

New Europe College Yearbook

2023-2024

Volume 2



ANCA DIANA AXINIA
MALTE FUHRMANN
PETRO KUZYN
ADRIAN-GEORGE MATUS
MANUEL MIREANU
DAN-ALEXANDRU SĂVOAIA
ROMAN SHLIAKHTIN
LUCIAN VASILE
NATALIIA VUSATIUK
EDWARD WAYSBAND

Editor: Andreea Eşanu

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. Dr. h.c. mult. Andrei PLEŞU, President of the New Europe Foundation, Professor of Philosophy of Religion, Bucharest; former Minister of Culture and former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania

Dr. Valentina SANDU-DEDIU, Rector, New Europe College, Bucharest, Professor of Musicology, National University of Music, Bucharest

Dr. Anca OROVEANU, Permanent Fellow, New Europe College, Bucharest; Professor of Art History, National University of Arts, Bucharest

Dr. Katharina BIEGGER, Strategic Advisor, Center for Governance and Culture in Europe, University of St. Gallen

Dr. Constantin ARDELEANU, Senior Researcher, Institute for South-East European Studies, Bucharest; Researcher, New Europe College, Bucharest

Dr. Andreea EŞANU, (non-tenure) Assistant Professor, University of Bucharest, Faculty of Philosophy

Copyright – New Europe College, 2025
ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College
Str. Plantelor 21
023971 Bucharest
Romania
www.nec.ro; e-mail: nec@nec.ro
Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10



ADRIAN-GEORGE MATUS

Ștefan Odobleja Fellow

Adrian-george.matus@alumni.eui.eu

ORCID: 0000-0002-2406-6923

Biographical note

Matus Adrian defended his PhD in 2022 at the European University Institute in Florence. His dissertation, turned into a book published at De Gruyter Oldenbourg in 2024, focuses on the Eastern and Central European countercultures in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In parallel with the PhD, he worked as an assistant archivist intern at the Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives, where he processed the Kevin Devlin collection. In 2022, he was the recipient of the OSUN-Democracy Institute Postdoctoral Fellowship, and in 2023-2024, he was a Global Teaching Fellow at the ELTE University Budapest, where he taught *Breakin' the Law. Challenging the socialist state in the 20th century* and *Digital Humanities*. In parallel with his scholarly work, he is an educator within various educational institutions in Budapest.

KEVIN DEVLIN, ARCHON. THE NOTION OF AUTHORSHIP IN THE RADIO FREE EUROPE'S ARCHIVES *

Adrian-George Matus

Abstract

This article focuses on an auto-ethnographic reflection of a particular archival collection held by the Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives, titled Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties. This collection was produced during the Cold War by the Radio Free Europe Research Unit. While the vast collection of RFE Research Units focuses on the countries from the socialist bloc, this collection mapped thoroughly from 1960 until 1990 the various Communist Parties from all over the globe. At the same time, the producer, Kevin Devlin is a mysterious author with limited information about his person. By using the concept of trace and archival authorship, my study aims to understand the context of the collection's creation by focusing on the role of the archivist and the complexity of the archival workflow. This study belongs to a larger project in which I aim to understand the notion of archival authorship by using the case study of the Kevin Devlin collection.

Keywords: Kevin Devlin, Open Society Archives, archival authorship, auto-ethnography of archival workflow, archival representation

1. Introduction

My research focuses and uses as a starting point a unique collection, named *Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department*

* I would like to express my gratitude to the New Europe College Bucharest for the kind support in shaping the early stages of this research project. At the same time, I would like to thank to the Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives staff for encouraging me to continue the investigation on Kevin Devlin fonds, particularly to Ioana Macrea-Toma, István Rév, Robert Parnica, Judit Hegedűs Anastasia Felcher, Iván Székely and Tari Örs.

on *Non-Ruling Communist Parties*' held by the OSA Archivum Budapest (HU OSA 300-5-90, Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis, 2022). Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives (OSA), based in Budapest, hold one of the most important collections on the activity of the Eastern and Central European Communist Parties. Produced in the Cold War context by the Radio Free Europe Research Unit, the vast collection focused on the post-war political, social, and economic history of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. A vast majority of the researchers that focus on Communism, the Cold War, the history of East-Central European socialist states, and human rights use this archive to expand the frontiers of academic knowledge.

Before discussing the chosen research angle, let me briefly contextualize the relevance of this collection. In 2019, this unusual set of documents was found inside the Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives in Budapest. Initially, when the archivists discovered this collection, it seemed to be the usual story: some materials that were left unprocessed were diligently waiting for their turn to be entered into the database. As the archive comprises 9000 linear meters of textual documents in 40 languages (OSA website, 2023), there were obvious reasons why boxes passed unnoticed in this large volume of documents.

At first glance, this collection contradicts the Open Society Archives content. The collection was spread throughout the 13 large boxes onto which the name 'Kevin Devlin' was written, a mysterious name at that point. Having only this prior information, the archival collection was provisionally named 'the Kevin Devlin collection'. The puzzle grew even more intricate when opening these boxes. While Donald and Vera Blinken's vast majority of collections focus on the activity of the Eastern and Central European Communist Parties, this collection focuses on the Communist Parties from the rest of the globe. The documents show an alternative story of the Cold War: the story seen by the Communist Parties from non-socialist countries.

While processing the documents, our knowledge of the content grew, but it also added layers of complexity to the enigma. This archival collection, which after processing resulted in 141 boxes, deals with materials collected between 1960 and 1990 by a particular office – the Communist Area Analysis Department. This unique collection consists of press clippings, reports, audience reports, Communist Party leaflets and research documents concerning Communist Parties from more than 100 countries. The main topics of this collection are the International

Communist Movement activities, the impact of the Sino-Soviet split in the countries from the Global South, the impact of the Warsaw Pact Invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the perestroika reforms. The documents cover virtually all the Communist Parties from non-socialist countries, and the materials are organized according to the country of origin.

As the collection was dispersed inside the archive, only in 2020 it started to be processed systematically. The series of documents immediately challenged the existing archival structure, as up to that point, it was thought that Radio Free Europe Research Analysis Department focused solely on the activity of the C.P. from the socialist states. To tackle this riddle, a novel and distinctive approach was required.

In light of this specific context, this study aims to trace the history of the creation of Kevin Devlin collection. An enigmatic aura surrounds the person who presumably created this collection. The corporate items from Radio Free Europe (accounting, HR, security) do not mention him. Despite his unique expertise in Communist Parties, information about Kevin Devlin is scarce. The Hoover Archives, where a part of the Radio Free Europe (RFE) collection is held, have more consistent information. From the Hoover Archives, we found out that Devlin worked for the Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) Research Institute for 45 years. During this long period, he gathered texts, reports, press clippings in order to map the activity of the Communist Parties from non-socialist countries. He was born in Londonderry, Northern Ireland and graduated from Queen's University in Belfast with a degree in English Literature. (Devlin, RFE Hoover Corporate Records, n.d.) After his graduation, he worked for 10 years for several Irish and British newspapers. In 1961, he joined the RFE. During his first two years, he worked for the Central News Room and later became an analyst for Radio Free Europe in Munich. (Devlin, RFE Hoover Corporate Records, n.d.) He published on Europe's Communist parties and was involved in various collective research projects.

One could easily argue that Devlin was a simple employee at Radio Free Europe in Munich, and his role was too insignificant to gain visibility. On the other hand, he produced one of the most extensive collections of documents inside the Research Department from Radio Free Europe. He gathered data, processed it, and used his analytic qualities to produce relevant research and publish high-quality academic papers. Yet, finding information about his work inside RFE proved difficult and did not help us understand the workflow and records creation. So far, most of the historiography of RFE has focused on the role of radio journalists and

more visible public intellectual figures. Historians gathered extensive oral history interviews and wrote substantial works on the journalists and high-rank RFE profiles (Documentary Films of the Black Box Foundation, 1988-2006). The sources that describe the workflow inside the Radio Free Europe Research Analysis Departments are scarce and incomplete.

