

# Russia's Trophy Archives - An Update on Restitution Issues<sup>1</sup>

Patricia Kennedy Grimsted,

*Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University*

*International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam*

Five years ago when accepted as a member of the Council of Europe in January 1996, Russia committed itself to the restitution of cultural treasures to member States - among a number of other specific intents - namely Article XIV to settle rapidly all issues related to the return of property claimed by Council of Europe member states, in particular the archives transferred to Moscow in 1945.<sup>2</sup> Restitution matters are hardly moving rapidly in Russia. Today I speak only about archives and, surprising, developments with respect to the restitution of archives are much more encouraging than is the case with art and library books. Russians use the term *Atrophies* for all of the foreign cultural property brought back to the USSR after World War II, because all of those captured cultural treasures are considered *compensation* for the tremendous losses, damage, and destruction they suffered during the war. But many Russians overlook the fact that the *Trophy* archive - hidden away for fifty years - are in reality the records of other European countries that also suffered wartime losses and destruction, and in many cases the memory of individuals and institutions who were victims of the Nazi regime.

**Captured Archives and Restitution Demands.** Ten years ago in an October 1991 interview with me, a Russian journalist friend was first to reveal the over seven linear kilometers of French intelligence and related records held by the then still top-secret *Special Archive* in Moscow (TsGOA - Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennykh osobyi arkhiv). A week later, the director confirmed the

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented at a seminar at the International Institute of Social History (IISH) in Amsterdam, 24 September 2001. Part of this essay was drawn from my report, *Russia's Trophy Archives: Still Prisoners of World War II?* being prepared for electronic publication by the Open Society Archives at the Central European University in Budapest, expanded from my lecture for the Summer University 19 July 2001. See also my earlier report, *Twice Plundered or Twice Saved? Identifying Russia's Trophy Archives and the Nazi Agencies of Their Plunder*, which appears in Russian and in English with the proceedings of the conference *Mapping Europe: Fate of Looted Cultural Valuables in the Third Millennium*, Moscow, 10-11 April 2000, at the website of the All-Russian State Library for Foreign Literature (VGBIL) - <http://www.libfl.ru/restitution/conf>; a printed edition is in preparation. Some of the data are drawn from my book, *Trophies of War and Empire: The Archival Heritage of Ukraine, World War II, and the International Politics of Restitution* (Cambridge, MA: distributed by Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute, 2001). See also Grimsted, *Twice Plundered or Twice Saved?: Russia's Trophy Archives and the Loot of the Reichssicherheitshauptamt*, *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 15(2) (Fall 2001): 191-244; and my earlier articles, *Trophy Archives and Non-Restitution: Russia's Cultural Cold War with the European Community*, *Problems of Post-Communism* 45(3) (May/June 1998): 3-16; and *Displaced Archives and Restitution Problems on the Eastern Front in the Aftermath of the Second World War*, *Contemporary European History* 6(1) 1997: 27-74, originally published as *IISG Research Paper*, no. 18 (Amsterdam: IISH/IISG, 1995), and reprinted in *Janus: Revue internationale des archives/ International Archival Journal* 1996 (2): 42-77.

<sup>2</sup> Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly, Opinion No. 193 (1996) - *On Russia's request for membership of the Council of Europe*, adopted by the Assembly on 25 January 1996 when Russia was admitted to membership on its basis. Another paragraph in the admission document signed by Russia committed it to negotiate claims for the return of cultural property to other European countries on an ad hoc basis that differentiates between types of property (archives, works of art, buildings etc.) and of ownership (public, private or institutional).

findings of the well-known archival spy Grimsted.<sup>3</sup> I was not permitted in the archive for another two years! Euphemistically rebaptized the Center for the Preservation of Historico-Documentary Collections - TsKhIDK (Tsentral'noe khraneniie istoriko-dokumental'nykh kollekttsii) in 1992, in March 1999 TsKhIDK was abolished as a separate repository and, now even symbolically, incorporated into the neighboring Russian State Military Archive - RGVA (Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi voennyi arkhiv).<sup>4</sup>

Soon after the story of captured French records became front-page news in Paris, the director of the French Archives Nationales queried his Russian counterpart, "How soon can we send transport to pick up our archives?"<sup>5</sup> The answer turned out to take ten years: the latest segment of the twice-plundered archives from France was turned over to French authorities in October 2000.<sup>6</sup> Typically, as another theme important to emphasize, the official authorizing resolution of the Duma called it an "exchange" rather than restitution: Indeed France paid approximately half a million dollars and turned over to Russia some original files of Russian provenance in exchange. A few fonds of French provenance remain in the former Special Archive in Moscow, but not all of those in other archives have even been identified; nor have the books and museum exhibits.

Liechtenstein (July 1997) and Great Britain (July 1998) are the only two other countries to have received their archives from Moscow since 1991. In both cases, an act of the Russian Duma was also required. The larger restitution to Liechtenstein was approved only because there was a significant "exchange" of documentation relating to the assassination of the Russian imperial family (1918), which the Prince of Liechtenstein agreed to purchase from Sotheby's.<sup>7</sup>

Many millions of files "saved by the Soviet Army" had been restituted to Eastern-bloc countries before 1991, always positively portrayed as the Soviet role of "helping other countries

---

<sup>3</sup> Evgenii Kuz'min, "Vyvezti... unichtozhit'... spriatat'...," *Sud'by trofeinykh arkhivov* (interview with P. K. Grimsted), *Literaturnaia gazeta*, no. 39 (2 October 1991), p. 13; publication of that interview was delayed for almost a year and was permitted in print only after August 1991. See the follow-up interview with TsGOA director, Anatolii Prokopenko, in the article by Ella Maksimova - "Arkhivy Frantsuzskoi razvedki skryvali na Leningradskom shosse," *Izvestiia*, no. 240 (9 October 1991).

<sup>4</sup> See more information about the merger and a brief overview of the history, holdings, and bibliography of published reference literature, in *Archives of Russia: A Directory and Bibliographic Directory of Holdings in Moscow and St. Petersburg*, English edition edited by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, Introduction by Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov, 2 vols. (Armonk, NY, London: M.E. Sharpe, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 225-30, with bibliographic updates on the ArchoBiblioBase website - <http://www.iisg.nl/~abb>. Since the merger, fond numbers have remained same for all of the former TsGOA/TsKhIDK holdings as now held in RGVA, except that the letter "AK" now follows the fond number.

