

Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California

University of California History Department Oral History Series

Martin Edward Malia

HISTORIAN OF RUSSIAN AND EUROPEAN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

An Interview Conducted by
David Engerman in
2003

Copyright © 2005 by The Regents of the University of California

Since 1954 the Regional Oral History Office has been interviewing leading participants in or well-placed witnesses to major events in the development of northern California, the West, and the nation. Oral history is a method of collecting historical information through tape-recorded interviews between a narrator with firsthand knowledge of historically significant events and a well-informed interviewer, with the goal of preserving substantive additions to the historical record. The tape recording is transcribed, lightly edited for continuity and clarity, and reviewed by the interviewee. The corrected manuscript is indexed, bound with photographs and illustrative materials, and placed in The Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, and in other research collections for scholarly use. Because it is primary material, oral history is not intended to present the final, verified, or complete narrative of events. It is a spoken account, offered by the interviewee in response to questioning, and as such it is reflective, partisan, deeply involved, and irreplaceable.

All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between The regents of the University of California and Martin Edward Malia, dated December 16, 2003. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Director of The Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to the Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, Mail Code 6000, University of California, Berkeley 94720-6000, and should include identification of the specific passages to be quoted, anticipated use of the passages, and identification of the user.

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

Martin Edward Malia, "Historian of Russian and European Intellectual History," an oral history conducted in 2003 by David Engerman:, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 2005.

Copy no. _____



Martin Edward Malia

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Martin Edward Malia

Interview History by David Engerman	i
Interview 1: December 16, 2003 [Audio File Malia 01 12-16-03]	1
Childhood, family and education	1
Early intellectual development in the late thirties and early forties	3
Language studies at Yale	4
George Trager’s Russian course at Yale	5
Initial interest in Russia	6
V-12 Program	7
Coursework at Yale	8
College life at Yale	13
Midshipman’s School	17
Meeting Russians in Dutch Harbor, Alaska; forming antipathy to the Soviet system	19
Interview 2: December 17, 2003 [Audio File Malia 02 12-17-03]	
Entering Harvard in Slavic studies	25
Michael Karpovich	26
Isaiah Berlin’s seminar	34
More on Karpovich	36
Discovering Alexander Herzen	38
Influence of Crane Brinton; interest in revolutions	40
Making connections at Harvard; trips to France, 1948-51	45
The postwar generation of French intellectuals; influence of communism on French thought	52
Influence of trips to France; finishing the doctoral dissertation	58
Interview 3: December 18, 2003 [Audio File Malia 03 12-18-03]	
Final thoughts on École Normale	61
Teaching at Harvard; curriculum reform	61
Becoming a tenure-tracked assistant professor	66
First trip to the Soviet Union as part of the Library of Congress book exchange program	66
Trip to Vladimir and Gor’kii	71
Meeting Karpovich’s family in Moscow	76
Gaining Karpovich’s approval after returning from the Soviet Union, 1956	78
Cultural exchanges with young Soviets	78
Meeting Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev	80

Final reflections on first trip to the Soviet Union	82
Observations in 1956 about the weakness of the ideological structure of global communism	83
Meeting Allan Dulles, head of the CIA, in Washington	84
Harvard Department of History faculty, late fifties	86
Russian Research Center	87
Denied tenure at Harvard; takes position at Berkeley, 1957	88
Karpovich retires, 1957	90
George Fisher	91
Meeting George Kennan	92
Karpovich's Russian history lecture notes	93
The UC Berkeley Department of History, late fifties and early sixties	94

Interview 4: December 19, 2003

[Audio File Malia 04 12-19-03]

Anti-Soviet joke	97
More on appointments at Harvard and Berkeley	97
Working with graduate students	100
Russian history courses at Berkeley	101
State of Russian and Soviet studies, late fifties to early sixties	103
Climate at Berkeley prior to the Free Speech Movement	105
Teaching at École Pratique des Hautes Etudes	106
Spending time with Communist intellectuals in Paris	106
Intellectual connections in the United States	112
Developing an intellectual framework for the comparative study of revolutions	112
Second trip to the Soviet Union, 1962	114
Trip to Warsaw, 1962	118
More on trip to Soviet Union, 1962	120
Meeting Anna Akhmatova in Moscow	121

Interview 5: December 21, 2003

[Audio File Malia 05 12-21-03]

Advent of social history in the sixties	125
More on Anna Akhmatova	125
Krushchev's denunciation of "degenerate art" at a Manezh art exhibit, 1962	128
Oleg' Ginzburg	129
Denunciation of Malia in Pravda	129
"Russian career over until 1988"	130
Meeting Reginald Zelnik in Leningrad	131
The Free Speech Movement	133
Meeting with Clark Kerr	134
"The Two Hundred"	136

December 8 faculty meeting; Greek Theatre event	137
“The Slate Slate”	139
The Filthy Speech Movement	141
Carl Landauer’s December 8 speech	143
The Vietnam Day Committee	145
Thoughts on the anti-Vietnam War movement	145
Anti-war march to Oakland from Berkeley against the “Oakland Wall”	146
Effect of protests on the history department	150
Advocating “the Eugene McCarthy approach”	150
“It would flare up, recede, but it was always there;” student activism in 1966	151
Retiring from the battle, 1967-71	154
The collapse of the sixties movement	156

Interview 6: December 22, 2003

[Audio File Malia 06 12-22-03]

More on the cause and legacy of the sixties’ student activism	159
Situating the sixties “revolution” in comparison with modern Western political revolutions; developing a comparative revolutions theoretical framework	161
Shifting career interests to general European history	163
The seventies, the decade of “Euro-Communism:” the experiment of popular leftist fronts	165
Traveling to Poland, summer of 1981	170
Pilgrimage to Czestochowa	174
Solidarity Congress in Gdansk, September 1981; realization that communism is mortal	175
Writing two articles on Solidarity in the <i>New York Review of Books</i> , 1982-83	178
Crackdown on Solidarity in 1981	179
Re-entering the American Slavic studies field	181
Debate in the history department over Gorbachev	183
Returning to the Soviet Union and Russian history, 1988	185
“Z” article in <i>Daedalus</i>	187

Interview 7: December 23, 2003

[Audio File Malia 07 12-23-03]

Debate over Gorbachev in France	189
Glasnost and the collapse of the Soviet Union	191
Article in <i>Daedalus</i> , 1990	191
Losing anonymity as “Z”	194
Trip to Russia, 1991	198
Retirement in 1991	199
Articles in the <i>New York Review of Books</i> , 1991	199

Falling out with the <i>New York Review of Books</i> ; writing for <i>Commentary</i> and <i>The New Republic</i>	201
Thoughts on post-Sovietism	202
“Reforming the field” of Soviet and Russian studies	203
Differences with Richard Pipes	204
Situating communism in the longue duree of European history	209
The end of the social welfare state	212
Interview 8: December 23, 2003	
[Audio File Malia 08 12-23-03]	
More on the Age of Ideology	215
Questions for interviewer David Engerman, posed by Martin Malia; reasons for entering the field of Russian history	215
Engerman’s graduate studies at Rutgers and Berkeley	217
Controversy over Arno Mayer’s Judeocide argument	221
Discussion of Revisionism	223
Malia’s criticism of current trends in stasiology	226
Discussion of American exceptionalism	228

INTERVIEW HISTORY by David Engerman

Martin Malia, a historian of Russian and European intellectual history, taught at Berkeley from 1958 until his retirement in 1991 – though he remained an active presence in Dwinelle Hall until his death in November 2004. He came to Berkeley's department as it was expanding its offerings in Russian and Soviet history; Nicholas Riasanovsky had been on the faculty for three years when Malia arrived, and within a few years they were joined by Reginald Zelnik.

By his own account, Malia was “not an organization man.” Nevertheless, he was involved in some of the central issues at Cal during his long career there. Most notable here were Malia's experiences during the controversy over the Free Speech Movement in fall 1964. He reports beginning the semester in favor of the students although he quickly grew disenchanted with the FSM and other student movements. His scholarly interest in revolutions – the topic of his final book, left incomplete – intersected with his political observations. His frequent comparisons of 1960s social movements with the French and Russian Revolutions only bolstered his opposition to student protests in his own time.

Malia played an important role in Berkeley's Russian history program, working with many Berkeley graduate students during the best years of the Russian program. Many of these students came together to produce a *Festschrift* in his honor: *The Cultural Gradient: The Transmission of Ideas in Europe, 1789-1991* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2003). That volume was edited by two of his most successful students, Catherine Evtuhov at Georgetown and Steven Kotkin at Princeton. The range of topics makes a fitting tribute to Malia's capacious intellectual interests; essays covered comparative topics over two centuries of European history.

The list of contributors to the *Festschrift* contains within it the story of Malia's long and distinguished career as a historian and as commentator on contemporary events. His half-century of close connection to French intellectual life is represented by two distinguished scholars, sociologist Alain Touraine and historian Jacques Le Goff. Malia's friendships with the leaders in Poland's struggle for independence in the 1980s are represented by contributions from Elbieta Kaczyska and Adam Michnik. And of course the many articles on Russia reflect Malia's lifelong interest in and observation of Russia. Taken together, this group of friends and students reveals Malia's unerring ability to find a fascinating group of intellectuals wherever he traveled: Paris, Warsaw, Moscow, and of course Berkeley and Harvard (where Malia earned his Ph.D. in 1954 and taught until heading west).

Malia published one major work in English during his career: *Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, 1812-1855* (Harvard University Press, 1961); this remarkable book was on the surface an intellectual biography of Herzen, but in fact an interpretation Russian intellectual life for much of the nineteenth century. In 1980, a French press published a set of his lectures at the École des hautes études as *Comprendre la Révolution Russe* (Seuil, 1980). After retiring from teaching in 1991, Malia began to publish more widely and frequently; his books were *The Soviet Tragedy: A History of Socialism in Russia, 1917-1991* (Free Press, 1994); and *Russia Under Western Eyes: From the Bronze Horseman to the Lenin Mausoleum* (Harvard University Press, 1999). Malia had completed a draft of this latter book in the late 1960s; that encompassed Western ideas of Russia up until 1917. The book was waylaid by his decision to add a section on Western responses to Soviet Russia. Both of these books revealed Malia's intellectual breadth and erudition; they also demonstrated Malia's love for good argument and polemic, not shirking from criticisms of other interpreters.

Even more than these books, however significant, Malia will be most remembered for an article in *Daedalus*, “To the Stalin Mausoleum” (1990). Originally published under the pseudonym “Z,” the article attacked Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev as attempting to reform an unreformable system; he also criticized Western commentators enthralled by Gorbachev’s efforts. Though an astute reporter quickly discovered that Malia was “Z,” this occurred only after he had denied authorship to many colleagues and friends. This article helped establish Malia as a commentator on current events in eastern Europe; though *The New York Review of Books* had published his reports from Poland in the early 1980s and Moscow at the end of that decade, the “Z” article gave Malia wider renown and more access to general-interest media; he wrote for *The New York Review*, *Los Angeles Times*, *New Republic*, and many other outlets from the early 1990s until his death.

The oral history interviews took place in a Dwinelle Hall seminar room in December 2003, meeting for roughly ninety minutes per day over seven sessions. The final session had two parts: a conclusion to the formal oral history plus a shorter eighth recording that deliberately abandoned some of the conventions of oral history.

The sessions took place under less than ideal circumstances. Malia had spent the prior two months in Paris (as he did almost every autumn) and had been ill enough to postpone his return to the U.S.; the long flight and subsequent jetlag did little to improve his condition. His determination to complete the oral history was occasionally matched by his physical frailty; nevertheless he came each day with a number of comments prompted by the previous discussion. In fall 2004, Malia’s health took a turn for the worse. He was hospitalized in early October with a stroke; he died in an Oakland convalescent hospital on November 19.

The many obituaries published in fall 2004 recount his biography and his writings. For additional information, see Nicholas Riasanovsky, “Martin Malia and the Understanding of Russia,” in *The Cultural Gradient*, ed. Evtuhov and Kotkin.

Malia’s untimely death meant that he never had an opportunity to review the oral history transcripts; this may account for a larger-than-usual number of “[inaudible]” notations and (most likely) mistakes. I edited the transcripts twice, and enlisted the help of Steven Kotkin with some of the names. In addition to Kotkin, I would like to thank the Regional Oral History Office staff, especially Ann Lage and Brendan Furey for their help in organizing and producing the oral history; and also David Hollinger and Richard Cándida Smith for helping arrange it.

The Regional Oral History Office was established in 1954 to record the lives of persons who have contributed significantly to the history of California and the West. A major focus of the office since its inception has been university history. The series list of completed oral histories documenting the history of the University of California is included in this volume. The Regional Oral History Office is a division of The Bancroft Library and is under the direction of Richard Cándida Smith.

David Engerman
Assistant Professor of History,
Brandeis University

January 2005

[Interview #1: December 16, 2003]

[Begin Audio File Malia: 01 12-16-03]

1-00:00:07

Engerman: I'm here with Martin Malia. It's Tuesday, December 16, and we are starting an oral history project. As you know, when interviews start, you usually go chronologically. So we will start in your earliest years, and we will see how far we go today, and then we will take it from there. So, you were born in Springfield, Massachusetts, and went to high school in Hamden.

1-00:00:35

Malia: Well, I was born in Springfield, Massachusetts, but I grew up in Hamden, which is a suburb of New Haven. So basically I am a New Haven, Hamden product. The family was originally from Springfield. My mother was from Springfield, and my father was from Thompsonville, which is in Enfield Township just across the border in Connecticut.

1-00:01:03

Engerman: Tell me a little bit about your parents and your upbringing.

1-00:01:06

Malia: Well, my mother before her marriage had been a secretary, and my father was a businessman who worked as one of the officers at a company manufacturing automobile radiators. This was way back in the 1920s when radiators were manufactured separately from the rest of the car, apparently. Both parents were of Irish extraction and Catholic, so it was an Irish Catholic family. Let's put it this way: I had a happy childhood. I didn't have any problems or trauma—dramas or traumas. Most of my adolescent years—my adolescent years were spent in Hamden, Connecticut, at Spring Glen, to be specific—if that means anything to you. That is why I went to Hamden High School, which was a new outfit then. It had on its faculty a number of people who were getting PhDs at Yale. So the faculty was, I would say, better than average quality. That is where I started French, and I continued that when I went to Yale, a little while later.

1-00:02:41

Engerman: Were there people you would describe as important personal influences for you up through high school? Parents, teachers, other people around town?

1-00:02:55

Malia: I had some high school English teachers.

1-00:02:56

Engerman: Yes.

1-00:02:57

Malia: Marietta Knapp, who was getting a PhD at Yale. She felt that I was genuinely interested in the subject, so she would send me upstairs to the school library to have me read more advanced stuff than what was given in class. Yeah, she was a big influence. Another English teacher named Tierney, who was much help with the latest sort of avant-garde books, people like Thomas Mann, James Joyce, things like that. And that is just about it about my high school teachers.

- 1-00:03:51
Engerman: In terms of personal influences as opposed to intellectual, are there people in the community, either in the church or in the family or elsewhere who meant—?
- 1-00:04:00
Malia: Nothing that stands out. As I said, I had a happy childhood. [laughs] It was very ordinary, between the wars, suburban childhood.
- 1-00:04:22
Engerman: Was Irishness or Catholicism keenly felt in that community? I mean, the inter-war years are not known for excessive tolerance.
- 1-00:04:33
Malia: No, I would say that half or a third at least, and probably nearer to half of Hamden was Catholic and usually Irish. Then there were the Italians. They arrived less than the Irish. There was a sense of the difference between Catholics and Protestants. That is about all there was in Hamden. But no great tension. It was Catholics and Protestants, and they were really quite integrated, I would say, in Hamden.
- 1-00:05:29
Engerman: Was it in high school that you got interested in Russia?
- 1-00:05:34
Malia: No.
- 1-00:05:37
Engerman: Well, could you tell me then maybe—?
- 1-00:05:41
Malia: Marietta Knapp advised me to put off reading the Russian novels until later.
- 1-00:05:45
Engerman: Why, did she say?
- 1-00:05:47
Malia: Because it was just too heavy going. She said to stick with the English and the French ones for the moment. It was the war. No, when I was in high school I read *The Brothers Karamazov* and *War and Peace*. I went beyond what she had advised me to do. That's what started it. What really got me interested in the things that eventually became my career was when I got to Yale, and it had a much better French class than I had had in high school. It was an Egyptian, whose name I can't remember, who was teaching the language. He gave us a phonetic alphabet, because you can't learn to say anything. You try to pronounce the written alphabet—so he gave us the phonetic alphabet. I discovered that I could make all the sounds perfectly. By the end of my freshman year at Yale, I was able to speak the language. And I enjoyed that tremendously. I discovered I could just pick up a book and read it.
- 1-00:07:11
Engerman: You must clearly have a great talent for languages. Not everyone can learn it in a year.

1-00:07:16

Malia: No, I had already learned the basics before. I remember the first book I read all the way through was [Prosper] Mérimée's *Carmen*. Then, in I think it was my freshman year at Yale, or my sophomore year at Yale, I read *Les Thibault*, by Roger Martin du Gard, which is a multi-volume, realistic novel about the pre-war and wartime (World War I that is) period in France. It was very readable. I read this in five or six volumes. It is a Proust. Five or six volumes. I read that through. After that, I could read just about anything in French, and I could speak it well enough to win the Montaigne Prize. I majored in French because—well, when I originally arrived at Yale, I was going to major in English because I wanted to be a poet. This was the age of sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, I had started to write poetry, and that was Marieta Knapp, one of the reasons she encouraged me. I was going to major in English because I wanted to be a poet, but I discovered that I had this other literary possibility in French that I was good at. There was a whole lot of literature there that I didn't yet know, and so I majored in French to open that up. So then the war happened.

1-00:09:02

Engerman: Before we go on to the war, I just want to ask one last question or two about the high school before we do that. It is actually more about your high school days, and that is, when you were an early teenager, it was obviously a tumultuous time in the Soviet Union. Did you follow what was going on there?

1-00:09:18

Malia: Didn't know about it.

1-00:09:21

Engerman: Did you follow any of the political issues of the day? The Spanish Civil War, the New Deal, court-packing, these sorts of things, were you engaged in?

1-00:09:29

Malia: Well, my father, although Irish Catholics normally were Democrats, he hadn't been a Democrat until Roosevelt. As a businessman, he was very anti-New Deal, because he was interested in business. So, he was very critical of Roosevelt. The first thing I remember really was that he went up in smoke over the Supreme Court-packing issue, which I of course didn't understand. I wasn't interested in this. I didn't pay any attention to that. When I got to voting age, I decided I was going to vote for Roosevelt because something had to be done about the people, that sort of thing. [laughs] This didn't occasion any great family drama. I just voted for Roosevelt. My mother always voted for Roosevelt. I didn't pay much attention to foreign affairs. I obviously knew that Hitler and Mussolini were there, and I knew that in '39 when Chamberlain was flying back and forth to—what was that place on the Rhine where he met with Hitler—Bad Godesberg. Yeah, it was drama. I remember Munich, and I remember the Spanish Civil War, but it was drama. I didn't really have any sense of what was right and what was left. The kids I grew up with were not political. They were not terribly intellectual either, I might say.

1-00:11:42

Engerman: But you were intellectual, were you not?

1-00:11:44

Malia: I was the intellectual in the group. It was a group. We were at Hamden High together, and we went to Yale together. They all became businessmen afterwards. Well, one became an architect. He lived just in back of us. We lived on this street, and he lived on that street, and our backyards were connected. We all went to Yale together. I was the only one who was bookish and who was interested in literature, who wanted to write poetry, but this didn't create any problems with these other guys because, well, it just didn't.

1-00:12:31

Engerman: Did you publish any of the poetry in student—?

