazi retreat from Soviet territories, were found by Soviet authorities after the war and are now held in Kiev. The Fourth Ukrainian Front of the Red Army liberated the Ratibor area in late February and March of 1945. Presumably these ERR records were found in the Ratibor area, although a report of their "capture" has yet to surface, and official transfer documents to the Kiev archive state they were found in "Dresden"—which is unlikely. As is apparent from the notes above, these records frequently refer to

movements of the Smolensk Archive, but the latest relevant reports in the records from Ratibor date from late 1944.[139] Some additional scattered ERR files are held in the former "Special Archive" (*Osobyi arkhiv*—TsGOA SSSR), now the Center for the Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections (TsKhIDK) in Moscow, but these are much less revealing, and their exact provenance or point of capture has not been determined.[140] As far as is known, no additional Smolensk Party files were found among either of ERR records.

On the basis of data compiled from various sources, apparently—and indeed remarkably—no significant quantity of files from the Smolensk Oblast Party Archive were lost or destroyed in the course of their wartime odyssey. Neither is there evidence of intentional destruction of those parts of the archive that Party authorities were not able to evacuate in 1941, as was the case for many oblast Party archives in Ukraine. Probably, however, the prewar finding aids were lost or destroyed in the process of Soviet evacuation because, as noted above, the Germans found only a very few, and none now exist in Smolensk. Probably also, many current agency records from the immediate prewar years were destroyed, since these figure among current holdings in Smolensk. Because Soviet archivists do not use precise linear metric measures as do Western European archives, and as did Nazi archivists, it is difficult to resolve the question with quantitative precision. Freight-car loads or number of crates and boxes are hardly an accurate unit of measure, because much depends on size and how the contents are packed. Yet even within the realm of approximation, we can conclude that the discrepancy between what was removed from Smolensk by the Nazis and what is now accounted for is not as significant as might have been expected, nor as was earlier claimed by Soviet archival authorities. Indeed even as late as 1992, Russian archivists were still repeating the earlier Soviet archival report that "4 wagons of Smolensk VKP[b] records...in July of 1944 were taken to Germany and then to the USA."[141]

According to Nazi reports, four freight carloads (ca. 1,500 linear meters) were removed from Smolensk in January and April of 1943. According to Soviet reports, three-and-a-half to four freight cars were returned from Poland in 1945. The

approximately 28 linear feet (ca. 10 meters, representing 541 files with an estimated over 200,000 folios) remaining in Washington, DC, would help make up the difference, although it would hardly amount to half a freight-car load. Until the archive is once again united, and until an analysis is made of the German lists of evacuated fonds against those remaining, it will not be possible to determine potential gaps. Actual losses are almost impossible to establish now, since many fonds in the Smolensk archive in 1941 were transferred in connection with postwar administrative-territorial changes, and undoubtedly some files were weeded out as not needed for permanent preservation in connection with Stalinist archival appraisal policies after the war. The apparent loss or destruction of related finding aids—including the Nazi-produced abstracts and card files—along the way may prove to be the biggest loss in terms of potential intellectual access and utilization of the archive.

We do not know if the Nazis destroyed any of their own notes, propaganda tracts, or other working materials based on the Smolensk Archive but, apart from those found in Vilnius, none have been located nor even mentioned in available reports from German, Soviet, or Western Allied sources. Nor do we know the fate of the card files (over 17,000 cards) the Germans prepared in Vilnius, which they undoubtedly intended to forward for use in the Ratibor area and beyond. More significantly, in terms of potential exploitation of the archive by the Nazis, there is no evidence of a single scholarly, pseudo-scholarly, ideological, economic, or political publication or any other specific anti-Bolshevik product resulting from the monumental Nazi effort to evacuate and analyze the Smolensk Archive. Nevertheless, ironically, the success of Nazi archivists in evacuating it from the front line assured its salvation, unlike the other historical archives that they left behind, which perished entirely during the closing year of the war. Ironically too, ERR efforts concerning their archival loot, the Communist Party Archive from Smolensk Oblast—and the fact that they were able to dispatch a small group of files further west—paved the way for postwar American research and for the scholarly analysis that culminated in the 1958 Fainsod monograph.

The Smolensk Archive under U.S. Jurisdiction in Germany

The Offenbach Archival Depository (OAD)

We still do not know for sure when and where U.S. troops found and first identified the Smolensk files now in Washington. Out first indication that some Smolensk Party archival materials were being held by American authorities in the basement of the Offenbach Archival Depository near Frankfurt in early October 1946 came in a secret cable from the intelligence office (G-2) at Headquarters, U.S. Forces European Theater, to the War Department in Washington. Ten days earlier, the War Department had cabled a confidential inquiry to USFET in Frankfurt about the reported "existence of Russian material in a large library collection stored in the basement of the I. G. FARBEN Building in OFFENBACH" requesting:

> A. Confirmation or refutation of report;
> B. Approximate volume;
> C. General subject matter and whether material has intelligence value or value to American institutions such as LIBRARY of CONGRESS or HOOVER LIBRARY; [and]
> D. Present status and plans for disposition.[142]

The secret reply to Washington included an appended one-page nine-point "inventory," the third point of which characterized the Smolensk files:

> Minutes and other papers of meetings of Communist local organizations and dealing with party work and governmental functions in the region Smolensk. This is important as a small scale model of the actual operation of the Communist party and the Government. (Very important). Some of the allied material is classified "Top Secret."[143]

The G-2 officer who prepared the "inventory" of Russian materials and decided that the Smolensk files were "very important" is not indicated, nor has the original of the document in question been found. Understandably, no mention of the G-2 visit has been found in Offenbach records, and records of the G-2 Document Control Section in the Frankfurt area, which might reveal contingent relevant documentation, have not been located.[144]

The Offenbach Archival Depository (OAD), established in March of 1946 in the extensive I. G. Farben compound in a suburb of Frankfurt, was the major collection center—under the control of the U.S. Office of Military Government (OMGUS)—for archival and library materials captured by the Nazis from countries throughout Europe. All of the materials in OAD were "earmarked for return" according to the Army cable quoted above. Characterized as "the antithesis" of ERR operations, the Offenbach Archival Depot "accomplished the largest book restitution operation in library history," with more than three million volumes passing through its doors between March 1946 and its closing in April 1949.[145] The largest percentage of the materials that passed through OAD came from Jewish, Masonic, and labor organizations, and other persecuted institutions and individuals.

Books arriving from all over the American Zone were sorted in OAD on the basis of ex libris, library stamps, and other markings for return to their owners in fifteen countries of origin—for example, 377,204 to France (especially the Rothschild Collections), 334,241 to the Netherlands (including the Rosenthaliana), and 252,068 to Italy. An authoritative source cites a total of 273,695 volumes returned to the USSR, although that figure does not include those books returned from other locations that did not pass through OAD. Over 700,000 books were returned to the Prussian State Library (*Preussische Staatsbibliothek*) in the Russian zone—although the OAD director had been reluctant to do so, for fear they would be hijacked by Soviet authorities, who were known to be making a clean sweep of cultural treasures in Berlin. Many more thousands of displaced books went back to other German libraries. Materials from institutions liquidated by the Nazis were restituted to their "legal successor"—for example, in the case of holdings from the Yiddish Scientific

Institute (YIVO) in Vilnius, which had legally changed its base of operations at the beginning of the war, 79,951 items, including important archival files, were transferred to the legal successor in New York City. In the case of Jewish materials (including ritual treasures) from areas where Jewish institutions and the Jewish population had been annihilated, they were turned over to the Commission on European Jewish Cultural Reconstruction or to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem as custodian. Other Nazi military books and those representing Nazi propaganda literature, along with some archival materials and books that could not be identified as to owner, were turned over to the Library of Congress Mission. A total of 5,957 items were transferred from Offenbach to the Army intelligence (G-2) Documents Section.[146]

In addition to the Smolensk files in the October G-2 "inventory," other Russian archival materials held in Offenbach included files from the Russian Trade Commission in Czechoslovakia; "important" correspondence between Skoda and Russian economic, industrial and trade agencies; secret government instructions in agriculture, industry, and city administration; photographs; and microfilms of propaganda and educational materials.[147] Published Russian materials included pamphlets issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other agencies; books on military strategy and industrial reconversion; books by or about Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin; Communist writings in various fields; and 80 volumes of the *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia*.[148]

The October 1946 G-2 report also noted a major cache of Russian library collections in Offenbach consisting of 250 cases of predominantly pre-1923 "technical books...looted from various points in Russia and assembled at [Gera] (Gora [sic]), where it was captured by American troops in the fall of 1945." With reference to the library collections, the Offenbach "material has all been earmarked for return to various Allied nations in accordance with quadripartite agreements." By the time of the October 1946 report, 190 cases of the Gera books had "already been returned to the Russians," and the remainder were said to be awaiting shipment, that library having already been surveyed by the Library of Congress Mission and G-2

Documents Section agents and determined to be of "no interest."[149] The October 1946 G-2 report further notes that "all books on Russia and originating from Russian sources available at the depot are earmarked for restitution," and that restitution of the technical books originating from Russian sources had been authorized by the War Department in February 1946. Apparently the Smolensk files and other Russian materials listed in the October "inventory" had been overlooked in earlier G-2 inspections, which would have been quite understandable, given the quantity of unopened, unsorted, and constantly arriving boxes accumulated in OAD.

There is no indication in the October "inventory" or in other OAD sources as to where the Smolensk files had been found by the U.S. Army. Most probably they were retrieved with other materials shipped west by the *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg* that were transferred to OAD in April and May of 1946. According to a postwar trial deposition by Dr. Gerd Wunder, who directed ERR operations in Ratibor, the ERR Ratibor office (*Dienststelle Ratibor*) retreated to Staffelstein near Bamberg in February 1945, and then in April 1945 to Zell-am-See (in the Austrian Tyrol), but he gave no further details about the fate of remaining Nazi-seized archives.[150] Staffelstein (O-37) was in fact the site where a U.S. Army intelligence target team reported in October 1945 "fourteen 2 and 1/2-ton truckloads" of records of the "Einsatzstab Rosenberg–Ost." No further description of the documents found at this "target" has been located, and hence we have no indication if any Smolensk files or other "Russian archives" were identified among the ERR records picked up there.[151]

Presumably, the ERR records found in Staffelstein were all transferred to the U.S. Ministerial Collecting Center near Kassel, and thence to the Berlin Document Center or the center preparing for the Nuremberg war crimes trials. The subsequent fate of the Rosenberg records recovered by the U.S. Army is well known. After use for the Nuremberg Trials, most ERR records were shipped to the United States and remained under U.S. Army jurisdiction until they were turned over the Captured Records Division at the U.S. National Archives in 1958. Transferred to Germany in February 1963, most of them are now in the *Bundesarchiv* in Koblenz.[152] From

OAD records, however, we do know that some Russian "archival materials" (probably left behind when the "target teams" seized the other ERR records) were among the 318 cases brought to Offenbach from Staffelstein, which also included many Russian books and meteorological materials.[153]

Some of the Russian archival materials described in the October 1946 "inventory" may also have come from the nearby Banz castle and monastery. This would coincide with the data in the ERR January 1945 report quoted above to the effect that ERR office records were being forwarded from Ratibor to Banz, although the neighboring Staffelstein site mentioned above could have also been the ultimate destination.[154] The October 1945 U.S. Army document "target list" cited above notes "one 2 and 1/2-ton truckload" of "Correspondence files—Archiv Rosenberg" to be evacuated from "Kloster Banz (O-3275)," the former Benedictine Abbey (or Convent) near Staffelstein.[155] Those ERR archival materials were presumably removed along with the other ERR records from Staffelstein. Others were found in the nearby town of Lichtenfels, at Schloss Banz owned by Baron Kurt von Behr, who had directed the ERR Paris office. After he had his wife took their own lives there at the end of the war, "thousands of books and documents were found stored in readily accessible parts of the castle's cellars. Others were discovered in a cement-covered steel vault five stories underground."[156] In February 1947, 150-200 folders (including Hauptamt correspondence) of ERR records from Banz Castle were then being held at the nearby Bamberg Collection Point (acquired November 1946) for transfer to the Frankfurt Document Center.[157] Library collections that were found in Banz Castle, totaling some 569 cases, many from ERR sources and apparently including some from the *Ostbücherei* in Ratibor, were removed to Offenbach in the spring of 1946. Some of these apparently also came from the Convent, where "in the basement...there [were] a number of open boxes" containing "mostly German books," which appear to "have been brought together through the infamous Rosenberg staff by looting libraries abroad." But Army personnel reported before removal from Banz that, given the disorder in which the books were found, it was impossible to determine "which books were looted from Russia or which from Germany."[158]

Probably some of the looted Soviet archival materials—and particularly the files from the Institute of Jewish Proletarian Culture in Kiev and a few other Jewish-oriented files from Belorussia—that have ended up as part of the Smolensk collection in the U.S. National Archives (see below), were among the over 1,200,000 items transferred into Offenbach from Hungen, some seventy kilometers northeast of Frankfurt. As mentioned earlier, the ERR center in Hungen was part of the Institute for the Study of the Jewish Question in Frankfurt, and had received some related shipments from Soviet lands; other materials were moved to Hungen from the Frankfurt Institute itself after Allied bombing raids started in late 1943 and 1944. U.S. Third Army Museum, Fine Arts & Archives officers surveyed the surviving collections in April 1945 and identified significant holdings in the Castle of Solms-Braunfels and seven other buildings in and around Hungen.[159] They were all subsequently transferred to Offenbach for sorting and restitution, although apparently there had been some looting in Hungen. Also, evidently, as will be apparent below, a few of the Jewish files from Hungen got interfiled with the Smolensk files and vice-versa.

U.S. Intelligence Seizure from OAD

The removal of the Smolensk files from Offenbach, along with the other Russian library materials that were earlier "earmarked for return," was carried out as an established G-2 procedure for materials determined to be of potential intelligence value. The specific order or explanation for removal has not been found, but the G-2 notation of "Very Important" on the 7 October report quoted above would have undoubtedly assigned a high priority. Understandably, the U.S. Army was intentionally not being precise about its intelligence seizures, which were an exception to the general restitution policy. Presumably the Smolensk files and other Russian archival materials were among the "17 boxes, containing Archive-Material...sent 26 October 1946," which were acknowledged in an innocuous receipt

by the G-2 Document Control Section near Frankfurt—the only transfer from OAD to G-2 during the fall of 1946 that has been documented.[160] (At that time the centralized G-2 Document Control Center was operating in Oberursel, northwest of Frankfurt, with another depot in the former I. G. Farben warehouse in Feshenheim, within Frankfurt itself.) The OAD Monthly Report for November 1946 lists 17 boxes containing 3,740 items as having been handed over to G-2.[161] On the 5th of November 1946, the Smolensk files were presumably on their way to America, as part of a shipment of two tons (27 boxes) of "Russian Library Material from Offenbach" despatched that day to the War Department, for the U.S. Army's German Military Document Section (GMDS) under the Office of the Adjutant General, first moved in from Camp Ritchie to the Pentagon, and then in Alexandria.[162]

Other receipted transfers from OAD to G-2 Oberursel specifically labeled "Russian" were "33 vols Russian Encyclopedia" on 15 July 1947 and "41 vols Russian encyclopedia" on 13 January 1948.[163] The "4 cases of books and maps, received 6 October 1947," were elsewhere identified as "337 items from the Chemical Institute in Kiev," while 16,823 items from that institute were then reported to be "ready for shipment to USSR."[164] As these notations show, G-2 was regularly checking materials at Offenbach before restitution to the USSR, and removing specific materials of potential intelligence interest for shipment to the War Department. This would explain the decision not to return to Smolensk files and some of the other Russian archival materials at OAD.

The U.S. Army was obviously and understandably reacting immediately to the growing split between the Soviet Union and the Western Allies. Already by the end of May 1945, U.S. intelligence authorities were instructing seizure of German documents relating to the USSR:

> 30 May 1945 (Top Secret): "Request that the following enclosed captured German documents on Russian forces be forwarded to the A.C. of S., G-2, War Department, Washington."

> 14 June 1945 (Top Secret): "Request that the captured documents upon RUSSIA and the BALKANS, listed below, be forwarded to A.C. of S, G-2, WD."

Reference is in the first case to "books and organizational charts of the Russian Army taken from German Officer PW's" and in the second to seized German military intelligence (*Abwehr*) documents relating to the Soviet Army found hidden in a top-level *Abwehr* cellar hiding place. There were further "top secret-priority" orders "to evacuate all important documents from future Russian Zone to eventual...U.S. Zone....Task must be completed prior 1 June."[165]

The extent to which military intelligence units such as the German Military Documents Section (GMDS) were actively exploiting documentation on the USSR is revealed in a summary evaluation of the GMDS collection, probably prepared in April 1946, while it was still based at Camp Ritchie MD (July 1945 to April 1946), before it moved to the Pentagon. The unnamed reporting officer was involved with analysis of "several hundred tons of high level military records" that were evacuated from Germany. Recognition of the growing Cold War is glaringly apparent in the assessment of the importance of the captured German records, by a military unit already preparing for new battles:

> 1. These documents are at present our richest source of factual intelligence on the USSR. Much of this information can never be secured from any other source.....
> 3. Our existing intelligence on the USSR is extremely limited and inadequate and is based on information dated prior to 1940.
> 4. ...Under present circumstances the meager flow of information on the USSR is not properly exploited for the lack of factual background data.
> 5. If the US were to be forced to conduct strategic air operations against the USSR the German document collection would constitute the chief source of intelligence upon which to base such operation.[166]

GMDS was also looking beyond purely military documentation. A confidential list of "Matters of Interest to Liaison Agent," which after a long enumeration of predominantly German topics, also included:

> Information the Germans had on the Communist set-up in Russia.
> Information on the activities of the Russian intelligence services.
> Information on the organization, personnel, activities, and tactics of the Soviet system...the NKVD (or NKWD).
> Information the Germans had collected as to the Russian economic and political moves in Europe....
> General activities of Russians in various countries....[167]

Although the Russian files at Offenbach were mostly limited to pre-1940 data, and contained little strategic data, their relevance to the issues listed are apparent as was undoubtedly recognized when G-2 specialists found them, especially the "Very Important" Smolensk documents.

Boris Nicolaevsky and U.S. Restitution to the USSR

We now know that only a small fraction of the ERR and other Nazi anti-Bolshevik research collections from Silesia reached the West, but American specialists had no way of knowing this in the immediate postwar period. The importance of the Rosenberg collection at OAD in terms of Russian-oriented materials was exaggerated to U.S. intelligence authorities in communications from several individuals. No less a specialist than the émigré Menshevik scholar and collector Boris Nicolaevsky visited Offenbach in hopes of finding his personal collections and those of the Paris Branch of the International Institute of Social History (IISH), a large part of which had been confiscated by ERR agents in Paris in 1940. Nicolaevsky was under the impression erroneously, as we now know from the above analysis of the Ratibor

center, that most of the ERR anti-Bolshevik research collection was in OAD. Even before his first visit, he wrote a strong memorandum in December 1946, which was circulated to American authorities, urging them not to return the ERR collection to Russia:

> Alfred Rosenberg, during the high tide of German victories founded an Institute for the Study of the theories and practices inimical to Nazism, and first of all, Bolshevism. In order to get materials for this Institute, special delegates with unlimited power, conferred by Hitler himself, were sent to the German-occupied countries, who confiscated libraries, archives, and private collections. The author of this memorandum is one of the despoiled; he was the director of the Paris Branch of the International Institute of Social History, which library, together with his personal library, was confiscated in Paris and in Ambroise by the agents of Rosenberg (there were no less than 1200-1500 large cases).
>
> All the confiscated material is now to be found in Offenbach near Frankfurt-on-Main, in the basements of one of the buildings of the I. G. Farben Industries....There are about 2,000,000 books not counting the very great number of various documents. The scientific value of this collection is exceptionally great and not to be equaled in the world.
>
> The fate of this collection has not yet been decided, but according to American journalists who have just returned from Europe, there is a plan to turn over to Soviet Russia all books and documents in the Russian language.
>
> This would constitute an entirely unjustified act. Russian books and documents were robbed by Rosenberg's agents from many Russians who lived abroad, and in particular, from the author of this memorandum who possessed a very great number of them.

Nicolaevsky was among those recommending shipping all of the Russia-related materials from Offenbach to America for a proposed Russian studies institute:

> During the war it was patent that there was a dearth in the U.S. of material necessary to a thorough study of the present-day Europe, and, in particular, of contemporary Russia. Since the war, a systematic study of Russia has become even more urgent, for only such a study would permit a clear understanding of what is going on behind the iron curtain. Only with the help of a special Institute, possessing adequate collections of pertinent material, would it be possible to undertake a comprehensive study of the problems. The material collected by Rosenberg, which is now in the possession of the U.S. Army, is destined by its very nature to become the nucleus for such a future Institute. It should, therefore, be immediately brought to the U.S. and undergo scientific classification.[168]

We know that Nicolaevsky's memorandum did reach the CIA and other Army intelligence offices, because a confidential notation in response to his memorandum from a CIA file explains:

> In top secret memo of 30 Dec. 46, Col.(?) Eunis of ID wrote to CIA that this Rosenberg collection had been screened by WD representatives and material of intelligence value sent to Washington, D.C. USFET thought that the collection could not be shipped to U.S. and that commitments had been made to return some 300,000 volumes to USSR of which 75,000 volumes had already been returned.[169]

Nicolaevsky himself apparently was unaware of the Smolensk files held in Offenbach. By the time of his first visit in 1947, they had undoubtedly already been removed to America. But his earlier anxiety to find his own and the other Paris IISH holdings confiscated by the ERR during the war may in fact have triggered the more thorough G-2 inspections of the "Russian archival materials in the basement" that led to their discovery. Nicolaevsky probably better than many of the Americans in the field understood the broader historical dimensions of the burgeoning Cold War, and like other émigré scholars of his generation contributed to the postwar development

of Soviet studies in a Cold War context in America. If his outspoken and exaggerated assessment of the Offenbach Russian holdings was not in fact the immediate trigger that brought the "Smolensk Archive" into American intelligence custody, his attitudes illustrated and also nurtured the burgeoning Cold-War sentiments in the West. Displaced from his own country by the Bolsheviks for being a Menshevik, and long an exile in France, he was again dispossessed by the ERR as an enemy of the Nazi regime. Nicolaevsky escaped to America in 1940 and subsequently remained anxious to establish a secure haven for anti-Bolshevik research in the New World.

