

Wendy Z. Goldman. *Inventing the Enemy: Denunciation and Terror in Stalin's Russia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. x, 320 pp. \$29.99 (paper). ISBN-13: 978-0-52114-562-6.

Having in earlier books examined Soviet policies toward women and the role of women in Soviet industry, Wendy Goldman has turned recently toward exploring the social dynamics of Stalinist terror in five Moscow factories, beginning with her 2007 book *Terror and Democracy in the Age of Stalin: The Social Dynamics of Repression* (Cambridge University Press). While that book investigated workers' motivations for facilitating the unfolding of repression in the factories (not least among them the desire to draw higher-ups' attention to poor working conditions), *Inventing the Enemy* completes the picture by developing the stories of individuals who faced the dilemma of whether to denounce others for political crimes and who struggled to avoid being denounced for connections to victims during the years from 1934 to 1939.

For both books on the terror, Goldman conducted research in the Central Archive of Social Political History of Moscow, mining stenographic reports of party meetings at Moscow factories representing both heavy and light industry: *Dinamo*, *Serp i Molot*, *Trekhgornaia Manufaktura*, *Krasnyi Proletarii*, and *Likerno-Vodochnyi Zavod*. Other sources include factory newspapers and information collected by the human rights society Memorial. Goldman weaves compelling personal stories from the archival records, recasting the stenographic reports into dramatic emotional struggles between individuals. Each chapter begins with an anecdote dressed in rich contextual detail that conveys a mood.

A twenty-two page introduction does a fine job of summarizing historians' explanations of Stalinist terror from the first works to appear through the most recent ones. Goldman advances the debate that some had thought settled by Igal Halfin and Jochen Hellbeck, with their attention to discourse as driving force in the terror and to individuals' attempts to refashion their self-perceptions (or "souls") to accord with officially promoted ideals. Acknowledging (à la Halfin) that a single official party discourse prevailed by 1937, Goldman nevertheless finds that the stenographic reports of factory party cell meetings yield "multiple perspectives uninflected by a single subjectivity" (p. 4). This multiplicity of voices contrasts to the voice of the single author in the diaries upon which Hellbeck relied.<sup>1</sup>

Fully aware that the terror could neither have begun nor ended without the initiative of Stalin and other top party leaders, Goldman devotes her first

---

1. Among Halfin's works are *Stalinist Confessions: Messianism and Terror at the Leningrad Communist University* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 2009), and *Intimate Enemies: Demonomizing the Bolshevik Opposition, 1918-1928* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 2007). Hellbeck's argument unfolds in *Revolution on My Mind: Writing a Diary under Stalin* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 2006).

chapter, "The Terror: A Short Political Primer," to clearly explaining the major political decisions and turning points during the terror, as well as the course that terror took in factory party cells. She pays close attention both to initiative from above and the directions in which participation from below took terror. Each subsequent chapter finds individuals struggling to ensure their own survival in a "whirlwind" (Evgenia Ginzburg) of events nearly impossible to understand.

Chapter 2, "Comrades and Coworkers," dwells on events in the *Dinamo* factory, noted for having "produced the first electric trolley bus" (p. 87) and "assembled the metro's first passenger locomotive" (p. 88), a workplace that had seen workers promoted from the factory floor to management and that had been riddled with networks of oppositionists in the 1920s. Attempts to bypass the terror by means of delays and silence became futile, as these tactics were labeled as those of enemies. Goldman finds that individuals' strategies of self-defense during the terror contributed to its spread: "Like drowning people, they tried to save themselves by struggling atop the bodies of their comrades and frantically pushing them underwater" (p. 125).

Goldman turns her attention to *Trekhgornaiia Manufaktura* in chapter three, "Family Secrets." Here she finds that social origins were still an important concern in factory party meetings devoted to questioning accused "enemies" and by no means had been replaced by the communist soul-searching that Hellbeck and Halfin have emphasized as the exclusive means for verifying party members during the terror. By choosing the family as the category of analysis in this chapter, Goldman reveals the critical kinship networks that linked victims targeted under the seemingly unrelated categories of kulaks, former oppositionists, former priests or nobles, and suspect national minorities. Echoing her concern with gender in previous books, she finds that women behaved similarly to men during the terror. People reacted in a variety of ways, some renouncing "enemy" relatives, others defending them, still others pretending to distance themselves from family but continuing to assist them secretly. Moreover, "the same person might act very differently in different situations . . . . No one's actions were either wholly selfless or entirely self-interested" (pp. 194-195). Finally, she allows that individuals often may have been unaware themselves of their motives.

