From Dispersed to Distributed Archives: The Past and the Present of Samizdat Material

Olga Zaslavskaya
OSA Archivum at Central European University, Budapest

Abstract   Historians turn to archives for historical evidence, the availability of which is not to be taken for granted. In many cases, archival practice excludes a significant part of documentation from archival solicitation.[1] This can be applied to the history of the samizdat documents, which were excluded from the long-term preservation policy of state archival authorities in the Soviet bloc countries. At the same time, the singularity of the historical context that had motivated the emergence and spread of samizdat also engendered the peculiar logic of its circulation. A significant share of samizdat documents were smuggled out of the communist countries to the West, ending up in numerous organizations and private collections abroad. The dispersed character of samizdat archival sources has a negative effect on the quality of research in this area. One of the main objectives of the International Samizdat [Research] Association is to find and work out possible solutions to overcome the decay of samizdat materials both physically and "virtually"—in the collective memory of the present and for the cultural memory of future generations.

Archives and the Memory Turn

The question about the possibility of having history written in its fullness and objectivity is not yet answered. History employs and rests on the traces of the past that have been preserved in different forms, including memory. The past few decades have witnessed a boom in studies of memory and

1. Archival solicitation means acquisition policy and refers to the process of identifying and acquiring historical documents by archival institutions.

related concepts, such as forgetting and remembering, repression, trauma, transference, testimony, evidence, document, nostalgia, and so forth.[2] The disciplinary development of social memory studies is closely connected with recent thematic and theoretical developments in the humanities, beginning with new discussions of the relationships between memory and history. The relationships have been brought into focus through the analysis of memorial and historic "sites," such as archives and museums.[3]

Although a collective memory is richer in its content than individual memory, even it has a tendency to blur over time.[4] As Cornelius Holtorf (2003) writes, oral histories show that, in "Western" societies, the living memory of the past transmitted from one person to another does not go back in time more than eighty years. Everything earlier than that becomes history, and those facts and events have to be learned at school, through books or other media. "What nowadays is still considered 'recent past' slowly goes toward incorporation into the notion of 'distant past,' the past which is beyond individual memory, and beyond the memory of other contemporaneous individuals." While knowledge of the recent past is "stored" in social memory, cultural memory contains mostly facts from the distant past. Knowledge of the recent past is transmitted to cultural memory through the oral tradition, written histories, documents, and the artifacts of cultural heritage (both "tangible" and "intangible").[5] Cultural memory binds the past to the present and the future. In this respect, archives are crucial in the process of transmitting "recent" to "distant" past: archives have the power to make the fragmentary record of the past less fragmentary by filling in gaps and making accessible the documents for historical research. However, there is a clear-cut boundary between "factual history" and "remembered past" (Assmann 2006: 272). The question of who controls what is remembered and how we remember is closely connected with

2. Starting from the 1980s, history and memory have become central to academic discourse. As Alon Confino (1997: 1386) remarks: "The notion of memory has taken its place now as a leading term, recently perhaps *the* leading term, in cultural history." A series of publications provide insights into different aspects of this juncture, such as Bal 1999; Boym 2001; Carr 1986; Connerton 1989; Le Goff 1992; Nora 1989; Ricoeur 2004. Two recent special issues of *Poetics Today* ("How Testimony Communicates" 26:2 [2005] and "The Humanities of Testimony" 27:2 [2006]) are devoted to testimony, especially concerning the Holocaust, where the relations between memory and history have been particularly contested.
3. See, for instance, Ernst 2000; Hedstrom 2002; Körmendy 2007; Steedman 2002.
4. On personal versus collective memory see Ricoeur 2004: 93–132.
5. "Tangible cultural heritage" denotes physical objects, such as buildings and historical places, monuments, and other objects significant to the different aspects of the culture, including archaeology, architecture, science, art, ethnography, etc. Intangible aspects of culture refer to the ethical values, social customs, beliefs or myths, language, and other forms of human activity in certain historical periods. See, for example, Bouchenaki 2003.

an existing politics of cultural memory and a new awareness of the past as a social construction shaped by the concerns of the present (see Halbwachs 1992).[6] Both the "memory turn" (as a part of the larger theoretical debate on the notion of historical representation) and the "crises of representation" (Pinn 2001) had serious implications for the social accountability of archives, regardless of their type (governmental, corporate, or private) (Wilson 2002: 163).

These developments frame my discussion of samizdat as a primary source for historical research. I will begin with the contemporary debates on the notion of archive, which constitute the theoretical backdrop for this study. Then I will explore the circumstances under which samizdat has been collected and preserved, and I will analyze how the practices of communist regimes and the realities of the Cold War led to samizdat's dispersion. I will also look at the history of the particular samizdat collection formed by the Radio Liberty Samizdat Unit (known as Arkhiv Samizdata or Samizdat Archives), stored at Open Society Archives (OSA) Archivum (at Central European University, Budapest), in order to show how the needs of its creators have been reflected in its scope and makeup. I will also outline possible solutions to overcome the dispersion and decay of samizdat material both physically and "virtually"—in the collective memory of the present and for the cultural memory of future generations.

There are several definitions of an *archive*, including (1) noncurrent records preserved with or without selection; (2) an institution responsible for the acquisition, preservation, and communication of archives; and (3) a building or a part of a building in which archives (see definition 1) are preserved and made available for consultation (Walne 1988: 22). Traditionally, an archive in the general sense means "documents made or received and accumulated by a person or organization in the course of the conduct of affairs and preserved because of their continuing value" (Ellis 1999: 2).[7]

However, such philosophers as Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida

6. Schwartz (1996: 277) points out that the growing interest in the social construction of the past since the 1980s is a result of the development of three overlapping perspectives: multiculturalism, postmodernism, and hegemonic history. Kammen (1995) adds to this list the fall of Communism and the politics of victimization and regret. See also Blouin and Rozenberg 2006; Le Goff 1992; Nora 1989; Olick and Robbins 1998; Schwartz and Cook 2002; Steedman 2002.

7. Together with other forms of evidence of past and present human activity (e.g., artifacts, oral tradition), archives constitute cultural heritage and aim to preserve the records of continuing (historical) value. "In its singular form archives refers specifically to the whole body or group of records of continuing value of an organization or individual, a vital resource also known by the French word *fonds* or the term *archief* common to many European languages" (Ellis 1999: 2)

have described *the archive* as the system that establishes statements as events and things or spaces each as a site of power, which is manifested by the act of assembling, structuring, and interpreting signs (see de Certeau 1988; Derrida 1996; Foucault 1972; Ricoeur 2004). By considering the limits and limitations of the range of repositories denoted by the word "archive," Derrida (1996) shifted the focus from the archive as a place for storing documents to its metaphorical meaning as the process of collecting traces of the past and then forgetting them. The meaning of the archive, according to Derrida (ibid.: 2), comes from the Greek *archeion*, a house of magistrates, the *archons*. "They [archons] not only ensure the physical security of what is deposited and of the substrate. They also accorded the hermeneutic right and competence. They have the power to interpret the archive." And as Carolyn Steedman (2002: 11) points out, "although *Archive Fever* may have nothing at all to do with archives and the attendant practices of history, Derrida showed us a place on *Mal d' archive*, a building, with an inside and outside, which is often a house (occasionally a home)." He recognizes archives as shelters for memory, as arks that house documents before they pass from the private to the public domain. In his turn, Foucault (1972: 129) considers the archive "as the law of what can be said, the system that governs the appearance of statements as unique events." For him, the archive is the general system of the formation and transformation of statements (ibid.: 130). The inert mass of documentation gains its documentary power through history, in history, and has its own history. Since history emerged as a discipline, the documents have been studied, questioned, and given rise to questions. There is a big critical concern behind these questions of how to restore the past from what is said by the documents emanating from it. "Document was always treated as the language of a voice since reduced to silence, its fragile, but possibly decipherable trace" (ibid.: 6). History in this respect is a method by which a society recognizes and processes this documentation mass. Or, in other words, "history, in its traditional form, undertook to 'memorize' the monuments of the past, transform them into *documents*, and lend speech to those traces which, in themselves, are often not verbal, or which say in silence something other than what they actually say; in our time, history is that which transforms *documents* into *monuments*" (ibid.: 7). Continuing these debates, Paul Ricoeur (2004) sees archives not only as physical places presented as shelter for documentary traces, but also as social places.

These debates bring into question whether the archive provides evidence of historical events or in fact creates (constructs) these events through its own "always-opening narrative." Traditionally, archival documents have been seen as a passive resource, a "neutral repository of facts" that is an

object of research for various historical and cultural purposes.[8] Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook (2002) argue that in fact archives were established by the powerful to protect their position in society, and it is through the archive that the past is controlled.

As archives have been from the beginning of their history social constructs involved in "power games," they have always been about the power of the present "to control what is, and will be, known about the past, about the power of remembering over forgetting" (Schwartz and Cook 2002: 3–4). In his novel *1984*, George Orwell wrote:

> Who controls the past, controls the future; who controls the present, controls the past. . . . The mutability of the past is the central tenet of Ingsoc. Past events, it is argued, have no objective existence, but survive only in written records and in human memories. The past is whatever the records and the memories agree upon. And since the Party is in full control of all records, and in equally full control of the minds of its members, it follows that the past is whatever the Party chooses to make it. (Quoted in Samuels 1986: 109)

Social groups construct their own images of the world and its history. These images arise from the interactions among individuals, based on agreement upon versions of the past. Therefore collective memory emerges through communication, through social frameworks, and "it is to the degree that our individual thought places itself in these frameworks and participates in this memory that it is capable of the act of recollection" (Halbwachs 1992: 38). Collective or social memories are put into shape by certain circumstances both political and cultural, shared beliefs and values; and they embrace issues of authenticity, identity, and power (Cattel and Climo 2002: 4). Archives are an important part of such frameworks, as they are the instruments used by the collective memory to reconstruct an image of the past. Remembering (or constructing) the past through archival research does not simply amount to the retrieval of stored information "but the putting together of a claim about past states of affairs by means of a framework of shared cultural understanding" (Halbwachs 1992: 40). Being a part of such a claim, archives help to shape that understanding. In

8. "The function of the archive is to collect, catalog, and materially preserve information that is relevant to the identity of society and to an understanding of its history and development. The historical archive stores information for the use of specialists. . . . The archive, in other words, is not a form of presentation but of preservation; it collects and stores information, it does not arrange, exhibit, process, or interpret it. . . . The archive is a pure potential, a possible source of information, nothing more. It is dependent on others to actualize and realize this potential, to transform it from the status of virtual information to that of palpable objects that can be transmitted and received by future individuals who, in witnessing the witnesses, will themselves learn and know and remember" (Assmann 2006: 270–71).

order to determine their role in this process, it is important to understand what was excluded from archival preservation, why exactly these documents were not taken into custody, and whether it was due to an archival acquisition policy deeply rooted in the period when "the European archive came into being in order to solidify and memorialize first monarchical, and then state power" (Jemerson 2006: 23). The traditional policy of archival acquisition, based on the decisions about what types of primary source materials should be collected today, represents an elitist approach, which in effect excludes the history of certain social groups (national minorities, women, working people) from archival solicitation.[9]

Social Memory and Historical Knowledge

Historical knowledge, as a part of culture, represents a record of social memory that is closely connected with past historical experience. In the process of cultural change, memory is contested, repressed, or reconfigured. The most extreme forms of social oppression even demand that we forget certain aspects and facts of historical experience.[10]

Lewis A. Coser, in his introduction to Maurice Halbwachs's book *On Collective Memory* (1992), recalls his experience of communicating with people from the former Soviet Union who had to shed their memory like a skin and to reconstruct a largely different collective memory after the major societal transformations that took place in 1989. In this connection, he cites György Konrad, a Hungarian writer and former dissident activist, who claims that "today only the dissidents conserve the sentiment of continuity. The others must eliminate remembrances; they cannot permit themselves to keep the memory. . . . Most people have an interest in losing memory" (ibid.: 22). Echoing these words, Pierre Nora writes: "we speak so much of memory because there is little of it left." He sees the reason for the current interest in les lieux de mémoire in there being no longer any real environments of memory, which disappeared "with the end of societies that had long assured the transmission and conservation of collectively remembered values, whether through churches or schools, the family or the state; the end too of ideologies that prepare smooth passage from the past to the

9. See, for example, Chaterjee 1997; Dirks 1993; McEwan 2003; Stoller 1995.
10. The totalitarian regimes of the twentieth century imposed "highly mythologized schemes" upon societies and different social groups (Lotman and Uspensky 1978: 217) and required them to accept the regimes' image of the past. As a consequence, with the change of the political system in the early 1990s, historical knowledge was found to have been not only fragmented and falsified. The last five years in Russia have shown the new wave of rewriting history in accordance with the new emerging myths (Levinson 2005; Zvereva 2003).

future or that had indicated what the future should keep from the past—whether for reaction, progress or even revolution" (Nora 1989: 7).

Describing the work of historians, Keith Jenkins (1992: 22) emphasizes that, in addition to embodying certain values, ideological perspectives, and epistemological presuppositions, they employ different routines and procedures for finding various materials to work with and "work up" histories. They shuttle between published and unpublished material (documents, records, artifacts) in order to "trans-form" the past into history through reproducing these "traces of the past" in a new category.[11] It is obvious that many of these traces of the past would mostly be found in archives. But the question arises to what extent history can be "worked up," and what evidence can be articulated by historians if archival material is not accessible or, in a worse case, does not exist anymore due to previous practices of selection or because it has been destroyed.

