

1: Aleksandr Herzen | LibraryThing

*From The Other Shore, and, The Russian People And Socialism: An Open Letter To Jules Michelet [Alexander Herzen, Isaiah Berlin] on www.enganchecubano.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

Alexander Herzen, by Sergei Lvovich Levitsky , Free Russian Press[edit] Having founded in London in his Free Russian Press , [14] the fortunes of which he gave an interesting account in a book published in Russian in , he published a large number of Russian works, all against the system of government prevailing in Russia. Some of these were essays, such as his Baptized Property , an attack on serfdom ; others were periodical publications, the Polyarnaya Zvezda or Polar Star , the Kolokol or Bell , and the Golosa iz Rossii or Voices from Russia. Both publications acquired great influence via an illegal circulation in Russian territory; it was said the Emperor himself read them. Both publications gave Herzen influence in Russia reporting from a liberal perspective about the incompetence of the Tsar and the Russian bureaucracy. For its first three years, the Russian Free Press went on printing without selling a single copy and scarcely being able to get a single copy introduced into Russia; so when at last a bookseller bought ten shillings worth of Baptized Property, the half-sovereign was set aside by the surprised editors in a special place of honor. The death of the emperor Nicholas in led to a complete change. Writing in Herzen became excited by the possibility of social change under Alexander II, "A new life is unmistakably boiling up in Russia, even the government is being carried away by it". Yet by , full serf emancipation had not been achieved and Herzen grew impatient with reform. By May The Bell restarted its campaign for the comprehensive emancipation of the serfs. Alexander II granted serfs their freedom, the law courts were remodelled, trial by jury was established, and liberty was, to a great extent, conceded to the press. Their etatist variety of liberalism was opposed by Herzen as it supposed that Russian society would evolve to an ideal state based on a Hegelian view of reason. They believed the revolutionaries would merely postpone the establishment of the ideal state, while Herzen thought that, on the contrary, they were blind to historical reality. Herzen was disliked by Russian radicals as too moderate. Radicals such as Nikolai Chernyshevsky and Nikolay Dobrolyubov wanted more commitment towards violent revolution from Herzen and the withdrawal of any hope in the reformist Tsar. Radicals asked Herzen to use The Bell as a mouthpiece for violent radical revolution, but Herzen rejected these requests. He argued that the Russian Radicals were not united and strong enough to seek successful political change, stating, "You want happiness, I suppose? I dare say you do! Happiness has to be conquered. If you are strong, take it. If you are weak, hold your tongue". The radicals describe Herzen as a liberal for not wanting immediate change, but Herzen rejects their pleas arguing for change at a pace that will ensure success. This breach resulted in a declining readership for The Bell, which ceased publication in . By his death in , Herzen was almost forgotten. Influence in the 19th and 20th century[edit] "There are two authors whom I make propaganda for: They are both totally decent, open-minded, open-hearted human beings. Alongside populism , Herzen is also remembered for his rejection of corrupt government of any political persuasion and for his support for individual rights. A Hegelian in his youth, this translated into no specific theory or single doctrine dominating his thought. Herzen found greater understanding by not committing himself to an extreme but rather lived impartially enabling him to equally criticise competing ideologies. Herzen believed that grand doctrines ultimately result in enslavement, sacrifice and tyranny. Tolstoy declared that he had never met another man "with so rare a combination of scintillating brilliance and depth". Herzen was a hero of the 20th century philosopher Isaiah Berlin. The words of Herzen that Berlin repeated most insistently were those condemning the sacrifice of human beings on the altar of abstractions, the subordination of the realities of individual happiness or unhappiness in the present to glorious dreams of the future. Berlin, like Herzen, believed that "the end of life is life itself" and that each life and each age should be regarded as its own end and not as a means to some future goal. Set against the background of the early development of Russian socialist thought, the Revolutions of and later exile, the plays examine the lives and intellectual development of, among other Russians, the anarchist Mikhail Bakunin , the literary critic Vissarion Belinsky , the novelist Ivan Turgenev and Herzen, whose character dominates the plays.

2: The Pregnant Widow - Wikipedia

Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.

