

Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies

Volume 5

Article 9

2018

The Nuremberg Trials Project at Harvard Law School: Making History Accessible to All

Judith A. Haran

Harvard Law School, jharan@law.harvard.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/jcas>

 Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#), [European History Commons](#), [International Law Commons](#), [Legal Commons](#), [Legal History Commons](#), [Military History Commons](#), and the [Military, War, and Peace Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Haran, Judith A. (2018) "The Nuremberg Trials Project at Harvard Law School: Making History Accessible to All," *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies*: Vol. 5 , Article 9.

Available at: <https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/jcas/vol5/iss1/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by EliScholar – A Digital Platform for Scholarly Publishing at Yale. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies* by an authorized editor of EliScholar – A Digital Platform for Scholarly Publishing at Yale. For more information, please contact elischolar@yale.edu.

The Nuremberg Trials Project at Harvard Law School: Making History Accessible to All

Cover Page Footnote

Acknowledgments I would like to thank three members of the Nuremberg Project team who have assisted with the preparation of this article: Paul Deschner, Matt Seccombe, and Stephen Chapman. Others team members who've made significant contributions over the years include Terry Martin, Tom Bruce, Peter MacDonald, Cathy Conroy, and Silke Sahl. My apologies if I have inadvertently omitted anyone.

THE NUREMBERG TRIALS PROJECT AT HARVARD LAW SCHOOL: MAKING HISTORY ACCESSIBLE TO ALL

This is the raw material of history in wonderful profusion.

—Telford Taylor

The thirteen Nuremberg trials together constitute one of the most significant events in the history of the twentieth century. Taking place during the years immediately after the Second World War, the trials set the stage for the development of the modern law of warfare, codified protocols in the fields of human rights and medical experimentation, and, perhaps most importantly, created an indelible, if at times incomplete, record of the crimes of Nazi Germany. Quincy Wright gave an excellent summation of the trials' *raison d'être* in the *Harvard Law Review*:

The Nuremberg trials were designed (1) to carry out the Allied war aim of punishing the major war criminals without denying due process of law to the accused, (2) to influence opinion in Germany and elsewhere in order to deter future aggressions and atrocities, (3) to contribute to the historical record and to public enlightenment by making available authentic evidence of the process of development and methods of the “Nazi Conspiracy,” and (4) to contribute to the development of international law, especially on the subjects of war, aggression, and atrocities.¹

Former Harvard Law School librarian Terry Martin, an early organizer of the Nuremberg Trials Project, summed up why these records continue to matter: “The documentation from such tribunals helps establish a permanent record of the truth that makes it more difficult for revisionists to try to alter history.”² The impending seventy-fifth anniversary of the trials' commencement offers a welcome opportunity to look at the current status of the documentary evidence.

This paper addresses two separate but related topics. First, what is the fate of the documents left behind in 1949, when the trials finished. Where are these documents now? How accessible are they? Second, this article describes the history, development, and current status of the Nuremberg Trials Project at Harvard Law School.

The Trials' Printed Record

Thousands of books and journal articles have been written about World War II over the past seven decades. Of these, an enormous number of books and scholarly articles have focused on the trials themselves, including memoirs by participants (prosecutors, defendants, judges, psychologists, and others), historical and legal analyses, and discussions of the trials' impact on international law and historiography. Authors of these

¹ Wright, “Nuremberg,” 964.

² “HLS Launches Nuremberg Trials Project.”

works, writing primarily in German or English, have used the trial documents as primary sources, as evidenced by their abundant appearance in notes and bibliographies over the past six and a half decades. Clearly lawyers, historians, and scholars have found the records of the Nuremberg trials useful. A careful review of the literature, however, reveals a surprising dearth of writing about the trial documents themselves. After being featured in press releases in 1949, this topic—the nature, quantities, locations, accessibility, and preservation/arrangement challenges of the trial documents—has virtually disappeared from printed discourse.

It is rare for a collection of paper weighing more than one hundred tons to nearly disappear from the historical record.³ This feat becomes even more remarkable on reading Telford Taylor's August 1949 *Final Report to the Secretary of the Army on the Nuernberg War Crimes Trials*. Taylor, the chief of counsel for all twelve Nuremberg Military Tribunal (NMT) trials (those following the International Military Tribunal of 1945–46), stated that “one of the most important problems . . . was the disposition of the very large amount of documents . . . assembled in connection with the trials.” He went on to list the repositories to which a complete, or nearly complete, set of records was being donated. According to this knowledgeable source, seventeen U.S. repositories would receive these collections, ranging from the obvious—the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), Library of Congress—to the less obvious, such as the University of North Dakota.⁴ Taylor's list includes thirteen academic libraries. Remaining sets were donated to German institutions and other European entities such as the International Criminal Court at The Hague.