Thus, this study does not aim to recreate the life of Kevin Devlin. Instead, the central focus of my investigation is to understand his *trace* within the collection. The knowledge created within this collection was collective; not only Kevin Devlin created it, but also other members from the Communist Area Analysis Department, such as William McLaughlin, Robert Salloch, Joseph Kun and Rudolf Steward Rauch. In this sense, at the heart of my research stands the question: what does this collection dedicated to Communist Parties from non-socialist countries reveal about Radio Free Europe's activities?

In order to solve this conundrum, I will use several methodological approaches. On the first level, I will try to pinpoint the complex relationship between the author, archivist and the archive in unfolding and creating the meaning. Consequently, the first part will be dedicated to explaining the archival methodological tools needed to process this collection. Nonetheless, it is crucial to highlight that this study does not exclusively deal with archival methodologies. For this, I decided to do an auto-ethnography of my experience. The main reason for this tedious work is, as Bruno Latour stated wittily when working with the document making from the Conseil d'Etat, that all such elements contribute and provide meaning about the functioning of an institution:

"Why should we discuss all these sordid details, as if the ethnographer had the myopia of a paper-eating mouse or that of an ant? Because, even while we are following the slow fabrication of a file, we are not neglecting the intellectual and cognitive foundations for one moment." (Latour, 2009, p. 88) Bruno Latour pursues his ethnographic inquiries into the different value systems of modern societies. After science, technology, religion, art, it is now law that is being studied by using the same comparative ethnographic methods. The case study is the daily practice of the French supreme courts, the Conseil d'Etat, specialized in administrative law (the equivalent of the Law Lords in Great Britain

Let us expand based on this quote. By working on the archives of the French State Council (Conseil de l'Etat), he discovered that the "carton

folder held together with elastic bands” (Latour, 2009, p. 71) Bruno Latour pursues his ethnographic inquiries into the different value systems of modern societies. After science, technology, religion, art, it is now law that is being studied by using the same comparative ethnographic methods. The case study is the daily practice of the French supreme courts, the Conseil d’Etat, specialized in administrative law (the equivalent of the Law Lords in Great Britain gives meaning by organizing every institution’s activities. The file transforms the colloquial complaint into elevated speech and grievances into written claims; in other words, according to Latour, it transforms reality into speech (Latour, 2009, p. 80) Bruno Latour pursues his ethnographic inquiries into the different value systems of modern societies. After science, technology, religion, art, it is now law that is being studied by using the same comparative ethnographic methods. The case study is the daily practice of the French supreme courts, the Conseil d’Etat, specialized in administrative law (the equivalent of the Law Lords in Great Britain. For Latour, archives themselves have the agency. He uses a metaphor to illustrate his point: “the files, like the king, never die...” (Latour, 2009, p. 80). This statement has many implications for the work with the Kevin Devlin collection.

For Bruno Latour, such clusters of knowledge that create documents (laboratories, research institutions) do not *explain* but *assemble* the reality. This process-oriented approach documents “actions, actors, communication, imitation and translation, networks, knowledge flows and the continual process that constructs society” (Levi & Valverde, 2008, p. 809). Bruno Latour gives equal credit to physical and discursive elements that create meaning through networks. The relationship between documents and networks constitutes reality through an assemblage (Levi & Valverde, 2008, p. 817). According to Bruno Latour, this process is called knowledge production, which is far from being objective. Instead, the process is always contingent (Levi & Valverde, 2008, p. 811).

Along with Bruno Latour’s observations, we will follow the micro-stories of the fabrication of files and its transformation into knowledge. After explaining the various vector roles in (un)folding the files, I will move to this collection’s multiple readers and producers. After explaining the role of the archivist and their subjective position, I aim to discuss the collection’s content. I focus on unfolding changes in categorical and classificatory practices influenced by official and non-official information availability. Once having understood the epistemological context, in the

second part, I will investigate the role of the mysterious producer of the archive: Kevin Devlin.

This part has two primary intentions. Firstly, by researching Kevin Devlin's holding, I intend to understand how the Radio Free Europe employees gathered information from official and non-official sources and how biography played a crucial role in the process of knowledge gathering. Secondly, having understood the classificatory practice and the biographies of the authors, I will present how this archival collection mirrors the changes outside the archive.

The relevance of this collection surpasses a simple archival curiosity. Instead, my argument is that the Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties mirror the changes that happened inside this department and around the globe. While in the 1960s, the main focus was on gathering materials about the Sino-Soviet Split, in the 1970s, the attention of the Non-Ruling Communist Parties Department shifted to punctual events, like the reforms in Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union dissident Andrei Sakharov's process, the Solidarity Movement, the Troubles in Northern Ireland and the perestroika. This office followed how Communist Parties from all over the world perceived these shifts.

2. Materiality in all its (dis)honesty

Let us first discuss the materiality of the collection. We will start first by discussing the context of the archival processing within the OSA. It will tackle the main problem that the processing brought as well. The paper documents constituted the first traces that led to the enigmatic name of Kevin Devlin. On several brown large-sized boxes, the name Kevin Devlin stood written since the late 1990s. Within these boxes, folders about different countries waited to be re-arranged. This was the setting in which the Kevin Devlin collection processing started in October 2019. This was the first visible *trace* of Kevin Devlin: his name on a series of boxes.

With this common name as a label on the boxes, we inspected the content. Throughout the first weeks, we knew very little about the precise archival provenance of the boxes from the depot. The preliminary inspection proved that the documents follow the RFE protocol, meaning they were produced within the larger company. At the same time, content-wise, the collection seemed unfitting in the archives.

I used the available clues to circumvent the topic. In the 1990s, an archival company based in Germany pre-processed the documents and provided a detailed description of the content through entry logs. The documents were donated to the Open Society Archives and stored inside its premises between the late 1990s and 2020 when Archivist Tari Örs signalled the presence of the materials. Thus, in November 2020, when the Open Society Archives initiated the project, the first task was to check the conditions of the documents.

The preliminary analysis of the documents lasted between November 2020 and March 2021. By carefully analyzing the materiality of the documents, I understood that the documents on paper were in good shape and that no document needed any physical restoration. At the same time, the content evaluation process showed another excellent news—the entry logs provided by the previous archiving company matched the content. The preliminary analysis concluded that the collection has a different focus than the rest of Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives' usual content. More specifically, the documents were grouped into countries and followed the history of the Communist Parties from non-socialist countries.

While the content was different, the documents respected the structure of other collections from the same archive. On the first level, this collection included press clippings from *Le Monde*, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, *La Libertà*, and occasionally from other international newspapers. The second category of documents was daily press reports produced by Radio Free Europe's staff. Finally, the research reports, produced inside the Non-Ruling Communist Parties Department, presented a broader focus and used academic language. These three categories constitute the extensive quantity of the collection. Nevertheless, we sometimes found documents produced by the national Communist Parties (leaflets, programs, brochures). Occasionally, we found documents addressed to Kevin Devlin, like letters.

After analyzing the nature of the sources, our focus moved to create a meaningful categorization of the documents. The crux of the categorization followed the 'respect des fonds' rule. As the Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives closely respected this rule, we aimed to keep the whole collection together in one place. We kept the original structure, as each document (press clipping, article, document, etc.) had a reference code consisting of two or three letters that usually referred to the country or the topic discussed.