The different factions within Populism were united by a common faith in the Russian people or narod hence narodnichestvo "relating to the population, not popularity and in particular in the institution of the village commune. This was seen an alternative to the capitalist development that the radicals perceived not only in Europe, but rapidly taking hold in Russia as well. In the obshchina in particular, with its collective ownership of land, they both saw an institution of a unique social and moral significance. But while the Slavophiles were looking for their ideal in the pre-Petrine past, the Populists kept turning their eyes towards a future which, in their opinion, had much to do with the obshchina but very little with the sentimentalized paternal monarchism of the Slavophiles. This changed later with the development of the revolutionary movement and terrorist organizations about which more later , and indeed even as a starting point their political convictions were essentially revolutionary: The idea was that following the destruction of the state, a federation of communes would emerge as ideal autonomous social structures Ulam, p. Unlike Herzen, Bakunin sees the narod as a primarily rebellious force "albeit one hampered by traditional beliefs" and he proposes that the main task of revolutionaries should be to forge links between communes in order to create a common ideal that will enable the many separate peasant revolts to come together in a more powerful and sustained movement. Nor was he a consistent theoretical writer; action was always far more important to him. He was from a family of wealthy landowners and was educated at the military academy in Petersburg, thereafter teaching mathematics at various military academies. He was made a colonel in , and became interested in philosophy around this time. Lavrov started out as a liberal, but became more radical, and was in touch with the leadership of the first Zemlia i volia Land and Freedom group. It was then that he met Marx and Engels, which was the start of a lasting friendship see Pomper, pp. Lavrov was more radical than many of his supporters at home in Russia, and did not just advocate peaceful propaganda; he thought the education of the peasantry was important, but saw the future in the Russian commune and agrarian socialism, and may well have influenced Marx on this question. Nevertheless, he condemned the Nechaev line that all means were permissible in the revolutionary struggle, warned against revolutionary adventurism, and emphasized the need for a lengthy and careful preparatory struggle. He shared the general Populist belief in the priority of social over political goals and agreed with Bakunin that the introduction of socialism could not be reconciled with the retention of the state apparatus. He was famous for duping Bakunin into believing he had a large, secret revolutionary organization in Russia, and for arranging the murder of a student to bind a group of radicals together in a conspiratorial organization "Dostoevsky used these events as the inspiration for his novel Demons Besy, After the assassination of Alexander II in , Lavrov joined Narodnaya volya and edited the party journal in Geneva, but when this movement fell apart he went back more to scholarly work, before his death in Paris. Lavrov was not a materialist "his conception of knowledge was confined to phenomena and the relations between them" but he saw different types of phenomena: He viewed the physical sciences as dealing with the concrete phenomena of what exists, but proposed that human beings also strive to realize things that do not yet exist, and insists that this is also part of life that must be studied and taken into account. However, he rejected religion and metaphysics as unprovable. Though there are various distinct sciences, there would be no science at all without the human being as an active subject. Man can, of course, objectify himself as an object of scientific study, in physiology, for example, or anthropology or psychology. But it is man who performs the objectifying of himself and who constructs science. In spite, therefore, of their heterogeneity the sciences have a common integrating factor, namely the human being. Obviously, in astronomy the human being is not the object of study, but there would be no astronomy without the human being. So how does Lavrov get from this point to a Populist philosophy? His model of the personality had not two parts body and spirit but three: Of these, he privileged consciousness, which allowed human to shape their own lives and distinguished them from other animals. Thus the human being is an active subject who conceives goals and pursues them. In

doing so he perceives himself as free, even if he acknowledges that according to science he is subject to determining laws the laws of nature ; he still considers himself to be freely acting from the subjective point of view, and this feeling is ineradicable here we see a very different view from that of Chernyshevsky. Freedom is in fact the crucial concept: Lavrov [â€] was a social reformer. He did not believe in the inevitability of progress. Social advances depended on human choice and human action, and the human being, Lavrov was convinced, could not choose and pursue social goals except with the idea of freedom. Social activism and belief in freedom were inseparable. So it is unclear whether he is saying that the human being is a free agent or just perceives himself as such. Possibly he is asserting that man cannot choose without the idea of being free, but there is clearly an unresolved tension here. Nevertheless, the subjective point of view is manifested in thought directed towards the attainment of social ideals, and this involves treating people as free agents pursuing goals and evaluating those goals. So it is important to understand that Lavrov was not only developing a theory; the practical side of his thinking was equally, if not more, important, and his thinking was constantly directed towards that practical aspect. His aim was socialism, and he believed in the power of people â€” an elite group at first who help prepare the minds of the narod for revolution â€” to achieve that: Nikolai Mikhailovsky Nikolai Mikhailovsky in contrast was not a revolutionary, although he had contacts with revolutionary groups, but was a prominent sociologist, publicist and theoretician of the populist movement. The key idea to discuss here is his definition of progress, and how this relates to populist thinking. He discusses interesting implications of this for the position of women, for example, but in terms of the purely Populist dimension of his thinking, it is the idea of the abolition of the division of labour that is important: It expresses the very essence of the backward-looking Populist utopia, with its idealization of the self-sufficient primitive peasant economy. The Russian peasant, like primitive man, lived a life that was poor but full; he was economically self-sufficient; and he could therefore be called an example of an all-around and independent personality. He satisfied all his needs by his own efforts, making use of all his capacities, so that he was farmer and fisherman, shepherd and artist in one person. The peasant community was egalitarian and homogeneous, but its members had differentiated and many-sided personalities. The low level of complex cooperation enabled them to preserve their independence, whereas simple cooperation united them in mutual sympathy and understanding. This moral unity was expressed in the common ownership of the land and the self-government of the Russian mir. So although they disagreed on some subjects, Lavrov and Mikhailovsky in many ways represent the moderate wing of populism. Both agreed that the autocracy had to be overthrown in order for equality and the welfare of the people to be achieved, but neither of them advocated violence. And their ideas were instrumental in instigating the first manifestation of Populist ideas in action. This was essentially a spontaneous movement â€” it was not organized, and nobody was really openly propagandizing for it â€” but nevertheless it was a very important moment when large numbers at least hundreds, probably thousands of mainly young people went into the Russian countryside to meet the people. There were different aims in the movement: Although many of the young people did have practical skills â€” there were a good number of doctors, for instance â€” they often ended up learning skills from the peasants rather than teaching them, while the more radical elements found the peasants very conservative and unreceptive to revolutionary ideas â€” many of the narodniki were indeed handed over to the police by the very peasants they were attempting to help. Hundreds were arrested and tried â€” in particular there were two famous trials in Some were acquitted, and others received lighter sentences, although they were deported to Siberia. These events were important because they led to a change in tactics among the radicals. Even many who had previously rejected violence came to the conclusion that nothing in Russia would change through peaceful activity alone, there would be no mass movement among the peasantry, and revolution would have to come from above. The memoirs of Vera Figner give a good account of the sort of change of heart many experienced at this point â€” having spent several years working as a doctor in the countryside, she realized that only violent actions would change anything. This disturbed orthodox populists, leading to a split in that year. It was led by Plekhanov and joined by Zaslulich, but only lasted a year before Plekhanov fled to Switzerland. The difference between this group and traditional populists was the rejection of the priority of social over political goals, advocating the overthrowing of the state as an instrument of and creator of the social classes that entrench inequality in