Nicolaevsky sent appeals to several U.S. authorities, including the Library of Congress, about the Offenbach holdings. In September 1946 (before the Russian materials were removed by G-2), OAD director Isaac Benkowitz, in a reply to the head of the Library of Congress Mission in Germany, reported that they had "not identified any books with the name of Boris I. Nikolaevsky," although they did "have eight books identified by name of Nikolskij, N. M."; he added that possibly others from Paris or elsewhere in France would have been already restituted to France.[170] Not willing to give up his search for the lost Paris IISH collections, Nicolaevsky had various schemes to prevent the return of the Russian-related holdings from Offenbach to the USSR, including an unrealized plan for an IISH branch at Harvard University. This branch was to house his collections (and presumably others from OAD), along with others, and duplicates were to be transferred from Amsterdam.[171]

In May and June of 1947, Boris Nicolaevsky made extended visits to Offenbach himself. His "highly confidential" first visit, in the company of a high-ranking CIA officer, was arranged by USFET G-2. At that time he selected "about 10 cases of books and brochures" for the CIA, which, according to the OAD director, were turned over to G-2 for shipment to the United States. And there was another G-2 shipment of seven cases later in October, consisting of materials with intelligence value which were "segregated by two G-2 officers from the approximately 30 cases which Nickolaevsky [sic] had selected for himself, claiming them as property of the Paris Branch of the Institute of Social History." OAD

authorities were dubious about the extensive lists of books (lacking appropriate library markings) that Nicolaevsky had claimed and wanted to have shipped to America.[172] Nevertheless, some materials labelled "Alfred Rosenberg Collection (Offenbach)" were turned over to military authorities and left for the United States as part of a four-ton shipment (42 boxes) "destined for the Library of Congress," shipped to the War Department 23 May 1947.[173] An additional cargo, "Russian newspapers (Earmarked for B. I. Nicolaevski [sic])" was shipped to the War Department on 15 August 1947.

Many of the other materials that Nicolaevsky had claimed at Offenbach were apparently never turned over to IISH or to him, because the books had no library markings, because Nicolaevsky produced no evidence of ownership or proof that the materials belonged to IISH, and because OAD authorities were suspicious about his designs. According to a memorandum from Secretary of State Dean Acheson in 1951 with reference to the materials Nicolaevsky had claimed that were then still being held at the Wiesbaden Collecting Point (OAD was closed down in 1949), those materials that were identified as belonging to libraries in the Baltic states were to continue to be held in escrow; books identified as the property of Russian state libraries "should be restituted to the Soviet Union, as soon as any items in this category which are of interest to the Intelligence agencies of the United States have been microfilmed"; and the remaining materials were to be offered again to "appropriate intelligence agencies" for immediate shipment to the U.S., after which those not needed were to be turned over to appropriate German authorities "for public use" under standardized U.S. restitution procedures.[174] Apparently, neither Nicolaevsky nor IISH were able to establish a legitimate claim for the library collections found in Offenbach. In the meantime, and undoubtedly unbeknownst to all involved, a much more significant part of the Paris and Amsterdam IISH archival materials was seized by Soviet authorities in Silesia as part of the much larger Nazi RSHA Division VII operations, while many of the looted IISH Paris library holdings were recovered by the Soviet authorities who fell heir to the ERR Ratibor collections mentioned above, including the *Ostbücherei*.[175]

The government procedures followed in the case of the ERR-looted Soviet collections at OAD well demonstrate the American commitment to restitution, despite Nicolaevsky's pleas to bring all the Russian materials to the United States. But the record also shows that if there were materials deemed to be of intelligence value, U.S. agencies were given priority over restitution. In a 1985 doctoral dissertation, Michael Kurtz, now Deputy Archivist of the United States, discusses the growing negative effects of the burgeoning Cold War on the Western Allied restitution process, including the degeneration of negotiations regarding the future of Germany and the lack of Soviet cooperation in restitution. Kurtz's claim that "no matter how bitter relations became with the Soviet Union and eastern Europe, the United States continued to restitute all identifiable public property and much of the private property claimed through government to government procedures" still holds true for the most part.[176] But the case of the "Smolensk Archive" and other Russian archival and library materials seized by G-2 from Offenbach stand as a major exception. From a technical legal standpoint, the Soviet authorities can be faulted for never having filed the required formal claim for the remnants of the Smolensk Party Archive. However, this was because they apparently knew that such documents were being held in a basement in Offenbach. The majority of the Nazi-evacuated holdings from the Smolensk Party Archive had already been located in Silesia by Soviet authorities and returned to Smolensk, so why would Soviet authorities have wished to file a claim for such a politically explosive group of files, even if they had known of their existence in the West at that point? Of course, the American authorities apparently had no interest in informing Soviet restitution officers (as they did in other cases), when they wanted the materials for intelligence exploitation.[177]

It is not known when Soviet authorities first learned that part of the archive was in Washington. Kurtz was not aware of the G-2 seizures from Offenbach and the non-restitution of the fragments of the Smolensk Archive and other Russian archival materials from Offenbach, which would have contradicted his generally favorable appraisal of the American restitution process, despite Soviet non-compliance with Western Allied agreements on restitution. In fact, almost all of the

other archival and manuscript materials looted from Soviet lands by the Nazis that reached Germany itself (along with art treasures, museum exhibits, and library books) were returned to Soviet Union from various collection centers in the U.S. Zone of Occupation in Germany. And, as American authorities defensively pointed out in response to a Soviet inquiry in 1948, many more items were returned than were claimed by Soviet authorities. A list of the thirteen major American transfer shipments during the years 1945–1948 and related correspondence was recently published.[178] The first shipment in September 1945, consisted of four railway freightcar loads of "Russian archival materials, removed by the Germans in 1943 from Novgorod" that had been found in the Prussian Privy State Archive (*Geheimes Staatsarchiv*) in Berlin-Dahlem.[179] The list mentions two shipments from Offenbach in June and July of 1946, the first of which also included "documents," and a third in October 1947, said to contain "library and archival material." Restitution from Offenbach on that list totals 265,395 items, which corresponds to the Offenbach figure of shipments to the Soviet Union through 1948. Other books were transferred directly to Soviet authorities later, and still others were restituted directly without passing through OAD. Soviet authorities were cooperating with the OAD operation, with formal visits of reparation officers.[180]

The "Smolensk Archive" in America

The German Military Documents Section (GMDS)

In an increasing Cold War atmosphere, the fragments from the Smolensk Archive and other Russian archival materials from Offenbach that were considered of intelligence value were taken back to the United States for intelligence use, along with the massive captured Nazi records recovered in Germany by British and American forces. Already by September of 1947, the Smolensk files were being worked over by intelligence specialists in Washington. Brief card descriptions, and some abstracts and translations were prepared, although it was clear from their choice and content that very limited data was being sought, since the resulting card indexes (later included with the microfilm edition) were hardly an adequate appraisal or summary of the file contents.[181] The Smolensk collection was being held by the German Military Documents Section (GMDS), a U.S. War Department intelligence exploitation unit first located in the Pentagon, after its move from Camp Ritchie, MD and then in Alexandria, VA. A finding aid was prepared for the Smolensk files and published in a classified status in 1950.[182] The Smolensk materials were not listed in the classified 1950 or 1951 U.S. Army *Guide to Captured German Records*. They were included, however—although not designated from Smolensk—in a more general 1952 issue.[183] In 1953, a CIA confidential GMDS Research Aid, listed them as "Record Group 1056—Communist party" with an annotation providing details:

> 494 Russian documents of the Smolensk area, 1917-41, arranged according to the following breakdown: Minutes, correspondence, directives, financial, Jewish Autonomous Republic, minority groups, propaganda, welfare, religious affairs, party press, industry, agriculture, women's activity, youth activity, party control, investigations, activity reports, information bulletins.[184]

> organization and functioning of the party apparatus, attention will be directed to collectivization, intra-party opposition at the regional level, problems of industrialization and planning at the regional level, and evidences of disaffection as revealed in internal party reports.

In the opinion of Rand, "the Collection was great interest among students of Soviet affairs in Government agencies during the period when it was classified" but at that time it appeared to be "impossible to exploit the documents due to the lack of adequate Governmental funds and the pressure of other duties on qualified research personnel." Initially, the Fainsod study was "intended...as part of [the] Project Rand research program," i.e. as government contract research under the U.S. Air Force sponsorship.[188] Following signature of an initial contract with Rand, the Army sent nine footlockers with the original copies of "524 documents"—the covering letter of 29 June 1954 noted that three files were then missing—together with box 255, which they understood to be the "index," to Fainsod's Harvard office.[189] Thanks to the formal declassification of the Smolensk files, Fainsod was able to hire assistants to help with the thorough, systematic analysis, including Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was then an instructor at Harvard. As Rand explained, "We believe that the Army performed a great service in determining to declassify these materials and make them generally available to qualified scholars who otherwise would not have had access to the collection."[190]

After a summer of work, Fainsod himself quite rightly recognized that he had a "mixed bag" of files from Smolensk. As he reported in a long letter to Melville Ruggles at the Rand Corporation in September 1954, there were major limitations to the "Smolensk Archive." Documents representing central directives were spotty, and on the local level, "situations emerge in episodic form" due to interruptions in continuity. Despite these limitations, Fainsod wrote, "I regard the Archive as the richest body of authentic data on the operations of the Soviet system which I have encountered." As per agreement with Rand, he proposed a two-year contract beginning in September 1954, and at the same time, requesting funding for two

At that point they were still being held with the Records of the Soviet Purchasing Commission (RG 1055) and 200 linear feet of miscellaneous "Russian Records" (RG 1054).[185] Declassified in 1953, the Smolensk collection was included in the 1954 published "General List of Seized Records Available for Unofficial Research."[186] Microfilms were prepared during 1953 under the auspices of the American Historical Association program, which were subsequently made available for public sale by the U.S. National Archives. Some of the microfilms were later acquired for the CPSU Central Party Archive in Moscow (now RTsKhIDNI).

The Fainsod Study and Newspaper Accounts

At the height of anti-Communist sentiments in America, the U.S. Army agreed for a senior, well-placed American academic specialist—Merle Fainsod, Professor of Government at Harvard University—to analyze the Smolensk files. Fainsod's four-year study on an exclusive contractual basis was arranged and sponsored by the Rand Corporation, a Cold War "think tank" with considerable funding from government intelligence sources. At the suggestion of Hans J. Epstein, Fainsod was already examining the Smolensk documents in 1953 for a project then code-named "Boris," sponsored by the U.S. Air Force (Maxwell Air Force Base). With Rand sponsorship assured, Fainsod addressed a formal request in March 1954 to the Departmental Records Branch (DRB), Office of the Adjunct General (OAG), United States Army to authorize a research project based on the Smolensk documents.[187] According to the official project contract description:

> This study of the local party apparatus is based upon the records of the Smolensk District Communist Party. The study will examine party organization at the local level, party controls, relationships with higher and lower party and governmental bodies and changes in the role of the party over the period 1919–1941. While the central focus of the study is the

use of mass terror in imposing collectivization on the Soviet peasantry," which "acknowledged that from 1929 to 1932 the Soviet Union employed 'fierce repression' against 'not only kulaks, but private farmers and, in part, collective farmers,'" which "took the form of 'mass arrests'...and mass exiling of kulaks and their allies to northern 'and distant territories.'" In that case, "the order declared that the collectivization campaign had been won and that therefore Soviet officials and secret police must adopt milder tactics," with statistics about the numbers that could be exiled from "different regions with the highest number, 2,000 families for the Ukraine."[194]

An unsigned editorial in the *New York Times* the following day, entitled "Russia's '1984'," commented to the effect that the Soviet historical journal, *Voprosy istorii*, had published "a complaint by three historians telling of the difficulties imposed on Soviet historical research because of lack of access to Soviet archives." It suggested that "if they could freely explore their nation's archives," Soviet historians might find "a behind-the-scenes glimpse" such as had been revealed in the Smolensk Party Archive held by the U.S. Army—"for example, that agricultural collectivization twenty-five years ago was carried out by pitiless terror against millions of people, and was not the 'voluntary' movement portrayed by Soviet historians." The Soviet reality that would emerge would be "much like that envisaged by Orwell in '1984' than that described by the Soviet press or that shown foreign visitors on guided tours." Suggesting the American government's intentions in opening the Smolensk files to scholarly scrutiny, the editorial concluded:

> The fact that these archives are available to the United States Government should be an important contribution to American scholarship on the Soviet Union. Perhaps we might even invite Soviet historians to make use of this source material they are denied at home. For the Voice of America and other branches of the United States Information Agency, these archives may well be invaluable for educating the Soviet people on their own true history.[195]

research assistants, he agreed "to prepare special reports based on the archival materials which would be of particular interest to the Rand Corporation."[191] By that time he had already prepared a "Selective Index."[192]

As far as can be determined, a *New York Times* article by the Soviet area specialist Harry Schwartz in January 1955 was the first public news that the "Smolensk Archive" was actually in America. The article simultaneously noted that "a leading American university student of the Soviet Union has contracted with the Rand Corporation to spend the next two or three years analyzing the materials in detail." The headline, "Secrets of Soviet held by the U.S. Army," and the subhead "1919–39 Party Files Present Picture of Endless Spying, Terror Against People," were followed by choice gleanings from materials said to occupy "twenty-three feet of shelf space in more than 500 large manila envelopes." Schwartz listed "secret instructions given by Stalin and other Soviet leaders, evidence of widespread internal disaffection and reports of informers who spied on their fellow Soviet citizens," and noted the content varied from printed instructions and telegrams from Moscow leaders, including some still in power, to handwritten notations from local secret police officials to local Communist party leaders." [193]

Published at the height of the Cold War, the article emphasized that the files

> confirm and document the Western belief that life in the Soviet Union is based on endless spying of Government agencies upon the population and each other, that terror has been used by the Soviet government against its people, and that the Communist party is the final authority in all areas of Soviet life.

Schwartz noted Fainsod's evaluation to the effect that American scholars of the Soviet Union acquainted with these files "agreed that no such wealth of inside information on Soviet life had ever before been available to American students of that country." Emphasis was placed on key examples of documents such as "a copy of a hitherto unknown secret order [8.V.1933, signed by Stalin and Molotov]...dealing with the

The *New York Times* article and editorial failed to mention how the U.S. Army came upon the materials, and the Army was anxious to hush up that story. The Army was in an uproar over the fact that Schwartz had seen the Smolensk files in Fainsod's custody in Cambridge in that "his access had not been authorized through proper channels." His access was hastily cleared retroactively.[196] Later in May 1955, when the military editor of *U.S. News and World Report*, retired General A. Robert Ginsburgh, sought access to the Smolensk Archive, the chief of the Departmental Records Branch (DRB) under the Office of the Adjutant General "sought to dissuade General Ginsburgh from making any mention of acquisition by the Army of these records." When the General "insisted that the story would lack a degree of authenticity without making some reference to the acquisition," they agreed on a compromise: "DRB authorized a phrase such as 'These documents are among the records captured by the U.S. Army during World War II'."[197] By that time the original Smolensk files were back in Army custody in Alexandria.

The article and editorial in the *New York Times* "stimulated an interest by various Governmental agencies and others in the 'Smolensk Archives'," and after the Schwartz access incident, the lack of DRB access control and the exclusive access to the files for a Harvard professor under Government patronage were being called into question. There was a scurry of phone calls and correspondence between Rand and the Air Force, DRB and Rand, and Fainsod at Harvard. Initially Fainsod's research was to have been included as part of the Air Force funded Rand projects, and "as far as the Adjutant General's Office is concerned...the loan of the records to Dr. Fainsod at Harvard had been based on Rand's representation that the research was USAF sponsored. Otherwise, it would have been contrary to policy to allow the original records to be loaned even though access on the premises was authorized."[198] Presumably to avoid further controversy, Rand decided to shift the project "to private foundation sponsorship rather than that of the Government."[199] Accordingly, the Army refused Fainsod's request to keep the original Smolensk files in Cambridge, but the Rand Corporation arranged for photostatic copies from the microfilms, assuring Fainsod that the copies would be "as legible as the originals."[200] Other

journalists were scrambling for access, but by early February the Army wanted to "avoid clearing any other individuals for access to these records while on loan, particularly in view of the fact that they were being recalled from Harvard and could be made available at the DRB on their return."[201]

After the Smolensk files were safely back in Alexandria, the first British correspondent, David Floyd, was given access, with a resulting series in the *London Daily Telegraph & Morning Post*—"'1984' in Real Life: How Russia is Ruled," revealing how the Communist Party operates "behind a most efficient security barrier," in "the dictatorship of fear," with "the horrors of the Communists' attack on the peasants," and featuring a picture of "N. S. Khruschev [sic], who to-day faces the same problems of peasant resistance as did his pre-war predecessors." As to acquisition, the Smolensk papers, according to Floyd "were captured in the late summer of 1941 by the German armies when they reached Smolensk," and, "when the war ended...were transferred for safe keeping to America."[202]

The scholarly thoroughness of Fainsod's analysis is apparent in the ten boxes of systematic notes and document summaries remaining in his papers.[203] Harvard graduate seminars devoted to the Smolensk archive under Fainsod's guidance provided a training ground for future Sovietologists and background for Fainsod's monograph. Published in 1958, *Smolensk under Soviet Rule* immediately became a classic analysis of the Soviet system in microcosm during the 1920s and 1930s. It remains today the only such thorough analysis available based on archival documentation, although later the Smolensk files were used for many other specialized Western studies.

In his introduction on "the nature and significance of the Smolensk Archive," Fainsod suspects that "at Party headquarters in Smolensk, where current files were kept, Party officials managed to burn or remove all important documents," noting the lack of material "of any real significance" for the period 1939–1941. He then quite correctly notes that, in mid-July 1941—the time of the Nazi invasion—earlier records, covering the period 1917–1938, were stored in another building and "remained largely intact." He goes on to extrapolate that "German intelligence officers, who

The Smolensk Files in the U.S. National Archives

The same year that Fainsod's book appeared, 1958, the Smolensk files were turned over by the Army to the U.S. National Archives, along with most of the captured German records, although in official accession papers the Smolensk files were not listed separately.[208] The Army's sensitivity on the matter of their acquisition cited above may explain why the U.S. National Archives has such little information about from whence they came and why Professor Fainsod likewise gave so little explanation about the American seizure of the Smolensk files, if indeed he had ever been informed.

The 1980 *Guide to the Records of Smolensk Oblast*, published by the U.S. National Archives, comments on the WKP designation and correlates the files with the microfilms, but it does not provides a history of the collection before its accession to the National Archives, nor does it make any attempt to describe the materials in terms of their provenance in their original Soviet fonds (record groups), representing the records of their agency of creation. As explained in the introduction, there are 541 files in the so-called Smolensk Archive arranged in eighty archival boxes—occupying approximately 28 linear feet—now held in the original National Archives building in Washington, DC. That introduction erroneously claims that seven files were inadvertently sent to Germany with other Nazi records transferred to the *Bundesarchiv* in 1962. (After archivists in Koblenz could not locate any Smolensk files there, the U.S. National Archives determined that the seven reportedly missing files in fact remain in Washington.)[209]

As Fainsod noticed, the files are in fact "a rather random selection" from many different fonds. The so-called "Smolensk Archive" is thus in a technical sense an artificial archival collection—with a sequence of files extracted from their natural order in the records of their creating agencies, and assembled for specific Nazi research preoccupations. To be sure, documents from the Smolensk Party Archive predominate in the collection.[210] However, the subject matter of the Smolensk files as such does not indicate any particular rational intent with which Nazi specialists

discovered the collection, found it in a state of great disarray and made a rather random selection of more than 500 files containing approximately 200,000 pages [sic. i.e. *folios*] of documents which were shipped back to Germany for examination [and] at the end of the war...fell into American hands."[204] It is, of course, possible, as Fainsod posited, that the Smolensk files now in Washington were in fact removed from Smolensk before the Mommsen seizure in January 1943, but this is unlikely since neither von Waldenfels, Morozov, nor Mommsen mentioned such a possibility. Waldenfels noted that the secret police were working in the Smolensk Party Archive already in September 1941, and Mommsen noted that the Nazi secret police had worked through the Smolensk Party Archive before he evacuated it. Although the secret police's aims were quite different, it is possible that they sent some files directly to Berlin without Mommsen's knowledge.[205]

It is also possible that once the ERR had the entire remaining Smolensk Party Archive in Vilnius, selected files were culled out and sent back to Berlin for immediate intelligence use. However, no reports have been found to confirm such a scenario. Nevertheless, there is evidence that some of the files now held with the collection had reached Germany before the end of the war. For example, at least one file has a German folder from the Reich Ministry of Food and Agriculture with signed indication of many users.[206] Yet the fact that almost all of the Smolensk materials—including that particular file—bear original German WKP designations suggests that they were being worked over together under ERR direction in Vilnius, where we know from earlier-cited reports the Nazis were having them arranged and abstracted for anti-Bolshevik purposes.[207] Many of the files bear two different WKP numbers, suggesting they were rearranged at some point—under American auspices. Perhaps the Nazis intended a multi-faceted study (similar to the done later by Fainsod) using the 20,000 or more files they had sorted in Vilnius and took on to the Ratibor area, but they were forced to make a hasty selection for removal westward. Certainly, among the Smolensk files that ended up in Washington are many of scant or marginal importance.

Russian documents mentioned above as being held in Offenbach (and which is also still in Washington) or that they came to the Army documents unit (GMDS) from different sources.[212] In preparation for their return to Russia in an official presentation, new American acid-free folders were recently added for all of the files.