Confusingly, a press release dated two months earlier from the Office of Military Government for Germany (OMGUS) gives a list of only twelve U.S. repositories, including two not even mentioned in Taylor's count.⁵ Other writers give lists that include yet other repositories. No source has a complete list, and none of the lists agree. Together, the lists name over twenty U.S. repositories. (Appendix A provides a list of these, with current status of records.)

Even if only a handful of the named recipients (primarily leading academic libraries such as Harvard, Stanford, and Princeton) had received large collections of original trial documents, one might expect such historically significant collections to have generated some documentation of their own in professional journals read by archivists, academic librarians, or historians. Such, however, is not the case. Searches have turned up only four articles about these documents, two published by members of the prosecution team, one by the head of the Document Division at Nuremberg, and one by a leading Library of Congress archivist—all written prior to 1955.

³ Mendelsohn, *Trial by Document*.

⁴ Taylor, *Final Report*, 98, 99–100.

⁵ Public Information Office, OMGUS, “Collection Donation.”

Chief of Counsel Telford Taylor wrote about research possibilities afforded by the trial record before the final trial had concluded.⁶ A year later, former Deputy Chief of Counsel Robert Kempner wrote a piece in the *American Political Science Review*.⁷ Fred Niebergall, head of the Document Division, penned a “brief survey” of the records’ current status for the *Law Library Journal*.⁸ And a grand total of one additional article has appeared since 1950: Library of Congress archivist Fritz Epstein wrote about “research opportunities in Washington, DC for the WWII period.”⁹ A few articles have appeared over the years in German-language journals as well, which are not discussed here.

The situation is not much different with regard to books. Of the three relevant titles that appeared by the mid-1970s, two were written by NARA archivist John Mendelsohn: his Ph.D. thesis analyzing the four main document series used in the twelve “subsequent” NMT trials, still considered a primary source for anyone dealing with these documents, and his detailed finding aid to the microfilmed NARA documentary record for NMT case 9, the “Einsatzgruppen Trial.”¹⁰ In 1976, Jacob Robinson, an international legal scholar, and Henry Sachs, a former document analyst at Nuremberg, compiled a detailed, deeply indexed list of 3,001 Nuremberg documents (listed by evidence file number and heavily annotated) pertinent to the Holocaust.¹¹ One other useful catalogue is the 1961 *Catalogue of Nuremberg Documents* from London’s Wiener Library, which not only lists prosecution and defense documents but also references a separate list of 4,500 interrogation summaries.¹²

Last but not least is an essay by the prolific Telford Taylor, “The Use of Captured German and Related Records in the Nuernberg War Crimes Trials.”¹³ The trial record has contributed to countless works of historical and legal analysis since 1949, but since 1978 no further books or articles in English discussing the documents themselves have emerged.¹⁴

It is worth noting that the U.S. government published over sixty bound volumes of trial records, evidence documents, and related materials in the years during and immediately following the trials; these are known as the Blue, Red, and Green series. Despite the large amount of shelf space these take up in academic libraries, they contain less than 10

⁶ Taylor, “Forum Juridicum.”

⁷ Kempner, “The Nuremberg Trials.”

⁸ Niebergall, “Brief Survey.”

⁹ Epstein, “Washington Research Opportunities.”

¹⁰ Mendelsohn, *Trial by Document*; Mendelsohn, *War Crimes Trials*.

¹¹ Robinson and Sachs, *The Holocaust*.

¹² *Catalogue of Nuremberg Documents*.

¹³ Taylor, “Use of Captured German and Related Records.”

¹⁴ An amusing exception to this was the flurry of news articles, mostly from 2013, on the controversy between the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and the heirs of Deputy Chief of Counsel Robert Kempner, who had shipped eight tons of documents from Nuremberg to his home in Pennsylvania in 1949. See Wittman and Kinney, *The Devil’s Diary*.

percent of the existing trial documents.¹⁵ An additional catalogue of Nuremberg-related materials is the useful *European War Crimes Trials: A Bibliography*, prepared by Inge Neumann and published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.¹⁶ This well-annotated list of books and articles is unfortunately limited by its temporal coverage (1941–50) and lack of later editions.

After all this time, some might argue that this lack of discourse on the trial documents and their fate no longer matters, especially as few of the record sets appear to have survived. Apart from holdings at NARA, significant sets of Nuremberg trial records can be found at only a handful of the listed schools and institutions.¹⁷ Given Telford Taylor’s statement that “the most immediate problem is that those records be disposed of in such a way that *they will be available to those who need them*,” one can only imagine his dismay at how far current reality diverges from this ideal.¹⁸ It therefore becomes a cause for celebration—for historians, educators, and anyone interested in the historical record—that the Harvard Law School Library has digitized its Nuremberg Trials Collection and is in the process of making all of it freely available to anyone with a computer and Internet access.

