

## **ESF Exploratory Workshop: EW13-093**

### **Eastern and Western European Prosecution of Nazi War Crimes in the Soviet Union. From a Local to a Transnational Perspective**

Berlin, 27-29 March 2014

Convened by Catherine GOUSSEFF, Nathalie MOINE, Tanja PENTER

#### **Scientific Report**

##### **1/ Executive Summary**

This exploratory workshop was convened by the Center for Russian, Caucasian and Central-European Studies (CERCEC, Paris), the Heidelberg University and the Hamburg Institute for Social Research. It took place in the Centre Marc Bloch in Berlin from Thursday 27 March 2014 until Saturday 29 March 2014.

25 scholars participated in the workshop. In addition, scholars interested in the topic were present during the sessions, although the size of the room did not permit a very large audience.

The technical equipment included a videoprojector, most of the presentations included illustrated presentations, including the copy of unknown photographs and unpublished archival material of very high value (see presentations of Leonid Terushkin, Tetiana Pastushenko, Uvan Dereiko). Some videos were also displayed.

Work language: english

General atmosphere was very friendly and relax as well as concentrated on the matter. The general attendance to the diners organised downtown demonstrated the same dedication to the workshop with many important discussions going on in a more informal framework and personal interaction being developed.

The main objective of this exploratory workshop was precisely to bring together scholars from several countries who are experts in the field of the war crimes committed in the occupied Soviet territory during World War II, in order to confront narratives and archival sources and to start thinking to the writing of a transnational history of the investigation and judicial prosecution of these crimes. Taking in account both the Eastern and Western European sides of this history, it aimed as well at exploring the East-East judicial relations, taking in account the fact that some countries of the Communist Europe used to be former Allies of Nazi Germany, occupied parts of Soviet Union during the war, their citizens perpetrating mass crimes, especially in the case of the Romanian occupation in the so-called Transnistria (actual Ukraine).

Up to now, this issue of the legal prosecution of war crimes that were committed in the occupied Soviet Union has been mainly studied in the German context. The shifting to Eastern Europe itself should allow to rewrite the history of East-West relationships in the post-war decades, in terms of bilateral relations and logics of the two blocs, as well as internal

relations inside the communist bloc, emphasizing times of cooperation as well as times of conflict in this precise field and linking them to explicitly or implicitly connected topics.

The legal issue should allow to extend the levels of analysis, focusing on interstate relations as well as on dialogue or attempt of dialogue, between Western and Eastern administrations and judicial agencies. At the national level, the interplay between war crimes central policy, regional and local stakes should shed some new light on the political and social history of these authoritarian regimes. The process of legal investigation offers also a window on post occupation East European local societies and on the way local populations managed to cope with the war and its mass atrocities' memory in the long term, from the war's aftermath to the present.

Finally, the workshop aims to put some landmarks in order to explain the complex and distorted perception of the Nazi War on the East, both in Eastern and Western European societies, that exists until today, including the recent reassessment of the Jewish genocide that took place in the occupied part of the Soviet Union, and that still have to be replaced inside the history of the Nazi policy of the European Jews' extermination. The discrepancy between Eastern and Western memories, as well as the discrepancy between national and local memories regarding the fate of other categories of Nazi-victims, were concomitantly on our agenda.

War crimes investigations and prosecutions on the East have notably profited after the end of the communist regimes from the opening of the national archives. Important research has been undertaken these last two decades in order to identify some milestones of this history, focusing mostly on the war's aftermath. Nevertheless, further research has been impeded by the partial opening of archives regarding the states' security policies and legal prosecutions, although the situation varies extremely from one country to another. Mapping the archives policies in different countries and regions was therefore one of our main practical objective.

The linguistic gap is also a major impediment in the construction of a transnational vision of post-war legal prosecution. The experts of one particular area can encounter serious trouble if they want to get access to the historiography, not to say the archives, of other countries, although it would allow them to get a more comprehensive understanding of the whole process at stake. Convening together scholars with various linguistic and scientific fields of competence was supposed to be a way to sketch out a collective narrative exceeding the skills of one individual.

