

Manfred Kehrig

Bundesarchiv – Militärarchiv
Wiesenstalstrasse 10
Freiburg
Njemačka

THE POSITION OF MILITARY ARCHIVES IN THE FRAME OF ARCHIVAL SERVICE – INDEPENDENCE OR INTEGRATION?

UDK 930.253:355](100)

Izlaganje sa znanstvenog skupa

Arheološka istraživanja su pokazala da su već u najstarijim poznatim arhivima u Mezopotamiji i Egiptu, kasnije i u carskom Rimu, postojale odvojene prostorije u kojima su se čuvali vojni arhivi. To je posljedica činjenice da su arhivi od početka bili usko povezani s upravom, što je vidljivo već i iz same riječi arhiv, koja ne znači ništa drugo nego upravno tijelo.

Organizacija vojnih arhiva danas je raznolika. Negdje su vojni arhivi ustanove u sastavu ili podčinjene ministarstvu obrane ili određenom visokom vojnom zapovjedništvu, dok su drugdje organizirani kao vojni odjeli pri nacionalnom arhivu. U prvom slučaju arhivi su ponegdje ujedno i ustanove koje se bave istraživačkim radom za potrebe vojske, a ponegdje je istraživačka djelatnost odvojena u zasebno formiranu ustanovu. Postoje i hibridni slučajevi gdje su vojni arhivi neposredno u nadležnosti nacionalnog arhiva, ali je ministarstvo obrane zadržalo određene kompetencije.

Model organizacije vojnih arhiva kao ustanova podčinjenih ministarstvu obrane karakterističan je za romanske zemlje (Francuska, Španjolska, Portugal) i zemlje Istočne i Srednje Europe, donedavno sa socijalističkim društvenim uređenjem. U Francuskoj i Španjolskoj, na primjer, to je posljedica povijesnog razvoja arhivske službe – vojni arhivi su organizirani daleko prije središnjeg državnog arhiva i nije bilo pritiska za integraciju tih arhiva u nacionalni arhiv. Organizacija arhiva u

pravilu slijedi podjelu vojske na kopnenu vojsku, ratnu mornaricu i zračne snage. Vojni arhivi u ovim zemljama djeluju sukladno nacionalnom arhivskom zakonodavstvu, smatraju se dijelom nacionalne arhivske baštine i primjenjuju stručne standarde koji ne odudaraju od onih koji vrijede za nacionalne arhive. Suradnja s nacionalnim arhivom je uglavnom neformalna i dobrovoljna, usmjerena na usklađivanje određenih pitanja stručnoga rada.

Vojni arhivi u Rusiji nastali do 1941. godine čine dio nacionalne arhivske službe, tj. nisu podčinjeni ministarstvu obrane. Gradivo nastalo nakon 1941. čuva se u vojnim arhivima (odvojeno za kopnenu vojsku i ratnu mornaricu) koji su podčinjeni generalštabu, odnosno admiralitetu. Iako se ova dva arhiva često smatraju međuarhivima – pretpostavlja se, dakle, da bi gradivo moglo biti predano drugom arhivu – očita je tendencija prerastanja ovih međuarhiva u povijesne arhive. Za razliku od vojnih arhiva u Francuskoj i Španjolskoj, gdje se na korištenje vojnih arhiva primjenjuju odredbe nacionalnog arhivskog zakonodavstva i u pravilu mjesto čuvanja gradiva ne utječe na režim njegova korištenja, u Rusiji je režim korištenja gradiva koje se čuva u arhivima pod nadležnoću ministarstva obrane znatno restriktivniji u odnosu na gradivo koje se čuva u državnim arhivima.

Vojni arhivi u Švedskoj i u Njemačkoj pripojeni su nacionalnome arhivu – kao odjeli nacionalnog arhiva – na temelju ugovora ministarstva obrane s ministarstvom nadležnim za arhive. Iako vojni arhivi više nisu u njegovoj neposrednoj nadležnosti, u oba slučaja ministarstvo obrane je zadržalo neka prava i ovlasti u pogledu korištenja gradiva, nadzora nad zaštitom, obradom i korištenjem i sl. U njemačkom slučaju ugovorom je određeno da je direktor vojnog arhiva u sastavu saveznog arhiva uvijek pukovnik njemačke vojske te da je određen broj osoblja iz reda djelatnih vojnih lica. Ovakav hibridni položaj vojnih arhiva posljedica je s jedne strane potrebe za kvalitetnijom stručnom obradom, boljom dostupnošću gradiva i smanjenjem troškova – što se postiže ako se gradivo preda nacionalnome arhivu – i s druge strane potrebe vojske za određenom razinom nadzora i očuvanjem vlastitoga povijesnog identiteta.

U Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama i Velikoj Britaniji gradivo vojne provenijencije čuva se u nacionalnome arhivu jednako kao i svo ostalo gradivo nastalo djelovanjem tijela državne vlasti. Prije predaje gradiva arhivu nadležna vojna ustanova može pregledati gradivo (radi istraživanja ili deklasifikacije), no nakon predaje gradivo je u punoj i isključivoj nadležnosti nacionalnog arhiva. Jedino je za korištenje klasificiranih dokumenata, prije isteka zakonskog roka, potrebno odobrenje nadležnog vojnog tijela. Za SAD i Veliku Britaniju karakteristično je i to da se vojno gradivo privatne provenijencije ne preuzima u državne arhive, kao što je to uobičajeno u arhivima na europskome kontinentu gdje takvo gradivo služi kao nadopuna ili nadomjestak za javne arhivske fondove.

Primjer Švedske u kojoj je donedavno samostalni vojni arhiv izuzet iz nadležnosti ministarstva obrane i postao odjel nacionalnog arhiva, upućuje na tendenciju koja će vjerojatno biti sve prisutnija. Suvremene vojske nisu vezane za vlastitu povijest kao element njihova identiteta i samosvijesti i nastoje se usredotočiti isključivo na svoju osnovnu zadaću u sadašnjosti i neposredno predstojećoj budućnosti. Zahtjevi za smanjenjem troškova i transparentnošću također imaju velik utjecaj. Ipak, svaki od tri analizirana modela može se pokazati uspješnim, ovisno o tradiciji, organizaciji uprave i vojske, raspoloživim resursima i sl. Bez obzira na to koji je model primijenjen u pojedinoj zemlji, važno je da je rad vojnih arhiva reguliran nacionalnim arhivskim zakonodavstvom na isti način kao i rad ostalih javnih arhiva i da se osigura dostupnost i jednaki uvjeti korištenja gradiva vojnih arhiva kao dijela nacionalne arhivske baštine

Sažetak izradio Jozo Ivanović

In one of his essays the German poet Friedrich von Hardenberg, better known as Novalis, stated that archives were the peoples' memory. This placed him in the tradition of Herder, who promoted the collecting of popular legends and particularly songs partly out of a belief that peoples should have an accurate knowledge of their literary past, as their historical and political history was manifested in them as much as their national identity. The extraordinary collecting activities in the field of European songs and legends which resulted in the publication of 'Voices of the Peoples' greatly stimulated the development of German national identity. It is surely no coincidence that the Balkan peoples, amongst others, still look upon Herder as the founder of their national awakening. Hardenberg's literary career spans the late 18th and early 19th centuries and is of course closely linked to the German Classical movement had such a rapid and powerful international impact and whose leading lights were Goethe, Schiller, Wieland and the Schlegel brothers, not to speak of the great philosophers Kant and Hegel. Hardenberg's statement concerning archives has lost nothing of its validity, and is frequently cited today, particularly in the German-speaking world. In the present essay on archives their core tasks are defined as follows: to secure and to take charge of archival materials, to prepare and keep them, and to edit and make them publicly accessible. To the present day nothing has altered these archival tasks, as I am sure we are all persuaded.

For reasons of definition I would like to point out that the description of archives as the memory of states, peoples and nations embraces different areas of competency. Archives as the memory of the state relate to the documentation of the administrative activities of the state bodies; archives as the memory of the peoples and nations relate mainly to securing, keeping and ensuring public access to the literary and artistic sources. In many European states (to which we will confine ourselves)

these three areas fall within the competence of the State or National Archives, whichever designation is used in a particular country.

By their origins, archives are subordinate bodies to the state administration; that is manifested in the word *archaion*, which means nothing other than an administrative body or office. Important documents of state administration are kept in this *archaion*, particularly those which possess legal authority vis-a-vis other countries and citizens, and which in general documented the state administration's concern for its tasks in the interests of the rule of law. These bodies were initially chanceries with a special character which, over time, increased markedly in size and became significant for scientific enquiry when it was necessary to reconstruct the development of a state in the interests of self-legitimation and the self-assurance of its citizens. Five thousand years ago there were archives in Mesopotamia, and four thousand years ago ancient Egypt had these same bodies, which have been excavated for many years by the German Archaeological Institutes in Baghdad and Cairo. During the course of these excavations, German and French scientists made the interesting discovery that these archives had separate rooms for the preservation of military documents, in other words that the differentiation of state activities had found its way into the archival organisation and had led to archives of military significance being treated in a special manner. A similar state of affairs existed in the Imperial Roman archives, the *tabularium*, as we know from the studies of Theodor Mommsen on Roman state law and administration. It is therefore an interesting phenomenon that military documents were given a separate status within the early development of the archival system. This surely also relates to the fact that archives are always necessarily created when state organisation and human culture have reached a particular level of development.