I kept the original administrative principle of the archive to a large extent. I divided the fond into two main parts, according to the context of production. The first sub-fonds of the collection (boxes 1-122) contain the activities of the Communist Parties from the non-socialist countries. The second sub-fonds (123-141) contains the activities of the International Communist Movement. The sub-fonds International Communist Movement focuses on the impact of Maoism in Africa, South America, and South-East Asia. While the producer of the first sub-fond was Kevin Devlin, a Research Analyst, the second sub-fonds was organized by William McLaughlin and Joseph Cornelius Kun.

The original scaffolding of the archive was re-composed by referring first to the country and then to the theme under focus. The structure chosen respects the following order:

Name of the Country: issue: sub-topic, for instance
 Sweden: Communist Party
 Sudan: Communist Party
 Italy: Communist Party
 Italy: Communist Party: Socialists

On a broader level, this structure revealed an important aspect: the archive catalogue always mirrors the logic of the creators (Vladimir Lapin, *Hesitations at the Door to an Archive Catalog*, in Blouin & Rosenberg, 2007, p. 480). By taking into account this statement, the first reflection about the role of the archivist arose. The archive creators, in this case, were the bureaucrats from the Radio Free Europe Research Department and the researchers focusing on the given topic. Meanwhile, the information taxonomy followed the Library of Congress' classification practices (Congressional Preliminary Annual Report on RFE, 1972, p.46). While the structure of the boxes was clear, the content had significant shifts from the orthodox content of Radio Free Europe. The material content aligned with the overall archival collection; however, the meaning differed.

In order to explain the significance of this observation, we will make a slight detour and focus on the history of the archives, as it will help us understand the multiple understandings of the road from a written document to an archive. The notion of archival workflow and storage changed throughout the last decades, having significant relevance in understanding the role of the archivist and, on a broader level, the archival authorship.

2.1. What constitutes an archive?

The meaning of an archive has changed throughout societies and times. The word's etymology derives from the ancient Greek *arkheion*, which designated the house of the *arkhon*. The *arkhon* was the judge in ancient Greek city-states. In this logic, the *arkhon* needed a particular space to keep administrative documents designated for judging cases, which became the *arkheion* (in Ancient Greek meant "related to the office"). Based on the word's root, the French philosopher Jacques Derrida provided a unique interpretation, which we will shed light on in the following sections.

Until then, let us narrow down our focus on the history of archives. Until the 16th century, most archived documents reflected transactions and charters. Usually, such documents were kept within local or regional institutions, like churches or town halls. These repositories were defined as *loci publici in quibus instrumenta deponuntur* [lat. "public places where legal documents are deposited"] (Duchein, 1992, p. 16). The transformation of the European powers into empires required new institutions that needed to be coordinated through extensive documents (Blouin & Rosenberg, 2013, p. 16). This marked a first paradigm shift: the document received authority and authenticity not by an individual case but by belonging to a cluster or a collection. The second paradigm shift happened in the 19th century when the archival documents became a subject of central concern for legitimizing the past. Starting with the French Revolution and doubled by the increase in the quantity of administrative works, the European countries realized the need for a separation between functioning institutions and the archival repositories (Duchein, 1992, p.18). Thus, governmental documents became more prevalent than church records (Ridener, 2009, p. 26).

Thus, the accuracy and authenticity of the record is given by the institution that created, collected, stored and preserved them. Therefore, while in the early modern period the document itself received its authenticity and authority on an item level, the paradigmatic shifts changed the focus. In other words, the place where the document was kept gave or not legal force and validity (Duchein, 1992, p. 14). The documents received meaning within the collection, and from the 19th century based on the collection they belonged to and the institution they were stored in. This context gave a new role to the archives: to legitimate an institution's activity based on the authenticity of the archival record. Also, in a century dominated by positivism and the obsession for objective historical truth,

archives have become the repository of the truthful representation of past events (Ridener, 2009, pp. 24-26). While the archives were a public storage place in the Middle Ages, in the 19th century, their role changed. Instead, the archives became the main reference for all verifiable historical knowledge (Blouin & Rosenberg, 2013, p. 31).

By the late 19th century, historians were the principal users of an archive. As the positivist paradigm dominated historiography, historians were obsessed with the objective truth within the archive. Therefore, the archivists anticipated this need by reinforcing archival standards. Several guiding archival principles aimed to create an objective, rigorous classification set to ensure an “objective” access to the historians. One central principle became the norm: the principle of provenance, or *respect des fonds*, as initially named in French. This means that “all documents which come from a body, an establishment, a family, or an individual form a fonds, and must be kept together” (Duchemin, 1992, p.19). This principle, doubled by the 1898 *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives* (known as *The Dutch Manual*) created the modern practical archival standards for creating and curating archives (Caswell, 2016). The manual’s authors were three Dutch archivists: Samuel Muller, Johan A. Feith and Robert Fruin. They aimed to provide a practical framework of archival processes in which context, original order and provenance were highly valued (Horsman et al., 2003). Yet, the manual met its limits in supporting private and personal archives (Cook, 1997, pp. 21–22; Ridener, 2009, pp. 38–40).

Sir Hilary Jenkinson’s *A Manual of Archive Administration* continued the Dutch Manual’s archival practices. Written in 1922, Jenkinson focused both on theory and practical approaches. For him, the archives are a form of “artificial memory, paper replacements for memorization and oral transmission of evidence” (Ridener, 2009, p. 52). In this sense, archives own the custody of records, subsequently legitimising information authenticity. Again, the notion of truth is strongly related to the archive’s institution. Again, this legitimizes the historian’s work by referring to archival documents.

By directly challenging Sir Hilary Jenkinson’s understanding of appraisal and custody, Theodore Roosevelt Schellenberg published *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques*. This work, published in 1957, changed the field (Schellenberg, 1956). For the American archivist Schellenberg, appraisal means an archival process in which archival items are evaluated and professionally eliminated. The postwar context

determined this paradigmatic change. Compared to the documents produced in the Middle Ages or early modernization, the contemporary administration produced new documents exponentially each year. Thus, the question of controlling and selecting new documents became crucial for modern records (Ridener, 2009, pp. 78–79). These observations had vast implications: the archival public changed from professional historians to everyday citizens. Schellenberg saw the documents as a form of state accountability to its citizens (Schellenberg, 1956, p. 81). According to Schellenberg, two new “virtues” define the archives: research value and public accessibility.

Starting from the 1960s, four elements determined the pivotal paradigm change in contemporary archival sciences. Firstly, the context was recognized as an important element in record creation and curation (Ridener, 2009, p. 122). Secondly, Thomas Kuhn’s *The Structure of the Scientific Revolutions* heavily impacted the field through self-observation of the archivists, awareness of the paradigmatic changes and the need to create a junction between theory and practice (Kuhn, 1996). Thirdly, the critical theory debates around the diversity of records, the archival institutions’ authority, and the archivist’s role created the need for new conceptual approaches within the theoretical field. Lastly, the technological impact constantly reshapes the field by opening new avenues, such as digital archiving (Ridener, 2009, pp. 122–123). All these debates solidified in the 1990s by emphasising the role of interpretation in archival appraisal.

To sum up, the archives had different meanings throughout history. Initially, the term designed the judge house in ancient Greek city-states. Subsequently, the archives were considered the repository of documents. The modern period brought significant changes: archives meant, amongst other definitions, a place of government accountability to its people. *The Dutch Manual indeed started the debates around the junction between praxis and theory, but only* Jenkinson and Schellenberg brought into debate notions such as the distinction between records and archival items, appraisal, authenticity, and standards.