The Nuremberg Trials Project at Harvard Law School

Harvard is the only U.S. institution apart from the National Archives currently thought to have a nearly complete set of trial records; since 1949 Harvard Law School (HLS) has been the proud owner of approximately 1 million pages (between seven and twelve tons of paper). In the 1990s, HLS librarians realized that this enormous, aging collection would need significant attention to ensure its survival for use by future researchers.

Over the first fifty years of their existence, the trial records were stored haphazardly in unused stairwells, filing cabinets in damp cellars, and wherever space could be found. Some boxes sustained water damage as a result. Preservation of the collection became ever more urgent as the fragile condition of the paper necessitated restricting public local access at Harvard. Thus, digital preservation would instead enable digital access over the Web.

The HLS collection includes transcripts (over 150,000 pages) of the full course of courtroom activity during each of the trials; indictments, arraignments, opening and closing statements, trial briefs, all documents prepared as evidence by prosecution and

¹⁵ Kempner, “The Nuremberg Trials,” 449.

¹⁶ Neumann, *European War Crimes Trials*.

¹⁷ Apart from the Harvard collection, significant holdings exist at the Universities of North Dakota, Michigan, Washington, and Cincinnati; Columbia University; the Center for Research Libraries, Chicago; and the University of Southern California (which was not named in any source). The University of Georgia Law School has a smaller collection. See appendix A for a complete list. Many repositories have related collections donated later by trial participants: Cornell University’s Donovan Collection and the Robert Jackson Papers at the Library of Congress are only two examples. See appendix B for a list of these related collections.

¹⁸ Taylor, “Forum Juridicum,” 508, emphasis added.

defense attorneys (“case files”); plus the much larger set of source documents from which trial exhibits were selected—the so-called evidence files, which constitute a full 60 percent of the collection. The evidence files contain not only Nazi documents captured by Allied forces but also affidavits, interrogations, articles from newspapers, and excerpts from Nazi law journals. Nearly 16 percent of the entire collection consists of photostatic reproductions, and a full quarter of the collection is from trial 11, the “Ministries Trial.” Original documents, captured during or at the end of the war, were kept at Allied-controlled facilities across Germany; photostats made at these “document centers” were the closest thing to the originals the prosecutors had. Originals of postwar documents (interrogations and affidavits) were kept separately at Nuremberg, with photostats also provided for these.

By the end of the 1990s, HLS library staff realized that the time had come to impose access limitation on these original records; the half-century-old documents, printed on low-quality paper to begin with, were fast becoming too brittle to be handled. The staff decided to digitize 750,000 pages from the collection, an enormous undertaking that would end up taking far more time and resources than anticipated. (The remaining 250,000 pages were either duplicates or German transcripts and trial documents for which English translations existed.) As digitization progressed, the boxes holding original files and papers would be transferred to the Harvard Depository, a gargantuan, climate-controlled, high-density book and media storage facility located in a remote forest in Southborough, Massachusetts, thirty miles west of the Law School.

Ambitious Goals, Scarce Funding

The project began with digitization of documents from the first NMT trial, the “Medical Trial.” The Kenneth and Evelyn Lipper Foundation generously awarded \$100,000 to the HLS Library to get started. This donation, along with internal library funding and salaried staff support, underwrote this pilot phase of the project. By 2003, over twenty thousand pages had been scanned in, analyzed by the project historian, and uploaded to the Web, allowing the website to be launched that same year. By the time this pilot phase was completed, staff realized that getting the entire record of all thirteen trials online would cost several million dollars. Funding failed to keep up with expectations, however, and progress became intermittent. Then, in 2014–16, Harvard Library’s Open Your Hidden Collections project provided a welcome infusion of \$230,000, which enabled staff to complete the digitization phase of the project. Subsequent funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities has supported document analysis for the Einsatzgruppen Trial.

Digitization Process

The process of digitization has been a long and winding road, beginning in 1999 and only completed in 2016. Originally, staff used flatbed scanners and digital cameras, and progress was slow. In 2011, an outside vendor managed to scan nineteen thousand pages in five months. After the Open Your Hidden Collections funding arrived, the team took advantage of the high-speed, batch-loading ImageTrac scanner already on site (leased for

another project), and work sped up. Over a five-month period, the six-person team spent two thousand hours to bring the total number of scanned pages up to nearly 750,000.

Because of the age and condition of the documents, however, scanning proceeded at only one-fourth the rate possible with modern documents.¹⁹ For each hour of actual scanning, three to four hours of quality control and prep work were needed. This included removing fasteners and replacing old folders with bar-coded acid-free ones. (The original prep work of putting the files and documents into proper sequence took place in 1998–99 and is not counted in these figures.) Given the amount of prep work needed, and the slower scanning rate for old paper, the total cost came in at an acceptable \$0.22 per two-sided page.