Archivists probably know better than most to what extent human social memory is fragile. In their everyday practice, they witness the ease with which documents can disappear because of an unprofessional practice or due to lack of time, storage space, finances, the appropriate means of preservation, or just archival ignorance. Additionally, archives can be destroyed during civil wars, oppressions, and general conflicts.[12]

Recently several steps have been taken to formulate a policy toward archives within the larger framework of human rights. In 1997 the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), together with the International Council on Archives, published a special report (the Quintana Report)[13] on the archives of the security services of repressive regimes. This document proposes, among other things, the right of people to the integrity of their written memory.[14] The integrity of writ-

11. Jenkins (1992: 49) warns us to be consistent and not to use the term "evidence" ambiguously, because certain "silent points" should be remembered: "(a) the past occurred; (b) traces of it remain; (c) these traces are there whether the historian goes for them and finds them or not; (d) evidence is the term used when (some or other) of these traces are used 'in evidence' on behalf of (some or other) argument (interpretation) and not before. Evidence, therefore, as opposed to traces, is always the product of the historian's discourse simply because, prior to that discourse being articulated, evidence (history) doesn't exist: only traces do (only the past did)."

12. In 1993, UNESCO launched the Memory of World program, which aims to preserve endangered documentary heritages and thus to democratize access to them. The 1996 special issue of *Archivum: International Review on Archives* entitled "Memory of the World at Risk: Archives Destroyed, Archives Reconstituted" provides data on the natural and human catastrophes "which had brought about the disappearance of entire sections of the history of certain nations" (*Archivum* 1996: x).

13. See Quintana 1997.

14. Other rights are the right of people to choose their own path to political transition; the

ten memory is closely connected with state policy toward national heritage and therefore with the principles and practice of archives.[15]

In most cases, historians turn to archives for historical evidence, but their reliability is not to be taken for granted. To become accessible to scholars, the documents must have been acquired, processed, and described in accordance with archival standards. As mentioned above, existing archival practice excludes a significant part of documentation from archival solicitation. Thus the words by Antoinette Burton (2001: 66), "the history of the archive is a history of loss" (although said in different context), can be fairly applied to the history of such archival documents as samizdat. This particular case can serve as an example of how cultural heritage can be endangered primarily as a direct result of political and ideological causes and how the power over archives and the power of archives was exercised in order to eliminate or preserve the historical evidence of free thought in the USSR and other countries of the Soviet bloc.[16]

Following the political changes that took place in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe in the early 1990s, some archival documents have been declassified, thus revealing the hidden facts and secrets of the past.[17]

right to truth (i.e., information on what actually happened); and the right to identify those responsible for crimes against human rights (Cook 2006: 8).

15. The term "written memory" is used here in its archival sense, meaning the complex of different documents related to the history of the particular entity. Recent discussions about "refiguring archives" (Hamilton 2002: 11) suggest the development of archival systems that "can represent multiple recordkeeping realities . . . and rethink definitions of the records and archives that exclude orality, literature, art, artifacts, the built environment, landscape, dance, ceremonies, and rituals as archival forms" (McKemmish et al. 2005: 154). In these circumstances, samizdat represents one of these challenges for the traditional archival practice not only because of its origin outside mainstream documentation but also as an archival object that comprises different formats and media (textual, audio, and video materials; photographs; and art) (see Doria 1986).

16. The Soviet secret police (KGB) usually confiscated all materials that were considered "propaganda," including manuscripts, books, artworks, and typewriters; these rarely returned to their owners. There were several attempts to collect and preserve samizdat material inside the Soviet Union. The so-called Leningrad collection in the Memorial Archive dates back to 1974. Several people, from both Moscow and Leningrad, took part in its creation. In 1977, S. Dediulin and V. Sazhin started its systematization and description. After the arrests of 1977–79, the collection was dispersed into more secure places. In 1991 it was donated to the archive of Memorial Center (www.memo.ru/history/diss/arhiv.htm).

17. As Walter Laqueur (1990: 34) writes, "the revelations of glasnost shed new light on almost every aspect of Soviet life." Under glasnost and especially after the end of the Soviet Union in December 1991, many of the archives were opened and, with them, new possibilities for international cooperation and collaboration in this area. Thus Yale University Press launched the Annals of Communism series, which heavily published archival sources (www.yale.edu/annals/books_available/books_available.htm). The book *Revelations from the Russian Archives* (Koenker and Bachman 1997) contains 350 documents translated into English; the originals were first shown in 1992 at an exhibition organized by James Billington for the

For this part of the world, the postmodernist reflections on the notion of *the archive*, and the historical practice of "making history," become crucial to understanding how archives "wield power over the shape and direction of historical scholarship, collective memory, and national identity, over how we know ourselves as individuals, groups, and societies" (Schwartz and Cook 2002: 3).

Cold War and Samizdat

The political changes that took place in the early 1990s in the countries of state socialism were the result of a considerable degree of internal dissent.[18] In turn, the scope and effectiveness of the dissident movement was very much dependent on the spread of uncensored information in the form of samizdat.[19] Studying the phenomenon of samizdat and the consequent shifts in the social and political thought after the "perestroika" period should therefore be considered indispensable to a better understanding of the history of the twentieth century.

It is an indisputable fact that samizdat deserves special attention not only as a cultural and sociopolitical phenomenon but also because "European history in the 20th century cannot be written without *Samizdat*," to quote Wolfgang Eichwede (2002: 11). "As unimpressive as the seventh carbon copy of the 'Chronicle,' poems on yellowed paper or undercover mes-

Library of Congress in cooperation with Russia's chief archivist at the time, Rudolf Pikhoia, and the historian Dmitrii Volkogonov. Another example of giving access to archival resources is the so-called Bukovskii/Soviet Archives, which contain materials from the archives of the CPSU [Communist Party of the Soviet Union], including the KGB reports to the Central Committee, which were copied in 1992 by the former dissident and human rights activist Vladimir Bukovskii (psi.ece.jhu.edu/%7Ekaplan/IRUSS/BUK/GBARC/buk.html).

The official Web site of the Federal Archival Agency of the Russian Federation contains some documentation concerning the process of declassification of the archival material, including some lists of declassified documents (1998–2006) (www.rusarchives.ru/secret/index.shtml).

Of particular interest is the special issue of *Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie* (*New Literary Observer*, www.magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2005/74/) devoted to the problems of archives, including the contemporary situation with regard to access to classified materials.

See also the early review of the former Soviet Union archives by Patricia Kennedy Grimsted (1998) and Rachel Donadio's (2007) article on the recent re-declassification processes in the Russian archives.

18. The roles of dissidence, resistance, and civil disobedience were already the focus of many scholars in the Soviet period (e.g., Alekseeva 1985; Skilling 1989; Tony 1988). Among recent publications about dissident legacy and dissident genealogy, see Arato and Cohen 1992; Daniel 2002; Falk 2003; Kozlov 2003; Kulavig 2002; Yurchak 2006. The Winter 2007 issue of *Slavic Review* was devoted to the title "Genealogies of Soviet Dissent" (Komaromi 2007; Nathans 2007).

19. See Feldbrugge 1975; Krivulin 1999; Mal'tsev 1976; Skilling 1989.

sages from the camps may appear—the very fact that they appeared at all was spectacular. They all left their mark on an age—and contributed to overcome it. . . . Not only did national cultures survive in *Samizdat*, but also works were created that entered into the canon of European literature. Alexander Solzhenitsyn's 'Gulag Archipelago' and Vaclav Havel's 'Power of the Powerless'—[are] works without which the century would have been different, certainly poorer."

It is widely known that the name "samizdat" has a Russian origin, and it is traditionally attributed to the poet Nickolai Glazkov, who in the late 1940s invented the term "sam-sebia-izdat" for self-published collections of his poems (Daniel 2002; Gereben 1986; Telesin 1973).[20] Samizdat activities were a common phenomenon, existing in one form or another in most of the countries of the Eastern bloc (Kowalczuk 2002; Preibisz 1982; Skilling 1989; Tökés 1996). Samizdat was both the process and the outcome of the "communication network" (Darnton 1982), which involved the cooperative efforts of many people—from writers to typewriters to the Western-based radio broadcasting programmers. In this circulatory process, the samizdat texts were produced; passed from hand to hand; retyped or copied by other means; broadcast, read, or listened to; discussed both in the country of origin and abroad; and, as later archival revelations showed, carefully analyzed by the authorities.[21]

The traditional political approach toward samizdat emphasized its content, its truthful and authoritative message (Komaromi 2004). In his Nobel lecture, Alexandr Solzhenitsyn (1972: 34) said: "One word of truth will change the course of the entire world" (quoted in Komaromi 2004: 597). In 1979, Vladimir Bukovskii wrote that "the only weapon we [dissidents] had was glasnost. Not propaganda but glasnost, so that nobody could say afterwards 'I did not know'" (Bukovskii 1979: 248–49; quoted in Oushakine 2001: 193). As Ann Komaromi (2004: 597) writes, this "idealized characterization made a compelling Cold War narrative, but it has little cur-

---

20. As Irene E. Kolchinsky (1999: 191) writes: "in the beginning Glazkov used the word 'Sam-sebia-izdat,' which he later contracted to 'Samizdat.' However, an adjective derived from that same noun can already be found in one of his poems written before the mid-1940's: 'Утвреждаю одно и то же я / самиздатным стихом не стихая . . .' (I declare the same thing all the time, / nonstop with my samizdat verses . . .). This poem, which I discovered in the poet's archive, perfectly confirms Glazkov's later confession: 'Самиздат . . . Придумал это слово я еще в сороковом году . . .' (Samizdat . . . I invented this word as early as in 1940 . . .)."

21. See, for example, materials from the Bukovskii archives (Soviet Archives), particularly the Suppression of Dissidence section (psi.ece.jhu.edu/~kaplan/IRUSS/BUK/GBARC/buk.html), and also the conference paper by Alexander Gribanov, "*Samizdat* in KGB Analysis of 1970–1971: Reading and Comparison of Two Documents" (ccat.sas.upenn.edu/slavic/events/slavic_symposium/samizdat_cold_war.htm).

rent relevance. In fact, *samizdat* was a more complex cultural phenomenon binding a varied Soviet dissident public. Idealized conceptions of *samizdat* have lost their resonance, but the *samizdat* form continues to influence post-Soviet thought and praxis." However, as Martin Machovec (2004) stressed, this "part of our history is still found on the margins of interests of most historians, sociologists, politicians, literary historians, to say nothing about the general reading public." Echoing his words, Irina Prokhorova (2005: 3) points out that "the underground is barely ever studied as an alternative social universe with its own creative associations and circles, its own authorities and aesthetic criteria, its own press and efficient distribution system for its political and artistic production, its own literary prizes, a social life with its own peculiar rituals, its own foreign contacts." Although recent events[22] demonstrate the growing interest in this particular phenomenon, its history has yet to be written. For this to be done with appropriate depth and scholarly sophistication, questions of the archival

22. Among them—just to name a few—are the series of exhibitions organized by the Research Institute for Studies in Eastern Europe (Bremen, Germany) in Berlin, Prague, and Budapest in 2000–2004 (Eichwede 2000); the online publication of one of the most important Soviet political samizdat periodicals, Chronicle of Current Events, by the Memorial Center (Moscow); the online guide to the RFE/RL collection of Soviet Published Samizdat provided by the same institution in cooperation with the OSA Archivum (Budapest) in 2004 (www.memo.ru); the exhibition Beyond Memory: Soviet Nonconformist Photography and Photo-related Works of Art at the Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum (Neumaier 2004); the samizdat workshop in Budapest in 2004; and the conference in Trento, Italy, on dissidence and samizdat in 2004. Additionally, during the first half of 2005 alone, several exhibitions were held in Moscow which were thematically connected to the history of samizdat and alternative culture. In February 2005, "The Flats' Exhibitions, 1956–1979: Yesterday and Today" was held within the program of the first Moscow Biennale, and in March the exhibition Accomplices presented more then 250 works of underground art from the famous Tsaritsino collection at the Tretiakovskaia Gallery and several private collections. The same year the Museum of Non-conformist Art opened another exhibition, part of which was devoted to the independent art of Leningrad in the 1970s and 1980s. In 2006 several other conferences took place: for example, Samizdat and Underground Culture in Soviet Bloc Countries (University of Pennsylvania, United States) (ccat.sas.upenn.edu/slavic/events/slavic_symposium/samizdat_cold_war.htm); "From Samizdat to Samizdat: Dissent Media Crossing Borders before and after 1989," organized by the Center for Contemporary History Research (Potsdam, Germany) in cooperation with Central European University (Budapest) and hosted by the Institute for Human Sciences (Vienna) (www.iwm.at); and "The Ways to Freedom in the Culture of Central and Eastern Europe 1956–2006" (Poznan, Poland). In 2005 the International Samizdat [Research] Association was founded as an informal network of archives, museums, research centers, and other institutions and individuals from around the world that serve, research, teach, or study the samizdat phenomenon (www.samizdatportal.org). It is worth mentioning two other recent events that promoted new approaches within the samizdat scholarly community, namely, "The Other Europe—From the 1960s to the 1980s: Dissent in Politics and Society, Cultural Alternatives" (Bremen, June 2007); and the workshop "From Samizdat to Blogging: Globalization and New Forms of Expression" (Budapest, February 2008), www.samizdatportal.org.

documentation of samizdat, its systematization and preservation, take on crucial significance.