In practical terms, these debates had several essential implications for the archival workflow of the Kevin Devlin Collection. First and foremost, the clusters of documents needed to be catalogued and identified according to specific sets of archival protocols (Blouin & Rosenberg, 2013, p. 19). As Open Society Archives follow the *respect des fonds* rule, this collection needed to keep all the documents within one collection. Secondly, the

value of press clippings from *La Libertà*, *Le Monde* and other newspapers is given by the cluster of gathered documents rather than the document on a unit level. Thirdly, the value of the folders was also given by the keywords, which needed to insure both the accessibility and accuracy. The fourth implication was that, in order to understand the nature of the documents, we needed to understand the administrative processes around the documents rather than the documents themselves. In a broader sphere, the plus-value of a document was given by two coordinates within the collection: the location within the file and the administrative processes that explain the document's existence.

2.2. Paradigms about archivist's role

However, there was a weak point to clarify before engaging with the administrative processes of RFE that created the documents: the archivist's subjectivity and historicity. Having established the praxis and main archival coordinates, one question still needs to be answered: what is the archivist's role in evaluating the documents? The question that arises is: to what extent is the archivist leaving their own historical trace on the document? Within the archival studies field, one of the core issues at stake for the last fifty years was how to address the archival intervention by the archivists (Ridener, 2009, pp. 130–142).

In the 19th century, the large consensus was that the archivist was passive, merely a keeper of the records and only the historian was active in creating historical knowledge (Blouin & Rosenberg, 2013, p. 141.) Jenkinson confirms this approach. For him, the role of the archivist is very specific: "a curator [...] charged with the supervision of the accumulation of records in an archive" (Ridener, 2009, p. 55). In concrete terms, the archivist arranges and describes the records, maintains the collection and provides support for the public, dominated by professional historians. They need to process the documents in a given time by following a rigorous protocol established by the custodial institution. In this case, the archivist is not an interpreter, as the archive information is seen as objective (Ridener, 2009, pp. 55–56).

Schellenberg's paradigm allows the archivist more autonomy and decision-making. For the first time, the archivist is a *creator* who selects and appraises documents. To achieve this task, the archivist, as a profession, is distinct from history and library studies (Ridener, 2009, pp. 85–86). Secondly, the archivist is a mediator among multiple entities. The task of

reclassification creates a bridge between record creators and the public. In this case, the public is constituted of professional historians and regular citizens (Ridener, 2009, p. 89).

Two reasons determined the shift towards acknowledging the active role of the archivists. One lies in the broader discussions that followed Michel Foucault's reflections on archives. For Michel Foucault, archives reveal hidden social and institutional hierarchies, produce knowledge, selectively include and exclude (Foucault, 2005, 2008). While Foucault does not explicitly discuss the archivist's role, this turn highlights the archive as a social and cultural construct. Foucault's observations were continued from an anthropological perspective by James C. Scott's *Seeing Like A State*, in which he expands on the social reification done by the state through documents (Scott, 1999). Gathering, processing and sharing information about events constitutes the event in itself.

In this context, Derrida's *archival fever* concept proved invaluable. According to his seminal article *Archival Fever*, the archivist actively participates in the production of the archive (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995). Written in 1995, his article brought a paradigm shift in understanding the archivist's work (Steedman, 2001). By using or recreating a structure, the archivist is for Derrida both a consumer and a producer of knowledge:

Archivists are analysts of texts in their examination of archives, but they are also consumers and producers of texts in maintaining and generating the knowledge base necessary for supporting archival work and study (Riter, 2015, p.389).

For Derrida, the archive represents a unique space where "law and information intersect in a result of privilege" (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995, pp. 9–14). This privilege reinforces social structures by including some narratives and excluding voices of underrepresented silent people that are named ex-centric (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995, pp. 9–14). According to Derrida, the archivist produces the event by selecting and appropriating knowledge. On this logic, the archive is never closed; it anticipates the future by ascribing constant meaning to the text (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995, p. 68; Ketelaar, 2001, pp. 137–139).

If we were to follow Derrida's logic, as archivists who processed the collection, we intervened in creating the collection's meaning. As Brien Brothman argues, arranging an archive betrays the original intention of

the documents. The simple act of arranging the documents in a different space and re-creating an order is already an archival representation:

finally, the most basic disruption of original order, of course, is the removal of the records from the originating site of provenance and their placement in archives. And once records are transplanted from their native homes, archival arrangements also distort original order in more subtle ways. In the first place, they become archival. (Brothmann, 1991, p.85)

This situation begs the question: How do we deal with the notion of authorship within an archive? To what extent does the *provenance* concept clearly reveal the author within an archive?

In order to solve this conundrum, Tom Nesmith's new definition of the concept of *provenance* proved its utility. For him, the provenance reflects the sociohistorical context, as it consists of "the social and technical processes of the records' inscription, transmission, contextualization, and interpretation, which accounts for its existence, characteristics, and continuing history" (Nesmith, 1999). This definition considers the record in itself and the society in which it was born. This definition also reflects the relationship between the individual and the record and between the individual and collective memory (Jennifer Douglas, "Origins and Beyond: The Ongoing Evolution of Archival Ideas about Provenance" in MacNeil & Eastwood, 2017, p. 35.)

To condense, the philosophical reflections by Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida revealed the active role of the archivist as a separate entity from the records creator. The archivist's active intervention can be spotted in seemingly insignificant places: the structure and architecture of the collection and archive, the item-level description and appraisal. Considering this paradigm, this collection's structure reflected not only the activity of Kevin Devlin's Communist Area Analysis Department. On a broader scale, it reveals the logic of Radio Free Europe, an institution financed by the United States of America. It also underlines different taxonomical practices: the option chosen for this one was the classificatory practices of the Library of Congress. On a broader scheme, the archival structure reflects the Cold War context.

3. Archives try to represent reality

3.1. Controlled vocabulary

The previous part argued that the contemporary paradigms favours the archivist's active role. In a nutshell, the archivist is prone to be influenced by surrounding discourses and is embedded in a sociohistorical context. At the same time, the archivist's task differs from the historian's. The archivist needs to be aware of the paradigm shifts but at the same time, must act. Ultimately, the core of the archivist's task is to describe the content and place it for public access. If this paradigm is taken into account, the question that still needs to be answered is: How do we avoid the analysis paralysis and proceed with discernment in creating a systematic implementation?

The core of this issue was the prudent yet firm use of the keywords and controlled vocabulary. We needed to create a keyword system that would be faithful to the documents in various languages and offer quick access for the broader audience. Thus, the set of keywords or the controlled vocabulary had to adjust the two seemingly contradicting main goals. The first one was to reach the scientific community from the 21st century, while the second was to respect the original conceptualization created between the 1950s and 1990s. Thus, following the contemporary paradigm of archival studies, notably Terry Cook and Jacques Derrida, we were aware that the whole process of arranging, describing, processing, and cataloguing the collection was far from being an objective process. On the contrary, subtle archivist interventions changed the collection from when the documents arrived in Kevin Devlin's office. This opened new avenues for reflection.

That is why we needed to understand the issues covered before creating a controlled vocabulary. While we kept the original structure when working with the collection, the content description faced significant changes. The content evaluation gave us insight into the archives concerning the activities of the Communist Parties from the nonruling countries. In this context, the content evaluation offered a solid understanding of the main issues tackled by the documents. The next part of the archival processing was to create a relevant catalogue description. More specifically, this process aimed to create a metadata system and controlled vocabulary that would facilitate finding aids for the public. The main issue was properly representing the information and providing comprehensive entries for

the public. Describing an archive of this kind implied a multidisciplinary approach of history and archival sciences.