1-00:12:40

Malia: Only in the campus, the class literary magazine. They had a literary magazine at Hamden High School. I published some poetry. I wrote the class poem, which I don't have a copy of. It is at my late sister's house, or her kids have it. By the time I got to Yale, I knew that I was not going to be a poet. I wasn't going to even try, but I did like learning languages. I entered Yale in 1941.

1-00:13:21

Engerman: In 1941. Why Yale? It was the local university?

1-00:13:25

Malia: It was the local university. It was Yale or Wesleyan. And Yale was bigger, and it was nearer, and it was just better, so it was Yale. I was lucky I got in. I didn't know it was an elite school at the time. So I entered in September of '41. Of course, we got into the war in December of '41. That is when I became aware of Russia, because she was our ally. Then, the drama of 1939 and all the drama of 1939-40, I noticed that as a drama, and it gave way to the Russian campaign.

1-00:14:25

Engerman: Which was a couple of months old when you had started?

1-00:14:26

Malia: A couple of months. And that was more drama. This was epic. So I noticed that, and since I already knew that I was good at languages, I decided that I would start learning Russian. I started to learn German first, which is what—my advisor at Yale was a man named Franklin Baumer. Franklin Lee Baumer. He was one of the first people in this country to do intellectual history. He has an intellectual history reader. They had a basic Western civilization and Western history course called History 10, and he was then a young professor. He was my section man. It was all taught by professors. I was in his section. He was a very good, extremely good teacher. He advised me. I wanted to acquire was a new language, Greek first.

1-00:15:35

Engerman: Why Greek?

1-00:15:37

Malia: Because that is important to be cultivated. I had some Latin already. You had to have Latin to get into Yale in those days. That is what cultivated people had, to be a cultivated person. So he advised me to take German instead, it would be more useful. So I started in on German, which was just as well anyway that he got me started in

German. But then because of the war, I decided to learn Russian. And, Russian was just then being taught for the first time at Yale.

1-00:16:15

Engerman: This was by Trager?

1-00:16:17

Malia: Yeah! How come you know about Trager?

1-00:16:19

Engerman: I spent a little time this morning with Hugh McLean.

1-00:16:21

Malia: Okay. Hugh McLean was one of the other two people learning Russian with me.

1-00:16:28

Engerman: Tell me about—his name was George Trager, right? Well, he was a linguist. Yale had a very big linguistics department. It had no Slavic department at all?

1-00:16:42

Malia: It had no Slavic department. It had a big linguistics department, and there were fooling around with phonemes and trying to make linguistics a science. Because of the war, they decided that they would have to offer Russian. So they took him from linguistics. He happened to be from Odessa. His family was from Odessa. He created a Russian language course. It was an absurd course. Shall I describe it to you?

1-00:17:11

Engerman: Yes, but why don't you tell me about your experience in it?

1-00:17:14

Malia: Well, they were interested in language as such. And the premise of the course was that we should not learn the language through abstract rules of grammar or even the written language. That we should learn it the way children do, by hearing, by picking up phrases, and figuring out the grammar ourselves. So we were given—I remember the first phrase we had to learn by heart was: "*U Odnogo cheloveka odna golova, odin nos, odno litso.*" ["One person has one head, one nose, one face"] So you get the three genders by learning from the words *golova*, *nos*, and *litso*.

1-00:18:08

Engerman: *I potom "dva, tri, chetyre?"* [And then "two, three, four?].

1-00:18:10

Malia: I don't remember. So we had to memorize by heart all sorts of absurd sentences like that. [laughs]

1-00:18:18

Engerman: It obviously worked though, because—

1-00:18:19

Malia: It did.

1-00:18:20

Engerman: Professor McLean actually told me the very same sentence earlier today.

- 1-00:18:23
Malia: Oh he did?
- 1-00:18:24
Engerman: Yes. And he said it went up through five, six, seven.
- 1-00:18:27
Malia: That I don't know.
- 1-00:18:29
Engerman: "*U chetyrekh chelovek—*" *i tak dalee*. ["Four people have" and so on]
- 1-00:18:33
Malia: Okay, I didn't remember that. I eventually bought a grammar book myself.
- 1-00:18:40
Engerman: Other than his own?
- 1-00:18:41
Malia: Other than his. It wasn't a grammar book, it was a phrase book! I bought a grammar book, and that was what worked. We weren't even told that these were the three different genders or not. I think we were supposed to figure it out.
- 1-00:19:00
Engerman: I think you were supposed to figure it out. In the same way that kids figure it out without being told.
- 1-00:19:05
Malia: Yeah, but we're not kids! [laughs] Our brains are not wired in the same way that kids' are wired. A lot more is known about brains now than was known then.
- 1-00:19:14
Engerman: Yes.
- 1-00:19:14
Malia: In any event, we did pick up the rudiments of the language.
- 1-00:19:22
Engerman: In spite of Professor Trager?
- 1-00:19:23
Malia: I would say in spite of Professor Trager.
- 1-00:19:26
Engerman: I want to ask you another question about Russia before moving on to Yale more generally. You say that you got interested and you wanted to take Russian because of the Russian alliance during World War II. How did you feel about Russia as an ally? What was your feeling about that alliance?
- 1-00:19:44
Malia: Well, I was growing up in a Connecticut suburb, not in New York. I was not political. The people around me were not political. I knew Russia was communist, and communism was bad because most Americans, or at least most circles where I lived,

felt that communism was bad. But Russia was putting up this great fight, and it was epic. So the Russians at least, not the communists running the place, must have something going for them. And that deepened my interest in the literature. I was still interested in the literature.

1-00:20:34

Engerman: Yes. So after you read *Karamazov* and *War and Peace*, what did you turn to in college when you started reading Russian literature?

1-00:20:40

Malia: Well, I wasn't reading Russian literature in college. Also, remember this was wartime, and after the first year, everyone in—I was the class of 1945—everyone was confronted with the draft. At this point, the navy came up with a program known as V-12.

1-00:21:20

Engerman: Why don't you tell me about what the V-12 program was?

1-00:21:23

Malia: Well, the rationale of it was that the navy wanted all of its officers to have college degrees. So, it decided to subsidize a whole bunch of kids who were already in college by putting them in uniforms and letting them go to their regular classes. So I wore a sailor's suit, and went to class to study Rimbaud and Baudelaire, and things like that.

1-00:21:53

Engerman: Was it any different in a sailor's suit than it would have been in civilian clothes?

1-00:21:57

Malia: Exactly the same, except we had to get up at six in the morning, get out in the big courtyard and do calisthenics, and then we were on our own for the rest of the day. We were disguised as sailors.

1-00:22:10

Engerman: So you had signed up for V-12 so you wouldn't be drafted into the army?

1-00:22:14

Malia: Yeah, it was that or being drafted. I could continue with college. So I finished. I had three and a half years as an undergraduate because you went summers too.

1-00:22:33

Engerman: Was that part of Navy V-12, or was that something that all universities did?

1-00:22:38

Malia: No, it was part of V-12. We went summers. My sophomore year was a regular year. It was junior year that I entered V-12. And with a French major. There was no Slavic department so there were no courses in Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, things like that. So I didn't read any more books in Russian. The V-12 years were over some time in 19—early '44, I think spring '45. Then I went to midshipman's school at Cornell. That was just four months.

1-00:23:39

Engerman:: Can we talk more about your experiences at Yale? You started talking about what you were studying, Rimbaud and Baudelaire and being a French literature major, is that it?

1-00:23:53

Malia: Well, there were some very good people in French literature then, Henri Peyre, P-E-Y-R-E, who was a Normalien. He was from the École Normale Supérieure in Paris, a very good scholar, a very good teacher. You had authentic French people there, and he brought very interesting lecturers to campus. André Breton, the surrealist guru, came. I was exposed to him. A guy named Albert Cohen, who was a great medievalist. Henri Focillon, an art critic. Yale was a major center of French studies at that time. I think it still is, isn't it?

1-00:24:48

Engerman: Yes. It still is.

1-00:24:50

Malia: So they had a first-rate department. All the courses were taught in French. That is one of the reasons why I got to speak it quite readily. The courses were taught in French, and we ended up having a very good survey of French literature from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century. When I got through in midshipman's school, I read the whole of [Marcel] Proust. I studied Russian during the daytime, and in the evening, I read the whole of Proust. I don't know how I got through this. And I really read it. I understood the whole thing.

1-00:25:28

Engerman: You must have taken a lot of evenings.

1-00:25:31

Malia: Well, I was not in midshipman's school, maybe language school.

1-00:25:37

Engerman: Well, let's stay at Yale then, for a couple more minutes. What other courses did you take aside from French literature?

1-00:25:47

Malia: Of course, a survey of the history of philosophy, which impressed me, which I enjoyed. Oh, and Eugene O'Neill, Junior.

1-00:26:00

Engerman: Son of the playwright?

1-00:26:02

Malia: Son of the playwright. His course on Greek and Roman history. He was very far to the left, so he criticized both the Athenian democracy and the Roman republic for not being adequately egalitarian.

1-00:26:20

Engerman: And how did you feel about that? Obviously it made an impact.

1-00:26:23

Malia: Well, I didn't even notice that the guy was particularly doctrinaire left. I thought it was somewhat odd the way he went on about how exploitative the two societies were. But, I didn't react against it. I didn't endorse it. Oh, I had one very great teacher, [Michael Ivanovich] Rostovtzeff, the ancient historian. A survey course in Greek history. I did take a number of history courses.

- 1-00:27:06
Engerman: Which other history courses did you take?
- 1-00:27:08
Malia: I'll come to that in a minute. Let me finish with Rostovtzeff. I didn't know who he was, but I wanted to learn about Greek history. So I signed up for this course. There were about six or seven of us, and this older man, speaking very poor English, teaching these raw undergraduates Greek history. I didn't know that I had the great Rostovtzeff as my teacher. I think that was my freshman year, before I really discovered Russia. Then, what is his name, Potter, this other historian.
- 1-00:27:45
Engerman: David Potter.
- 1-00:27:46
Malia: David Potter.
- 1-00:27:46
Engerman: He must have been quite young.
- 1-00:27:49
Malia: It was before he went to Stanford, obviously. He was great as a teacher. He made a big impression on me. One of the books that he gave us to read made a very big impression on me. That was Cash's *The Mind of the South*.
- 1-00:28:03
Engerman: Yes, W.J. Cash, the literary critic.
- 1-00:28:06
Malia: Yes, do people still read that?
- 1-00:28:07
Engerman: I assigned it to my graduate students as an example of Southern regionalism.
- 1-00:28:12
Malia: I thought it was a great book.
- 1-00:28:13
Engerman: It is a wonderful book.
- 1-00:28:16
Malia: I had Eugene O'Neill. It wasn't Greek and Roman history. It was Greek and Roman political thought. He was analyzing constitutional politics. Who else impressed me? Henri Peyre, I already mentioned that.
- 1-00:28:42
Engerman: What about him impressed you? He was a Normalien?
- 1-00:28:46
Malia: Yes.
- 1-00:28:46
Engerman: What did he teach, French literature?

1-00:28:48

Malia: He taught the seventeenth century, Racine, Gournay, and so forth. Oh, a man named Wallace Fowlie, F-O-W-L-I-E.

1-00:29:01

Engerman: What did he teach?

1-00:29:08

Malia: He taught the sixteenth century, and also the Baudelaire and Rimbaud. He was sort of a guru, who wrote books. One of his books was—he wrote in both English and French. One was called *Clowns and Angels*. He was all the time making psychological and philosophical analyses of literary texts, something that I and the other students found fascinating. It was sort of substitute religion, treating literature as a sort of a substitute religion, reading into it all sorts of metaphysical meaning. I found that fascinating at the time. Oh, among the other people, the people that I knew there, was Roger Shattuck. He roomed across the hall from me. Was he a roommate? No. He roomed across the hall from me my sophomore year. He was taking all these same courses. You know who Roger Shattuck is?

1-00:30:34

Engerman: He is the literary critic?

1-00:30:37

Malia: The literary critic, the Proust man. He has a good book about early twentieth century French culture in general called *The Banquet Years*. He is now the head of the literary equivalent of the American Historical Association, the breakaway group, the Modern Language Association.

1-00:31:02

Engerman: You have come a long way. Many years in between, and you have ended up in similar spots.

1-00:31:08

Malia: Yes, and we have been in contact over the years. He was also very much into the Proust business. As you know, he has written a book on Proust. Henri Peyre was a big Proustian. Fowlie was a big admirer of Proust. Another man named Jean Borsch, who was a fellow of Pierson College, which was the college that I was in as an undergraduate, and he ran the French table there. He was my advisor for a senior thesis that I never got to write because V-12 program cut us short before I got to write the thesis.

1-00:32:00

Engerman: Were there other history courses that you took? You mentioned Franklin Lee Baumer?

1-00:32:05

Malia: He was very good. He turned out to be a fairly respectable historian. He created the first course in intellectual history at Yale.

1-00:32:19

Engerman: Was there a sense of insurgency in that course, that this was a new topic and a new way to look at things, or was it just one other course that you took?

- 1-00:32:27
Malia: Yeah, it was a new way of looking at things. He made a big point that this was a radical innovation. I still have his reader if you want to take a look at that.
- 1-00:32:39
Engerman: What from it strikes you now? Have you looked back on it at all, and thought about it? Since you became an intellectual historian, is it something that you have found, or would find useful today, or does it represent only an early stage?
- 1-00:32:55
Malia: It was fairly conventional. The great names, the great books from I would say, beginning with Machiavelli and Erasmus and things like that, and down to—not to Freud. Freud was not a part of the canon then, way back in the early forties. He was obviously known as—
- 1-00:33:17
Engerman: Everyone talked about Freud. Psychoanalysis was—
- 1-00:33:20
Malia: He was not in the curriculum. Beginning when Harry Levin, this was Harvard later on, gave a course on Proust, Joyce, and Mann. That was revolutionary. That sort of thing had not been done before.
- 1-00:33:37
Engerman: Now, it's interesting, Calvin Trillin has an essay about teaching modernism, modernist authors, in fact like Proust, Joyce, and Mann at Columbia, in which he feels a certain kind of discomfort with it. As these people are so busy challenging the norms of literature and yet here he is teaching them to students as regular literature. Did you have any sense of reading—? You talk about all these people who were Proustians, did you have a sense of “then again this was something novel or innovative”?
- 1-00:34:09
Malia: Well, I had already read most of what Mann—most of what had been translated of Mann in high school. This guy Tierney that I told you about. I read Proust after I got through with Yale, at Russian language school. No, I had started to read him already at Yale. I finished him, read the whole thing in language school. Tierney also started me in on Joyce. Joyce was the only one that I felt was radically breaking with the past, what we call modernists. Mann, in a novel like *Buddenbrooks*, was not particularly modern or modernist. Even *The Magic Mountain* reads as a story. I didn't realize at the time all the symbolic significance that was going on it, but you can read it as a story. The one I did not respond to was T.S. Eliot. I didn't know what on earth he was trying to say. Fowlie was big on T.S. Eliot.
- 1-00:35:29
Engerman: You found him incomprehensible, is that what you are saying? Or that you comprehended and didn't like what you understood?
- 1-00:35:35
Malia: Well, first incomprehensible, and then not that big a deal. Eliot was taught at Yale. We had a very good survey of English literature. We had to begin with Chaucer and Medieval English, which I can no longer read, and we went down to T.S. Eliot's “Love

Song of J. Alfred Prufrock,” which I understood, but thought was a little—it was no great shakes. What I had trouble with was “The Wasteland,” and “Ash Wednesday,” which were things this guy Fowle was big on. Until I eventually found a book that explains what they are about. [laughs] Okay, I am still not a great fan of his. I remember *The Four Quartets* came out when I was an undergraduate at Yale, and Fowle, who was the arch-modernist, was all in a dither about “The Four Quartets” being so great. I think the guy’s overrated, frankly. I responded much more to certain French modernists, Paul Valéry, for instance, “Le Cimetière Marin,” which is great stuff. And that is difficult. That I learned to read when I was an undergraduate at Yale.

1-00:37:15

Engerman: It’s a remarkable education.

1-00:37:18

Malia: That is a great poem, and it’s quite difficult. I had to read a book that explained it by this guy, Alfred Cahquier, a Medievalist. He wrote a book explaining “Le Cimetière Marin.” Or Claudel of which I fed great quantities at Yale because Henri Peyre greatly admired him. What else?

1-00:37:45

Engerman: What else in Russian? You started taking Russian at Yale. Were you reading Russian literature, were you taking other courses?

1-00:37:52

Malia: No, I didn’t read any literature there at all.

1-00:37:53

Engerman: Did you take any courses with George Vernadsky in Russian history?

1-00:37:56

Malia: No. I already knew in my dealings with Baumer that I really wanted to do eventually someday was history, but I wanted to get all these languages and all this culture first, before I plunged into the history. Then because of the war and V-12, everything was so accelerated, with no summers off, that I didn’t really have time to think about, or go about shifting to history. But I was pretty sure that I wanted to—

1-00:38:39

Engerman: And you had taken plenty of history courses. You mentioned a few already.

1-00:38:44

Malia: I had taken—

1-00:38:46

Engerman: Baumer or Potter.

1-00:38:49

Malia: Yeah, I think that the Baumer probably was History 10, it was called. I think that I had to take that, but I enjoyed it tremendously. I think I had to take some American history, and that is why I took the Potter. What other history courses did I take? I don’t remember.

- 1-00:39:10
Engerman: What sort of history had you planned on studying? Were you thinking you would do French history?
- 1-00:39:18
Malia: History!
- 1-00:39:18
Engerman: History.
- 1-00:39:19
Malia: The works! I wanted to know what the human adventure added up to.
- 1-00:39:24
Engerman: In all periods of time?
- 1-00:39:26
Malia: All periods.
- 1-00:39:28
Engerman: Small ambition.
- 1-00:39:30
Malia: Yeah. In high school, I came across [Oswald] Spengler's *Decline of The West*, which gave me the human adventure overall. When I got to Yale, Baumer told me that Spengler wasn't really very good, and that I should read [Arnold] Toynbee instead. So I read Toynbee, [chuckles] who gave me what it was all about. And I didn't like Toynbee as well as—. Well, the first volume of Toynbee I felt was—on challenge and response.
- That was not bad. And, well he was a classicist you know, by training, so he knew a lot about Greece and Rome. He also obviously knew his European history, so this idea of challenge and response when Northern Africa dried up and people were squeezed into the narrow Nile Valley, they responded by creating this civilization based on the flooding of the Nile. That first volume can be read with interest and profit. I also read somewhere along the way, Hendrik Willem Van Loon *History of the World*. I read that I guess as a kid. All sorts of things, such as Dickens' *A Child's History of England*. I don't remember what other courses I took at Yale in history.
- 1-00:41:13
Engerman: How about outside the classroom. What was the Yale experience like? You mentioned you were in Pierson College. What was that like?
- 1-00:41:22
Malia: Well, I wasn't in Skull and Bones or anything of that sort. Outside of class there wasn't much because we had to go to classes all day, and study in the evenings, and there was no summer vacation. So, I had a number of friends such as Shattuck, and a guy named Packard. Did you ever—?
- 1-00:41:46
Engerman: What is the first name?

- 1-00:41:48
Malia: Stephen Packard, I think it was. He achieved some notoriety. I forget just what it was. He was a professor somewhere. And, [long pause] well that was it. It was a completely deformed college experience.
- 1-00:42:23
Engerman: Did you feel it was a big intellectual jump from high school?
- 1-00:42:28
Malia: No, it was quite a sort of continuum, because Marietta Knapp had prepared me very well for this survey of English literature, which was taught by a number of different people, all of them extremely good. I remember one, the guy who gave us Chaucer and Shakespeare, his name was Pierson. I think he was a scholar of some eminence. I forget his first name. He is not the Pierson who did *De Tocqueville in America*.
- 1-00:43:11
Engerman: That is George Pierson.
- 1-00:43:12
Malia: That is George Pierson. It might have been George Pierson. He was in the English department, George Pierson was?
- 1-00:43:18
Engerman: I thought he was actually in history, but I may be wrong.
- 1-00:43:22
Malia: Well, he was an excellent teacher. The textbook that they used to unlock the histories of literature as far as was [Cleanth] Brooks and [Robert Penn] Warren—do you know that, *Understanding Poetry*?
- 1-00:43:36
Engerman: Austin Warren?
- 1-00:43:36
Malia: What?
- 1-00:43:37
Engerman: Is it Austin Warren? I don't know the—
- 1-00:43:40
Malia: Cleanth Brooks and—
- 1-00:43:43
Engerman: And Austin Warren.
- 1-00:43:44
Malia: Is it Austin or William [i.e. Robert] Penn [Warren]?
- 1-00:43:46
Engerman: It could have been either actually. Both were New Critics.

