

To the Editor:

Professor Claus Offe's enthusiasm for "transitology research" and his insistence on crediting West Germans for any successes in the transformation in East Germany, while situating all violence to the east, obviously leads him to conclusions different from those in my *Settling Accounts: Violence, Justice, and Accountability in Postsocialist Europe* (*Slavic Review* 58, no. 2). The question is why he insists this failed encounter between two (national) disciplinary perspectives—(West German) political science/sociology and (U.S. American) social anthropology—is entirely my fault. I suspect that his wish for "social integration," which is inferred from situations and events and cannot be proven to exist as it has no empirical referent, is possible only because he avoids any ethnographic work. As he appears to gather all his data from reading "German and international media," he never encounters any single person, or even anything foreign, that might resist speaking to his point of integration. If West Germans are the positive agents of change, then East Germans are denied any agency except that of complying with western scholars and western political discourse; in other words, agreeing to submit to "social integration" without themselves having done anything. By categorically rejecting my claim that the state, specifically through its law, represents itself as a "moral authority," he removes himself from the consequences of this insight for a theory of the nature of accountability as a systemic strategy of democratic governance, and democratic governance only. Support for the former Communist Party is just a symptom of dissatisfaction in the new Germany; the cause being the lack of accountability among new western elites for the outcomes of "unification policies." In the three years since I completed this book, accountability and "retributive justice" have become the key demands of reformers in transforming states as diverse as Indonesia, South Africa, and Guatemala. There is nothing "obsessive" or "absurd" about this claim except Professor Offe's reaction to it.

JOHN BORNEMAN  
Cornell University

Professor Offe does not wish to reply.

To the Editor:

In his excellent review essay "The Icebreaker Controversy: Did Stalin Plan to Attack Hitler?" (*Slavic Review* 58, no. 3), Teddy J. Uldricks refers, without comment, to Viktor Suvorov's claim "that [Iosif] Stalin made an irrevocable decision for a war of conquest at the Politburo meeting of 19 August 1939" and cites the text of Stalin's speech as published by T. Bushueva in *Novyi mir*, 1994, no. 12:232–33. Bushueva states that the version of the speech to the "Politburo and Leaders of Comintern" she publishes is a translation from a French report of the speech made by one of the French Comintern representatives present at the meeting, and that this document can be found in the fond of captured documents, the "trophy" archive or the *osobyi arkhiv* (TsKhIDK now merged with RGVA).

No other versions of this speech seem to be available, and scholars commonly accept that this document is a forgery originating from the French Intelligence Services, the best explanation of this being provided by L. A. Bezymenskii in "Sovetsko-Germanskii dogovory 1939 g.: Noveye dokumenty i starye problemy," *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia*, 1998, no. 4: 3–4. Bezymenskii's case is based primarily on Comintern sources, and the increasing availability of Politburo documents provides additional evidence that no meeting of the Politburo and leaders of Comintern took place on 19 August 1939. There is no record of the meeting in the list of Politburo sessions contained in the invaluable *Stalinskoe Politbiuro v 30-e gody: Sbornik dokumentov*, comp. O. V. Khlevniuk et al. (Moscow, 1995), 251–52, and this is confirmed by examining the Politburo fond at RGASPI (f. 17, op. 3, d. 1013).

A more detailed examination than Bezymenskii's of Stalin's appointment diary and of his and Viacheslav Molotov's activities on that day seems to clinch the matter. The office diary, "Posetiteli Kremlevskogo Kabinetu I. V. Stalina" as published by A. V. Korotkov et al. in *Istoricheskii arkhiv*, 1995, no. 6:37–41, shows that, on 19 August between 13:40 and 13:55 and again between 17:15 and 20:40, Stalin was occupied in a series of meetings in his office, meeting Molotov twice, first at 13:40 and again from 17:35 to 20:25. On 19 August, Molotov met Count von Schulenburg, the German ambassador, twice, consulting Sta-