Russian life. A primary mover here was Lev Tikhomirov , a member of the Executive Committee of Narodnaia volia, who later became disenchanted with revolution and became a leading conservative thinker: Tikhomirov used this [â€] theory in support of his own thesis that in Russia the struggle against the possessing classes must necessarily turn into a political struggle against the state that had called these classes including the bourgeoisie into being and was their main source of strength. He perceived the possibility of revolution in Russia â€” because of the communal tendencies of Russia and the weak grip of capitalism â€” through violent means, but also advocated the seizure of power by conspiracy Hardy, pp. Tkachev, contra Mikhailovsky, advocated the homogeneity of both society and the individual, and, even more significantly, rejected the abolition of the state â€” quite the opposite. Within the ranks of Narodnaya volya, therefore, there were still differences of opinion about the idea of political struggle, but basically by the end of the s everyone in the organization agreed that the most effective way of forcing change was to assassinate the tsar. They succeeded on the third attempt, but the result was far from what they had hoped: Instead of political freedom, there arose an even more reactionary government; and instead of the tremendous increase in the strength and popularity of the party, the arrest of its most important leaders put an effective end to its activities. As a result, some of the early Populists, such as Plekhanov, converted to Marxism, while the more extreme Bakuninite wing of Populism later found expression in the Socialist Revolutionary party. Offord Ardis, Copleston, Frederick C. University of Chicago Press, , 2: Peter Lang, Ulam, Adam B.

3: Project MUSE - To the Other Shore

Apart from The Russian People and Socialism, none of Herzen's other major works appear to have been translated into English. There exists a German translation of the autobiography under the title Erinnerungen von Alexander Herzen (trans. Dr O.