On a superficial level, this task seems simple: to create keywords and other archival architectures that can facilitate or, on the contrary, obscure the researcher's access. However, if we consider Foucault and Derrida's thoughts on archive, this issue opens several new points on a more complex level. First and foremost, language itself might enhance or limit the accessibility. While the reports were written in English, a substantial part of the collection was in German, French, Italian, Spanish, or Dutch. Also, the archivist changes the meaning by reordering and creating new keywords. The second implication is that the archivist, as demonstrated in the previous pages, actively intervenes in the archival process and has a clear agency throughout his work of reordering.

3.2. Representing realities through keywords

Having understood the context of production and considering the archive structure, the main issue was how to create a relevant vocabulary that would encompass both the original structure and facilitate the general public's access (Vladimir Lapin, *Hesitations at the Door to an Archive Catalog*, in Blouin & Rosenberg, 2007, p. 480). The usual way is to refer to normative documentation. In this case, the compromise was reached by referring to the Library of Congress standards and respecting the original conceptualization practised in the Central News Room Department inside Radio Free Europe. Thus, the Library of Congress Subject Headings (from here, LCSH 44) was the leading auxiliary aid in creating the file description (Library of Congress Subject Headings, 2022).

Two reasons determined the use of the LCSH 44. Firstly, the documents produced within the Radio Free Europe Research Department were sorted and classified according to this framework. The content classification of Radio Free Europe Research Department reports referred to LCSH; hence, using the same standards for the document creation meant a more accurate description. Secondly, I described the content on the file level using the LCSH 44 as it is one of the most used sources of terms for subject cataloguing in the English-speaking framework (Walch, 1994, pp. 106–107). This way, the collections and specific files might reach a wider public. After choosing the word-related framework, I needed to attribute meaning to specific files. The files focused on specific topics, primarily

related to the activity of Communist parties from non-socialist countries. Four main categories gave meaning to the collection:

Countries covered	Personalities covered	Topics covered	Creation Year
-------------------	-----------------------	----------------	---------------

The covered countries were the first set of descriptive keywords. Broadly, the geographical references were state entities and fell into two categories. On the one hand, as previously mentioned, the country of provenience of the socialist party was a classificatory element. This meant the country the document directly covered was already contained in the file's title. For instance, the file *Italy: CP: Czechoslovakia* focused on the Italian Communist Party's reaction to events in Czechoslovakia.

On the other hand, the geographical references to countries functioned also as keywords. This set of keywords described the countries with public reactions, criticisms, appraisals, bilateral agreements, reciprocal references, inferences, and other reactions within the respective national Communist Party. The table 1 provides the detail about the countries used as keywords. The first column refers to the country covered, the second one shows the number of entries, and the third column shows the relevance when 1 is the maximum number.

Table 1. Countries used as keywords

word	count	relevance
Soviet Union	328	1
France	182	0.08
Italy	153	0.08
China	143	0.074
Czechoslovakia	98	0.088
Spain	76	0.042
Romania	66	0.05
Cuba	64	0.051
Yugoslavia	42	0.035
Poland	42	0.026

Hungary	40	0.028
Vietnam	37	0.02
Greece	34	0.023
Chile	33	0.025
United Kingdom	31	0.094
Japan	31	0.015
Finland	30	0.021
United States	29	0.088
India	25	0.012
Sweden	24	0.015
Venezuela	22	0.018
Bulgaria	21	0.017
Portugal	21	0.015
Argentina	21	0.015
Albania	20	0.019
Belgium	19	0.013
Austria	19	0.012
German Democratic Republic	18	0.082
Indonesia	18	0.014
Uruguay	18	0.012
Israel	17	0.011
Afghanistan	16	0.013
Algeria	15	0.013
Denmark	15	0.008
Bolivia	13	0.012
Palestine	13	0.011
Brazil	13	0.008
Cyprus	11	0.01
Peru	11	0.009
Ecuador	10	0.009

Iceland	10	0.009
The Netherlands	10	0.006
Sri Lanka	9	0.027
Guatemala	9	0.008
Ghana	9	0.008
Congo	9	0.008
Syria	8	0.007
Iran	8	0.006
El Salvador	7	0.021
Nicaragua	7	0.007
Paraguay	7	0.007
Sudan	7	0.006
Panama	7	0.006

A quick observation is that the Soviet Union is the most referred country in terms of occurrence. This might initially seem odd because separate files concerning the Soviet Union do not exist within this collection. However, the collection's logic provides an explanation. In Kevin Devlin's Non-Socialist Countries collection, all parties from non-socialist countries referred to the Soviet Union. The historical explanation for this consistent reference relies on the centripetal role of the Soviet Union's Communist Party in coordinating the activities of the Non-Ruling Communist Parties. Virtually all the Communist Parties referred to Moscow's decisions in relationship to many issues.

Yet, as this collection shows, they did not rigorously follow Moscow's directions in all cases. While in the interwar period, the channels of public communications were limited and the centrifugal reactions against Soviet Unions were less visible in the written press, the postwar period and the Cold War paradigm changed the situation. In parallel, media expansion also played a crucial role. The postwar world witnessed the creation of many more alternative channels of communication and public expression, and politicians swiftly reacted through media channels in a much more intense way. Therefore, Radio Free Europe heavily documented these public interventions. Moreover, the decolonization movement, doubled by the exclusion of socialist countries from Western European markets

and China's ideological expansion, created new forms of solidarity (Eric Burton, James Mark, and Steffi Marung, *Developments*, in Mark & Betts, 2022, p. 95).

Kevin Devlin mapped these ideological transitions in detail. These shifts might pass unobserved, but they come up to the surface during specific events: state funerals of political leaders, political interventions after specific events, and public reactions of politicians after elections. Thus, the archive meticulously maps ideological splits between various factions (for instance, Belgium Communist Party: Ideology- Marxist-Leninist, 1967 – 1989, Finland: Communist Party: Factions, 1969 – 1970, India: Communist Party: Marxism-Leninism [Communist Party of India (Marxism)], 1971 – 1987), as well as China's aim in creating an alternative ideological centre (International Communist Movement: Eastern Bloc: China) and alternative leadership within global, continental or regional Communist Parties alliances. Kevin Devlin's final aim was to understand the rise and fall of the Soviet Union within the global framework.

France and Italy were the second and third most referred countries in terms of incidence. Two points explain the significant occurrence. The first explanation resides in the records creation process. Most news clips came from newspapers from these countries (*Le Monde*, *L'Unita*). At the same time, most news correspondents were based in these countries; hence, the representation is ampler.

The second explanation is that a considerable part of the archive is dedicated to the Communist parties from the respective countries. Kevin Devlin's understanding of the global situation surpassed the national boundaries, as his focus was instead on the entanglements and larger frameworks. In some cases, the national Communist Parties heavily supported the Soviet Union's actions, while in other cases, on the contrary, they openly challenged Moscow's hegemony.

The French Communist Party stands as a particular example of this situation. Kevin Devlin's department closely scrutinized the political standpoints concerning ideological shifts and issues or the elections in France (France: Communist Party: Soviet Union, 1981- 1982). The volume of data gathered on this country is impressive. In total, 20 boxes gather information solely about the French Communist Party. The work is highly detailed: two archival boxes are dedicated solely to the French CP's internal politics, and three to internal party affairs. Based on the data gathered, Kevin Devlin wrote detailed reports about the position of France in the Soviet Union's affairs, in which he nuanced the so-called

internationalist solidarity. On one hand, within the Western CPs, the French Communist Party was one of the closest to supporting the Soviet Union's policies. One report written by the French press correspondents in 1982 revealed the strategy of Georges Marchais, the president of the French Communist Party.

The French Party is still with the Soviets, as Marchais' list of joint targets showed. The only difference is that the Marchais party no longer automatically praises everything the Soviets do. It has even published criticism of Moscow. [...]

