

In his effort to find logic and structure within this peasant community, however, Hoffmann runs the risk of treating “peasants” as too monolithic a category and of essentializing “peasant” behavior. He emphasizes the subaltern status of peasants, and is very sensitive to these subalterns’ “weapons of the weak” and “everyday resistance”. But urban wage earners were also subaltern, and it is often not clear in Hoffmann’s discussions which behaviors are attributable to peasants’ subaltern status (and thus might be shared in common with urban workers), and which due to peasant material culture, modes of life, to the “essential” peasantness that they brought with them to the cities. Occasionally, Hoffmann contradicts himself: at one point, “peasants” embrace piece rates to maximize their individual earnings (p. 109), at another, “peasants” support collective earnings and level pay scales (p. 112). Some of the behaviors that Hoffmann labels as “peasant” are just as commonly found among urban workers (and were frequently denounced by Soviet officials during the 1920s, before the presumed influx of peasants who diluted urban working-class culture): a task orientation is found among urban artisans as well as among peasants (p. 107); urban workers also drank excessively (p. 154), they preferred fiction to non-fiction (p. 167), they observed religion (p. 170), and they resisted Soviet work discipline and rules (p. 219). A love of nature and even a nostalgia for wood sprites is not the sole preserve of peasants, as the fiction of Vladimir Nabokov shows us.

Soviet officials and Soviet sources were quick to label any behaviors they disapproved of as “alien”, whether peasant, Trotskyists, or petty-bourgeois. It is important for the historian to resist taking these labels at face value. This, of course, makes the identification of specific strands of values and cultures within a larger whole very complicated. When Hoffmann shows that workers found jobs through and received training from fellow villagers, here is a concrete example of the role of peasant networks, but other attempts to find a peasant logic in migrants’ behavior seem forced. And as Hoffmann also acknowledges but does not incorporate into his analytical framework, the very instant that the peasant migrant entered the urban world or world of work, he or she began to change: the peasant ditties took on urban themes, they learned from their urban co-workers how to bend work rules to suit their own sense of work rhythm, their worlds expanded beyond the confines of their particular village as they began to stroll in large groups in the parks on the outskirts of Moscow and, presumably, as they began to marry outside their villages, their districts and their provinces.

Hoffmann has done an admirable job in incorporating ideas of social identity, of the subaltern, of everyday resistance into the discussion of industrialization, urbanization, and the formation of the Soviet labor force. But perhaps it is time to move beyond the rigid confines of a strict urban-rural dichotomy that still undergirds his approach to the development of Soviet Moscow.

Diane Koenker

Der Parteivorstand der SPD im Exil. Protokolle der Sopade 1933–1940.
Hrsg. und bearb. von Marlis Buchholz [und] Bernd Rother. Projektleitung: Herbert Obenaus [und] Hans-Dieter Schmid [Archiv für Sozialge-

schichte, Beiheft 15]. J.H.W. Dietz Nachfolger, Bonn 1995. lxxi, 573 pp. DM 98.00; S.fr. 99.00; S 1165.00.

In 1988, the Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus (ILM) in Berlin (GDR), which became the Stiftung Archiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen der DDR im Bundesarchiv (SAPMO) following the German reunification, approved the request by the project managers to publish the 116 minutes of the meetings held by the Social-Democratic Party executive committee in exile – called Sopade – in Prague and, from the Spring of 1938 onward, in Paris. The minutes, which begin with the meeting on 14 June 1933 and conclude on 18 August 1939, passed so to speak without a break from the possession of the Reich Security Headquarters in Berlin (where they had been transferred to following their discovery in a bank safe in Paris during the Nazi occupation) into the hands of the other adversary of the SPD, namely the KPD and subsequently the SED (Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands). This party incorporated them into the Zentrales Parteiarchiv (ZPA) and denied Western scholars and usually the national historians, too, any access to them for decades. Only in the second half of the 1980s did the Archiv der Sozialen Demokratie at the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Bonn receive a copy. In 1991, after legal issues had been resolved and funding by the Volkswagen-Stiftung had been secured the two editors started on the publication project. Thus read the highlights in the short preface by the project managers.

In the period of barely four years that preceded the book's publication, Buchholz and Rother accomplished a considerable task. Unfortunately, they rushed the completion in their justified effort to present the edition to Fritz Heine, a former member of the Sopade and the only one still alive, on his ninetieth birthday on 6 December 1994. In fact, the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung has dedicated the volume to Heine who after the war served on the board of the SPD and appears here in photograph. The time constraints led to a few mistakes, of which the error on the inner title page is probably the most embarrassing and perhaps the most disastrous for library indexes (at least for the institutions having taken early delivery): project manager Obenaus appears as Obenhaus. Meanwhile, the copies that remain to be despatched contain a card listing this error and three missing page numbers. However, some additional corrections have to be made: "volkssozialistische(n) Regierung" in Note 30 on p. 139 and in the register should read "Volkssozialistische(n) Bewegung" (the movement was founded in Prague on 5 February 1936, by Hans Jaeger, who had resigned from the KPD in 1934, by Arthur Arzt, who had quit the Sopade's illegal border courier operation – this appears repeatedly through the book – and by Fritz Max Cahen, a liberal journalist). In addition, the bibliography on p. 537 and Note 19 around p. xvii reverse the title of a publication by this reviewer. The correct title is: "'Es gilt die Menschen zu verändern. . .' Zur Politik des Sozialdemokraten Paul Hertz im Exil".