Europe - History - subject: His father, Ivan Alekseyevich Yakovlev, came of an ancient, wealthy and aristocratic Moscow family. He established her as mistress of his household, but, perhaps for reasons of social disparity, did not marry her. Like other young men in Europe in the new dawn of radical thought, he admired the writings of French socialists and German Idealist philosophers, and defended their views with fervour and wit in the Moscow literary salons. There are semi-Hegelian disquisitions on the true vocation of man in the nineteenth century and on the relations of nature to history; fragments of autobiography; an elegant and amusing account of the difference between the spirit of Petersburg and that of Moscow; and finally a lengthy dissertation on the rival dangers of dilettantism and pedantry. The last of these essays is perhaps the acutest and best written. Herzen draws an entertaining and very telling contrast between easily excited but superficial amateurs who view facts through a telescope and do not see the trees for the wood, as against the microscopic pedantry of professional scholars, happy victims of the worst German academic models. He enjoys himself equally at the expense of both these failures of perspective, but, on the whole, is Introduction ix severer towards the amateurs who are terrified by the prospect of losing their own unique individuality in preoccupation with scholarly pursuits, than to the professionals who see nothing, and cling timorously to their own minute specialized field. His best novel, *Who is to Blame?* He was ambitious and knew this; he wished to make his mark in the world, to build himself a monument. His spectacular failure to be a model government official had shown him plainly that there was no room in Russia for a high-spirited, gifted, violently liberty-loving, romantically inclined aristocratic young man who wished to enter the field of public activity. In the winter of , taking with him his wife, his mother and his entire household, he left for Paris. He never saw Russia again. After slowly crossing x Introduction Germany and France the travellers reached the French capital. The arresting quality of his mind and personality made an impression even in that extraordinary assembly of talent and genius; he was, with Bakunin, almost the first denizen of the barbarous and frightening Russian Empire to be recognized as an equal by the political thinkers of the fabled West " as an equal intellectually, and not, like other liberal travellers from Russia, as a gifted and agreeable intellectual tourist, or an indolent and curious passer-by. A new revolution was clearly gathering in Europe and Herzen was caught in its mounting tide. During he travelled in Switzerland, Savoy and Italy, and his description of the stirring events which he witnessed in Rome and Paris during the *annus mirabilis* are a masterpiece of acute observation and literary talent. He does not seek to conceal his sympathies: By a bitter irony of circumstance the relationship between himself, his wife and first cousin Natalie, and Herwegh, began more and more to resemble the plot of his own *Who is to Blame?* Introduction xi stranger falls in love with the happily married wife of a man who trusts him, and duly destroys himself and his friends. Herzen perceived this analogy himself and rejected it with indignation. Herzen set down the details of the entire episode with a self-revealing candour and painful precision, oddly unexpected in so proud and sensitive a man. Natalie, betrayed by her lover, returned to her husband, to die in his arms a year later. The revolution in Europe collapsed ignominiously in one country after another. In a state of acute personal and political misery, Herzen left France and settled in the free but, to him, bleak and chilly atmosphere of England. His attitude to Frenchmen was more reserved. The solemnity, the rhetoric, the monomania of the *ci-devant* tribunes of the people and their entourage offered too much material for his highly developed sense of the ridiculous. He found the mystical Hungarian worship of Kossuth more bizarre than awe-inspiring; the Germans, in particular Karl Marx and his friends, he found unbearable. As for the xii Introduction English, he scarcely met them. He paid a visit to the aged and senile Owen; he corresponded with Carlyle; he respected Mill. But, on the whole, no attention was paid to him in England, and he responded with mingled admiration and dislike for his hosts. He delighted in the stream of Russian visitors who came to see him " writers and journalists, liberal aristocrats with a

taste for taking political risks, old Slavophil opponents, vehement young radicals who thought him a useless relic of a previous epoch, dissident Orthodox priests, university professors, old acquaintances of all sorts, whom his growing prestige drew towards what had in fact become the official centre of the opposition to the Russian government. After the suppression of the Polish Revolution in 1831, its influence which it had supported the Poles in the face of almost united patriotic indignation in Russia began to fall precipitately. He is buried in Nice and his statue stands above his tomb. Early in his London period he began his celebrated autobiography or biographical memoirs "The Past and Reflections", on which his fame as a writer ultimately rests. This work is a literary and political masterpiece, worthy to stand beside the great Russian novels of the nineteenth century. Past and Reflections is an autobiography of the first order of genius, and remains pre-eminent even in the nineteenth century which was exceedingly rich in this genre. Besides this great classic, Herzen, during twenty years of uninterrupted activity as a publicist "the voice of free Russia abroad, calling for revolution" poured out a mass of articles, letters, essays, proclamations, the best of which are original masterpieces both of journalism and of art. He was one of the most perspicacious observers of the European scene in the nineteenth century "in this respect only Marx and Tocqueville are comparable to him" and the Letters from France and Italy he called an earlier version Letters from Avenue Marigny which he sent in instalments to his friends in Moscow, to be printed in the radical Russian Journal, The Contemporary. Introduction general analyses of the political and social scene of the West just before and during the revolution, anywhere to be found. He continued to observe, record and analyse public and private life in France, in England, in Russia, unsystematically, in articles and improvisations, all his life. At once brilliantly entertaining and permanently valuable, these fragments are scattered in the twenty-two volumes of his posthumously published works, and still form a unique account of the life of Europe in the middle years of the last century. More important than these historical sketches is the long essay which Herzen entitled From the Other Shore. Herzen wrote neither to justify individuals and parties, nor to demonstrate a specific philosophy of history. But he resembled Marx and Tocqueville in that he, too, sought to describe the situation, to examine the views and ambitions and desires of the various parties and individuals and classes, and the social. So far as I know, here translated for the first time into English. For Herzen these are merely modern versions of ancient religions which demanded human sacrifice, faiths which spring from some irrational belief rooted in theology or metaphysics in the existence of vast and menacing powers, once the objects of blind religious worship, then, with the decay of primitive faith, degraded to becoming terms of political rhetoric. The dogmas of such religions declare that mere invocation of certain formulae, certain symbols, render what would normally be regarded as crimes or lunacies "murder, torture, the humiliation of defenceless human bodies" not only permissible, but often laudable. Against this Herzen advances his own positive beliefs: This is the doctrine at the heart of German historical romanticism both as interpreted by the reactionary Right and by the revolutionary Left; and indeed has formed the content of much subsequent German thought and art, with its recurrent emphasis upon the supreme value of the death and transfiguration, if need be, of entire peoples and civilizations in wars and revolutions and other forms of terrible, but inevitable, and therefore sacred, cataclysm. Herzen rejected this as nothing but a sadistic mythology peculiar to the Germans, possessing no moral justification, founded on no empirical evidence. He maintained that man invents his own morality; that, animated by that egoism without which there is no vitality and no creative activity, man is responsible for his own choices, and cannot plead the alibi of either nature or history for failing even to try to bring about that which he considers, for whatever reason, to be good, or just, or delightful, or beautiful, or true. This denial on his part that it was, in principle, possible to formulate general and eternal moral rules, made without a trace of Byronic self-dramatization or Nietzschean hyperbole, is a doctrine that is not often encountered in the nineteenth century; indeed, in its full extent, not till well into our own, where it forms a bridge between positivists endowed with moral imagination and existentialists who have something genuinely intelligible to say. It hits both right and left: It is empirical and naturalistic, recognizes values that are absolute for those who hold them, as well as change, and is overawed neither by determinism nor by socialism. And Introduction xvii it is very independent. Herzen attacked with particular indignation those who appealed to general principles to justify savage cruelties and defended the slaughter of

