BOOK REVIEW


In 1961 Martin Malia published his brilliant book "Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism 1812-1855", and it has been highly appreciated. Edward Acton suggests in his compact and interesting book that although many scholars analyzed Herzen from various points of view, these studies were not "related to a unified picture of his development". And he makes it his aim "to evoke such a picture during the central years (between 1847 to 1863–H.M.) of his career, by tracing the impact of public events and private tragedy upon his political thought and activity". Acton offers his own interpretations taking issues with Malia's views in the former part of his book, and with Soviet historians' views in the latter part. The most impressive point in his book is the wide difference between the portraits of Herzen drawn by him and Malia.

Acton emphasizes that Herzen held emotional cosmopolitanism until 1852, when he suffered a family tragedy. This is to criticize and correct Malia's 'distortion', who sees Herzen as a convinced nationalist when he arrived in the West in 1847, the crucial year, and as a messianic and revolutionary nationalist for the rest of his life. Malia came to the conclusion on Herzen's nationalism by fully studying German Idealism, Romanticism and Russian slavophilism. But Acton seems to treat lightly Herzen's thought before 1847 and his nationalism. Instead, Acton attaches greater importance to Herzen's involvement in the European situation than to his controversy with Slavophiles over *mir* problem. And Acton asserts that "Herzen expected revolutionary transformation where the commune did not exist at all" before the tragedy in 1852. Such assertion leads also to criticism of the interpretations among Soviet historians who assert Herzen's faith in the *mir* and anticipate his disilusionment.

These two biographies reflect clearly the times in which they were written. As a scholar who made a special study on Herzen during the nineteen
BOOK REVIEW

-forties and fifties, the days of the Cold War, Malia had an interest in the Russian Revolution, Marxism and socialism, in a negative sense. In other words, he sees history from the standpoint of the East-West problem. On the other hand, younger Acton seems to bear well in mind a helplessness of the contemporary elite before the masses. He argues 'the role of intellectual revolutionary' because it is the problem which faced Herzen and because it remains unresolved today.

Acton follows almost all books and papers on Herzen published after World War II. But we have had unique studies before the War, even before the Russian Revolution. They are not to be neglected. For example, Ivanov-Razumnik says in his "Istoriia russkoi obschestvennoi myслi" that Herzen's Russian Socialism is the synthesis of Slavophilism and Westernism. This opinion shows us the importance of the Slavophile element in Herzen's thought that Acton discusses lightly.
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