During the period of the communist regimes, samizdat documents were never considered to be a part of the national heritage. This meant that they were excluded from the long-term preservation policy of state archival authorities, except in those cases when the secret police took special notice of the documents and their authors.[23] Moreover, the singularity of the historical context that motivated the emergence and spread of samizdat also engendered the peculiar logic of its circulation. A significant percentage of samizdat documents would be smuggled out of the communist countries to the West as well as secretly spread within the communist bloc, ending up in numerous organizations and in different collections in both Europe and America.

At present, the geographical range of repositories and collections (both public and private) containing samizdat documents is fairly broad. Samizdat materials can be found in Russia, the Ukraine, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Germany, but also in other European countries and in America.[24] Remarkably, the samizdat collections based in particular countries of the former communist bloc typically comprise both locally produced documents and those originating from other countries. The collections based in Western countries also comprise materials from different sources.[25] Thus the Bremen collection includes materials from all of the

23. KGB archives store materials regarding different dissidents, and their personal "dela" (a Russian archival term that can be tentatively translated as "folder") contain numerous pieces of samizdat—from underground periodicals to open letters, appeals, and literary works. Documents from the Radio Liberty Samizdat Archives in their turn attest what types of documents were confiscated by the secret police during searches. For example, AS 10 lists several books and also typewritten texts among the materials confiscated during the search at the Uirii Galanskov apartment. These thirteen items include the article "Relationships between Knowledge and Belief" by Aleksei Dobrovolskii, Open Letter to the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by A. Levitin-Krasnov, a typewritten text of the journal *Feniks* (total 379 pages) (RFE/RL1967).

24. The list of the institutions worldwide that store different samizdat collections is at www.samizdatportal.org under Samizdat Directory. Currently it contains descriptions of forty-one institutions (but this number is growing), including the British Library; Keston Institute; Hoover Institution Library and Archives; Library of Congress; Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library; Jimmy Carter Library and Museum; and Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies at Harvard University.

25. For example, documents of samizdat and dissident activists at the Hoover Institution are located in the East/Central European Collection, which consists of a number of subcollections: (1) "Vardy (Alexander) Papers, containing studies, newsletters, printed matter, and photographs that relate to Radio Liberty broadcasts to the Soviet Union and to Soviet politics, culture, and society (including samizdat); (2) Czechoslovak and Polish Independent Publications Collections (1969–90); and (3) Tymowski (Andrzej W.) Interview Transcripts, interviews with activists of KOR (Workers' Defense Committee), Solidarity, and other Polish

above-mentioned countries.[26] The biggest OSA Archivum samizdat collection contains documents produced in the USSR and collected by Radio Liberty and is widely known as the Samizdat Archive (it is a part of the subfonds HU OSA 300–85 Soviet Samizdat Archive). Other collections are of Polish and Hungarian samizdat.[27]

Scholarly samizdat phenomena are described as separate, unique, and rooted in the nature of totalitarian regimes.[28] Nevertheless, clandestine literature and illegal publications have a long history. In Russia, for example, the illegal press played a significant role in the struggle against the tsarist regime; but as soon as the Bolsheviks seized power, they introduced the Decree on the Press, which forbade "counterrevolutionary" publications and thus ended the short period of freedom of the press declared by the February Revolution.[29] This decree was just the first in a series of legislative and other measures taken by the Communist Party to insure strict control over the printed word. The introduction of the NEP (new

dissident movements of the 1970s and 1980s. On the Hoover Institution and other samizdat collections, see Samizdat Directory at www.samizdatportal.org.

26. The center has collected more than 100,000 samizdat documents that had been published in the countries of the region in the 1950s through the 1990s. These consisted of unofficial artistic, literary, and scientific productions: underground newspapers, banned works of art, outlawed theater pieces, secret messages from detention camps, leaflets, and clandestine videos. The overwhelming majority of samizdat documents derive from political, religious, and artistic dissent in the former USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, and Hungary. Since the midnineties, personal bequests and private collections have complemented the collection. See also www.forschungsstelle.uni-bremen.de/ubdex .php?option=content&task=view&id=14#udssr (in German).

27. Polish samizdat (although this particular term was rarely used in Poland, where they used *bibuła* instead, meaning underground publications/press) is mostly represented by subfonds HU OSA 300–55; Hungarian samizdat constitutes several series, most of them donated by the former activists of the dissident movement (for example, HU OSA 302 Samizdat Publications of Gábor Demszky; HU OSA 355 Samizdat Collection of János Kis; HU OSA 397 Samizdat Collection of György Krassó).

28. From the moment of its emergence, attempts have been made to define the samizdat phenomenon. Traditionally, it is seen as a form of production and distribution of banned literature in the Soviet Union. It refers both to the process of producing such texts and the products (Oushakine 2001; Telesin 1973). With the spread of the practices of samizdat in the early 1960s, the terminology itself ramified: *kolizdat* (or publication in quantity) refers to a book or typewritten journal; *magnitizdat*, to music and verse recorded by type recorder; *radizdat*, to foreign radio broadcasts; and, finally, "the word *tamizdat* was coined to denote books published 'over there,' i.e., abroad, which often find their way back to Russia in printed form or are reproduced in *samizdat* form" (Skilling 1989: 66). With the development of computer technologies, it became possible to compare samizdat with the Internet. Thus Sergei Kovalev, a prominent Soviet dissident, called samizdat the "Internet-for-poor" (Oushanine 2001: 194). Self-publishing manifested itself in other communist countries (Skilling 1989; Tökés 1996; Raina 1981).

29. The Decree on the Press was promulgated on October 28 (November 10), 1917, just three days after the October Revolution (Goriaeva 2002).

economy policy) in 1921 opened a period of relative cultural and creative freedom. Robert C. Tucker (1977) describes NEP Russia as a society with two uneasily coexisting cultures. From the very beginning, the competition between them presumed the victory of the new culture that sought to transform the old one; according to the views of Bolsheviks, expressed by Lenin in addressing the Moscow Soviet on November 20, 1922: "out of NEP, Russia will become socialist Russia" (quoted in ibid.: 80). Thus the postrevolutionary period, including the NEP, witnessed a process that slowly replaced one culture (literature in particular), based on the Christian moral norms, with another, later called Bolshevik culture, which topologically launched the chain of the totalitarian cultures of the twentieth century. Suppressed both ideologically and physically, the "old" culture and literature seemed to disappear or become marginalized to such a degree that in the 1920s and 1930s there were only a few uncensored texts in circulation (see Saunders 1974). While the number of such texts, handed from one person to another, had risen dramatically already by the late 1940s and the early 1950s, it is only possible to talk about samizdat as a mass phenomenon after Khrushchev's "thaw," when a relative "freedom of thought" was achieved (Mal'tsev 1976).

At the Second Congress of the Union of the Soviet Writers in December 1954, the writer Veniamin Kaverin reflected on the future of Soviet literature, saying: "I see a literature in which a strong independent criticism daringly determines the road of the writer, his capabilities and prospects. I see a literature in which the most experienced, the most famous writers concentrate on their creative work, without destruction and without forcing readers to wait for decades for their new works. . . . I see a literature in which any, even a most authoritative opinion, does not close the gates to a literary work, because the fate of a book is the fate of its author" (quoted in Pospielovsky 1978: 48). These hopes were shared by most of the Soviet intelligentsia at that time. But as the artist Viktor Pivovarov remarked in an interview given to Radio Liberty, it was not enough to see the exhibitions and albums or to read monographs on Western art that were smuggled into the Soviet Union starting from the 1950s. Minds should be also prepared for receiving new ideas, and this new mentality could be achieved only under the influence of the "air of freedom" (Tolstoi 2004).

It is difficult to say what the first samizdat publication was. In 1956 in Leningrad, the first issue of the newspaper *Kultura* (*Culture*) was published, with poems by Evgenii Rein, Dmitrii Bobyshev, and others, and the same year Revolt Pimenov issued the first political *Bulletin of Information*. The secret speech of Khrushchev at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) was considered by the Soviet dissidents

to be among the first samizdat texts. This text was also commonly believed to be the first samizdat document to arrive at Radio Liberty.[30] In the mid-1960s the word "samizdat" appeared in the official lexicon of the KGB reports (Mitrokhina 2003).

Talking about the genesis of samizdat, Aleksandr Daniel (2006: 88) points out that events in the cultural life of the 1950s and the 1960s "transferred *samizdat* from spontaneous process into an independent cultural institution. The word '*Samizdat*' began to be written with a capital letter, like Gosizdat [Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo–State Publishing House] for it began to be perceived as a real alternative to the Gosizdat, as a form of freedom of creativity—without 'them,' beyond 'them,' outside of 'them.'" As D. Pospielovsky (1978: 45) has pointed out, "writing for the desk drawer, *tamizdat* or *samizdat* became in a totalitarian state the mainstream of man's creativity, in quality if not in quantity."

There are two important, though not exhaustive, features of the text produced by underground culture: its unpublishedness and its self-distribution. If in the 1960s and early 1970s samizdat consisted mostly of displaced texts, by the middle of the 1970s the situation changed: "independent" culture started to understand itself as special, alternative culture with its own aesthetic criteria and ideology. Although unpublishedness remained a tragedy for a writer, the text, once created (whether apartment exhibition or manuscript), could not be adequately incorporated into and read within the traditional cultural infrastructure any longer (Ivanov 2003). The extent of the aesthetic distance between the "official" expectations and dissident cultural production that resulted from these processes led to the ultimate rupture between the two and to the institutionalization of the "other culture." Under such circumstances, many mechanisms and notions of the literary and artistic process, as well as the perception of "literary fact," were transformed or reconsidered.

The logic of samizdat production assumes that the author typed his or her uncensored work with several carbon copies (Telesin 1973: 30) and disseminated it through several people (usually close friends), who in turn would retype and pass on their copies to their circle of acquaintances. Through this process of "snowballing," samizdat spread to various regions and countries and ended up in different institutions abroad (Feldbrugge 1975: 3). "After 1964, a range of manuscripts made their way to the West from the Soviet Union: by one way or another, *samizdat* escaped from the country to turn—somewhere out there—into *tamizdat*" (Tolstoi 2003).

30. For more details, see the description of the subfonds 300–85 at the OSA Archivum, prepared by Natasha Zanegina (www.osa.ceu.hu).

Being "displaced" or "forced out" from the boundaries of the communist homeland, samizdat found its way back through "enemy voices," such as Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, among others.[31]

The trial and conviction of the writers Andrei Siniavskii and Iulii Daniel in 1966[32] not only changed the social climate in the Soviet Union and had serious consequences for the development of the dissident movement; it also became a landmark for Western broadcasting, and especially for Radio Liberty, which played "a unique role in conveying the facts, the significance, and Western reactions to the trial to the Soviet people. It has also broadcast back into the Soviet Union detailed information on every important letter, protest document, and piece of underground literature which has reached the West through underground channels. Recent Soviet defectors, among them the author Anatole Kuznetsov, have specifically cited Radio Liberty's vital function in providing such information and thereby expanding the scope and depth of dissident attitudes" (Federation of American Scientists [FAS] 1969: 461–63).

The dynamics of the posttrial events were characterized as a "process of chain reaction" (Daniel 2006: 89) which in its turn led to the formation of political dissent. D. N. Shalin (1996: 78) remarks that, exactly around this time, the Soviet intelligentsia divided: "one part chose to continue working for liberalization through official channels and another gave up on reforming the system from within." The latter came up with a program centered on human rights and the need to hold the Soviet government accountable for its deeds. The power of the literary word, of samizdat, was recognized by both dissidents and the Soviet authorities. "*Samizdat* rather troubles those who are in power and our so-called literary authorities, not by its content," but "by the level of its mastery. . . . Those philosophical works that appeared in *samizdat* speak a language that you would never meet in any official works on philosophy. The level is rising to such heights that none of these literary bureaucrats would ever reach it. And this perturbs them" (Suetnov 2001: 14).

31. As James Critchlow (1995: 147) pointed out, Voice of America also carried samizdat but on a much smaller scale in order not to involve the U.S. government too directly in the Soviet dissident movement.

32. Andrei Siniavskii (Abram Terts) and Iulii Daniel (Nikolai Arzhak) published their uncensored works in the West; they were arrested, tried, and convicted in 1965–66. As Benjamin Nathans (2007: 658) stressed, "for many members of the intelligentsia, the Siniavskii-Daniel case marked an ominous return to the show trials of the 1930s, a sign that the Brezhnev Politburo was preparing to reverse the gains of Khrushchev's de-Stalinization campaign." The demonstration in support of the arrested authors and demanding judicial transparency was held in Pushkin Square on December 5, 1965, and is considered to be the birth of the civil rights movement in the Soviet Union. See also Velikanova 1989; Daniel and Roginskii 2005.