The important fact to bear in mind is, therefore, that in antiquity the archival system already in large measure provided for the administration of separate military repositories.

The organisation of the military archival system is variously arranged throughout the world. Military archives either belong as independent organisations within the competence of the defence minister, or as military departments within the National or State Archives. The first group itself displays varying characteristics, being in some cases at the same time research organisations for the armed forces whereas in other instances the military archives are separated from the research organisation. Some states have a hybrid organisation, whereby the military archives are a part of the National Archives but are subject to important prerogatives on the part of the defence ministry as a result of the latter's traditional self-understanding or its prominent functions. In most cases these developments are the result of the historical evolution of the military archive systems, which I now propose to analyse in order to ga-

in a better understanding of the current situation in this area. Naturally I cannot deal with the developments in every country, and will concentrate only on those themes which I consider significant for my subject.

I will start with the military archive system in France, where the state administration was organised centrally from an early period. The growing political, military and economic importance of the French Kingdom found expression internally in a well organised military administration with the aim of having ready to hand all necessary documents, including maps and fortification plans, for the prosecution of war. In 1689 Colbert set up the 'Depot d'archives centrales de la Marine', renamed 'Service historique de la Marine' in 1919 and housed in the Chateau de Vincennes. The archive also had the task of conducting historical research, so that the combination of archives and research activities was established from the beginning as far as the navy was concerned. This Naval Archive was subsumed under the Admiralty Staff in the second half of the 19th century, in order to support the latter's operational activities with military-historical studies. In 1688 Louis XIV and Marshal Comte de Louvois ordered the creation of the 'Depot de la Guerre' as a central repository for records concerning land-based military operations, which was subsumed under the General Staff in the latter half of the 19th century in a similar manner to the naval archives. In 1934 the 'Service des etudes historiques et geographiques de l'air' was formed when the French air force was established as an independent armed service, and in 1939 was renamed the 'Service historique de l'Armee de l'air' and relocated to the Chateau de Vincennes. The French National Archives were created only in 1789, marking the culmination of the establishment of the centralised state apparatus in France. In other words, the French military archives, like their Portuguese counterpart established in 1540, preceded by more than 100 years the creation of civil archives. Significantly, the French National Assembly made no attempt to integrate the military archives into the National Archives, and this has remained so to the present day, not simply for practical reasons but also out of respect for the organic historical development in this area. Of course the French archival law of 1794 applies also to the military archives, a law often revised and adapted to changing circumstances, but an organisational integration under the umbrella of the National Archives has not been effected or considered. It goes without saying that the French military archives consider themselves to be part of the national archival system in so far as they define themselves as part of the memory of the French nation and its historical development. This is demonstrated, for example, in the meetings which take place once or twice a year between the three Heads of the 'Service historique' in Vincennes and the Director General of the French Archives and his colleagues to ensure that measure of archival coordination and cooperation which is desirable for the state, the armed forces and for the scientific community. Based on the French archive law of

1794, which, incidentally, is frequently referred to in Germany as the Declaration of Archival Human Rights, the three French armed services (not to speak of other military organisations with their own archival systems) have issued regulations which have been signed by the Chief of the respective armed service. These direct that all records (written, pictorial and film as well as digital records) are to be deposited in the military archives, notwithstanding special regulations for photographs and film. Those who have visited the military archives in the Chateau de Vincennes are deeply impressed by the archival professionalism, the excellent technical backup, the reliable work of archivists and researchers, the grandiose architecture and the ambience, which can only inspire the work of every visitor. To conclude, we can state with regard to the French military archives: On the principle of their organisational integration into the competency of the French Ministry of Defence, the military archives are responsible to the Chiefs of the General Staff of the respective armed services, and define themselves as an auxiliary of the French Ministry of Defence in its function as a part of the state administration. They are characterised by military archival professionalism as well as by a harmonious cooperation with the National Archive in Paris. Their holdings are available to all by law, unless other regulations apply. The French military archives achieve in their work the organisational unity of research and archival tasks.