<sup>5</sup> As recounted to me by the Russian archival leader who had been sent to Paris for ICA discussions. There were many newspaper accounts in Paris about the French archives - for example, Thierry Wolton, "L'histoire de France dort à Moscou" (interview with Anatolii Prokopenko), *L'Express* (21 November 1991).

<sup>6</sup> The 2000 restitution was not publicized in either Moscow or Paris. I first learned of the October transfer when the reading room of the former Special Archive (now part of RGVA) was closed that day. An earlier transfer took place in February 2000. Colleagues in Rosarkhiv and at the Quai d'Orsay kindly briefed me on the transfers. Regarding the return of the Masonic archives, see Pierre Mollier, "Paris-Berlin-Moscou: Les archives retrouvées," *L'Histoire*, no. 256 (July-August 2001): 78-81, and Grimsted (interview by Pierre Mollier), "Les prises de guerre de l'Armée rouge: Témoignage de Patricia Kennedy Grimsted," *ibid.*, 84-85.

<sup>7</sup> Details are provided in Grimsted, *Trophies of War and Empire*, chapter 10, and my earlier article, "Trophy=Archives and Non-Restitution."

reunify their national archival heritage.<sup>8</sup> But that internationalist policy was abandoned since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Initial archival restitution agreements signed in 1992 with the Netherlands, Belgium, Poland, Hungary, and Germany have still not resulted in actual transfers, and so those archives still remain prisoners of war.<sup>9</sup>

Rosarkhiv Deputy Chairman Vladimir Tarasov has spoken out at several conferences regarding post-1991 Russian archival restitution developments, although he avoids the term Restitution.<sup>10</sup> His remarks reflect the Rosarkhiv point of view that most important for Russia in returning the archives of other nations is the receipt in exchange - or barter as it really is - for important components of archival Russia, i.e. lost fragments of the Russian archival legacy dispersed abroad.<sup>11</sup> He accompanied then Rosarkhiv Deputy Chief Vladimir P. Kozlov to the 1994 CITRA meeting in Thessalonica, where Russia was one of only three countries to abstain from the concluding resolution declaring that archives should not be used as trophies or objects of exchange.

**Russian Legal Bases for Restitution.** It has taken ten years since the revelations about displaced treasures for the Russian Federation to develop a legal basis and procedures for processing restitution claims, but still most of the trophy cultural property and archives held in Russia have not been openly described. Rosarkhiv Chairman Vladimir Kozlov boasted to me last week that Russia is the only country that has a law regulating restitution. My answer should have been that Russia is the only country that really needs one! And we should recognize, while there are limited provisions for restitution, the law that took effect in April 1998 is basically a law nationalizing the cultural treasures brought to the USSR after the war.<sup>12</sup> The latest version of the

---

<sup>8</sup> See, for example, E. G. Baskakov and O. V. Shavblivskii, 'Vozvrashchenie arkhivnykh materialov, spasennykh Sovetskoi Armiei,' *Istoricheskii arkhiv*, 1958, no. 5, pp. 175-179; S. L. Tikhvinskii, 'Pomoshch' Sovetskogo Soiuzu drugim gosudarstvam v vossozdanii natsional'nogo arkhivnogo dostoiianiia,' *Sovetskie arkhivy*, 1979, no. 2, pp. 11-16.

<sup>9</sup> Regarding captured German records in Moscow and related restitution problems, see Kai von Jena, 'Die Rückführung deutscher Akten aus Russland - eine unerledigte Aufgabe,' in *Archiv und Geschichte: Festschrift für Friedrich P. Kahlenberg*, ed. by Klaus Oldenhege, Hermann Schreyet, and Wolfram Werner (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 2000), pp. 391-420. An estimated two million files were restituted to the German Democratic Republic (GDR) before 1991, but none since.

<sup>10</sup> Vladimir Tarasov's remarks have been reprinted in several variants. For example, his 1998 contribution, 'The Return of Archival Documents, Moved to the USSR as a Result of World War II,' *Spoils of War: International Newsletter*, no. 6, pp. 53-57; also available in Russian), was reprinted (unfortunately without updating) in *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, 2001, no. 3, pp. 75-77. All versions are available electronically: English - <http://lostart.de>, and Russian - <http://www.libfl.ru/restitution>. See also Tarasov's more recent contribution to the 2000 VGBIL conference, 'Problems of Looted Archives,' *Problemy peremeshchennykh arkhivov*, <http://www.libfl.ru/restitution/conf/>.

<sup>11</sup> See the Russian version of my report at the November 2000 Rosarkhiv conference on Archival Russia - 'The Russian Retrieval of Archival Russia Abroad: Politics or Culture?' in the proceedings (forthcoming Moscow 2001); an English version is in preparation.

<sup>12</sup> See Grimsted, *Trophies of War and Empire*, especially chapter 11. The full text of the law appears as 'O kul'turnykh tsennostiakh, peremeshchennykh v Soiuz SSR v resul'tate Vtoroi mirovoi voiny i nakhodiashchikhsia na territorii Rossiiskoi Federatsii' (signed 15 April 1998), in *Sobranie zakonodatel'stva RF*, no. 16 (20 April 1998), statute 1879. An English translation (along with the original Russian text) is available electronically - <http://docproj.loyola.edu>. The Constitutional Court decision is printed in *Sobranie zakonodatel'stva RF*, no. 30 (26 August 1999), statute 3989, pp. 6988-7007. The Russian texts of both the law and the Court decision appear electronically - <http://www.libfl.ru/restitution/law/index.html>. See the statements by the then Minister of Culture, Vladimir Egorov and several museum leaders in 'Nachinaem restituivat', 'No Germanii ne dadim nichego,' *Kommersant*, no. 127 (21 July 1999), p. 10, and 'Spravedlivoe reshenie v nespravedlivykh obstoiatel'stvakh,'

law (signed by President Putin with amendments in May 2000) reinforces the prohibition of restitution of cultural property to Germany and the Axis powers. At the same time, it provides for the potential restitution of cultural treasures under specified conditions from countries that fought against the Nazi regime and from those victimized by the Nazis.<sup>13</sup> Specified conditions for restitution include provisions for high financial charges by the Russian side, including storage, appraisal, and processing fees.