Origins of Samizdat Archives

Only five years after the Siniavskii-Daniel trial, in April 1971, "a group of scholars and journalists, all of whom had long experience in dealing with *samizdat* materials," met in London at a conference to discuss the "Future of *Samizdat*: Its Significance and Prospects" (Boiter 1972). In his paper titled "Samizdat: Primary Source Material in the Study of Current Soviet Affairs," Albert Boiter proposed to create centralized access to samizdat material and suggested Radio Liberty as such a center. "The basis for this proposal was the consideration that Radio Liberty already possessed one of the largest organized collections of *samizdat* and that its staff includes people with the necessary linguistic and research skills to undertake the task" (ibid.: 282). More than one hundred scholars, journalists, and official organizations contributed documents to the collection. "In return, Radio Liberty agreed to make available to scholars in an appropriate form the texts of all *samizdat* documents placed in the archives" (RFE/RL 1973a: 3), which brought into being the publication of *Sobranie Dokumentov Samizdata* (*Collection of Samizdat Documents*). Thus the small samizdat collection at Radio Liberty (at that moment it contained, according to Boiter, approximately two thousand separate documents covering around twelve thousand pages) became an internationally recognized samizdat archive.[33]

Founded in 1953, Radio Liberty was "the only Western short wave broadcaster to the Soviet Union to concentrate on the need of Soviet listeners for complete information in their own language about the actions and interests of their own government and peoples" (RFE/RL 1974: 2). The role of the Radio as the major channel for broadcast back to the USSR of the unofficially distributed manuscripts, appeals, and other documents was clearly understood: "Radio Liberty gave its listeners the precise words of Soviet dissenters" (ibid.: 4). That is why its staff gave samizdat texts very serious attention and started incorporating them into its programs as early as the late 1950s.[34] Already in 1957–61 Radio Liberty had broadcast the text of Khrushchev's secret speech at the Twentieth Party Congress, Boris Pasternak's *Doktor Zhivago*, Milovan Djilas's *New Class*, and the novel *Sud Idet* by Abram Terts (Andrei Siniavskii). The crucial year for samizdat at

33. Publications on the history of the Radios focused mainly on their broadcasting activities, while other divisions of the Radios, including Samizdat Archives and the Research Institute founded in 1992, have not yet been covered. The most recent publication by Eugene Parta (2007) deals with the Media Opinion Department.

34. See, for example, the virtual exhibit "Radio Liberty: 50 Years of Broadcasting" devoted to the history of the radio. It contains photographs, documents, sample broadcasts, and general information on the history and activity of the station (171.66.113.76/rlexhibit/index .php).

Radio Liberty was 1968, when, that fall, it started broadcasting readings of samizdat materials on political and social themes in a show entitled *Pis'ma i dokumenty* (*Letters and Documents*).[35] And as Mario Corti (1996: 3), the former head of the Samizdat Unit, stated in his interview with the OSA Archivum, with the increase in the number of documents, toward the end of the 1960s it was felt that some sort of control should be established. In 1968 the Samizdat Unit was established within Radio Liberty's Research Department, and that same year the first issue of an in-house samizdat bulletin was issued.[36] Later it became a more or less regular weekly *Materialy Samizdata* (*Materials of Samizdat*).[37]

Prior to the middle of the 1960s, samizdat documents were received sporadically and were kept by different departments and staff members. With the creation of the Samizdat Unit, it became possible to collect the dispersed samizdat materials in one place. In April 1969 Albert Boiter initiated the first serial register for samizdat documents. In July, a special project called Soviet Protest Documents was announced in a separate memorandum, indicating that since April, 60 other documents had arrived, bringing the total amount to 160 documents. It was recommended to register all incoming documents (which were not yet listed in the register) and also to indicate the location of the original document within Radio Liberty departments (Boiter 1969). Around this time, the first attempt to create a

35. The program was terminated in 1979. Another program called *Unpublished Works of Soviet Authors* started in May 1969 and specialized in reading literary works. In 1970–80 a series called *Obzor Samizdata* (*Samizdat Review*) presented samizdat documents along with discussions on different aspects of the dissident movement in the USSR. Among other programs devoted to samizdat were *Dokumenty nashego vremeni* (*Documents of Our Time*), *Dokumenty i liudi* (*Documents and People*), and *Prava cheloveka* (*Human Rights*). Part of the samizdat documents were broadcast or discussed in programs like *S drugogo berega* (*From the Other Shore*), *Poverkh bar'erov* (*Over Barriers*), or various religious programs. Not only the Russian Service, but also Ukrainian, Belorussian, Georgian, Armenian, Baltic, and other services broadcast samizdat. Some of the RFE desks, for example the Polish one, also read Soviet samizdat materials translated into the respective languages.
36. The samizdat unit operated until its dissolution in 1992. During this period, the collection was incorporated into the centralized RFE/RL Research Institute Archive (SBEA). There were several attempts to process the collection, especially its "unpublished" part. The real processing of the materials started after they were moved to the OSA Archivum in 1995.
37. In 1976, with the merging of Radio Liberty with Radio Free Europe, the Research Department became the Research on Soviet Affairs Department, part of the larger Information Resources Department. In November 1990, RFE and RL research activities were incorporated into the newly formed Research Institute, a separate division of RFE/RL, Inc. The Information Resources Department was divided into several parts, including Samizdat Archives, Soviet Red Archives, and Soviet Monitoring. In 1992 the three were merged into the Slavic, Baltic, and Eurasian Archives (SBEA).

bibliography of Soviet protest documents was undertaken.[38] The policy on samizdat documents was formulated in accordance with the Radio Liberty (later Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty or RFE/RL) Program Policy Guidance and other strategic documents.

In order to understand the logic behind the acquisition of samizdat documents, the broader context of the Cold War period should be taken into account.[39] It is well known that both radios—Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—came into being in response to the international situation after the Second World War.[40] On July 26, 1947, President Harry Truman signed the National Security Act, by which two other organizations were created: the National Security Council (NSC) and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). As early as December 1947, the NSC signed National Security Council Memorandum 4/4A, "Coordination of Foreign Information Measures," to coordinate U.S. propaganda activities and to counter the well-organized and quite effective Soviet propaganda campaign. While NSC 4 dealt with overt actions, "NSC 4A, a classified annex, directed the CIA to initiate and conduct covert psychological operations to counteract Soviet propaganda" (Gough 2003: 7–8). In the next month (January 16, 1948), the Smith-Mundt Act provided funds "to spread America's message to the world through a variety of media, including radio, print, film and exchange programs" (Rose 1999: 11–12). Another directive, NSC 10/2 (June 18, 1948), established the Office of Special Projects (later changed to Office of Policy Coordination) to carry out covert psychological operations, in particular via U.S.-controlled overseas broadcasting stations, including Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty (ibid.: 40). On the initiative of George Kennan of the State Department, some civilian émigrés took part in the founding of an organization aimed at the restoration of democracy

38. Suggested classification includes ten main categories, under which documents were listed chronologically. In addition to that one, several other initiatives were proposed: a special guide to the literary works of Boris Pasternak; a thematic reference index to the content of the Soviet protest documents; and a name index to all people mentioned in these documents. These indexes currently comprise series HU OSA 300–85–1 and 2. Further work resulted in several other indexes (both cards and electronic).

39. The literature on Cold War history is enormous. See, for example, Leffler and Painter 1994; Major and Mitter 2004. Of particular interest is *A Failed Empire* (2007) by Vladislav Zubok, which provides interesting insights into the causes of the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

40. Among other publications dealing with foreign radio broadcasting during the Cold War (e.g., Critchlow 1995; Nelson 1997; Puddington 2000), the book *Sparks of Liberty* (1999) deserves special attention. It was written by Gene Sosin, who was for many years the program director at Radio Liberty. His accounts of the Radio's activities are based on documents from his personal archives and give some insights into the internal policy on the broadcasting of samizdat documents.

in the countries of Eastern Europe. In 1949 the National Committee for a
Free Europe (later the Free Europe Committee) was founded to serve as an
outlet for exiles broadcasting back to their "captive homelands" (Browne
1982: 136).

   This project was one of the first covert operations of the CIA, founded
just two years earlier. With the success of Radio Free Europe and the
growth in the number of listeners in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary,
Bulgaria, and Romania, the CIA became interested in broadcasting to the
Soviet Union. In 1953 a new organization, the American Committee for
the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia (Amcomlib), created Radio Lib-
eration from Bolshevism (in 1956, it was renamed as Radio Liberation; in
1959, as Radio Liberty).[41] From the beginning of its existence, the CIA con-
ducted psychological, political, paramilitary, and economic operations.
One of its main activities involved the media. In addition to book pub-
lishing, the CIA owned or supported for propaganda purposes magazines,
newspapers, news services, and radio and television stations. The docu-
ment NSC 5502/1 (January 31, 1955) on the subject of U.S. Policy toward
Russian Anti-Soviet Political Activities generated a covert action program
in support of media and of activities intended to stimulate and sustain
pressures for liberalization and evolutionary change from within the Soviet
Union. This document, which was reviewed and approved again by the
NSC Planning Board on November 1, 1960, provided the authorization
for the CIA covert action programs directed at the Soviet Union involving
émigrés from Soviet-dominated areas.

   The first concerns about funding of CIA activities appeared in the early
1960s, but only in 1967 did *Ramparts* magazine expose the CIA's use of a
network of private organizations through which millions of dollars went
into covert funds. Although the Radios were not mentioned by *Ramparts*,
the publication triggered numerous press investigations into CIA activities
and covert funding.[42] As a result, in 1968 the Lyndon Johnson administra-
tion adopted a policy that CIA funds should not go to any U.S. educational
or voluntary organizations. For a time Richard Helms, director of the CIA,
managed to exclude the Radios from this policy as they were government
initiatives and functioned under official government policy. The CIA con-
tinued funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty until Congress

41. Extracts from NSC 5502/1, "Statement on U.S. Policy toward Russian Anti-Soviet
Political Activities," January 31, 1955, are printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1955–57, vol. 24, Soviet
Union, Eastern Mediterranean, Document 3.
42. A February 21, 1967, article in the *New York Times* provided information about links
among the CIA, the Hobby Foundation, and RFE (Browne 1982: 136).

in 1971 authorized an annual expenditure of public funds to support the stations and in 1973 established the Board for International Broadcasting as their public supervisor (Browne 1982: 142).

A series of documents from 1969 reveals the deep involvement of the CIA in the Radio's activities. This involvement had a direct impact on the determination of archival policy toward samizdat materials and their use for broadcasting purposes.[43] The memorandum from December 9, 1969, for the 303 Committee, "United States Government Support of Covert Action Directed at the Soviet Union," recommended that the committee approve the continuation of this covert action program "directed primarily at the Soviet intelligentsia and reaffirm the approval it has given in the past to the program generally and the individual projects specifically" (FAS 1969: 311). Based on detailed analyses of the intellectual climate of the Soviet Union, the authors of this document anticipated the persistence of such trends as "desire for personal and intellectual freedom, desire for improvement in the quality of life, and the persistence of nationalism in Eastern Europe and among nationality groups in the Soviet Union." It was suggested "to encourage and support the publication and distribution of dissident literature and socio-political commentary on the broad current issues and the conditions of life in the Soviet Union, even though the regime will continue to repress dissidence" (ibid.: 312). Both this memorandum and another document, the undated paper prepared by the CIA titled "Tensions in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe: Challenge and Opportunity," referred to an American professor (whose name has not been declassified) who reported that the dissidence is widespread among the Soviet intelligentsia and they "yearn for exposure to Western literature and cultural influence" (ibid.: 458).

In order to prove the effectiveness of the CIA's programs against the Soviet Union, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty activities[44] were analyzed: "Radio Liberty which broadcasts to the Soviet Union has had a significant role in increasing manifestations of dissent and opposition among the Soviet intelligentsia. Defectors have often commented on the signifi-

43. Unfortunately, materials from 1970 onward are unavailable or still classified (Gough 2003: 20).
44. The funds for the Radio Liberty Committee were approved by higher authority on February 22, 1969, to support the activity of three "major RL divisions: (1) a radio station (Radio Liberty) which broadcasts via shortwave to the Soviet Union 24 hours a day in 18 languages; (2) a book publication and book distribution program designed to provide Soviet citizens with books not normally accessible to the Soviet public; and (3) the Institute for the Study of the USSR which produces research papers and publications targeted at the developing countries in Africa, Middle East, and the Far East" (FAS 1969: 455).

cant impact of the broadcast of documents written by protesters" (ibid.: 456).[45] It was accordingly proposed to put a special emphasis on "greater exploitation of dissent through modernized radio transmitting facilities, wider dissemination of criticism by the intellectuals, and stimulation of nationality aspirations among Soviet minorities" (ibid.: 457). The CIA was well informed about the dissidence in the Soviet Union and followed its latest developments. Among the most influential dissidents, both leading scientists and writers were mentioned, along with the younger members of the intelligentsia and also workers, teachers, and other professionals.[46] Special attention was paid to the foundation of a Committee for the Defense of Human Rights (May 1969); the role of the *Chronicle of Current Events* (since April 1968) in disseminating information on arrests, threats and other acts of the Soviet regime against opposition, and also the latest news concerning underground literature and other documents circulated in samizdat. "Ten issues of the *Chronicle* were subsequently circulated in hundreds of typewritten copies inside the USSR. A few copies of each reached the West, where they have been republished and broadcast back into the Soviet Union. The writing and circulation of protest documents of many varieties, typed in carbon copies or handwritten, continues in the face of regime repression" (ibid: 459–60). Of great importance for the CIA activities against the Soviet Union were issues related to nationalities, the economic situation, and relations with Eastern European countries. The paragraph on minority repression reads: "Among many of the non-Russian minorities in the Soviet Union, dissent is vocal and widespread. It is also vigorously repressed. In the Ukraine, the arrests of hundreds of Ukrainian dissidents in 1965 and 1966, and subsequent repressions, have been vigorously protested by leading Ukrainian scientists, artists, and writers. . . . The contempt of the Baltic people for Soviet rule remains as strong as ever" (ibid.: 460).

The economic situation was summed up in the paragraph on Economic

45. Another indication of the Radio's effectiveness was the $150 million that the Soviet Union spent annually on jamming Radio Liberty broadcasting. In addition, "Publication of smuggled manuscripts and magazines geared to the Eastern European audience and distribution of books not available in Communist countries have also made an impact" (ibid.: 456).