- 1-00:43:51
Malia: It was the New Criticism, which marked me very much. I thought that it was sound doctrine. I still have the book if you want to take a look at it.
- 1-00:44:03
Engerman: So you said there wasn't much life outside the classroom. Everyone was really just in classes?
- 1-00:44:07
Malia: No one had a life outside the class.
- 1-00:44:08
Engerman: One of the things that is striking about Yale is that certainly in the middle of the twentieth century, there is a degree of social exclusivity in both kind of financial and ethnic terms, as being a place for well-off WASPs [White Anglo-Saxon Protestants] to put it bluntly.
- 1-00:44:27
Malia: Yeah.
- 1-00:44:27
Engerman: Did you feel, did that have any impact on your college experience?
- 1-00:44:33
Malia: No. All of—well, we wound up eventually—. There is a section in Pierson College that calls it “the slave quarters” because it looked like slave buildings in New Orleans in the early nineteenth century. I am sure it is no longer called “the slave quarters” anymore. It was a large room and two bedrooms. It was initially for two people, and we wound up, there were four of us, and this is throughout the whole V-12. I think it was three semesters. They were all well-off, well-to-do WASPs. I remember one of them, a fellow named [Keekoffer? unconfirmed], his father was an economics professor at Wisconsin. They had a summer home in Westerly, Rhode Island. I remember going there for a weekend. We were allowed to go out for weekends and things like that during one summer that I was in V-12. At some point we wound up—I was still in the sailor suit—at the home of the Browns of Brown [University] in Providence. Carter Brown later became the director of the National Gallery in Washington. That family.
- 1-00:46:16
Engerman: Yes, but the family that founded Brown University, the John Carter Brown library?
- 1-00:46:20
Malia: That is right. The whole thing. So, I circulated in these WASP circles, and there was no feeling of tension. And I don't think I am romanticizing or being naïve about that, no.
- 1-00:46:37
Engerman: So there was no sense in the social or in an academic setting of your coming from a non-WASP background as being an issue?
- 1-00:46:48
Malia: No, no. But then I wasn't in touch with the fraternity circuit at Yale, let alone the secret society circuit at Yale. The people I knew were the other literary and intellectual types in Pierson College, and in the French and history departments. I mean, there were

enough people like [McLean? confirm] for instance, well he wasn't in Pierson, he was in another college, enough people like that so that constituted my Yale community. I didn't pay much attention to the rest, and since the whole thing went by so fast because of the war, I never really got to reflect on it.

1-00:47:51

Engerman: Is there any one person, either a classmate or a professor, you'd identify as your most important influence at Yale, in the same way that Marietta Knapp was for your high school experience?

1-00:48:04

Malia: Well at the time, and in retrospect, in a rather superficial way, this guy Fowlie, the modernist. In a more substantial way, Peyre because he represented really a very refined culture. He was also very open to modernism. The person that the two of them were touting was Henry Miller, who was at the time forbidden in the US. You couldn't publish him here. They both thought he was a great writer. Later on when I got to Paris, and I bought a couple of his books, and yeah, they are interesting. But I don't think that I now consider them great writing. Baumer impressed me because of the seriousness with which he went about history, in particular intellectual history.

1-00:49:08

Engerman: And that is something that you then carried with you later in the career?

1-00:49:12

Malia: Well, he is someone that I have remembered, and Jean Borsch, who was my advisor when I enrolled as a French major, never impressed me that much as an intellectual. He was a very nice guy, but Baumer was more impressive intellectually.

1-00:49:35

Engerman: Were there any extra-curricular activities going on, or political activities at Yale? Or did the wartime give it a singularity of purpose?

1-00:49:47

Malia: I was completely unpolitical. There may have been political activity going on. Oh, one thing that I should mention, the master of Pierson College was Arnold Wolfers, a political scientist. Swiss. In other words, German-Swiss. He somehow or other wound up here, and he was a specialist in international affairs. He was very good at commenting. He gave—Oh, in the History 10 course, which I took the year that the war began or that we got into the war, he gave some brilliant lectures on twentieth century diplomatic and military history.

1-00:50:42

Engerman: Wolfers did?

1-00:50:44

Malia: Yes. Mostly we met in these sections, but Arnold Wolfers was brought in from these brilliant lectures on the twentieth century, which dazzled me because they were just so good. I brought my father around too, when I was in Pierson College. Every time Wolfers would update us on what was going on, I wrote my father, because he worked in New Haven—we lived in Hamden, but he worked in New Haven—because he was

very political and interested in all this kind of stuff. I was bored stiff with the football weekend, and that kind of stuff.

1-00:51:31

Engerman: Did you go to the football games?

1-00:51:32

Malia: Yes, I was sort of pressured into going. Because I still saw these people from Hamden High, who were at Yale, and who would be going to those things, and I was being pressured into going along.

1-00:51:50

Engerman: So, you were most of the way through with Yale, and then V-12 sent you to midshipman's school?

1-00:51:59

Malia: Yes.

1-00:51:59

Engerman: And that was at Cornell?

1-00:52:00

Malia: That was at Cornell, which has a beautiful campus.

1-00:52:03

Engerman: Yes. What did you do there? What did midshipman's school entail?

1-00:52:08

Malia: It is a full-time job, to go to midshipman's school. Well, I found some French people to talk with. And weekends we were free, and another bookish guy, [chuckles] what was his name? I forget it. We double-dated two French girls who were refugees. Somehow or other they got to this country. So I continued to speak French. I went to visit one of the local professors of French, who happened to be French. I called on him, and I introduced myself. So he invited me to dinner a few times. I kept up that interest.

1-00:53:06

Engerman: What did you actually do in the school though? In midshipman's school itself?

1-00:53:11

Malia: You learned about being an ensign. I had damage control, navigation, naval law, and I forget what the courses were. How to recognize the various types of aircraft that were flying. They would show slides, and we would have to write down what aircraft it was, both American ones and enemy ones—the German and Japanese ones. It was full-time, learning about that stuff. The part of the naval stuff bored me, the navigation, the damage control. What interested me was the naval law because it had a certain academic cast and flavor to it. I really took to that, but the rest bored me. Then came the moment of what they were going to assign me to. This was late in the war. This was already 1945. They discovered that I was colorblind. I guess it was early 1945, that I was a little bit colorblind. And, since you are supposed to be able to read semaphore all the time—

1-00:54:43

Engerman: The semaphore flags, right, which are colored and patterned?

1-00:54:47

Malia: Yeah, it is rather ridiculous, as if most officers would be involved in that. I couldn't be assigned to regular duty. So at this point a certain Commander Hindmarsh came through. He recruited for the Navy Language School at Boulder, Colorado, which was founded initially to teach people Japanese. Then they added Russian, Malay, and a fourth language. It must have been Chinese. Henry May went there. He learned Japanese.

1-00:55:37

Engerman: Hugh McLean went there, too.

1-00:55:38

Malia: Hugh McLean went there too. So, Captain Hindmarsh came through this midshipman's school looking for recruits among the people who for one reason or another were not going to be assigned to the active fleet. He was initially going to put me in the Japanese language school, and then I pointed out that I already knew some Russian. So he put me in the Russian language program, and I was shipped off to Boulder, Colorado. Well, Trager and company had not done a very good job of teaching me elementary Russian at Yale. At Boulder they did a good job! They had a whole bunch of Russians. Prince Meshchersky was one. Mrs. Kliachko was a noisy, maternal woman. Bienstock his wife had a voice like mine right now. These were native speakers, and it was learning Russian every day, all day long.

1-00:56:57

Engerman: It was five hours of class a day, or something like that?

1-00:57:00

Malia: I don't know. That was all we did. Then they let us out on Saturday evening. That was about it. That was when I finished reading Proust. I must have started it earlier. I must have started at Yale.

1-00:57:16

Engerman: This is out in Colorado?

1-00:57:17

Malia: In Colorado, yes. I wasn't in the same group as Hugh McLean. I think I was in the first one, and he was in the second group. That was a really good course. And that was about it. I think I went into Denver once or twice. One of the people in this course was a guy, a very tall guy named Gross, who knew Spanish well because he lived in Buenos Aires for a long time. He introduced me to Chinese food. I had never had any Chinese food before then. Egg Foo Young I think it was. Dishes that you probably can't find anymore.

1-00:58:14

Engerman: Oh, you can always find Egg Foo Yung.

1-00:58:16

Malia: You can? Okay. So, that was again a very bookish, academic experience.

- 1-00:58:26
Engerman: How long was your stint at the language school?
- 1-00:58:28
Malia: I forget exactly how long it was.
- 1-00:58:30
Engerman: Six months, a year, two years? Something like that?
- 1-00:58:33
Malia: No, it couldn't have been more than six months. Then they shipped me to Dutch Harbor, Alaska, where I got to meet real Soviet Russians.
- 1-00:58:45
Engerman: What were they doing there?
- 1-00:58:46
Malia: The Lend-Lease ships coming from Vladivostok and Magadan and Nakhodka and places like that had to go through La Perouse Strait between Japan and the [Sea of] Okhotsk, and then through the Bering Sea and then through the Unalaska Strait, where Unalaska is. There they had to receive moving instructions to go to Seattle, San Francisco, or Long Beach. They had to follow certain groups so that American submarines wouldn't sink them. I was the liaison officer. I was in naval intelligence then. I was the liaison officer that gave them these moving instructions. I just handed the things that someone else, people who knew about them, the people who were running the navy, would give to me. Also they refueled there. About half of them were coal burners, so they took out the coal. Others with Lend-Lease ships, these "Liberty Ships" they were called, which ran on diesel fuel. They received diesel fuel. So we fueled them, we supplied them with all sorts of goodies. They went—going to the States they were empty, the Liberty Ships would be very high in the water. Coming back—
- 1-01:00:21
Engerman: Very low in the water.
- 1-01:00:22
Malia: Very low in the water, with locomotives and lord knows what on them, on their decks. Well, the great interest of this was that these captains had been to sea, either way, especially coming from the submarines, in a rough sea for a fair period of time, and they wanted to relax. This meant having a dinner with a lot of *vodka*, *pel'meni* [ravioli], *ikra* [caviar]. [laughs] They carried jars of *ketovnaia ikra*, which is the red ikra, and smoked fish of various kinds. They put on a big spread, and they would invite the Americans to dinner. Now, it was usually the captain, the first mate, and the political officer. But very often it was just the captain without the political officer. And the political officer was likely a Party man? As captain, he could do that. So they talked, some at great length and with great frankness.
- 1-01:01:55
Engerman: What sort of things did you learn? This must have been your first encounter with people who had lived in the Soviet Union.
- 1-01:02:00
Malia: Real live Soviet Russians.

- 1-01:02:02
Engerman: Yes.
- 1-01:02:02
Malia: Well, one was a captain called Amerikantsev.
- 1-01:02:09
Engerman: A good name for his job.
- 1-01:02:11
Malia: Which he got when his grandfather, at the time of the Emancipation, took that as his last name, Amerikantsev. Another was a woman, Anna Shchinina. Everyone at Dutch Harbor was very impressed with this woman. She had this Tartarish look, she was commanding a ship. This was of course, way before women got emancipated. This could happen in the Soviet Union, but not in the U.S. Another was an Arctic explorer named Bedinion, who you can find in the history books. He was with a Soviet *ledokol*, an ice-breaker, got caught in the Arctic ice, and was drifting towards the North Pole. The important personnel had taken off by airplane, but he stayed. When he came back, this was some time in 1937, 1938, shortly before the war, he became a national hero!
- 1-01:03:30
Engerman: I have read about him. The Americans were following him quite closely also. It was international news.
- 1-01:03:35
Malia: He became a national hero! He gave me some stamps with his picture on it, which I have lost unfortunately. He talked moderately about—I mean moderately critically. Amerikantsev said the works. He was very critical.
- 1-01:03:56
Engerman: What did you learn, what did he say?
- 1-01:03:59
Malia: That Magadan was the entrance to Kolyma, that collectivization had been a disaster for the peasants. What I learned was that what people who were hostile to the Soviet Union were saying was in fact true. One of the most revealing was a Spaniard named Alvarez, who spoke perfect Russian or excellent Russian, who had been evacuated from Spain in 1939 when the Republican government at last collapsed. He was from Barcelona. That was how he knew about ships. He was actually devastated, completely disillusioned about the Soviet experience. He invited me to dinner without the political officer, alone. Then others were without going to the lengths of Amerikantsev or Alvarez, in an off-hand way said an awful lot of revealing things. There was never any mystery to me about the Soviet system.
- 1-01:05:37
Engerman: Would you say that those kinds of conversations confirmed what you had believed, or did they change what you had thought in some ways?
- 1-01:05:46
Malia: Oh, I didn't believe much. I didn't have a very clear image of the Soviet Union.

1-01:05:49

Engerman: So it really formed your image rather than changed it?

1-01:05:52

Malia: I was brought up believing that the Soviet system was bad, and I heard in the course of my frequentation of the Russians in Boulder that they had camps, and that the purge trials were phony and so forth. So, I had been exposed to a fair amount of critical discourse about the Soviet system, so I wasn't expecting anything. I had no illusions to lose. I mean, I wasn't expecting anything good. But, I also was not expecting the kind of details that the more talkative ones gave me. It was quite clear to me that what critics of the Soviet Union said about it was true. I never had, therefore, any phase of even moderate fellow-traveling with respect to this Soviet system. Next time, when we come to the École Normale, where all the people were communist, I'll tell you some strange things. So I knew roughly what the Soviet system was. It was what its critics said it was. I enjoyed immensely talking to these people. What I did at night when I went home—oh, also, I was the assistant liaison officer. The main liaison officer was someone whose name I will not mention. He in fact, at one point was the American vice consul in Vladivostok, when we had a consulate there. Yes, we did—

1-01:08:07

Engerman: No, no, no, I am trying to think who that was, that is all. I will look it up. If you refuse to say, I can look it up. But, who was the—?

1-01:08:17

Malia: Well, he told me a lot of tales about what life was like in Vladivostok. Anyway, he managed to get a hold of one of the few women that were on the base. She was a nurse. After I showed up to help out with the Russians, he spent all his time with her and turned the whole job over to me, which didn't bother me because I had a monopoly on the Russians. [laughs] No contact was allowed between the personnel on the base and the Russians. I don't know whether we decided this or the Russians asked for it or whatever. I was the only person who saw Russians.

1-01:08:59

Engerman: By your boss' devolution of power, I suppose it was, it gave you a chance to really have a unique role. You could not have learned as much with two people in the room.

1-01:09:12

Malia: Yes. So, I hobnobbed with the Russians by day, and in the evening, I read the whole of *War and Peace* in Russian.

1-01:09:20

Engerman: Which is a daunting task.

1-01:09:22

Malia: And I duplicated what I did with Roger Martin du Gard, but this time with Tolstoy.

1-01:09:26

Engerman: Very, very difficult in Russian.

1-01:09:31

Malia: And by the time I got through, I could read Russian like that. Then it all ended on V-J Day. Japan surrendered, and suddenly Dutch Harbor was filled to the hilt. A whole fleet

of Russian merchant ships, because the Soviets had telegraphed or communicated in some way to these Russian merchant ships to seek refuge in Dutch Harbor. So they all—there were about ten or twelve of them—and the captain of the base decided to give a party, inviting all of the Russian captains to the club. It was bachelor something, what is it called? B something Q. It was the club. All of them. And I was in a PT boat, little PT boat, sent around to invite all of the captains. Of course at each ship, I was handed down an *iunka* of vodka.

1-01:10:47

Engerman: [laughs] Only one?

1-01:10:50

Malia: One, but there were twelve ships. So, by the time I got to the party, I passed out. You couldn't refuse!

1-01:11:01

Engerman: Oh, it would have been impossible.

1-01:11:02

Malia: Impossible!

1-01:11:04

Engerman: A breach of protocol.

1-01:11:04

Malia: A breach of protocol, and I was supposed to translate [laughs]. So I missed the party, and I don't know how the captain of base, the commander of the base, and the Russian captains communicated. Anyway, there were drunk Russians being picked up all over the base. So that is it.

1-01:11:24

Engerman: But you got in trouble for that?

1-01:11:26

Malia: No.

1-01:11:27

Engerman: No, so with Lend-Lease, it all came to a very quick end. With V-J Day, Lend-Lease immediately ended.

1-01:11:35

Malia: Well, there were no more ships.

1-01:11:37

Engerman: Yes, and when did you leave?

1-01:11:40

Malia: Oh, I had to wait several months before I was discharged.

1-01:11:43

Engerman: So it would have been fall of 1945 that you were discharged, and V-J Day would have been August or early September?

1-01:11:52
Malia: No, I spent six months in Kodiak, Alaska.

1-01:11:56
Engerman: Yes, doing what?

1-01:11:57
Malia: Nothing! I was waiting to be demobilized.

1-01:12:00
Engerman: I see, and when you were looking to demobilization, what were your options? You were eligible under the GI Bill?

1-01:12:07
Malia: Yeah. So I decided I had had enough of Harvard and New Haven. I wanted to leave home.

1-01:12:12
Engerman: Of Yale and New Haven?

1-01:12:13
Malia: Excuse me, Yale and New Haven. Mostly I wanted to travel. I wanted to see the world. So I decided I would go to Harvard.

1-01:12:21
Engerman: Why Harvard and not Columbia? There were two programs at this point.

1-01:12:25
Malia: I went and visited both. [pauses] I don't remember why. They both offered me fellowships. I went to Harvard in Slavic languages and literatures.

1-01:12:55
Engerman: I see. Well, we have a lot to do then next time.

1-01:13:00
Malia: And then the guy who ran the department, it was Wilbur Cross.

1-01:13:04
Engerman: Samuel Hazzard Cross.

1-01:13:04
Malia: Samuel Hazzard Cross. Wilbur Cross is the parkway in Connecticut.

1-01:13:07
Engerman: Yes. Samuel Cross died then right after you got there.

1-01:13:10
Malia: He died, so I transferred to history.

[End of Interview]

[Interview #2: December 17, 2003]
[Begin Audio File Malia 02 12-17-03]

2-00:00:03

Engerman: So I am here with Martin Malia. It is 17. This is our second session. When we left off, you had just been mustered out of the navy as it were.

2-00:00:17

Malia: Yeah.

2-00:00:17

Engerman: And were alighting at Cambridge, at Harvard.

2-00:00:20

Malia: Yeah. You asked me why I went to Harvard.

2-00:00:25

Engerman: Why you went to Harvard rather than Columbia, and you said that you couldn't remember a specific reason.

2-00:00:30

Malia: Well, I remembered.

2-00:00:30

Engerman: Oh, terrific. What was it?

2-00:00:32

Malia: Just a minute. [pauses] I looked into Yale history, and they said that I had to take a course in economics. That turned me off. Also I didn't want to go back to Yale because it was too close to home. And I wanted to get away from home. I looked into the Slavic program at Columbia, and I didn't much care for Ernie Simmons, who was the big wheel there.

2-00:01:06

Engerman: Yes, you weren't alone in that.

2-00:01:08

Malia: Yeah. I looked in at Harvard. Samuel Cross was very welcoming and offered me a lot of money and so forth.