The ImageTrac scanner performed well on old paper, but oversized and damaged documents had to be scanned separately by Harvard Library's Imaging Services group, and the 157,000 photostats required manual processing using a Zeutschel scanner. The main output of these digitization workflows was an archival master image: 300 dpi lossless 24-bit JPEG 2000. When the scanning had been completed (and much of the funding depleted), the much slower work of document analysis resumed.

The Collection Itself

Before the arrival of the Internet, a collection as large and unwieldy as the million-plus pages of Harvard's Nuremberg records presented library and archives staff with a daunting challenge: how to arrange these papers and make them fully accessible to users? The fact that so few of the U.S. repositories owning these records (other than NARA) appear to have created a finding aid in the fifty years since their original distribution speaks to this challenge.²⁰

Harvard Library staff decided early on that this challenge required a new tool, something far deeper and richer than a traditional, twentieth-century finding aid. The ambitious objective of full-text and document-level discovery mandated the use of a sophisticated database capable of holding all data fields relevant to future users. (The database supports the site's graphical user interface.) Initially launched in 2003, back in the days of Web 1.0, the site was completely redesigned and relaunched in 2016. The interface features

- for each trial:
 - a basic narrative
 - an indictment, with specific counts
 - list of trial issues (e.g., hostage taking, medical experiments)
 - a detailed chronology, with dates matched to transcript pages

¹⁹ Stephen Chapman, personal communication, 2017.

²⁰ NARA archivists compiled three finding aids between 1949 and 1966. The first one, Preliminary Inventory 21, was digitized by Google and put online by HathiTrust. Aside from the official, published records of the trials contained in the Blue, Red, and Green series, it remains the only known online guide to the Nuremberg records in English. The two later NARA finding aids are available only at NARA and at the Wisconsin Historical Society.

- lists of defendants, counsel for both sides, judges, witnesses
- explanatory material (charts, list of evidence file groups, etc.)
- a “Who Was Who” in Nazi Germany
- an explanation of how trial documents are organized, structured, and analyzed
- a choice of basic or advanced fielded search for documents (for NMT trials 1–4 and 7 so far) and document images
- keyword search for trial transcripts (for NMT trials 1–4 and 7 so far)
- a collection of two hundred digitized photographs related to the trials
- a history and description of the project, including funding timeline

As of this writing, the Nuremberg Trials Project website has 55,285 pages analyzed, uploaded, and ready for inspection. These include the trial-related “case files” for cases 1–4 and 7, plus “evidence files”—documents relevant to cases 1 and 2, and a partial set for case 4. These documents are interlinked and fully searchable at <http://nuremberg.law.harvard.edu>.

With this many documents (and many more to come), design of the search function is critical. Historians and researchers will appreciate the number of search options available. Within any given trial, one can filter results by date (a drop-down menu lists all dates that trial was in session), author, defendant, or trial issue. For example, for trial 1, the Medical Trial, clicking on “Karl Gebhardt,” one of the twenty-three defendants, returns sixty-nine results: sixty-eight individual documents and the transcript itself, where he is mentioned numerous times. Clicking on the title of any of the listed documents brings up an image of the paper document, with a magnification option. The results can be further sorted by date, relevance, or document length.

In this example, clicking on the first title in the list brings up an image of a 1946 affidavit by Oswald Pohl about medical experiments on concentration camp inmates. The document has an original Nuremberg evidence code of NO-65. The information panel to the right of the image provides links to the author and to the defendants mentioned. Clicking on the evidence code number, NO-65, brings one to a list of all forms of this document: a photostat of the German original, a German transcript of it, an English translation of it, and a “staff evidence analysis” focusing on its usefulness for the prosecution. All of these images can be downloaded as PDF files.

The “Advanced Search” option at the bottom of the home page enables users to focus their search requests. The page gives a high-level overview of all ten thousand individual items currently available on the website, and users can narrow a search by material type, date, trial, defendant, author (101 to date), language, source, or trial issue. It is perhaps this last choice that researchers will find most useful: eighty issues are listed so far, ranging from “hostage-taking and reprisal actions” to “sterilization experiments.” Trial issues are taken from a controlled list, as are names for case files.

The ability to search through this immense trove of records and quickly pull out all documents related to a specific issue, such as the “Night and Fog Decree,” is an example

of the power of digitization. Having the trial record online opens up research possibilities that did not previously exist or that would have taken a prohibitively long time to achieve. The website can instantly access eighty-six documents relevant to this issue; a search of the best alternative site (Library of Congress Military Legal Resources, with online versions of the many volumes of excerpts from the trial records) brings up nothing.

The success of the search function on the website stems directly from the painstaking work of the document analyst/historian. All of the 55,000-plus pages now available on the site have been analyzed by one person; he returned to the project in 2014 when funding once again became available after a gap of some twelve years.