He makes a show of independence by criticising the Soviets, but then glides over their breaches and mistakes for the sake of what finally looks very much like the traditional form of internationalism (FF087- EURO- Marchais and the New Internationalism, n.d.)

At the same time, France criticised the Soviet Union – especially on the issue of human rights breaches in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Yet, the criticism is always limited, as the collection shows. Georges Marchais, the leader of the French Communist Party, always claimed that such problems were “nothing in comparison to what allegedly happens in the West” (FF087- EURO- Marchais and the New Internationalism).

In other cases, Kevin Devlin focused on understanding the CPs that firmly challenged Moscow's decisions. Within this framework, a good example is Italian Communist Party. Again, the documents gathered are substantial: 31 boxes focus only on this country, from box 59 to box 90 of the collection. A particular focus for Kevin Devlin was to understand the Italian CP's reactions against the Soviet hegemony. Among many others, one document showing the complexity of analysing such interventions is *Italy:CP:Czechoslovakia* file. The research report *PCI's Firm Reaction to Prague Developments*, from 18 April 1969, is based on press clippings referring to the Italian CP's reaction to the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia:

The Italian Communist Party's official reaction to the changes made in (or imposed on) the Czechoslovak leadership has been prompt, firm – and predictable. As the fateful plenum approached, the PCI had made its position unequivocally clear in a drumfire series of statements and articles, among which we may note Giuseppe Boffa's critical commentaries on

Soviet and foreign policies (Kevin Devlin, *EURO- PCI's Firm reaction to Prague Developments*, n.d.)

A similar explanation is why China is mentioned consistently throughout the collection. Kevin Devlin particularly scrutinized the impact of the Sino-Soviet split in the countries. China does not have a separate file; as in the case of the Soviet Union, Kevin Devlin's office mapped the influence of China in various countries, particularly from the Global South, among which the Indian Communist Parties, South African Communist Party, or Indonesian Communist Party.

Let us turn the attention to the second set of descriptive keywords: topics. The topics covered had two functions. On one hand, they constituted classificatory elements within the collection and took the role of descriptive keywords. The first function was to create sub-divisions within the same country. Let us take the case of France, to show how the documents were divided according to specific topics:

France: Communist Party: Dissidence
 France: Communist Party: Doctrine
 France: Communist Party: Factions
 France: Communist Party: Foreign Policy
 France: Communist Party: Internal Policy
 France: Communist Party: Party Affairs

As in the case of countries, topics also took the role of descriptive keywords. Again, out of the prominent topics, a few had a consistent repetition, as one can see in table 2:

Table 2. Keywords to describe the archival content

Word	count	relevance
Election	141	0.279
Factionalism	117	0.84
communist party	92	0.301
Congress	89	0.217
Maoism	65	0.499
Communism	63	0.3

Euro-Communism	59	0.168
warsaw pact invasion	42	0.999
invasion of Czechoslovakia	42	0.999
soviet split	35	0.555
Revisionism	32	0.226
Stalinism	31	0.207
socialist party	30	0.412
Ideology	29	0.134
Socialism	28	0.12
Dissidence	25	0.193
north atlantic treaty Organization	24	0.571
parti socialiste	20	0.317
party of india	18	0.428
prague spring	15	0.238
italian communist party	14	0.333
israeli communist party	14	0.333
maki hamiflega hakomunistit	14	0.333
political alliance	14	0.222
political pluralism	14	0.222
vietnam war	11	0.174
foreign policy	10	0.143
european parliament	10	0.111

The reason for the topic variety resides in the constant focus on documenting multifocal issues from each national Communist Party. In some cases, Kevin Devlin's office decided to archive some topics related to local, regional, and national elections on a periodical and systematic basis. Notably, the elections in countries like Italy, West Germany, France, and Spain were under constant scrutiny, and Kevin Devlin's office regularly followed the debates on this topic. Therefore, the keyword related to *elections* is the most recurrent in terms of incidence. Also, *factionalism*, which for Devlin meant the multiple ways socialism was understood, perceived, and applied, was another constantly recurring issue. The

congresses were also closely followed by the Communist Area Analysis. Their focus was to understand possible influences, synergies, but also counter-reactions to the congresses by the socialist countries and those organized by the national Communist Parties.

While some events were cyclical, the office also aimed to map more punctual and unique events. Some of them were particularly received a punctual concern:

1. *The impact of the Sino-Soviet split.* The office followed the ideological shifts in the national parties. A particular focus is on the International Communist Movement, an institution parallel to Comintern, having as its principal ideology Maoism. As Maoism became an alternative ideological option for Communist Parties from non-ruling countries, the RFE/RL Communist Area Analysis Department closely followed it.
2. *The impact of the War in Vietnam.* The non-ruling Communist Party office followed the reactions of the national Communist Parties to the conflict and which sides they chose.
3. *Prague Spring and Invasion of Czechoslovakia.* The Prague Spring and its aftermath were turning events in the ideological evolution of many Communist Parties in Western Europe. That is why the office closely followed the impact of the Prague Spring and the Invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 for a more extended period until 1980.
4. *Common Market.* The department followed how Western European countries reacted to the construction of the Common Market, the forefather of the European Union.
5. *Euro-Communism.* In the late 1970s, euro-communism seemed to be an alternative to Moscow's ideological hegemony for a period of time. As in the case of Maoism, the office became highly interested in the ideology that openly challenged the primacy of Moscow's hegemony.
6. *Reforms in the socialist bloc.* The impact of the reforms in the socialist bloc was closely scrutinized.

We might wonder why some of the topics seemed to be a particular concern for Radio Free Europe. One of the most interesting cases under the scrutiny of the Communist Area Analysis Office was Euro-Communism. While the French Communist Party was loyal to the Soviet Union's policies until the late 1970s, other European Communist Parties questioned the authority of Moscow's understanding about socialism. In the 1950s, the Italian Communist Party leader Palmiro Togliatti argued for a 'polycentric' view of Communism. However, this initiative was received only with limited support by the other Communist Parties. The

situation changed in the late 1960s when the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia led to widespread criticism of the Soviet version of Communism (Holmes 2009, p.14). This action had two direct implications. Some intellectuals, both in the socialist countries as well as in Western Europe, left the country. Others preferred to develop a version of Communism that would align with democratic principles. The whole process intensified in 1975 when Franco's dictatorship collapsed by creating a common platform called Euro-Communism.

It might seem odd to look retroactively, as this movement did not have the same visibility as the Prague Spring or other reformist movements. Nevertheless, Euro-Communism was a particular concern as it showed the multiple ways communism could evolve in Western countries. Discursive plurality, as well as possible ideological scenarios, were particularly central.

More than this, Radio Free Europe's broadcasting department was particularly keen on mapping Euro-Communism. The aim was to broadcast information about alternative ways of socialism that criticized the Soviet Union. Why broadcast the speeches of a Spanish or Italian politician in East Central Europe?