46. "The top rank of dissenters in the Soviet Union includes leading scientists, some of whom share the views of Andrei Sakharov, an eminent scientist. In 1968, Sakharov in a long pamphlet advocated radical changes in human society the world over. . . . The Sakharov pamphlet has never been published in the Soviet Union, but through Western radio broadcasts and publications Sakharov's words have been carried back to his countrymen. After the scientists, next in prestige come the writers" (ibid.: 458). Another paragraph was devoted to the role of Alexandr Solzhenitsyn in the emergence of dissidence in the Soviet Union.

Unrest, based mainly on the information gathered from defectors and Soviet economists: they depicted the Soviet economy as suffering from overcentralization and rigid control and as a system of falsification and misrepresentation, which prevents anyone from knowing what the true conditions were. A citation from one of the samizdat documents described the problems of the economy in the following terms: "It is obvious to everyone that in our system nobody is involved in real work. They only throw dust in the eyes of the bosses. Phony events, such as jubilees and special days, have become for us more important than the real events of economic and social life. . . . Other states in which the economy is not ruled from the heavens, but from earth . . . are outdistancing us more and more. . . . Freedom to discuss problems openly, only such freedom, can put diseased Russia on the road to recovery" (ibid.: 461).[47] Another topic of interest was connected with Eastern Europe, where the tensions in society were considered much greater than in the Soviet Union and the Western orientation much stronger. "Dissident elements in the USSR and Eastern Europe display remarkable sympathy and understanding for their fellows throughout the whole Soviet dominated region. . . . Intellectuals in all Eastern European countries have actively collaborated with the Soviet dissidents, and have expressed their sympathy for those arrested and imprisoned. With its easier access to the West, Eastern Europe acts as a conduit for books, letters, manuscripts and ideas. The flow back and forth across the Soviet borders is relatively easy and constant. The fact that Eastern European standards of tolerance and freedom of expression, although restrictive, are well above the levels permitted in the Soviet Union makes the region's ability to influence the Soviet Union a consideration of major importance to the United States" (ibid.: 460–61).

These facts supported the CIA perceptions that the only way to foster the tensions was not to promote armed rebellion but rather to work toward encouraging "the movement for greater personal freedom within the Soviet Union and to weaken the ties between the nations of Eastern Europe and Soviet Russia." Radio broadcasts were seen as a primary means to this end. Radio Free Europe, whose audience was estimated at more than thirty million people, became a political force with which the Eastern European regimes had to reckon. It was more difficult to measure the effectiveness of Radio Liberty, because its activities targeted the more restrictive Soviet

47. Although it is not indicated that this particular document was provided by the Radio Liberty Samizdat Archives, the collection contains other documents on the same themes that were circulated and broadcast by Radio Liberty. For example, Anatoly Kuznetsov, in his talk concerning the economic situation in the Soviet Union, refers to letters from a Leningrad listener who described shortages in Soviet stores and services (RFE/RL 1977a).

system. "However, letters from listeners, defector reports and legal travelers indicate that there is a sizeable audience. It is generally agreed that Radio Liberty merits a significant share of the credit for the increasing manifestations of dissent and opposition among the Soviet intelligentsia" (ibid.: 461–63). The constant Communist attacks on the Radios served as an indicator of their success: "The Communist regimes are particularly discomfited by the two radios' detailed news coverage and highly effective cross-reporting of internal developments, and by their exploitation of intellectual ferment, nationalist tendencies and general dissent within the Soviet Union" (ibid.: 463).

The CIA interest in continuing to broadcast dissident writings shaped and determined what had hitherto been a loosely defined archival policy toward this particular type of material at Radio Liberty. In 1969, the Radio Liberty memorandum "Handling of Documents from the Soviet Union" was issued as preliminary guidance to ensure "that so far as possible policy directives on the use of documents originating in the USSR are carried out." The document provided details on the responsibilities of the samizdat unit staff for the receipt and processing of all documents received by Radio Liberty. "Any document which comes to the attention of Program Policy Division (PPD) will immediately be sent to him [Samizdat Custodian Peter Dornan] or if that proves impossible he will be in any case notified of their existence" (RFE/RL 1969). In his turn, Dornan was responsible for keeping both the New York office and the PPD informed about new samizdat documents. The latter (in the person of Van Der Rhoer, the acting director) was responsible for determining whether a document's contents were suitable for broadcasting. Besides establishing the authenticity of the documents, which was the primary and most important task, the staff members also analyzed the content, not only providing references and correcting obvious mistakes, but in some cases also slightly editing the texts. Thus, in order to avoid broadcasting "fake" documents, strict regulations were imposed to "determine the apparent authenticity of the document when appropriate on the basis of whatever information is available about its method of transmission or through inspection of the document itself," and PPD was to be kept informed by the samizdat custodian of all cases where authenticity was in question. Thus, none of the documents could be distributed before such a determination was made in PPD. Where documents raised problems, PPD might wish "to issue additional guidance prior to the distribution of the document or in connection with that distribution" (RFE/RL 1969).

In 1971, the Radio Liberty Program Policy Division (PPD) issued broadcast guidance in "The Use of Documents from the USSR," which was then

amended in 1972 by a document entitled "Samizdat, Freedom of Speech, and Official Repression."[48] The former document issued general guidelines for the handling of samizdat materials that arrived at Radio Liberty and set up procedures "intended to assure the receipt, registration, processing for broadcast, and safekeeping of all *samizdat* documents" (RFE/RL PPD 1971). Every unpublished samizdat document that reached any employee of Radio Liberty was immediately to be given to the samizdat custodian for registration and evaluation as to broadcast utility. This and other policy documents confirmed that the primary purpose of samizdat documents at Radio Liberty was to support broadcasting: "The Samizdat staff will research and process materials for use as fast as possible in coordination with the supervisors and programmers concerned. It will recommend materials it considers most appropriate for priority processing for programming use. No unpublished *samizdat* materials should be programmed without prior consultation with the Samizdat staff" (RFE/RL 1979).

Under the Soviet legal system, individuals could be brought to trial under the provisions of the criminal code, which prohibited the production, retention, or dissemination of "anti-Soviet libel." In order "to avoid confirming Soviet efforts to equate *samizdat* with wrong-doings, illegal or criminal activities," policy papers stated that Radio Liberty must scrupulously avoid labeling samizdat as anti-Soviet and any false identification of "legal and illegal" with "right and wrong" (RFE/RL PPD 1972: 1). According to this instruction, Radio Liberty was not to say that people were punished "for publishing their works in *samizdat*" but rather to underline that the courts were meting out sentences to those who freely expressed their views. Following these and other policy papers, the Samizdat Unit staff closely scrutinized the samizdat texts before they were handed over for broadcasting.

In most cases, the registered samizdat documents (originals or photocopies) differed from those published in *Sobranie Dokumentov Samizdata* or *Materialy Samizdata*.[49] Besides correcting misspellings and grammatical

---

48. These procedures were in force during the entire span of activity of the samizdat unit, being confirmed by additional letters and memos. See, for example, Procedures for Processing Samizdat Documents from 1977 (RFE RL 1977b), 1979, 1989, and 1990 at HU OSA 300–85–47 Administrative Files.

49. All samizdat documents were registered upon arrival and were filed according to their registration numbers, that is, in chronological order of arrival. "In many cases order of arrival does not correspond with the date of the document since the time which it takes a document to reach the West may vary widely from one item to another" (RFE/RL 1973b: 1). After the establishment of the Samizdat Unit in 1971, a special procedure for handling new arrivals was developed. Staff members thoroughly studied each incoming document to iden-

mistakes, the staff provided references based on the cross-checking of the names and events mentioned in the particular documents. Moreover, in the most sensitive cases (see RFE/RL PPD 1972, mentioned above), they erased some words and phrases or suggested that they should not be broadcast. For example, a memorandum on December 28, 1972, reads: "Document AS1198 is approved for broadcast, however BEFORE [*sic*] using it is necessary to check with this Division [Policy and Research Division] concerning several passages of the text." It was suggested that the following words should be omitted from the broadcast: p. 7, "fashist"; p. 25, "alkogolik" [alcoholic]; page 55, "Khrushchev . . . podavit" [Khrushchev . . . repressed] (RFE/RL PPD 1972).

The motivations for creating a centralized archive as a repository of all samizdat documents and exercising a certain control over the content and dissemination of the materials had to do with policy considerations but also with the ways samizdat materials, by their very nature, reached Radio Liberty. They arrived through different channels and were received by different Radio Liberty divisions. Only a few samizdat documents were mailed from the USSR. Most of them were smuggled abroad and then sent to the Radio's field offices in Rome, Paris, and London or directly to the New York or Munich headquarters.

In some cases, when Radio Liberty programmers decided to use the documents without prior consultation with the Samizdat Unit, certain problems arose, including even misinformation. Thus, in 1972 Dornan referred to wrong terminology used in a program on samizdat and to contradictions between two Radio Liberty programs: the weekend show *Mir za nedeliu* (*World for a Week*) and a special program (June 26–27, 1972) on Sakharov's text (Dornan 1972). Policy concerns also define the peculiar logic of samizdat broadcasting. The article "On the Question of Illegal Forms of Struggle" in the samizdat periodical *Demokrat*, issue 5 (AS 1152), argued in favor of "illegal opposition." This was immediately brought to the attention of the Radio Liberty management, and a special memorandum was distributed, saying: "This in no way corresponds with RL policy. All RL broadcasters are reminded that while RL offers its facilities for the expression of contending democratic opinion from *samizdat*, this does not constitute endorsement by RL of specific action plans or approaches to such questions as 'illegality'. RL's position is defined in the Policy Handbook and other policy documents" (RFE/RL 1972). Although the text was

---

tify and screen out items which might have been falsified and to verify the information in the authentic ones. Each of the selected documents was given a registration number for identification under the letters AS (or AC in Russia)—Arkhiv Samizdata—and a serial number (Dornan 1996: 4; Corti 1996: 2).

authorized for broadcast, it was strongly recommended to avoid commentary or other use of this article that might endanger the author or authors and to refrain from any expositions that might sound to the listeners like Radio Liberty endorsement of the article's position.[50]

In 1972, another letter from the editorial board of *Materialy Samizdata* postponed the broadcasting of issue 37/72 because all of its three documents needed additional editing and/or commentary. Meanwhile, the staff were asked to use AS 1157, AS 1158, and AS 1159. As a result, the final edited issue of AS 1158 contains more then fifty mistakes and misspellings. In order to avoid such situations, the policy guidance (reissued almost every year starting from 1971) set up a rule that "no original documents are allowed to be photocopied or used without the express approval of the Samizdat Custodian. All unpublished *samizdat* documents for programming use should be first retyped." Restrictions were also set on the dissemination of the documents: they could be sent to outside scholars and recognized institutions only with the approval of RFE/RL Inc., management (RFE/RL 1979).

The above-mentioned documents shaped the focus and content of the Radio Liberty Samizdat Archives (Joo 2004; Komaromi 2004; Rusina 2001). Given the Radio's interest in political and economic subjects, literary samizdat was mostly excluded from solicitation, and the exceptions have political significance.[51] The document "Basic Information about Arkhiv Samizdata" (RFE/RL 1973b: 1) states that "as a rule poetry, novels, and other works of *belles-lettres* are not included as an integral part of the *Arkhiv samizdata*, which contains primarily documents of social, political, economic or historical significance concerning contemporary Soviet society."[52]

According to the Radio Liberty classification system in 1974, the Samizdat Archives included the following groups of materials (at the time, the collections consisted of 2,071 registered documents):

50. The article, discussed in the Radio Liberty program *Obzor samizdata* (*Samizdat Review*), was titled "O nelegal'nykh formakh bor'by. Obsuzhdenie stat'i iz zhurnala *Demokrat*" (AS 1152; transcript of broadcast at HU OSA 300–85–47 Administrative Files).
51. See AS 116, with Lidiia Chukovskaia's "Not execution, but thought, but word," publicistic reflections about Stalin (on the fifteenth anniversary of his death) and neo-Stalinism (1968); AS 249, Valentin Moroz's "Report from the Beria Reserve," written in the form of a letter of a political prisoner in a labor camp to the deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union (1967); AS 1618, A. Kolosov's "Non-anniversary Reflections," an essay on the philosophy of N. Berdiaev (1974), all in HU OSA 300–85–9 Published Samizdat, Samizdat Archives.
52. Archiv Samizdata, transliterated from the Russian Архив Самиздата (Samizdat Archives).