A implementing Regulation (*postanovlenie*) of the Government of the Russian Federation (2 December 2000 - no. 913) puts the Ministry of Culture in charge of processing restitution matters. Subsequently, another Government Regulation (*postanovlenie*) (11 March 2001 - no. 174) established and named the members of a new Interagency Council on Restitution with offices under the Ministry of Culture. Minister of Culture Mikhail E. Shvydkoi chairs the Council and Chief Archivist of Russia and Chairman of Rosarkhiv Vladimir P. Kozlov serves as Deputy Chair. The Council includes the directors of major museums, including Irina Antonova, and the Chairman of the Committee on Culture of the Duma, Nikolai N. Gubenko.<sup>14</sup> Each act of restitution must now be approved by the new Interagency Council. Once approved by the Council and an appropriate agreement with the holding repository (usually RGVA for archives) or Rosarkhiv is in place, a *Postanovlenie* (Regulation) of the Government is still required for export.

So far the Council has approved three cases involving archives, but those are still only in the first stage. First, the return of the Rothschild family papers from Vienna approved in May involves a private exchange for a collection of personal letters of Russian Emperor Alexander II to his morganatic wife to be purchased from Sotheby's (although the details are still under negotiation).<sup>15</sup> Potentially the Rothschild restitution is of tremendous importance, because it could open the road for the return of other twice-plundered records initially confiscated by the Nazis from enemies of the regime in Austria. Two years ago at my seminar at the Netherlands Institute for War Documentation (NIOD), the question arose if the Russian commitment to the Principles of the Washington Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets would help the restitution momentum in Russia. When I queried Rosarkhiv colleagues on this point last week, I was told that Rosarkhiv is not prepared to open the question generally with respect to archives of victims of the Holocaust in Germany and Austria. Based on my own recent experience in Moscow archives, the Russian pledge in Washington for more archival openness has also not been

---

*Kul'tura*, no. 27 (29 July-4 August 1999), p. 1.

<sup>13</sup> The text of the new amendments - AO vnesenii izmenenii i dopolnenii v Federal'nyi zakon "O kul'turnykh tsennostiakh, peremeshchennykh v Soiuz SSR v resul'tate Vtoroi mirovoi voyny i nakhodiashchikhsia na territorii Rossiiskoi Federatsii" (signed 25 May 2000) (No. 70-FZ) appears in *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, no. 155 (27 May 2000), pp. 4B5; *Sobranie zakonodatel'stva RF*, statute 2259; and electronically - <http://www.libfl.ru/restitution/law3/>.

<sup>14</sup> AO vnesenii izmenenii i dopolnenii v Polozhenie o Ministerstve kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii (2 December 2000 - no. 913); and AO merakh po realizatsii Federal'nogo zakona "O kul'turnykh tsennostiakh, peremeshchennykh v Soiuz SSR v resul'tate Vtoroi mirovoi voyny i nakhodiashchikhsia na territorii Rossiiskoi Federatsii" (11 March 2001) (no. 174). An electronic version of the latter text appears at the VGBIL website - <http://www.libfl.ru/restitution/law/index.html>.

<sup>15</sup> Receipt of the papers of Vienna-born Alfons Israel Rothschild by the RSHA in Wölfelsdorf (18 July 1944) is documented in RGVA, 500K/1/1302, fol. 27. See Frank Trentmann, "New Sources on an Old Family: the Rothschild Papers at the Special Archive, Moscow - and a Letter from Metternich," *Financial History Review* 2:1 (April 1995): 73-79. Those papers now constitute RGVA, fond 637K (2 opis; 419 file units; 1769B1939). See also the description in Gerhard Jagschitz and Stefan Karner, *Beuteakten aus Österreich: Der Österreichbestand im russischen Sonderarchiv Moskau* (Graz, Vienna: Selbstverlag des Ludwig Boltzmann-Instituts für Kriegsfolgen-Forschung, 1996; = Veröffentlichungen des Ludwig Boltzmann-Instituts für Kriegsfolgen-Forschung, vol. 2), pp. 128-30.

fulfilled - none of the secret files regarding trophy culture goods that I had earlier been refused have been declassified.

A second case involving the Netherlands, signed during the visit of Queen Beatrix to Moscow in early June 2001, follows up on the abortive 1992 agreement for the return of Dutch archives.<sup>16</sup> In meetings last week at the Russian Ministry of Culture, Deputy Minister Pavel Khoroshilov justified to me the fact that not even a symbolic file was transferred during the Queen's visit. As I understand it, negotiations continue regarding microfilming and how much the Dutch government should pay Rosarkhiv. The Dutch transfers are further delayed because of the inadequate description of the Dutch records, with which Dutch archivists are currently assisting in Moscow. Now some Dutch books have been identified among the 60,000 volumes in the former Special Archive, but those were not specified in the approved list.

The Interagency Council approved the restitution of Belgian archives from RGVA at the end of August 2001, although again, the terms of payment are still being negotiated with Rosarkhiv. The long, frustrating negotiations will be explained in a separate report by my Belgian colleague. The return of related books and printed materials identified by Belgian specialists in the former Special Archive has yet to pass further professional scrutiny, and Rosarkhiv claims inadequate proof of ownership (especially for those lacking stamps) has been put forward by the Belgian side. Records of alleged Belgian provenance identified in two other archives are also still under contention.

Negotiations continue with Greece, while Croatia is still working on a formal claim for a few groups of Jewish records recently identified in Moscow last week. But neither of those two cases has reached the Interagency Council. Polish specialists in cooperation with Russian colleagues recently issued a new guide to fonds of Polish provenance in the former Special Archive (also including those in GA RF), but diplomatic arrangements for their return appears stagnated despite a Russo-Polish agreement for restitution in 1992. Restitution to Poland is technically not covered by the new Russian law, because most of the Polish records in Moscow were seized before World War II or were produced during the prerevolutionary period when a large part of Polish lands were part of the Russian Empire. Polish archival authorities are now concentrating on mutual restitution negotiations with Ukraine.

Thus, experience of the last five years since the Council of Europe Aintents@ were signed shows that there is little hope for Arapid@ return of archives to the countries of their provenance. Costs to the receiving country (permitted within the law) run high, and usually Rosarkhiv tries to barter for some archival Rossica from the receiving country in return. Besides, Rosarkhiv reportedly now intends to move more carefully in restitution matters, since it was discovered that some files of Belgian and German were mistakenly returned to France.

**Inventorization of Cultural ATrophies.** Another important new development, at the end of March 2001 the Russian Ministry of Culture issued a *prikaz* ordering all cultural institutions to undertake a full accounting of their trophy holdings (including archives) in a consolidated database. The Ministry was suggesting the need for identification on the level of individual books and documentary units, but librarians and archivists disagree violently, pointing out that such a project would take decades. Negotiations continue between Rosarkhiv and the Ministry.