On a more theoretical level, a broad and deep understanding of this issue has been largely impeded by views inherited from Cold War logics and its legacy: the prosecution of war criminals in the Eastern bloc has been mostly studied as a tool of state repression in authoritarian regimes. Up to now, the transnational aspect of this history has been narrowed to the single aspect of the "shadow of the Kremlin" on its new satellites, using war crimes prosecutions to eliminate internal political enemies. We would like to shape a new, more complex framework in order to shed more light on a fully neglected chapter of the Cold War transnational history, the implications of which seem to us central in East/West European mutual understanding's ability.

## 2/ Scientific Content of the Event

The first Session, « Broadening Space and Time of the War Crimes Judicial Proceedings », attended to fix the scope of the workshop, that is to envision the investigation of the war crimes committed in Soviet Union, and, beyond the legal aspects, the reconstruction and the interpretation of this unprecedented launching of violence, as a long-term process and as an history involving actors of various countries.

Oula Silvennoinen, in a communication entitled « War Crimes investigations in Finland, 1944-1950 » contrasted the case of the civilian and POWs camps in occupied Karelia that were almost untouched by Finland investigations, with the accusation against the former Finnish Government to have launched the War against World War II that permitted the new Finnish authorities to set a political trial against the former political elites. He also underlined the fact that for a long time archival documents concerning the Finnish involvement in the SS was concealed to the research.

Vladimir Solonari, in a contribution entitled « Communist-era Investigative Files as a Source in Holocaust Studies. Romanian and Soviet Cases in Comparative Perspective », compared Soviet and Romanian sources on crimes committed in Transnistria, a territory designed by the occupant in the Southern Ukraine, between the Dniestr and the Bug Rivers, that had been allocated to the Romanian State and showed that, while the Soviet documentation became more and more professional in the post Stalinist decades and bring out essential material on the local participation to the mass killings of the Jews, the Romanian investigative material, marked by a high-level of professionalism at the wake of the liberation, to the contrary of the Soviet case, almost abandoned the subject in the following post-war decades, with no postwar cooperation between Soviet Union and Romania on these legal issues.

Franziska Exeler, speaking about « War time Choices and Post War Ambivalences in Soviet Belorussia » explored the erratic Soviet policy towards local collaborators, emphasizing the lack of clear definition of what should be considered as collaboration by the Soviet authorities and the need of qualified and intellectual cadres for the liberated territories.

Diana Dumitru, in the same way as Vladimir Solonari, convincingly demonstrated how Stalinist documentation, as ideologized as it sounded, was reliable in many ways and could be corroborated with oral testimonies delivered decades after the facts in a totally different political context. She underlined as well the potential of poststalinist Soviet investigations.

In his discussion, Kirill Fefermann sketched out the main issues and flaws of Soviet first wave of prosecution, showing the impact of the « fifth Column »'s obsession and contrasting the prewar Great Terror, with the secret police acting mostly out any judicial framework, with the punishment of local collaborators that implied, after the summary executions perpetrated by the partisans, a formal justice, although expeditious. He then switched more in details to the four papers of the panel, opening a discussion that went in four directions : 1/ foreign impact on national investigations : the role of the Control Commission, dominated by the Soviets in Finland, on the judicial prosecution of Finnish war criminals, or, in cases presented by Solonari the impact of Western German Justice on the Soviet one, trying to try again former Soviet collaborators ethnically Germans ; 2/ the way Soviet authorities dealt with the grey zones of the collaboration ; 3/ Stalinist methods of investigation, including beatings, and 4/

the memory of the victims of Stalinist repression, raising the issue of differentiated rehabilitation.