Most important, and apparently not recognized previously, is the fact that five to ten percent of the so-called Smolensk Archive did not come from in the Party Archive of Smolensk Oblast.[213] Neither Fainsod nor other researchers noted that some documents have been added from other sources. When Fainsod first worked with the original files, however, while they were still in U.S. Army custody, the Army sent him only 524, suggesting others were added to the collection later; possibly in processing after the materials reached the U.S. National Archives. Some of the displaced fragments were probably intermixed with the Smolensk files in the course of their odyssey, and other documents were apparently added to the collection after it came into American custody. For example, one later document is stamped as "Joint U.S. and British Property—MIRS," designating its accession by the Military Intelligence Research Section, a joint British-American unit that functioned with offices in London and Washington from May 1943 through July 1945. The document—a mimeographed Russian-language anti-Soviet Nazi propaganda tract dating from the summer of 1943, with a MIRS stamp on the first and last page—shares a file folder with an August 1922 issue of a Homel' (Belorussia) Guberniia Communist Party Newspaper, including a penciled note indicating interest in the celebration of "Kornilov Days" in Mogilev. The latter document is presumably of Belorussian provenance, but neither of them came from Smolensk Party files.[214]

One file containing posters has two dating from 1931 the backs of which had been used for posting announcements of lectures, while other Soviet anti-Nazi war propaganda posters in the same file date from July 1941. And the same file contains a school notebook with notes (dated November–December 1940) on lectures on Marxism-Leninism (WKP 479). Another German "Leitz" folder (dated 2.VII.1943) contains anti-fascist photographs and cartoons, including one of the bank robbers

would have selected these particular documents for urgent dispatch westward early in the war, or for exceptional preservation and further research near the end of the war when they would only have had the chance to evacuate a limited number of boxes from Silesia during their retreat. For example, included are some miscellaneous fragmentary account registers of no seeming political interest (WKP 491–494). One file, probably only included in the shipment by accident, contains a single inconsequential receipt (*uchetnaia kartochka*) together with fifty blank receipt cards of the same type (WKP 461). Nor is any logic in the present arrangement of files in most instances, although that could have been the fault of American intelligence analysts, who were probably responsible for renumbering, rather than the Nazis.

Although Fainsod was unaware of the facts of the Nazi seizure and the odyssey of the archive, he nonetheless was quite correct in noting the "random" character of the files. After Mommsen turned the materials over to the ERR, their Nazi and later American anti-Soviet exploiters had no concern for preserving the documents in their order of creation. None of the files are now sewn together or attached to their folders—as is the normal practice in Russian archives. Many, but not all, of the original Russian file folders have been preserved (together with the official Russian notations on how many folios were contained within), whose cover designations identify their fond of provenance. We do not know if the Germans had cut the files apart, or if that was done by the U.S. Army GMDS in the microfilming process. In many cases, the original order of Russian foliation has not even been preserved within the present files, folios have been jumbled, many documents have missing folios, and in some folders documents or miscellaneous fragments have been rearranged helter-skelter or added from different sources.[211] Contingent documents have not been kept together, and the present file arrangement bears no relationship to what can be expected to have been their original arrangement in the Party Archive of Smolensk Oblast. Some present files that are clearly from Smolensk Party records did not have original WKP designations, but rather "RS" or other temporary EAP numbers, suggesting that they were earlier held with the miscellaneous collection of

from Kiev, Kharkiv, and other cities in the same folder, it might also have come (at least in part) from the Kiev institute. As noted above, many Jewish materials from Kiev were shipped to the Nazi Institute for Research on the Jewish Question in Frankfurt, or to the subsidiary ERR depository in Hungen, and these files from the Kiev institute probably went with them. Undoubtedly they became intermixed with the Smolensk materials in Offenbach, since according to Offenbach reports, other materials from the same Kiev institute were held there.[218]

The Kiev Institute of Jewish Proletarian Culture was liquidated after the war, in 1947, and most of its extensive remaining archive and collection of working manuscripts now survive in the Institute of Manuscripts of the Vernads'kyi Central Scientific Library (TsNB) of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in Kiev, along with other records of its parent All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (VUAN). Some additional administrative files from the institute are held by the Archive of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Some other files from that institute that had also been seized by the ERR in Kiev during the war, and that undoubtedly likewise ended up in Offenbach, were turned over to the Commission for Jewish Cultural Reconstruction by Offenbach authorities, because they assumed the institute no longer existed in Kiev after the war. Those materials were subsequently sent to Israel, where they are found today in the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem. Illustrative of the complications and haste of the Offenbach restitution process, several files from Smolensk were mistakenly returned to TsNB in Kiev—one Smolensk Komsomol file was identified and forwarded to Smolensk some years ago, and several files identified more recently are now being prepared for return.[219] Such findings in no way lessen the importance of the Smolensk files that Fainsod and his students so masterfully analyzed, but they complicate appraisal of the provenance of the collection as it is now arranged in the U.S. National Archives. Simultaneously, they help to explain its variegated and poorly arranged contents.

Once in the National Archives, the Smolensk files were held by the Captured Records Division throughout the Cold War. They were open for public research, and available for purchase on microfilm, but after Fainsod's thorough study, few took

Sacco and Vanzetti in America (WKP 478). Other Soviet wartime posters—obviously not from the Smolensk Party Archive—are found in two adjacent folders (WKP 480 and WKP 482), obviously added from another source with WKP numbers assigned later. Such materials represent the typical propaganda tracts prepared during the war under Nazi sponsorship, along with contemporary Soviet propaganda materials and press clippings collected by the ERR in the USSR. Other files in the collection contain newspaper clippings from different sources, suggesting they came from other ERR press operations, one of which was also located in Pless at the time the Smolensk archive arrived there in the summer of 1944.[215]

One small group of approximately ten files in the Smolensk collection that has no relationship to the Smolensk files came from the records of the Institute of Jewish Proletarian Culture of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (VUAN) in Kiev. These Jewish-related materials, dating from the 1930s, obviously also interested the ERR, and many other materials from that institute had been seized by Nazi authorities in Kiev. Among those now housed with the Smolensk collection are several typescript studies in Russian and Yiddish of agricultural problems in the Jewish Autonomous Oblast that had been sent to the Kiev institute in 1934, and account records, including pay receipts for graduate students in the institute (in Ukrainian) in 1934.[216] Of potential interest for the Jewish question in Ukraine are a collection of 34 personnel questionnaires (curricula vitae) for scientific workers in that same institute in 1936, predominantly in Ukrainian.[217] There is also a library accession register for Jewish-related books (through no. 844), extending with entries as late as 1940 (WKP 489). Its provenance is not immediately apparent; it might have been from the same institute or another Soviet library that was collecting such publications. One folder contains bibliographic annotations on Jewish subjects—some in Yiddish, particularly with reference to the workers movement in Belorussia, which may have come from Minsk (WKP 475). Another file has a Russian label on the folder (WKP 482) to the effect that it contains clippings relating to Jewish folklore, most of which were prepared by a Belorussian newspaper clipping bureau in Minsk (1936–February 1938) with notations in Yiddish; but since there are also clippings

decided to postpone further discussion of the matter until after completion of the German restitution program then underway.[222] By February 1963, however, Archivist of the U.S. Wayne C. Grover raised the matter formally with the appropriate U.S. Army and State Department authorities. In a formal letter, he explained:

> [now that] the Japanese records have been restituted and restitution of the German materials is almost complete...it has become more embarrassing for the United States to fail to act on the Russian records. This is particularly true concerning the Smolensk records which have been declassified and microfilmed and are open to use by American students.
> I suggest that the question of the restitution of the Smolensk records should be seriously considered.[223]

In March 1963, formal approval came to the U.S. National Archives to the effect that "the Department of State would have no objection to the return of the Smolensk records that were among the captured German archives."[224] The Adjutant General's Office simultaneously requested the Department of State to arrange the return with Soviet authorities. When "a Russian archives official...accompanied the Soviet delegation to the UN General Assembly meeting in New York" and the State Department learned of his desired visit to the National Archives, the Archivist of the United States made it clear that they were prepared "to return the Smolensk CPSU archives."[225] The later sequence of events from the American side has not been found in official U.S. National Archives records, although a memorandum in an administrative file in the Captured Records Division, notes that in the same year, when a U.S. archivist offered to show a visiting Soviet official the original Smolensk files, the Soviet official showed no interest.[226]

American archival authorities remained anxious in that period to return the Smolensk records, and continued to raise the issue with their Soviet counterparts at international archival gatherings, but at that point it was Soviet Cold War attitudes and intransigence that were to be blamed for the non-restitution. Thanks to newly

advantage of their riches, as was pointed out in the introduction to the 1980 National Archives *Guide*. The Central Intelligence Agency, however, continued to "exploit" the files, at least during the period 1969–1971, as is evident from a series of translated and detailed summary analysis of selected documents on a variety of topics from the 1920s and 1930s, along with other photostatic copies, remaining in CIA records.[220]

More recently, in 1988, J. Arch Getty pointed out the potential source value of the "Smolensk Archive" and its contents, listing the many published studies based on its files, but he did not pursue the matter of its provenance or present arrangement. His article was republished in Russian translation in Moscow. As to the history of the archive, Getty, following Fainsod, suggests that the Smolensk files were found in July 1941 by the "invading German army units" and "taken back to Germany, where in 1945 they were found again, this time by the advancing American Army."[221] We now know that such a simple scenario hardly represents the facts. We also know that the major part of the archive was found by Soviet forces in Silesia and returned to Smolensk. Hence, obviously, the randomly selected files remaining in Washington are only a small part of the local CPSU records that the Nazis seized from Smolensk in 1943. But that does not lessen their impact on Western knowledge and understanding of the Soviet system, largely thanks to the Fainsod analysis.

The Politics of Restitution

After the appearance of Fainsod's book, Soviet archival authorities took considerable interest in the Smolensk Archive in Washington. Following a report from the 1961 Round Table of the International Council on Archives (ICA) in Warsaw, where there had been a direct Soviet inquiry about its possible return, the Archivist of the U.S., instigated discussions about restitution with U.S. Army authorities. Initially it was

1960s, were aired at a U.S. National Archives conference in 1968 and the conference proceedings, published in 1974.[228] Since the conference was concentrating on German records, the issue of the Smolensk Archive was not raised. Interestingly enough, Dr. Wolfgang Mommsen took part in that Washington conference as President of the West German *Bundesarchiv* and expressed gratitude for the American restitution of captured German records. When the issue of Nazi seizure of other enemy records was raised in discussion, Mommsen himself did not answer, although an American colleague, Ernst Posner, responded briefly on his behalf noting that the subject had not been studied.[229]

The fame and significance of the "Smolensk Archive" lies in the fact that is was the only group of Party files to have reached the West, and as such it has become a Cold War symbol. Now that similar archives are open to researchers throughout the former Soviet Union, it is time for it to be returned home. After August 1991, when former Communist Party archives were officially transferred to the authority of the Committee for Archival Affairs of the Russian Federation (Roskomarkhiv) by presidential decree, Russian archivists were ready more openly to request the return of the Smolensk Archive, as they did on several occasions.

In March 1992, then Archivist of the United States, Don Wilson, wrote an official letter to Roskomarkhiv Chairman R. G. Pikhoia agreeing to the restitution of those portions of the Smolensk Party Archive now held in the U.S. National Archives, since "the most propitious time for their return...has now arrived." Such an agreement for the return to Russia was symbolic of new post-Cold War attitudes and political normalization. For example, during that same spring, Rosarkhiv Chairman Pikhoia promised the Dutch that their archives captured by the Nazis and long held in Moscow would likewise be returned, and an official agreement with The Netherlands to that effect was signed. Restitution agreements were likewise signed with other countries, once that extent of European archives remaining in Moscow became known. Wilson suggested that an appropriate occasion for the formal transfer would be the summit meeting in June in Washington, DC, with "our respective presidents to participate in a ceremony, here at the National Archives."[230]

opened CPSU Central Committee records, the Soviet position can now be clarified. In a move that their successors undoubtedly regret today, Soviet archival authorities rejected American proposals and preferred not even to admit that the "Smolensk Archive" contained original documents. In July 1965 Glavarkhiv chief G. A. Belov reported to the CPSU Central Committee that Acting Archivist of the USA Robert H. Bahmer had recommended to him personally "that if the USSR were to make an official request for the return of the Smolensk Archive, undoubtedly the State Department would be prepared to resolve the matter favorably."

Belov, to the contrary, recommended to the Central Committee against such a demarche and in reporting the American offer, interpreted Bahmer's suggestion with a typical Cold War mentality:

> Among the documentary materials of the Oblast Party Archive...are telegrams and other documents of CPSU leadership...materials on the effects of collectivization, on operational organs of the NKVD and others...including testimony of tolerated errors in collectivization procedures and extensive repression and brutality.
>
> An official petition by the Soviet Union to the State Department could be used in the USA as an official recognition of the authenticity of those documentary materials, and thus even contribute to falsified display in public exhibits and further published utilization with the aim of anti-Soviet propaganda and hence appear to substantiate concrete examples of events which took place during the 1930s.
>
> In this connection, GAU recommends that it is not appropriate at the present time to raise with the State Department the question of the return of the Smolensk Archive, and further especially because it currently presents no special practical value.
>
> The Ministry of Foreign Affairs agrees in this matter.[227]

General U.S. policies and procedures with regard to *Captured German and Related Records*, together with a discussion of their utilization by American intelligence authorities and the return of the German records to West Germany in the

matter into the U.S. Senate Record and had the support of the entire Senate in his appeal that the Schneersohn Collection be transferred to the Lubavichi heirs in Brooklyn.[233] The return of the Smolensk Archive was thereby halted by the U.S. Senate against the advice of the U.S. Department of State and the National Archives. As of early 1995, it is still being held up by the Vice President of the United States.[234]

On the Russian side, the Schneersohn heirs have been turned down in their appeal to a Russian court, and the Russian Parliament refused to grant special permission for export of the collection. One duplicate book from the collection was presented to Vice President Gore during his visit to Moscow in 1993, and President Clinton carried seven books on inter-library loan to the Library of Congress in January 1994. The Vice President's office is still actively engaged and following the matter, while diplomatic pressure and negotiations continue. Meanwhile, as a compromise solution in Moscow, the Russian State Library agreed to transfer the collection to a special Center for Oriental Languages, but local politics have thus far blocked the acquisition of an appropriate building.[235] The Hasidic synagogue, which at one point had been proposed as an alternative Moscow home for the collection, was burned in an as yet undiagnosed fire in the fall of 1993.

Curiously, there is a substantive link between the two collections: one file in the "Smolensk Archive" describes Jewish-related activities in the 1930s in Lubavachi, the ancestral home of the Schneersohn Collection. The reports reveal the ugly anti-Semitism that persisted there under the Soviet system and the attempt to eradicate the memory of the Jewish community in the area.[236] The Ministry of Culture considered a proposal to establish a memorial to the Schneersohn Hasidic community in Lubavichi and restore the collection to a local museum. But the official group that visited Lubavichi decided that the village as it remains today would not be an appropriate site for such a cultural center.

Obviously, the political linkage of these two claims is inappropriate from an international legal perspective, because the Smolensk Archive involves the Nazi-plundered state property of an American wartime ally. The archive would have

The transfer was to coincide with the high-level exhibit of "Revelations from Russian Archives" at the Library of Congress, symbolizing the opening of archival records similar to the Smolensk files throughout the Russian Federation were now available for public research by foreign specialists as well as Russians. Many documents exhibited openly in Washington at that time were much more damaging to the Communist Party image than any similar documents among the Smolensk files.

Unfortunately, however, the promised return of the Smolensk Archive to Russia did not take place at the June 1992 Summit. Politics came into play. Restitution was halted as a result of political linkage of the Smolensk Archive in the U.S. Congress to the unresolved claim for the return of the Schneersohn Collection of Hebrew and Yiddish books and manuscripts held in the Russian State Library (former Lenin Library) in Moscow. The Schneersohn Collection originally belonged to the Jewish Habad Hassidim community in the town of Lubavichi, which coincidentally is now located in Smolensk Oblast (earlier part of the pre-revolutionary Mogilev Guberniia). During the First World War, that collection was evacuated to Moscow and was left in a Moscow warehouse, when its owners fled the country in 1918. Nationalized after the Revolution under Soviet decrees, along with all other remaining collections from religious and other organizations and private individuals, the Schneersohn Collection was held for many years under wraps and uncatalogued in the Lenin Library.[231]

For the last few years, the Schneersohn heirs of the Lubavichi Hasidic community now resident in Brooklyn, New York, have been actively demanding the return of their collection and conducting an exceedingly aggressive campaign in Moscow. Their Moscow campaign was highlighted by forced entry into the library and a candlelight vigil with chanting in the reading room of the Manuscript Division. Such activities, which incidently would never be tolerated by security police in the Library of Congress, in turn escalated strong anti-Semitic reactions, and parallel demands for the return of Orthodox and other private collection nationalized by the Soviet regime, all of which has complicated a possible compromise solution.[232] In March 1992 Vice President Gore (then Senator from Tennessee) read a report on the

by predecessor regimes and that are now held in state archives, libraries, museums, or other repositories. Similar normative regulations regarding the Russian national archival legacy were enacted in the July 1993 with the passage of the "Law on the Archival Fond of the Russian Federation and Archives," which would be applicable to the manuscript parts of the Schneersohn collection. The definition of such manuscripts as part of the Archival Heritage of the Russian Federation were further elaborated in a Russian Presidential Decree on Archives in March 1994.

Hence rendition of the Schneersohn Collection to the family heirs in Brooklyn of even a few symbolic volumes would set a precedent that is completely out of keeping with present Russian laws, and with state archival, library, and general cultural policies. It would further appear to favor Jewish over Russian Orthodox pretensions to nationalized manuscript and book collections in the State Library of Russia, and could hence escalate the spiral of anti-Semitism and Russian nationalist reaction. Yet at least for the printed parts of the Schneersohn Collection, an exchange of duplicate books without Schneersohn inscriptions for those books with signed inscriptions, as proposed by the American side, might be a compromise solution to the current impasse. While the general issues have yet to resolved satisfactorily in court or in parliament in a new Russian and international legal context, present political factors and the ugly specter of anti-Semitism have unfortunately prevented an appropriate resolution of the Schneersohn claim. At the same time the highly complicated and politically volatile issues of the Schneersohn claim in the United States remain inappropriately linked in the U.S. Congress and the agreed-upon restitution of American-held fragments of the Smolensk Party Archive.

In May of 1994, the politics of restitution reached another crisis peak in Moscow, when the Russian Parliament resolved to block further return of the voluminous French archives that had been plundered by the Nazis from France at the outbreak of the war. Captured by Soviet authorities in Silesia in 1945, they have been held in secret in Moscow ever since. A high-level Franco-Russian diplomatic agreement in November 1992 provided for their return by the end of 1994 (following selected microfilming—for which France was obliged to pay a high rate). When the

undoubtedly been returned immediately after the war, had the Soviet Union not become a Cold War enemy. As mentioned above, most other archival materials and cultural treasures captured by Nazi authorities and located by United States forces at the end of the war in Germany and neighboring lands of Eastern Europe were returned to the USSR under terms of the United States restitution program. The Smolensk files were among the few exceptions of Russian materials held at the Offenbach Depository that were not turned over to the Soviet Union, but at least by 1963 both the U.S. Army and the Department of State recognized that restitution was appropriate, as was again reiterated in 1992.

The Schneersohn claim, in contrast, does not involve the issue of "restitution," since the collection was created in and never located outside of the Russian Empire and Soviet Union and would be recognized under current Russian law as part of the official Archival Heritage of the Russian Federation. The Schneersohn claim thus raises different international legal issues that would traditionally be handled with reference to contracted international archival or cultural precedents: (1) the right of heirs to claim non-state institutional cultural property that had been nationalized under a predecessor regime, and (2) the right of heirs now living in emigration or exile to claim and alienate abroad library and manuscript materials created or held within Russia. Both legal claim and alienation abroad under such circumstances are prohibited under Russian law. The official document establishing the State Library of Russia on the basis of the former Lenin Library recognizes its collections as an especially valuable permanent component of the Russian National Cultural Legacy, and an earlier presidential decree prohibits the dispersal by sale, gift, or any other form of alienation of such holdings.[237] A special presidential decree in 1993 prohibits the restitution of nationalized property of religious organizations to their former owners or their heirs, although there have been a few exceptions in the case of duplicate books from the State Library of Russia.[238] Such measures would legally dismiss any claims for restitution to church or other religious authorities, the Russian Orthodox Church included, of any private or family papers, institutional records, archives, and manuscript collections legally nationalized

> nothing....If we speak strictly about the Smolensk Archive...that small archive, of approximately 600 files...which has been so well written about, that it has virtually no value, neither for our historians, nor for anyone else. Hence, it is only a matter of our prestige to insist on its return. But you should properly understand its value from a scholarly standpoint.

Russian Minister of Culture E. Iu. Sidorov, who has been directly involved with the controversy over the Schneersohn Collection for the last few years, followed Tiuneev on the podium. He was also under question by the Duma on broader issues of cultural restitution and recommended more extensive hearings on the subject. He was pessimistic in regard to the Smolensk Archive:

> The Americans will never give it back to us. We have no agreement on that account....When I was in America, a deal was proposed (I won't say by whom): okay, we'll give you the Smolensk Archive, and you give...the Hasids....the well-known Schneersohn Collection....I repeated some of Comrade Tiuneev's same arguments. I answered that such a bargain, first of all, is not a very correct one, and secondly, there is no equivalence, because the 12,000 item Schneersohn Collection obviously is worth much more than the Smolensk Archive, which has already been completely published and utilized in the work of American sovietologists.[239]

Thus the Smolensk Archive is being revived as a symbol of the political use of archives on both sides of the Atlantic. And what is more, it has become a powerful pawn in the international restitution process. It is to be hoped that the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II will produce more internationally viable and rational solutions for the restitution of archives that still remain displaced as a result of wartime plunder and counter-plunder. The collections of Smolensk and Schneersohn have become linked in another more important way: both of them now symbolize the inadequacy of international law to resolve such issues. International law can prescribe, but cannot be enforced without the voluntary agreement of all

matter was raised in the Russian Parliament on 20 May 1994, emotions were high. One deputy, who admitted that the French materials should undoubtedly be returned to France, went so far as to suggest that it might be appropriate to exact storage charges from France for the million files that had been preserved in Moscow for fifty years—as if France had wanted or even known about the long-term storage, or as if the quoted three-and-a-half million francs that the French had paid for microfilming was not high enough ransom.