---

<sup>16</sup> According to the formal agreement (6 June 2001), 22 fonds of Dutch provenance were to be restituted immediately and the additional 9 fonds claimed by the Netherlands were to be transferred by the end of 2001. I am grateful to Eric Ketelaar, who headed the Dutch archival expert commission, for acquainting to me with the text of the agreement, and for discussions on the subject with RGVA archivists. See Ketelaar's recent report, ANederlandse archieven in Moskou: Winterslaap ten einde, @Archievenblad 105/6 (August 2001): 36B39.

Rosarkhiv is now prepared to circulate the *opisi* of their remaining trophy fonds if that would be deemed appropriate.

Plans call for the database to be completed by the end of 2002, but as things appear in Moscow in fall 2001, that date is as unrealistic as the identification of all displaced treasures. According to the order the displaced treasures are not to be displayed during the inventorization period without permission of the Ministry, and special permission is also required (at least in the case of museums and libraries under the Ministry) for the participation of foreigners in their identification.<sup>17</sup> Once a special catalogue from the database is published, Aforeign countries or individual citizens will have 18 months to files claim in accordance with the Federal Law on Displaced Cultural Treasures. Those not claimed will be registered as federal property. Cultural treasures that were Adisplaced to the Soviet Union as gifts or purchase, or even personal trophies of individual service men or citizens are not to be included in the database; these are to be regulated under the Civil Codex of the Russian Federation and the federal law AOn the Import and Export of Cultural Treasures.<sup>18</sup>

According to the Ministry the inventorization project covers Athose cultural treasures (currently held in state repositories) that were displaced in implementation of compensatory restitution from the territories of Germany and her former military allies - Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, Romania, and Finland to the USSR. There is no mention of those brought from Eastern European countries in that regulation and the law itself. This could raise further legal problems because most non-German archival materials now in RGVA came from Nazi hideaways in Silesia and the Sudetenland, having been evacuated from the Berlin area after Western Allied bombing intensified in 1943.

It is not clear the extent to which repositories will (or even will be obliged to) describe all cultural valuables that are already registered as state property. Many books and archival materials seized by Soviet authorities after the war - many of them with clearly displayed stamps or other markings of ownership - were in fact integrated into the main holdings of state libraries and archives. Claims in such cases are nonetheless anticipated by the Ministry of Culture.<sup>19</sup>

**Captured Records for AOperational Use.** Unlike art and library books, most Soviet archival seizures could hardly be termed compensation restitution. One of Lavrentii Beria's orders is the cover picture on my new book, TROPHIES OF WAR AND EMPIRE. Captured records brought to Moscow under Beria's orders were principally for operational analysis against Aenemies of the regime, as were the archival seizures by military intelligence, counterintelligence (SMERSH), and other authorities. Today, however, these are also included in the Acompensatory reparations category and subject to restitution (or not) under the terms of the new law.

**The Special Archive for Soviet Captured Records.** That formerly top-secret facility (officially TsGOA SSSR) founded in March 1946 especially to house Soviet captured foreign records, has been open to specialists since 1992, although the reading room was closed for

---

<sup>17</sup> *Prikaz* of the Ministry of Culture, no. 305 (30 March 2001), AOb inventarizatsii peremeshchennykh kul'turnykh tsennostei.

<sup>18</sup> See the explanatory instructions (20 June 2001), AOb inventarizatsii peremeshchennykh kul'turnykh tsennostei, issued over the signature of Deputy Minister of Culture Pavel Vadimovich Khoroshilov.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

two months in the summer of 2001. As of fall 2001, holdings from the former Special Archive still total slightly over 600 fonds (captured records groups or collections) from all over the European Continent.

Most difficult for researchers today, no comprehensive list of fonds is available. The archive itself prepared a provisional list of fonds, which was readied for publication with German sponsorship already in 1998, but as of fall 2001, publication is still being delayed.<sup>20</sup> Specialists from various countries have already surveyed records of specific national provenance - German,<sup>21</sup> Austrian,<sup>22</sup> Belgian,<sup>23</sup> Polish<sup>24</sup> and Dutch.<sup>25</sup> The Rosarkhiv list includes much less data than is available in those sources. Rosarkhiv is apparently hesitant to publish the list because of its many inaccuracies, and now that restitution to the Netherlands is already approved and Belgian restitution following soon, further reediting will be required.

When discussing those finding aids, we have to remember that the Special Archive was never set up as a normal archive for research purposes. Many materials not needed for operational utilization were never properly arranged in *fonds*, as distinct groups of records are known in Russian, and their description never completed. Many integral collections were split up into fragmentary fonds that further obscure their provenance. Some unnecessary materials were destroyed as waste-paper. Many collections combine documentation from varied sources, sometimes grouped by presumed national origin, but others grouped by language, or by type, such as Belgian Masonic files or records of Dutch Jewish agencies. One large collection of over 14,000 files contains jumbled Masonic documentation from all over the Continent (although

---

<sup>20</sup> Provisionally title: *Kratkii spravochnik po dokumentam inostrannogo proiskhozhdeniia, fondam Glavnogo upravleniia po delam voennoplennykh i internirovannykh (GUPVI) NKVDBMVD SSSR i dokumentam, peredannykh v stranakh poiskhozhdeniia* (Moscow: Rosarkhiv/RGVA, forthcoming).

<sup>21</sup> Götz Aly and Susanne Heim, *Das Zentrale Staatsarchiv in Moskau (ASonderarchiv@): Rekonstruktion und Bestandsverzeichnis verschollen geglaubten Schriftguts aus der NS-Zeit* (Düsseldorf: Hans-Böckler-Stiftung, 1992).

<sup>22</sup> Jagschitz and Karner, *Beuteakten aus Österreich@ Der Österreichbestand im russischen ASonderarchiv@Moskau* (Graz, Vienna, 1996; = Veröffentlichungen des Ludwig Boltzmann-Instituts für Kriegsfolgen-Forschung, vol. 2).

<sup>23</sup> *Fondy bel'giiskogo proiskhozhdeniia: Annotirovannyi ukazatel'*, comp. A. S. Namazova and T. A. Vasil'eva, ed. M. M. Mukhamedzhanov (Moscow, 1995); Flemish version: *Fondsen van Belgische Herkomst: Verklarende: Index*, ed. H. De Conninck, P. Creve, M. Vermote, and M. M. Mukhamedzhanov; translated by E. Saelmaekers (Ghent: AMSAB, 1997). An earlier survey of Belgian holdings, compiled by Wouter Steenhaut and Michel Vermote from the Archives and Museum of the Socialist Labour Movement in Ghent (Archief en Museum van de Socialistische Arbeidersbeweging), also covers holdings in RGASPI (formerly RTsKhIDNI) - *AMSAB Tijdingen*, n.s. 16 (Summer 1992), extra number: *Mission to Moscow. Belgische socialistische archieven in Rusland*. See also the intriguing study of the migration of the Belgian records in Moscow by Jacques Lust, Evert Maréchal, Wouter Steenhaut, and Michel Vermote, *Een Zoektocht naar Archieven: Van NISG naar AMSAB* (Ghent: AMSAB, 1997).