The second panel, « Stalinist Justice and International Law », examined how Soviet Union dealt with the international codification of War Crimes, including the new step embodied by the Charter of the International Military Tribunal. Claudia Weber focused on the Katyn case, showing the coalition of various Polish and American activists lobbying for the revision of the Soviet denial and the creation of a new Investigative Committee. Valentyna Polunina argued that the Soviet Khabarovsk trial was a good example of a Stalinist show trial that put on the stage reliable material, confirmed by independent research, on the Japanese bacteriological warfare. Karsten von Lingen's intervention highlighted wartime governments in exile's policy attending to put on the forthcoming agenda of the international community mass crimes committed in occupied territories, by capitalizing on the scholarship of political leaders linked by common political beliefs, linguistic skills and legal culture. She offered as well an overview of their fate in divided postwar Europe. Andrew Kornbluth highlighted the legal responses of Western and Eastern European countries facing the common issue of prosecuting unprecedented crimes and the necessity to design a new legal framework that happened to be strikingly similar despite the various postwar national contexts. .

Niels Bo Poulsen opened the discussion by underlining the striking time factor that made, in a very short time, international cooperation aiming at a tough answer to Nazi crimes, that dominated the end of the war, become totally obsolete with the launching of a decades-long Cold War, with political considerations shifting from the prosecution of war criminals and collaborators to a transnational fight aimed at the consolidation of the political system in both camps, with the assimilation of former War criminals in the West and the Soviets playing with silence and the punctual use of compromising material, while destalinization opened the way to bilateral bargaining around POWs sentenced in Soviet camps, with no real consideration of justice. He also pointed out how the Katyn case inflamed American public opinion and politicians, while, for instance, the massacres in NKVD jails at the eve of the German occupation did not raise the same level of interest in the American society. The same interest in the impact of the prosecution of war crimes in an international context broader than we are accustomed to consider is as well at stakes in the Japanese case, with the Khabarovsk trial being but the public part of a wave of Soviet secret trials of Japanese POWs, in the same way that has been already highlighted by research regarding European POWs in the Soviet Union during the late 1940's. While most of the scholar research takes the univocal path of a Soviet manipulation of international law, the attractiveness of a Soviet Union strongly committed to the prosecution of war criminals has been pointed out by some scholars in the past and is confirmed by the reading of war time production of Soviet jurists that demonstrate their theoretical as well as practical participation in the framing of the Nuremberg judicial proceedings, and could have exercised, therefore, some attraction for small-size European states viewing themselves as outsiders in the international negotiation around the definition of war crimes that have to be documented and judged by the international justice. Finally, Niels Bo Poulsen advocated a fruitful diachronic overview, taking in account the recent cases of former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, while underscoring the flaws of actual scholarship that does not include the Greek case and did not totally explore the role of the Soviet Union in the early

Polish trials concerning former German and Austrian staff of concentration and extermination camps.

The third session was devoted to Stalinist Justice at home. Using archival material that is still classified for most of the researchers and that illustrates the permanent difficulty of research work conditions in Russia, Nikita Petrov thoroughly reconstructed the Soviet preparation of war time trials, shifting from one main charge to the other for international policy considerations, and selecting therefore the locations and set of indicted individual that should be indicted, focusing especially on the case of the Kharkov Trial that took place in December 1943 with an international audience.

The two following papers highlighted the specificity of Stalinist justice in a different direction, since they pointed out the counterintuitive nature of indicted individuals in closed trials. Tetiana Pastushenko revealed the existence of a totally unknown trial, that took place in 1949 in Crimea and sentenced a former woman POW of Ravensbrück for having participated, as a prisoner doctor, to the selection of sick prisoners for the gas chamber and to the injection of lethal products. She underlined how much the witnesses testimonies could help the historians to reconstruct a social landscape of the camp that was totally ignored in the Soviet and post-Soviet literature. Tanja Penter focused on several trials in liberated Ukraine that staged former Jewish survivors who have had responsibilities in the Jewish Councils of various ghettos. Despite this highly constrained Stalinist context, Nathalie Moine questioned the reliability of some late memories of former war victims ignoring the accusations they had formulated in their testimonies in 1944. Showing that at least part of the former accusations were indisputably true although they had been later silenced by these witnesses, she underlined the impact of Soviet repression among a lot of former war victims, the two witnesses she studied having spent many years in the Gulag camps in the aftermath of their liberation, and conversely the necessity to take seriously, though cautiously, the Stalin-time mass documentation on liberated Soviet territories. She therefore proposed, in the case developed for Riga, a methodology in order to find external evidence for highly controversial and poorly documented Soviet testimonies in a context of mass destruction of German archives.