The issue became much broader, and the "Smolensk Archive" was again invoked in the political fray as a symbol of much larger unresolved issues of cultural restitution. As a second matter of principle, the same deputy challenged V. A. Tiuneev, Deputy Chairman of Rosarkhiv:

> There is the world-renowned Russian Soviet archive, the so-called Smolensk Archive, which was plundered by the Germans in Smolensk in 1941....Practically all sovietologists in the West were schooled on the Smolensk Archive, because it was the only accessible archive. We all know where it is held....To what extent are efforts being made for the return of the Smolensk Archive, which should be returned to us on the same grounds under which we are obliged to return the French archives?

Tiuneev was emphatic in reply:

> What measures we have taken in connection with the Smolensk Archive, I don't even know them all....We have made representations on all possible levels, but we have not received any documents.
> Now all sorts of international organizations and foreign representatives are making representations to us to return their documents....But now, I personally think, perhaps we should wait a little for the return of the Smolensk Archive. Why? Because that is our only trump card....You reproach us that we got too little in the bargain from France. But I believe that if there had not been the Smolensk example, we would have received

parties involved. The Hague convention of 1907, the London Declaration of 1943, and more recently the 1954 Hague Convention, all outlaw cultural items being held as war trophies. Each of these agreements was signed and ratified by both the Russian/Soviet and the U.S. government, and a protocol to the 1954 convention clearly calls for the return of displaced cultural treasures at the conclusion of hostilities. Moreover, a resolution of the October 1994 conference of the International Round Table on Archives held in Thessaloniki under auspices of the International Council on Archives, specifically condemns holding archives as war booty or objects of exchange. Given the intensity of political feelings, however, professional advice alone can hardly prevail. What is clear in these cases is that politics can make a mockery of international law and resolutions, and that the world still lacks an acceptable legal framework and professionally formulated, viable mechanisms to resolve such conflicts and an adequate legal basis for the restitution of displaced archives and manuscript collections.

The twice-plundered Smolensk files held now in Washington are infinitesimal in comparison to the kilometers of files in Moscow that await return to their homeland, many of which were also twice captured during World War II and its aftermath. U.S. intelligence units removed the Smolensk files from the designated U.S. restitution process at Offenbach in 1946. That was a year after Soviet authorities had already transferred the Nazi-captured French files and many other European archives to Moscow, in defiance of restitution claims which had not been satisfactorily resolved among the Allies. By that time, they had already opened a top secret "Special Archive" to house their foreign archival loot, which was being put to "operational" use by Soviet intelligence and internal security agencies. At the beginning of 1994 there were still as many as 830 trophy fonds in the "Special Archive" alone, by then euphemistically renamed the Center for Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections (TsKhIDK)—from Belgium, the Netherlands, Poland, and even Liechtenstein, among other countries, and more from Germany itself, most of them already under official bilateral agreement for return.

Half a century after their second capture, over half of the French archives brought to Moscow were returned home. But now, while the Russian parliament votes to block the further return of French archives and the return of all other foreign cultural treasures held hostage in Moscow—and cites the practice of "democratic" America in justification—the U.S. Senate has transformed the Smolensk Archive into a much larger pawn, to the detriment of the international restitution process. Archivists and historians may find little new or of interest in those miscellaneous files from Smolensk; researchers visiting in the National Archives are not normally given access to the originals in any case. But their fate has become much more than a matter of national pride or a symbol of Cold War politics. The return of the "Smolensk Archive" to its original archival home could set an important example of America's willingness to stop playing politics with the archival heritage of other nations, and provide new impetus for a more appropriate and professional restitution process in the spirit of international archival cooperation.

Abbreviations Used in Notes

AGO	Office of the Adjutant General, U.S. Army
BA-K	Bundesarchiv, Koblenz
CDJC	Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine, Archive, Paris
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union (*Russian*: KPSS; *earlier* VKP[b])
DRB	Departmental Records Branch, Administrative Division, OAG
ERR	Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg
GA RF	Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (State Archive of the Russian Federation), Moscow, *formerly* TsGAOR SSSR
GASO	Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Smolenskoi oblasti (State Archive of Smolensk Oblast), Smolensk
GMDS	German Military Documents Section, U.S. Army
HA	Heeresarchiv
HAG	Hauptarbeitsgruppe (Main Task Force, literally, Higher Work Group), under ERR
HUA	Harvard University Archives, Cambridge MA
KPSS	Komunisticheskaia partiia Sovetskogo Soiuza (Communist Party of the Soviet Union—CPSU) (*earlier* VRKP[b])
LCVA	Lietuvos Centrinis Valstybinės Archyvas (Lithuanian Central State Archive)
LV ABM	Landesverwaltung der Archive, Bibliotheken und Museen (Provincial Authority for Archives, Libraries, and Museums), headquartered in Kiev under the RKU

MFA&A	Museums, Fine Arts, and Archives, (Division of SHAFE and OMGUS)
OAD	Offenbach Archival Depot, Offenbach, Germany, Restitution Division (OMGUS)
OMGUS	United States Office of Military Government for Germany
RKU	Reichskommisariat Ukraine (Reich Commissariat of Ukraine), headquartered in Rovno
RMbO	Reichsministerium für die besetzten Ostgebiete (Reich Ministry for Occupied Eastern Territories [i.e. in the USSR]
RSHA	Reichssicherheitshauptamt (Reich Security Headquarters)
RTsKhIDNI	Rossiiskii tsentr khraneniia i izucheniia dokumentov noveishei istorii (Russian Center for the Preservation and Study of Documents on Modern History), Moscow (*formerly* TsPA, Central Party Archive)
SHAFE	Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Forces, European Command
SVAG	Sovetskaia voennaia administratisiia v Germanii (Soviet Military Administration in Germany)
TsDAHO	Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi arkhiv hromads'kykh ob'ednan' Ukraina (Central State Archive of Societal Organizations of Ukraine), Kiev (*formerly* TsPA pry TsK KPU)
TsDAVO	Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchykh organiv vlady ta upravlinnia Ukraina (Central State Archive of the Highest organs of Government and Administration of Ukraine), Kiev (*formerly* TsDAZhR URSR)
TsDISO	Tsentr dokumentatsii noveishei istorii Smolenskoi oblasti, (Center for Documentation on Modern History of Smolensk Oblast), Smolensk (*formerly* Party Archive of the CPSU Central Committee of Smolensk Oblast)

TsKhIDK	Tsentr khraneniia istoriko-dokumental'nykh kollektsii (Center for the Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections), Moscow (*formerly* TsGOA SSSR—Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi osobyi arkhiv)
TsKhSD	Tsentr khraneniia sovremennoi dokumentatsii (Center for the Preservation of Contemporary Documentation), Moscow (formed on the basis of various CPSU post-1953 records)
USFET	U.S. Forces, European Theater
US NA	U.S. National Archives, Washington, DC
VKP(b)	Vsesoiuznaia Komunisticheskaia Partii'a (Bol'shevikov) (All-Russian Communist Party [Bolsheviks]), later CPSU
WKP	German transliterated version of VKP(b)
ZAGS	Zapis' aktov grazhdanskogo sostoianiia (Registry of Vital Statistics)

N.B. For transcription of Cyrillic references, the Library of Congress system of transliteration is used throughout, modified with the omission of ligatures, except when an alternate form appears in a documentary title or text.

In citations from Soviet-area archives, numbers are given sequentially for *fond/opis'* (inventory within fond)/ and *delo* (or file) numbers.

To avoid confusion in place names for areas under constantly changing control during the war, place names are given in their current (i.e. 1995) official national-language versions (Vilnius, *rather than* Wilno or Vilna; Lviv, *rather than* Lemberg or Lwów), except where there is a commonly accepted form in English, such as Moscow, Kiev, or Warsaw). However, for historical references to localities officially annexed to the Reich during the war, such as Silesia or Western Poland, citations are given in the then official (and usually more familiar in the West) German forms with the Polish or Czech versions in parentheses on first reference—Ratibor (*Polish* Racibórz), Troppau (*Czech* Opava), Danzig (*Polish* Gdańsk), etc., unless there is a common accepted English variant, such as Silesia.

Notes

1. V. N. Shepelev, "Sud'ba 'Smolenskogo arkhiva'," *Izvestiia TsK KPSS*, no. 5, pp. 135-38.

2. Merle Fainsod, *Smolensk Under Soviet Rule* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958). Fainsod (1907-1972) long served as professor of Government at Harvard University and director of the Russian Research Center.

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

4. See the initial Grimsted studies cited in the acknowledgement note above, "The Fate of Ukrainian Cultural Treasures" and *Dolia skarbiv Ukrains'koi kul'tury*.

5. The first top-secret evacuation order dated 30 June 1941 called for the evacuation in the first priority of "all materials having operational-security importance, including lists and card catalogues of spies, provocateurs, diversionists, members of the police and gendarme corps, and other counterrevolutionary elements; inventories (*opisi*) and other reference materials (NSA), materials regarding personnel of archival organs, and documents having military potential." —GA RF, fond 5325 (Glavarkhiv), *opis'* 10, *delo* 835, passim (that file contains copies of the evacuation orders addressed to a number of different regions). A report on evacuation efforts (dated 29.XII.1941) quotes the top-secret Postanovlenie No. 1811-813/ss, dated 5 July 1941, with similar evacuation guidelines—5325/10/836, fols. 1-2. Specific evacuation orders for Smolensk Oblast have not been located, neither in Moscow nor Smolensk, but the 5 July order and supplemental ones dated 25.VII.1941 have been found for many oblasts in Ukraine—TsDAVO, 14/1/2314.

6. See below, notes 9, 58, and 59.

7. According to the "Akt" submitted to the Smolensk commission on losses during the war (12.XII.1944), 486 fonds with 284,386 files from Smolensk were taken to Kuibyshev—GASO, 1630/2/32, fols. 1-2. A chart of archival evacuations (9.IV.1942) notes for Smolensk Oblast of the 1,802,764 files held before the war in the State Archive, only 120,000 were evacuated to Kuibyshev—GA RF, 5325/10/836, fol. 74. The discrepancy in that report has not been explained. Later the postwar "Plan raboty Gosudarstvennogo arkhiva UNKVD po Smolenskoi oblasti na 1945 god" (1.XII.1945), notes plans to "reevacuate" 300,000 files that had been taken to Kuibyshev from the Smolensk Oblast Archive—GA RF, 5325/2/1313, fol. 5v. Another document in the same file refers to a total of 7 railway cars to be returned (2 in February and 5 in March). "Plan raboty Arkhivnogo otdela UNKVD Smolenskoi oblasti na 1-i kvartal 1945 goda" (17.I.1945), GA RF, 5325/2/1313, fol. 2.

8. "Spravka o sostoianii partiinogo arkhiva Smolenskogo obkoma VKP(b)" (21.V.1945), RTsKhIDNI, 71/6/191, fol. 119-119v. See also A. M. Efremenkov to Sutotskov (17.VII.1945), fol. 115.

9. Nazi reports from other areas have provided detailed and often exceedingly graphic descriptions of archival destruction. Since neither the Nazi reports regarding Smolensk archives, including the Smolensk Party Archive, nor postwar Party Archive reports mention evidence of Soviet destruction, we may assume that Smolensk was not one of the areas to have ordered destruction of Party files not evacuated. See the Dnipropetrovs'k example cited below (note 58). According to archival authorities in Smolensk, no prewar finding aids were preserved, but the extent to which they existed and their fate has not been determined.

10. Fainsod suspected such destruction, as he noted the absence of post-1938 files among those in the United States. Roberta Manning of Boston College has reported to me gaps in records from the late 1930s, based on her recent research in Smolensk. These findings are confirmed by archival authorities in Smolensk, but no reports have been found about the extent of destruction of curent files in Smolensk on the eve of the invasion. See below (notes 78, 79, 81, 82, and 85) for initial Nazi reports.

11. Archive head Medvednikov to Secretary Smolensk Obkom VKP(b) Popov, "O sostoianii khraneniia i kontsentratsii partiinykh arkhivov partorganizatsii oblasti—Dokladnaia zapiska" (1941; with a verification note dated 7.V.1941), TsDISO, 6/1/725, fols. 203-206. The archive director noted plans to accession an additional 25,000 files in 1941, for which, he complained, there was no room in the church building. Possibly additional files accessioned in 1941 before the Nazi invasion were placed elsewhere (see note 96), but details are not available. A prewar report on the Smolensk Party archive by an inspector from Moscow notes that it was located "in Konnozavodskii ul. in the building of a former church"—A.S.

Gladkovin, "Akt" (4.IV.1940), RTsKhIDNI, 71/6/191, fols. 66-69. A Smolensk Party archive report in 1945 notes that before the war the archive was located "in a former church on Vygonnyi pereulok"—"Spravka o sostoianii partiinogo arkhiva Smolenskogo obkoma VKP(b)" (21.VI.1945), RTsKhIDNI, 71/6/191, fol. 119. That church building no longer exists, but was located between the two streets mentioned. A picture of the church has not been located, and details have not been established as to when it was destroyed.

12. According to a 1945 report, the State Archive was still occupying the building of the "Abramievskii" Monastery, while some of its fonds were held in the building of the former Ecclesiastic Consistory (Sobornyi dvor, d. 25) and a neighboring a merchant shed—"Dokladnaia zapiska o sostoianiia Gosudarstvennogo oblasnogo arkhivogo upravleniia NKVD na 1e noa. 1945" (19.XI.1945), GA RF, 5325/2/1313, fol. 26. According to another report, the Oblast Archive had been located in the former Polish Church before the war, but after evacuations to Kuibyshev, the church was given over to the "Zagorzerno" Office, and they needed it back in order to house the materials returned from Kuibyshev. Kruglov to A. N. Kosygin (30 March 1945), GA RF, 5325/2/1313, fol. 13. A "Reshenie, no. 49" of the Smolensk Executive Committee of the City Soviet (23.X.1943) lists the buildings assigned to the archive—GASO, 1478/3/2, fol. 63. Details on the locations of the archives before and after the war have been further clarified for me by S. L. Solodovnikova, present Chief of the Archival Directorate, Smolensk Oblast Administration.

13. The English-language transcript of the Rosenberg trial is printed in *Trial of the Major War Criminals*, vol. 7, pp. 77-85; vol. 11, pp. 444-589; vol. 18, pp. 89-128; and vol. 22, pp. 381-83, and 539-41; supplemental volumes include exhibited documents; large portions are also included in U.S. Chief of Counsel for Prosecution of Axis Criminality, *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*, 10 vols. (Washington, DC: GPO, 1946-1948), vol. 2, pp. 593-624, and Supp. B, pp. 302-365, 1326-1356. GA RF holds a complete set of the Rosenberg interrogation and depositions among the Soviet copy of the Nuremberg Trials records (fond 7445); see especially the summary prosecutor's deposition (7445/1/1984—English version), and file nos. 1758 and 1759, which include references to the deposited documents.

14. Regarding Rosenberg's intellectual background and his activities as *Beauftragter des Führers* in the ideological sphere, see the detailed study with extensive bibliography by Reinhard Bollmus, *Das Amt Rosenberg und seine Gegner: Studien zum Machtkampf im Nationalisozialistichen Herrschaftssytem* (Stuttgart, 1970), and also the earlier dissertation by Herbert Phillips Rothfeder, *A Study of Alfred Rosenberg's Organization for Nationalist Socialist Ideology* (PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963). Both these studies concentrate on the BFU rather than the ERR, although there is considerable coverage of general Rosenberg operations; neither of those works have used records of ERR records in

Kiev and Moscow. See also the register of selected documents in CDJC (some of which duplicate those used in Nuremberg) with commentary, J. Billig, *Alfred Rosenberg dans l'action idéologique, politique et administrative du Reich hitlérien: Inventaire commenté de la collection de documents conservés au C.D.J.C. provenant des archives du Reichsleiter et Ministre A. Rosenberg* (Paris, 1963; "Les inventaires des archives du Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine," vol. 1).

15. See, for example, *Le pillage par les Allemands des oeuvres d'art et des bibliothèques appartenant à des Juifs en France: Recueil de documents*, edited by Jean Cassou (Paris, 1947; CDJC. Série "Documents," no. 4), and a recent study emphasizing ERR seizures in Holland by F. J. Hoogewoud, "The Nazi Looting of Books and its American "Antithesis": Selected Pictures from the Offenbach Archival Depot's Photographic History and Its Supplement," *Studia Rosenthaliana* (Amsterdam) 26:1/2 (1992): 158-92. Regarding art looting by the ERR and other Nazi agencies, art sales, and Western restitution efforts, see the recent book by Lynn H. Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994). See also Jonathan G. Petropoulos, "Art as Politics: The Nazi Elite's Quest for the Political and Material Control of Art" (PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1990). I am grateful to the author for providing me a copy of the revised version, which will appear as a monograph (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, forthcoming).

16. See Rosenberg's early sketch, "Die Hohe Schule am Chiemsee," *Die Kunst im Dritten Reich* 3 (January 1939): 17-19. The Rothfeder dissertation (note 14) includes considerable data about the *Hohe Schule*. See also Reinhard Bollmus, "Zum Projekt einer nationalsozialistischenAlternativ-Universität:Alfred Rosenbergs 'Hohe Schule'," in *Erziehung und Schulung im Dritten Reich*, part 2: *Hochschule, Erwachsenenbildung*, edited by Manfred Heinemann (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1980). Veröffentlichungen der historischen Kommission der Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft, vol. 4:2, pp. 125-52.

17. Hitler to the Information Services of Party and State (Berlin, 29.I.1940), reproduced in Billig, *Alfred Rosenberg*, facing p. 64 (French translation, p. 181).

18. Decree of the Führer (Führererlass), and Hitler to Commander in Chief, General High Command, All offices of the Wehrmacht, the Party, and State (1.III.1942), Nuremberg document 149-PS. A Russian translation of the Nuremberg exhibit document (GA RF, 7445/2/139, fol. 286) is published in *Prestupnye tseli—prestupnye sredstva: Dokumenty ob okkupatsionnoi politike fashistskoi Germanii na territori SSSR (1941-1994 gg.)* (Moscow, 1963), p. 255.

19. See the U.S. MFA&A "Preliminary Report on Zentralbibliothek der Hohen Schule (NSDAP)" (1.VIII.1945), a copy of which is found among the records of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas (Roberts Commission), US NA, 239/11. In terms of Nazi records see, for example, the lengthy historical report on the library of the Hohe Schule by Cruse, "Übersicht über die Bucheinteilung des ERR für die Zentralbibliothek der Hohen Schule" (1.I.1944), CDJC, CXLV-159 (2 copies); Rosenberg to Schwarz (18.I.1944), CDJC, CXLII-199. See also the "Jahresberichte für das Jahr 1942," HAG-O, Sonderstab Bibliothek der Hohen Schule (Riga, 5.I.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/136, fols. 237-241. Weekly reports follow, for example, fols. 235-236. 242-251, 222-231, 280-282, 283-321. See the working instructions (Berlin, 12.III.1942), fols. 433-444, the shipping plans and more detailed subject profiles, fols. 218-219, and the "Aktennotiz" (Riga, 10.XI.1942), fols. 222-231, and 234. A copy of the library annual report for 1943 is found in BA-K, NS 8/267. A picture of the Tanzenberg facility was found in TsDAVO, 3674/1/3, fol. 300.

20. See the details regarding the transfer of books among the Künsberg Berlin holdings to the ERR in September 1942, including approximately 5,000 volumes from the Bibikov collection from TsNB in Kiev, and over 27,000 volumes from the palaces of Pavlovsk and Gatchina (TsDAVO, 3676/2/1, fols. 4-5, and fols. 42-57).

21. The U.S. "Preliminary Report" provides statistics and lists many of the looted and purchased collections found there after the war.

22. Regarding the seizure of the IISH collections from Amsterdam and the Nazi rivalries over the spoils for use by various agencies involved in social research and library building, see Karl Heinz Roth, ed., "The International Institute of Social History as a Pawn of Nazi Social Research: New Documents on the History of the IISH during German Occupation Rule from 1940 to 1944," *International Review of Social History*, XXXIV, Supplement (1989). Roth notes that that 892 boxes, including 776 boxes with newspapers and journals from the IISH were shipped to the Central Library on 16.VIII.1943—pp. 19-20 and 88. This library was not mentioned in the U.S. report mentioned above, although its holdings were found there after the war (see note 21).

23. See the official British report by Leonard Wooley, *A Record of the Work Done by the Military Authorities for the Protection of the Treasures of Art & History in War Areas* (London: HMSO, 1946), pp. 39-40; and the report of the British Committee on the Preservation and Restitution of Works of Art, Archives, and Other Material in Enemy Hands, *Works of Art in Austria (British Zone of Occupation): Losses and Survivals in the War* (London: HMSO, 1946), p. 4. Materials were returned to Kiev, Riga, Voronezh, and other

Russian locations, including Tsarskoe Selo. Parts of the Rothschild library from Paris and 975 crates from the IISH Amsterdam that were found in Tanzenberg were also returned.

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

25. Regarding the Frankfurt institute, planned already in November 1938, see for example, CDJC, CXLII-230. Regarding library materials assembled in Frankfurt from different European collections see the report by J. Pohl (29.IV.1943), BA-K, NS 30/19.

26. See, for example, "Bericht über die vorläufige Sichtung der Judaica und Hebraica in Kiew," TsDAVO, 3676/1/50, fols. 10-13; Zölffel to Benzig (17.IX.1942), TsDAVO, 3206/5/16, fol. 417, with mention of Dettmann and Fuchs as being in charge of the operation; Anton to Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage (25.IX.1942), TsDAVO, 3676/1/39, fol. 2, with acknowledgement of receipt of one wagon in Frankfurt (5.X.1942), fol. 4; and further references to collections sent "one wagon of Judaica and Hebraica from Podol and 6,000 volumes from the Jewish conservatory in Kiev (Pawlowskaja 2)" (29.V.1943), fol. 1.