thousands to-day by the promise that millions would thereby be made happy in some invisible future, condoning unheard-of miseries and injustices in the name of some overwhelming but remote felicity. This attitude Herzen regards as nothing but a pernicious delusion, perhaps a deliberate deception; for the distant ends may never be realized, while the agonies and sufferings and crimes of the present remain only too real; and since we know so little of the future, and possess no means of accurate prediction, to affirm the opposite and seek to condone the effects of our brutal acts by holding out such hollow promises, is either lunacy or fraud. We cannot tell whether the millions will ever achieve the happy fate we have so confidently guaranteed to them; but what we do know is that thousands will perish, unheard, to-day. Herzen, however, was writing a century ago, in a time of mounting democratic eloquence, when the enemy was cold-hearted individualism, or clerical and dynastic despotism, and against them there rose the vast, visionary utopias of the socialists and the catholics and the Hegelians and the positivists and many another among the great metaphysical and religious system builders of the nineteenth century. This was the dominant current, and Herzen resisted it both intellectually and emotionally, because it seemed to him to threaten individual liberty. He belongs to the tradition of Erasmus and Montaigne, Bayle and Fontenelle, Voltaire and Constant, Humboldt and the English philosophic radicals, of all those who protest against despotism wherever they find it, not merely in the oppression of priests or kings or dictators, but in the dehumanizing effect of those vast cosmologies which minimize the role of the individual, curb his freedom, repress his desire for self-expression, and order him to humble himself before the great laws and institutions of the universe, immovable, omnipotent and everlasting, in whose sight the sum of human endeavour is but a speck of dust. All such systems seemed to Herzen equally spurious. In *From the Other Shore* he attacks the meanness and enviousness of the bourgeoisie which crushes everything original, independent or open, as he attacks clerical or military reaction, or the hatred of freedom and barbarous brutality of the masses. He has a sense of impending doom no less vividly than Marx or Burckhardt, but, whereas in both Marx and other Hegelian visionaries there is an unmistakable note of sardonic joy in the very thought of vast and destructive powers unchained against the bad old world, Herzen is free from this desire to prostrate himself before the mere spectacle of power and vengeance; he is free from contempt for or hatred of weakness as such, and from the romantic pessimism which is at the heart of the nihilism and fascism that was to come. But, unlike the apocalyptic prophets of his time, Herzen thinks this cataclysm neither inevitable nor glorious. It may, of course, be too late; Europe may well be going under; must Russia, too, be submerged in the tidal wave? Herzen replied temperately, with genuine sympathy for the Poles, and expounded, in answer to Michelet, some of those optimistic, and indeed utopian, notions on which as he grew progressively more pessimistic about the prospects of the Western world, he had fixed his hopes. He saw salvation in the communal organization of the Russian peasants, and wrote eloquent pages about the generous and spontaneous Russian character uncontaminated by the corroding doubts and moral squalor of the Western world in decline. Collectivized production together with the preservation of the eights and freedom of individual personsâ€™ rights and freedoms for which neither Marx nor Cabet, nor Louis Blanc had shown the least sympathyâ€™ that is the answer with which the Russian peasant will astonish the xx Introduction world. Russian populism, whether sentimental or realistic, owes more to the ungrounded optimism with which Herzen comforted himself than to any other single source. Herzen struck impartially in all directions, and so was duly condemned by both sides: You bowed without feeling respect, we shall push and jostle and make no apologies. Their suspicions turned out to be valid enough. He has no love for the mass of the oppressed as such, only indignation and a desire for justice. The qualities that he loves best are those which they too seldom possessâ€™ imagination, spontaneity, humanity, civilized feelings, natural generosity, courage, wide horizons, instinctive knowledge of what individual freedom is, and hatred of all forms of slavery or arbitrary rule, or human humiliation and degradation. And he extols these virtues wherever he finds them, even in the camp of the oppressors; and rejects political formulae and generalizations however deeply sanctified by the martyrdom of fighters for a cause which he called his own. He declares over and over again that words and ideas offer no substitute for experience, that life teems with exceptions, and upsets the best made rules and systems. But in his case this attitude led not to detachment or quietismâ€™ to the tolerant conservatism of a Hume or a Bagehotâ€™ but was allied to an impatient, passionate, rebellious temperament, which made him the rarest of