The Spanish military archives are subordinated to the Ministry of Defence and count as amongst the oldest in Europe. Their origins go back to the mid-16th century, when it was necessary to produce and retain maps of the European theatres of war and to the rapidly developing organisation of the armies in the field. Similar organisations for the naval and land forces were set up at the same time. Unlike the situation in France, the Spanish military archives are located in several places, namely Madrid, Segovia and Cadiz. This reflects the national development of Spain since the defeat of the Arabs and the unification of Aragon and Castille. The Air Force archive was established in 1940. The three service archives confine themselves to their professional tasks of securing, evaluating, editing and making available the historical sources, whereas the military historical research is left to other military organisations. The work of the military archives is regulated by the 1985 Law on Spanish National Tradition, as there is to date no valid archive law. The coordination of the work of the various military archives is the responsibility of the Directorate of Military Historical Services. The Spanish armed forces have a strong sense of their importance as a pillar of the state, and correspondingly of their role as part of the national memory, a state of affairs equally applicable to their most recent history and to that period of Spanish history when its fleets sailed the world's seas to gain and secure colonies with strong land forces on board. The archive personnel is professionally trained and has access to modern technical equipment. The holdings are accessible un-

der a 30-year closure rule (unless otherwise regulated). Only informal contacts are maintained with the National Archives.

The French model of the integration of the military archives into the national archive system as a whole is to be found in nearly all European countries with a Roman heritage, and I would like to include in this the countries of Spanish and Portuguese tongue. All these military archives are subject to the military authorities, nearly all military archives are subject to a greater or lesser degree to the national archive laws, they all regard themselves as administrators of the national heritage, have professionally trained staff and allow unhindered access to their holdings.

I would now like to cast a glance at the organisation of the Russian military archival system. The fundamentals have not changed since the days of the Soviet Union and we see there the general situation that in conformity with the law on the unity of the socialist archival holdings the military archives fall within the competence of the state archive administration. The 'Archive of Old Military Records' in Moscow, which is housed in the former Governor's Palace, a magnificent but now dilapidated Baroque building where the papers dating from the time of Ivan the Severe until the outbreak of the October Revolution are held, and also the 'Archive of Old Naval Records' in St Petersburg, which holds the papers of the Russian naval forces from the time of Peter the Great to the outbreak of the October Revolution, both belong professionally and organisationally to the state archival administration. The same applies to the holdings of the Military Archives, whose remit encompasses the period October 1917 – 21 June 1941 (i.e. up to the date of the German invasion of the Soviet Union). The records of the higher military commands, in particular those of the Stavka (the Russian General Staff from 1917 to the present time), are held in the Administrative Archives of the General Staff in Moscow. This archive has recently been brought under the administration of the Central Russian Army and Air Force Archive in Podolsk, which houses the army and air force records from 22 June 1941 to the present and which is subordinate to the Deputy Russian Chief of the General Staff – in the same way as the Naval Archive in Gatchina near St Petersburg, which holds the records of the Soviet/Russian naval forces for the same period, is subordinate to the Admiralty Staff of the Russian naval forces. For the sake of completeness, I should add that the three armed services have their research arm in the Military Historical Institute in Moscow, which is organisationally separate from the military archives. The Russian military archivists basically view the archives in Gatchina and Podolsk as large intermediary archives or places of deposit for old files, but they no longer have this character but have become a mixture of intermediary and historical archive. In recent times the Podolsk and Gatchina archives primarily see themselves once more as administrative archives, evidently so that they can better regulate research access. The Russian military archives up to June 1941 fall within

the competence of the civil archival administration and are largely open to research, whereas access to the Gatchina and Podolsk archives is often considerably restricted. It is not surprising, in view of the wellknown patriotism of the Russian military, that Russian military archivists should see themselves as the guardians of the military heritage of the Soviet Union and Russia from June 1941 to the present. However, with regard to this patriotism they believe that they can avert threats to their fatherland through controls and restrictions on access to the records in their care.