27. Details on the major shipments of archival and printed materials from YIVO in Vilnius and other Lithuanian Jewish collections are found in ERR HAG-Ost reports—for example, the report of Pohl (2.IV.1942), TsDAVO, 3676/1/128, fols. 163-164; lists of Hebraica from Kaunas (20.IV.1942) and another report of Pohl on YIVO (28.IV.1942), fols. 179-193; and a note that by October, 50 crates were packed for Frankfurt (15.X.1940), fols. 330-335.

For Riga shipments, see reports of Redlich (15.X.1941), TsDAVO, 3676/1/128, fols. 54-55 and Pohl (Dunaberg, 10.XI.1941), fols. 72-74, fols. 149 and 152; (21.III.1942), TsDAVO, 1/128, fol. 149 mentions 17,000 Jewish books to be sent from Riga to Frankfurt and 20,000 for waste paper. See also the report of Schäfer (4.XII.1942), TsDAVO, 3676/1/145, fols. 5 and 6. Another list (Riga, 19.XII.1942) includes 25 crates for the Jewish Institute in Frankfurt, TsDAVO, 3676/1/118, fol. 16.

28. Langkopf (HAG-Mitte), "Monatsberichte 12.43-1.44" (Minsk, 21.II.1944), TsDAVO, 3676/1/171, fol. 347 (cc 341). Other Belorussian collections were sent earlier.

29. A two-page summary MFA&A report on Hungen (inspected 9.IV.1945) is included in the "Semi-Monthly Report on MFA&A for period ending 15 April 1945," Headquarters, 3d U.S. Army, G-5 Section (17.IV.1945), US NA, RG 331 (SHAEF), box 334; another copy is found with the records of the Internal Affairs Branch/751, box 19. See the later more detailed inspection report by the U.S. restitution officer in charge, Glenn H. Goodman, "Rosenberg—Institut für Judenforschung, Repositories in Hungen, Oberhessen," [nd], US NA, RG 242, AGAR-S, no. 1454; that report estimates the total at over one million volumes, but other analyses cited above put the total much higher.

30. See for example, the ERR report on the *Hohe Schule* (X.1942), TsDAVO, 3676/1/22, fol. 174, and the later ERR reports (16.I.1943), CDJC, CXLII-204, and (13.IV.1943), CXLII-201. See also the undated (late 1944) general report (19 p.) summarizing ERR activities to date, CDJC, CXLI-158.

31. See the study by Michael Burleigh, *Germany Turns Eastward: A Study of* Ostforschung *in the Third Reich* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989). Burleigh does not deal with the research work of the ERR, since his concentration is on the *Publikationstelle*, and on more scholarly units operating in Poland rather than the Soviet area.

32. See, for example, the quarterly report "Arbeitsbericht" from the summer of 1942 with lists of receipts from all over the Continent and also the organizations being supplied by the ERR—signed by Wunder (Berlin, 8.X.1942), CDJC, CXLI-156.

33. Will to Utikal (21.VI.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/22, fols. 79-81. On this point, see also the Rosenberg's interrogation (29.IX.2945) in *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*, Supp. B, p. 347.

34. One of the most revealing lists of the studies planned and underway was circulated in the HAG-Ukraine circular report—*Rundschreiben*, no. 9/43 (Kiev, 23.III.1943), signed by Anton, TsDAVO, 3676/1/26a, fols. 204-218.

35. See for example, the lists of writings underway for the ERR in Vilnius, Supplement to the HAG-O monthly report for November 1943 (Vilnius, XI.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/171, fol. 185.

36. For example, Rosenberg to RKU (3.X.1941), TsDAVO, 3602/5/4, fols. 183-184. Reference here is to the records of the Provincial Authority for Archives, Libraries, and Museums (*Landesverwaltung der Archive, Bibliotheken und Museen*—hereafter, LV ABM), headquartered in Kiev under the RKU, which now constitutes *opys* 5 of the RKU fond in

TsDAVO (3206/5). That particular group of records was retrieved after the war by Soviet archival authorities from Troppau, Czechoslovakia, following its evacuation there by the LV ABM, as noted in the report of the Ukrainian delegation leader Pavliuk to Nikitinskii (Prague, 9.VIII.1945), GA RF, 5325/2/1353, fol. 78.

37. A general report by Lommatzsch (late April 1943) (18 p.) gives the overall plan of the library and its operation; copies were sent with a cover note from Dr. Will datelined Berlin ([ca. 10.V.1943]) to HAG-Ostland, HAG-Mitte, and HAG-Ukraine, BA-K, NS 30/163. An original typescript copy with a cover note from Zeiss to HAG-Frankreich (3.VI.1943), is in NS/55; another copy is in TsDAVO, 3676/1/213, fols. 128-144. Another plan for work on the *Ostbücherei*, including a report on the organization of card catalogues with 1,000 titles per drawer, drawn up by Lommatzsch (4 p.) is found in the same NS/55 folder. See also the Lommatzsch plan for development of the library in terms of preparatory work in Kiev (6.IV.1943), 3676/1/213, fols. 166-171. See additional reports (from the summer of 1943) in TsDAVO, 3676/1/213, especially fos. 3, 36, 65-71, 74-75, 82-84, 95-96, 108-111. Copies of two later undated 1944 reports give a retrospective view of ERR library activities, including the *Ostbücherei,* remain among the Rosenberg papers in CDJC, CXLI-158 and 159.

38. One of the first ERR offices (24.V.1943) was already located at Oberwallstrasse 25. Ratibor was conveniently located on main railway lines Berlin-Breslau (Wrocław)-Oderberg-Vienna, and Berlin-Breslau-Cracow.

39. Lommatzsch memorandum (26.VIII.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/16, fols. 170-171v. See other scattered correspondence and instructions about the move—3676/1/16, fols 144-171, with note about one shipment of 6,000 crates—3676/1/17, fols. 90-108, 116-120, and packing lists (5.VIII.1943), 3676/2/19, fols. 1-1v, and 2-5.

40. Lommatzsch, "Aktennotiz" (Ratibor, 4.IX.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/16, fols 144-171, and the notes on holdings sent to different buildings in a subsequent report (10.IX.1943), 3676/2/23, fols. 50-53 (copy—3676/2/22, fols. 49-52).

41. A postwar biography and list of writings by Wunder (1908-1988) completely omits his work with the ERR during the Nazi period, although it does mention that during the war he served with the infantry in Belgium and France, and then Russia, were he was subsequently involved with "a party office for research regarding Communism in the Soviet Union, in Riga, Berlin, and Ratibor." Before he was involved with the ERR, Wunder had taught for several years in Chile (1933-1934) and, starting in 1935, directed the public library in Düsseldorf (*Düsseldorfer Volksbücherei*). After the war he was a gymnasium professor in Schwäbisch-Hall and active in the Commission for Regional Studies in Baden and

Württemberg. His postwar writings were primarily in the field of local history and genealogy with emphasis on the medieval and early modern period. See Dieter Wunder, "Gerd Wunder," in *Festschrift für Gerd Wunder*, *Württembergisch Franken. Jahrbuch*, vol. 58 (Schwäbisch-Hall: Historischer Verein für Württembergisch Franken, 1974), pp. 7-13, and Edith Ennen, "Sehr verehrter, lieber Herr Wunder! (Laudatio Gerd Wunder), *Württembergisch Franken. Jahrbuch*, vol. 67 (Schwäbisch-Hall, 1983), pp. 3-9.

42. ERR report (30.VIII.1943), BA-K, NS 30/39.

43. Lommatzsch, "Aktenvermerk" (Berlin, 5.VII.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/213, fol. 46, with notes on those parts of the library that were packed. ERR quarterly report (1.I–4.III.1944), BA-K, NS 30/55. The last part was moved to Ratibor 4.III.44.

44. ERR report (17.IV.1944), BA-K, NS 30/55; Lommatzsch report (13.XII.1944), NS 30/50. See the large series of ERR reports on work in the *Ostbücherei* in Ratibor during 1943 and 1944 in BA-K, NS 30/55. A photograph of the ERR library operations in Ratibor, reproduced from a collection of ERR photographs in US NA, is printed in the article by Hoogewoud, p. 177.

45. Wunder report (10.XII.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/2/22, fol. 5.

46. ERR report (14.IX.1944), BA-K, NS 30/53. The destination is given in a note in the same file from Anton, head of HAG-Ukraine (30.XI.1944).

47. ERR report (1.VIII–30.IX.1944), BA-K, NS 30/122. The totals in this report come to 343, but it is not clear from the report if all these individuals were on the professional staff.

48. ERR report ([?1944]), CDJC, CXLI–158.

49. See the account of other Nazi archival units and their evacuations in the broader Grimsted account in preparation. More details on the organization and holdings of the Troppau center are in Grimsted, "The Fate of Ukrainian Cultural Treasures," pp. 68-69.

50. See for example the report of an ERR conference in Zhytomyr (8.VI.1942), TsDAVO, 3206/5/4, fol. 305.

51. ERR report (14.II.1944), BA-K, NS 30/22, fol. 246.

52. See Roth, *The IISH as a Pawn*, especially pp. 19-20. See also the additional studies by Roth, "Searching for Lost Archives: The Role of the Deutsche Arbeitsfront in the Pillage of West European Trade-Union Archives," *International Review of Social History* 34 (1989): 272-86, and Karl Heinz Roth and Karsten Linne, "Searching for Lost Archives: New documentation on the pillage of trade union archives and libraries by the Deutsche Arbeitsfront (1938-1941) and on the fate of trade union documents in the postwar era," *International Review of Social History* 38 (1993): 163-207; regarding the Silesian shipments, see especially the latter article, pp. 169-71; Roth was not then aware of the additional sources in Kiev and Moscow relating to the Ratibor center. RSHA holdings are detailed in the forthcoming Grimsted study and the additional citation in note 73.

53. As evidence that such materials were being held by the ERR in Ratibor is the list prepared by archivists in Kiev in November 1947. See the memorandum by Bondarevskii to Hudzenko (11.VII.1947), TsDAVO, 4703/2(1s)/10, fols. 19-20, and the separate annotated list of 38 fonds that were separated out for transfer elsewhere—"Spisok i kratkoe soderzhanie fondov i grupp dokumentov na frantsuzskom iazyke, vyiavlennykh v fonde 'Aenzatsshtaba Rozenberga'," signed by A. Bondarevskii (Kiev, 26.XI.1947), TsDAVO, 4703/2(1s)/10, fols. 33-52. Regarding the acquisition of Rosenberg materials in Kiev, see below, note 139.

54. ERR *Ostbücherei* report (X–XI.1944), BA-K, NS 30/29.

55. Winter report (3–4.VI.1942), TsDAVO, 3206/5/2, fol. 631. Winter's claim that he had found in Dnipropetrovs'k "the only large Party Archive that still remains," was cited in his published report on the archival situation in Ukraine in the Nazi wartime archival bulletin, "Das Ukrainische Archivwesen im Kriegsjahr 1942," *Mitteilungsblatt des Generaldirektors der Staatsarchive*, 1942, no. 8, p. 107. Evacuation of the Dnipropetrovs'k archive to Chakolova by Party authorities is confirmed in the local reports to IMEL in Moscow—See for example, Minaeva to Karabaev (20.II.1944), RTsKhIDNI, 71/6/253, fols. 4-5, and the additional reports from Dnipropetrovs'k (1939-1946) in 71/6/260.

56. Winter (ERR-AG Ost Ukraine), monthly report, June 1942, TsDAVO, 3676/1/26, fols. 37-39.

57. Lüddeckens, Report on visit to Dnipropetrovsk (13.V.–15.VII.1942), TsDAVO, 3206/5/21, fols. 23-26. He notes that of the 1,000 bundles prepared for evacuation by Soviet authorities, only 120 were left behind. His report on the Party archive follows "Geschichte der (Oblast) Parteiarchiv Dnjepropetrowsk" (1.VII.1942), fols. 43-48.

58. Lüddeckens' translation of the local NKVD evacuation/destruction order (dated 18.VII.1941) is appended to his report dated Dnipropetrovs'k (15.VII.1942), TsDAVO, 3206/5/21, fol. 27. Similar orders issued by Glavarkhiv authorities in Ukraine have been found in contemporary records in Kiev from the summer of 1941, especially TsDAVO, 14/1/2314, but destruction was minimized in later versions from 1942—for example, the top secret report of Shkliarov to Nikitinskii (Zlatousk, 5.IV.1942) mentions intentional destruction (14/1/2315, fol. 8), but the summary chart enclosed lists destruction only in Zhytomyr.

59. Minaeva to Karavaev, "Spravka o sostoianii i rabote oblastnykh partiinykh arkhivov obkomov KP(b)U na 1.III.45 g.," RTsKhIDNI, 71/6/253, fols. 34-53. At that time, Party archival authorities in Ukraine were apparently not aware that the Nazis had worked in those archives and that some materials had been looted from Ukrainian Party archives.

60. ERR quarterly report, 1.VII.-30.IX.1942 (Berlin, 9.X.1942), CDJC, CXLI-147, fol. 3 and CXLI-428.

61. Lüddeckens, "Parteiarchiv des Oblasts Dnjepropetrowsk Repertorium des Fonds Nr 1—Dnjepropetrowsker Oblast-Kommitee der Kommunistischen Partei der Bolschewiken der Ukraine (1932-1941)" (typescript, 197 p.) (22.II.1943), TsDAVO, 3206/5/21, fols. 373-582 (2d copy—fols. 586-784); TsDAVO, 3206/5/14, fols. 1-150 (3rd copy). Another copy remained in the Party Archive in Dnipropetrovs'k, but was destroyed along with other German documents there in the late 1980s—as reported to the present author by Dnipropetrovs'k archivist Dmytro Meshkov.

62. The list of fonds (dated 18.V.1943) also remains in TsDAVO, 3206/5/8, fol. 603.

63. Winter to RKU (3.XII.1943), TsDAVO, 3206/5/8, fols. 160-162; Winter report (30.X-7.XI.1943), fol. 182.

64. Anton to ERR Aussenstelle (Cracow, 27.X.1943), dated its dispatch from Dnipropetrovs'k as 3.X.1943—TsDAVO, 3676/1/225, fol. 300. According to a Kurzweil memo (ERR Aussenstelle Krakau), (30.X.1943), the Dnipropetrovs'k freight car was dispatched 3.X.43 and arrived in Cracow (Hauptstr. 17) 11.X—TsDAVO, 3676/1/225, fol. 298; Hülle (ERR Aussenstelle Krakau), weekly report, 9.-16.X.43, TsDAVO, 3676/1/225, fol. 307. The arrival of the Dnipropetrovs'k Party Committee records by rail in a freight car together with materials from the Dnipropetrovs'k Ethnographic Museum on 11.X.1943 is also noted by Hülle to HAG-Ukraine (Truskavits, 15.X.1943)—TsDAVO, 3676/1/225, fol. 308. According to one HAG-Ukraine monthly report the freight car to Cracow from Dnipropetrovs'k also contained records of German colonies in the area and a prehistory

collection from the Dnipropetrovs'k museum (8.XI.1943)—TsDAVO, 3676/1/171, fol. 256—but it turned out that those materials went with another shipment and not to Ratibor.

65. Its dispatch from Cracow in a freight car to Ratibor is confirmed by Hülle, "Halbmonatsberichte 9.-31.Okt.1943" (Cracow, 2.XI.1943), with a copy of the shipping list—"29 Kisten 64 Schachteln und 343 Aktenpakete," together with "1 crate of books and atlases and 6 large crates [*Verschläge*] with paintings—'*die schon im Besitz des ERR waren*'," TsDAVO, 3676/1/225, fol. 296. Hülle to ERR HAG-Ukraine (8.XI.1943), fol. 288— and his monthly report for November 1943 (fol. 268), both in the same file, confirm that the shipment with the Dnipropetrovs'k material left for Ratibor 5.XI.1943.

66. Lommatzsch report (13.XII.1944), BA-K, NS 30/50.

67. "Aktenvermerk für den Reichsleiter—"Dienstgut in Oberschlesien" (25.I.1945), signed by Utikal, BA-K NS 8/261.

68. "Doklad o rabote arkhivnykh organov BSSR za 1 polugodie 1946 g." (Minsk, 22.VII.1946), GA RF, 5325/2/1558, fol. 137. According to Tsaplin (p. 402), the archive was found in Ratibor, so perhaps more details are given in the later letter from AU UkrSSR to GAU SSSR (19.VIII.1957) (which he cites as Arkhiv GAU 19s/129, fols. 106-111), but that document is located in still classifed files.

69. Hudzenko, who then directed the Ukrainian Archival Administration (NKVD), noted at a meeting of local Party archival leaders at the end of October 1946 that "some 10,000 units from the Dnipropetrovs'k Party Archive were taken to Germany and are now in Belorussia."—"Stenogramma respublikanskogo soveshaniia zaveduiutsikh partarkhivami obkomov KPb/U" (30-31.X.1946), RTsKhIDNI, 71/6/251, fols. 63-64; see also remarks on the subject by the Dnipropetrovs'k representative (fol. 98); mention is made of the recovery of some "Party chronicles," newspapers and library materials (fol. 103).

70. A letter from the Ukrainian Branch of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism mentioning the materials seized by the Nazis that were returned to Ukraine was found in local Party files in the State Archive of Dnipropetrovs'k Oblast (Derzhavnyi arkhiv Dnipropetrovs'k oblasti, fond 19/5/110, fol. 55) by Dmytro Meshkov, and is noted in Meshkov's compendium of wartime documents relating to the archive—"Arkhivy, muzei, biblioteky Dnipropetrovs'ka pid chas Drugoi Svitovoi Viiny: Anotovanyi perelik vyiavlenhykh dokumentiv," *Ukrains'kyi arkheohrafichnyi shchorichnyk* 4 (1994), forthcoming. A full list of the files recovered has not been located, so no comparison is possible with the 1942 Lüddeckens inventory and Nazi packing lists mentioned above. At the September 1994 conference in Chernihiv on displaced

Ukrainian cultural treasures during World War II, Meshkov reported that only a small part of the files plundered by the Nazis were returned.

71. See the reports of Bruno Skolaude, head of ERR AG-South Ukraine, to ERR (Berlin), dating from June 1942, TsDAVO, 3676/1/229, fols. 29 and 31; "Beschlagnahmung eines Parteiarchives in Kirowograd" (fols. 33-34), and "Aktenvermerk" (fols. 29-30). The latter particularly notes the importance and uniqueness of the Party Archive found in Kirovohrad.

72. The top secret report of S. I. Kuz'min and Golubtsov, "Spravka o rezul'tatakh raboty Glavnogo Arkhivnogo Upravleniia NKVD SSSR po vozrashcheniiu v Sovetskii Soiuz dokumental'nykh materialov Gosudarstavennogo Arkhivnogo Fonda Soiuza SSR i o vyvoze v SSSR arkhivov inostrannogo proiskhozhdeniia" (15.XII.1945), mentions the recovery in Poland, but does not give details about the quantity or where they were found—GA RF, 5325/10/2148, fol. 3.

73. The report of the Special Archive (Osobyi Archive—TsGOA SSSR) for 1946 dates the transfer as 25.VI.1946, with reference to a letter from Krulov to Khrushchev (30.V.1946), GA RF 5315/2/1640, fol. 82. Copies of the official acts of transfer to Kiev from Moscow and from Kiev to Kirovohrad are available in Kiev, TsDAHO, 39/3/507. The official act of transfer lists the materials returned to Ukraine with a note in its heading that the Kirovohrad CP records were among "the thirteen wagons received via Kiev from the village of Vel'fol'dorf" [sic] "near the city of Gratz and from the castle of counts Al'toneu near Gavel'shberga (Germaniia [sic])." Reference is to the shipment from the Silesian village of Wölfelsdorf (*Polish* Wilkanów) and the castle of the counts Althann, near the town of Habelschwerdt (*Polish* Bystrzyca-Kłodzko), southeast of Gratz, which today is part of Poland, but was in fact part of Silesia. It was there that Soviet army intelligence units located and seized the headquarters and main archival depository of the infamous 7th Division of the Reich Security Services Headquaters (RSHA), with its substantial collections of archival materials—including many from socialist sources—captured by the Nazis from all over the Continent. For more details about these holdings, see the forthcoming Grimsted study.

74. The act of transfer cited above in TsDAHO (note 73) lists 413 boxes from Novo-Ukrainskii raikom records from Odessa Oblast. The report of S. I. Kuz'min and Golubtsov (15.XII.1945) cited above also mentions the recovery in Poland of raion Party Committee records from Odessa, but does not specify the quantity or where they were found—GA RF, 5325/10/2148, fol. 3.

75. Walter Modrijan reports (Cracow, 27 and 28.XII.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/225, fols. 258-259; and monthly report for December (fols. 252-253), with a note about their shipment (fol. 254).

76. ERR quarterly report, 1.VII-30.IX.1942 (Berlin, 9.X.1942), CDJC, CXLI-147, fol. 3. A more detailed report by Lüddeckens on his work in Zaporizhe has been found among the ERR materials in TsDAVO, 3676, as reported to the present author by Dmytro Meshkov, but the promised copy did not arrive in time for citation here.

77. Local reports from the Ukrainian Party archives affected from the years 1945 to 1947 available in Moscow (RTsKhIDNI, 71/6/251-266) make no reference to the return of Party files looted by the Nazis other than those from Dnipropetrovs'k and Kirovohrad.

78. Transcript of Schubert telegram to the Foreign Minister (2.VIII,1941), Sonderkommando v. Künsberg, no. 52, Politisches Archiv, Auswärtiges Amt, R 27575.

79. Freiherr von Waldenfels to Chef der Heeresarchiv Potsdam (Smolensk, 21.IX.1941), TsKhIDK, 1387/1/115, fols. 51-52. The same text is repeated by the Chef der Heeresarchiv to Zipfel, Kommissar für der Archivschutz (7.X.1941), fol. 50. Waldenfels reports from other cities visited during the same period are preserved in the same file.