It's All about the Metadata

From its inception in 1998 until today, the Nuremberg Trials Project has been driven by metadata—metadata at the item/document level, not at the series level. Collecting and recording this metadata takes time; an average-length document requires up to fifteen minutes of analysis. (Documents prepared but not used in the trials require less analysis and can be processed more quickly.) Twenty-one pieces of data are extracted by the historian and entered into the database that underlies the search function of the site.²¹ The most time-consuming of the analyst's tasks has been creating a keyword-rich descriptive title for each document, matching the relevant people or entities to controlled lists, and identifying where in the trial transcript the document is introduced. The metadata schema is loosely based on Dublin Core, according to interviews with librarians involved in the project in its early years.

The Larger Picture: A Landscape of Silos, Linked by Google

It has often been said that the more digital libraries one looks at, the more bewildering the landscape becomes. They are all so different in structure, selection of content, and ease of use (or lack thereof) that meaningful comparisons are hard to make. Only a handful of digital libraries cover ground at all similar to this project. The ones that stand out are Yale University's Avalon Project, the Library of Congress, the University of North Dakota, and NARA:

- The Avalon Project offers a complete online transcript of the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg (the first, most famous trial) but without actual page images, evidence files, or links to cited documents. (The transcript is a copy of that found in the Blue series.) Many ancillary documents, as well as key documents from trial 4, are also found on this site. There is no coverage of the other NMT trials.

²¹ Date, descriptive title, literal title, personal author, group author, trial name and number, transcript page, trial issue, defendant(s) concerned, language, source, box code, folder number, exhibit number, document book number, evidence file code letters and number, number of pages, notes, trial document category (evidence or case file), English versus German trial documents, country submitting evidence (for IMT).

- The Library of Congress site offers searchable PDF versions of the original Blue, Green, and Red series.
- The University of North Dakota has digitized 1,100 pages (of their 240,000-page collection) related to the German invasion and occupation of Norway, in a project funded by the Museum of the Norwegian Resistance in Oslo.
- NARA offers PDF finding aids describing the contents of hundreds of microfilm rolls of Nuremberg documents. Its website search engine also serves as a finding aid to the vast archives of original paper and microfilmed Nuremberg documents. A small number of items are available online, but in most cases, it is only by visiting Washington or by purchasing microfilm (in either original or digitized format) that a researcher can see the actual documents. There are, for example, 48 rolls just for trial 7, not one of the longer trials; the total cost to purchase digitized microfilm for this trial alone, at \$125/roll, would be \$6,000.

Other than the University of North Dakota, the repositories holding large collections of Nuremberg documents have apparently decided against digitization, perhaps out of awareness of the project at Harvard. In any event, there exists no digital collection to which the Nuremberg Project can be directly compared.

American archives hold many collections of personal papers of trial participants; twenty-six such collections (from twenty-three men—judges, prosecutors, and one psychiatrist) are listed in appendix B. Similar collections donated by German attorneys no doubt exist outside of the United States. All of these collections have an online presence, although in sixteen cases it consists of just a finding aid. Of the remaining ten collections with digitized material, half have a significant number of items. The ten repositories holding these manuscripts offer a widely varying selection of private notes, newspaper clippings, trial documents, photographs, and ephemera, searchable by title or description. Transcribed documents are searchable by content as well. In no case were criteria for selection explained.

The collection of Judge Paul Hebert's papers at Louisiana State University (LSU) is a typical example. Hosted on Digital Commons, the site is easy to navigate, and the selected material is presented in a visually attractive manner. One can search for terms in title, description, and transcribed content (if transcription has been done). However, only forty-seven documents are available for review; examining the rest of the collection requires a visit to Baton Rouge. Even finding out how extensive the Hebert Collection is (fifty linear feet) requires a detour via a search engine to the completely separate LSU library site. Here one finds the usual link to a PDF finding aid, where one can read about the 49.9 feet of not-yet-digitized material. This reviewer found no easy way to navigate between the Digital Commons Hebert Collection and the description of the larger collection at the library site, as neither has a direct link to the other.

At the other extreme is Harvard University's collection of Assistant Counsel Drexel Sprecher's papers. Although the collection contains over 22,000 pages, every single item has been digitized and is easily found on the well-organized website. Not only is the digitized material readily accessible; the links are embedded into the container list of the finding aid, thus making extra searching unnecessary. The collections of Thomas Dodd's papers at the University of Connecticut and the Donovan Collection at Cornell are also worthy of note, with over 1,500 digitized items apiece.

These digital libraries are hosted on widely varying platforms. Some are intuitive and easy to use, while others present more of a challenge. Examining these twenty-six collections, one is struck above all by the wide range of user interfaces. With the exception of those hosted on commercial platforms such as bepress, these sites show little similarity in terms of arrangement or navigation strategy.