Chapter 4, "Love, Loyalty, and Betrayal" revolves around a triangle of friends and coworkers at *Serp i Molot* factory: a female party member tormented by her brother's arrest, a Polish woman (the first woman's friend) targeted by the NKVD because of her nationality and her former friend's denunciation, and finally a party committee head, a hereditary proletarian, whom the second woman loved. The mentality of the "true believer" struggling to reconcile party loyalty with love for her arrested brother is dissected, as well as the resentment she feels toward the woman in love, who casually regards victims of the terror, until she becomes one herself. Goldman teases much meaning from the words of all three, while recognizing that some mys-

teries behind their statements and behavior cannot be solved. Here also the topic of party elections intersects with the personal fates of the three.

In the study's fifth and final chapter, "The Final Paroxysm," Goldman demonstrates how the terror spread outside the party and ultimately became unsustainable; it had become clear that everyone was a potential enemy and if so, who could truly be an enemy? The terror had led to a breakdown in production in the factories, a worrisome and threatening economic development. Fear and constant meetings had undermined work discipline. In addition, party leaders came to "understand that the terror was destroying the Party." Members were afraid to nominate new candidates for membership, because of the risk that they could be arrested and drag down their sponsors with them. Finally, party leaders halted the terror, blaming mistakes on "slanders" (p. 290).

In her conclusion, titled "A History without Heroes," Goldman emphasizes that "agents" of terror and "victims" were often one and the same (p. 298). Reiterating the major findings of each preceding chapter, she notes, "The record reveals no grand gestures of personal sacrifice, no attempts to organize a collective response to the prevailing political culture" (p. 304). Agreeing with David Shearer that the terror at its height shows that party leaders feared both oppositionists and discontented social groups and especially that they would join forces at a time when the regime might be vulnerable (as in war), she challenges Paul Hagenloh's assertion that the mass operations overshadowed and were separate from political terror.<sup>2</sup>

As Goldman emphasizes, her studies have laid to rest Robert Thurston's argument that terror did not affect ordinary workers in factories.<sup>3</sup> Despite Goldman's belief that her conclusions about Moscow factories can be generalized to factories across the Soviet Union (she provides a few examples from Kiev and Rostov), this book about five factories in Moscow, the political center of the country, in this reviewer's opinion cannot represent the full range of workers' experiences during the terror. For example, in his memoir of the 1930s, Gennady Andreev-Khomiakov recalled that terror did not touch the remote corner of the forestry industry where he worked, for which he gave credit to the factory boss. (Another reason may have been that there were very few communists employed in his factory.)<sup>4</sup> Still more studies of work environments during the terror may provide information about different repertoires of responses from those employed in Moscow. As Goldman admits, there are still baffling silences and gaps, due to the unavailability of im-

---

2. David Shearer, *Policing Stalin's Socialism: Repression and Social Order in the Soviet Union, 1924-1953* (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 2009); Paul Hagenloh, *Stalin's Police: Public Order and Mass Repression in the USSR, 1926-1941* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2009).

3. Robert W. Thurston, *Life and Terror in Stalin's Russia, 1934-1941* (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 1996).

4. Gennady Andreev-Khomiakov, *Bitter Waters: Life and Work in Stalin's Russia* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1997).

portant NKVD records, which if accessible could allow historians to trace more closely the interaction between secret police organs, party committees, and newspapers. The stenographic reports, especially as she uses them, are valuable sources, but they obscure what was whispered in hallways and conveyed by body language on the factory floor, in the cafeterias and dormitories, and on the streets; such interactions are only obliquely conveyed through NKVD informational reports on which Sarah Davies and other historians have relied.<sup>5</sup>

The book has an index and footnotes, but no bibliography or pictures (relevant photographs are reproduced in the earlier *Terror and Democracy*). Given the extensive contextualization and clear explication of major historiographical arguments, the book is essential reading for graduate students of Russian and Soviet history. Due to the compelling biographical narratives running through the book, with accompanying threads of love, passion, and jealousy, I would recommend *Inventing the Enemy* over *Terror and Democracy* for use in undergraduate classes.

Barbara C. Allen

La Salle University

allenb@lasalle.edu

---

5. Sarah R. Davies, *Popular Opinion in Stalin's Russia: Terror, Propaganda and Dissent, 1934-1941* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997).