<sup>24</sup> *Archiwalia polskiej proweniencji terytorialnej przechowywane w Państwowym Archiwum Federacji Roszjskiej i Roszjskim Państwowym Archiwum Wojskowym (Archiwalia władzy roszyjskich 1813-1918, archiwalia niemieckie z ziem zachodnich i północnych Polski do 1945. Archiwalia Senatu WM Gdańska 1920-1939)*, ed. Władysław Stępnik and Aleksandra Belerska (Warsaw: NDAP, 2000). The guide also describes fonds of Polish provenance in GA RF.

<sup>25</sup> See Eric Ketelaars report cited in fn. 16. Evert J. Kwaadgras, archivist for the Great East of the Netherlands, shared with me the results of his research in RGVA after I furnished him with indications of the Dutch Masonic files I had noticed there. See his report to the April 2000 Moscow conference (in English and Russian), *AA Great Waste of Time and Energy: The Seizure and Scrutiny of Masonic Documents During and After World War II@-<http://www.libfl.ru/restitution/conf/>*.

predominantly German and Austrian). Other integral groups of records and even individual files were fragmented and distributed among many different fonds, archives, or other agencies.

Most printed books that arrived with the archives went to various libraries, but many of the transfers are virtually impossible to document. Over 60,000 volumes are still held inadequately processed by the successor RGVA. We can document the fact that 340 Torah scrolls and 240 crates of Masonic portraits and regalia were transferred to the State Historical Museum from the Special Archive in 1946, but as yet their fate has not been determined.

**Dispersal of Trophy Archives.** Much less information is available as to what foreign Atrophy@ archival materials are held in other Russian archives. Some repositories or specialized agencies received Atrophy@ archival materials directly after arrival in the USSR, others groups of records were transferred from TsGOA or other institutions. It is not clear how many of other federal archives and agencies archives will be included in the official inventorization under the Ministry of Culture. Some current federal archival directors and other archivists are not even aware of the extent of their trophy holdings or whence they came, nor do they want to be reminded.

Significant trophy archives are still held by NKVD/MVD agency archives and those of the KGB successors the Foreign Intelligence Service (SVR) and the Federal Security Service (FSB), but it is doubtful that those agencies will make information about their holdings public. Trophy holdings in military and military intelligence archives can only be surmised. Many military records from the Special Archive have been returned to France, and many of Belgian and Dutch provenance are slated for restitution. But we still do not know how many important files were sifted out to Soviet military agencies and may now remain in the Central Archive of the Ministry of Defense (TsAMO) Podolsk or others under the General Staff.

A preliminary guide to holdings of the postrevolutionary Archive of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation (AVP RF) under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is expected in the fall of 2001. But the Foreign Ministry denied to me again a couple of weeks ago that it has any displaced or Atrophy@ holdings.<sup>26</sup>

Many of the socialist materials brought back to the USSR after the war were turned over to the former Central Party Archive (TsPA, now the Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History - RGASPI). For example, the papers of German socialist Ferdinand Lassalle, retrieved by a Soviet trophy brigade in a Saxon salt mine were one of the first Atrophy@ fonds to have been publicly identified in the Central Party Archive.<sup>27</sup> Later also transferred from the Special Archive to IML were some of the Nazi pre-1940 police investigatory files regarding the Communist Party in France and other countries, along with a few files of the French security services regarding

---

<sup>26</sup> For a brief overview of all these archives and a bibliography of published reference literature, see *Archives of Russia*.

<sup>27</sup> The retrieval of the Lassalle papers is highlighted in the report of Golubtsov to I. A. Serov, *Dokladnaia zapiska o rezul'tatakh obsledovaniia dokumental'nykh materialov germanskikh arkhivov, evakuirovannykh i ukrytykh v shakhtakh Saksonii* (Berlin, 24 October 1945), GA RF, 5325/2/1353, fol. 216 (another signed copy in 5325/10/2030, fol. 35). The recent guide to personal papers in RGASPI admits that a basic part of the fond was acquired in 1946 from Germany among displaced archival materials. *RTsKhIDNI: Putevoditel' po fondam i kolleksiiam lichnogo proiskhozhdeniia*, ed. Iu N. Aniantova, K. M. Anderson, et al. (Moscow, 1996; = *Spravochno-informatsionnye materialy k dokumental'nyim fondam RTsKhIDNI*, vol. 2).

Paris visits of Soviet dignitaries such as the Comintern General Secretary Geogorii Dimitrov.<sup>28</sup> Many individual files from French and German security agencies, especially those relating to the German Communist Party, were transferred to East Germany during the Soviet period.

Other socialist materials when deposited in the Central Party Archive often arrived with inadequate data as to their origin and migration and now form parts of various fonds in RGASPI. In 1947 the Special Archive forwarded what was then called the Fond of the Socialist Workers= International@to the Institute of Marxism-Leninism (IML) because, as explained in the covering letter, it A had historico-scientific interest, but could not be used for operational-security work.@<sup>29</sup> Today, it has not been possible adequately to identify the actual materials involved in RGASPI.

Probably at least part of those Atrophy@ socialist materials went to the Central State Archive of the October Revolution (TsGAOR) SSSR rather than the Party Archive, since today a fragmentary fond by that name is held by the successor State Archive of the Russian Federation (GA RF). This and another collection of editorial materials most probably came from the collections of the Paris Branch of the International Institute of Social History, directed before the war by Boris Nikolaevskii.<sup>30</sup> The IISH Paris Branch had already received many of the records of the Second International on deposit, although some remained in Brussels at the outbreak of the war and were immediately seized there by Nazi agents, together with personal papers of the secretary Frederich Adler.<sup>31</sup> Many of them were among the 144 crates of archival materials from the Paris Branch of the IISH - and an additional 15 crates of materials from the Second International, seized by the Nazis in Paris, as documented in an ERR list I found last month in Kyiv.<sup>32</sup> We do not yet know how many of those crates stayed with the ERR during the war or how many were turned over to the RSHA and were evacuated to Silesia where they were seized a second time by Soviet authorities. Russian archivists may want to attribute the acquisition of these socialist materials to the Russian Foreign Historical Archive (RZIA) from Prague. Clearly, however, available documentation suggests documentation to suggest that many of them came from Paris, and hence further investigation of acquisition and wartime transfer records is required.