In three of these cases, a donor's personal papers are split between two repositories. None of these six websites inform the user of this fact. Even the Robert Houghton Jackson Center, a standalone nonprofit organization and archive devoted to the life and work of the former Supreme Court justice, fails to mention that some of Jackson's papers are held at the Library of Congress. None of the repositories refer the reader to collections about Nuremberg personnel held elsewhere. (Each trial had multiple judges and prosecutors, so links to the relevant archives would be of great help to those researching any given trial.) The only way to get a complete picture of archival holdings related to Nuremberg is to use a search engine. And, of course, it is entirely possible that other collections of relevant personal papers exist in the United States with no online presence at all, not even a finding aid.

All of this leads one to wonder, would it not be useful for repositories to become more aware of outside resources that are related to their own holdings? Providing linkage to related collections would be a common courtesy to researchers, save everyone a lot of time, cost nothing, and reflect well on each participating archive. Perhaps it is high time we got out of our silos and started cooperating.

Lessons Learned from the Harvard Project

Creating a digital library is a long, iterative process; even with the best of funding and intentions, things rarely come together quickly. Given the usual interruptions in or scarcity of funding, putting together a digital library of any significance can take years, and the task often outlasts the careers of those with the original vision. Such has been the case with this project. Some institutional knowledge has been lost with the inevitable departure of early participants. The current project manager notes the following as among the lessons learned:

- The project historian is still entering metadata into the same standalone Access database originally set up twenty years ago, although the project now relies on distributed metadata-creation workflows. Implementing a web-based suite of metadata-creation tools backed by

an appropriate database will allow the project to become far more efficient and stable in this area.

- Until recently, funding efforts were intermittent, less focused and persistent than required. Understanding the funding landscape, identifying key institutional decision-makers, and coordinating with them have led to improved prospects for finding the resources to see the project through to completion.
- The first transcript was keyed in from a copy on microfilm (obtained from NARA), the work having been outsourced to an overseas firm; the results were not good enough to use without subsequent extensive editing.
- OCR technology and workflows to fully correct raw output have vastly improved since the project's early days, allowing close to 100-percent integrity in the rendering of transcript and document machine-readable text. The resulting full-text keyword-search capability adds enormous power to the suite of discovery options the project can offer to users of the website.
- The expert analysis necessary to create rich metadata for materials as varied as these trial documents is well worth the cost and effort. Relying exclusively on automation in this area would severely restrict the resulting points of access available to end users.
- Documentation of metadata workflows, website design, and website coding decisions is critically important for future staff who will need to build out the project's current contents and shape. It is important for those who come after us to be aware of why the project is structured as it is.

Other issues worth noting include the following:

- Content development has so far relied on a single person, due to funding restrictions. With full funding, having a team of historians, lawyers, and other subject experts working on document analysis will enhance the project on many levels and reduce the inevitable loss of institutional knowledge when the current person retires.
- Harvard has an excellent History Department. Faculty and graduate student involvement in the content end of this project could considerably enhance the knowledge base of the website, assist with usability issues, and possibly even provide some extra hands for document analysis.
- The project has relied on an internal controlled vocabulary created by one person. Ideally, it would have been optimal to use a recognized controlled vocabulary, such as the Library of Congress Name Authority File or the Virtual International Authority File. Linkage out to other collections in the future will require reconciling the existing vocabulary with one or more of these entities.

Impact Measures

When the project website was launched in 2003, news organizations in the United States and abroad covered the event. The project team gave interviews to reporters from the *Boston Globe* and to Boston and German TV news teams. Since that time, the site has steadily attracted several hundred visitors per day. A survey done recently for a grant application showed that several thousand websites (in over twenty languages) have linked to the Nuremberg Trials Project. According to Google Scholar, over a hundred scholarly articles and hundreds of books have cited the project website since its launch.

2020: An Anniversary

Aware of the impending seventy-fifth anniversary of the trials' commencement in the fall of 1945 and the opportunity to tie in completion of the project with international attention to the trials, project managers decided in 2016 to take a proactive approach: to analyze the work remaining to be done in such detail that a reasonably exact estimate could be made of the funds needed to wrap up the project. They created a manual describing the work involved in "unitization" (clustering digital page images into documents), "objective coding" (basic document identification), and "subjective coding" (detailed document analysis—the work the project historian has been doing intermittently since 1998), and gave it to two legal document-analysis firms to see if non-historians were able to adequately process and analyze the trial and source documents. The results were encouraging, and enough data was gathered to make a useful cost and time estimate for completion of the project. Outreach to likely funders is in process, and signs point to a successful outcome in the near future.

