

unterschied sich die 1906 gegründete Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei Poale-Zion nicht in ihrer theoretischen Grundlage, denn auch sie war marxistisch, wohl aber in ihrer zionistischen Zielsetzung. An den jüdischen Mittelstand wandte sich die kleine, aber einflußreiche »Folkspartei«, die weder sozialistisch noch zionistisch war. Vor allem die Schriften Kautskys und Bauers wurden in diesen Parteien eifrig gelesen und heiß diskutiert. Jede Partei versuchte, am Ansehen dieser marxistischen Theoretiker teilzuhaben, wenn das bei ihren Zielgruppen gut ankam; sie waren aber auch gewillt, sie zu kritisieren, wenn sie es für nötig hielten, wie ihr vielschichtiges Verhältnis zum Marxismus von Jacobs charakterisiert wird.

Dieses neue Buch zu einer Frage, die so alt ist wie die moderne Arbeiterbewegung, ändert zwar unsere Kenntnis der Antworten und die Beurteilung dieser Antworten nicht grundlegend, es erweitert jedoch unseren Blick für die Komplexität der Probleme und führt dazu, manche Meinungen über die Haltung sozialistischer Politiker und Theoretiker revidieren zu müssen, denn der Verfasser hat eine Fülle bisher kaum oder gar nicht berücksichtigten Materials herangezogen.

*Susanne Miller, Bonn*

Ludger Heid/Arnold Paucker (Hrsg.), Juden und deutsche Arbeiterbewegung bis 1933. Soziale Utopien und religiös-kulturelle Traditionen, J. C. B. Mohr Verlag, Tübingen 1992, 245 S., Ln., 108 DM.

Heid and Paucker's anthology is based primarily on papers delivered at an academic conference which was cosponsored by the Salomon Ludwig Steinheim Institut für deutsch-jüdische Geschichte and the Leo Baeck Institute and which was held in Mülheim in 1990. As such, it ought to be seen first and foremost as part of the dialogue on Jews and the German workers movement among German, Israeli and other interested scholars which has been taking place over a period of decades. Four of the contributors to the present volume – Walter Grab, Shlomo Na'aman, Susanne Miller, and Jacob Toury – also took part in a similar conference held in Tel Aviv in 1976, and thus may be characterized as long-term participants in this dialogue. Other scholars represented in the new anthology, including Arno Herzig and Robert Wistrich, have written on relevant themes over a period of years.

A handful of the articles in the work edited by Heid and Paucker stand out as particularly notable. Na'aman, for example, distinguishes effectively between rishes (traditional Judeophobia or antipathy of Jews) and anti-Semitism (a modern phenomenon which did not crystallize as a political ideology until after Jewish emancipation had already taken place, and which was intended to undo or roll back this emancipation) and uses this distinction as a way of explaining the attitudes of certain German working class movements and leaders. He points out, for example, that Wilhelm Hasenclever – a particularly popular leader of German workers in the 1870s and 1880s – displayed rishes in a revealing pamphlet published in 1881, but that Hasenclever opposed anti-Semitism in that same pamphlet. Though Na'aman's overarching thesis and explanation of Hasenclever are reliable and enlightening, the same cannot be said of certain other assertions made in Na'aman's piece. Na'aman's statement that Leo Jogiches was probably the author of the famous pamphlet *Four Speeches by Jewish Workers*, for example, is outmoded, and ignores compelling evidence which indicates that the introduction to this pamphlet was actually written by Boris Krichewsky. Similarly, Na'aman's one sentence summary of Bundist history – which suggests that the Bund lost all influence on developments during the period of the Revolution of 1917 and that it »dissolved into Communist assimilation« (S. 57) – ignores the split which occurred within the Bund in 1920, and the accomplishments of the Bund in inter-War Po-

land. Na'aman's assessment of Karl Kautsky's article on the massacre in Kishinev and the Jewish question – which Na'aman characterizes as being »as suitable for the shock of Kishinev as coughdrops for cholera« (S. 55) – strikes me as grotesquely unfair to a writer who not only displayed neither rishes nor sympathy for anti-Semitism but who was markedly sympathetic to the plight of European Jewry.

Mario Kessler – a younger German scholar sympathetic to the left but critical of both German Social Democrats (SPD) and German Communists (KPD) – has contributed a solid piece on socialism and Zionism in Germany from 1897 to 1933. This well-researched article makes good use not only of published materials in German, French, English and Russian, but also of hitherto unknown archival materials located in Poland and elsewhere. Kessler concludes – correctly – that while the SPD accorded greater significance to Nazi hatred of the Jews than did the KPD, the Social Democrats failed to recognize the full extent of this hatred. I have two comments, however, relevant to Kessler's discussion of the KPD. Kessler points out that there were a relatively large number of Jewish intellectuals in the leadership of the KPD in the formative years of that party. Shouldn't it be added that a series of purges and splits ultimately resulted in there being virtually no such individuals still prominent in the top ranks of the KPD by the end of the Weimar era? Similarly, Kessler sharply criticizes the stance taken by the KPD in 1929 in response to the Hebron pogrom. He does not indicate, however, that this stance paralleled that of Communists elsewhere – i.e. the Jewish Communists affiliated with the *Morgn Freiheit*, a Yiddish-language newspaper which was published in New York. The positions of the KPD in 1929 not only on Zionism but also on all other of political questions must be understood in light of that party's relationship to the Communist International, not primarily in relationship to German conditions.

Christl Wickert and Klaus-Dieter Vinschen both wrote on women of Jewish origin who had been active on the German left and who were forced into exile by the rise of the Nazis. They both point out that the Jewish family background of the women about whom they wrote was not important to the self-identity of these women during the Weimar years. Neither Wickert nor Vinschen, however, discuss the impact – if any – which contact with the Jewish socialist and labor movements had on women like Hedwig Wachenheim and Rosi Wolfstein-Frölich after they arrived in New York. Wachenheim was intimately involved in the rescue effort spearheaded by the Jewish Labor Committee (JLC) which ultimately saved the lives of a significant number of German leftists – including Rosi Frölich. Wachenheim and Frölich, moreover, were all but certainly aware of the political activities involving both the JLC and German socialist exiles during and after World War II. Are there no hints at all in the papers of either of these two women as to the significance of these brushes with the Jewish left?

As these questions – and the interesting new source material uncovered by Jacob Toury – suggest, the topic of Jews and the German labor movement has still not been exhausted. Heid and Paucker make a point of mentioning that an additional volume focused on Jews and the labor movement in the Weimar Republic and on the positions on relevant issues taken by the illegal socialist and communist movements which operated during the Nazi era would be desirable. I agree wholeheartedly.

*Jack Jacobs, New York*