---

<sup>28</sup> Indications of transfers of such files to IML are apparent in the working annotated copies of TsGOA inventories (for example fonds 500K and 501K). Some of these were never fully processed in TsPA (and hence not available to researchers), but their existence there has been confirmed by RGASPI archivists.

<sup>29</sup> Musatov to Nikitinskii (12 June 1947), GA RF, 5325/2/1946, fols. 49B51. As was explained the fond also contained executive office records of Frederich Adler and original autograph letters of Avgust Bebel and Karl Kautsky, among others. Possibly some of these files are part of RGASPI fond 340, but further investigation is needed.

<sup>30</sup> The fond ARabochii sotsialisticheskii internatsional,@GA RF, 7007 (118 units; 1919, 1923B1939), contains a miscellaneous collection of materials of Western European socialist provenance. See also the ACollection of Matrixes [Printing plates] of Journals, Newspapers, Handbills, and Brochures, Published by the Central Committee of the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries in Paris@(1907B1910) (fond 5884; 40 units; 1907B1912), which was undoubtedly received from Paris. Other documentation collected for the IISH by Boris Nikolaevskii was deposited in the fond of his personal papers, now GA RF (fond R-9217; 2 *opisi*; 164 file units; 1900B1929), and those of Viktor Chernov (fond R-5847; 2 *opisi*; 441 file units; 1892B1938), among others.

<sup>31</sup> The records of the IISH Paris Branch and the files of the Second International are mentioned in several Soviet reconnaissance and transfer reports involving the RSHA cache in Wölfelsdorf (see below). Seizure of the Adler materials from Brussels is also mentioned in several Nazi reports and is confirmed in documentation available at IISH in Amsterdam. See, for example, the ERR report (Berlin, 4 December 1941), TsDAVO, 3676/2/1, fol.

1

<sup>32</sup> The undated list is one of a series that accompanied an ERR report to Berlin, found among the ERR files in TsDAVO, 3676/1/172, fols. 274B275.

TsGAOR SSSR (now part of GA RF) was the designated recipient of documentation of Russian émigré origin, including papers of exiled Russian Menshevik and Socialist Revolutionary Party (SR) activists. In 1946 that archive established a special division for the nine sealed freight wagons of archival materials from the Russian Foreign Historical Archive (RZIA) from Prague. As a duly designated gift to the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Russian archivists today do not consider RZIA among trophy holdings. But the Prague collections became hopelessly admixed with other trophy receipts by TsGAOR in the postwar decade. Subsequently holdings from RZIA were dispersed in at least thirty repositories throughout the former USSR, but a recent inter-repository guide describes many of the now dispersed fonds.<sup>33</sup>

Much more complicated is the task of identifying the unmistakable trophy origin of many the émigré holdings seized after the war from other sources - and indeed from many other countries (Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, France, and, for example) - that were subsequently deposited and intermixed with RZIA holdings in TsGAOR SSSR.<sup>34</sup> Many papers of Pavel Miliukov, Viktor Chernov, and Boris Nikolaevskii, among others from Paris, for example, came to the Special Archive with the Nazi-plundered RSHA cache from Silesia and were subsequently transferred to TsGAOR. Many of those Nazi-confiscated files are still incorrectly identified in GA RF as having come with the RZIA gift from Prague.

Russian archivists are so committed to the retrieval of archival Rossica from emigre sources that they often refuse to consider restitution of materials clearly created abroad that rightfully belong to foreign repositories, even when there is convincing documentation that they were confiscated by Nazi agencies. For example, in connection with the recently approved Dutch restitution, among the files from the International Institute of Social History that remain in Moscow in RGVA, Rosarkhiv wants to disallow the restitution of a folder of correspondence of Boris Nikolaevskii, who served as director of the Paris Branch of IISH before the war.<sup>35</sup> Many of his personal papers were seized with those of the Paris IISH Branch, the Second International, and related socialist sources in Paris and Amboise. Undoubtedly, this file was left behind in TsGOA when other papers of Nikolaevskii were transferred to TsGAOR in 1946, since a large fond of Nikolaevskii papers is now held in TsGAOR, part of which have been identified as having been confiscated by the Nazis from Paris.<sup>36</sup>

Many earlier historical trophies were delivered to the Central State Archive of Early Acts (TsGADA, now RGADA). The Central State Historical Archive in Leningrad (TsGIAL, now RGIA), and the Central State Military History Archive (TsGVIA, now RGVIA) also received their share of historical trophies appropriate to their profile. Literary trophies, including many

---

<sup>33</sup> See *Fondy Russkogo zagranichnogo istoricheskogo arkhiva v Prage: Mezkharkhivnyi putevoditel'*, ed. T. F. Pavlova et al. (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1999).

<sup>34</sup> See more details and additional examples in my article in preparation, "Rationalizing the Retrieval of Archival Rossica Abroad: Politics or Culture?" for *Cahiers du Monde Russe*; a condensed version appears in Russian in the proceedings of the Rosarkhiv conference - *Azarubezhnaia arkhivnaia Rossika: Itogi i perspektivy vyivleniia i vozrashcheniia*, Moscow, 16-17 November 2000 (forthcoming, Moscow, 2001).

<sup>35</sup> The file in question in RGVA remains part of the IISH fond in RGVA, 528K/1/69, and includes correspondence between Nikolaevskii (then in Berlin) with RZIA, 1928-1931.

<sup>36</sup> Other documentation collected for the IISH by Boris Nikolaevskii was deposited in the fond of his personal papers, now GA RF (fond R-9217; 2 opis; 164 file units; 1900-1929), and those of Viktor Chernov (fond R-5847; 2 opis; 441 file units; 1892-1938), among others. The seizure of these materials from Paris is well documented among the Papers of Boris Souveraine held by IISH in Amsterdam, especially the Souveraine correspondence with French authorities and attestations of Nazi confiscation, including Nikolaevskii's list of seizures of materials on deposit with IISH in Paris and his own papers (folder 8).

papers of Russian émigré writers were acquired by the Central State Archive of Literature and Art (TsGALI, now RGALI), while other archival trophies went to many different libraries and museums.