80. Il'ia Avksent'ivich Morozov (b. 1889) studied at the Moscow Archeological Institute and then in military school. After demobilization he worked from December 1926 to May 1930 as an instructor and then as an archivist (*nauchnyi sotrudnik*) in the Smolensk Guberniia (after 1929 Western Oblast) Archival Bureau, but was fired and repressed in 1931. He returned to Smolensk in 1941 and was working in the historical and ZAGS archives under the Nazis. He left Smolensk in the fall of 1943 (see below). He went to Germany at the end of the war, but was sent back to Smolensk by American authorities (in accordance with the Allied repatriation agreement); arrested as a Nazi collaborator in 1949 he was sentenced to 23 years in prison camp. Copies of official documents regarding his career from the administrative records of the Smolensk archive were kindly furnished me by the Chief of the Smolensk Oblast Archival Administration, S. L. Solodovnikova—including early employment record forms, GASO, 1544/1/1163, fol. 2 and fol. 78, and dismissal form (15.IV.1931), fol. 85. Information about his postwar fate came from a KGB interrogation report in Smolensk, but a copy of the report was not available.

81. An ERR report from Riga (22.IV.1942)—TsDAVO, 3676/1/176, fol. 38—refers to an earlier report on archival preservation in Smolensk—"Betreffend Archivschutzmassnahmen in Smolensk vom 4.12.41," but the 1941 document itself has not been located.

82. Nerling, ERR Sonderkommand Heeresgruppe-Mitte to ERR Stabsführung, Berlin (Smolensk, 17.V.1942), BA-K, NS 30/195 (photostat).

83. Wunder to Mommsen (Berlin, 6.VI.1942), TsDAVO, 3676/1/136, fol. 37—quoting the Nerling report mentioned previously (17.V.1942).

84. See the obituary of Wolfgang Mommsen (1907–1986) by Hans Booms, in *Der Archivar* 41 (1988, no. 4): cols. 661-664.

85. One remaining report by Mommsen and Speer of their August 1942 visit to Smolensk, describing the general situation there and various impressionistic details, makes no mention of archival reconnaissance; it notes that the archival situation was covered elsewhere—"Stimmungsbericht des Staatsarchivrats Dr. Mommsen und Dr. Speer über ihre Dienstreise in das östliche Weissruthenien" (receipt stamped 1.IX.1942), CDJC, CXLIV-428. Coverage of Smolensk is missing entirely in an incomplete copy of Mommsen's later October report covering the archival situation as a result of that trip (available in Kiev with the first section missing)—"Über den Zustand des Archivwesens in Weissruthenien und die Archive in Smolensk, Mogilev und Witebsk—Bericht des Staatsarchivrates Dr. Mommsen über die von ihm von 3.-15. August durchgeführte Dienstreise" (Riga, 10.X.1942), TsDAVO, 3206/5/2, fols. 68-69; an additional copy has not been located elsewhere.

86. ERR quarterly report, 1.VII.-30.IX.1942 (Berlin, 9.X.1942), CDJC, CXLI-147, fol. 2 and CXLI-428.

87. Kantler (RKO) to Mommsen (Riga, 7.XII.1942), TsDAVO, 3676/1/136, fol. 22-22v.

88. "Bericht des Staatsarchivrates Dr. Mommsen über seine im Januar 1943 durchgeführte Dienstreise nach Witebsk und Smolensk und den Abtransport des Smolensker Partei-Archivs nach Wilna," ERR HAG-Ostland, Sonderstab Archive, BA-K, NS 30/78, fol. 3. Note the reference to the location of the Party Archive in a former church, as discussed above (note 11). Two other copies of Mommsen's undated January report are found among the ERR records in Kiev, TsDAVO, 3676/1/136, fols. 84-88 and 96-100.

89. Mommsen, "Bericht (I.1943)," BA-K, NS 30/78, fols. 3-4. The Nazi document mistakenly refers to the "Control Committee" instead of "Control Commission." The 1940 report cited above (note 11) explained that not all raion records had been deposited in the Party Archive by the beginning of 1941.

90. Two variant copies of the German list of 348 fonds have been found, "Aufstellung der Archiv-Bestände des ehemaligen Archivs der allruss. Partei der Bolschewiken," along with a separate listing of 191 fonds of local district/raion Party organizations—all bear the general cover title "Verzeichnis der Archivbestande der ehemaligen Allrussischen Kommunistischen Partei der Bolschewiken" (Bearbeitung des kommunistischen Parteiarchivs in Smolensk) (Smolensk, 29.I.1943). All are carbon copies, bearing the same date, with indication that they were translated by Pastor and typed in Riga for the ERR-HAG-Ostland, Sonderkommando Mitte—BA-K, NS 30/78 (the file unit lacks foliation).

91. Mommsen, "Bericht (I.1943)," BA-K, NS 30/78, fol. 4. That specific inventory has not been located. See above regarding confirmation of Soviet evacuations from the Smolensk Party Archive.

92. Mommsen, "Bericht (I.1943)," BA-K, NS 30/78, fol. 5. In translation from the German, I am on occasion substituting for literal German translation words that more correctly render the original Russian designation of institutions and administrative divisions.

93. Four file-level inventories remain in the same file listing the files in the records of the Trans-Dnieper Raion Committee for 1921 (listing 125 files), 1922 (163 files), 1923 (168 files), and 1926 (231 files). All are carbon copies, bearing the date Smolensk, 29.I.1943, also with indication that they were prepared by Dr. Mücke, translated by Pastor, and typed in Riga—BA-K, NS 30/78.

94. Mommsen, "Bericht (I.1943)," BA-K, NS 30/78, fol. 2.

95. Mommsen, "Bericht (I.1943)," BA-K, NS 30/78, fol. 4.

96. Mommsen, "Bericht (I.1943)," BA-K, NS 30/78, fol. 3. Again the reference is to the records of the Commission on Party Control. According to Smolensk archival authorities, CP archives would not have been intermingled in the same building with state archives. This was possibly an emergency arrangement in 1941, or occurred after the start of the war, since the 1940 archival report mentioned above (see note 11) noted that there was no further space available for new accessions in the church where the Party Archive was housed.

97. Mommsen, "Bericht (I.1943)," BA-K, NS 30/78, fol. 4.

98. Mommsen, "Bericht (I.1943)," BA-K, NS 30/78, fols. 4-5.

99. Mommsen, "Bericht (I.1943)," BA-K, NS 30/78, fols. 5-6.

100. Mommsen memo (17.III.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/136, fol. 17.

101. ERR-Sonderstab Archive, "Bericht des Staatsarchiverats Dr. Mommsen über seine Dienstreise nach Witebsk, Smolensk, Brjansk und Gomel vom 30. März bis 17. April 1943" (Riga, 19.IV.1943; 8 p.)—BA-K, NS 30/160; a photostatic copy is held in NS 30/78, together with the other Smolensk inventories and reports. A mimeographed copy is found among the ERR records in Kiev, TsDAVO 3676/1/136, fols. 45-52. The shipment from Vitebsk is confirmed by Mommsen in a note (5.IV.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/136, fol. 13, and inventory (Vitebsk, 3.IV.1943), fol. 15.

102. Lommatzsch to ERR Berlin (Vilnius, 8.V.1943) mentioned that they were expecting in Vilnius a rumored forty freight cars with administrative records from Vitebsk that were prepared for shipment—BA-K, NS 30/163. See another list of materials to be evacuated from Vitebsk (20.X.1943), fols. 80-82. The shipment and receipt of 27 freight-car loads from Vitebsk by the following January is confirmed in a memorandum from Speer to Dülfer (17.I.1944), TsDAVO, 3676/1/136, fol. 5. Those shipments, however, contained no Party archives destined for the ERR center in Ratibor.

103. Mommsen, "Bericht (April 1943)," fols. 3-4—BA-K, NS 30/160.

104. See above (note 11) regarding the location of the State Archive of Smolensk Oblast, and note 96 regarding the reference to the location of Party records in the State Archive.

105. "Verzeichnis der Archivbestände der ehemaligen Allrussischen Kommunistischen Partei der Bolschewiken im Awramijewkloster Zimmer Nr. 1" (Bearbeitung des kommunistischen Parteiarchivs in Smolensk), Smolensk, 5.V.1943 (carbon copy)—BA-K, NS 30/78.

106. Mommsen, "Bericht (April 1943)," BA-K, NS 30/160.

107. These are listed in a detailed inventory. A separate inventory lists the 14 autographs and 25 manuscript books with indication of their original inventory numbers, as having been sent on 15 April to Vilnius—enclosed with Langdopf to ERR (Stabsführung—Berlin) (25.VI.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/144, fols. 384-386.

108. See a copy of Mommsen's shipping order addressed to city authorities in Smolensk (8.IV.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/136, fol. 91. The shipping report by Nehmzow to HAG-Ostland (Smolensk, 1.V.1943), noted that the Party Archive was packed with the duplicate archival registers in wagon Kassel no. 20858, TsDAVO, 3676/1/144, fol. 480-480v (2d copy,

fol. 304-304v). See further confirmation in the ERR HAG-Mitte, Sonderkommando, monthly report (April 1943) by Nehmzow (Smolensk, 2.V.1943) TsDAVO, 3676/1/144, fol. 477-478.

109. According to S. L. Solodovnikova, Chief of the Archival Directorate of the Administration of Smolensk Oblast, Morozov, in his interrogation report after the war, attributed this loss to intentional destruction by the Nazis, but that cannot be substantiated from Nazi records. A copy of the Morozov report that Solodovnikova saw was not available to me from local KGB files.

110. Also held there were (b) materials from the Tenishev Museum (from Smolensk), (c) five freight cars of nineteenth-century Russian archives from Smolensk, (d) one freight car of Russian archives from Vitebsk, including pre-Bolshevik periodicals, and (e) "other materials from Minsk." The report mentioned that aside from the Benedictine depository, in the Vilnius YIVO building, they were holding Judaica for the Preussische Staatsbibliotek, GPU documents, and materials collected for the *Ostbücherei*. Lommatzsch to ERR Berlin (Vilnius, 8.V.1943), BA-K, NS 30/163. See also the similar original typed interim report (without cover transmittal document), "Zwischenbericht über die Besprechung am 8.5.1943 in Wilna" (8.V.1943), CDJC, CXL-161 (2 p.). According to another report dated a week later, some icons, books, and paintings from Smolensk were also held in the same place, Kraft to ERR (Vilnius, 17.V.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/144, fol. 416, and (28.V.1943), fol. 421. Wartime German reports refer to the building as a former Bendictine Monastery, but Lithuanian archivists more precisely identify it as a former convent."

111. Berg to Stabsführung-Berlin (Vilnius, 28.VII.1943), BA-K, NS 30/78. Manuscript fragments of a draft that correspond to Berg's outline have been found among the remains of ERR files in Vilnius—"Verzeichnis der Bestände des ehemal Gebietsparteiarchivs am Smolensker Gebietsausschuss der Kommunistischen Partei der Union (der Bolschewisten)," LCVA, R 633/1/30, fols. 18-19. The list was probably prepared by someone whose native language was not German, since the word "fonds" was crossed out and replaced with "beständ."

112. Berg to Stabsführung-Berlin (Vilnius, 28.VII.1943), BA-K, NS 30/78.

113. Berg to Stabsführung-Berlin (Vilnius, 28.VII.1943), BA-K, NS 30/78. Berg's supervisory work with the Smolensk Archive is confirmed by reports remaining in the Vilnius archive, as quoted by S. Jegelevičius, "Lietuvos archyvai 1940-1945 m.," *Lietuvos archyvai*, 1990, no. 2, pp. 13-14. The document cited there has now been more fully identified as an August 1944 report from the Lithuanian NKVD Commissar Colonel I. Bartashiunas to Deputy

NKVD SSSR Commissar N. S. Kruglov, CVA, R-234/1/15, fol. 19; Berg's role is further confirmed in other Nazi documents received from Vilnius.

114. Langkorf (HAG-Mitte) to ERR (7.V.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/144, fol. 458-458v.

115. Professor Henryk Łowmiański settled in Poznań after the war and Professor Stanisław Marian Zajączkowski taught in Łódz.

116. ERR-HAG-Ost/AG-Litauen, Berg monthly report for October 1943 (Vilnius, 15.XI.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/171, fol. 209-211. An urgent request by Berg for an apartment for Najarnokowa [sic] and her family remains in Nazi files in Vilnius—LCVA, R-614/1/204, fol. 241.

117. Berg monthly report for November 1943 (Vilnius, 8.I.1944), TsDAVO, 3676/1/171, fol. 181. Speer to ERR Berlin, November report (Riga, 7.XII. 1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/171, fol. 183 (cc fol. 187).

118. Nerling to HAG-Mitte (Riga, 8.XI.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/144, fol. 205; Langkopf (HAG-Mitte, Minsk) to ERR, HAG-Ostland (Minsk, 23.XI.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/144, fol. 190. Nerling wrongly identified Morozov as the "long-time director of the Smolensk Oblast Party Archive," and elsewhere as a librarian. Regarding Morozov, see note 80.

119. Supplement to the monthly report for November 1943 (Vilnius, XI.1943), TsDAVO, 3676/1/171, fol. 185. Curiously he is there listed as an "archimandrite," unless by chance there was another Morozov in ERR service in Vilnius.

120. Pirson (*Obereinsatzführerin*), "Bericht über den Stand der Arbeiten im Smolensker Parteiarchiv," film copy from CDJC in RTsKhIDNI (courtesy V. N. Shepelev); a cover slip filmed with the report identifies it as comprising documents 159 and 160 in CDJC from the Rosenberg File from the Offfice of Chief Counsel for War Crimes, U.S. Army, but neither originals nor copies have as yet been located in CDJC Paris (the earlier document numbers specified do not correspond to current signatures in the Rosenberg files there). The CDJC copy was not signed, but Pirson's name is typed at the end. The RTsKhIDNI copy lacks the first page and/or the normal ERR transmittal memorandum, which makes identification more difficult. A carbon copy of what might have been a transmittal memorandum by Speer to Dülfer, ERR Sonderstab-Archiv (Riga) (Riga, 14.IV.1944), found among the ERR records in Kiev, claimed to be forwarding a report of work on the Smolensk archive, but the enclosed report itself (Anlage) is missing—TsDAVO, 3676/1/136, fol. 2.

121. Pirson, "Bericht," CDJC (RTsKhIDNI photocopy).

122. "Über die Liquidierung von Kulacken" ("streng Geheim"—top secret), LCVA, R-633/1/30, fols. 1-14. The documents translated and/or abstracted date from January–March, 1930.

123. Fainsod, *Smolensk under Soviet Rule*, Ch. 12, "The Story of Collectivization," pp. 238-64.

124. Pirson, "Bericht," CDJC (RTsKhIDNI photocopy).

125. "Aktennotiz. Besprechungen mit Dr. Nerling under Dr. Speer in Riga. am 26. und 27.April 1944," signed by Gerh. Spinkler, Einsatzführer (Vilnius, 28.IV.1944), LCVA, R-633/1/30/16, fol.16. The Morozov report of 30th April has not been found. V. J. Muschkotow has not been further identified.

126. Bartashiunas to Kruglov, LCVA, R-234/1/15, fol. 18. The shipment to Liepaja was also reported by Jegelevičius, "Lietuvos archyvai 1940-1945 m.," pp. 13-14, without further details, apparently based on the same report which was then only partially declassified.

127. A summary of the evacuations from Minsk and Vilnius was reported by Utikal to Rosenberg, "Aktenvermerk für den Reichsleiter" (Berlin, 12.VII.1944), BA-K, NS 8/261, fols. 97-99. Regarding shipments from Białystok and Vilnius, see also the later ERR report (14.IX.1944), BA-K, NS 30/53.

128. Bartashiunas to Kruglov, LCVA, R-234/1/15, fols. 18-19. That report was earlier inadequately cited by Jegelevičius (because it was then still restricted), "Lietuvos archyvai 1940-1945 m.," *Lietuvos archyvai*, 1990, no. 2, pp. 13-14; a partial copy of the document has now been obtained.

129. See for example, "Plan raboty Gosudarstvennogo arkhiva UNKVD po Smolenskoi oblasti na 1945 god" (1.XII.1945), which notes plans to "reevacuate" 300,000 files that had been taken to Kuibyshev, and to return from Vilnius four freight wagons that were taken by the Nazis from the Smolensk Oblast Archive—GA RF, 5325/2/1313, fol. 5v. According to the Belorussian state archival report for 1945, some 714,000 units were returned from Vilnius; at the same time 710 fonds (38,054 units) were returned from Riga to the Central State Historical Archive (TsGIA BSSR) in Mogilev, 187 fonds (over 100,000 units), to TsGAOR BSSR, and 20 fonds (27,150 units) to the State Archive of Mogilev Oblast—"Doklad o rabote arkhivnykh organov BSSR za 1945 god," GA RF, 5325/2/1260,

fol. 72. Regarding the Belorussian fonds sent on to Riga, see the list of fonds from several different archives in the 1944 report to Moscow from the Latvian Archival Administration—"Dokladnaiazapiska" (Riga, 6.XII.1944), GA RF, 5325/2/943, fols. 10-10v; and a later report in the same file (Riga, 17.IV.1945), fols. 65-66.

130. A quarterly report for the period through September, "Arbeitsbericht—Hauptabteilung IV, 1.7.44–30.9.44" (Ratibor, 6.X.1944), mentions the contemporary newpaper division in Pless, but does not mention the Smolensk Archive—CDJC, CXLI-142 and 143.

131. Müller, monthly report for November 1944 (Pless, 1.XII.1944), BA-K, NS 30/55.

132. Report of Lommatzsch (13.XII.1944), BA-K, NS 30/50.

133. Utikal, "Aktenvermerk für den Reichsleiter—"Dienstgut in Oberschlesien" (25.I.1945), BA-K, NS 8/261.

134. I. V. Shikin to G. M. Malenkov, TsK VKP(b) (1.III.1945), RTsKhIDNI, 17/125/308, fols. 11-12. Quoted by V. N. Shepelev, "Sud'ba 'Smolenskogo arkhiva'," *Izvestiia TsK KPSS*, 1991, no. 5, p. 135.

135. G. F. Aleksandrov and I. V. Shikin to G. M. Malenkov, TsK VKP(b) (1.III.1945), RTsKhIDNI, 17/125/308, fols. 14-17. Published by V. N. Shepelev, *Izvestiia TsK KPSS*, 1991, no. 5, p. 136.

136. Aleksandrov to Shikin (10.III.1945), RTsKhIDNI, 17/125/308, fol. 18.

137. "Stenogramma respublikanskogo soveshchaniia zaveduiushchikh partarkhivami obkomov KPb/U" (Kiev, 30–31.X.1946), RTsKhIDNI, 71/6/251, fols. 55-56. The 1945 and 1946 Party oblast archive reports from Lviv in RTsKhIDNI (fond 71/6/266) confirm that 1939-1941 fragments of the Lviv Party Archive were totally destroyed in 1941, and that the archive was only getting organized again in 1945/46.

138. A June 1945 report to Moscow from the Smolensk Party Archive notes three and a half freight cars from Dziedzice, and explains that the archive was then in a different building from its prewar location. "Spravka o sostoianii partiinogo arkhiva Smolenskogo obkoma VKP(b)" (21.VI.1945), RTsKhIDNI, 71/6/191, fol. 119. A letter of A. M. Efremenkov to Sutotskov (17.VII.1945), fol. 115, mentions four freight car loads "taken to Germany" that were returned in April 1945, but presumably reference is to the same shipment, as there is no other evidence of a second shipment. "Drezdetse (Pol'sha)" is also the name given

(without quantity) for the origin of the shipment in the "Dokladnaia zapiska," A. M. Efremenkov to Karavaev (28.XI.1945), fol. 120. Any further retrospective determination of quantities would be difficult since, as a result of the redivision of oblasts after the war, many prewar materials from the Smolensk archive were transferred to Kaluga and Briansk oblasts.

139. According to the official TsDIA URSR report for 1946 (12.I.1947—*sov. sekretno*), the ERR group of records were received from the Committee for Affairs of Cultural Enlightenment of the Council of People's Commissars [later Council of Ministers] of the Ukrainian SSR [*Komitet po delam Kul'tprosvetuchrezhdenii pri SNK UkrSSR*], and were placed in the "Special Division of Secret Fonds [of TsDIA URSR]," TsDAVO, 4703 (administrative archive of TsDIA URSR) /1/20, fol. 25. These constitute the major group of ERR records now held in Kiev (TsDAVO, fond 3676) and are predominantly of Ratibor provenance, as are the additional files with predominantly in-coming reports from the ERR Task Force in Belgium and the Netherlands (fond 3674). These materials greatly expand the source base for the study of ERR operations, especially in occupied Soviet lands. The records are clearly predominantly of Ratibor provenance, although some of the earlier records may have been brought to ERR headquarters there from other sources; most of the documents from late 1943 and 1944 consist of either original incoming reports addressed to ERR in Ratibor or copies of outgoing documents from the ERR Ratibor operations. They were apparently captured in Silesia by Soviet forces after the war, although details of their seizure have not yet been found. The official acts of transfer when they were accessioned by the Special Secret Division of the Central State Historical Archive in Kiev note that they were received from Dresden—Pashchin, Chairman of the Committee on Affairs of Cultural Enlightenment, to TsGIA UkrSSR (12.XII.1945-s), TsDAVO, 4703/2(1s)/3, fol. 1; most probably this is a mistaken reference to Czechowice-Dziedzice, which was the railway junction six miles south of Pless—sixty-five kilometers east of Ratibor—from whence four freight cars of materials from the Smolensk Party Archive were returned to the USSR (see above, note 138). If in the unlikely fact the ERR materials were actually received from Dresden, this would suggest that the ERR managed to evacuate much more of its Ratibor holdings than had previously been suspected.