The fourth session switched the discussion to post Stalinist Soviet Union and dealt with East-West cooperation in the documentation and prosecution of war crimes committed in former occupied Soviet territories. Annette Weinke demonstrated how the GDR found some interest in developing a public discourse advocating international law and human rights in the hope to accelerate its UN membership and offered its own expertise on war crimes to Third World countries and participating in the Cambodian People's Revolutionary Tribunal.

Jasmine Söhner demonstrated how the Soviet Union used the coming back to judicial prosecution against war criminals in Western Germany to distillate documentation targeting individuals while Western Germany not really welcoming a suspect Soviet contribution, despite the creation of the Ludwigsburg Zentrale Stelle at the end of the 1950s. Martin Dean explained in which conditions British and Australian War Crimes Units started to research Soviet documentation in the late 1980s, being confronted with the lack of general indexation of a huge quantity of material.

Therefore, Peter Klein added to the general discussion the fact that the historical knowledge on the Holocaust and the War in the East was rather low in the Western world of the late 1950s-beginning of the 1960', in addition to poor trained personal in Ludwigsburg that had no command of the involved languages and, as Jasmin Söhner underscored, very few translators at their disposal in order to face the steadily flux of documentation sent by the Soviet Union. Infrastructures and prejudices, Peter Klein argued, probably mattered more than pure politics to explain the impediment to a smooth East/West judicial cooperation.

Leonid Terushkin presented the fate of Aleksandr Pecherskii, a Soviet Jewish POW and the head of the Sobibor uprising in October 1943 , that was largely downplayed by postwar Soviet discourse, while Pecherskii being successively repressed under Stalin and summoned to testify in poststalinist Soviet trials against the Ukrainian guards of the camp, but with no permission to travel abroad. Excerpts of a 1989 documentary film featuring uprising survivors around the world in the late 1980s, including Pecherskii, as well as a documentary shot by Terushkin in 2007 featuring Pecherskii's relatives as well as Pecherskii remembrances of the camp were presented to the workshop's audience in addition to Pecherskii's depositions in the 1960s, showing therefore the long-term multifaceted legacies of a repressed narrative.

The fifth session was devoted to Ukrainian nationalists, with Per Rudling sketching out the transnational history of Ukrainian narrative of WWII that led from the Ukrainian community in Canada, which was generously funded by US intelligence to shape a memory that would be able to challenge Soviet propaganda labelling ukrainian nationalists at war as facists to the transfer of this narrative in post 1991 Ukraine, nurturing most of the recent local narrative on the OUN. Conversely, Ivan Dereiko presented the case study of a collaborationist unit composed of former Soviet POWs that operated in Eastern Ukraine with most of its attributes inherited from the Red Army, including uniforms and Russian as the language of official communication. This research was based on the investigative material of a Soviet Trial that took place in Sumy (Eastern Ukraine) in the late 1960', poststalinist inspectors refreshing the earlier material of the Stalinist enquiry, showing for instance the role of collaborators in the burning of villages that had been attributed exclusively to the German occupier by the Stalin time investigation.

The last session attended to figure out to what extent new sources and new questioning would add to our understanding of the war and its legacies. Leonid Smilovitsky explored unvaluable wartime ego-documents , as letters and diaries, that dealt with the murder of the relatives and the difficulty to write down facts and feelings. Finally Andrej Umansky presented one interviews campaign of Patrick Desbois team collecting testimonies on the mass murder of Gypsy members of a collective farm in the region of Smolensk. He especially highlighted the case of one eyewitness who, despite his age, gave a 3-hours interview to the team and showed them the relevant places in this locality that is now part of Smolensk suburbs. Both postwar documentation and recent interviews demonstrate the importance for the German of Soviet administration tools and local environment in order to perpetrate the murder, from the lists of names given by the collective farm book keepers to the collective farms shovels.