In the countries of the former Warsaw Pact it is a regulation that the written military heritage from the start of national independence to the present is organised in military archives which are subsumed under the Ministry of Defence; I refer primarily to Poland, the Czech and Slovak Republics, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and the Federal Republic. According to the archive laws of these countries, the military and the diplomatic archives are designated as Special Archives under the administration of the respective ministries, but at the same time are subject to the state archival legislation and therefore to the professional direction of the civil state archival administration. In Poland, Hungary and Rumania the military archives see themselves as guardians of the national memory of these states, which largely derive their legitimation from the struggles for independence against Czarist Russia, Imperial Austria and the Imperial Ottoman Empire. Particularly in Hungary and Rumania I believe to have observed a closer cooperation between the heads of the military archives and those of the state archival administration. In Hungary this cooperation is very visible in the fact that the military and civil archive administrations practically live nextdoor to each other. The heads of the military and civil archive administrations meet at irregular intervals for talks which concern current work and problems and the opportunities for mutual support. In Hungary, for example, conservation work for the military archives is carried out to a significant degree by the workshops of the State Archives in Budapest.

We can see from these examples that there are many countries in which the military archives are organised separately from the state archives and are affiliated to the Ministry of Defence, but all of these military archives nonetheless see themselves as integral parts of the national memory.

I would now like to turn to those military archival organisations which are in all respects a part of the civil state archival administration. Let me begin with the Swedish and German examples.

The Royal Swedish War Archives were set up in 1805 by the amalgamation of the royal map collection and the records of the Fortifications Corps. However, there are predecessors of the military archives already in 1634, at a time when Sweden's military power was at its height in the wake of the 30 Years' War. In 1873 the Swedish General Staff unified the Section for Military History and the Royal Military Ar-

chives in a special department, much as happened in Prussia. The archives opened their doors to the public in 1882. In 1926 the Royal Military Archives assumed responsibility for the records of the Swedish Air Force and in 1943 for those of the navy. Whoever is concerned with European history generally and military history in particular will continually encounter the valuable and extensive holdings of the Royal Swedish War Archives, which represent a veritable goldmine of sources for the researcher. Not many years ago the Swedish Ministry of Defence transferred its responsibility for the records of the Swedish Armed Forces to the National Archives. This means (if I may so formulate it) that the military has let go of its responsibility for its own memory purely out of financial considerations and has as a result given priority to the idea of professionalism and efficiency in the military sphere over the stewardship of the intellectual foundations of military service. This has surely also got something to do with the completely different nature of the contemporary armed forces' self-perception, just as historical consciousness is currently rather neglected across Europe and today's fighting services are little concerned with the foundations on which they stand and with their history, and believe that they can best discharge their duties by concentrating on the present and on the short-term future. I believe that the developments in Sweden are symptomatic of those in the European military institutions generally, and I am of the opinion that the latter will increasingly assume a mercenary character. We thus have a situation in Sweden where the Military Archives are part of the Imperial Archives, whose director is present today in the person of Dr Eric Norberg, where the basis of its activities is the Swedish Archive Law, but where the Swedish Ministry of Defence has come to an agreement with the Imperial Archives to satisfy its professional needs in this area.

Let us now look at the German situation, which has a complicated history. In 1918 the four kingdoms which dominated Germany (Prussia, Saxony, Wurttemberg and Bavaria) had their own military-historical department and war archives alongside their own General Staffs. The German Empire itself had no Imperial Archive. This situation changed after the First World War, when the Chief of the Troop Office (Truppenamt), Major General Hans von Seeckt, presented a memorandum to the Reich Cabinet in which he demanded the creation of an Imperial Archive in which to hold the large quantity of records accumulated by the demobilising army; this archive was to have the primary function of documenting the war on sea, land and in the air, but was also to function as an Imperial Archive in the wider sense. It is not surprising that this idea originated with the military, as the latter had always demanded the creation of a strictly organised central imperial authority. As the documentation of the First World War was to be the Reich Archive's principal immediate task, it was proposed that its President was always to be a retired general. In 1919 the Reich Cabinet approved General von Seeckt's ideas and the Imperial Archive was founded