A concise and informative eleven-page report on the fond signed by Bondarevskii, deputy director of TsDIA-K (11.X.1947) clearly shows the different groups of ERR materials involved—"Kharakteristika dokumental'nykh materialov shtaba reikhsliaitera Rozenberga,"—TsDAVO, 4703/2(1s)/12, fols. 3-13. The original order of the materials was subsequently seriously messed up and intermingled when the documents were bound in helter-skelter order and *opisi* prepared in the archive. Apparently not all the ERR materials mentioned are still present in the two Kiev ERR fonds. Regarding the additional original archival materials of French and other Western origin that were received by TsDIA-K with the ERR materials, see note 53.

140. The ERR files in TsKhIDK now constitutes fond no. 1401.

141. A. P. Pshenichnyi, "Arkhivy na okkupirovannoi territorii v gody Velikoi Otechestvennoi voiny," *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1992, no. 4, p. 94.

142. Headquarters, US FET, incoming classified message—W-81678 (27.IX.1946), from AGWAR to USFET for G-2 [intelligence], copy, US NA, RG 242, AGAR-S (Pomrenze collection), no. 1887 (the Pomrenze notation—?CW/ar G-2 Docs—on the copy is incomplete, and archivists have been unable to locate the original file).

143. "INVENTORY" (SECRET) and similar "'Short Report' of INVENTORY of Russian Material" (SECRET), enclosed with an unsigned copy of the outgoing report in the name of Lt. Colonel M. C. Taylor "Investigation of Library Collection in Offenbach," from Headquarters, USFET, Office of the Acting Chief of Staff, G-2, to Director of Intelligence, War Department General Staff—attention: Chief of Captured Enemy Documents Branch, (7.X.1946), (copy), US NA, RG 242, AGAR-S, no. 1887. The AGAR-S copy made by Pomrenze in the 1960s of the G-2 response is attached to the original inquiry cited in note 142, but again it has as yet been impossible to locate the original or contiguous documents.

144. I have queried this point in several Freedom of Information inquiries to the US NA, suspecting that the answer may lay in unclassified intelligence files, but again have not received a satisfactory answer. Archivists there have been unable to locate relevant documents, or to lead me to the appropriate boxes. Records of the G-2 Document Control Section that was operating in the Frankfurt area in 1946 have apparently not been retained intact. The extent and complexity of G-2 records that are divided among numerous record groups, further fragmented among complicated structured series and subseries within voluminous record groups—all of which are arranged under the Army decimal classification system, and even further fragmented into formerly security-classified numerically coded series of intelligence documents, has resulted in the dispersal of such files. Retrieval is severely hindered by the total lack of folder-level finding aids and by current box labels that do not indicate precise dates and decimal contents. I appreciate the efforts of US NA Suitland archivists Richard Boylan and Rebecca Collier in trying to guide me through the maze.

145. The characterization of OAD as "the antithesis of the ERR" appears in the title of photo albums of the OAD and ERR operations, an entire set of which are are held by the Still Picture Division of the US NA. The recent essay by Hoogewoud, "Nazi Looting," pp. 174-92, reproduces selected photographs from the albums, including schematic charts comparing the Rosenberg and the OAD operations. Copies of some of the volumes are available elsewhere, as Hoogewoud explains. The other quoted passage occurs twice in a revised

version of the doctoral dissertation by Leslie I. Poste (from the Library School at the University of Chicago, 1958), *The Development of U.S. Protection of Libraries and Archives in Europe during World War II* (Fort Gordan, GA: U.S. Army Civil Affairs School, 1964), p. 306 and p. 311. Poste devotes a major chapter to Offenbach (pp. 258-301). A similar quotation is found in Poste's article, "Books Go Home from the Wars," *Library Journal* 73 (1 December 1948): 1704. Poste had been involved in the MFA&A operations under OMGUS, and had a first-hand knowledge of OAD.

146. All of the figures above are cited in Poste, *U.S. Protection*, p. 299. Monthly reports and other Offenbach administrative records, including incoming and outgoing receipts and related correspondence, are found in the Ardelia Hall Collection, among the OMGUS records in US NA (Suitland), RG 260, Property Division, Restitution Branch. The first director of OAD, Seymour J. Pomrenze, in a later article, quotes a total figure of 2,404,530 items processed between March 1946 and May 1948 (a year earlier than Poste's totals), and accordingly gives lower figures for restitution to the different countries listed—"Policies and Procedures for the Protection, Use, and Return of Captured German Records," in *Captured German and Related Records: A National Archives Conference*, edited by Robert Wolfe (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1974; "National Archives Conferences," vol. 3), pp. 19-23. Related documents collected by Pomrenze used in preparation of that paper are now held in a special collection at US NA—AGAR-S (now part of RG 242, Reference Materials), including the documents cited above.

Pomrenze kindly shared recollections and personal documentation with the present author. Of particular interest are the first volume of the photographic history of OAD and two volumes of albums of photographs of library stamps found in OAD, which give a vivid impression of the extensive range of OAD holdings from USSR territories (including now virtually extinct Jewish collections). Separate sections cover the Baltic countries—Estonia, Latvia, Kovno (other Lithuanian collections, including those from Vilnius, are listed under Poland), Belorussia, Russia, and Ukraine. See "Library Markings Found among Looted Books in the Archival Depot," vol. I: "Eastern," and vol. II: "Western," copies of which are also held in US NA (Suitland), OAD records, boxes 778 (ex libris) and 779 and 780 (library markings), and in the Still Picture Division, US NA.

147. Reference here is undoubtedly to another collection of Nazi-seized Russian materials that still remain in US NA (Suitland), as mentioned in the *Guide to the National Archives of the United States* (Washington, DC: NARS, 1987), p. 735. The Prague materials (1936-1941, 49 lin. ft., earlier listed as 37 lin. feet) were described in the *Catalog of the Records of the Soviet Purchasing Commission (Torgovoye predstavitel'stvo SSR v Prage)*, prepared by Michael Halyshyn and Edward Roszkowski (November 1949; 47 pp.; a copy is found in RG 242, GMDS reference aids, box 157, no. 33.).

148. The so-called "Miscellaneous Russian Records, 1870-1947," also still held in US NA (Suitland), comprising 146 linear feet (some unprocessed) and 6 rolls of microfilm, actually contain few original documents. "RS" designations have been assigned from RS 1 though RS 5309. Most of the collection comprises published materials, ranging from a full set of the *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia* (Great Soviet Encyclopedia) (quite possibly the set removed from OAD as noted below) and other published reference works, to a wide range of scientific, technical, and economic tracts and serial publications from the 1920s and 1930s (many of which were presumably also seized from OAD by G-2), to military training and operational handbooks from the war years that were retrieved by intelligence units or captured with prisoners of war. The contents are listed in an earlier security-classified "confidential" finding aid, "German Military Document Section: Catalog of Russian Section," mimeographed, [n.d.] (93 p. with a 30-page typescript supplement covering photographs).

149. Taylor report (7.X.1945), as per note 143. A memorandum from the OMGUS Economics Division, Restitution Branch (3 April 1946), addressed to MFA&A requests OAD to "take over for restitution to the Russian Government 240 cases of books now held at Fechenheim," where they were being then held after removal from Gera (Russian Zone), which had already been examined and cleared for restitution by G-2 and the Military Intelligence Service in the War Department. According to that memo, the collection "was presumably culled by the Germans from various libraries and scientific institutes in Russia." US NA, RG 260, OAD Records, box 252.

150. It has not yet been possible to obtain a copy of the text the Wunder court testimony (30.X.1964), which is cited in *Mitteilungen des Archivs für Wiedergutmachungssachen*, 1965, no. 1, in a footnote reference in the introduction to the *Findbücher* for the ERR records in BA-K, NS 30.

151. A copy of the U.S. Army Target Report, signed by Major Dudley P. Digges, from Headquarters, Third U.S. Army Document Center (Provisional) (24.IX.1945), US NA, RG 331, was kindly furnished to me by Robert Wolfe at US NA. The document (dated 19.X.1945) listing "Targets to be Evacuated," includes the Staffelstein (O-37) reference as No. 652, with no further description. According to the covering letter from Wolfe, US NA (16.XII.1993), the U.S. Army "target team" inspection reports from 1945 are in need of preservation and hence are not now open for public research. A supplemental document lists archives received by the Center subsequent to an earlier (4.IX.1945) list. More detailed records of the recipient U.S. Army Document Centers have not been located.

152. Some Rosenberg files were incorporated as exhibits in the Nuremberg trial records and others that were not used officially in the trials were given to CDJC (Paris). Most of the

Rosenberg materials that remained in American custody were accessioned by US NA from the U.S. Army in 1958 and were microfilmed as temporary record group EAP 99. After they were turned over to the *Bundesarchiv* (Koblenz) in 1963, they were separated into several separate fonds, representing the different Rosenberg chancery and ministry functions. The microfilm series produced in the U.S. (EAP 99) thus includes both fonds—See *Guides to German Records Microfilmed at Alexandria, VA*, no. 28: *Records of the Reich Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories, 1941-1943*. The ERR records themselves are now held in BA-K as Bestand NS 30; while the records of the Rosenberg Ministry—Reichsministerium für die besetzten Ostgebiete (RMbO)—is now Bestand R 6 and the Rosenberg chancellery is Bestand R 8, and some files form part of other fonds in the *Bundesarchiv*. The introduction to the *Bundesarchiv* finding aid (*Findbücher*) for NS 30 and those for other fonds provide more details about the history of the fonds and include correlation tables for the U.S. produced microfilms, but because of the rearrangement, the films are very difficult to use.

153. An OAD memorandum to MFA&A in Bavaria (18 June 1946) reports the receipt for 318 cases of books from Staffelstein—294 cases of books from the Collecting Point Staffelstein, including "186 cases Russian books," 11 cases Russian meteorological material," and 47 cases of mixed, Dutch, Russian and French books"; an additional "5 cases Russian books" and "5 cases new ERR books" were among the 24 cases of books removed from the city hall of Staffelstein. Ardelia Hall Collection, OAD records, US NA (Suitland), RG 260, box 252. See the photograph captioned "Books from Staffelstein, Bavaria, 318 cases, Dutch, French, Russian and other books....OAD, May-June 1946," Hoogewoud, p. 187, reproduced from the OAD photo album at US NA. An additional handwritten note includes a more detailed breakdown with mention of "archival materials" among the Russian figures.

An earlier OMGUS memo (29.XI.1945) signed by Major General Walter M. Robertson recommended the direct "release to the Russians for removal to Russia of books taken from Libraries of Russia by the Germans"—with specific reference to materials from Ukrainian institutes found in the Staffelstein area ("a. One truck load in the basement of the City Hall; b. About eight truck loads in the Inn Wolfsschlucht; [and] c. About five truck loads in a barn at No. 3 Ring Strasse")—that were identified as belonging to the "Kiev Chemical Institute," the "Kiev Library," and the "Dnieperosky [sic—Dnipropetrovs'k] Library." According to a memo of 12 January 1946, the Russian liaison officer Lt. Colonel Davidov had inspected the Staffelstein sites and "indicated that Russia is anxious to have these books removed to Russia." An order of 28 January requested "a Restitution claim number be assigned" and an inventory be prepared." RG 260, box 207/2. But it is not clear from that and related documents if in fact they were immediately turned over to Soviet authorities. As noted elsewhere, many Russian books were transferred to OAD from Staffelstein, and we have later specific reference to some there from the Chemical Institute in Kiev, some of which were turned over to G-2. (See note 164.)

154. See Utikal, "Aktenvermerk für den Reichsleiter" (25.I.1945), BA-K NS 8/261 (see note 129).

155. The U.S. Army document cited in note 151, listing "Targets to be Evacuated" (19.X.1945), mentions the Rosenberg correspondence to be evacuated from Banz. A Third Army G-5 MFA&A report (31.V.1945) describes the materials inspected at Schloss Banz—bei Kulmbach (28.V.1945); that survey does not mention any Russian archival materials, but notes that "a full inventory is at this Hqs." According to Wolfe's letter also cited in note 151, the Rosenberg files from Banz were "transferred to the Berlin Document Center (Collection no. 55), shipped to the Pentagon in July 1948, [and] transferred to the Military Documents Center in July 1949."

Another earlier list (24.IX.1945) attached to the same U.S. Army report, includes No. 628, "Archive (Russian)" found in "Tachau (P-5244)." Tachau (*Czech*, Tachov) was in fact a railroad junction west of Pilsen (*Czech*, Plzeň), and due south of Karlsbad (*now Czech*, Karlovy Vary), to which the December ERR report quoted above noted the despatch of the Smolensk materials. No further report of the American reconnaissance operation in Tachau has been located, although it is close to two deposits of archival materials from Kiev and Riga (also identified as "Russian") which were found by a unit of the U.S. Third Army in May and returned to the USSR in October. The content and fate of those materials is documented in Grimsted, "The Fate of Ukrainian Cultural Treasures," p. 69; the Ukrainian edition includes several published documents from U.S. Army files relating to the restitution of the "Russian archives" found there—*Dolia skarbiv Ukrains'koi kul'tury*, pp. 109-16.

156. James Rorimer, *Survival* (New York: Abelard, 1950), pp. 159-60. A "Weekly Summary" (week ending 21.VII.1945) of the Military Government in LK-Lichtenfels-Staffelstein reports "Rosenberg papers removed from Schloss Banz by Lt. Loeb, OSS Mission for Germany," without further indication of their destination. US NA (Suitland), RG 260, box 1086 (1404). But the books remained in Banz until April and May 1946.

157. According to a report from the U.S. Office of Military Government in Bavaria—OMG-Bavaria, Property Control Branch (5.II.1947), BA-K, B 232/328.

158. The first truck loads of "books and other materials from Schloss Banz" arrived in Offenbach 23 April 1946, as noted in the "Monthly Report, April 1946," US NA (Suitland), RG 260, OAD records, box 256. See the letter addressed "To the American Military Government, Lichtenfels" (30.IV.1946) (box 1088 [1406]). A memo dated 9 May 1946 (box 252) confirms the receipt of 569 cases from Schloss Banz. See the picture with caption "Books from Schloss Banz, Bavaria....569 cases approximately 110,000 books, OAD, April 1946," reproduced by Hoogewoud (p. 187) from the OAD photo album at US NA. Another

OMGUS "Historical Report" (30.VI.1946) mentioned among the other materials in Schloss Banz "Rosenberg's collection of books from all parts of Europe and many Russian films" (box 193).

159. See the summary description of the Hungen holdings as found by a U.S. 3rd Army inspection team 9 on April 1945—"Semi-Monthly Report on Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives for Period Ending 15 April 1945" (17.IV.1945), US NA, RG 331 (SHAEF), General Staff, Operations Branch, G-5, MFA&A, box 334. A copy of a more detailed report about materials found in Hungen is held in the Pomrenze collection, US NA 242, AGAR-S, no. 1454 (see note 29 above).

160. The receipt, on the letterhead of Headquarters USFET, G-2 Division, Document Control Section, was signed by H. Weiner, USC, of the Research Branch "For the Chief of Documents Section," who was identified as Capt. Winick. The figure was partially corrected by hand and "(18)" was added in the margin. US NA (Suitland), RG 260, OMGUS Property Division, Ardelia Hall Collection, Offenbach Administrative Records, box 250.

161. The OAD November report (box 251) cites "3740 items—17 cases"; and the same figures appear as the total of deliveries to G-2 from Offenbach in subsequent monthly reports for December 1946 and January 1947. Some of the later monthly reports in listing outgoing materials to different destinations do not list G-2 deliveries at all, nor to they include the G-2 transfers in the running totals of outgoing shipments to different stated destinations.

162. A photocopy of a carbon-copied list entitled "Documents Shipments to War Department" (n.d.), covering the period 24 August 1945 through 27 August 1947, is found in US NA, 242, AGAR-S, no. 1553 (Pomrenze's notation of origin is 9:4. Bernharelt Report, GMDS, Shipments). That shipment was labelled "special" rather than assigned a running number in the shipment list. Some additional "Russian books" (not identified as to point of origin) were dispatched to the War Department on 27 November 1946.

163. Other G-2 receipts for materials from Offenbach found among OAD records, most of them received by Major Kaufman from Oberursel, mention "8 cases of books (1,083 books)" on 5 January 1948 and "1 case with 74 items" on 8 January 1948, but there is no indication if these were of Russian provenance. US NA (Suitland), RG 260, OAD records, box 250. For other shipments intended for the CIA and or the Library of Congress, see notes 172 and 173 below.

164. US NA (Suitland), RG 260, OAD records, box 252. Probably these are some of the books from the Chemical Institute in Kiev mentioned earlier as having been found at Staffelstein.

165. HQ 12th Army Group, Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2 to A.C. of S., G-2, ETOUSA, 14 May, 30 May, and 14 June 1945, US NA, RG 331 (SHAFE), classified decimal files, box 24.

166. "Evaluation of GMDS Collection," summary sheet, Col. R. L. Hopkins to Chief of Staff, n.d. (Apr. 1946?), copy US NA, RG 242, AGAR-S, no. 1377. Pomrenze cites his source as "GMDS Background Papers, History, File 5:1 folder 1," but that collection has not been located in US NA.

167. "Matters of Interest to Liaison Agent," GMDS, Camp Ritchie, MD, unsigned [n.d.] (since the memo was datelined Camp Ritchie, it would necessarily have been prepared between July 1945 and April 1946, when GMDS moved to the Pentagon), copy NA, RG 242, AGAR-S, no. 1393. Pomerenze again cites his source as "GMDS 5:1 folder 1," but the original has not been located in US NA.

168. The confidential "Memorandum" (December 1946) by Boris I. Nicolaevsky, Director, the American Labor Research Institute, Inc., was found in a handwritten copy in the Pomrenze collection, US NA, RG 242, AGAR-S, no. 1367. Pomrenze again cites his source as "GMDS 5:1 folder 1." Although most of the documents cited retain the more usual spelling "Nikolaevsky" (from the Russian, Nikolaevskii), I use the form Nicolaevsky here, since that was the official spelling of his name in America.

169. The handwritten notation follows at the bottom of the second page of the Nicolaevsky memo in the Pomrenze copy, AGAR-S, no. 1367, with a source reference noted as "ID CIA." It is not clear if Pomrenze added this note from a separate source, or if it is the full text that actually appeared on a CIA copy of the actual memo.

170. Isaac Bencowitz, Director OAD, to Library of Congress Mission, Hq USFET (26.IX.1946), US NA (Suitland), RG 260, OAD records, box 251. Although a 1950 State Department memo in the OAD files claims that he gave part of his prewar collection of Marxist materials to LC in 1942, reference is probably to the part of his collection that he sold to the Hoover Institution. See the published finding aid, compiled by Anna M. Bourguina and Michael Jackson, *Guide to the Boris I. Nicolaevsky Collection* (Stanford: Hoover Institution, 1989); considerable correspondence relating to Nicolaevsky's search for

the missing Paris IISH collections are mentioned there, but it has not been possible to review them all in connection with this study.

171. A carbon copy of a two-page memorandum describing the arrangements for the Harvard Branch of IISH is included in the same OAD file. According to OAD director Horne, the memo was obtained through the Dutch Restitution Officer. Horne to OMGUS, Restitution Branch (11.III.1948), US NA (Suitland), RG 260, OAD records, box 251. Horne also enclosed a letter from Friedrich Adler about three cases of his materials found at Offenbach, which had been donated to IISH before Adler escaped to America but which had been looted by the Nazis from France and Belgium; Offenbach authorities were shipping the materials to Austria in virtue of Adler's Austrian citizenship. In fact, most of the Adler materials, like the Paris IISH collections, were found by Soviet authorities after the war in Silesia and are still held in Russia.

172. Horne to OMGUS, Restitution Branch (10.VI.1947, secret), enclosing an extensive list of French-language books, which "had been discussed with Majors Kauffmann and Winn, both of G-2"; Horne to Office of the Political Advisor (26.V.1948), enclosing a report on a meeting regarding the Nicolaevsky affair (24.V.1948)—US NA (Suitland), RG 260, OAD records, box 251. There are many more lists and correspondence regarding the Nicolaevsky affair among OAD records.

173. "Documents Shipments to War Department" (n.d.), US NA, 242, AGAR-S, no. 1553. It is not specified if the latter materials for Nicolaevsky in the large August shipment were from Offenbach.

174. Acheson to HICOG, Frankfurt, Property Division (12.IX.1950, confidential) and (21.II.1951, confidential), US NA (Suitland), RG 260, OAD records, box 251. The September 1950 memo made reference to a recent visit to Weisbaden by Nicolaevsky in 1950 in the company of a Foreign Service Officer; Nicolaevsky was then "willing to turn the books over to the Library of Congress for research purposes if they are restituted to him."

175. See more details about these discoveries in the forthcoming Grimsted study, *Plunder—Counter Plunder*. As noted above (see notes 22 and 23), some IISH library collections were also recovered from the ERR Central Library of the *Hohe Schule* in Austria.

176. See the published doctoral dissertation by Michael J. Kurtz, *Nazi Contraband: American Policy on the Return of the European Cultural Treasures, 1945-1955* (New York, 1985). Kurtz is generally positive about the success of the American restitution program, although he did not use any German documentation in his study and had no material at his disposal

regarding Soviet-related developments. On the problems of dealing with Soviet authorities and Eastern Europe, see especially pp. 226-49; the quotation is from p. 247.

177. Reports from the Party archive of Smolensk Oblast after the war make no reference to additional materials known to have been seized by the Nazis. See above (notes 134-136) for the reports of Soviet recovery of the much larger part of the Smolensk Archive in Silesia.

178. See, for example, an official U.S. Army list of 13 restitution shipments from the American zone alone between the years 1945—1948, with a covering memo (20.IX.1948) OMGUS, Property Division—Restitution Branch (US NA [Suitland], RG 260, Box 291), published as an appendix in Grimsted, *Dolia skarbiv Ukrains'koi kul'tury*, pp. 117-19.

Detailed inventories and the extensive property files listing individual items found and returned (often with photographs) are located among OMGUS records in US NA (Suitland) (RG 260). Inventories of most of the shipments from Germany, together with related correspondence and property cards from the main Munich Collection Point are now also available in BA-K (B 323—*Treuhandverwaltung [Collection Center] für Kulturgut, München*).