2-00:01:22

Engerman: This was in the end of 1945?

2-00:01:25

Malia: No, this was '46.

2-00:01:26

Engerman: Early '46, because Cross dies in 1946 I think, right?

2-00:01:32

Malia: He died in the middle of the first semester I was there.

2-00:01:36

Engerman: Ah, I see, so at the end of '46?

2-00:01:38

Malia: Yeah. One thing that also influenced me was that Columbia didn't look like a university, coming from the pseudo-chauvinist atmosphere of Yale, whereas Harvard looked like a university. What did I know of the world? I knew Hamden, Yale; I knew Midtown Manhattan, Boulder, Colorado, and Dutch Harbor, Alaska. That is all I had seen. Columbia just didn't look like what I was used to in the way of universities, whereas Harvard did. But that was not the only reason; the warm welcome that Cross extended. So I enrolled in the Slavic department there.

2-00:02:31

Engerman: Now, you had originally—when we talked yesterday, you had said that you were choosing between history and literature, but that you were inclined to become a historian to explain the human adventure.

2-00:02:41

Malia: Yeah, I looked into Yale in the history department. They had no Slavic department. So I was interested, and when I got to Harvard, I signed up for Karpovich's history course, the Introduction to Russian History, because I didn't know any Russian history. I didn't know about the Emancipation, or the Duma or anything. All I knew was what I read in *War and Peace*. Oh, and the reason why I never took any Russian literature at Yale was because they didn't offer any—one, and two. Trager's course didn't prepare you to read on your own. It was a lousy course. So I went to Harvard, and signed up for some Slavic courses, and Karpovich's history course. Then in the middle of the semester, Cross died, and that more or less liquidated the program. There were no longer any eminent people there. So I did what I really wanted to do from the beginning. I moved to history. And history let me move and keep the fellowship that they had offered me, or that Cross had offered me and so forth. So I did history at Harvard.

2-00:04:03

Engerman: Now, still why didn't you look to doing history at Harvard from the start? You briefly detoured through—.

2-00:04:09

Malia: Well, until then my career had been a linguistic and literary one when I studied, my career of studying was literary. I was going to continue in that vein. But I at last realized that my real interest was history.

2-00:04:28

Engerman: What sort of classes did you take there? You said that your first semester you started with Cross' class in literature, Karpovich's—this is a big lecture class, right?

2-00:04:37

Malia: Big lecture class. Well, I will give you the program overall. For the PhD, you have to have a certain number of fields. The fields that I picked were modern Russia. That meant Russia from 1485 really to 1917.

2-00:04:58

Engerman: That is right, because Karpovich tended not to teach the Soviet Union as history.

- 2-00:05:04
Malia: He would not teach it because he said, "That is not my Russia." For him, Russia ended in 1917. Modern France, that was France from Louis the Eleventh to the present. That was in fact to World War II. Byzantine history, and then Renaissance and Reformation. So my course work and reading were all of those subjects. In addition, I audited Charles Taylor's Medieval France, because he was a superb teacher, and his Medieval intellectual history, which went from Augustine to Thomas. And one of the things, in addition to giving a superb intellectual history course, he was the only person around who was really familiar with Marc Bloch and the *Annales* school.
- 2-00:06:04
Engerman: Yes, so you were interested in the *Annales* school then?
- 2-00:06:08
Malia: Well, I heard about it.
- 2-00:06:09
Engerman: You had heard about it at Harvard?
- 2-00:06:11
Malia: Yeah, I heard about it, I knew it was important, and I knew what it stood for and so forth. So I did those various things. The two people who struck me most were Karpovich because I had the usual woolly American ideas about Russia as a place.
- 2-00:06:31
Engerman: What were those woolly American ideas about Russia?
- 2-00:06:35
Malia: Well, in part, it was Asiatic, despotic, and barbarous, and in part it was soulful and spiritual, because after all you had Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. Karpovich was of course against those—
- 2-00:06:53
Engerman: Both of those.
- 2-00:06:55
Malia: Yeah, did you read that little thing I wrote on [Terence] Emmons?
- 2-00:06:59
Engerman: I did not read the thing on Emmons yet, no.
- 2-00:07:00
Malia: Well, I explain all of this.
- 2-00:07:02
Engerman: Yeah.
- 2-00:07:01
Malia: I explain Karpovich's position. He was against [Nikolai] Berdiaev, who was the riding high with the Russian idea.

- 2-00:07:09
Engerman: And his Russian idea was that communism had emerged out of a certain sense of Russian spirituality, a communal sense of it.
- 2-00:07:16
Malia: It was Russian spirituality perverted.
- 2-00:07:17
Engerman: Yes.
- 2-00:07:18
Malia: And the first volumes of E.H. Carr's *Communist or Bolshevik*—
- 2-00:07:26
Engerman: *History of Bolshevik*—
- 2-00:07:27
Malia: “What do you mean Bolshevik Revolution? There was a Russian Revolution and the Bolsheviks stole it,” was the attitude. So Karpovich, who until the postwar period had been only an associate professor and had been given sort of menial tasks around the Harvard history department. He occasionally taught a little course on Russian history, but it wasn't a big deal. He never had a seminar before the two seminars I described in that piece on Emmons. He had one student, or he had two students.
- 2-00:08:09
Engerman: Phil Mosely.
- 2-00:08:10
Malia: Phil Mosely, and the guy at Yale.
- 2-00:08:12
Engerman: Fred Barghoorn. [Mosely and Barghoorn]—those are the two students he had before the war. And both of course were very successful, went on to—
- 2-00:08:18
Malia: No, three!
- 2-00:08:19
Engerman: What?
- 2-00:08:19
Malia: Oliver Radkey.
- 2-00:08:20
Engerman: Oliver Radkey, who went on to Texas.
- 2-00:08:24
Malia: Texas, yes. And Sheila Fitzpatrick later on occupied the Oliver Radkey Chair, my friend Sheila. So he just had an occasional graduate student, and maybe a little lecture course once a semester, which of course in Russian history, the whole, all of it. And for the rest, he taught History 10 or whatever they call it.

- 2-00:08:50
Engerman: History 1?
- 2-00:08:50
Malia: History 1.
- 2-00:08:51
Engerman: This was the history of Europe from the beginnings to—
- 2-00:08:55
Malia: From the fall of Rome, I think.
- 2-00:08:57
Engerman: From the fall of Rome until World War I or something like that.
- 2-00:09:01
Malia: He taught that.
- 2-00:09:02
Engerman: Which was a famous class.
- 2-00:09:04
Malia: It was a famous class. Well, I never took that course. He taught that, but he had no school really, no school of historians. This is the war. But, it was the postwar that gave him loads of graduate students. He had two seminars in two successive years, and almost all of the people in my generation, [Nicholas] Riasanovsky was one of them, [Richard] Pipes was one of them, [Leopold] Haimson and so forth, who later on fanned out across the country to set up Russian history programs. Well, there was one in Berkeley with [Robert] Kerner.
- 2-00:09:42
Engerman: But it was nothing of either intellectual or quantitative substance.
- 2-00:09:50
Malia: Well, we [Berkeley] had [Robert J.] Kerner and [George] Lantzeff.
- 2-00:09:51
Engerman: Yes.
- 2-00:09:52
Malia: You had [O'Brien? Unconfirmed] at Davis. You had [Waclaw] Lednicki and Gleb Struve in the Slavic department. Oh, you had a good Slavic outfit here. Lednicki and Struve were first-rate. Kerner and Lantzeff were not. They were okay.
- 2-00:10:14
Engerman: Yeah, but Lednicki and Struve were in Slavic literature and language, not in history.
- 2-00:10:19
Malia: Yeah, but they were a resource for anyone interested in Russia. They knew a lot about Russia.

2-00:10:24

Engerman: Well, why don't you describe the Karpovich classes that you took? We could maybe start with the famous seminars, either your seminars or—

2-00:10:32

Malia: Well, he was a mild-mannered man, but he was firmly opposed to the various woolly ideas circulating about Russia; the Asiatic despotism, the Russian soul, that communism is a promising experiment, the revolution is Bolshevik, and not a broader revolution. His constant theme was that the difference between Russia and the West is not a difference in kind, but a difference in degree.

2-00:11:15

Engerman: Which you then adapt to a cultural gradient.

2-00:11:18

Malia: Which I think is true. Theme number two, to explain what happened, the terrible things that happened after 1917, you don't have to go back to the pre-revolutionary past and find the origins of that. For instance, the fact that Nicholas I declared Chaadaev to be a madman does not explain the psychiatric internment under the Soviets, things like that.

2-00:11:52

Engerman: Peter the Great doesn't explain Stalin.

2-00:11:55

Malia: Yeah, Peter the Great doesn't explain Stalin, the fact that the Decembrists confessed doesn't explain the purge trials, because explanations of these sort were current.

2-00:12:05

Engerman: Were dominant. Even some of the most erudite Russia observers like George Kennan, George Frost Kennan, were prone to this kind of explanation.

2-00:12:13

Malia: Yes, I know. Robert Conquest has done it. Quite a number of people.

2-00:12:19

Engerman: But even if we are talking in the forties now, when Kennan was writing, he is full of this kind of Russia.

2-00:12:26

Malia: He was for that, yeah. Well, Karpovich, patiently, wearily, I would say, was against all of this. He didn't like Dostoevsky because Dostoevsky was the main text for this kind of stuff, well, for the Russian soul kind of stuff. So, his first theme was that the difference between Russia and the West was a difference of degree, not of kind, and two, to explain what happened in 1917. After 1917, you have to go to the immediate circumstances that produced whatever happened. In other words, the Bolsheviks were able to take over because of the war. Until then, here I part company with him, he believed that the constitutional experiment could have worked if Russia had had a decade or two more of peace. But in Europe at that time, that was just impossible. And he would show that at the time, he and his whole generation were against the [Pyotr] Stolypin coup d'etat, but in retrospect, it was just as well that Stolypin did it because the Duma was too radical, too polarized—the Second Duma—between the revolutionary Left and a reactionary Right. You couldn't get a constitutional order working on that

basis. It was better to have a more restricted suffrage, and move into things gradually the way the British did, I would say, with their reform bills in the nineteenth century, and until the country got educated, and the Duma voted for compulsory primary education. In a generation it would have been a different Russia. Stolypin broke up the peasant commune, or when he started to break up the peasant commune, that would have created a different society. And with time, Russia could have become just another European constitutional democracy. I now think that was utopian anyway.

2-00:14:37

Engerman: But it is basically the Russia that he left in 1917.

2-00:14:43

Malia: Yes. As he and his émigré friends said, “In the good old days of the cursed autocracy.” All of them former SRs, former Mensheviks, well there weren’t many Mensheviks at the time, believed more or less this line.

2-00:15:07

Engerman: And of course, Karpovich himself was a former SR, Socialist Revolutionary.

2-00:15:11

Malia: Well, as a very young man, around twenty or something like that, in 1905 or 1906. But by 1917, he was a Kadet [Constitutional Democratic Party member]. He switched in April 1917, at the time of the April Crisis in 1917. Then of course he was sent to Washington.

2-00:15:35

Engerman: Yes, the story I read is that he ran into Boris Bakhmetev on Nevskii Prospekt and was offered, or he knew the Bakhmetev family.

2-00:15:44

Malia: That is it, that is it. So he was not there for the showdown.

2-00:15:48

Engerman: Now, why don’t we talk about Karpovich as a professor then. What you just outlined was his theme of Russian history. The main themes he drew in Russian history.

2-00:16:01

Malia: Now, this is sanity about Russia.

2-00:16:03

Engerman: Yes.

2-00:16:03

Malia: He had no brilliant insights about Russia’s development, fancy conceptual themes, nothing borrowed from sociology or Max Weber or [Emile] Durkheim or anything like that.

2-00:16:20

Engerman: Or from other fantasies like his friend George Vernadsky’s.

2-00:16:25

Malia: Or Eurasianism.

2-00:16:26

Engerman: Eurasianism, yes.

2-00:16:27

Malia: In his lectures, he would say that he would agree with Russians who were there during the Mongol yoke, that it was essentially a negative experience.

[laughter]

And they didn't really feel that they benefited greatly from being included in a great Eurasian empire, that kind of thing. It was low-keyed. Also, when Adlai Stevenson was running against Eisenhower—

2-00:17:06

Engerman: In '52.

2-00:17:07

Malia: In '52. He confided to me. I, of course, was a New Deal Democrat. I had been since the first time that I voted, which was probably 1940, against my father. I already explained that. I was going to vote for Stevenson, and he said, "Well, I think I am going to vote for Eisenhower. I think he has a better understanding of the tense international situation. He would be more anti-communist than Stevenson." So, he [Karpovich] had moved progressively to the right, if you want to consider Eisenhower to the right, I suppose, I mean relative to—

2-00:17:51

Engerman: He was certainly right of Stevenson.

2-00:17:52

Malia: He was right of Stevenson. But mostly he was low-key. In addition, he was very close to Alexander Gerschenkron.

2-00:18:01

Engerman: Who was the economic historian who had been hired at Harvard in '47 or '48.

2-00:18:08

Malia: Yes. And you know whom Gerschenkron modeled? It is the cultural gradient as applied to economics.

2-00:18:16

Engerman: That the different kinds of backwardness required different kinds of responses and yet everyone can catch up.

2-00:18:20

Malia: Everyone can catch up. And it is right there in Struve's 1889 manifesto of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party. The farthest east you go, the weaker and more cowardly becomes the bourgeoisie, and the greater the tasks therefore that fall to the proletariat. Well, if you cross out proletariat, and put in the state, or the *intelligentsia*, it works.

2-00:18:56

Engerman: Yes, the state for Gerschenkron, the *intelligentsia* for Karpovich.

- 2-00:19:00
Malia: Well, *intelligentsia* for the revolution, either of them.
- 2-00:19:04
Engerman: Yes.
- 2-00:19:05
Malia: I mean, you can find—this is found in [Pavel] Miliukov, statements that amount to the gradient. So Karpovich never used that term. I got that from [Wolfgang Zal? Inaudible name], or from the Germans. [Friedrich] Meinecke's whole work, [Leopold von] Ranke's whole work is centered around that.
- 2-00:19:35
Engerman: But what you are doing here is showing Karpovich's connections, and you also say this about the Emmons article.
- 2-00:19:40
Malia: He was close to Gershenkron, and I always got along with Gershenkron very well also. Then he, after I finished my work and I was teaching, founded at last a proper Slavic department at Harvard. The university administration woke up to his presence, and realized that he was an asset precisely because he had this network. So he founded the Slavic department, brought in big names, like Roman Jakobson.
- 2-00:20:16
Engerman: The linguist who had been at Columbia.
- 2-00:20:19
Malia: Who had been at Columbia. He was more than a linguist.
- 2-00:20:21
Engerman: He was in everything.
- 2-00:20:22
Malia: He was in everything. Roman Jakobson, and that was who brought Hugh McLean to Harvard, because McLean had been at Columbia studying with Jakobson.
- 2-00:20:31
Engerman: Jakobson cut a deal with Harvard that brought not just Jakobson, but a dozen of his students, and then an assistant professor, I think, all came to Harvard.
- 2-00:20:43
Malia: Yeah, [Dmitrij] Chizhevksy.
- 2-00:20:44
Engerman: Yes.
- 2-00:20:46
Malia: Who couldn't speak English, but that was fine.
- 2-00:20:49
Engerman: And Horace Lunt, and McLean.

- 2-00:20:52
Malia: Horace Lunt. Well, McLean came as a graduate student, and Horace Lunt came as a faculty member. And Chizhevsky. Then—not Szeftel—what is his name? Marc Szeftel. [Vsevolod] Setchkarev, who was found out later. He was somewhat tainted because he spent some time in Germany and taught there during the war. Setchkarev, Chizhevsky, well, you probably—
- 2-00:21:26
Engerman: Yes, but remember this isn't just for me.
- 2-00:21:28
Malia: Okay.
- 2-00:21:29
Engerman: One of the things—
- 2-00:21:30
Malia: Let me just finish with this. Then in addition, he invited Isaiah Berlin.
- 2-00:21:38
Engerman: For the British—
- 2-00:21:39
Malia: You know.
- 2-00:21:40
Engerman: No, I am trying to do this for the tape. The British political philosopher and historian.
- 2-00:21:46
Malia: Philosopher and amateur Slavicist, because he was a native speaker of Russian. Berlin gave a course, a dazzling course, in Russian intellectual history. It was the first time it had been taught. I audited it, most of it. It was quite a dazzling performance. In retrospect, I know it was not really very good.
- 2-00:22:08
Engerman: Why wasn't it very good?
- 2-00:22:10
Malia: Because Berlin lectured as a philosopher, not as a historian. And, if you have ever read his *A Remarkable Decade*, well, he has remade Alexander Herzen over to be a precursor of Isaiah Berlin. So we get Herzen presented as a philosopher with Berlin's point of view, and he has written it up numerous times. Aileen Kelly, if you know who she is, she continues to preach the gospel: Herzen is the predecessor of Berlin, and no error is tolerated. I am in error because I can't agree with it.
- 2-00:22:56
Engerman: But at the time though, you found Berlin's class stimulating?
- 2-00:22:59
Malia: Oh yeah, and we taught a class together on the concepts and categories of the historian. What he wanted to do was to put down, as I understood it later on, E.H. Carr, whose immensely—this was when I was an instructor—whose immensely popular and

influential *What is History?* put him down with the aid of Karl Popper. Karl Popper's book on historicism, what is it called?

2-00:23:34

Engerman: *The Poverty of—*

2-00:23:34

Malia: *The Poverty of Historicism*, because Berlin was against any kind of systems, long-term trends, social factors in history. Man makes his own period. Man makes his own history, period. Nothing about conditions or trends. He was ferociously anti-sociological. Of course, I was somewhat open to, rather open to sociology. So anyway, I have understood in retrospect that that is why he wanted to talk about the concepts and categories of the historians, to argue against any kind of social or other determinism in the name of an extreme voluntaristic nominalism. E.H. Carr, and fellow-travelers like him were the target. Well, okay, this is a philosophical debate. It was fun teaching with [him]. He enjoyed me, so he asked me to give this course with him. So Berlin gave this intellectual history course, then Karpovich after Berlin left—

2-00:25:09

Engerman: Berlin just visited for a year?

2-00:25:10

Malia: He came a couple of times.

2-00:25:11

Engerman: I think '47, '48.

2-00:25:14

Malia: He came a couple of times. There was—the Society of Faculty Wives that would show up to listen, people not involved at all in Russian history, to listen to this show. You certainly have never heard Berlin speak, but he spoke with the rapidity of a machine gun. And, it is really not awfully good when you read it over. He gave some famous lectures on Romanticism on the BBC at this machine-gun pace. It was an enormous hit. After his death, they were published, and I saw them. I have heard him enough a lot of times on Romanticism; he was really very shallow. Peter Gay massacred the book in the *TLS* [*Times Literary Supplement*], but politely. He said that this was an embarrassment, and this should not have been published. Berlin is overrated. Don't quote me on this later, because he is a sainted name in many quarters, in particular the *New York Review of Books*. The two patron saints of that were Edmund Wilson, who was a chum of Berlin's, who I met through Berlin, and Berlin. Berlin was very good to me over the years. I would get invited to Portofino, and he had a luxurious villa along with such people as Hugh Gaitskill and so forth. They were an interesting crowd. But, I think Karpovich was telling me that this was not all that fun.

2-00:27:02

Engerman: He also liked Berlin.

2-00:27:05

Malia: Oh yes!

2-00:27:05

Engerman: And Gershenkron became very close to him.