(a) documents concerning individual complaints or specific themes, which was by far the largest group (784 items);[53]

(b) literary and philosophical samizdat (120): "most essays and poetry included in the Archiv Samizdata have some political significance";

(c) general political writings (183): "This category embraces articles and even some books which aim at a more or less general discussion and analysis of the Soviet political system";[54]

(d) religious samizdat (487): "The principal sections within the group concern the Baptists, the Russian Orthodox Church, and the Lithuanian Roman Catholics. The Baptists are particularly active in Samizdat. There are also a small number of documents regarding the Uniates (a formerly numerous group from the Western Ukraine, adhering to the old Slavonic liturgy and to the Roman Catholic Church) and the Buddhists. Islam is notably absent from Samizdat literature but geographical factors may in part be blamed for this (the Islamic population is to be found mostly outside Russia proper— Azerbaijan, Central Asia and the region of the Urals). Documents concerning the Jewish religion have been classed under (e)";

(e) Jewish samizdat (176): "Jewish *Samizdat* is a comparative latecomer and does not start until 1968. Most of it is concerned with individual acts of discrimination, often in connection with the expression of the wish to emigrate to Israel";

(f) national samizdat (203): "This category embraces documents attacking the official nationalities policy, or complaining about specific acts related to the nationality question in the USSR. The most numerous are documents concerning the Crimean Tartars, followed by another large contingent of Ukrainian documents (most of them in Ukrainian). Other significant groups of national Samizdat concern Meskhetians (a small Turkic-speaking nation from Southern Georgia), the Armenians and the Lithuanians. Jewish Samizdat is not included in the group";

(g) official Soviet documents (52): "This group consists chiefly of official reports about searches (which should be handed to the inhabitant of the premises which have been searched), arrests, etc.; psychiatric reports about dissidents; documents issued by the prison administration, copies of court sentences and the like";

(h) trial reports and "final words" (43): "Official reports of trials of political dissidents have not appeared in Soviet court bulletins, but since the Siniavskii-Daniel trial in February 1966, it has been the practice among Soviet dissi-

53. For example, AS 162, letter from G. V. Gabai to the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, demanding open court proceedings on the case of her husband Iulii Gabai, arrested in connection with the demonstration in Pushkin Square on January 22, 1967, HU OSA 300–85–9 Published Samizdat, Samizdat Archives.
54. For example, AS 1500, R. A. Medvedev, "The Problem of Democratization and the Problem of Détente" (October 1973), HU OSA 300–85–9 Published Samizdat, Samizdat Archives.

dents to prepare verbatim reports (as far as possible) immediately after the trial by comparing notes (usually made surreptitiously) and relying on the memory of several observers. An impressive number of reports have been compiled in this way, providing not only a vivid account of the confrontation between the Soviet regime and its dissident citizens, but also rare information about the actual operation of the Soviet legal system. In many cases the final words spoken by the accused have been incorporated in the trial reports, but a number of speeches from the dock also circulate separately and for this reason have been included in this group of documents";

(i) nondissident Soviet documents (19): "This category covers a relatively small number of documents of completely 'loyal' character which have ended up in Samizdat because of their specific interest to dissident circles";[55]

(j) documents of foreign origin (4): "The Archiv Samizdata contains a few bibliographical notes about foreign works circulating in Samizdat (or sometimes in the original form) in the Soviet Union" (RFE/RL 1973b: 1–2).[56]

Starting from the middle of the 1970s, the flow of samizdat documents increased dramatically, and currently the Samizdat Archives contains 6,617 published documents and about 10,000 to 15,000 (roughly estimated) unpublished samizdat. Nevertheless, the focus of the collection remains the same, and its materials primarily feature sociopolitical issues. In the published collection of the Samizdat Archives, political samizdat amounts to approximately 62 percent (3,284 items; Joo 2004: 574).

The sensitive nature of such material was obvious to the Samizdat Unit staff and the Radio Liberty management. In order to protect information sources, a policy to limit access to these resources was introduced. In his letter of July 29, 1986, to a Mr. Hamman, Peter Dornan (1986: 1) wrote that "we never indicate here or anywhere in an open source, the source of our materials. . . . All originals or Xerox copies of same in whatever form are filed in locked filing cabinets in locked rooms." "Procedures for Processing Samizdat Documents" stated that "no original documents will be photocopied or used without approval of the Samizdat Custodian" (i.e., Peter Dornan until his retirement in 1988; then Mario Corti took over this position) (RFE/RL 1979).

Forced restrictions on access to samizdat documents determined the

55. AS 42 contains the transcript of a meeting of the teachers' union at a Moscow school, held to discuss the question of sending V. M. Gerlin to sign a protest petition about the Ginzburg-Galanskov trial (April 16, 1968), HU OSA 300–85–9; see also www.memo.ru/history/diss/index.htm.

56. For example, AS 464, Milovan Djilas, "The New Class," HU OSA 300–85–9. For more details on the content of the Radio Liberty Samizdat Archives and its arrangement, see the series description of HU OSA 300–85–9, Published Samizdat at www.osaarchivum.org/db/fa/300-85-9.htm.

path of their circulation and publication. Initially, samizdat items were not published but circulated through Radio Liberty in the form of memoranda (internal correspondence). Later the *Materialy Samizdata* bulletins were published for internal use. In 1971 the first big project of publishing samizdat documents was launched. By this time, it was clear that the importance of the samizdat materials demanded wider dissemination and interpretation than Radio Liberty could undertake alone. In 1976 a group of Soviet studies scholars and writers met in Munich to found the Samizdat Archives Association (SAA), an independent international research organization. Its purpose was to make samizdat texts more readily available to libraries and individual scholars as well as to support research projects that made use of samizdat materials for scholarly purposes.

One of the main outcomes of SAA activity was thirty volumes of *Sobranie Dokumentov Samizdata*, which contain a total of three thousand samizdat documents.[57] More than thirty-five hundred other documents were published in the *Materialy Samizdata*, while most of the Radio Liberty samizdat collection has never been published. According to Mario Corti, very often samizdat was not published because of time and staff constraints. The unpublished material in no way is less historically valuable: rather, at the particular time certain documents were deemed more topical. Many documents came very close to publication but had to be put aside: "The reasons for this were varied but it seems to boil down to lack of human resources. Sometimes documents were abandoned due to failure to check upon all the facts [meaning that they were not verified]" (Corti 1996: 5).

The Munich collection of samizdat documents at RFE/RL has been considered for years one of the biggest in both Europe and the United States and the most valuable resource for writing the history of the dissident and human rights movement in the second half of the twentieth century. In 1980 Sydney Haitman described this collection as "an especially important source, whose extent and richness cannot be conveyed by a single entry" (RFE/RL 1991: 2): it was made available to him during three extended

57. *Sobranie Dokumentov Samizdata* (*SDS*), have been available by special arrangement in several American and European libraries (namely, the Slavic and East European Division, Library of Congress, United States; Center for Slavic and East European Studies, Ohio State University, United States; Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, United States; Hoover Institution, Stanford University, United States; Department of Printed Books, Slavonic and East European Division, British Museum, United Kingdom; Osteuropa-sammlung, Die Bayersche Staatabiblithek, Munich, Germany; Department of Printed Books, Slavonic Section, Bodlein Library, Oxford, United Kingdom; and Oost-Europa Instituut in cooperation with the Alexander Herzen Foundation, Amsterdam, Netherlands). Currently the full collection of the published samizdat documents (*SDS* and *Materialy Samizdata*) is available only at the Memorial Center (Moscow, Russia), while the biggest Russian State Library (widely known as Leninka) has only a few volumes of *SDS*.

visits there. Not only scholars visited the Munich headquarters of Radio Liberty to work with the materials collected by the Samizdat Unit. Among its correspondents were such international human rights organizations as Amnesty International, the International Society for Human Rights, the Boekovski-Foundation (Amsterdam), and the Center for Democracy in the USSR (New York). Among the subscribers to *Materialy Samizdata* over the years were YMCA Press (Paris), the Ukrainian Press Agency (London), POSSEV Verlag (Frankfurt am Main), Fundacion de Estudios Libertarios "Anselmo Lorenzo" (Madrid), Tolstoi Bibliotek (Munich), the Workers Solidarity Alliance (United States), the International Institute of Social History (Amsterdam), the Danish Confederation of Trade Unions (Copen-hagen), and the International Association on the Political Use of Psy-chiatry, to name a few.[58] Close contacts with Amnesty International were established in the 1960s. By 1969, there were 640 groups in 21 countries, and by that time 4,000 prisoners had been adopted and 2,000 released since Amnesty International was founded in 1961. In many cases, the infor-mation about a particular prisoner, his or her address, and other related data were forwarded to Amnesty International by the Samizdat Unit staff upon request.

The value of this collection lies not only in the documents themselves (which in many cases can be found in other archives and libraries), but also in the interrelations among them and the complementary nature of the different collections (or archival series) which make up the archive. These include the published and unpublished material, the search aids created by the staff of the Samizdat Unit, and the reference materials (several series of card indexes, collections of newspaper clippings, news agency materi-als, RFE/RL research papers, etc). Of particular value is the collection of materials broadcast by the Radio Liberty Russian Service (both tapes and scripts), containing programs based on samizdat documents or related themes.[59] Nevertheless, the solicitation policy and the Cold War sociopolit-cal framework which configured this valuable resource should not be for-gotten. Questions of authenticity still plague it, gaps and lacuna remain unexplained, some materials are still stored unprocessed, and unpublished documents sit in the vaults, inaccessible.

58. See, for example, the list of people and organizations that subscribed to *Materialy samiz-data* (1990) at HU OSA 300–85–47 Administrative Files, Samizdat Archives.
59. RFE/RL's Corporate Records and Broadcast Archives (1952–95) have been transferred to the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. The collection consists of administrative and policy files from RFE/RL executive offices and operating units, and it also contains selected program texts on paper or microfilm, selected audio recordings, and associated documentation. According to the information at hoorferl.stanford.edu, the collection (eighty thousand reel-to-reel tapes) is presently available on a very limited basis.

If in 1988 it was still possible to talk about samizdat in its classical meaning (Daniel 2002; Komaromi 2004), in the period of perestroika a transformation in samizdat took place that resulted in the appearance of a new phenomenon known as informal, independent, nontraditional, or alternative press (see Strukova 2005). It differed significantly from traditional samizdat and did not fit into publications such as *Materialy Samizdata*, whose objective was to provide access to information that was otherwise inaccessible. The Samizdat Unit decided to create a separate collection, which was partly described in *Katalog russkoiazychnykh periodicheskikh izdanii, nakhodiashchikhsia v sobraniiakh neformal'noi i mestnoi pechati issledovatel'skogo instituta RSE/RS* (Wispelwey 1994). The period of this new phenomenon started at the end of 1987, reached its peak by 1990, and slowly declined by 1994–95.[60]

Parallel to collecting and describing the informal press, the Samizdat Unit continued its efforts to process the main collection—the Samizdat Archives. In the early 1990s the unit worked out its "Proposal for Preserving and Improving Access to Radio Liberty Samizdat Collection of the RFE/RL Research Institute," designed to obtain additional funding for the preservation, microfilming, and cataloging of the Samizdat Archives. The document states that "given the relevance of these documents to the present political situation, heavy future demand for the materials is predicted. . . . In order to preserve and simultaneously make accessible these valuable and unique documents, the Research Institute proposes to microfilm and catalog into the RLIN database 15,000 previously un-cataloged titles. . . . All of the documents in the historical samizdat collection are written on highly acidic, poor-quality paper and already embrittled, are in great danger of deterioration" (RFE/RL 1991: 8). The project was never realized, because in 1992 the samizdat unit was dissolved, and two years later the RFE/RL Research Institute archives and library holdings were moved to Budapest, Hungary. However, the problems pointed out in this document still persist, and they also concern the materials in similar collections.

Questions of preservation and access are becoming more and more pressing and important. As early as 1992, the Memorial Center (Moscow) organized the conference "Dissident Movement in the USSR in 1950–1980: Resources, Object, and Methodology of Research" within its program History of the Dissident Movement in the USSR.[61] The topics dis-

---

60. Suetnov (2001) provides the following figures: 1988—366 publications; 1989—966; 1990—1,366; 1991—1,566 (not including rock samizdat and fanzines and also some amount of unrecorded publications).
61. See the program at HU OSA 300–85–48 Administrative Files, Samizdat Archives.

cussed during this conference include: dissidents in the relations between West and East; the historical and geopolitical context of the Cold War; contacts and the influence of ideas transmitted over borders; samizdat as a sociopolitical and cultural phenomenon; research methodologies; "oral history" and sociological methods of research; as well as problems of processing, description, and preservation of primary sources; problems of scientific publishing of dissident literature, and so on. In the sphere of archival research, the issues included: the problems of locating collections and sources accumulated in different institutions and organizations, both in the countries of the Soviet bloc and abroad; private collections and the problems of their description; access to the materials related to the history of samizdat and dissident movements in official state and institutional archives; and also questions of international cooperation among different institutions, archives, and research centers.

Almost fifteen years have passed since this conference, but the situation has not changed much. It concerns the whole body of samizdat material created and accumulated by different organizations, both during and after the communist regimes. Currently the archival collections of samizdat materials comprise prohibited publications coming from the West (known as tamizdat); gray literature (pamphlets, brochures, and other ephemera like postcards and stamps); nonconformist art, photography, and recordings; and the informal press of the late 1980s. Samizdat collections have likewise expanded to encompass personal papers, official documents, and objects—the entire complex of material that relates to samizdat and dissent activities.

Although currently more than forty repositories have been identified, the number of samizdat archives and other institutions that contain samizdat materials is still growing. And most of them are far from being archives in the strict sense of the term. They also differ in language, archival principles and approaches, and financial capacities. Moreover, many of the samizdat documents and related materials are still in private collections and require special attention. As a result, the documents are not always properly arranged, described, and preserved according to archival standards. This situation creates difficulties for scholars who try to locate and identify relevant sources for their research. Although many samizdat texts were published after 1990, many are still unknown to researchers. In addition, after the collapse of Communism, several key organizations established in Western countries underwent changes, and their samizdat collections were moved from one repository to another.