Project staff are optimistic about uploading all of the thirteen Nuremberg trials, with all of the relevant documents, in time for the seventy-fifth anniversary. But that is far from the end. If digitization is seen as an initial phase, document analysis and upload as a second phase, then a third phase—still on the drawing board—opens up exciting possibilities. This phase could include linkage from the website out to related collections around the world, as well as to entities such as DBpedia, "a crowd-sourced community effort to extract structured information from Wikipedia and make this information available on the Web."²² In addition, API delivery of document metadata (i.e., delivery to machines by means of an "application programming interface") is anticipated. With these features and others still under discussion (or awaiting discovery), it appears certain that the Nuremberg Trials Project will become the premier resource for research into this fascinating episode of twentieth-century history.

Appendix A. U.S. Recipients of Trial Records in 1949

Most academic libraries own the official published volumes of trial records, referred to as the Blue, Red, and Green series. The list here refers to the actual trial records only (bound

²² "Learn about DBpedia."

or unbound), and not to these published, multivolume series. Records are paper unless otherwise noted.

Center for Research Libraries, Chicago: extensive holdings (all 13 trials)

Columbia University: extensive holdings (all 13 trials)

Harvard Law School: 1 million pages of trial records (all 13 trials, partly digitized)

Hoover Institution/Stanford University: 75 linear feet, IMT only

National Archives and Records Administration: complete paper and microfilm record

University of Cincinnati: 50 volumes, IMT transcript plus index

University of Georgia Law School: several indictments, opening/closing statements, and judgments, plus dissenting opinions, motions, and transcripts of a few videos. Trial 11, the Ministries Trial, is exceptionally well documented (<http://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/nuremberg/>)

University of Michigan: 413 volumes covering trials 1–12 (and possibly IMT)

University of North Dakota: 240,000 pages total; 1,100 documents related to occupation of Norway digitized (<https://library.und.edu/digital/nuremberg-transcripts/>)

University of Southern California: 300 boxes of transcripts of all 13 trials (this repository was not mentioned in *any* contemporaneous source as a recipient)

University of Washington School of Law: 1,236 bound volumes (all 13 trials)

Correspondence at the end of 2017 with the following “named recipients” revealed no significant collections of trial documents. Institutions marked ** have related collections of personal papers of trial participants—see appendix B.

Cornell University**

Duke University

Georgetown University**

New York Public Library

Northwestern University

Princeton University

U.S. Military Academy at West Point

University of Arkansas

University of California, Berkeley

University of Chicago

University of Nebraska

University of Texas**

University of Wisconsin

Appendix B. Principal U.S. Collections of Personal Papers Related to the Trials

Nürnberg Krupp Trial Papers of Hu C. Anderson, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.: <https://krupp.library.vanderbilt.edu>

Walter Beals Papers, University of Washington, Seattle: <http://archiveswest.orbiscascade.org/ark:/80444/xv47470>

Francis Biddle Collection, University of Syracuse, Syracuse, N.Y.: https://library.syr.edu/digital/guides/b/biddle_f.htm

Francis Biddle Papers, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.: <https://repository.library.georgetown.edu/handle/10822/559026>

Judge Mallory Blair Collection, Guide to Trial Notebooks from Nuremberg Justice Case, University of Texas, Austin: <https://legacy.lib.utexas.edu/taro/utlaw/00022/law-00022.html>

Edward F. Carter Papers, Nebraska Historical Society, Lincoln: <https://history.nebraska.gov/collections/edward-francis-carter-1897-1981-rg4231am>

William Christianson Papers, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, D.C.: <https://collections.ushmm.org/search/catalog/irn502047>

Richard Dillard Dixon Papers, East Carolina University, Greenville, N.C.: <https://digital.lib.ecu.edu/special/ead/findingaids/0601/>

Richard Dillard Dixon Papers, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: <http://finding-aids.lib.unc.edu/03567/>

Thomas Dodd Papers, University of Connecticut, Storrs: <http://archives.lib.uconn.edu/islandora/object/20002%3A20>

Donovan Nuremberg Trials Collection, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.: <https://newcatalog.library.cornell.edu/catalog/8924801>

Benjamin Ferencz Papers, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, D.C.: <https://collections.ushmm.org/search/catalog/irn508277>

Paul H Gantt Nuremberg Trial Papers, Towson University, Towson, Md.: <http://library.towson.edu/digital/collection/gantt>

Winfield B. Hale Papers, University of Tennessee, Knoxville:
http://dlc.lib.utk.edu/spc/view?docId=ead/0012_002411_000000_0000/0012_002411_000000_0000.xml

Hebert Nuremberg Collection, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge:
<https://digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/nuremberg/>

Robert H. Jackson Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.:
<https://www.loc.gov/item/mm83061408/>

Robert H. Jackson Papers, Robert H. Jackson Center Archive, Jamestown, N.Y.:
<https://www.roberthjackson.org/archive/>

Douglas McGlashan Kelley Papers, University of California, Santa Cruz:
http://www.oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/kt5d5nc7tj/entire_text/