We would like here to sum up the various discussions that were engaged at the end of each presentation, of each session and in more informal context. A first pool of issues concern the reliability of sources and their selectivity, that require a reading of the testimonies taking in

account the political context. Selectivity might be implied by the selection of the witnesses. In the case of Romania, although the mass deportation of Roma to Transnistria and their high level of mortality were denounced in early Romanian trials, no Roma was summoned as eyewitnesses during the trial, the investigation being mostly based on Antonescu-time administration archive. The same invisibility of Roma in Soviet show trials could be underscored, despite the facts that some Roma survivors had been interrogated on the field. One could add the same ambiguity towards other mass categories, as former Ostarbeiter, POWs, as well as Jewish survivors.

A second major set of issues raised during the discussions concerns the long-term perspective of testimonies, as well as the impact of diaspora phenomenon. Collecting testimonies of one witness in various period of time and context does not lead always to an addition of information or the confirmation of earlier depositions. Sometimes, it leads to a totally different point of view.

Nevertheless, in what might seem paradoxical, most of the participants agreed to the high value of the Soviet documentation, be it from the poststalin time, with high profile standards, be it although in the far more summary practices of the 1940', the proximity of the events compensating the bias-effects due to a high political pressure.

Two main concerns therefore were raised: the low availability of high valuable sources, for instance most of the poststalinist investigation conducted by the KGB as well as stalin time sources that had not been stored in the official Soviet investigative Commission; 2/ the extremely difficult but inescapable task to cross several sources in depositories of various countries, including Western countries where former occupiers have been interrogated and sometimes tried, in order to open up Soviet narrative and reconstitute puzzles that have been kept disjoined for decades because of the lack of consideration, most of the time, of Soviet documentation/Western documentation in an encompassing research process.

### **3/ Assessment of the Results, Contribution to the Future Direction of the Field, and Practical Outcomes**

The workshop highlighted the existence of mass documentation on war crimes that still need to be made available to the public, including researchers, or to documentation that is still exploited at the micro level with no clear overview of its structure and its size. This concerns especially the archival material that is still classified or/and stored in closed depositories as it is the case of Soviet investigative material of Soviet trials or Soviet intelligence material seized at the liberation of the former occupied territories, which are kept in special administrative archival centers of the Russian Federation, to the exception of the few cases that were reproduced and sent to Western documentation centers, mostly the United States Holocaust memorial Museum in Washington after 1991, but that exclude for instance any closed trial of collaborators from the Belorussian republic. Most of the papers in various sessions of the workshop referred as well to mass oral history projects totally or partly devoted to the memories of former victims and witnesses of the occupation in Soviet territories. They highlighted the fruitful outcomes of crossing several layers of testimonies in order to understand what happened as well as the legacy of the occupation in its perceptions and its flaws.

Therefore, one of the main task of a future website should be to map these various sources : archival documentation in state, regional and local depositories in several European countries, oral history projects dealing with the Nazi and Nazi satellites ' occupation in the East, as well as private archives. Further, this mapping should be accompanied by an attempt to describe national legislation regarding the access to this documentation, as well as the way it is implemented at the national, regional or local level. Therefore, the website should be a place where researchers or any individual could share their personal experience in researching and working in various depositories. In a sense, this focus on the various practices could become a way of putting some pressure towards more transparency in archival policies.

A practical approach implies as well, in a mid-term perspective, the design of an ambitious project of indexation that would make the crossing of sources easier. Past projects as the « Justiz und NS-Verbrechen/Nazi Crimes on Trial », which was initiated by the University of Amsterdam already in the 1960s and has now for years a website with all the trials of both Western and Eastern Germany indexed by names and locations of the crimes ([www1.jur.uva.nl/junsv/JuNSVEng/JuNSV English Homepage.htm](http://www1.jur.uva.nl/junsv/JuNSVEng/JuNSV%20English%20Homepage.htm)) illustrates a fruitful and feasible approach.