- 2-00:27:07
Malia: Became very close to him. Well, listen, at last, in Cambridge there was a little Russian society which Karpovich liked immensely. Berlin, Gershenkron. Then Chizhevsky wasn't much fun, Setchkarev was sort of dull too, Jakobson.
- 2-00:27:25
Engerman: Who was anything but dull.
- 2-00:27:28
Malia: He was not dull. He was very lively. So, at any rate, Karpovich wound up gaining a permanent intellectual history course, which I also audited. And I took notes on it. Trying to rewrite and reconstruct his lectures, I was feeding in stuff from my own notes. His course was first-rate. It was a real historical course. The various currents, who stood for what, and a balanced judgment over all. He came out more or less with the position of the *Vekhi* [Landmarks], that kind of criticism of the *intelligentsia* extremism.
- 2-00:28:26
Engerman: How about his seminar? You mentioned that this was his famous seminar. You were in the first year?
- 2-00:28:31
Malia: No, I was in the second year.
- 2-00:28:32
Engerman: Who was in the first year, then?
- 2-00:28:34
Malia: Pipes and Riasanovsky.
- 2-00:28:35
Engerman: Okay. Were there others who never went on to—
- 2-00:28:38
Malia: [Leopold] Haimson.
- 2-00:28:39
Engerman: And Haimson. So all three of these obviously huge figures in the field later.
- 2-00:28:46
Malia: Yes. Well, it was just more of the same. We got the Karpovich line as applied to our individual topics.
- 2-00:28:56
Engerman: Who else was in the seminar your year?
- 2-00:28:59
Malia: I forget. You can look in the [*Festschrift*] for Karpovich that we did. McMasters was one of them. By and large less distinguished.
- 2-00:29:13
Engerman: Was Treadgold, Donald Treadgold?

- 2-00:29:14
Malia: He was in the first year. See, I didn't take the first year because until the middle of the year, I wasn't in the history department.
- 2-00:29:24
Engerman: Ah, you were in Slavic.
- 2-00:29:26
Malia: I was in Slavic. So anyway, I forget exactly who was in which.
- 2-00:29:35
Engerman: Well, why don't you tell a little bit—the seminar is so famous because for those two years it trained a tremendous group of scholars who then trained—
- 2-00:29:45
Malia: That is what he is famous for. We talked about such things as: well, if Speransky's constitution had been accepted by Alexander I, would it have made a difference if Alexander II would have just signed the decree for that little consultative assembly? If he hadn't been shot and had that assembly, could the constitutional experiment have started earlier and worked out?
- 2-00:30:10
Engerman: And finished in time, finished before the war. A lot of counterfactual?
- 2-00:30:17
Malia: A lot of counterfactual, because he would have of course liked to have seen Russian history work out differently. Among other things, he made it clear that he thought that Dostoevsky was a *nesnosnyi chelovek* because of all of his xenophobia and obscurantism, and so forth. Karpovich was a practicing Orthodox, member of the Orthodox church. I don't think he went a great deal, but he was practicing. He also called himself a Kantian, by which I think he meant that he subscribed to the categorical imperative, which is just the golden rule expressed in rational terms. He was on good terms with former SRs, former Mensheviks. I remember when I was teaching there was an instructor, I was once invited to their, what he called his *imanie* in Vermont, he had a little place in Vermont. The next-door neighbors were Mensheviks in his family.
- 2-00:31:27
Engerman: The parents of Alexander were neighbors?
- 2-00:31:29
Malia: The parents of Alexander, these are Mensheviks, and they were very chummy. So, he was quite open to the whole range of the spectacle, liberal to radical opinion in Russia. He didn't like Russian nationalism, and he didn't like Russophobia of the Pipes sort. He never mentioned any names, but he preferred me, someone who wrote on Alexander Herzen, to someone who wrote on a Slavophile. Slavophiles should be studied, but perhaps not [inaudible, two names of Slavophiles Pogodin and Shevyrev], who was a second-rate journalist. Why bother with him?
- 2-00:32:21
Engerman: Right. Now, how did you come to the Herzen topic? Was it in that seminar?

- 2-00:32:26
Malia: No. I wrote a paper on the radicals in the sixties.
- 2-00:32:33
Engerman: Who in particular?
- 2-00:32:34
Malia: I mean in the seventies. The seventies. The people who went to the people, the first part, not the *Narodnaia Volia*, but the ordinary *Narodniki*, to get at their worldview, their motivation. I have the paper somewhere. It is kicking around my basement. I have never looked at it since.
- 2-00:32:57
Engerman: Then how did you come to the Herzen paper that would define your first decade of intellectual work as a historian?
- 2-00:33:04
Malia: Because he had invented socialism. Not because he was something of a liberal, which is what interested Karpovich about him. He didn't like [Mikhail] Bakunin.
- 2-00:33:16
Engerman: He was too radical.
- 2-00:33:16
Malia: Too radical. But he liked the late Herzen, and therefore forgave him his improvident declarations in the early sixties. And because he stood after all for free press and emancipation and whatnot, in many respects an attractive figure for someone of Kadet persuasion, which Karpovich was. I was interested in Herzen because he dreamt up the plausible adaptation of the socialist idea in Russia. That was going to have a big historical future.
- 2-00:33:52
Engerman: So you were looking back to 1917, and he was looking back to a way to avoid 1917?
- 2-00:33:57
Malia: That's right.
- 2-00:33:58
Engerman: But you both found it in the same—. You both found this all in the same person?
- 2-00:34:03
Malia: Yes, and then Herzen is a considerable literary figure. Here Isaiah Berlin comes in with his cult of Herzen, whom I was influenced to read by Berlin. So that is the Karpovich component in my life.
- 2-00:34:21
Engerman: How did he react when you wanted to write only about the early Herzen and not about the later Herzen whom he liked?
- 2-00:34:28
Malia: He thought it was okay. You begin with the beginning, after all.

- 2-00:34:32
Engerman: Did he expect you then to write a volume two? I mean, your dissertation goes up, I think, only to 1852.
- 2-00:34:38
Malia: Yeah. Well, he expected it. I was contemplating it, but I never got around to it. I wasn't that interested in Herzen per se. I was interested in, well, broader currents, and then I never got around to doing the second volume.
- 2-00:35:04
Engerman: When you look back to that book, I mean your dissertation, your first book—accounted for a number of your other publications in that era. When you look back at it, what do you see as its greatest achievements, and looking back now, where do you think you would have done something differently?
- 2-00:35:25
Malia: Well, the dissertation had to be squeezed in between my trips to France.
- 2-00:35:33
Engerman: Which we will come to in just a second.
- 2-00:35:35
Malia: No, we haven't finished with Harvard.
- 2-00:35:37
Engerman: Yes, exactly.
- 2-00:35:38
Malia: Because the other figure that counted was Crane Brinton. Crane Brinton—
- 2-00:35:45
Engerman: But before we get to Brinton, the question about looking back at your work on Herzen, have you looked back at that? What do you think?
- 2-00:35:55
Malia: Well, the thesis. I didn't say anything in the thesis. There was no thesis. The book was written in two summers in the sixties. I started it virtually from scratch.
- 2-00:36:09
Engerman: You just took the mass of information that you had gathered for your dissertation, and rewrote more or less from scratch?
- 2-00:36:16
Malia: Well, I was too young, and I didn't know enough European intellectual history.
- 2-00:36:20
Engerman: So it forced you—the dissertation then was, you felt too narrowly focused on Herzen himself?
- 2-00:36:27
Malia: Yeah.

2-00:36:27

Engerman: And you wanted to write, as you said, broader.

2-00:36:30

Malia: I couldn't situate him really. I couldn't situate him really in the Russian context. I didn't know enough about [Vissarion] Belinsky and [Mikhail] Bakunin and the Slavophiles. I didn't know enough about Russia when I wrote the—. I had never been there. I didn't have much of a feel for the place. As I was saying, I was just too young, and inadequately cultivated to situate Herzen in his Russian context and especially in the general European context. I had not read enough Hegel. Well, when I finally wrote the book, then I read all this Schiller and Schelling and Hegel and George Sand and a whole lot of stuff in order to write the book. So the book is a completely different product.

2-00:37:42

Engerman: So then you were going to turn to your other major intellectual inspiration, Crane Brinton.

2-00:37:49

Malia: It was Crane Brinton. History then (this was right after World War II) was a very unsophisticated discipline. It was a major event when Gerth and Mills published those little selections from Max Weber.

2-00:38:11

Engerman: This book was *From Max Weber*, which is a set of translated documents.

2-00:38:15

Malia: And not the central thing of that. We heard about charisma, and the routinization of charisma, and what were some of the other things?

2-00:38:26

Engerman: "Politics as a Vocation" is there. It has a number of well-selected essays.

2-00:38:33

Malia: Well-selected, but you didn't have Weber's system as a whole.

2-00:38:37

Engerman: You didn't have *Economy and Society*.

2-00:38:38

Malia: You didn't have *Economy and Society*. And oh, the *Protestant Ethic* obviously. Well, these were just beginning to be known in American universities. By and large, the history faculty, including Karpovich, was not open to that kind of stuff. None of them knew anything about what their colleague Talcott Parsons had been up to, or Clyde Kluckhohn. The Department of Social Relations, as it was called, was the first sociology department in the country, I believe. It was put together only right after World War II. So these were pre-sociological, pre-psychological, pre-everything historians, who did old-fashioned political, military, diplomatic history. William Langer is the type.

2-00:39:40

Engerman: The diplomatic historian.

2-00:39:42

Malia: Diplomatic historian. He was open to one modern thing: psychohistory. That turned out to be a non-starter. But that was his only opening to modern culture. The rest, including Karpovich, had a nineteenth-century, early twentieth-century historical culture. Brinton was the only exception. He was open to sociology and to generalization. He wanted to know where the modern world is moving in general, what are the laws that govern its movement. Also, he was a big proponent of intellectual history. He taught one of the first courses in the country in European intellectual history, which he started up only after World War II. He was a great big proponent of Lovejoy, and the journal of the history of ideas.

2-00:40:44

Engerman: Arthur Lovejoy, the sort of philosopher-historian from Johns Hopkins [University].

2-00:40:48

Malia: Yeah. And we all had to read *The Great Chain of Being*.

2-00:40:54

Engerman: Lovejoy's most famous book.

2-00:40:56

Malia: Yeah. He was big on [Vilfredo] Pareto, who no one pays any attention to now. That was what was behind his book, *The Anatomy of Revolution*. Well, I was interested in the Russian Revolution, and the French Revolution, revolutions in general. I felt revolution was a big subject in the postwar period. They had just had a new one in China. Who knew how long this was going to go on, when the next one might show up? Brinton devised a theory of revolutions, *The Anatomy of Revolution*. Have you ever read it?

2-00:41:39

Engerman: Yes.

2-00:41:40

Malia: Well, it struck me immediately. It is an immensely entertaining book. He said that essentially they all repeat the same pattern. What struck me immediately was one: they don't all repeat the same pattern.

2-00:41:55

Engerman: Now, he looks at, if I am remembering correctly, I think four revolutions.

2-00:41:58

Malia: Yes.

2-00:41:58

Engerman: English—

2-00:41:59

Malia: English, American, French, and Russian. The Russian one doesn't fit.

2-00:42:04

Engerman: But then again, neither does the American one.

2-00:42:06

Malia: And neither does the American one.

2-00:42:08

Engerman: And I am not sure, the English and the French don't fit so well either.

2-00:42:11

Malia: Well, if you arrange them the way I do, they do fit.

2-00:42:13

Engerman: Yes, but we will get to your revolutions in a couple of days.

2-00:42:19

Malia: So he is, in a way, the origin of my lifetime project, which is to figure out revolutions and to get the pattern of European history overall, which is what I was interested in.

2-00:42:37

Engerman: How did the Herzen book, then, fit into that project, if you say that is your lifelong project?

2-00:42:41

Malia: It didn't. You have to write a book to survive in academia. You can't write a book on European revolutions in general.

2-00:42:53

Engerman: Not as a historian, anyway.

2-00:42:56

Malia: Not as a historian, in order to get a job in an American university. You have to write a more monographic thing. That is what I had, like everyone else. So, Brinton was the only one in the department who had ideas. Even when he was wrong, he made you think. I also realized later on—and he was very interested in the subject of revolution. He knew that was central to modernity. He was a comparativist. He knew about England and France, both quite well. He knew something about Germany, nothing about Russia. No one knew anything about Russia. The average European historian still doesn't know anything about Russia, in this country anyway. So, he made me think. I took the seminar with him.

2-00:43:56

Engerman: What did you write about in that seminar?

2-00:43:58

Malia: The Enlightenment in Bordeaux. The institutions of the Enlightenment in Bordeaux. He gave me Daniel Mornet's book, *Les origines intellectuelles de la révolution française*, and said, "work it out for a Bordeaux." So we each had different places in France to work on.

2-00:44:17

Engerman: So you were assigned—this is the old style of history seminar, where you were essentially assigned your topic by the instructor?

2-00:44:26

Malia: I am not sure of that. I think it was suggested.

- 2-00:44:31
Engerman: And likewise, Karpovich suggested Herzen to you for his interest in the late Herzen, but you just—
- 2-00:44:37
Malia: No, he didn't suggest anything to me.
- 2-00:44:39
Engerman: Oh, I see.
- 2-00:44:40
Malia: Oh, Marc Raeff was in my seminar. I am not sure.
- 2-00:44:47
Engerman: He was in one of those seminars.
- 2-00:44:48
Malia: He was in one of those seminars. He is the one I feel most close to.
- 2-00:44:54
Engerman: At the time you did [feel close to him], also?
- 2-00:44:57
Malia: At the time.
- 2-00:44:58
Engerman: Who else did you—?
- 2-00:44:59
Malia: See, the trouble with the others was that they were too narrowly Russian. Whereas Marc is European. He grew up first in Germany, then in France, then in the U.S., so he is quadri-lingual, and he knows the literatures of all of those countries. And he knows their histories. Whereas the others were grimly, narrowly focused on Russia. Leo Haimson wanted to show that October 1917 was really *zakonomerno*, was not caused by the war.
- 2-00:45:37
Engerman: It was inevitable.
- 2-00:45:39
Malia: Because it had already taken place in the summer of 1914, that is why Haimson writes endlessly on the summer of 1914. No one has ever said that in print, but it is true. He is a left Menshevik. And, therefore, it was an authentic proletarian revolution twisted out of shape in many important respects, but still a proletarian revolution. And the proof is that it was just ready to happen in July, 1914.
- 2-00:46:15
Engerman: His own July Days.
- 2-00:46:17
Malia: His own July Days. That's Haimson for you.

- 2-00:46:20
Engerman: So Haimson was deeply and narrowly focused on Russia. What about the others, Treadgold, Riasanovsky?
- 2-00:46:26
Malia: Riasanovsky was very focused on Russia. Riasanovsky is a Russian patriot. Treadgold was—well, they were all focused on Russia. Treadgold goes along with this Russia and the West thing. He has his book, *Russia and the West* paralleled to China and the West, as if the relationship of—
- 2-00:46:54
Engerman: As if Russia is as distant from Europe, from the West, as it is from China.
- 2-00:46:59
Malia: Yeah, as China is. But my answer to that is Joe [Joseph R.] Levenson. Do you know who he is? He used to teach Chinese history here. This was I think forty, fifty years ago. He drowned. He was a rather brilliant guy. He drowned in a tragic accident in Clear Lake. In one of his books, he has a phrase: “Russia is a part of Europe, China is the whole of China.”
- [laughter]
- It is a different world, a different culture.
- 2-00:47:28
Engerman: Socially as opposed to intellectually, what was sort of the fabric of life first as a graduate student, a Karpovich student at Harvard in the fifties?
- 2-00:47:40
Malia: Well—
- 2-00:47:41
Engerman: Where did you live, who did you spend time with?
- 2-00:47:44
Malia: Okay, I lived in a dormitory. There were three of us in the room. One was a scientist of some sort. The other one was in European history. He dropped out. He never became a historian. But across the hall, the first year, across the hall from us there were a group of French students. This is what started the French connection that led me to *École Normale*, well, I will come to that later. But I want to finish with—. I am giving you the Brinton connection. That is very important. So those two together.
- 2-00:48:23
Engerman: Brinton and Karpovich.
- 2-00:48:24
Malia: Yeah. Another thing, I’ve already said Charles Taylor’s introduction to the Middle Ages.
- 2-00:48:33
Engerman: And his intellectual history?

2-00:48:35

Malia: Intellectual history. He was a big chum of [Joseph] Strayer, the Princeton French Medievalist. He never wrote a line himself, but he was a teaching influence. There was someone named Myron Gilmore who taught Renaissance and Reformation. That was the field that I warmed to most, because the historiography was high-class. You got to read really interesting books by people such as Lucien Febvre and [Roland Bainton? Inaudible name] It was just livelier. And what it meant was fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Europe. This is sufficiently remote for them to have built up a large-scale, and now classic historiography at a very high level. So even though Myron Gilmore himself—he has a book in the Langer series called *The World of Humanism*—was not a terribly stimulating teacher, he put me in contact with a body of literature. It did raise an awful lot of interesting problems.

2-00:50:08

Engerman Did you have any sort of intellectual inspirations among the students? Were there close connections that you felt there, or people you learned from?

2-00:50:15

Malia: Well, we lived in dormitories. After the first year, I was in a dormitory mostly with other history students, but not in Russian history. Pipes was already married, and was not living in a dormitory. Marc Raeff was not there. There were no Russian historians there. It was Bernard Bailyn and Gene Rice who taught Renaissance and Reformation—we were very good friends—at Columbia. And John Clive, if that name means anything to you.

2-00:50:55

Engerman British historian.

2-00:50:56

Malia: British historian. The great social event was listening to Mozart operas on record and getting to know Mozart by heart. Everyone had a call to Mozart. So, it was a more cosmopolitan group that I saw socially than the people that I met in the Russian history seminars.

2-00:51:31

Engerman What else was the social fabric like there? It sounds like a very serious place.

2-00:51:39

Malia: It was very serious.

2-00:51:41

Engerman What did you do to blow off steam?

2-00:51:49

Malia: There was not any blowing off steam. We worked hard to get ready for the oral examinations. It was a long grind. We worked all day long. Well, the other main thing going on was getting a way to Europe. I had never been out of the U.S. The one thing I didn't mention last time, there was a Russian connection in my family. My father's older brother was in—he went to Europe before the U.S. got involved in World War I, working I think for the Friends—

2-00:52:40

Engerman American Friends Service Committee.

2-00:52:42

Malia: —American Friends Service Committee, and stayed there. He never was in the American army. He stayed there through the war, and after the war, he married a Russian, a Volkonskaya, a Kniaginic, a princess from the Volkonsky family of Tul'skaya [____], the place Tolstoy put in *War and Peace*. And his family here never knew what to make of Maria. I mean, she didn't exactly fit in in Thompsonville, Connecticut.

In any event, they lived in Chicago, and he died eventually, and she was left as a widow with a boy to raise roughly my age. Around 1939—she talked—. Well, my father more or less would help them out financially, but she also taught French to earn money. She taught French to the Chicago elite. Around 1938 or 1939, one of these elite families took her and her son, my cousin, to Paris. When they came back, Jack was his name, had all these wonderful photographs of Versailles and La Place de la Concorde and Nôtre Dame, all these exotic things that I had never seen. And then, this was just before the war, I knew that was where I wanted to go.

2-00:54:21

Engerman Now, did she teach you any French, or did you get all of your French done in school?

2-00:54:26

Malia: In school. See, she lived in Chicago. They just visited us in Hamden, so I didn't see a great deal of them. But I said, "Well, if Jack can go to Paris, why can't I?" I couldn't go, of course, because of the war. There was no getting there. So, the first thing after I got settled in Harvard was I was going to go to Paris for the summer, after my first year at graduate school. This is where the group of French students across the hall came in. I could speak with them. They were all from the École Polytechnique. You know what the École Polytechnique was?

2-00:55:13

Engerman Well, why don't you just do this again. We are doing this for the tape, so why don't you explain the École Polytechnique just for a second?