The problem of access is also inherent to the material itself (Komaromi 2004). Most works of samizdat are "unstable," existing in many copies, ver-

sions, formats, languages; many exist only in the form of reproductions and translations, as the so-called originals were destroyed by the secret service or the authors themselves. In many cases, we do not know if works were destroyed or simply lie undiscovered among someone's personal papers or in a lesser-known archive. As samizdat was previously excluded from archival status and thus not collected or preserved, the material is often deteriorating, the paper brittle and thin, the photographs decaying. All these circumstances have a negative effect on the quality of research in this area, hinder active exchange and discussion among scholars, and result in the absence of comparative research.

The analysis of the state of samizdat archival documentation done in 2004–5 by OSA Archivum staff members (including the author) led to an enumeration of the following main problems that researchers face: (1) there is no single consolidated source of information about the locations and contents of preserved samizdat materials; in particular, there is no unified list of repositories available online. The existing reference instruments, such as archival search aids, are fragmentary. Moreover, many of them provide information in the local languages (the Web site of the Research Center for East European Studies at the University of Bremen is in German, that of the Memorial Center is in Russian, etc.); (2) there is no standardized archival approach to processing samizdat documents; in most cases, there are no online search aids applicable to the samizdat collections (not even to the archival fonds, let alone comprehensive item-level descriptions); there is no established practice of publishing samizdat documents online based on digital images; (3) there is no centralized information service that would provide updates on current events and developments in related fields: conferences, forums, exhibitions, projects, publications, new acquisitions from private collections, etc; (4) there is no organized source of information about scholars and institutions conducting research into samizdat history and related fields.

Coordination among institutions has begun but is still in its early stages, mostly taking the form of joint exhibitions, workshops, conferences, and resource sharing.[62] Very little digitization of samizdat has thus far been attempted, though several institutions have recently begun to repair this hole. A few small-scale coordinated projects have been undertaken, for example, the Catalog of Soviet Samizdat, an online resource that was created by the Memorial Center (supported by OSA Archivum) and that describes approximately seven thousand samizdat documents published

---

62. For more details, see note 22; also see www.samizdatportal.org for news and updates.

by the RFE/RL Research Institute in the *Sobranie Dokumentov Samizdata* and *Materialy Samizdata* (Kuzovkin and Zubarev 2002). This move toward a coordinated effort culminated in the inauguration of the International Samizdat [Research] Association (IS[R]A) in 2005.[63] This initiative arose in order to provide the scientific community with easy access to samizdat collections up to the item level (documents) through a union catalog of samizdat materials and also to create a network of institutions, specialists, scholars, and independent researchers to foster further research. In 2005–6, the Samizdat Directory was launched as the first step toward creating a unified directory of information on the location and contents of archival and other relevant repositories.

The Samizdat Text Corpora (STC) project was initiated in 2006, under the aegis of IS[R]A, by Komaromi of the University of Toronto, with support from the Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and the participation of the Scientific and Educational Center Memorial (Moscow, Russia) and the OSA Archivum (Budapest).[64] The project aims to build up a comprehensive catalog of Soviet samizdat periodical literature and to publish it both in print and online. The searchable online database is also intended to serve as a union catalog for IS[R]A member institutions and affiliates. Alongside Soviet samizdat, it is eventually slated to include: (1) samizdat periodical literature from other countries of the former Soviet bloc (e.g., Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary); (2) nonperiodical samizdat, that is, books and documents; (3) scanned original documents in both photo and full-text format. This project marks the first step in a new approach to archiving and providing access to materials dispersed over different repositories and available in a range of formats, mediums, and languages. As a single point of access to a distributed archive, it promises to overcome the problem of decaying, displaced, and excluded samizdat material.

The success or failure of this and similar projects will to some extent be determined by the current framework of shared cultural understanding. Has the time come for samizdat to take its place in the social memory of both East and West? One may also ask whether the technology will allow us to overcome the problems inherent in the archival endeavor. Or does the fate of archives as a site and principle of historical evidence still hang in the balance?

---

63. For more details, see www.samizdatportal.org.
64. Information on this project was provided by Kathryn Máthé, who is responsible for the design of the database and who also has provided valuable feedback on this article.

Conclusion

Historians today are increasingly interested in the relationship between history and memory. The twentieth century brought into question not only the notion of historical fact but also the innocence from the archives. Their role was reconsidered: the purpose of the archives is not to furnish the materials for historical inquiry but rather to express past society's power over memory and over the future. It has become evident that "the archive cannot offer direct access to the past, only a textual refiguring of it" (Kemp 1998: 44).

The particular case of samizdat as an archival document reveals how the integrity of written memory can be destroyed. The ideology of socialist states with its imposed censorship, strict bans over freedom of press, and "socialist realism" as a principle of Soviet culture defined the logic of archival solicitation. The documents and artifacts produced by the underground milieu, and thus samizdat as such, were excluded from the long-term preservation policy. Documents smuggled abroad ended up geographically dislocated and dispersed. Those that remained at home were threatened by physical destruction, whether at the hands of the authorities or of the authors themselves or simply as a result of their own fragile nature and the passage of time.

The history of this particular material also demonstrates to what extent the ideological assumptions and the archival practices based on them can lead to marginalization and underrepresentation of a significant part of cultural memory. Although samizdat was collected by Radio Liberty, the integrity of this corpus of documents and its claim to represent the samizdat phenomenon can be questioned. Certain materials, especially literary and artistic samizdat, were excluded from the solicitation policy, processing, and publication because of the Radio's programming needs, which were themselves rooted in the Cold War policy of the CIA. This in turn led to the perception of the dissident movement in the Soviet Union as primarily political resistance. Here we see that the arbitrary nature of archival solicitation and processing, which allows only some documentation to survive, caused real losses of cultural heritage.

An archive, regardless of when it is formed, is not just the bearer of documentation but also a reflection of the needs of its creators, and the purposes behind its creation should be taken in a broader sociopolitical and cultural context. For archives are not passive "storehouses of old stuff, but active sites where social power is negotiated, contested, confirmed" (Schwartz and Cook 2002: 1). Archives give "the very possibility of knowledge"; it is not a question of the past, but of the future, the question of response, of a promise and responsibility for tomorrow (Derrida 1996: 37).

References

Alekseeva, Liudmila
    1985 *Soviet Dissent: Contemporary Movements for National, Religious, and Human Rights*, translated by Carol Pearce and John Glad (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press).
Arato, Andrew, and Jean Cohen
    1992 *Civil Society and Political Theory* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
Archivum
    1996 Memory of the World at Risk: Archives Destroyed, Archives Reconstituted. Special issue, *Archivum: International Review on Archives* 42.
Assmann, Aleida
    2006 "History, Memory, and the Genre of Testimony," *Poetics Today* 27: 261–73.
Bal, Mieke
    1999 "Memories in the Museum: Preposterous Histories for Today," in *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, edited by Mieke Bal, Jonathan Crew, and Leo Spitzer, 24–52 (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England).
Blouin, Francis X., and William G. Rozenberg, eds.
    2006 *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).
Boiter, Albert
    1969 Soviet Protest Documents [memorandum], HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files, Samizdat Archives.
    1972 "Samizdat: Primary Source Material in the Study of Current Soviet Affairs," *Russian Review* 31 (3): 282–85.
Bouchenaki, Mounir
    2003 "The Interdependency of the Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage," keynote address, Fourteenth General Assembly and Scientific Symposium of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe, October 27–31, www.international.icomos.org/victoriafalls2003/papers.
Boym, Svetlana
    2001 *The Future of Nostalgia* (New York: Basic Books).
Browne, Donald R.
    1982 *International Radio Broadcasting: The Limits of the Limitless Medium* (New York: Praeger).
Bukovskii, Vladimir
    1979 *I vozvrashchaetsia veter . . .* (*And the Wind Is Returning . . .*) (New York: Khronika).
Burton, Antoinette
    2001 "Thinking beyond the Boundaries: Empire, Feminism, and the Domains of History," *Social History* 26 (1): 60–71.
Carr, David
    1986 *Time, Narrative, and History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).
Cattel, Maria G., and Jakob J. Climo
    2002 "Meaning in Social Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives," in *Social Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by Maria G. Cattel and Jakob J. Climo, 1–36 (Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira).
Chaterjee, Indrani
    1997 "Testing the Local against the Colonial Archive," *History Workshop* 4: 215–44.
Confino, Alon
    1997 "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method," *American Historical Review* 102: 1386–1403.
Connerton, Paul
    1989 *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Cook, Michael
    2006 "Professional Ethics and Practice in Archives and Record Management in a Human
        Rights Context," *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 27 (1): 1–16.
Corti, Mario
    1996 Interview, HU OSA 206, Administrative History Files, Samizdat Archives, OSA
        Archivum.
Coser, Lewis A.
    1992 "Introduction: Maurice Halbwachs 1877–1945," in Halbwachs 1992: 1–34.
Critchlow, James
    1995 *Radio Hole-in-the-Head/Radio Liberty: An Insider's Story of Cold War Broadcasting* (Wash-
        ington, DC: American University Press).
Daniel, Aleksandr
    2002 "Istoki i korni dissidentskoi aktivnosti v SSSR" ("Origins and Sources of Dis-
        sident Activity in the USSR"), *Neprikosnovennyi zapas* 1 (12), www.nz-online.ru/index
        .phtml?aid=55011576.
    2006 "Freedom of the Press, Freedom of Culture," in *Human Rights in the Democracy Move-
        ment Twenty Years Ago—Human Rights Today*, conference proceedings November 21–22,
        2005, edited by David R. Evans and Ferenc Kőszeg, 86–91 (Budapest: Hungarian Hel-
        sinki Committee).
Daniel', A., and A. Roginskii, eds.
    2005 *Piatoe dekabria 1965 goda v vospominaniiakh uchastnikov sobytii, materialakh Samizdata, doku-
        mentakh partiinykh, komsomol'skikh organizatsii i v zapiskakh Komiteta gosudarstvennoi bezopas-
        nosti v TsK KPSS (The Fifth of December 1965 in Memoirs of Participants of the Events, Samizdat
        Materials, and the Documents of the Party and Komsomol Organizations, and in the Notes of the
        State Security Committee)* (Moscow: NIPTs Memorial).
Darnton, Robert
    1982 *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
        Press).
de Certeau, Michel
    1988 *The Writing of History*, translated by Tom Conley (New York: Columbia University
        Press).
Derrida, Jacques
    1996 *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, translated by Eric Prenowitz (Chicago: University
        of Chicago Press).
Dirks, Nicholas
    1993 "Colonial Histories and Native Informants: Biography of an Archive," in *Orientalism
        and the Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia*, edited by Carol Breckenridge
        and Peter van der Veer, 279–313 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).
Donadio, Rachel
    2007 "The Iron Archives," *New York Times*, April 22, www.nytimes.com/2007/04/22/
        books/review/Donadio.t.html.
Doria, Charles, ed.
    1986 *Russian Samizdat Art: Essays* (New York: Willis, Locker, and Owens).
Dornan, Peter
    1972 Letter from June 27, HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files, Samizdat Archives.
    1986 Letter to Mr. Hamman, July 29, HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files, Samiz-
        dat Archives.
    1996 Interview, HU OSA 206, Central Administrative History Files.
Eichwede, Wolfgang
    2000 *Samizdat. Alternative Kultur in Zentral- und Osteuropa (Samizdat: Alternative Culture in Cen-
        tral and Eastern Europe)* (Bremen: Temmen).
    2002 "Europe and Its Samizdat," in *Samizdat—Alternative Culture in Central- and Eastern
        Europe from the 1960s to the 1980s*, 11–13 (Bremen: Temmen).

Ellis, Judith, ed.
  1999 *Keeping Archives*, 2nd ed. (Melbourne: Thorpe).
Ernst, Wolfrang
  2000 "Archi(ve) Textures of Museology," in *Museums and Memory*, edited by Susan A.
    Crane, 43–67 (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press).
Falk, Barbara J.
  2003 *Dilemmas of Dissidence in East-Central Europe: Citizen Intellectual and Philosopher Kings*
    (Budapest: Central European University Press).
Federation of American Scientists (FAS)
  1969 "Government Support of Covert Action Directed at the Soviet Union." Memoran-
    dum for the 303 Committee, Washington, DC, December 9, www.fas.org/irp/cia/
    product/frus1969.pdf.
Feldbrugge, F. J. M.
  1975 *Samizdat and Political Dissent in the Soviet Union* (Leyden: Sijthoff).
Foucault, Michel
  1972 *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (London: Tavistock).
Gereben, Istvan B.
  1986 *Defiant Voices: Hungary 1956–1986* (Pennsylvania: Alpha Publications).
Goriaeva, T. M.
  2002 *Politicheskaia tsenzura v SSSR. 1917–1991* (*Political Censorship in the USSR: 1917–1991*)
    (Moscow: ROSSPEN).
Gough, Susan L.
  2003 "The Evolution of Strategic Influence," USAWC Strategy Research Project, U.S.
    Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, www.fas.org/irp/eprint/gough.pdf.
Grimsted, Patricia Kennedy
  1998 "Archives of Russia Seven Years After: 'Purveyors of Sensations' or 'Shadows Cast
    to the Past'?" The Cold War International History Project, Working Papers no. 20,
    pt. 1, September, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, DC,
    www.iisg.nl/archives-and-restitution/seven1.pdf.
Halbwachs, Maurice
  1992 *On Collective Memory*, edited, translated, and with an introduction by Lewis A. Coser
    (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
Hamilton, Carolyn, ed.
  2002 *Refiguring the Archive* (New York: Springer).
Hedstrom, Margaret
  2002 "Archives, Memory, and Interfaces with the Past," *Archival Science* 2 (1–2): 21–43.
Holtorf, Cornelius J.
  2003 "The Distant Past," tspace.library.utoronto.ca/citd/holtorf/2.3.html.
Ivanov, B. I.
  2003 "Literaturnye pokoleniia v leningradskoi neofitsial'noi literature, 1950–1980 gody"
    ("Literary Generations in Leningrad Nonofficial Literature, 1950–1980"), in *Samizdat
    Leningrada (1950-1980): Literaturnaia entsiklopediia* (*Samizdat in Leningrad [1950-1980]: Lit-
    erary Encyclopedia*), edited by D. IA. Severiukhin, 535–84 (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe
    obozrenie).
Jemerson, Randall C.
  2006 "Embracing the Power of Archives," *American Archivist* 69: 19–32.
Jenkins, Keith
  1992 *Re-thinking History* (London: Routledge).
Joo, Hyung-Min
  2004 "Voices of Freedom: Samizdat," *Europe-Asia Studies* 56 (4): 571–94.
Kammen, M.
  1995 "Review of *Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory*, by Iwona Irwin-
    Zarecka," *History and Theory* 34 (3): 246–61.