Although the ambition to cover as many depositories and sources related to a vast territory might seem unrealistic, the constant progress in technology, as any quick research on Internet demonstrates for any obscure place of mass crimes committed in the East, make thinkable the linkage between manifestations of local memories and the archival traces widespread in various archival depositories. It requires certainly mostly financial ressources as well as political willingness. Traditional approach of indexation by names and geographical places should be supplemented by other entries, especially categories of victims, which would be a major breakdown with a tendency to divided memories or the lost memories of some victims, as most exemplified by the mass extermination of Gypsies.

The focus of our workshop on occupied Soviet Union was a choice mostly determined by practical consideration, taking in account the fact that the territory covered by our sessions was sufficient enough to make an inventory of current research and to think to new directions of research. In the same time, issues raised by the workshop are relevant for other occupied territories that are still under-researched. It would therefore make sense to broaden the space of our project by including all the former countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe that became part of the Eastern bloc after WWII, including as well countries like Finland and Greece which, for different reasons, mostly escaped archive-based historical research as well as collective reworking of wartime memories. Here again, our website could allow an efficient networking and the identification of experts in the field.

One could ask for which purposes such an effort on such a scale should be undertaken and supported and for which reasons a project based on war crimes documentation would be relevant at the beginning of the XXIth Century, when the time of judicial prosecution passed away, even in a symbolic way as it was still the case at the end of the 1990' and the beginning of the 2000s, that is when perpetrators were still alive.

We argue that we are precisely going to a less aggressive (as legitimate as it was) and more understanding approach, especially towards new generations who are no more the victims nor



the perpetrators or the bystanders of this history while being the bearers of local memories that need to be addressed.

Practical issues still need to be resolved in a geopolitical space where, for a long time, restitutions, compensations policies were unknown and public amnesia – and to a certain extent partial private amnesia- was the rule. The recent compensation policy implemented by the German state showed the actuality of historical research, especially for the few survivors who were children or very young at the time of the occupation.

Nevertheless, our project is thought in a long-time perspective and should address therefore additional issues that should be more and more important in the forthcoming years. One of them is the legacy of the sites of mass killings and mass persecution (notably former ghettos in cities and townships, camps of various , mass graves and erased localities). The landmarking of a public space is one but the many issues implied by the revealing process of a landscape spotted by former sites of mass violence. A legacy of the way mass violence was implemented during the war in the East is indeed the multiplicity of these sites. Part of them have been memorialized in the Soviet postwar decades but the scope of the investigation has been broadened after 1991 and is still in-progress, thanks mostly to local and/or private initiatives, but with no general policy and no encompassing view of the various categories of victims. Thinking to the future treatment of these places of mass killings and persecution makes us cross other collective academic project, notably « Corpses of Mass Violence and Genocide » (<http://www.corpsesofmassviolence.eu>). Nevertheless, they do not overlap, since documentation, the way it should be used and read, constitutes our central entry in the issue of mass violence, as a means of understanding. This implies that beyond commemoration the memory of mass violence should always tend to questioning and establishing the logics that resulted in mass violence. Mapping the current state of these sites, the existence of which might have been revealed by archival documentation or by any other circumstances, be they already major sites of memory, sites modestly marked in the past or by local communities, or sites where the memory of the past has totally been erased, should be a first step to think what a public policy should be, and which place documentation, that is (copy of) written archives as well as oral testimonies or any relevant artefacts, should occupy on the site itself. To consider a place of memory as a place that should be as well a place of documentation is a clear departure from the memorialisation culture in these regions. The alternative work conducted by the Russian association Memorial, in Moscow as in all its regional counterparts, towards the memorialisation of the Gulag and the Terror victims, should be a source of inspiration rooted in local societies, as western majors sites of memory, notably former concentration camps being the location of active research centers, being an other major reference.

We argue that not only availability and transparency in the access of archives are major issues in this part of Europe, but also the circulation (the sharing) of archives, thanks to the many possibilities now offered by basic technologies. This circulation has been partly implemented for part of the victims of the war in the East, namely the Soviet victims of the Holocaust, with copy of many Soviet archives relevant for these issues now available in the USHMM, Yad Vashem, and other less well-known places. Nevertheless, this circulation policy raises two issues : first, even in the case of the Jewish victims, who were, for obvious reasons, at the center of Western institutions dedicated to the Holocaust, the reproduction is not complete.