characters, a revolutionary xxii Introduction without fanaticism, a man ready for violent change, never in the name of abstract principles, but only of actual misery and injustice, of concrete conditions so bad that men were morally not permittedâ€”and knew that they were not permittedâ€”to let them exist. Starting from this kind of clear-sighted empiricism, which was influenced by the imaginative sweep of Hegel and rejected his metaphysical dogmas, Herzen gave expression to theses original enough to be rediscovered only in our own time: Herzen never forgot, as some of his most inspired fellow revolutionaries often did, that actual human beings, and specific problems can be lost sight of in the midst of statistical generalizations. And in the course of his analyses he uses the Russian language with a virtuosity to which no translation is ever likely to do complete justice. It was not for nothing Introduction xxiii that Dostoevsky recognized him as a poet. But he deserves to be read beyond the borders of Russia, if only for his moral and political ideas. Many of his predictions were falsified by events, and his practical remedies, since they were not applied, can easily be written off as utopian. But his ideas remain as fresh and arresting to-day as when they were first uttered by him a hundred years ago, and their relevance to our times seems even greater than to his own.

4: Alexander Herzen | Open Library

Alexander Ivanovich Herzen (Russian: Александр Иванович Герцен) was a Russian pro-Western writer and thinker known as the "father of Russian socialism", and one of the main fathers of agrarian populism (being an ideological ancestor of the Narodniki, Socialist-Revolutionaries, Trudoviks and the agrarian American Populist Party).

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: One afternoon in the summer of , when the Jewish quarter of Kieff was filled with groans and its pavements were strewn with the debris of destroyed homes, a group of young men entered one of the synagogues of the ancient city. They were well dressed, and their general appearance bespoke education and refinement. The rabbi had proclaimed a day of fasting and prayer, and the house of God was crowded with sobbing victims of the recent riots, but as the newcomers made their way to the Holy Ark silence fell upon the congregation. The young men were students of the University of St. Vladimir, and although sons of Israel like the others, their presence at a synagogue was an unusual sight. We have tried to persuade ourselves that we are children of Mother Russia. The terrible events which have called forth this fast and these tears have aroused us from our dream. The voice of the blood of our outraged brothers and sisters cries unto us that we are only strangers in the land which we have been used to call our home; that we are only stepchildren here, waifs to be trampled upon and dishonored. There is no hope for Israel in Russia. The salvation of the downtrodden people lies in other parts,â€”in a land beyond the seas, which knows no distinction of race or faith, which is a mother to Jew and Gentile alike. In the great republic is our redemption from the brutalities and ignominies to which we are subjected in this our birthplace. In America we shall find rest; the stars and stripes will wave over the true home of our people. The setting is a synagogue. Does the head of the "delegation" realize how much his speech echoes the religious service the congregation has just heard or is about to hear? When the student spokesman says "like our fathers," he calls to mind the first blessing, Oves avot in modern Hebrew pronunciation, "fathers" , in which the members of the congregation present themselves to the "God of our fathers," name the Jewish Patriarchs, and refer to the gracious acts of their predecessors fathers. The delegation comes to ask forgiveness, and we think of the sixth blessing, Slikhe slikhah, "forgiveness" , in which Jews implore God to forgive them, cry out that they have sinned, and lightly beat their breast. On Yom Kippur and on special days of fasting like the one called by the rabbi in Kiev, the congregants recite a long list of sins Al khet, "for the sin. The fifth blessing is called Tshuve tshuvah, "repentance". It goes like this: Return us, our Father, to thy Torah, And bring us nearer, our King, to thy service, And restore us to complete repentance [tshuvah] in thy presence. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, Who art pleased with repentance. Before the Jewish young people come to their own Al khet "We have striven to adopt. We have tried to persuade ourselves. Vladimir Universityâ€”Saint Vladimir University, that isâ€”and not a yeshiva. You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

5: Project MUSE - To the Other Shore

From the other shore, and, the Russian people and socialism, an open letter to Jules Michelet, translated from the French by Richard Wollheim.