2-00:55:19

Malia: Well, the two elite schools in France are the École Polytechnique for the sciences, founded by the Convention, and the École Normale for the humanities and the pure sciences. Now they have a third one, the École Nationale d'Administration, the management school of administration. The French elite is narrow. They go through these—. Okay, these were guys from the École Polytechnique, and I got friendly with them. There was one particular guy named Gilles, who was a brilliant guy. Eventually I think he was, well, in his mature years he refused to have a telephone, because he was allergic to telephones. [laughter]

2-00:56:11

Engerman Quite peculiar in his own way?

2-00:56:13

Malia: Okay, in any event, he didn't want to go home for the summer. His mother was ill, and the parents wanted him to go home. So he said, "If you are going to Paris this summer, you can stay at my parents' house, apartment." In other words, so that he didn't have to go home for the summer, he offered me as a substitute. So I went to Paris under absolutely ideal conditions. Not as a lonely foreigner.

2-00:56:48

Engerman You were in a family with no strings attached for you.

2-00:56:52

Malia: No strings attached. I had his room. The mother was ill, she was in bed most of the time. No, actually, she could get up and go around. She took me places in taxis. The father was a polytechnician, a retired polytechnician. Okay, his sister, whom the mother didn't like, was there to help out with the cooking and to take care of the house. Well, they introduced me to all sorts of people. All of his—Jean Jacques was his name—all of his old teachers from the lycee. These people, it was summer, invited me to their summer places in the Loire, in Brittany, on the Normandy coast. So, no, this was the second time. No this was the second year.

2-00:58:02

Engerman That you were with Jean Jacques' family?

2-00:58:05

Malia: The first year—

2-00:58:07

Engerman This would have been the summer of '47?

2-00:58:09

Malia: Yeah. No, the first year, I went for a shorter period of time, and most of my contacts then were American, other Americans going to—no, there was Matilda Mortimer, who later married the Duke of Argyle. Did you ever read about that, it was a scandalous affair? Well, it was Matilda Mortimer, who had attended, she had grown up in Paris. She had a flat on Louisburg Square in Boston. Do you know where Louisburg Square is?

2-00:58:55

Engerman Yes?

2-00:58:55

Malia: A very elite place.

2-00:58:58

Engerman Very posh.

2-00:58:59

Malia: Very posh. She came from a posh background. She had grown up in France, and attended the French lycee in New York. And on this converted Liberty Ship that we were going across the ocean in, there was her professor of French literature at the lycee in New York. So, she introduced me to some of her friends, and he introduced me to some of his friends. So I was a semi-detached lone American, but with connections in

the society, so that it was a pleasant experience. But it was just a short time that summer. Now, it was the next summer—

2-00:59:44

Engerman So the summer of '48?

2-00:59:45

Malia: The summer of '48 that I filled in for Gilles and his parents and got to go to all of these wonderful places. One of them had a manor house—a doctor, a very wealthy doctor—had a manor house in Brittany. Another doctor had a, now it wasn't a manor house, but a very handsome summer house at Les Andelys in Normandy right near the Chateau Gaillard, the castle that Richard the Lion-Hearted took to protect Normandy from the king of France. Okay, and among the people that I met through Gilles was his French teacher at the École Polytechnique, a man named [Tufolle? Inaudible]. There is a famous history of French literature, first written by a man named [Gustave] Lanson, who was an important eighteenth-century scholar, which was used in universities. After he died, it was reworked by this man [Tufolle?]. It was known as Lanson and [Tufolle?]. It is no longer used now. [Tufolle?] had been a Normalien, he had gone to the École Normale. He invited me to his place, his family's place, out with the end of Finistaire in Brittany. And we talked. We corresponded too, after I got back here. He told me about the École Normale, and he mentioned that there were occasionally foreign students there. So I asked him eventually how you get to be a foreign student there. He asked his old classmate, who was then the director of the École Normale, a guy who had a nondescript name like Dupont or something like that, how this was done. The director said, "Well, we have never had an American, so have this young man get some letters of recommendation from his Harvard teachers. Harvard is, after all, a reputable place." So I got letters from Brinton and Karpovich, and was accepted as an élève étrangé. I didn't get in through the very competitive concours, this competitive exam, but just like that. And there were a couple of Egyptians, a Lebanese guy, a German, a couple of Englishmen, and me.

2-01:02:47

Engerman But once you got in, were you treated separately as an élève étrangé? Were you treated separately from them?

2-01:02:52

Malia: When I first arrived, I had to sleep in a dormitory with a whole—one hundred and fifty other people. There was one place where we washed up and shaved and so forth. A row of beds. It was, after all, these things were reformed by Napoleon. It was somewhat like the École Polytechnique. They were semi-military. And that is the way—we were called conscripts the first year. A conscrit, I was a conscrit.

2-01:03:27

Engerman So you as a conscrit were the same as everyone else?

2-01:03:32

Malia: Then the second year I got an individual room, which is a rarity, way up high in—what do they call that? I forget the slang name of it. It was not the—anyway, way up high. I had an individual room. So that is where I went after I finished my oral exams at Harvard when I was supposed to be doing my thesis. So this got in the way of doing the thesis.

- 2-01:04:12
Engerman How long did you spend there? Your CV says you had a Fulbright in '50, '51?
- 2-01:04:18
Malia: Oh, that is right, there was a Fulbright year.
- 2-01:04:21
Engerman That was also at the École Normale Supérieure?
- 2-01:04:24
Malia: No, I first had a year where I lived with a family.
- 2-01:04:31
Engerman Because I am just looking at your CV. It lists élève étranger the same year as the Fulbright, '50-'51.
- 2-01:04:43
Malia: Well, I spent a year with a family, too. Show me that.
- 2-01:04:56
Engerman [Hands something to Malia] It's okay. Maybe it is incorrectly marked on there. I am just trying to sort out your trips.
- 2-01:05:05
Malia: I will have to go over it in my mind and tell you tomorrow.
- 2-01:05:09
Engerman That's great. Anyway, let's just stay with the École Normale Supérieure. You were there for two years?
- 2-01:05:17
Malia: For two years. Well, a year and a half. Well, I attended some classes at the Sorbonne and at the Collège de France. I listened to Labrousse, the economic historian, the guy who worked on grain prices in the eighteenth century, and discovered that the price of bread was at its maximum on July fourteenth, 1789.
- 2-01:05:52
Engerman Just when the Bastille was stormed.
- 2-01:05:54
Malia: Yeah, yeah. No, it was a very crude economic explanation of things. In the lectures I heard, he was explaining the Revolution of 1848 again by economic hard times.
- 2-01:06:05
Engerman Grain prices.
- 2-01:06:05
Malia: Well, not grain prices. Just general economic things.
- 2-01:06:09
Engerman Yes.

- 2-01:06:09
Malia: The teacher of philosophy. I listened to some lectures by Lucien Febvre.
- 2-01:06:16
Engerman Yes, what was he lecturing on then?
- 2-01:06:19
Malia: I forget. He was not a spectacular lecturer. It was some narrow topic he was working on at that time. Anyway, the École Normale itself was much more interesting than these lectures either at the Sorbonne or at the Collège. The guy who taught philosophy, the [Cahier mains?], the tutors if you want, to prepare the students at the École Normale for the [Inaudible] Gestion, which are very difficult, competitive exams. The one who did that for philosophy was [Louis] Althusser, the Marxist philosopher.
- He was a Communist Party member who had an enormous influence on the whole intellectual atmosphere of the place. But mostly I was at Harvard with a very interesting generation because they were postwar people who had been in the service during the war, and for the first time were back in an academic atmosphere. I was with a very interesting generation of people at École Normale again because they were postwar. They had been too young to have been involved in the war or in the resistance or anything, and therefore felt that they had missed the great experience.
- 2-01:08:00
Engerman Of being in the resistance.
- 2-01:08:02
Malia: Of being in the resistance, and therefore were in search of a cause to give themselves some sort of meaning and luster.
- 2-01:08:12
Engerman What cause did they find?
- 2-01:08:12
Malia: Communism, of course.
- 2-01:08:14
Engerman Now, how did you fit into all of this?
- 2-01:08:16
Malia: Well, first of all, I will explain, it was a particularly brilliant generation among historians. Jacques Le Goff, the medievalist, [Emmanuel] Le Roy Ladurie, he does the longue durée from the Middle Ages to the eighteenth century. Someone who was then a historian who became a sociologist because he felt that history was too narrow, parochial, Alain Touraine. I don't think that much of his sociology, but he is an important sociologist. Michel Foucault was there.
- 2-01:09:13
Engerman And you knew all these people?
- 2-01:09:16
Malia: Yes, I knew all these people. An important medieval historian was [Marc Venard? unconfirmed]. You have probably never heard of him. In any event, it was a very,

Michel {Crusé? Unconfirmed}, a very good generation. I got to know them quite well. I became personally friendly with them. As regards to my relation—I am beginning to run out of gas.

2-01:10:02

Engerman Do you want to take a break, and we can wrap up France today?

2-01:10:05

Malia: Okay let's take a break. [tape interruption]

2-01:10:07

Engerman Okay, we are back here, and you were just talking about this extraordinary group of scholars, of future scholars, who were students with you at the École Normale Supérieure. Foucault, Touraine, [Cusée?], Le Roy Ladurie, Le Goff. Were there others too, as if that wasn't enough?

2-01:10:28

Malia: That is enough of a sample. Or, a Roman historian who is quite well known in France, [Nicolé? Unconfirmed], but yeah, Erich S. Gruen will know who he is. He is an eminent Roman historian. [There's Mark Vidal? Inaudible phrase], who is one of the editors of the new history of Christianity that is being put out by the [Este du Catholique?] to replace the old [Affiche du Martin?], which was a twenty-volume famous thing that was sort of decades of standard work. This was going to be the new standard work. These are people who went on to become, most of them, well-known scholars in their areas of expertise. Some of them, no. Some of them disappeared from sight.

2-01:11:29

Engerman But as you suggested with Althusser, it is a generation, but also a group of scholars who are very closely connected to the left, including the Communist Party.

2-01:11:40

Malia: The École Normale began to really hit its stride under the Third Republic. It was a pepinière. A seedbed, if you will, of talent for the Third Republic. People like [Neil Bloom? Inaudible name] were from there. [Jean Pegi?] was from there. Very early on, in the 1890s, it became the intellectual left-wing of Republicanism and the pepinière of—it is a small hothouse, about that high. They had just little plants, and they put them out—of socialism—the librarian of the library was a man named [Lucien Ayre? Unconfirmed] who converted the students to socialism. This is socialism of the Jean Jaures variety. In the inter-war period, it produced people like Jean Paul Sartre and Raymond Aron, the two emblematic figures of post-World War II intellectual life. By and large, it has produced people on the left, from the 1890s to the post-World War II. Post-World War II, Louis Althusser was playing the role of [Lucien Ayre] in the 1890s. He was not the librarian, but he was the tutor in philosophy.

2-01:13:44

Engerman And was swinging the place even farther to the left?

2-01:13:47

Malia: Well, socialism was not very far to the left by the time you get to the mid-twentieth century. The left then was communism. So, communism dominated the place. There was a guy named [Peugard? unconfirmed], nothing to do with the shopkeeper who had a

brief moment of fame in the 1950s, who was a Gaullist. But almost everyone was either in the Party, you said Le Parti.

2-01:14:20

Engerman There is only one.

2-01:14:22

Malia: Only one. You were in the Party or you were thinking about joining the Party, or if you were an old fogey, you were at least socialist. Then there was of course the Catholic group, which I knew well. A guy named, what is his name? A Catholic student, what was his name? I used to go to their house in [Angier?]. He never became anything important, but he was very nice, and I knew the whole family. So, the Communists set the tone. I had never been in a milieu that far to the left in my life. Oh, no I started—no, this family that I lived with the year before I went to the École Normale—

2-01:15:23

Engerman Gilles' family?

2-01:15:24

Malia: No, no, that was the first time.

2-01:15:27

Engerman Oh, I am sorry.

2-01:15:28

Malia: I am going to go in this evening and look through the years and pluck things out more accurately than I have been able to do today. It was a widow who had four or five kids. Her husband had shipped off to some camp by the Nazis. He was involved in the resistance, and had eventually been shot or something. Anyway, she took in boarders to help make ends meet. She was a Catholic and a socialist. An extremely, oppressively moral person. She felt it frivolous to go watch the movies and so forth. She raised an interesting bunch of kids. They made out quite well in academic pursuits and stuff. Well, this was my first introduction to socialism. There weren't any socialists in Spring Glen, the part of Hamden where I lived.

2-01:16:43

Engerman And you described yourself in our interview as completely unpolitical.

2-01:16:45

Malia: Yeah. There weren't any socialists among my aesthetic and literary friends at Yale. Of course there were Communists in Dutch Harbor, Alaska, but that is different.

2-01:16:55

Engerman They were the Soviet Communists.

2-01:16:58

Malia: Soviet Communists.

2-01:16:59

Engerman But that is a whole different thing.

2-01:17:01

Malia: So, I was for the first time confronted with socialism as *the* moral goal of humanity. She was very much a devout, believing socialist. And I started then asking the question that I have been asking ever since, “I don’t know what you mean by socialism. What is it?” I know how to answer this now, but it was an object of faith with her. It was not a program, such as nationalization or collectivization, or something of that sort. That sort of thing was involved, but, I was unable to understand what these people who were so intensely socialist meant by their socialism. Or later on, when I get to the École Normale what was their communism. One of the notable things in that year was that her daughter, Anisse was the woman’s name, had been at [Rollinsbrook? Rollinsburg? Inaudible], I think it was, with Madame [Buber-Normand?]. You know who she is?

2-01:18:21

Engerman Buber is the wife or the daughter of Martin [Buber]?

2-01:18:25

Malia: No, no, this was a German Communist. Her name was [Normand? Inaudible]. Her name was Buber. She married Normand. When Hitler came to power, they took refuge in Moscow and were sent to camps. In 1941, this was a famous episode, Stalin gave his German Communists to Hitler who put them in German camps. So she was liberated by the Allies in [Rollinsbrough?] where she knew this French girl who was there. Okay, this was the time of the Kravchenko Affair. You know about that? *I Chose Freedom*. He was a diplomat. You have never read the book? It is a very good book, and a very accurate description of Soviet life in the twenties and the thirties.

2-01:19:38

Engerman Which was immediately discredited by—

2-01:19:40

Malia: No.

2-01:19:40

Engerman —Americans on the left.

2-01:19:42

Malia: —by Americans on the left.

2-01:19:42

Engerman Was challenged by, I should say.

2-01:19:44

Malia: Okay, then the French Communist literary magazine, *Les Lettres Francaises*, accused him of being a CIA agent, so he sued them for libel. So there was then a big trial, a libel trial, in Paris with a socialist deportee lawyer defending [Victor] Kravchenko. The world press was listening to this. The red dean of Canterbury came to testify. It was everyday in the newspapers.

2-01:20:19

Engerman And you were there.

2-01:20:20

Malia: I was there. And when [Madame Buber-Normand?] came to Paris to testify at this trial, she stayed in this household because she knew Anisse Gérard. So, the big debate in France at this time was, are there camps in the Soviet Union?

2-01:20:48

Engerman A remarkable debate.

2-01:20:50

Malia: A remarkable debate.

2-01:20:51

Engerman I mean, it is stunning that this would be debated.

2-01:20:53

Malia: And it was an open question. Well, I knew very well that there were camps in the Soviet Union because I had talked to people who had come from Magadan. So it was not a question for me, but for the French public, it was an enormous question. And Madame Gérard was very moral, “If there are camps, they are bad, but that is not real socialism.” So, this meeting with first of all, an intellectual moralistic, and Catholic Socialist as the preliminary to the hard socialists and the Communists—well, this went on—she was a devout reader of the newspaper *Combat*, which was edited by, it was then a famous newspaper, [Albert] Camus. This is long before he broke with Sartre. So I lived through that whole—rather intensely—that whole postwar French debate over communism, socialism, the USSR camps: “Is America an imperialist resisting progress as represented by Soviet socialism, or is it the savior of Western Europe from Communist subversion?” These were the years of the quasi-insurrectional strikes in France.

Okay, so I get to the École Normale, and it is really red. Not this moralistic socialism of Madame Gérard and her friends, but Stalinists. I was in a way a scandal to these people because I was an American. Just being there. I was even more scandalous in that I was human, and spoke fluent French, and even more scandalous, because I was open to what they had to say. I mean, I contradicted stereotypes that they had been fed about the U.S. I remember when I first arrived, one guy—in France you shake hands the first time you see someone in the day, so I would shake everyone’s hand. But ostentatiously, this was in the courtyard where everyone could see it, this guy said, “I refuse to shake the hand of American imperialism.” Well, I was such a scandal, that the cell, there was a cell—

2-01:23:40

Engerman The Party cell.

2-01:23:42

Malia: The Party cell, had a meeting about what to do about me, how to handle me, to talk with me, or to try to convert me. They eventually decided to try to convert me. They invited me to a meeting of the cell. So, I went to a meeting of the cell. I upset their stereotypes. I know this has been written up by people.

2-01:24:10

Engerman Who has written it up?

- 2-01:24:11
Malia: Le Roy Ladurie, in his little book of memoirs, he mentioned that I showed up and that the cell had a meeting about me and so forth. A friend of mine and a former student of mine, Jeremy Popkin, do you know who he is?
- 2-01:24:25
Engerman I know the name from reading.
- 2-01:24:26
Malia: Well, his father is Richard Popkin, down at UCLA. He teaches at the University of Kentucky, and does the history of the French press during the Revolution and then later on in 1830. He at one point had to go through a whole bunch of memoirs by Normaliens, and he discovered that I had made an impact on this whole generation.
- 2-01:24:50
Engerman You were a cultural ambassador.
- 2-01:24:54
Malia: A cultural ambassador. So, just by being sort of amiable and open, and sort of progressive-sounding because even though I knew the Soviet reality, and become something of a Marxist, an intellectual Marxist, during my stay there.
- 2-01:25:21
Engerman That was quite a conversion from where you had been. You said you were open to sociology, but--
- 2-01:25:26
Malia: Yeah, well, this was much more than Crane Brinton and his [Vilfredo] Pareto. This was a completely coherent system of explanation of everything.
- 2-01:25:34
Engerman You were a part of it, you bought it.
- 2-01:25:37
Malia: Yeah. I was giving class analyses of historical events in my mind, and sort of buying—I attended Althusser’s lectures, which were lousy incidentally. I remembered him explaining why Marx appeared in the Rhineland when he did, by the number of factories that were going up in the neighborhood at that time [laughs].
- 2-01:26:00
Engerman How many factories did one need to have Marx?
- 2-01:26:03
Malia: Yeah, it was absolutely ridiculous. There is nothing left about Althusser’s work now. It is doubtful that he really was competent in German. This is what Leszek Kolakowski, who *is* competent in German and competent in everything, later on averred, and I think he is right. So I became something of a Marxist, and became personally friendly with a number of the harder-core Communists. For instance, Le Roy Ladurie. You know who he is, the multi—you know all that.
- 2-01:26:38
Engerman Yes. These were extraordinary social histories.

2-01:26:41

Malia: Yes.

2-01:26:41

Engerman I mean, there are two aspects of this that are interesting to me. One is the political dimension. They were Communist. On the other is the methodological dimension that they all seem on an opposite pole from intellectual history. They [the *Annales* school] held that ideas were epiphenomenal.

2-01:27:00

Malia: Yeah, well, the *Annales* school was heavily economic and social history. However, there is a strain represented by Lucien Febvre especially and even by Marc Bloch. Marc Bloch's first book, after all, is *Les Rois Thaumaturges*, the kings that cure by—touching for the king's evil, which is heavily influenced by Durkheim's view on religion. It is heavily psychological and religious. Where things get to be sort of crudely materialistic is with Fernand Braudel, who was of course reigning in the postwar years. He eventually inherited the *Annales* enterprise. But there was always the other current. The Lucien Febvre and the early Marc Bloch current, which leads to Francois Furet. He was not a Normalien, but he was in this generation and in the Party, and later on a good personal friend, afterwards.