Notably, archives from closed depositories are still missing, to the exception of some material already mentioned. Second, it excludes so far all the other victims of the war in the East.

The need for a better circulation of documentation of various origins and its concentration in institutions able to produce research tools allowing a cross-research raises therefore the issue of new research centers devoted to the victims in the East. Several institutions already fulfil this task, as the USHMM and Yad Vashem already mentioned, or the ITS in Bad Arolsen, although, by design, the ITS never had a comprehensive policy towards these East European victims. Nevertheless, Paul Shapiro, head of USHMM, that had recently acquired a copy of most of ITS archives, underscored the wealth of informations that should be gained from an exploitation of many ITS files that have been ignored to these days. The Ostarbeiter policy would certainly find a lot of highlighting. One could further consider that ITS archives combined with the other archives already massively present in the USHMM make this place the more relevant to pursue a policy of centralization and indexation, with the cooperation of national archives of Eastern and Southern Europe. This would imply that USHMM would change the scope of its enquiry, which is to these days more or less rigourously, the victims of the Holocaust, that is, in our case, the Jewish victims of the occupied territory in Eastern Europe.

Therefore, one should consider both the political and practical gain of thinking to the location of a new research center, that would take in charge the huge task of centralizing the information on the Eastern European victims of WWII. Moscow, where most of the original information is concentrated could be the more relevant, except that the current archival policy, to say the least, does not, unfortunately, make this solution feasible. Other places could be under consideration, from Berlin, thanks to the German expertise and knowledge in these matters as well as the well-established capacity of the German state to cope with the most painful and complex memory, to Kiev, as a political challenge to a post-Soviet state with a new government.

Our claim for a need of a new international network of researchers putting in common their knowledge on the documentation of war crimes in the East is not a claim for importing a Western way to write history, although the expertise of some Western societies is certainly helpful to design a peaceful recognition of the unprecedented scale of this war in an other way than the communist regimes did. This project is also about a common rethinking of the still puzzling level of violence and the multiplicity of its targets, a common questioning of the dynamics of violence, at the micro-level as well as in a transnational perspective, and a common enquiry on the dynamics at stakes in the construction, intentional or not, of hierarchies of memories.

These questions adress the past of post Soviet and post-Communist Europe, and the past of Western democracies as well and make the project an undivided European one.

The website that we opened at the eve of the workshop in order to disseminate the papers among the participants is now in progress, with an architecture that mirrors our two main goals at this stage : concentration of the information on any archival collections, including oral history, and on their legal and their accessibility, in law and in practice/ concentration of any information on the history and the current state of former places of mass killings and mass persecution during WWII in occupied Soviet territories

<http://eastpros.hypotheses.org/1>

As already mentioned, this website, designed for scientific blogging with collective authorship, should evolve towards an integration of other occupied territories in Eastern and south-eastern Europe, but that is at this stage beyond the scope of the team that was gathered in Berlin.

The publication of the proceedings should be possible in the following months, since we received a proposal from the Open Edition of the University of Heidelberg.

We are attending as well to apply to the next call for ECR Advanced Grants (October 2014).

**4/ Final program** (identical to the programme published on the ESF website)

**5/ Final List of Participants** (as published on the ESF website)

#### **6/ Statistical Information on Participants**

We give here the repartition of the workshop participants by countries of THEIR INSTITUTIONS. Complex personal situation in citizenship matter as well as a concern for privacy would make another approach problematic. Nevertheless, the case of a double academic affiliation made this statistics partly irrelevant.

Germany : 7

Russia : 3

France : 3

US : 4

Ukraine : 2

Moldavia : 1

Finland : 1

Sweden : 1

Danemark : 1

Israel : 1

Italy : 1

Academic position distribution might be of some interest, although we had to cope with academic status that do not match each other from one country to another:

Professor of University : 1 ; Senior Researchers : 8 ; Assistant Professors : 8 ; Researchers : 2 ; Postdoctorate : 1 ; PhD Students : 4