in 1920. Its first President was retired Major General Merz von Quirnheim, a former officer in the Royal Bavarian Army, and his successor in the 1920s was the former Royal Prussian Army Major General Hans von Haefthen. Incidentally, the sons of both Presidents were shot on the night of the 20/21 July 1944 in the courtyard of the Armed Forces High Command headquarters in Berlin, in the wake of the failed 'July plot' against Hitler and the National Socialist regime. The core of the Imperial Archive was formed of the four war archives of the kingdoms in Berlin, Munich, Dresden, Stuttgart and Potsdam. The Imperial Archives was based in the former Prussian Officers School on the Brauhausberg in Potsdam, and its personnel was composed of retired Staff and General Staff officers (70%) and professional historians, with very few professional archivists (30%). These latter, in particular, were of course concerned to see the fledgling Imperial Archive evolve into a proper Imperial Archive housing the records of all government departments. They came into conflict with the Imperial Armed Forces in 1936, following the re-establishment of military sovereignty in the German Empire and the removal of the army records from the Imperial Archives which were then united under the 'Chief of the Army Archives', who was in turn subordinate to a Chief Quartermaster in the Army General Staff. The newly created Air Force placed its records in the Military Scientific Department of the Air Force (Archives), and the Naval Archive, which had already been created in 1916 outside the Admiralty Staff, was now redesignated as the Military Scientific Department of the Navy (Archives). In the Army, research was already separated out in the shape of the Army Historical Research Establishment. In 1940 the War Archive of the Armed Forces High Command was created under Major General Scherff, the 'Representative of the Führer for the military historiography of the Second World War', and in the same year the War Archive of the Waffen-SS was set up in Zasmuki Castle in Bohemia. At the end of the war the Air Force destroyed all of its archive material, the Navy on the other hand was able to move its own archived records out of Berlin to Tambach Castle near Coburg, did not destroy one single piece of paper, and even provided some of its personnel to accompany these records to London when the British forces took possession of them. The Army suffered a terrible loss when the Army Archive on the Brauhausberg in Potsdam was completely destroyed during a heavy multiple air raid by the Allies in April 1945. A proportion of the older records which had been moved to southern Germany was then destroyed by German soldiers. The War Archive of the Waffen-SS was confiscated by the Czechs, and remains in Czech hands to this day, on the grounds that the records are war-booty. I should like to mention here that the Czech position is unique among the NATO partners.

In 1950 the 'Blank Office' was set up in the Federal Chancellor's (Konrad Adenauer's) Office, which was to concern itself with a West German defence contri-

bution in the context of a European Defence Union. The 'Blank' official responsible for military sciences demanded, in 1952, the creation of an autonomous, traditional military archive organisation so that the records of all three services could be housed in a military central archive. This demand met with fierce opposition from the Federal Archives, which was commencing its work at that time, and from the Federal Ministry of the Interior, both of whom pointed to a Cabinet decision of 1950 which gave the Federal Archives administration competence over the military records. After much debate, an inter-ministerial agreement was reached in 1954/55 between the 'Blank Office' and the Ministry of the Interior over the consolidation of the military archive holdings, which envisaged the creation within the Military Historical Research Office (a central military office within the administration of the Federal Ministry of Defence) of a so-called Document Centre which would receive those records which were slowly returning from Washington and London. After having been evaluated by the Military Historical Research Office, these records were to be passed to the Military Archive within the Federal Archives. This solution had no positive results, so that in 1968 a new agreement between the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of the Interior was reached, whereby the Document Centre and the Military Archive in the Federal Archives were to be dissolved and their records aggregated in a new Federal Archives-Military Archive in Freiburg (Breisgau), in the same place as the Military Historical Research Office. The Director of the BA-MA was to be a Colonel in the General Staff or a naval Captain with qualifications, and 50% of the higher posts were to be filled with officers who had higher education qualifications. The Federal Minister for Defence was to participate in the finalisation of the budget, the conditions of use and the salary regulations. His requirement for military security was to be met, and he was to have a permanent right of inspection in the Military Archives. The Minister for Defence thereby surrendered his authority over the military archives and recognised the responsibility of the Federal Archives also for the military archival system, in exchange for which he got a military archives in the same location as the Military Historical Research Office whilst the Federal Archives had to move the military archive installed in its main office in Koblenz to Freiburg but secured its access to the military heritage. This agreement is still valid today, even after the passage of the Federal Archive Law in 1988. The Ministry of Defence issued a central administrative directive in this connection which regulates the handling and securing of paper, photographic and sound records within the Ministry's competence, which has the characteristics of a military order. Accordingly, all records, irrespective of their historical merit, are to be passed to the Federal Archives-Military Archive on the basis of catalogues pertaining to written records. Once in the Military Archive they are stored in a transit repository where they are kept for an agreed period of time during which the archivists evaluate them. In Germany we

therefore have a most interesting form of organisation of the military archives within the state archival system, in that the military archives belong both organisationally and professionally to the Federal Archives and therefore within the competence of the Ministry to which they are answerable, but the Minister for Defence has been granted the wherewithal, both materially and in terms of personnel, to ensure the best framework for the discharge of the military obligations. The military archives in the Federal Republic of Germany are, therefore, firmly integrated into the Federal Archives, both professionally and organisationally, with their director exercising a central role with regard to the mutual interests of both the Federal Archives and the Ministry of Defence. This agreement has been in place for 20 years, and I can say that the solution has worked well, with the exception of a few minor skirmishes between the parties. The demands of the professional German archivists are met insofar as the archival records of the entire federal administration are in their hands. You will see that the situation in Sweden and Germany is very similar, and as far as I can see also in Norway and Denmark, whereas in Finland the War Archive belongs within the competence of the Ministry of Defence.