The corporate files held by the Hoover Archive provide us with an explanation for the strong interest in this topic. The file dedicated to Kevin Devlin's work states that Radio Free Europe directly intended to broadcast Euro-Communism information by disseminating Berlinguer or Carrillo's speeches in Czech, Slovak, Polish or Romanian. Radio Free Europe was highly interested in mapping the plurality of the ideologies to emphasize to the public in Eastern and Central Europe the multiple possible ways to practice socialism. As the archival file that referred to Kevin Devlin stated about his activity:

Eurocommunism- an indirect destabilizing factor for the regimes of the East. The RFE, which in the 1950s incited Hungarians to Revolution, today limits itself to disseminating the speeches of Berlinguer or the Spaniard Carrillo. It is a massive bombardment in Russian, Czechoslovak, Bulgarian, and Polish languages, that annuls in deed the censorship and silence of the local Communist Press. A symptom of some interest can be the fact that the NATO defense College recently invited as lecturers two personages as different as Mr. Kevin Devlin, one of the executives of RFE, and the Communist journalist Giuseppe Boffa. And the remarkable thing is that the two of them did not repeat after all say things very different about Eurocommunism (Kevin Devlin, 1976)

Political figures were the third set of keywords to describe the archives. The reports that followed the press clippings closely followed the activity of the CPs leaders. The Communist Area Analysis office was aware of the futility of mapping ideologies without doubling it with a good understanding of the decision-makers. The diplomatic or personal visits were a particular focus for Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Office. Among the leaders, several names were more present within the collection, as follows:

Table 3. Keywords representing the political figures covered

word	count	relevance
Marchais, Georges	85	0.771
Castro, Fidel	54	0.997
Berlinguer, Enrico	51	0.486
Zedong, Mao	35	0.858
Mitterand, François	33	0.314
Brezhnev, Leonid	27	0.74
Pajetta, Giancarlo	24	0.229
Ceaușescu, Nicolae	20	0.607
Carrillo, Santiago	20	0.5
Thorez, Maurice	18	0.162
Togliatti, Palmiro	16	0.469
Dubček, Alexander	16	0.152
Kosygin, Alexei	15	0.471
Longo, Luigi	15	0.371
Rochet, Waldeck	15	0.143
Khrushchev, Nikita	15	0.143
Guevara, Che	14	0.338
Elleinstein, Jean	14	0.133
Enlai, Zhou	11	0.235
Chirac, Jacques	10	0.266
Allende, Salvador	10	0.179

ADRIAN-GEORGE MATUS

Tito, Joseph	9	0.19
van Geyt, Louis	8	0.508
Papandreou, Andreas	8	0.235
Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr	8	0.233
Stalin, Joseph	8	0.163
Novotný, Antonín	7	0.216
d'Eistang, Giscard	7	0.206
Sartre, Jean-Paul	7	0.183
Miyamoto, Kenji	7	0.181
Suarez, Adolfo	7	0.173
Aron, Raymond	7	0.171
Soares, Mário	7	0.17
Pelikan, Jaroslav	7	0.155
Fischer, Joschka	7	0.132
Chi mihn, Ho	6	0.381
Theodorakis, Mikis	6	0.187
Fabre, Robert	6	0.156
Caetano, Marcelo	6	0.153
Maurer, Ghoerghe	6	0.142
de Gaulle, Charles	6	0.14
Lukács, Georg	5	0.148
John Paul ii	2	0.19
Barrientos Ortuño, René	2	0.127
Ben Bella, Ahmed	2	0.127

Among the political figures, Georges Marchais, the president of the French CP from 1972 to 1994, has the highest incidence. He constantly entered the competition for the presidential elections in France. Kevin Devlin thoroughly mapped the interventions of the leader of the French CP throughout the 1970s and 1980s. The Communist Area Analysis office aimed to see to what extent Marchais was thoroughly following Soviet Union's directives or not. One good indicator was the invasion of

Czechoslovakia in 1968. As Marchais emphasized, he did not criticize the invasion: "We consider that it is not for us to take up an official position when a brother Party adopts a disciplinary measure towards one of its members, even when this measure is inconvenient for us." (France: Communist Party: Soviet Union, January 1981- December 1982). On contrary, Enrico Berlinguer's public reactions were against the military invasion.

Mao's reaction concerning the Sino-Soviet split were under constant scrutiny as well. The Communist Area Analysis office gathered his reactions in many contexts, as for instance when interviewed by Japanese socialists ("Interview of Mao Tse-Tung with Japanese Socialists", Sino-Soviet Split, 1964), or in the context of the external policies following Khrushchev's replacement ("Peking after Khrushchev- Part I", "Peking after Khrushchev-Part II", Sino-Soviet Split, 1964), or in the context of China's increased isolationism ("China's Growing Isolation" in Sino-Soviet Split, 1966).

Not only political leaders, but also dissidents appear within the collection on a constant basis. The Kevin Devlin's team from Communist Area Analysis Department closely followed the cases of the mathematician Leonid Plyshch (1972-1976), the human rights activist Vladimir Bukovsky, the Soviet film director and screenwriter Sergei Parajanov, the physician Youri Orlov and the physician Andrei Sakharov, among many others. As result of publishing a controversial essay on intellectual freedom in July 1968, Andrei Sakharov was contested by his fellow scientists in the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Very soon, the Western European journalists learned about the Sakharov affair and began to report it in the newspapers. Yet, the issue was apprehended in different ways by the Communist Parties from Western Europe. Some of them ignored the topic, as the French Communist Party, others supported his activity, as the Italian Communist Party or Belgian Communist Party (Matus, Felcher, *The Sakharov Case and Western Communist Parties*, 2022). By gathering the reactions of the decision-makers, but also the impact of dissident movements, the office aimed to offer a comprehensive understanding of possible centrifugal movements away from Moscow.

4. Conclusions

To sum up, processing the Kevin Devlin collection opened multiple questions. This research used two main conceptual pillars to unfold them.

By referring to Bruno Latour's work on the Conseil de l'Etat, the premise is that files assemble reality, and processes create and give meaning to the content. Throughout this investigation to find out who the author of the archive was, we favoured Derrida's thoughts on archival authorship. Considering these theoretical premises, this study inspected the records creation process during the Cold War by taking the case of the archives produced by Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department from 1960 until 1990.

Kevin Devlin was born in Ireland and moved to the United States, where he pursued a career in political science. He became in the 1960s a political analyst for the Radio Free Europe in Munich. He published on Europe's Communist parties, and he was involved in various collective research projects. Despite his unique expertise on Communist Parties, information about Kevin Devlin is scarce, even on the internet. Besides basic biographic facts, this person is an enigma. One could easily argue that Devlin was a simple employee at the Radio Free Europe in Munich, and his role was too insignificant to gain visibility. On the other hand, he produced one of the most extensive collections of documents inside the Research Department from Radio Free Europe. He gathered data, processed it, and used his analytic qualities to produce relevant research and publish high-quality academic papers.

This study argued that biography in itself plays little role in understanding the role within the archive. Instead, to spot his *trace*, two elements proved to be crucial: provenance and keywords.

In this regard, we needed to understand the rationale of the records' creation properly. The primary task of the Communist Area Analysis Department was to produce research reports on various global issues that involved the Communist Parties and other vital actors. Kevin Devlin, Joseph Cornelius Kun and William McLaughlin produced tens of reports yearly as a job duty. Thus, data gathering and knowledge production is more than merely gathering printed materials. As experts in their field, they were employed to produce relevant materials concerning the Cold War. We saw that their contribution was irreplaceable: their superiors did their best to keep them to work inside Radio Free Europe. This implies that the intellectual products they delivered were not reproducible. The reports on the activity of the Communist Parties were original and unique, not merely bureaucratic documents. Yet, the notion of authorship is different than in the case of a text written by a historian or a novelist. The critical difference relies on the notion of knowledge production.

When it comes to the topic of knowledge production in relation to archives, we saw that archives are a product of an increased interest towards printed documents, which started during the modern age. This agreement usually ends, however, on the question of the aim of this 'data appetite'. Throughout this study, we favoured Derrida's point on the matter. He aptly argued, "There is no political power without control of the archives." (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995, pp. 10-11). The French philosopher explains his standing by referring to the original meaning of the concept 'archive'. In Ancient Greek, it meant 'arkheion', which designated the house where the superior magistrate, called 'arkhon' lived. The *arkhons* were the signified political citizens with the right to represent the law. As they represented the power, the *arkhons* were the documents' guardians and producers of documents. They had as function to "unify, identify, classify" in a metaphoric place where "law and singularity intersect in privilege" (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995, p. 10).