2-01:28:10

Engerman Well, let's talk more about this Party, I have a hard time imagining you in a Party cell, so I am curious.

2-01:28:15

Malia: Well, the annual ball, at the end of the year, when the President of the Republic comes and everything, they have parties in the various rooms of [le term? Unconfirmed], which is slang for a room where three or four or five people study together. See, by then I had an individual room myself, but most of the other guys were still in these dormitories. Of course, the dormitories are no longer there. Everyone has an individual room, or at the most two people total. But there were three or four, sometimes as many as five together in a term for study purposes. At the end of the year, they would have parties in these [terms?]. Well, I got invited to the Communist Party in the [term?] of Le Roy Ladurie, who was interested in me, but very reserved. He wasn't the kind of guy that refused to shake your hand, but he was very reserved because after all, I did represent the enemy. Foucault was in the Party at this time, too. I had good relations with him, but he was not interesting at all, you never knew that he was going to be one of the great men of the generation. But I didn't really get to know these Communists until after we'd all graduated. One day in a restaurant that no longer exists near [San _____ inaudible street name], sitting across the room, there was Le Roy Ladurie and {Michel Crusé,} and someone else—a couple of ex-Communists. This was after Hungary. And they came over—

2-01:30:12

Engerman So this was a few years after?

2-01:30:13

Malia: A few years later.

- 2-01:30:14
Engerman After 1956.
- 2-01:30:16
Malia: After 1956, after the Hungarian thing. That is when they lost their faith. He came over and said, “Hello, we have to see each other,” and it came out that they were not Communists, so we got together and had a long talk, and it turned out that the whole generation was no longer Communist. They had left after the Hungarian uprising.
- 2-01:30:43
Engerman ‘56 was a tough year. The Secret Speech and then—
- 2-01:30:47
Malia: It was a tough year. So that is when Le Roy Ladurie explained to me, “Well, we hadn’t been in the resistance. We had done nothing for humanity. We had to do something, so we joined the cause.”
- 2-01:31:02
Engerman So what was it like going to the Party cell meeting when you were at the École?
- 2-01:31:06
Malia: Well, they were discussing secondary topics. They weren’t discussing really Party business. Well, they had their agenda. They had some circular handed out from on high, that so-and-so was to be criticized. The Communists were always having campaigns. Free this one, free that one, no to General Ridgeway, Ridgeway la peste—the guy who made germ warfare on Korea and so forth. They discussed the various causes or campaigns that they were pursuing at the time. The whole thing was designed to impress me that these were serious, progressive people working for good causes, and perhaps I should get interested. I went out of curiosity.
- 2-01:32:12
Engerman Were you involved with other political groups or social groups outside the École, at other parts of it, other than this Communist cell? It is also a time of really—
- 2-01:32:22
Malia: Well, the socialists were not worth paying any attention to.
- 2-01:32:25
Engerman The socialists, but what about the Catholics? It was actually a very interesting time for French Catholics.
- 2-01:32:28
Malia: There was no longer a—well, I had French Catholic contacts that I went to outside the École. There was the chaplaincy attached to the Sorbonne. It also had charge of the Catholic circle at the École Normale. I attended some of their affairs.
- 2-01:33:04
Engerman Did you get to know any of the people? The *Esprit* crowd?
- 2-01:33:08
Malia: No, only later.

- 2-01:33:10
Engerman That didn't happen in the first round.
- 2-01:33:13
Malia: The *Esprit* crowd.
- 2-01:33:13
Engerman That came in the 1959, '60 trip. Are there other things that we should talk about your time in France? I mean, when you look back at it now, what was the impact of your year and a half at the *École Normale*? What was the impact on your future intellectual development?
- 2-01:33:33
Malia: It broadened my horizons enormously just being with these people with very different backgrounds with very different political, intellectual, philosophical concerns. Just talking with them was broadening and sharpening my own critical abilities, and also it was a lot of fun.
- 2-01:34:04
Engerman How did you react to the politics? Did it ever sway you in any direction to see all of these names that you list, they may all be Communist, but they it is also a brilliant generation without any question. To see all these people of such magnitude—
- 2-01:34:24
Malia: Well, yeah, they were brilliant as individuals. Some of the most brilliant ones never panned out. There was a guy named Greco. He really talked a dazzling line. He became a professor, but never did a great deal. Some people interested in sociology, they did not do very much later on. There was no sociology, I guess, yet. It was much more stimulating than the people I was with at Harvard—either the fellow students or the faculty.
- 2-01:35:07
Engerman Did it sway you in any way?
- 2-01:35:10
Malia: No, it just matured me. This was more of a broadening experience than learning all the Mozart operas by heart.
- 2-01:35:23
Engerman Now, actually we haven't talked about the classes at the *École Normale*. What did you do?
- 2-01:35:28
Malia: We didn't have classes there.
- 2-01:35:29
Engerman What was your academic life at the *École*?
- 2-01:35:33
Malia: I was supposed to be writing my dissertation. I was writing it.
- 2-01:35:37
Engerman So you were writing your American dissertation?

2-01:35:39

Malia: I began it in the Harvard dormitory before I left, and I arrived there with a fair amount of it. I wrote the second half there, between conversations with fellow Normaliens. I couldn't talk with them all day. They had to prepare exams too. I wrote it on my little typewriter, and then took it to be retyped by the daughter of one Celeste Albaret. Celeste Albaret was once a famous person. She was the woman who took care of Proust, the Françoise. Françoise was the servant, the maternal servant that is in the Proust volumes. There were two real-life prototypes of this person, one earlier in his career, and then Françoise, who lived with him at the time he was writing *A la Recherche du Temps Perdu*. Her husband—she was a peasant girl from the country, married to the guy who was Proust's chauffeur. She came to Paris, and Proust had her run errands for him and things like that. Eventually she became sort of [the head of] the household. Okay, when Proust died, the Proust family bought for the Albaret couple a little run-down hotel in the—it's right off the {Place en Supice? Inaudible}. It was then run down and shady. It has now been gentrified because these are seventeenth-, eighteenth-century buildings—mostly eighteenth-century buildings. It has been gentrified. The beams have been exposed; they were covered in plaster and so forth. Okay, she was living there. It so happened that Jacques Barzun—

2-01:37:47

Engerman The famous cultural historian at Columbia.

2-01:37:51

Malia: Yes. He was writing a biography—he was editing Proust's correspondence in English, or a selection of it. And he knew Celeste Albaret. But, anyway, the French girl who did research for him, he wasn't in Paris, put me in contact with Celeste Albaret. The deal was that her daughter, [Odille?], would type my dissertation in English to improve her English, and I would talk with the girl in English for "x" number of hours a week.

2-01:38:37

Engerman In exchange for her typing.

2-01:38:38

Malia: In exchange for her typing. In fact, every time I went there, I would leave some stuff to be typed by the girl, and Celeste Albaret would regale me with stories about Proust.

2-01:38:49

Engerman Which must have been thrilling!

2-01:38:52

Malia: Which was thrilling. It was very interesting. She talked like Proust. She was semi-literate when she came to Paris, but she talked in these long, rolling periods. This made her husband furious. He said, "He is here to talk to the girl, not to listen to your stories." He was obviously jealous of Proust, who occupied too much of his wife's life and thoughts. [laughter] So every so often she would make a scene, but the next time I would come there, she would go on with it. And later on she became a television celebrity, telling her stories on national television. Okay, that is it.

2-01:39:37

Engerman That is it for today?

2-01:39:41

Malia: Yes.

[End of interview]

[Interview #3: December 18, 2003]
 [Begin Audio File Malia: 03 12-18-03]

3-00:00:01

Engerman: One final remark about the École Normale?

3-00:00:05

Malia: One final remark about the impact of the École Normale on my thinking. Historical study in France, even though they have Sinologists and specialists of the Arab world and also of India, they do those things, and also they do a lot of Greek and Roman history. But, overall, historical study in France is very Eurocentric. And it is the *longue durée*. You don't do a country in a given period. You do the *longue durée*, which means Europe centered around France, from around the year 1000 to World War I. So, this is what the *Annales* school does. The *longue durée* means specifically the year 1789. Or at the outside, 1914. So I, just by frequenting these people, was put in a comparativist context, in a context where it was routine to go back to the *ancien regime*, which I think has had a big influence on my thinking as a historian overall since what I was interested in was not history in one particular place and time, but history in general.

3-00:01:43

Engerman: The human adventure, as you put it.

3-00:01:44

Malia: The human adventure. Okay, this furthered that particular slant or interest. Okay, now ask me the next question.

3-00:01:57

Engerman: As far as I can tell, we have finished mostly about Harvard, we have talked about the Herzen book, especially as a dissertation, but you finished, you got your PhD in 1951?

3-00:02:09

Malia: Yes.

3-00:02:09

Engerman: And stayed at Harvard then, right? You had two possibilities. One was to join the Society of Fellows as a junior fellow, and one was to join the history department.

3-00:02:18

Malia: Yeah, well, Crane Brinton, who was the president of the Society of Fellows and I think then the chairman, I am not sure, he advised me to take the instructorship because it was with a view to Karpovich's retirement that I was appointed as an instructor. So, I was appointed as an instructor. I had never taught. I had never been a section man in History 10, which most of the PhDs at Harvard had been. I had never taught anyone in my life.

3-00:02:45

Engerman: How did you manage to avoid the sections in History 10?

3-00:02:51

Malia: Well, one year I had a fellowship to go to France, a Sheldon Fellowship from Harvard.

3-00:02:56

Engerman: The traveling fellowships.

- 3-00:02:57
Malia: The traveling fellowship from Harvard, and I had the G.I. Bill. I didn't need to do it to survive, so I did not do it. I did not go to graduate school to become a teacher. I went to graduate school because I wanted to *learn*. I didn't know that—well, I did know in a vague sort of way, but I was never fully aware of the fact that it led to a teaching career in colleges or universities during which you are supposed to publish books and there was a big emphasis on teaching. So I never thought I should waste any time preparing to be a teacher. There I was. Left to my own devices, I would have taken the Society of Fellows.
- 3-00:03:45
Engerman: Which is a three-year fellowship with no teaching or any other obligations.
- 3-00:03:49
Malia: No obligations.
- 3-00:03:50
Engerman: Except a few meals, as I understand it.
- 3-00:03:52
Malia: What?
- 3-00:03:53
Engerman: Lunches and dinners you have to have.
- 3-00:03:55
Malia: Well, the dinner is just once a week, I think. Anyway, it probably would have been a mistake. I didn't have any research project to work on. Roger Shattuck took the Society of Fellows at roughly that time. He didn't do anything with it, really. So I was a teacher, and I had two things to teach. They were revamping the curriculum, the undergraduate curriculum at Harvard, to modernize it. They set up humanities courses, social science courses, and science courses, and every undergraduate had to take one course in each of those three big divisions.
- 3-00:04:44
Engerman: This was the result of the Harvard Red Book?
- 3-00:04:46
Malia: That is right, yes.
- 3-00:04:48
Engerman: The curricular reform of the late forties.
- 3-00:04:50
Malia: Curricular reform. So they set up a number of social science courses that were to replace the old history course. Well, the first social sciences, one was in fact the old history course. Then there was Sam Beer, Samuel Beer, a political scientist who did a course centered around Max Weber and Karl Marx. I was put in Social Sciences 5, which was called "Change and Continuity." [laughs]
- 3-00:05:16
Engerman: Over the *longue durée*?

- 3-00:05:18
Malia: Well, yeah, we began with the origins of Christianity, with the fall of Rome and the origins of Christianity. It was set up mostly by Stephen Graubard. Do you know who he is?
- 3-00:05:33
Engerman: Yes, but again, tell this for the tape. I know Stephen.
- 3-00:05:36
Malia: Later the editor of the magazine *Daedalus*.
- 3-00:05:42
Engerman: For decades.
- 3-00:05:43
Malia: For decades. He just retired a couple of years ago. John Conway, the British historian, who is a very nice guy, but he never wrote much, he married Jill Conway.
- 3-00:05:54
Engerman: Jill Ker Conway—
- 3-00:05:56
Malia: Jill Ker Conway.
- 3-00:05:57
Engerman: —who became president of Smith [College].
- 3-00:05:58
Malia: Who became president of Smith. There was a very good group of people in this course. Hanna Holborn Gray.
- 3-00:06:07
Engerman: Who became president of the University of Chicago.
- 3-00:06:10
Malia: President of the University of Chicago; Gavin Langmuir, who became the Medievalist down at Stanford. Gene Rice, who became the Ren[aissance] and Ref[ormation] guy at Columbia. A Swede named Gran Olin, an economist.
- 3-00:06:29
Engerman: [spells] O-L-I-N?
- 3-00:06:29
Malia: [spells] O-L-I-N, he pronounced it “O-lean.” In this country, it is pronounced “O-lin.” He later went back to Sweden and eventually committed suicide. I don’t know for what reasons. Who else was in this? Oh, [Mel Richter? Unconfirmed], a political scientist, and another political scientist who was named Ted Bayer and never did anything. It was people from the various social sciences, but it was dominated by historians. It was all younger people. We had no senior figure like Sam Beer, so we were on our own. At first, it was Conway who was the head of the course, and eventually I became the head of the course. It was simply that time passed, and Conway went on to do other things.

- 3-00:07:25
Engerman: He went to be a housemaster, right?
- 3-00:07:26
Malia: He became a housemaster, that's right. I don't remember the full list of people that were associated with the course, but it was a very good group of people. It was stimulating and interesting, and it was a great general education for me because I had to put things together on a *longue durée* European-wide—
- 3-00:07:47
Engerman: Even longer than the *longue durée*?
- 3-00:07:48
Malia: Even longer than the *longue durée*. Well, the *longue durée* could go back to the fall of Rome. They were always quite aware that the origins of Western Europe were in Rome. So that was item number one, and item number two was Soviet history.
- 3-00:08:04
Engerman: Which was the first time they would have taught Soviet history.
- 3-00:08:07
Malia: I think it was the first time there was a course taught on Soviet history. As you know, there was not much literature that you could assign to the students at the time. I forget what on earth I assigned. I must have reading lists kicking around somewhere in my basement. But I had to put the Soviet thing together in a pattern, and since I already had a dim view of the Soviet experiment, it wasn't too difficult to do. Since this was 19— what was it?
- 3-00:08:42
Engerman: '51, I believe, is that it?
- 3-00:08:45
Malia: '51, something like that. Stalin was still alive. We didn't know anywhere near what we know now about the five-year plans, the building of socialism in the thirties. Most of the available literature was on 1917, Civil War, and NEP [New Economic Policy], so what I did was to take the whole revolutionary crisis, begin around 1900 and bring them to 1917. Do 1917 in detail, but to make 1917 understandable you had to go back to 1905, because all the actors in 1917 were there. It really is one revolutionary process, interrupted by the constitutional experiment. [chuckles]
- 3-00:09:39
Engerman: Which Karpovich was a keen supporter of the constitutional experiment. You were someone more skeptical of that experiment?
- 3-00:09:46
Malia: No, not that.
- 3-00:09:46
Engerman: No, of its viability.

3-00:09:50

Malia: No, I bought the Karpovich line then. I became skeptical later on when I learned more about how fragile the base of the constitutional experiment was. It was only when I got to Berkeley that I really gave up on the constitutional experiment, and then I passed that torch on to Terence Emmons, who wrote the two major books on it. One on the gentry's role in the Emancipation, and two on the Kadet origins of electoral politics in Russia. The Kadets. He believed in the constitutional experiment much longer than I did. And I am not sure that he has completely given up on it, even now.

3-00:10:37

Engerman: Anyway, in this course, you were teaching, or devoted a good block of it to 1900 to 1917.

3-00:10:44

Malia: Yes, and then we did a great deal of detail about 1917, the Civil War, the retreat of the NEP, and then the socialist crowning of the edifice, the crash program to build socialism under Stalin, then things sort of petered out because the guy was still in power and he didn't know what—. Then of course, he died while I was teaching.

3-00:11:11

Engerman: In March, 1953.

3-00:11:12

Malia: In March, 1953, so I could update the course a little bit as I went on. But it was still a course with a lot of loose ends because what was there to read? Oh, by then we had [Issac] Deutscher's *Stalin*.

3-00:11:27

Engerman: The biography of Stalin. I think that came out in the late forties, '48 or '49.

3-00:11:32

Malia: Maybe I used that from the beginning. I used for my personal purposes—it hadn't been translated into English, it has never been translated into English—[Boris] Souvarine's biography of Stalin, which is much better than Deutscher's. Boris Souvarine, whom I knew a little bit in Paris. Has that ever been translated?

3-00:12:00

Engerman: I believe that parts of it have.

3-00:12:03

Malia: Well, he was a disillusioned Trotskyite.

3-00:12:06

Engerman: And Deutscher was a left-disillusioned Trotskyite?

3-00:12:09

Malia: Well, Souvarine was much more anti-Stalin than Deutscher was, but he did a much more thorough job of research on the early years and on the 1920s. I think it is still the most readable thing on the early Stalin. So those are the two things I did. Then Myron Gilmore, I think in my second year—they really exploited me—in my second year, Myron Gilmore fell ill with tuberculosis. So I was asked to teach Renaissance and Reformation.

3-00:12:47

Engerman: My goodness, they really did exploit you!

3-00:12:50

Malia: So I had this course with two hundred people, with Hanna Gray sitting in the audience, [chuckles] and I had to lecture on the Renaissance and Reformation. In those days, I wrote out the whole lecture, twenty pages, twenty-five pages per lecture. The next to the last lecture, I was up until, the course was at eleven, and I was up until around seven or eight in the morning writing this out. I went to bed or laid down, and didn't wake up in time for the lecture. That was to a degree exploitation, but after all, I had had Renaissance and Reformation as a field, and therefore I should be able to teach it. It was very instructive, for me, again. By then I was an assistant professor.

3-00:13:45

Engerman: What had to happen for you to go from an instructor to an assistant professor?

3-00:13:50

Malia: Nothing. I just served three years as an instructor, and if they want you to become an assistant professor, you just become one. It was what would now be called a tenure-track position.

3-00:14:03

Engerman: Which at Harvard does not mean the same thing as a tenure-track position [anywhere else]?

3-00:14:07

Malia: Well, they have assistant professorships that do not even give you a crack at tenure at all. The middle year of the assistant professorship, you get a year's leave, and the purpose of that is for you to get your dissertation, or whatever it is that you have had, into publication-shape, so that you will be ready for the final, up-or-out moment at the end of the five-year assistant professorship.

Well, at that point, Cyril Black at Princeton called up and said, "The Library of Congress wants to send a representative to Russia to negotiate book exchanges," and they picked me.

3-00:15:01

Engerman: Why did they pick you?

3-00:15:03

Malia: Because I was a bright, up-and-coming young man.

3-00:15:07

Engerman: But it would seem in some sense like a dead-end opportunity. It certainly wasn't about writing your—

3-00:15:12

Malia: Well, it meant taking off that year to go to the Library of Congress. Now, the first six months I had to go to the Library of Congress to learn something about librarianship. I had to go to the U.S. Librarian's annual convention in Chicago. I did an internship at the Library of Congress, and then for a few months I sat around Cambridge assigning—. By

then the embassy was shipping in all sorts of books, and I was given the titles. I had to assign these titles to the universities involved. It was Harvard, Yale, Columbia.

3-00:16:00

Engerman: Berkeley and Washington.

3-00:16:02

Malia: Berkeley and where?

3-00:16:03

Engerman: University of Washington, Seattle.

3-00:16:05

Malia: Seattle, okay. So, I had these lists of books. [chuckles] I don't know on what basis I assigned them to the various universities, because I was supposed to be an expert librarian by then. So I spent six months, this was librarian's business. Then the next six months, I went to Russia, which was great!

3-00:16:28

Engerman: This was your first trip to Russia?