179. A receipt and list of box and wagon numbers has been found on the letterhead of U.S. Headquarters Berlin District, MFA&A (20.IX.1945)—US NA (Suitland), RG 260, Ardelia Hall Collection, box 40, but no more detailed inventory of the contents has been found in American restitution records. Quite possibly the contents are from different places, because some of the German box code numbers listed are "R" and others are "K."

180. In the spring of 1946, Major Davidov made several visits. The shipment of 10 June 1946 was released to Lt. Col. N. P. Novik, and the 31 July 1946 shipment was signed for by Lt. Col. A. J. Slavin. During the period August-October 1946, Major V. M. Ivanov was registered as the Soviet restitution liasion officer for OAD, and Major Nikolaew Hucoraebbu [sic] was so registered for October 1946. The 24 October 1947 shipment was officially released to Major A. J. Doltanov. The names of several other Soviet liasion officers are found in OAD records, and some were listed by Hoogewoud ("Nazi Looting," pp. 171-72). It will be of interest to check the corresponding SVAG records (when they become available) for possible Soviet reports from OAD and for other receipts of books and archival materials.

181. There are many notes about the filming operations in the U.S. Microfilm Publication of the Smolensk files, and abstracts of many documents are included. For example, abstracts/translation (for WKP 522 and 526) were dated 8 and 17 September 1947 respectively. Several are labelled as having been prepared by D. W. Chase (12 January 1948—WKP 266; and also WKP 242 and 243). An abstract for WKP 513 is translated by E. Belter. One of the folders of notes from the Smolensk files (WKP 29) found among Merle

Fainsod's papers contains a copy of one of the intelligence service summary/translations, noted as having been prepared 29 January 1948 by D. W. Chase—Fainsod Papers, HUA (HUG 4382.47), [box 1]. The brief card descriptions for WKP 1 through WKP 538, prepared by Michael Halyshyn, are included on reel 1 of the microfilm publication T87.

182. An "inventory" of the "records of the All-Union Communist Party, Smolensk District" appeared as an appendix to *GMDS Monthly Historical Report, December 1950,* Captured Records Section (CRS-NNMC File), as explained by Goldbeck, in *Captured German Records,* p. 36. This may be a further summary of the Halyshyn cards, but a copy has not been located. Between May 1994 and March 1995, archivists could not locate a copy of that finding aid in the US NA, but now suggest it may be among the boxes packed for transfer to Archives II in College Park.

183. U.S. AGO, Administrative Services Division, DRB, *Guide to Captured German Records in the Custody of the Department of the Army Agencies in the United States, Washington, D.C.* (Washington, DC, April 1950; 40 p.; DRB Pub no. 50-8); —, *Guide to Captured German Records in the Custody of the Army Agencies in the United States* (Washington, DC, June 1951; 64 p.; DRB Pub no. 51-10). Copies of these guides were found in US NA, RG 242 (GMDS reference collection). Gerhard L. Weinberg and the War Documents Project staff, under the direction of Fritz Epstein, *Guide to Captured German Documents,* Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research; "War Documentation Project," Study no. 1 (Air University, Human Resources Research Institute, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, December 1952; "Research Memorandum," no. 2, vol. 1).

184. The Collections and Indexes of the German Military Documents Section (AG0) ([Washington, DC]: CIA, May 1953; CIA/CD Research Aid #5). A copy is found in US NA, RG 242, GMDS reference collection, box 164, no. 8.

185. In that same CIA "Research Aid #5" the Soviet Purchasing Commission records (the RG 1055) were listed as comprising 37 linear feet (arranged and indexed) with "463 individual documents," consisting mainly of business correspondence, written in the Czech, German, and Russian languages, concerning the purchase of goods—machinery and machine parts, principally— from Czechoslovakian firms, notably the Skoda Works," as described in "Aid 10," p. 38. The other Russian records (RG 1054) are not described, but comprised 200 linear feet with catalogues as "Aid 5" and "Aid 28"; it was noted that the "First 2000 documents were described in Aid 5," and with a balance of "approximately 1500 additional documents" for which "subsequently 800 more cards were made" (p. 64). Copies of those cited reference aids have not been located, but were presumably included in the GMDS "Catalogue of the Russian Section" mentioned above (note 148).

186. "General List of Seized Records Available for Unofficial Research" (Washington, DC, February 1954, 7 p.; AGO, Administrative Services Division, DRB Reference Aid, no. 15); a copy is found in US NA, RG 242, box 157, no. 30; a typescript dated January 1954 is in box 157, no. 31 (GMDS reference collection); a revised version was issued in typescript in October 1955 (DRB Publication no. 55-6). This list also included the "Miscellaneous Russian Records Collection (RG 1054). See also the revised version, "General List of Declassified Seized Records" (Washington, DC, 1955, 16 p.), Reference Aid, no. 55-2. Item no. XIX (arranged numerically by accession number)—"Records of the Smolensk District of the All-Union (Russian) Communist Party," 1927-1941, 24 cubic feet. As noted, "These records chronicling the activities of the Russian Communist Party in and around Smolensk are in the Russian language." A subsequent edition was issued under the title *Guide to Seized Records*, Reference Aid no. 17 (Washington, DC, January 1956), and a revised version with expanded record group summaries appeared in 1957. A copy of the declassification order dated 11 May 1953 is found in RG 407 (AGO), DRB Classified Decimal Files, box 4.

187. Fainsod to AGO, U.S. Army (23.III.1954), Fainsod Papers, correspondence files (HUG 4382.5), HUA.

188. L. J. Henderson, Associate Director, Rand Corporation to Brigadier General Marcus F. Cooper, Assistant for Development Planning, U.S. Air Force (4 February 1955), US NA, RG 407 (AGO), Records of the Administrative Branch, DRB decimal files.

189. Chief, DRB OAG to Rand and Fainsod (29.VI.1954), Fainsod Papers, HUA. See also Rand to DRB and Fainsod (17.VI.1954).

190. Henderson to Cooper (4.II.1955), US NA, RG 407, DRB decimal files.

191. Fainsod to Melvin Ruggles, Rand Corporation (20.IX.1954), HUA, correspondence files—a folder designated "Smolensk" contains an undated handwritten draft; a typewritten carbon copy remains in one of the folders labeled "Rand" in the Fainsod papers.

192. "The Smolensk Archives, A Selective Index to Items of Principal Interest," prepared for the Rand Corporation by Merle Fainsod (typescript, September 1954). One of the carbon copies is among Fainsod's notes from the Smolensk files in the Fainsod Papers, HUA. A copy is included in the microfilm publication T-87, reel 1.

193. Harry Schwartz, "Secrets of Soviet Held by the U.S. Army," *New York Times*, 23.I.1955, p. A-13.

194. Schwartz, "Secrets of Soviet," *New York Times*, 23.I.1955, p. A-13.

195. Editorial comment, *New York Times*, 24.I.1955, p. A-22.

196. DRB Journal (Captured Records Publicity) (21 January 1955), US NA, RG 407, Records of the Administrative Service Division, DRB classified decimal files, DRB Journal, box 3.

197. DRB Journal (4 May 1955), US NA, RG 407, DRB Journal, box 3.

198. DRB Journal (4 February 1955), US NA, RG 407, DRB Journal, box 3. In the above cited DRB classified decimal files, there is a note in the 314.4 segment for 1953—"Smolensk Files removed by East (2 February 1955)."

199. See the explanatory letter by the Rand Corporation to the U.S. Air Force—Henderson to Cooper (4 February 1955), US NA, RG 407, DRB decimal files.

200. Fainsod to OAG, US Army (27.I.1955); Rand to Fainsod (8.II.1955); and related letters, Fainsod Papers, HUA (individual boxes of Fainsod correspondence are not numbered or foliated in HUA). The original receipted copy of Fainsod's letter is in US NA, OAG, DRB, decimal file, with a typed notation (signed by Sherrod East, Chief, DRB, 8.II.1955) that "the Rand Corporation is directing Professor Fainsod to return the records to DRB."

201. DRB Journal (4 February 1955), US NA, RG 407, DRB Journal, box 3.

202. David Floyd, "'1984' in Real Life: How Russia is Ruled," *London Daily Telegraph & Morning Post*, 3 May 1955, and "The Smolensk Papers—II: Russia's War on the Peasants," 4 May 1955. Copies of Floyd's articles were found in the DRB journal file.

203. Mimeographed work forms that were completed for almost all of the files now occupy 10 boxes in the Fainsod papers, HUA.

204. Fainsod, *Smolensk under Soviet Rule*, "Acknowledgements," and p. [3].

205. See notes 79, 94 and 99.

206. Inside the back folder of WKP 474 (old no. WKP 381) is a German use list of the *Reichsministerium für Ernährung und Landwirtschaft*. The file itself contains two radio broadcast texts dating from 1931 and protocols of meetings of the Kun'ia raion Komsomol

committee—"protokol Kuninskogo biuro RK VLKSM" (5 and 25.XII.1930). Kun'ia, a raion center southeast of Veliki Luki would have been part of the Western Oblast at that date, but it is possible that file may have been picked up locally by another Nazi agency.

207. WKP was the German transliterated abbreviation from the original Russian for "Allrussische kommunistiche Partei der Bolschewiken" [KP(b) SU], which now is still used as the file designator in the U.S. National Archives arrangement.

208. Freedom of Information reply from Robert Wolfe to Patricia K. Grimsted, 26 August 1993. According to Wolfe, the Smolensk files were not specifically noted in transfer documents, but rather were accessioned as part of a large body of captured records that were transferred to the National Archives from the U.S. Army.

209. Kai von Jena to P. K. Grimsted (enclosing letter from Acting Archivist of the U.S. Trudy Huskamp Peterson to Friedrich Kahlenberg, President, BA-K, dated 5.VIII.1994); the U.S. letter makes reference to eleven files, but in the 1980 introduction, it was only a question of seven. The files earlier erroneously identified as having been sent to Germany were those with the records filmed as T84 (identified by WKP 528 through 534, formerly EAP 116/154e, f, g, and h, and EAP 116/155, 116/156, and 116/171, reproduced on rolls 27 and 28), according to the introduction to *Guide to the Records of the Smolensk Oblast*, p. iii. Peterson curiously mentions "seven original record items not clearly of Smolensk provenance (WKP 528 through 534) and four clearly of other provenance (WKP 535 through 538)," although all of these appear to be of Smolensk provenance.

210. As explained in the 1980 *Guide*, microfilm publication T87 contains 530 files WKP 1-527, and WKP 539-541 on rolls 2-69; T84 has 7 files (WKP 528-WKP 534); and T88 contains 4 files (WKP 535-WKP 538 [formerly RS 921-RS 924]) on rolls 1-4.

211. For example, WKP 482 has documents from at least three different Russian archival files, two of which contain the original Russian recorded data regarding the foliation contained in the original file.

212. See Fainsod's "Bibliographical Note," p. [456] and the preface to the 1980 US NA *Guide*. Fainsod notes only two "RS" numbers, but there are now at least five.

213. Time did not permit a full analysis of all 541 files in US NA. The analysis that follows is based on a spot check of a limited number of boxes, some chosen randomly, others ordered out—after the problem of provenance became apparent—on the basis of "suspicious" descriptions in the US NA *Guide to the Records of the Smolensk Oblast*. I appreciate the

assistance of archivists in the Captured Records Section, and especially Robert Wolfe and Robin Cooksen, in enabling my analysis of the originals. Archivists in US NA were previously unaware of this situation, and it had not been pointed out by any researcher who has used the collection. Fainsod apparently did not receive all the files now held with the Smolensk collection. As a political scientist, Fainsod was interested in substantive analysis; although he recognized the limitations of the archive, he himself was not an historian or archivist and had never worked in a Soviet archive. Besides, these types of technical archival problems would be less apparent to researchers who normally are required to use the microfilm, and few of them would have been familiar with Soviet archival practices. Now that contingent files are open in Smolensk, and when these files are returned to their home, a full source analysis of their provenance will be in order in the tradition of Russian "historical source analysis" (*istochnikovedenie*).

214. US NA, RG 242, WKP 496. The MIRS stamp—which appears only on the 1943 tract—has a MIRS assigned "Ref. No. 322." As explained by Goldbeck, MIRS "had been set up as a joint agency to exploit German documents and extract intelligence information for British and American operational forces"—"The German Military Documents Section," in *Captured German Records*, p. 32. That 1943 document (the first one in folder WKP 496), cites a Party resolution from July 1943—"Postanovlenie TsK VKP(b) ot 18 iiulia 1943 g.—'Ob uborke urozhaia'," which obviously would have been acquired after the Nazi seizure of the Party Archive from Smolensk.

215. For example, WKP 456 has its folder marked in English "Soviet Press"—probably of Western intelligence origin—with several clippings from Ukraine. These include issues of a local transportation workers' paper dating from 21 and 25 February 1941 from Donetsk, and another Party paper from the Drohobych region in Ukrainian (5.IV.1941).

216. See, for example, WKP 484 (earlier no. 94) with a manuscript original and typed copies in Russian and Yiddish of a study by V. M. Solonets, "Krupnyi goratyi skot v EAO" (26.I.1934); WKP 486 (earlier no. 479), P. G. Ruzinov, "Bolezni sel'khoz kul'tur. EAO"; and WKP 490 with a manuscript and typescripts in Russian and Yiddish—Bialyi, "Kratkaia estestvenno-istoricheskaia kharakteristika Birobidzhana" (with indication to the effect that it had been sent to Kiev 13.X.1934). The account registers are in folders WKP 179 (earlier 366) and WKP 485 (earlier 347). Original folders or fragments remain for those files, in most cases in Ukrainian, with indication that the folders themselves were printed in Kiev. WKP 488 has a German translation of a 1929 study of Jewish philology by N. A. Kaganowitsch [sic], "Die jüdische Philologie in der UdSSR" (Kharkiv, 15.II.1929; 29 p.)—in that case it has an original folder from Iaroslav, marked *delo* no. 14, with the title apparently added later in German.

217. WKP 358 (earlier 204). Interestingly enough, the first personnel questionnaire is one for Kalmoi Mateiia Marmor, a U.S. citizen, born in 1876 in Vilno, who claimed to have joined the Communist Party in Chicago in 1920. The second part of the folder contains materials that would appear to belong with the remaining original folder cover with number 55 (1927, 1928, and 1929), containing different papers and testimonials from those dates. A long text in Yiddish dating from 1934 would appear to have been added to that folder from yet another source. A similar stray 1936 questionnaire from the Kiev institute is found in WKP 495, which has an earlier American file folder marked "Miscelaneous," in British English rather than U.S. orthography. Otherwise, that file contains fragments from several Russian files, but predominantly including of documents from Smolensk, along with a foreign broadcast transcript relating to a demonstration at the Reichstag in Berlin.

218. See, for example, "Tentative List of Library and Archival Collections at the OAD" (25.IV.1946), as appended to the OAD Monthly Report (30.IV.1946), p. 24, US NA (Suitland), RG 260; see a similar listing with the later monthly report (30.VI.1946), p. 58.

219. Regarding the fate of the archive of the Kiev institute, I am grateful to L. A. Dubrovina, Director of the Institute of Manuscripts at TsNB, and I. A. Sergeeva, head of the Judaica Division in TsNB, who in May of 1994 identified contingent materials from the Kiev insitute in Jerusalem. My colleagues in Kiev had no idea how the Smolensk file happened to be in Kiev or how the Kiev institute files happened to be found in Jerusalem before I explained to them about the Offenbach Archival Depository. The vagarieties of the American restitution process now also explain how a few Rothschild materials are now held in TsNB. Since it was an American policy at Offenbach to turn over most Judaica and Hebraica from Eastern European collections to the Commission for Jewish Cultural Reconstruction for transfer to Israel, this explains why other Judaica and Hebraica from Ukrainian collections are found in Jerusalem. Since our discussion of this issue in Kiev in May 1994 three more files from Smolensk identified as well in TsNB.

220. US NA, RG 263 (CIA), Foreign Document Division, boxes 15-17. Smolensk documents for which such translations or analysis were prepared include nos. WKP 49, 50, 118, 119, 137, 141, 143, 144, 148, 149, 176, 178, 185, 205, 215, 271, 273, 322, 525, 526, 535, and 538. The name of the analysist has been removed from most of the documents, but the name Charles appears on a few. Box 16 also contains analysis of other documents and publications in the Miscellaneous Russian series, but many of these bear the notation "of no intelligence value."

221. Getty, "Guide to the Smolensk Archive," p. 84.

222. The fact that Ernst Posner's report published in the *American Archivist* (January 1962): 15-23, aroused the interest of the Archivist of the U.S. is apparent from an internal memorandum in a US NA file. Dossier on Seized Enemy Records—Smolensk, US NA, RG 64. I appreciate the kindness of Stuart L. Butler in furnishing me a copy of this and subsequent documents cited from the dossier.

223. Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the U.S. to Major General J. C. Lambert, U.S. Army Adjutant General (12.II.1963), US NA, RG 64.

224. William M. Franklin, Director Historical Office, Bureau of Public Affairs, U.S. Department of State, to Robert H. Bahmer, Deputy Archivist of the U.S. (5.III.1963), US NA, RG 64.

225. See the undated draft memorandum in the same file, and Bahmer's letter to Igor K. Kolossovsky, Counselor, USSR Embassy (16.X.1963), "enclosing a brief description of the Smolensk records about which Dr. Grover spoke to Mr. Zemskoff," US NA, RG 64.

226. As reported by Robert Wolfe to the present author. The administrative file on the Smolensk Archive could not be located at the time of the author's last visit to US NA, due to preparation for the move to Archives II.

227. The GAU letter (2.VII.1965) was found in a recently declassified Central Committee file in TsKhSD, 5/35/212, fols. 158-159. Belov's meeting with Bahmer took place in London during a meeting of the Executive Committee of the ICA. The incident was first mentioned by TsKhSD archivist A. M. Petrov in a report at the December 1993 Rosarkhiv conference on Archival Rossica Abroad—"Voprosy vozvrashcheniia arkhivnoi Rossiki v dokumentakh TsK KPSS (1953-1986 gg.)," scheduled for publication in the conference proceedings. I appreciate Petrov's making a copy of his report available to me in advance of publication.

228. See especially the opening paper by Pomrenze, pp. 5-30, and the subsequent paper by Herman G. Goldbeck, "The German Military Documents Section and the Captured Records Section," *Captured German Records*, pp. 31-61.

229. See especially the comment by Ernst Posner, a German-American historian-archivist who had been trained with Mommsen in Berlin-Dahlem, but was then a professor at American University: "I have talked with Dr. Mommsen about...the story of the German effort to seize enemy records during the war[; it] is extremely interesting and it has not been covered....The whole story might some day be told in a thorough fashion, and it would be quite interesting." *Captured German Records*, p. 196. Posner himself had started an essay on this subject, a

typewritten copy of which is preserved in US NA, AGAR-S, no. 1524, but it remains impressionistic. Undoubtedly, Mommsen never revealed his own role in those events, and hence Posner would have not been aware of it.

230. Don Wilson, Archivist of the U.S., to R. G. Pikhoia, Chairman of Roskomarkhiv (Washington, DC, 18.III.1992). Professor Pikhoia kindly made a copy of that letter available to me.

231. Manuscripts in the collection were deposited in the Lenin Library Manuscript Division, although never mentioned in any published accounts before recently. Rare books went to the Rare Book Division, and other parts of the collection were deposited in the general (or special restricted) collections without note of their origin. Recently, a catalogue of the entire collection has been prepared and is now open for reference use. On the grounds of neglect and repression of the collection in the Lenin Library, Schneersohn lawyers in the West are claiming it was not "legally" nationalized.

232. See, for example, the Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty background report prepared by Julia Wishnevsky, "Controversy over Shneerson Collection Still Unresolved," dated 6 February 1992. There has been extensive press coverage of the controversy, but often without attention to the legal issues involved as, for example, the article by Joanne Levine regarding the efforts of Rabbi Boroch Cunin, "A struggle for books—Rabbi fights to 'free' 12,000 texts," *Moscow Times*, 11 August 1992, p. 16. There have been many other articles on the subject in the Russian press.

233. U.S. Congressional Record–Senate (31.III.1992): S 4537-40.

234. According to Acting Archivist of the U.S. Trudy Huskamp Peterson, the U.S. National Archives was required to sign an official letter to Vice President Gore (dated 14.IV.1993) guaranteeing that the "Smolensk Archive" would not be returned to Russia without an official release from his office.

235. See the explanation of the various court proceedings and the situation of the Schneersohn Collection as of the end of January 1994 in the article by Deputy Minister of Culture Mikhail Shydkoi, "Kto preziraet chuzhoe dostoinstvo? Sud'ba 'kollektsii Shneersona' kak zerkalo russkoi revoliutsii," *Moskovskii komsomolets*," 1.II.1994, p. 3.

236. See, for example, Smolensk Archive, WKP 17. Fainsod recorded details from that file and noted it as an example of the situation of the Jews in the USSR, although he was

apparently unaware of the earlier Hasidic community there. Fainsod, *Smolensk under Soviet Rule*, pp. 440-43.

237. "Ob osobo tsennykh ob'ektakh natsional'nogo naslediia Rossii," Ukaz Presidenta RF (18.XII.1991), No. 294, *Vedomosti S"ezda Narodnykh deputatov RSFSR i Verkhovnykh Soveta RSFSR*, no. 52 (26.XII.1991), pp. 2131-2132.

238. "O peredache religioznym organizatsiiam kul'tovykh zdanii i inogo imushchestva," Rasrorezhenie Prezidenta RF (23.IV.1993), No. 181-RP, *Rossiiskie vesti*, 27.IV.1993, p. 2.

239. Federal'nye Sobranie, parlament Rossiiskoi Federatsii, *Biulleten'*, no. 34, *Zasedaniia Gosudarstvennoi Dumy, 20 maia 1994 goda* (Moscow, 1994), pp. 31-32.

Center for Russian & East European Studies
University Center for International Studies
University of Pittsburgh
4G-12 Forbes Quad
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
(412) 648-7407

Ronald Linden, Director
Bob Donnorummo, Associate Director
Martha Snodgrass, Assistant Director