### *Twice-Plundered Archives and the Nazi Agencies of Their Plunder*

Identification of the provenance of archives and library collections seized and transferred to the Soviet Union after World War II is also complicated by the fact that almost all of the non-German captured foreign records in the former Special Archive, with the exception from those from Poland and Romania, were first captured by Nazi agencies from declared political and ideological enemies - twice plundered, or (as some prefer to call them) twice saved. In recent years I have been trying to identify major groups of archival materials according to the specific Nazi agencies of their plunder. Analysis of these complexes, together with the records of the Nazi agencies that captured them, is helping establish the exact provenance and migratory paths of many captured records and providing clues about contingent missing or dispersed segments. In the case of Dutch and Belgian records in Moscow, as far as I know, there were only two major agencies responsible.

**Nazi Military Archives - the Heeresarchiv.** The special military archival intelligence center for records from Western Europe (HABAktensammelstelle West) established in 1941 in Berlin-Wannsee, housed huge quantities of records from France, along with some from Belgium and the Netherlands. Those plundered foreign military records were among the most voluminous archives shipped to Moscow at the end of the war - no less that thirty Soviet freight cars were found in from Berlin-Wannsee.<sup>37</sup> Cooperative efforts with archival specialists from several countries involved will be needed to reconstruct the holdings in Berlin-Wannsee on the basis of the many German inventories of the Heeresarchiv captured loot have been preserved in Moscow.

**The Reich Central Security Office - RSHA (*Reichssicherheitshauptamt*), Amt IV and Amt VII.** With only a few minor exceptions, all of the other Dutch and Belgian records in Moscow came with the loot of the Reich Central Security Office (Reichssicherheitshauptamt), from the RSHA Amt VII (Seventh Office) archival center in Silesia. The RSHA Amt IV (Fourth Office), which also comprised the Gestapo, I recently discovered, was the agency that held the captured French intelligence records, most of which have now been returned to France.<sup>38</sup> But as far as I know, no Dutch or Belgian records were held under Amt IV auspices.

**The Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (ERR).** Many of the Dutch and Belgian archival materials (as well as those from France) that ended up in the RSHA cache in Silesia and their castles in the Sudetenland had initially been captured by the so-called Einsatzstab Reichsleiter

---

<sup>37</sup> Zapevalin to Nikitinskii (20 July 1945), GA RF, 5325/2/1353, fol. 207. The same report lists the major seizure from Potsdam without any specific quantity. Tsaplin confirms Soviet seizures from Berlin-Wannsee of 200 studebaker [truck loads], Vsevolod Tsaplin, *O rozyske dokumentov, pokhishchennykh v gody voiny iz arkhivokhanilishch SSSR*, *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 1997, no. 5, p. 13.

<sup>38</sup> See Grimsted, *Twice Plundered or Twice Saved? Russia's Trophy Archives and the Loot of the Reichssicherheitshauptamt*, *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 15(2) (September 2001): 191B244. A more detailed version is in progress with accompanying documents.

Rosenberg (ERR), the Special Command Force for Occupied Territories, headed by Hitler's ideological henchman *Reichsleiter* Alfred Rosenberg. In Western Europe the ERR is mainly known for art looting.<sup>39</sup> But the ERR was also responsible for the confiscation of extensive library and archival materials, many of its plundered Jewish and Masonic collections from France and the Low Countries. Some of the library materials they captured from France and Belgium stayed with the ERR during the war, were transferred in 1943 to their research and library center in Ratibor in Silesia, and thence ended up in the USSR, but only a few archival materials were also involved.<sup>40</sup>

Soviet authorities also captured many ERR operational records, which are now scattered in Moscow, Vilnius, and especially Kyiv. These records are extremely important in documenting ERR confiscations in many European countries. A current project with a library microform publisher (also involving the Bundesarchiv and the Holocaust Museum) seeks to bring together all of the ERR records scattered in many countries, including Germany, France, and the United States, and provide a virtual finding aid.<sup>41</sup> One important ERR collection remains in Amsterdam (in the Netherlands Institute for War Documentation - NIOD), which we undoubtedly should also include.

**RSHA Amt VII.** In terms of the extant displaced archival loot from the Netherlands and Belgium, most important was the Silesian cache of the RSHA Amt VII that was taken to Moscow under Beria's orders. The RSHA loot included massive plundered Masonic collections, Jewish materials (from communities, organizations, and individuals), socialist files (such as records of the Second International and collections from the Paris Branch of the IISH), records of churches and religious organizations, Russian émigré groups and individuals, and many personal papers in all categories. At least 28 freight train wagons of those archival holdings were transferred to Moscow by Soviet authorities in the fall of 1945.<sup>42</sup>

**A Case Study: Amsterdam and Thessalonica Jewish Community Records.** At the time CITRA was gathered in Thessalonica in 1994, undoubtedly none of the participants (including even those from Russia or Greece) realized that a major group of Nazi-confiscated records from the Thessalonica Sephardic Jewish Community was held in Moscow. Those files

---

<sup>39</sup> ERR art looting in the West and Rosenberg's alliance with Göring are well analyzed by Johnathon Petropoulos, in *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (University of North Carolina Press, 1996). See also the relevant chapters in Lynn Nicholas's *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); now also available in a Russian translation: *Pokhishchenie Evropa: Sud-ba kul'turnykh tsennostei v gody natsizma* (Moscow: Logos, 2001).

<sup>40</sup> My detailed study of the ERR library and archival confiscations and operations is in preparation; see also *Trophies of War and Empire*, ch. 8.

<sup>41</sup> The preliminary Grimsted survey is on deposit with the Bundesarchiv and the Holocaust Museum: *The Records of the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (ERR), Their Archival Fate and a Proposal for a Comprehensive Microform Edition with a Virtual Electronic Finding Aid: Introduction with Working Archival and Bibliographic Data* (latest version October 2001); publication as a Working Paper for the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and IISH is planned.