Let me now briefly turn my attention to those state archives in which the organisational integration of the military records show no particular peculiarities. Let me begin with Switzerland.

In accordance with the conditions laid down in the Swiss Federal Archive Law the Ministry of Defence passes its entire paper, photographic and sound records to the Swiss Federal Archives when they are no longer required for current administration. Unclassified records are subject to a 30-year closure period and anyone wishing to use them within his time needs the permission of the Chief of the Confederate Military Historical Service, who is also Chief of the famous Military Library in Berne. The military archives as a whole have achieved such significance for the Swiss Army leadership against the background of modern technical developments, particularly digitised documentation, that for the first time an Archives Deputy is part of the Army Staff. As I have heard from Swiss colleagues, the provisions of the Federal Archive Law with regard to the military function without notable problems. I believe that this also has something to do with the organically developed legal provisions of the Swiss Federal Constitution, which also enshrine a cantonal responsibility for the military, with cantonal regiments. Problems are also avoided in the Swiss confederation because the majority of men perform their military service and, in the case of Militia Officers, are often hold positions in the state, economic and financial institutions.

It is a similar picture in Austria. All of us are familiar with the famous Austrian War Archives, which for many years was housed in the Stiftsgasse and since 1919 has been part of the Austrian State Archives. In the War Archive one finds the re-

records of the three services down to 1918. The records of the First and Second Republics, however, are housed in the Archive of the Republic section of the State Archives, where the military component is administered by a single office. As far as I can judge, the rule is that records are passed to the State Archives but that the armed forces reserve their rights with regard to public access within the 30-year closure period. In most other respects the Ministry of Defence has no say in the policies and administration of the State Archives. In Austria, therefore, we see the complete integration of the military archive system into the State Archives, without causing any major problems for either party to this arrangement. This may also reflect the fact that the armed forces in Austria are relatively small, hardly play a part in public life or perceptions, and that matters are simply more manageable in terms of size, which is also the case in Switzerland.

Let us now take a brief look at the situation in the United States of America and in the United Kingdom.

In the USA the military archival records belong by law within the responsibility of the US National Archives. The Defence Department and the armed services are obliged to transfer all non-current records to the National Archives. However, some records are first passed to the historical branches of the various services where they remain until historical research and military evaluation have been completed on them. There are various Military Branches in the National Archives, but only civilian archivists are employed there. The Defence Department only has a measure of control over those records which have been deposited in the National Archives where classified status applies. This regulation has been in place since the creation of the National Archives, and causes no problems for either the Archives or the Defence Department.

In the United Kingdom we find a situation similar to that in the United States. Here also, certain non-current records are initially passed to the historical branches of the armed services and are transferred from there to the Public Record Office. The exceptions to this are official film and photographs, which are transferred to the Imperial War Museum as a Public Record Office-approved place of deposit for these materials. Military private papers are also not held in the PRO, and those which do reach a public institution are donated either to the archives of appropriate educational institutions (schools, colleges, universities) or to research collections such as those of the Imperial War Museum. The military records in the United Kingdom are, therefore, relatively fragmented when compared to the situation in the rest of Europe. I must therefore remind you that the Public Record Office sees itself as a purely state archive which is only responsible for the records illustrating the activities of the state administration. The general European archival tradition of gathering non-official records to supplement the state records in order to present the researcher

with as comprehensive and persuasive a body of material as possible is as little known in the United Kingdom as it is in the United States.

I believe that we have now described the most important forms of organisation and function of the military archival system. We can thus distinguish three groups, namely military archives which are fully the responsibility of the defence administration; military archives which are organisationally and professionally a part of the national or state archives, but which have a special status; and lastly military archives which are fully integrated into the state archive administration.