To do this, it will focus on three major works of Herzen: It will assert that Berlin was right stating Herzen is misused by Marxists, especially Lenin. The life of Alexander Herzen 1. Lenin and Berlin on Herzen 2. Herzen on socialism and liberalism 3. Marx and Engels thought that a highly industrialised country, such as Great Britain, would lead the world revolution of the proletariat. For Marx and Engels, communism was to be the next step after capitalism in the dialectic development of human history. It is interesting – indeed puzzling – to observe that it was not a pure capitalistic system where the communist revolution took place, but a basically agrarian society such as the Russian Empire was at the time. What is to be done? In this collection of essays, Herzen criticizes the Western belief in progress and grand ideologies. Herzen especially observes the course of the French revolution and the way its ideals justified terror. For Herzen, visionary as he was when we look at the development of modern history, people should not follow the grand doctrines as Nationality, Democracy, Equality, Humanity or Progress, as these are mere modern versions of ancient religions, demanding human sacrifice based on some irrational belief and ultimately resulting in enslavement and tyranny. The belief in human progress and dialectic development of humanity throughout history had proven false. Despite his bourgeois background, Herzen, Lenin states, was one of the more important thinkers of the revolutionary movement in Russia. It is interesting to notice that one of the most liberal thinkers Russia ever produced, apparently had found himself an example of the socialist movement in 20th century Russia. So who is right? This thesis will investigate the extent to which the positions Lenin attributes to Herzen in his article Pamjati Gercena are correct. Comparing these positions to Berlin and examining different texts of Herzen, we will try to find an answer to the following question: This work seems to express his overall view on politics and society. In the second chapter we will first analyse Pamjati Gercena. This way we have both a liberal and communist understanding of Herzen, and are in the position to determine similarities and differences of both interpretations. In the third chapter, we can directly analyse the three different works of Herzen to understand his ideas on human history, socialism, freedom and revolution. And how did Herzen think to realise this new order? This study builds on a broad history of research on Herzen and the Russian revolutionary movement. Herzen However, the triangle these three thinkers form has not yet been elaborated: With such a comparative exercise we can try to determine the Lenin: I also build on a methodological insight developed during broader philosophical studies. Because of my philosophy background, I have a special interest in the semantic history of terms as freedom, socialism and revolution. To give one conclusive definition of these kinds of concepts seems to be the Sisyphus labour of every philosopher. Therefore, we will focus on one philosopher, Herzen, by studying two different explanations, and so try to give his conclusive interpretation. Also, in applying hermeneutic approach to theories, I have learned to study differences in written interpretations of certain theories. With this hermeneutic approach, one can try to determine the actual meaning of a theory, and try to bypass prejudices that may exist. In *Dialectics of Enlightenment*, Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno tried to explain the dangerous turn that Enlightened ideals took in the 20th century. The title of this thesis, *What should have been Done*: We will see that Herzen was a visionary in his warning of the dangers of a communist revolution. Instead of what had to be done according to Lenin, we can conclude what should have been done according to Herzen. To understand Herzen, we must acknowledge both his importance as socialist revolutionary, as well as liberal reformist. April 6th, the same year Napoleon captured Moscow, Alexander Herzen was born in Moscow, a son of a wealthy aristocratic family. His father, Ivan Alekseyevich Yakovlev, had met his German mother in Stuttgart during one of his travels. He could not marry her because of her parentage. It also gave him the double identity that would determine his work: He had a classic aristocratic education and learned both German and French, languages in which he would publish later as well. When he was 13, the Decembrists revolt and its aftermath made a great impression on Herzen, and later in his life he would call himself heir of this movement. Herzen became politically suspect by the authorities quite early in