Robert Kempner Papers, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, D.C.:
<https://collections.ushmm.org/search/catalog/irn502566>

Michael A. Musmanno Papers, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh:
<http://guides.library.duq.edu/musmanno-nuremberg>

John Johnston Parker Papers, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: <http://finding-aids.lib.unc.edu/03566/>

Harold Sebring Papers, Stetson University, DeLand, Fla.:
<http://digital.archives.stetson.edu/cdm/landingpage/collection/LawSebring>

Drexel Sprecher Collection, John F. Kennedy Presidential Library, Boston:
<https://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/DASPP.aspx>

Sprecher Collection, Harvard Law School Library, Cambridge, Mass.:
<http://oasis.lib.harvard.edu/oasis/deliver/~law00216>

Telford Taylor Papers, Columbia University, New York:
http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/archival/collections/ldpd_10199444/

Charles Wennerstrum Papers, Drake University Law School, Des Moines, Iowa:
<http://www.drake.edu/law/library/collections/special-collections/>

John C. Young Papers, Truman Library, Independence, Mo. (in which case 12, the “High Command Trial,” is particularly well documented):
<https://www.trumanlibrary.org/hstpaper/youngjc.htm>

Bibliography

Catalogue of Nuremberg Documents. London, Wiener Library, 1961. Mimeographed list of their holdings, organized into prosecution documents, defense documents, and a sixty-page list of testimonies with relevant trial transcript pages noted.

Epstein, Fritz. "Washington Research Opportunities in the Period of World War II." *American Archivist* 17, no. 3 (1954): 225–36.

"HLS Launches Nuremberg Trials Project." *Harvard Law Today*, July 31, 2003. <https://today.law.harvard.edu/hls-launches-nuremberg-trials-project/>.

Kempner, Robert. "The Nuremberg Trials as Sources of Recent German Political and Historical Materials." *American Political Science Review* 44, no. 2 (1950): 447–59.

Kimmich, Christoph M. *German Foreign Policy, 1918–1945: A Guide to Current Research and Resources*. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2013. A comprehensive guide to archival resources as well as a substantial annotated bibliography of published sources relating to Nazi Germany (including the Nuremberg trials).

"Learn about DBpedia." 2017. <https://wiki.dbpedia.org/learn-about-dbpedia>.

Mendelsohn, John. *Nuernberg War Crimes Trials: Records of Case II, United States of America v. Erhard Milch*. Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1975.

———. *Trial by Document: The Use of Seized Records in the U.S. Proceedings at Nuernberg*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1975. Considered to be an essential reference for anyone dealing with the documentary record of Nuremberg.

———. *War Crimes Trials: Records of Case 9*. Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1978.

Neumann, Inge. *European War Crimes Trials: A Bibliography*. New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1951. Intended for scholarly use in the field of international law, this detailed bibliography includes publications in several languages between 1941 and 1950. Roughly two-thirds of the citations are annotated.

Niebergall, Fred. "Brief Survey Concerning the Records of the War Crime Trials Held in Nurnberg, Germany." *Law Library Journal* 42 (1949): 87–90.

Public Information Office, Office of Military Government for Germany (U.S.). "Collection Donation" (press release). 1949. <http://libguides.law.uga.edu/phillips>.

Robinson, Jacob, and Henry Sachs. *The Holocaust: The Nuremberg Evidence, Part One*. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1976. An extremely useful, exhaustive compendium of evidence relating to the Holocaust: 3,001 documents are described, and each listing notes

whether the document has appeared in other publications. Names, places, subjects, institutions, and areas are indexed.

Salter, Michael. "Countering Holocaust Denial in Relation to the Nuremberg Trials." In *Holocaust and Genocide Denial: A Contextual Perspective*, edited by Paul Behrens, Nicholas Terry, and Olaf Jensen, 21–33. New York: Routledge, 2017.

Taylor, Telford. *Final Report to the Secretary of the Army on the Nuernberg War Crimes Trials under Control Council Law No. 10*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1949. https://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/pdf/NT_final-report.pdf.

———. "Forum Juridicum: An Outline of the Research and Publication Possibilities of the War Crimes Trials." *Louisiana Law Review* 9, no. 4 (1949): 496–508. <http://digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/lalrev/vol9/iss4/4>.

———. "The Use of Captured German and Related Records in the Nuernberg War Crimes Trials." In *Captured German and Related Records, a National Archives Conference*, edited by Robert Wolfe, 92–100. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1974. This volume is the classic work on the larger topic of captured German records in the United States.

Wittman, Robert, and David Kinney. *The Devil's Diary: Alfred Rosenberg and the Stolen Secrets of the Third Reich*. New York: Harper, 2016.

Wright, Quincy. "Nuremberg: German Views of the War Trials (Review)." *Harvard Law Review* 69, no. 5 (1956): 964–72. doi: 10.2307/1337586.