Allow me now to take a brief look at the benefits and drawbacks of these forms of organisation, whereby I wish to be very careful in my arguments. For that group which, for the sake of simplicity, I would like to call the French group, the subordination to the Ministry of Defence in terms of organisation, personnel and archival professionalism ensures clear leadership and responsibilities. Not least within the military historical organisation of the armed services a clear system has been created: the Historical Service, the military archives, museums and libraries all form a significant historical-scientific organisation within the armed forces and where the exchange of specialist knowledge can take place. An officer who works in the military archives or in the Historical Service is of course of great value when he is able to contribute to the courses in the officer schools and the General Staff academies, and the knowledge and specialist professionalism which he brings with him makes him an almost ideal contributor in both institutions. The aim of the armed forces to foster historical-political learning, historical consciousness and the ability to think in historical categories is well served under these circumstances. It must have been the result of experience that in the German Army General Staff until 1945 the organisation of military historical research, military archives, museums and libraries was amalgamated under the office of the Chief Quartermaster V; even at the outset of the Federal Armed Forces all of these functions were concentrated in a military science department which was then dissolved in the early 1960s and which lay dormant with its constituent parts until they were revived in recent times. The competition between the various archives which are tasked with preserving the records of the state administration is also exacerbated: each naturally wishes to perform better than the others, through better personnel training (and on occasion better salaries), better technical equipment, better infrastructure and performance success. The autonomous military archives also provide an arena for the self-esteem of the military forces to express itself without this impinging on other areas of state administration. On the other hand, it is precisely the autonomous position of the military archives, reflecting the heightened profile of the armed forces, which nowadays gives rise to the argument that there is no room for such a profile in a democratic state characterised by egalitarian tendencies; in other words, a position is taken against the existence of au-

tonomous military archives for political or, if you will, ideological reasons. One could also argue that the uniform administration of the state's archived heritage is compromised by autonomous military archives, but as long as the latter are subject to the provisions of archive laws and the state archive administration has a right of inspection vis-a-vis the 'special archives' for defence and foreign policy, this danger must be regarded as being fairly remote.

As regards the second group of military archives, which I shall term the Swedish-German group, the consistency of archival work and documentation of the state administration is of course guaranteed. And when the archival requirements of the state archive administration and the professional demands of the military on the archive system are balanced, then a satisfactory situation has been achieved. However, this demands from both sides much discretion, consideration and sympathy for the tasks and peculiarities of the other party. Whether one can still call on such qualities of good citizenship is another matter.

With regard to the last group, which I would term the Anglo-Saxon group, many years of practical experience and the needs of the armed forces and of the archive administration have produced a satisfactory solution. We can, therefore, see that with all three models benefits and drawbacks are more or less balanced. The answer to the question as to where military archives are best placed, with the Ministry of Defence or the state archive administration, is therefore dependent on the question of where they can best fulfil their tasks of acting as a guardian of the records of the state's activities and simultaneously as centres of scientific research. The optimal discharge of these duties is conditioned to a significant degree by the extent to which the military and state archives are equipped with adequate resources in terms of finance, manpower, infrastructure and materials. In the countries of the former Warsaw Pact it is my impression that the autonomous military archives were better equipped in these respects than those archives under state administration. This was particularly evident in the former GDR, whose military archive in Potsdam I was responsible for integrating into the Federal Military Archives as from October 1990. However, autonomous military archives must unequivocally define themselves as part of the national memory, be bound by the national archival legislation and in accordance with this make their holdings accessible to all, and must demonstrate a sensible measure of willingness to cooperate with the state archive administration in order to show a common responsibility for the written heritage of the state. On no account, however, should historical developments in the field of the state archival administration be gratuitously disrupted and autonomous military archives forced into the civil archive administration, just as military archives which are integrated into the national or state archives should not be forcibly separated out into an inappropriate special position. It must be kept in mind that military archives, as "central me-

mory of the armed forces", must remain identity-affirming institutions for the military, who must be aware that their history, both good and bad, is to be found in the military archives and that they are obliged to make use of this resource in the context of historical-political education, and to ensure that it is preserved and developed for the benefit of future generations.

To conclude, let me sum up by saying that military archives are, by their nature, always a part of the national memory and as such crucial to the identity of states and their armed forces. Military archives are above all supporting institutions of the military state administration and only in second place centres for research and for the citizen. The character of the military archives as part of the national memory is manifested best in the state archival legislation. This firm 'legislative brace' must also be one which is tolerant of the need for autonomous military archives to be included in the responsibility for the creation and care of the national memory, and on the other hand to allow the integrated military archives their special relationship to the military administration in its widest sense, in order that their identity-affirming function for the military and its constitutional self-understanding is brought to flower.