<sup>42</sup> See the study by Grimsted, *Twice Plundered or Twice Saved? Russia's Trophy Archives and the Loot of the Reichssicherheitshauptamt*, *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 15(2) (September 2001): 191-244. See also my initial report, *New Clues in the Records of Archival and Library Plunder during World War II: The ERR Ratibor Center and the RSHA VII Amt in Silesia*, in *The Return of Looted Collections (1946-1996). An Unfinished Chapter: Proceedings of an International Symposium to mark the 50th Anniversary of the Return of Dutch Collections from Germany*, ed. F. J. Hoogewoud, E. P. Kwaadgras et al. (Amsterdam: IISH, 1997), pp. 52-67. I am currently preparing a monograph on these operations with extensive documentary appendices.

had been also been found in Silesia with the RSHA Amt VII, along with even more records of Jewish Communities and institutions in the Netherlands and Belgium, among those from other countries.<sup>43</sup> However, we now know that the RSHA had sent contingent files from those same record to the Castle of Mimon (*German Niemes*) in the Sudetenland, which they were using to evacuate their confiscated library materials. Other files they left behind in Berlin. Some that had earlier turned over to the Reichssippenamt which ran a center for Jewish genealogy based in one of the closed down synagogues in Berlin. This complicated situation explains why these Jewish records remain so widely dispersed and were found in different countries after the war, similar to those from Amsterdam.<sup>44</sup>

The Greek Jewish files in Moscow have already been microfilmed by Israeli specialists, who paid a high fee for the right to copy them. Copies were also purchased at a high cost by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Today Greece is claiming the originals in Moscow, but now Greece is being asked by Russia to pay again, similar to the case of the Netherlands. Archivists from the Greek Foreign Ministry are confident that there are archivists in Greece and even Thessalonica who are prepared to preserve them. However, they apparently are not aware of the extent to which files from the Jewish Community in Thessalonica, like the Amsterdam Jewish files were dispersed by the Nazis during the war and ended the war in different countries. As it turns out, there are even a few stray Thessalonica files in Amsterdam. Reportedly, there is a large group of Thessalonica files in the United States; possibly there are some originals in Israel; and I wonder if there might be any in the Czech Republic, like the case of the Amsterdam files that were returned from Prague earlier this year? This is but one example of the tragic dispersal of the European archival heritage during World War II.

**Conclusion.** Last year, the Greek premier made a visit to Moscow and took with him some Russian trophies found in Greece - including an historic battle-scarred Russian naval flag, but he received nothing in return. Fortunately, Queen Beatrix's visit to Moscow last June produced a rushed Russian approval of the Dutch archival restitution claim, even if no symbolic files changed hands. Only tangential mention in the Government Resolution was made of further consideration for the Dutch-supported claim of my friend Christine Koenigs (who is with us today) to her grandfather's collection of drawings that remain in the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts in Moscow. Thus, despite all the problems discussed, we nonetheless must conclude that archival restitution issues in Russia are well ahead of those for other cultural treasures - despite the fact that the market value and public appeal of art may raise its priority for diplomats who have to deal with restitution issues.

Russians appreciate the drawings in the Koenigs Collection, but who in Russia would ever

---

<sup>43</sup> The Thessalonica Community records (RGVA, fond 1428K; 297 file units; 1919B1941) and those from Athens (fond 1427K; 112 file units; 1901B1942) have both been filmed by specialists from Tel Aviv University. Two smaller fonds comprise records of Zionist offices in Thessalonica involved with assisting the emigration of Jews to Palestine (fond 1435K and 1437K), and there are a few more fragmentary files in a fond labeled for Jewish organizations in the Netherlands (fond 1432K). There are a few additional files of Greek Jewish provenance, such as files of B'nai B'rith from Greece and Yugoslavia (fond 1225K). Copies of all of these Greek fonds are available in USHMM. A Russian agreement recently signed with the Greek Foreign Ministry for the return of the originals was mentioned in the Greek report at the Vilnius Forum in October 2000, and Greek specialists have since been examining the materials in Moscow.

<sup>44</sup> See the report by Odette Vlessing, an archivist at the Amsterdam Municipal Archives, *Recovering looted Archives in Amsterdam*, in *The Return of Looted Collections*, pp. 112; and Vlessing's more detailed report, *De archieven van de joodse gemeente Amsterdam*, *Nederlands archievenblad* 99 (1995): 134-42. My further appraisal of the wartime and postwar context will be included in my expanded study of the RSHA loot.

study files of Dutch feminist organizations or Belgian theosophic societies, and how could those files possible compensate for Russian records lost or destroyed during the war? Yet, like the trophy art and library books, they still remain prisoners of World War II, prisoners in Moscow not only of the war itself, but also the Sovietized war in myth and memory. Most of them were first plundered - or if you will saved by the Nazis themselves from their victims who fled or were deported. When? and How many of them will come home from the war? Those are questions now that will be answered, alas, not necessarily by professional archivists, but rather in terms of the international politics of restitution.

**P. S. Trophy Library Books and VGBIL.** In contrast to archives, there has been no library restitution since 1992, when the Netherlands received from Russia two library restitution shipments - one of Dutch books from the All-Russian Library of Foreign Literature (VGBIL), and another of European socialist literature from the former library of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism. The Cold War battle lines were drawn in 1996 as German librarians (as if in reply to the Duma prohibition on restitution) published a volume of German translations of secret Soviet Trophy brigade reports and related documents (many of them now classified in Moscow), several of them documenting how many books (or cases) were taken from each of hundreds of German libraries and museums.<sup>45</sup>

The Library of Foreign Literature has been one of the leaders of openness in Russia with respect to displaced cultural treasures, including the Russian translation of the International Newsletter, *Spoils of War*. The VGBIL website, parts of which result from a joint Dutch-Russian cultural initiative, produced by its new Center for the Study of Displaced Cultural Treasures, provides a virtual bulletin board for Russian and related international developments.

None of us here today attended the VGBIL seminar last April - *Legislation and Gestures of Goodwill*, since unfortunately invitations for Dutch and Belgian colleagues came too late for them to make arrangements. My short contribution, *Gestures of Goodwill and the Unfinished Business of Restitution*, was not presented at the conference in my absence. But it now appears on the VGBIL conference website in English and Russian, and is being published with the proceedings in Germany. Unfortunately, there were few other Russian gestures to report.<sup>46</sup> Four of us present today attended an earlier VGBIL conference in April 2000 *Displaced Cultural Treasures in the New Millennium* - the first international conference in Russia addressing such issues. Many of the papers (including ours) are also available at the VGBIL website, but unfortunately, the treasures themselves discussed there remain displaced. A sequel is planned next April focusing on displaced private collections. It is to be hoped that more of those here today will be able to participate.

---

<sup>45</sup> Ingo Kolasa and Klaus-Dieter Lehmann, eds., *Die Trophäenkommissionen der Roten Armee: Eine Dokumentensammlung zur Verschleppung von Büchern aus deutschen Bibliotheken* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1996 [= *Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie*, Sonderheft 64]). Although some of the original Soviet documents are partially declassified in GA RF, those among former CP records in RGASPI and RGANI remain classified.

<sup>46</sup> See the program and reports: <http://www.libfl.ru/restitution/conf01/index.html>, including my own brief contribution, *Gestures of Goodwill and the Unfinished Business of Post World War II Restitution*, available in English and Russian translation.