his university career for his left-wing social views and his gatherings with other rebellious students, of which the great anarchist revolutionary Mikhail Bakunin. For this he was exiled to Viatka, present-day Kirov. Bakunin and Herzen would have an interesting relationship for the rest of their lives. Both would become the most important thinkers of the Russian revolutionary movement. But where Herzen would strive for a constructive approach to forming a socialist state, Bakunin fought for negative anarchism. Although it was not until that he could return to Moscow, it is said that especially his time in exile was an important period for Herzen to develop his thoughts and writing. One of their main goals was the liberation of the serfs. He got banned once again to Novgorod after the authorities opened a letter to his father, in which he had written a critical note about the system of government. Herzen decided to leave Russia and immigrated to Paris in , probably not aware that he would never see his home country again. Also, he did not know yet that his high expectations of Europe would not be fulfilled. And with the failure of the revolutions, he started to understand that even Europe could not realise his socialist ideals. It was in these same years that Herzen wrote his most famous philosophical-political work *From the Other Shore*, written in Russian, but first published in German as *Vom Anderen Ufer* in . After being naturalised in Switzerland, he moved to Nice, which still was Italian at that time. Because of personal tragedies, his work temporarily stagnated. He lost his wife Natasha in , whom he had married in . And his son Nikolai perished in a shipwreck on his way to his parents in Nice. Only until Herzen moved to London in , did he slowly recover and started to write again. Herzen relinquished the revolutionary cause in Europe and focused now on his home country. He wanted to expose the malpractices of the Russian system, primarily the serfdom-society and the benighted bureaucratic administration. He started to publish his own magazine, *Polyarnaya Zvezda* *Polestar* , in , in which he propagated against serfdom in Russia. It was with *Polyarnaya Zvezda* that Herzen finally reached a broad audience in Russia. After the death of tsar Nicolas I and the succession of Alexander II in the general consensus was that a period of change was about to come. Herzen put all his efforts in the abolition of serfdom. He wrote various public letters to the new tsar, whose policies gave Herzen hope that change in Russia finally would be realised. The letters were widely distributed in Russia. To ensure realistic change in Russia, Herzen narrowed his goal and abandoned any revolutionary socialistic propaganda. From then on, *Kolokol* would have three major goals: Gradually his subtle approach to change in Russia, which made Herzen also popular in aristocratic spheres in Russia, gave way to a harsher socialistic approach. This made him lose his liberal supporters. It was this same turn that Lenin would use to declare Herzen a pave-maker of the Russian revolution. Although Herzen did not promote an immediate revolution -as did his friend Michail Bakunin who also wrote for *Kolokol*- he grew more adverse then ever towards the Russian government. *Kolokol* became a voice of the Polish independence movement. For most Russians, Poland was naturally part of the Russian Empire, and sympathy with the Polish cause was equivalent to treachery. Therefore, according to general consensus, the view on Herzen soon changed from a socialist reformer to a revolutionary traitor. One year later Herzen would publish one more *Kolokol* in French, and that would be the end of the magazine. Here we see a careful approach to Marxist-socialist thoughts, and notice that Herzen slowly started to believe in the revolutionary movement. Herzen died after returning to Paris on 18 January , the same year Lenin, one of the most important figures of the Russian revolutionary movement, was born. One of the more important things Lenin wanted to make clear is that Herzen was a revolutionary: , , . The Right-wing press, too, is commemorating the Herzen centenary, falsely asserting that in his last years Herzen renounced revolution. First, according to Lenin, Herzen was more of a revolutionary than a liberal. Second, Herzen apparently did not renounce revolution in his late years. The idea of Herzen as the revolutionary is mentioned several times in the article. Lenin calls Herzen a democrat, revolutionary and a socialist. At the same time, Lenin hails Herzen as the founder of Russian socialism. Even worse, according to Lenin, it would have given way for capitalism to spread: Apparently Lenin did not deem this step of human history necessary. For Marx, Western European history consisted of different stages of development: Out of capitalism the workers would revolt and a communist world society would be created. In one of his last major works, *K staromu tovarishchu* *To an old friend* , Herzen cheers first gathering of the International in . He repeatedly places Herzen in his context as one of the pioneers of the Russian Revolution. In this work, Dobrenko studies the formation of Russian literature into the Soviet

ideology, just as Lenin seems to have done with Herzen. Berlin noticed that Herzen, in contrast to developments of his era as the French Revolution, focused on the madness of sacrifice for the greater good. Herzen had seen that some fictional principle of the greater good, such as Nationality, Equality or Progress, could make people rationalise whatever was done to meet the desired ends. Great ideas could bring great terrors to humanity: Because history does not follow some sort of plan, there is no formula or principle that can actually solve the problems of individuals and society. Because of the indeterminacy of human history, the only absolute value is liberty.

6: From the Other Shore

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

7: From Other Shore & Russian People & Socialism by Alexander Herzen

ThriftBooks sells millions of used books at the lowest everyday prices. We personally assess every book's quality and offer rare, out-of-print treasures. We deliver the joy of reading in % recycled packaging with free standard shipping on U.S. orders over \$

8: Russian Thought lecture 6: Populism: the Intelligentsia and the People | Dr Sarah J. Young

We have focussed on two particular works of Herzen to understand his view on human history, on socialism, and on revolution after the deception of the revolutionary events of From the Other Shore and The Russian People and Socialism.

9: What Should Have Been Done: View from the Other Shore | Christiaan Ate Paauwe - www.enganchecul

The Russian People and Socialism (From the Other Shore) Letters from France and Italy (From the Other Shore)

The girl on the train kickass West Mexican art and modernist artists Barbara Braun. Ultimate npcs skulduggery Animal Crackers (Marx Brothers) Catechism of the catholic church book Answers to starred excercises Kia rio 2003 manual Pretty little liar book Taxing International Business Income: Islamism, democracy, and the limits of freedom The artists birthday. V. 1. The family and property Mrs Vole the Vet (Happy Families) Collected poems of Jean Toomer 4th Division Tanks Land p. 60 Ways Means for Children Families (Local Officials Guide) Prebles artforms edition 11 Intelligent Java applications for the Internet and Intranets Java 101 learn java from the ground up The lady who put salt in her coffee (from: The Peterkin papers by Lucretia Peabody Hale Joint forest management in india The Giudecca Sargent Look the finished work of jesus Twickenham College of Technology Multimodal Transport Rules The Barberian Presidency I too had a love story author ravinder singh Production and Storage of Dried Fish What counts as a serving? The work of Graham Sutherland. I Can See You Comin! Introduction to the library and information professions Gate 2014 cs question paper Second Language Development The Fake Heir (Nancy Drew: Girl Detective Graphic Novels #5) The Miracle of Recovery Powers and principalities 2009 Time Saving Gourmet Cookbook Bolles Wilson Landeszentralbank, Magdeburg I Want My Dollar!