The 116 minutes have been supplemented by five from other archives than the IML and, above all – in chronological sequence – by letters, notes, circulars and the like, which either contain details omitted from the minutes or information about other executive committee meetings and discussions – some in still closer or even broader circles – for which minutes were either never kept or were lost (which probably only happened in a few isolated cases). The final document in

this series concerns a meeting held on 12 March 1940. Thirty appended documents relate to discussions with border secretaries, representatives of other parties, and of the Labour and Socialist International. The tradition of all documents is comprehensively listed on pp. I–lx. The annotations of the various documents contain capsule biographies and mention specific events and facts as well as secondary publications. Contradictions and highly diverse interpretations in topical literature are indicated, albeit usually without evaluations. Above all, this is true for the introduction (pp. xiii–xl), and especially its first section entitled “Geschichte der Sopade 1933–1940 im Überblick” (survey of the history of the Sopade 1933–1940, up to p. xxvi). Explanations of changes concerning the “Zusammensetzung des Exil-Parteivorstandes” (the make-up of the party executive committee in exile) and “Aspekte der Organisationsentwicklung der Sopade” (aspects of the organizational development of the Sopade) – from the party’s financial affairs, through the apparatus in Prague and Paris, the border operations into the National-Socialist Reich, to the periodicals published – follow as the second and third sections. Next, the fourth section of the introduction addresses the issue concerning the authorship of the minutes and provides examples from the executive committee meetings to convey the most important topics and debates at certain times. Contemporaries certainly did not view all aspects of these issues, nevertheless the editors’ perspective covers the themes which for ideological reasons have been discussed most controversially by historical research. The insistence by the majority of the Sopade on its “trusteeship” for the entire party engendered political and personal conflicts not only between the members of the executive committee in exile but also with (illegal) officials and supporters within the Reich, and dissident groups in exile. The description of the “perspectives of social democracy after the National Socialists’ seizure of power” has been limited to the conflict of the Sopade with the two executive committee members Siegfried Aufhäuser and Karl Böchel over the party’s organization, name, and programme in 1934/1935. (Incidentally, the term “seizure of power” is appropriate in this context as, contrary to widespread notion, the seizure of power actually started with the Enabling Act of 24 March 1933 – to which the SPD faction manifested the sole opposition of all still legal parties in the Reichstag – and not on 30 January 1933 when Hitler was made Chancellor of the Reich.) As to the “relations to the KPD”, which derived from the conflicts during the Weimar Republic and reflected the attitude toward United Front and Popular Front attempts, the editors roughly outline five phases. I disagree with the classification of my previous research findings among the works of historians (more or less) stalwart to Marxism-Leninism (p. xlvi and especially Note 223): the editors and the readers should carefully consider and perhaps reconsider my essay “Es gilt, die Menschen zu verändern. . .” (see above, quoted here as “Politik”). Neither there nor in my other publications did I say that Paul Hertz advocated discussions and possible cooperation with the Communists for any reason other than tactical concerns; like Friedrich Stampfer, he favoured reinforcement of the SPD as an organization and a source of ideological direction in the struggle against National Socialism and for a new Germany, although they differed on the question of whether or not the party and especially its executive committee in exile should achieve a programmatical renewal and rejuvenation of the staff adjusted to reflect the historical experiences and current political situation. Regarding the sale of the SPD archive, Hertz (otherwise

known for being very economical) was the only outspoken opponent – aside from Otto Wels, the chairman of the Sopade – to dealing with “Moscow”; Stampfer supported this move on opportunistic financial grounds.

The editors repeatedly appear to have tried to distribute “equitably” the references in the annotations to “Western” and “Eastern” historians; they may base their quotations more on the title than on the content of some literature. For example, in connection with the protest against the execution of the Communist Rudolf Claus in Berlin in December 1935 – a protest that can hardly be overestimated as far as the rapprochement between German social democrats and communists in Paris and the efforts in organizing a Popular Front to struggle against National Socialism are concerned – only a brief passage from a book originating in the GDR, whose author refers to “Western” literature only for critics against Social Democracy, is mentioned. The protest in the case of Claus, however, has been the subject of detailed commentary and even documentation in this reviewer’s book *Volksfront für Deutschland? Bd. 1* (pp. 142–144 and pp. 207–209), which is quoted quite extensively in other respects.

This publication of Buchholz and Rother which finishes with indexes of persons, subjects and places will surely enable modifications and in quite a number of cases even reassessments of previous historiography. The details, however, have to be confronted with other sources, as the editors themselves reveal in their annotations. My minor points of criticism – different reviewers may note other items – in no way diminish my sincere congratulation to Buchholz and Rother for their excellent work overall and to the project managers for their initiative.

Ursula Langkau-Alex