Kemp, Sandra
  1998 "The Archive on Which the Sun Never Sets: Rudyard Kipling," *History and Humanities Studies* 11 (4): 33–48.
Koenker, Diane P., and Ronald D. Bachman, eds.
  1997 *Revelations from the Russian Archives: Documents in English Translation* (Washington, DC: Library of Congress).
Kolchinsky, Irene E.
  1999 "The Last Futurists: 'Nebyvalists' and Their Leader Nikolai Glazkov," *Slavic and East European Journal* 43 (1): 174–95.
Komaromi, Ann
  2004 "The Material Existence of Soviet Samizdat," *Slavic Review* 63 (3): 597–618.
  2007 "The Unofficial Field of Late Soviet Culture," *Slavic Review* 66 (4): 605–29.
Körmendy, Lajos
  2007 "Changes in Archives' Philosophy and Functions at the Turn of the 20th/21st Centuries," *Archival Science* 7 (2): 167–77.
Kowalczuk, Ilko-Sasha
  2002 *Freiheit und Öffentlichkeit. Politischer Samisdat in der DDR 1985–1989* (Berlin: Robert Havemann Gesellschaft).
Kozlov, V. A.
  2003 "Kramola: Inakomyslie v SSSR pri Khrushcheve I Brezhneve. 1953–1982 gody. Po rassekrechennym dokumentam Verkhovnogo Suda I Prokuratury SSSR" ("Kramola: Dissent in the USSR under Khrushchev and Brezhnev, 1953–1982. Based on Declassified Documents from the Supreme Court and Procurator of the USSR"), *Otechestvennaia istoriia* 4: 93–111.
Krivulin, Viktor
  1999 "Zolotoi vek samizdata" ("The Golden Age of Samizdat"), in *Samizdat veka* (*Samizdat of the Age*), edited by A. Strelianyi et al., 334–52 (Minsk: Polifact).
Kulavig, Erik
  2002 *Dissent in the Years of Khrushchev: Ten Stories about Disobedient Russians* (New York: Palgrave).
Kuzovkin, Gennadii, and Dmitrii Zubarev
  2002 Samizdat Catalogue: Introduction, www.memo.ru/history/diss/index.htm.
Laqueur, Walter
  1990 *Soviet Realities: Culture and Politics from Stalin to Gorbachev* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction).
Le Goff, Jacques
  1992 *History and Memory*, translated by Steven Rendall and Elizabeth Claman (New York: Columbia University Press).
Leffler, Melvyn P., and David S. Painter, eds.
  1994 *Origins of the Cold War: An International History* (London: Routledge).
Levinson, Aleksei
  2005 "Arkhiv i prostota" ("Archives and Simpleness"), *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 74, magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2005/74/le4.html.
Lotman, Iurii, and Boris A. Uspensky
  1978 "On the Semiotic Mechanism of Culture," translated by George Mihaychuk, *New Literary History* 9: 211–32.
Machovec, Martin
  2004 "A Brief Report on Present Knowledge of Czech Samizdat Phenomena 1948–1989." Paper presented at the Budapest samizdat meeting, May.
Major, Patrick, and Rana Mitter, eds.
  2004 *Across the Blocs: Cold War Cultural and Social History* (London: Frank Cass).

Mal'tsev, Iurii
    1976 *Vol'naia russkaia literatura, 1955–1975* (*Free Russian Literature, 1955–1975*) (Frankfurt am Main: Possev-Verlag, V. Goradiek KG).
McEwan, Cheryl
    2003 "Building a Postcolonial Archive? Gender, Collective Memory, and Citizenship in Post-apartheid South Africa," *Journal of Southern African Studies* 29 (3): 739–57.
McKemmish, Sue, Anne Gillird-Setland, and Eric Ketelaar
    2005 "'Communities of Memory': Pluralizing Archival Research and Education Agendas," *Archives and Manuscripts* 33: 146–74.
Mitrokhina, Kseniia
    2003 "Samizdat: Nepodtsenzurnaia zhurnalistika v SSSR (1950–1980 gody)" ("Samizdat: Uncensored Journalism in the USSR [1950–1980]"), *Istoriia* 11, his.1september.ru/article.php?ID=200301102.
Nathans, Benjamin
    2007 "The Dictatorship of Reason: Aleksandr Vol'pin and the Idea of Rights under 'Developed Socialism'," *Slavic Review* 66 (4): 630–63.
Nelson, Michael
    1997 *War of the Black Heavens: The Battles of Western Broadcasting in the Cold War* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press).
Neumaier, Diane, ed.
    2004 *Beyond Memory: Soviet Nonconformist Photography and Photo-Related Works of Art* (New Brunswick, NJ: Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, Rutgers University Press).
Nora, Pierre
    1989 "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*," *Representation* 26: 7–25.
Olick, Jeffrey K., and Joyce Robbins
    1998 "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices," *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 105–40.
Oushakine, Serguei
    2001 "The Terrifying Mimicry of Samizdat," *Public Culture* 13: 191–214.
Parta, R. Eugene
    2007 *Discovering the Hidden Listener: An Assessment of Radio Liberty and Western Broadcasting to the USSR during the Cold War* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press).
Pinn, Judy
    2001 "Crises of Representation," in *Critical Moments in Qualitative Research*, edited by Hilary Byrne-Armstrong, Joy Higgs, and Debbie Horsfall, 189–98 (Oxford-Boston: Butterorth-Heinemann).
Pospielovsky, D.
    1978 "From Gosizdat to Samizdat and Tamizdat," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 20 (1): 44–62.
Preibisz, Joanna M., ed.
    1982 *Polish Dissident Publications: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York: Praeger).
Prokhorova, Irina
    2005 "Heirs to the Underground; or, What Keeps Russian Culture Going: Eye-Witness Notes," *Kultura* 1: 3–7.
Puddington, Arch
    2000 *Broadcasting Freedom: The Cold War Triumph of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky).
Quintana, Antonio Gonzalez
    1997 *Archives of the Security Services of Former Repressive Regimes: Report Prepared for UNESCO* (Paris: UNESCO).
Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) Samizdat Archives, OSA Archivum
    1967 AS 10 Texts of "Protocol of Search" of Galanskov's Apartment by KGB and Militia on 17 January and 21 July, 1967, HU OSA 300–85–9.

1969 "Handling of Documents from the Soviet Union," December 22 [memorandum], HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files.

1972a Samizdat, Freedom of Speech and Official Repression, Radio Liberty Program Policy Division Broadcast Guidance (Addendum), January 3, HU OSA 300–85–47 Administrative Files.

1972b Radio Liberty Memorandum, HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files.

1973a Register (Munich).

1973b Basic Information about Arkhiv Samizdata, HU OSA 206, Central Administrative History Files.

1977a Radio Liberty Audience Research and Program Evaluation, HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files.

1977b Procedures for Processing Samizdat Documents, memorandum, July 5. HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files.

1979 Procedures for Processing Samizdat Documents [memorandum draft]. HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files.

1990 Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute (RFE/RL RI), HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files.

1991 "Proposal for Preserving and Improving Access to the RL Samizdat Collection at RFE/RL Research Institute." HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files.

Radio Liberty Committee

1974 Annual Report, July 1, 1973–June 30, 1974, HU OSA 206, Central Administrative History Files.

Radio Liberty Program Policy Division (PPD)

1971 "The Use of Documents from the USSR," June 9, HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files, Samizdat Archives.

1972 "Samizdat, Freedom of Speech, and Official Repression" [memorandum], HU OSA 300–85–47, Administrative Files, Samizdat Archives.

Raina, Peter

1981 *Independent Social Movements in Poland* (London: London School of Economics and Political Science).

Ricoeur, Paul

2004 *Memory, History, Forgetting*, translated by Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Rose, Benjamin R.

1999 *Residentially Mandated Strategic Psychological Warfare Policy Coordination under Truman and Eisenhower: The Psychological Strategy Board and the Operations Coordinating Board* (Harrisonburg, VA: James Madison University).

Rusina, Iu.

2001 "Zhurnaly v samizdate 1960–1970 godov" ("Magazines in Samizdat 1960–1970"), in *Dokument. Arkhiv. Istoriia. Sovremennost* (*Document. Archive. History. Modernity*) 1:279–95 (Yekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo UrGU).

Samuels, Helen W.

1986 "Who Controls the Past," *American Archivist* 49: 98–114.

Saunders, George

1974 *Samizdat: Voices of the Soviet Opposition* (New York: Monad).

Schwartz, Barry

1996 "Memory as a Cultural System: Abraham Lincoln in World War II," *American Sociological Review* 61 (October): 908–27.

Schwartz, Joan M., and Terry Cook

2002 "Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory," *Archival Science* 2: 1–19.

Shalin, Dmitrii N.
  1996 "Intellectual Culture," in *Paradoxes of Post Communist Consciousness*, edited by D. N. Shalin, 41–97 (Boulder, CO: Westview).
Skilling, H. Gordon
  1989 *Samizdat and Independent Society in Central and Eastern Europe* (London: Macmillan).
Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr
  1972 *Noble lecture*, translated by F. D. Reeve (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux).
Sosin, Gene
  1999 *Sparks of Liberty: An Insider's Memoir of Radio Liberty* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press).
Steedman, Carolyn
  2002 *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press).
Stoller, Paul
  1995 *Embodying Colonial Memories: Spirit Possession, Power, and Hauka in West Africa* (New York: Routledge).
Strukova, Elena
  2005 *Al'ternativnaia periodicheskaia pechat' v istorii rossiskoi mnogopartiinost. (1987–1996)* (*Alternative Periodical Press in the History of the Russian Multiparty System*), edited by V. Tropinin (Moscow: GPIB Rossii).
Suetnov, Aleksandr
  2001 "Bessmertnyi samizdat. Segondia on depolitizirovalsia i ne zovet na ploshchsad'" ("Immortal Samizdat: Today It Is Depoliticized and Does Not Call for Barricades"), *Nezavisimaia gazeta*, July 27, www.ng.ru/printed/style/2001-07-27/8_samizdat.html.
Telesin, Julius
  1973 "Inside Samizdat," *Encounter* 15 (2): 25–33.
Tökés, Rudolf L.
  1996 *Hungary's Negotiated Revolution: Economic Reform, Social Change, and Political Succession, 1957–1990* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Tolstoi, Ivan
  2003 "Polveka v efire" ("Fifty Years of Broadcasting"), Radio Liberty, www.svoboda.org/programs/cicles/rl50/rl50-1964.asp.
  2004 "Khudozhnik i svoboda: K 30-letiiu 'bul'dozernoi' vystavki" ("The Artists and Freedom: Thirty Years of 'Bulldozer' Exhibition"), Radio Liberty, September 12, www.svoboda.org/programs/OTB/2004/OBT.091204.asp.
Tony, Judt
  1988 "The Dilemmas of Dissidence: The Politics of Opposition in East-Central Europe," *East European Politics and Societies* 2: 185–240.
Tucker, Robert C.
  1977 "Stalinism as Revolution from Above," in *Stalinism: Essays in Historical Interpretation*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 77–110 (New York: Norton).
Velikanova, E. M.
  1989 *Tsena metafory ili prestuplenie i nakazanie Siniavskogo i Danielia* (*The Price of Metaphor, or Crime and Punishment of Siniavskii and Daniel*) (Moscow: Kniga).
Walne, Peter, ed.
  1988 *Dictionary of Archival Terminology: English and French, with Equivalents in Dutch, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish*, 2nd rev. ed. (Munich: K. G. Saur).
Wilson, Jan E.
  2002 "Ordinary People and People Forgotten by History: Their (Shortfall in) Representation in Written Archives," *Comma* 1–2: 163–65.
Wispelwey, Berend, ed.
  1994 *Katalog russkoiazychnykh periodicheskikh izdanii, nakhodiashchikhsia v sobraniiakh neformal'noi i mestnoi pechati issledovatel'skogo instituta RSE/RS* (*Catalog of the Russian-Language Periodicals in the Collection of the Informal Press at the RFE/RL Research Institute*) (Munich: RFE/RL).

Yurchak, Alexei
  2006 *Everything Was Forever, until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
Zubok, Vladislav M.
  2007 *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).
Zvereva, G. I.
  2003 "'Prisvoenie proshlogo' v postsovetskoi istoriisophii Rossii (Diskursivnyi analiz publikatsii poslednikh let)," ("'Appropriation of the Past' in Post-Soviet Russia [Discourse Analysis of Last Year's Publications]"), *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 59, magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2003/59/zver.html.