The metaphor of the *arkheion* is vital for understanding the role of the collection in two ways. It clarifies the issue concerning the institutional authorship, as well as the role of the archivist in the production of knowledge. Again, the French philosopher clarifies this essential role of the *arkheion*, which is to ritualize and repeat the process of gathering information. Not the names and the keywords added, but the ritualistic gathering of information gives sense and legitimacy to the *arkheion*: "the first archivist institutes the archive as it should be, that is to say, not only in exhibiting the document, but in establishing it. He reads it, interprets it, classes it." (Derrida & Prenowitz, 1995, p. 38)

In this logic, the archivist's work turned from describing the documents to representing them. This process, called "archival representation", aimed to "reorder, interpret, create surrogates and design architectures for representational systems that contain those surrogates to stand in for or represent actual archival materials" (Yakel, 2002, p.2). In this regard, the new definition of provenance by Tom Nesmith proved its utility. The collection reveals, in this sense, the logic of Radio Free Europe, United States, the archive hosting this content, and the archivist's background. In this way, the archivist did not "describe" the content; rather, they "represented" the content for a new public.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- "China's Growing Isolation" in Sino-Soviet Split, 1964 - 1966-05; HU OSA 300-5-90:92/3; Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties; Analytic Research Department; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest
- "Interview of Mao Tse-Tung with Japanese Socialists" in Sino-Soviet Split, 1964-09 - 1964-12; HU OSA 300-5-90:91/3; Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties; Analytic Research Department; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest
- "Peking after Khrushchev- Part I", "Peking after Khrushchev- Part II" in Sino-Soviet Split, 1964-09 - 1964-12; HU OSA 300-5-90:91/3; Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties; Analytic Research Department; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest
- Belgium Communist Party- Ideology- Marxist-Leninist, 1967 - 1989; HU OSA 300-5-90:6/1; Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties; Analytic Research Department; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest
- Congressional Preliminary Annual Report on Radio Free Europe, 1972, p.46.
- Devlin, Kevin, 1976 in HU OSA 300-10-5, Yugoslav Biographical Files II, Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest
- Documentary Films of the Black Box Foundation, 1988-2006, HU OSA 305-0-2, Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives Budapest
- FF087- EURO- Marchais and the New Internationalism in HU OSA 300-5-90:45/3; Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties; Analytic Research Department; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest
- Finland: Communist Party: Factions, 1969 - 1970; HU OSA 300-5-90:25/1 Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties; Analytic Research Department; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest

- France: Communist Party: Soviet Union (January 1981- December 1982) in HU OSA 300-5-90:45/3; Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties; Analytic Research Department; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest
- France: Communist Party: Soviet Union (January 1981- December 1982) in HU OSA 300-5-90:45/3; Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties; Analytic Research Department; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest
- India: Communist Party: Marxism-Leninism [Communist Party of India (Marxism)], 1971 - 1987; HU OSA 300-5-90:55/2; Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties; Analytic Research Department; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest
- International Communist Movement: Eastern Bloc: China (1966), Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties; Analytic Research Department; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest
- Kevin Devlin, *EURO- PCI's Firm reaction to Prague Developments* in HU OSA 300-5-90:62/1; Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties; Analytic Research Department; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute; Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest
- Library of Congress Subject Headings Introduction, <https://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeLCSH/LCSH44-Main-intro.pdf>
- OSA Website. (2023) Archival Catalogue, <https://www.osaarchivum.org/archives>, accessed 12/09/2023
- Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty corporate records (n.d.), Box 28, Folder 5, Kevin Devlin. Hoover Institution Library and Archives,
- Records of Kevin Devlin and the Communist Area Analysis Department on Non-Ruling Communist Parties (2000). HU OSA 300-5-90, Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives, Budapest.

Secondary sources

1. Blouin, F. X., & Rosenberg, W. G. (2007). *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar*. University of Michigan Press.

2. Blouin, F. X., & Rosenberg, W. G. (2013). *Processing the past: Contesting authority in history and the archives* (1. issued as [...] paperback). Oxford University Press.
3. Brothman, B. (1991) "Orders of Value: Probing the Theoretical Terms of Archival Practice," *Archivaria* 32 (Summer 1991)
4. Caswell, M (2016) *The Archive is not an Archives: Acknowledging the Intellectual Contributions of Archival Studies*, *Reconstructions* Vol.16, No.1
5. Cook, T. (1997). What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas Since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift. *Archivaria*, 17–63.
6. Cox, R. J., Langmead, A., & Mattern, E. (Eds.). (2015). *Archival research and education: Selected papers from the 2014 AERI Conference*. Litwin Books.
7. Derrida, J., & Prenowitz, E. (1995). Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression. *Diacritics*, 25(2), 9–63.
8. Duchein, M. (1992). The History of European Archives and the Development of the Archival Profession in Europe. *The American Archivist*, 55(1), 14–25.
9. Holmes, L. (2009). *Communism, A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press.
10. Foucault, M. (2005). *Les mots et les choses: Une archéologie des sciences humaines*. Gallimard.
11. Foucault, M. (2008). *L'archéologie du savoir*. Gallimard.
12. Horsman, P., Ketelaar, E., & Thomassen, T. (2003). New Respect for the Old Order: The Context of the Dutch Manual. *The American Archivist*, 66(2), 249–270. <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.66.2.452235k813568872>
13. Ketelaar, E. (2001). Tacit narratives: The meanings of archives. *Archival Science*, 1(2), 131–141. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02435644>
14. Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (3rd edition). University of Chicago Press.
15. Latour, B. (2009). *The Making of Law: An Ethnography of the Conseil d'Etat* (1st edition). Polity.
16. Levi, R., & Valverde, M. (2008). Studying Law by Association: Bruno Latour Goes to the Conseil d'État. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 33(3), 805–825.
17. MacNeil, H., & Eastwood, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Currents of archival thinking* (Second edition). Libraries Unlimited, an imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC.
18. Mark, J., & Betts, P. (2022). *Socialism Goes Global: The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the Age of Decolonisation*. Oxford University Press.
19. Matus, A., Felcher, A. (2022) *The Sakharov Case and Western Communist Parties* <https://www.osaarchivum.org/blog/%E2%80%9Cthe-sakharov-case%E2%80%9D-and-western-communist-parties>
20. Nesmith, T. (1999). "Still Fuzzy, But More Accurate: Some Thoughts on the "Ghosts" Of Archival Theory". *Archivaria* 47 (February), 136-50. <https://archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/12701>.

21. Ridener, J. (2009). *From Polders to postmodernism: A concise history of archival theory*. Litwin Books.
22. Riter, R. *Derridean Influence: Archival Readings of Archive Fever* in Richard J. Cox, Alison Langmead, and Eleanor Mattern, eds., *Archival Research and Education: Selected Papers from the 2014 AERI Conference*, Archives, Archivists and Society, book 7 (AERI Conference, Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books, 2015), 389.
23. Schellenberg, T. R. (1956). *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques*. University of Chicago Press.
24. Scott, J. C. (1999). *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (0 edition). Yale University Press.
25. Steedman, C. (2001). Something She Called a Fever: Michelet, Derrida, and Dust. *The American Historical Review*, 106(4), 1159. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2692943>
26. Walch, V. I. (1994). *Standards for Archival Description: A Handbook : Information Systems, Data Exchange ...* Society of American Archivists.
27. Wittgenstein, L., & Russell, B. (2001). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (2nd edition). Routledge.
28. Yakel, E. (2003). Archival representation. *Archival Science*, 3(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02438926>