

the interesting observations in this study. Readers are encouraged to read this work on their own.

Much as I like this volume, I must point out one problematic feature. Quotes from literary works, especially poetic ones, are given in English translation, followed by transliteration. Why? Having the original can indeed prove useful, and many who can read transliterated Ukrainian or Russian can also read the original.

NATALIE KONONENKO
University of Alberta

Réinventer le monde- L'espace et le temps en Tchécoslovaquie communiste. By Roman Krakovsky. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2014. 326 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. Tables. €28.00, paper.

After the Second World War, the Soviet Union extended its influence to central Europe. The redefinition systems of symbolic meaning and their evolution from 1945 until 1968 is the subject of this book. It contains five chapters concerning topics of everyday life. The author sometimes goes too far, virtually eliminating state repression in his explanation of social and cultural developments.

The book begins with the implementation of the planned economy. It focuses on the planning involved and its difficulties, entering a kind of dissonance with the announced conceptual and economic framework of the time. The author makes parallels with public and symbolic policies implemented in the entire Soviet space. He confronts an international project with local, concrete problems. It is regrettable that he does not put forward more local specificities. The Czech lands were among the most industrialized in the world, while Slovakia was more rural: Czechoslovakia as a whole was in a much different situation than other countries.

In Chapter 2, the author posits that the aim of the new regime was to erase the religious character of Sunday. Large parts of this chapter recall the conflict between the regime and the Catholic Church, which, seen as having been a detrimental to the Czech national movement in the 19th century, has a different status than in Slovakia, Hungary, or Poland. I would have enjoyed seeing more of this theme included in the research, focusing mainly on the Slovak case. The author shows how local authorities made daily efforts to mobilize citizens to work on some Sundays, to de-sanctify it. Moreover, religious life was regularly bullied, with the clergy seeking appeasement in a posture between competition and compromise. The explanation given, based only on daily interactions, is not convincing. Major repressions also played a role, such as the action "K," which was heavily used against monks and nuns, leading in 1950 to a ban on clerical orders, under pain of prison or forced labor.

The third chapter aims to defend the idea of the existence of a non-bourgeois, specifically *proletarian public space*, functioning according to specific rules. According to Jürgen Habermas, public space is where through the use of reason, a critique of state power can be developed. It cannot be measured by studying the percentage of women in the national committee! (113–16) In his case study, the author effectively describes discussions at a local level, which, albeit distorted, are real and reveal the existence of popular opinion.

The next chapter is intended to investigate citizens' correspondence records of official bodies, including the citizens' complaint and denunciation letters to state agencies about other citizens. Focusing on an analysis of shared flats and building communities, the author investigates the disappearance of private boundaries, inviting the community of neighbors and hence the regime, into the apartments and

buildings. Here, the chapter goes beyond 1968, explaining changing social relations under the influence of the housing policies. The increasing number of construction projects enabled people to regain intimacy, and therefore, bourgeois values, in the 1970s (83–87).

The last chapter, presenting the celebrations of May 1, focuses on a central element of Soviet political anthropology. The author presents an analysis of generational changes through the shape of the processions and the festive nature of the event, which, depending on the ideological evolution of the regime, created new sacred places. The author considers this ritual in two periods, first the foundation of the regime (1948–55), and then the time to attempt a new contract (1969–75), which the author considers unsuccessful. Krakovsky argues that this was the ritual that created the link between society and ideology.

This book is disturbing. The concepts are not always elaborated upon or are poorly explained, such as the *Rational-Charismatic Time Frame* (62) or the *Proletarian Public Opinion* (Chapter 3). The book represents, at the same time, a break with explanations based solely on repression and fear. Finally, it is an important and interesting work from an archival perspective. This is an author who has the advantage of thinking for himself and the confidence to leave the beaten path, opening up new paths for the history of communism in central Europe.

NICOLAS MASLOWSKI
Charles University in Prague

Die Geglückte Revolution: Das Politische und der Umbruch in Polen 1976–1997.

By Agnieszka Zagańczyk-Neufeld. Paderborn, Germany: Verlag Fredinand Schöningh, 2014. 454 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Glossary. Index. €44.90, hard bound.

In 2015, the German historian Anna Veronika Wendland published a scathing article (“Hilfflos im Dunkeln “Experten” in der Ukraine-Krise: eine Polemik,” *Eurozine*, January 28, 2015) in which she linked the absence of scholarly knowledge about Ukraine in Germany to the dearth of nuanced analyses of the unfolding crisis. In her opinion, German “Ost-experten” were not well-versed in specifically Ukrainian realities, which, all too often, resulted in an uncritical acceptance of the Kremlin’s narrative. Fortunately, given increasing political tensions between the two countries, German scholarship on Poland is more voluminous and indeed embedded in a shared, even institutionalized, “Kommunikationsraum,” as Agnieszka Zagańczyk-Neufeld’s acknowledgements to both German and Polish scholars, and her own intellectual trajectory linking Poland and Germany, demonstrate. Her work itself is a comprehensive, exhaustively detailed and thoroughly documented study of Poland’s political history from 1976–1997 that will doubtlessly contribute to the German scholarly canon on Poland. With her use of Carl Schmitt’s view of the political as revised by Chantal Mouffe, Zagańczyk-Neufeld has also chosen a heuristic approach familiar to her German audience (the “Friend-Enemy” distinction) with which to illuminate the specificities of Poland’s successful revolution. Namely, she explores how “us versus them” divisions can remain deeply embedded in Polish political discourse to this day without, however, having impeded progress in the country’s democratic transformation.

Briefly summarized, her interpretation of Polish political discourse depicts an evolution from a Schmittian understanding of the political as characterized by mutually exclusive antagonisms to a Mouffian framing of political conflict as agonistic. While Mouffe retains Schmitt’s “we/they” adversarial relationship as central to