3-00:16:30

Malia: The first trip to Russia.

3-00:16:31

Engerman: So tell me what it was like. Did you land at Sheremet'ev Airport? How did you get into Russia?

3-00:16:34

Malia: I took a Pan-Am flight to Moscow. Sheremet'ev didn't exist then. It was Vnukova, I think. I don't know what it was.

3-00:16:46

Engerman: Vnukova is one of the smaller airports there.

3-00:16:48

Malia: Yeah. It was not Sheremet'ev. It was a smaller one.

3-00:16:52

Engerman: So what was your impression of Russia from your first moment there?

3-00:16:56

Malia: Well, I was met by a consular officer who took me to the National Hotel. You know the National Hotel?

3-00:17:07

Engerman: Right by Manezh?

3-00:17:09

Malia: Right by Manezh, right across the street from the Kremlin.

3-00:17:12

Engerman: Nice spot.

- 3-00:17:14
Malia: A beautiful spot, and I had on the third floor, an enormous long room all to myself. It was a luxury suite with a view of the Manezh and the Kremlin. It was obviously because I was an important person. I didn't have a diplomatic passport. I had what was called a special passport. So I had to work out of the U.S. embassy, the old one. Have they moved to the new one yet?
- 3-00:17:47
Engerman: Yes, they are out on the Kol'tso, I think. But, where were they?
- 3-00:17:52
Malia: The Ulitsa Chaikovskovo.
- 3-00:17:54
Engerman: Yes, right by the conservatory.
- 3-00:17:56
Malia: So, again, this other guy, I forget his name. Lowry, I think his name was. He was buying all sorts of books, and I still had to assign these to the universities. [laughter] So I just worked in the embassy. Then I went around to the various learned institutions, Moscow University, the Academy of Sciences, and then I traveled around the country too.
- 3-00:18:26
Engerman: You had quite a set of trips.
- 3-00:18:28
Malia: It was a six-month trip.
- 3-00:18:32
Engerman: No, but according to the report that you filed, you did a trip into Central Asia and the Caucasus, and a trip to Ukraine.
- 3-00:18:37
Malia: Oh, you have seen those reports?
- 3-00:18:38
Engerman: There is one report that is at the Harvard Library.
- 3-00:18:41
Malia: Okay.
- 3-00:18:45
Engerman: You spent, I think you said, three one-week trips to Leningrad, and then a number of more extensive and lengthier trips.
- 3-00:18:55
Malia: The Caucasus. I will tell you about the most interesting trip in a moment, which is not in that report. So I arranged—it was very easy to do, they were very eager to get American books. What they wanted was technology, science and technology, and what we wanted was social science. Well, we wanted stuff that would inform us about Soviet society, not so much literature. So, I got sort of VIP treatment at Moscow University. I got to meet the director and the president of the academy of sciences and so forth. I called on

the people in the history *kafedra* [department] in Moscow and met [the historian] [P.A.] Zaionchkovskii there.

3-00:19:47

Engerman: I wanted to ask you how you met Zaionchkovskii. You mentioned in your thing for Emmons that you had. Now Zaionchkovskii, was he already a famous historian by that point?

3-00:19:56

Malia: No, no. This was 1955. He was just getting started. By the time I saw him again in 1962, he was a famous historian, and he was building up this foreign legion, of which Emmons was the colonel-in-chief. But he was pretty cautious in 1955. I was working on Herzen, and he said that he liked the piece, "Pis'mo k staremu tovarishchu" [Letter to an Old Comrade]. It was his favorite Herzen book. I remember him saying that the non-revolutionary Herzen was what he liked best. But, he wasn't ready to start talking then. Indeed, in '62 he wasn't ready to start talking. What I was interested in, of course, in all of these contacts was to hear what people really thought. Among other things, I ran into another Spaniard of a different generation, who had been born and brought up in the Soviet Union. Maybe he was born in Spain, but he was brought up in the Soviet Union. He spoke Russian like a Russian. Again, terribly disillusioned with the whole thing. But I did manage to meet a number of younger people that were willing to talk.

3-00:21:37

Engerman: Anyone in particular, whose names we would know now?

3-00:21:40

Malia: Well, one guy named Lev [Khaleev? Or Khalin? Inaudible], who now lives as an émigré in New York. How did I meet him? Anyway, he took me to see Pasternak.

3-00:21:55

Engerman: Boris Pasternak.

3-00:21:57

Malia: Boris Pasternak. How did I meet Khaleev? He was a poet. I have a novel of his that he wrote. It was never published. I don't remember how I met him. Oh, I did get to go to the *Soiuz Pisazel'ei* [Writer's Union], to the restaurant. Oh, now I know how I got to meet him. No, that was later. [pause] No, now I know. They already had an exchange with France. There were two French exchange students living in MGU [Moscow State University] in the [Vodiet? Unconfirmed] School, kultura. And I met them through someone I knew at the French embassy. They are the ones who introduced me. They knew younger, more or less disaffected people. They are the ones who introduced me to Khaleev. As a matter of fact, they invited me to MGU, which was really not permitted. That is where I met Khaleev. He introduced me to a couple of other younger Russian poets, who were disaffected. After I got to know him reasonably well, he took me to Pasternak. We went there twice, out in Peredelkino. So I was doing things that I really shouldn't be doing, but it was irresistible. The first time, we just had a long conversation. And he just finished *Doctor Zhivago*. He showed me the verses that are at the end of *Doctor Zhivago*. He let me read the verses at the end of *Doctor Zhivago*, which I dutifully read. No, he declaimed them. He declaimed them. Not all of them, some of them. Then he started talking in sort of mystical tones about Russia, the meaning of it all, which I didn't follow very well. Khaleev knew him because he was a

poet and he somehow or other got to present some of his writing to Pasternak. Then I was invited to dinner at Pasternak's dacha, and we discussed literature, the art of translation. Again, all in somewhat mystical tones. I never got anything very clear out of Pasternak. He was not yet ready to send the manuscript out of the country. Otherwise he might—maybe that is why he invited me to dinner. Maybe he was thinking of sending it with me.

3-00:25:36

Engerman: Sending it with you.

3-00:25:37

Malia: He eventually sent it with—just a minute, no, it was in '62 that I met Lidiia Korneevna Chukovskaya. So, nothing very clear in my recollection of my conversations with Pasternak. I have a copy of his translation of *Faust* into Russian, autographed. I have looked at it. It is a good translation of *Faust*. So, I already was in touch with dissident Russia. It wasn't difficult.

3-00:26:22

Engerman: From your very first time there.

3-00:26:23

Malia: Yeah, this was 1955, two years after Stalin's death. It wasn't that difficult.

3-00:26:30

Engerman: Well, it was a moment of optimism in Russia. I would think that there would be—

3-00:26:34

Malia: Guarded optimism.

3-00:26:34

Engerman: Guarded optimism.

3-00:26:35

Malia: Very guarded optimism. This was only two years after Stalin died. It was quite a ways before the so-called Secret Speech. Then, there was another breakthrough to dissident Russia. There were all sorts of Western journalists in town at that time. One of them was a black journalist named Bill Worthy. Does that mean anything to you?

3-00:27:14

Engerman: No.

3-00:27:14

Malia: —from the *Baltimore Sun*, I think it was. He was looking up all of the blacks that had immigrated to the Soviet Union in the 1930s. He gave me the address of an American woman of Jewish origin from New York, who had married a black, and together the two of them immigrated to the Soviet Union in the thirties. Since her husband was from the South and knew about cotton, they were sent to Uzbekistan, where he was going to help introduce the culture of cotton. He, the husband, eventually died, but she was still there, giving English language broadcasts to India and Pakistan from Tashkent. So on this long trip, I went through Tashkent, I called her up. She said, "Please, come on over right away." So, I finally managed to—well, by then I knew how to get around by myself. I got myself there by public transport. I took a bus; I didn't take a taxi or anything. I spent

the whole evening with her. She was homesick for America. She wanted to know what they were reading in America. She was a very literary person. We talked until two, three, something like that, in the morning. In the meantime, the police of Tashkent had been alerted that I hadn't returned to the tourist hotel, so where was I? Well, I took a cab or something; I got back. They [expressed] dismay and horror at my conduct. But, she really went into detail about the building of socialism in the thirties and what it was like, and at the end, she had a really rather pathetic and touching—seven American dollars in one-dollar bills that she wanted to give me to buy the latest American literature for her and send it to her. [chuckles] I refused to take the dollars. I said, "I'll just send you the stuff." She *insisted*. So I took two or three of them. Something like that, and then sent her a bunch of literature—I don't know if she ever received it—when I got back to Cambridge. Later on, during Perestroika, her daughter showed up—oh, she talked a lot about Soviet racism, because she was a black person. You saw the article in the *Times* this morning?

3-00:30:16

Engerman: I didn't see the *Times* this morning.

3-00:30:17

Malia: Well, you should read it. It is about what is going on with [Patrice] Lumumba University now.

3-00:30:22

Engerman: It is a terrible conflict.

3-00:30:23

Malia: Yeah, this is much worse than it was in Soviet times. They are in physical danger now in a way that—

3-00:30:34

Engerman: Intolerance, in general, I think is worse than it was in Soviet times.

3-00:30:39

Malia: Well, the daughter showed up in the Western media as a great supporter of Perestroika, and, "We hope that it lasts and that we will get something decent and livable," and so forth. It was clear—well, I could tell from the write-up of the daughter that this was the daughter of the woman that I had seen in Tashkent. My big adventure was this: I wanted to do a little tour, so I asked the Intourist bureau in the National Hotel to get me a train—see, I buy all my train tickets through Intourist, and do everything through Intourist—to get me a ticket to Vladimir. I wanted to see the churches. They reserved me a hotel room. Well, they did that, with great reluctance because there was no Intourist hotel in Vladimir. It wasn't something that foreigners were expected to do. So they bought me the ticket and reserved the hotel. I went to the station. I thought the train was leaving at, let's say, twelve twenty. In fact it was leaving at twenty to twelve. So I get to the station, and there the train is chugging out of the station. After going through all the trouble with the foreign bureau of the hotel, here I'd missed the train.

So I came back sheepishly to the National Hotel, and said I had missed the train. The guy sounded really happy about it. He said, "Well, sorry, nothing we can do." One of the secretaries, a woman sitting there, said, "But there are *Marshrutnye taksi* [private minibuses] down at the Kursk railroad station." The guy glared at her for giving away

the secret. So as soon as I heard that, I said, “All right, I am going to the Kursk railroad station.” You were not supposed to do this—and I knew that you were not supposed to—“I am going to the Kursk railroad station, and if I am not back within an hour, that means I have left for Vladimir.” [laughter] So I get down to the Kursk railroad station, and of course there are *marshrutnye taksi*, so I buy a seat, and it is full of colonels and things like that. We drive over this lousy road to Vladimir, and it soon became apparent why you are not supposed to wander around. Soldiers were working on repairing the road, and there were visible camps with miradors—what do you call those watchtowers?—in a few places along the road.

We get to Vladimir, to the one ramshackle hotel that they had. There waiting for me was a woman, Maria Vladimirovna. Boycko was her last name, a Bulgarian name. She was the director for the restoration of the churches in Vladimir. I was going to say *gubernie* [federal unit in imperial times], but *oblast'*, [federal territorial unit in Soviet period]. She was a woman in her fifties, a matronly, buxom woman. She met me at the railroad station, and she took me to the hotel and put me up at the hotel. She came back the next day and showed me around the various churches of Vladimir. At some point or other—I didn't ask her any embarrassing questions or anything. Oh, the first night in the hotel—Did you go to Russia during the Soviet period?

3-00:34:40

Engerman: I never did.

3-00:34:41

Malia: Oh, then you never saw—

3-00:34:42

Engerman: I have seen Soviet-era hotels, which still exist actually.

3-00:34:45

Malia: Well, there was a special atmosphere.

3-00:34:47

Engerman: Tell me about it.

3-00:34:50

Malia: [Colwatskii?] is what the Russians call it. They had big red drapes over the door of the dining room. Of course you had the menu, a very long menu.

3-00:35:08

Engerman: With nothing available.

3-00:35:09

Malia: Matter of fact, only two or three dishes available. It is the same menu all over the Soviet Union, the same china, the same crystal, everything. I was eating my borscht or whatever it was, and someone pulled back the drapes, he was drunk—there were Russians in this, I was the only foreigner. He pulls back the drapes and says, “*udavis' sovetskaia vlast.*” In other words, he was not happy with Soviet power. They pulled him away fast. So the next day when we were visiting, she gave me a wonderful tour, we went to Vladimir, Suzdal, drove around to see the little churches. Somehow or other,

she asked me what I did. I told her, “I teach Russian and Soviet history,” and I mentioned Deutscher or something. Anyway, the name Trotsky was mentioned.

3-00:36:16

Engerman: Which is shocking to hear.

3-00:36:19

Malia: No, I mentioned it.

3-00:36:20

Engerman: Ah.

3-00:36:20

Malia: I mentioned him. She said, “Oh, you know him? You know about him?” I said, “Of course I know about him.” It was only then that she realized that I knew basically the whole Soviet story, so she didn’t have to pretend. So she began talking. She had been in Vorkuta, for I don’t know how many years, and had only been released shortly before I arrived, probably in 1953 or ’54. So she told me about Vorkuta, she told me about her life story. She was arrested because she had married a Bulgarian. She got married in October, 1917, and paid no attention to the revolution. She was nonpolitical. Of course, she talked quite frankly about the whole thing. I said, “Okay, the iron curtain is quite penetrable.” This is before I had been to see Pasternak with Khaleev or met these French students that put me in contact with the dissident types.

Incidentally, one of the French students, a guy named Martinez, turned into a first-rate translator. He has never written much of anything himself, but he had impeccable Russian. He turned into a first-rate translator of important people. One of them is—oh what is his name?—I will look it up when I get home. He is a reasonably important writer. Anyway, Martinez was an interesting person. So, I have gotten to Vladimir on my own steam. I knew about marshrutnye taksi. So after spending two or three days at Vladimir, I caught the next marshrutnoe taksi to Gor’kii, what was then called Gor’kii, Nizhnyi Novgorod, and, I did something that I knew the diplomats did. I sent a telegram to the gorodskoi sovet [city administration] of Nizhnyi Novgorod saying—

3-00:39:03

Engerman: The City Soviet.

3-00:39:04

Malia: The City Soviet.

3-00:39:05

Engerman: Sort of the city administration?

3-00:39:07

Malia: “Ja khochu bronirovat’ nomer”

3-00:39:09

Engerman: “I would like to get a room, please.”

3-00:39:12

Malia: “Reserve a room for me.” I knew that diplomats did that when they were going to places that they were allowed to go to. So I said, “Khochu bronirovat’ nome, ia predstavitel

biblioteki,” and so forth. I got to Nizhnyi Novgorod, and there was a representative allegedly of Intourist—but there is no Intourist in Gor’kii—waiting for me at the arrival of the marshrutka, and took me to the one hotel that before the war had been an Intourist hotel. They had a sumptuous room reserved for me. She said, “I assume you would like to have your dinner in the room,” to keep me away from the locals. [laughs] I said, “No, I want to have it in the dining room.” So, there I was. I went to the Gor’kii University the next day to negotiate book exchanges. Well, that was not why, I just wanted to get to Gor’kii.

3-00:40:27

Engerman: Why were you so keen to get to Gor’kii?

3-00:40:30

Malia: Because I wanted to see the country.

3-00:40:31

Engerman: So it was not Gor’kii in particular. It was everywhere you could see.

3-00:40:34

Malia: Well, at first I simply wanted to see Vladimir for obvious reasons.

3-00:40:38

Engerman: The cathedrals, yes.

3-00:40:39

Malia: But from Vladimir, where can you go except to Gor’kii? That was why I picked it. So I spent the next couple of days just sort of walking around Gor’kii, looking at things. I made all sorts of photographs—I still have them—talking to people, and I didn’t always tell them where I was from. Since my Russian is not perfect, when they asked questions, I would say I was from the Baltic states, and found that people would be reasonably forthcoming.

3-00:41:23

Engerman: So what sort of things did you learn from these people?

3-00:41:26

Malia: More of a feel of what Soviet life was really like. You see drunks in the street and so forth, and seeing what is in the shops, and what isn’t in the shops. The physical sight of Gor’kii, you know, it was quite spectacular. Then my success went—I said, “Well, here I am in Gor’kii, why stop?” Oh, I had earlier asked the foreign bureau of Intourist at the hotel to go to Tashkent and Almata.

3-00:42:00

Engerman: Yes, Central Asia.

3-00:42:02

Malia: Central Asia, and they said no. So, in Gor’kii I found out that there is a *rechnoi vokzal* [river terminal].

3-00:42:18

Engerman: A river terminal.

- 3-00:42:19
Malia: A river ferry station, where you can get a boat. So I went down to the *rechnoi vokzal* and bought a ticket to Kazan' in second-class—rather than in first-class because I thought it would be more interesting in second-class—and spent a day, or maybe it was two days on a river boat, going to Kazan', and sent another telegram.
- 3-00:42:43
Engerman: “Khochu bronirovat' nomer.”
- 3-00:42:46
Malia: “Khochu bronirovat' nomer.” And I arrived at Kazan', at the *rechnoy vokzal*, and there was the *predsidatel' gorodskogo soveta*, the director of the university, waiting for me at the *pristan'*, at the dock, because the dock is some distance from the city. So he took me into the city and put me up in the best hotel. I had the room that [Maksim] Gor'kii himself had had when he had come to Kazan'.
- 3-00:43:17
Engerman: From Gor'kii to Gor'kii's room.
- 3-00:43:18
Malia: Yes. But, I noticed that the washbasin, it was not running water. There was a wall with a basin in it, and in back of the wall, there was a tank with water. Otherwise, the hotel did not—I have since been back to Kazan' and visited the hotel. The hotel did not have running water really.
- 3-00:43:44
Engerman: They had something that looked like running water.
- 3-00:43:48
Malia: In a few rooms. So I had Gor'kii's room. I went to the university, and I negotiated with the University of Kazan'. I walked around the city. At this point, I was *golovokruzhenie ot uspekha*. [“dizzy with success”]
- 3-00:44:08
Engerman: Dizziness with success, like Stalin had said in collectivization.
- 3-00:44:12
Malia: Yes, so I went to the local office of Aeroflot, and bought an airplane ticket to Tashkent. Now, I had a dim feeling that this was pushing my luck. [chuckles] Oh, I had also sent a telegram to the American embassy, just in case.
- 3-00:44:32
Engerman: To let them know where you were.
- 3-00:44:33
Malia: To let them know where I was in case anything went wrong. So, I took off after visiting Kazan', and the plane landed at Samara. At Samara, I was supposed to change flights. There I was told that there was no room on the flight to Tashkent. I waited and a couple of planes came in from Leningrad. Only a few people got off, and there was obviously space. You have to disembark; everyone has to disembark. There was obviously space on those planes. Eventually I got the point that they were not going to let me get to

Tashkent that day. Somehow or other, I guess I took a taxi into town and went to the main hotel, and of course, there were no rooms. So I slept on a couch.

3-00:45:28

Engerman: In the hotel?

3-00:45:29

Malia: In the hallway of the hotel. Oh, incidentally, when I was in the hotel in Vladimir, I had the whole—it was a dormitory.

3-00:45:42

Engerman: Just when your adventure was starting.

3-00:45:43

Malia: Yes. I had the whole dormitory to myself. There were several beds in it. Of course, the bathroom was not in the dormitory. It was elsewhere. So I had to go out in the hall, and I saw some guy climbing up on the couch, cursing and saying there was no room in the dormitory. Well, there was no room in the dormitory because they had emptied it to leave it to me. I slept on the couch in the hotel in Samara, and then the next day I went back to the airport. Again, there was no room on any flight to Tashkent. So I was sitting in the lounge, drinking coffee or something or other, and a man came over to me. He was obviously a KGB guy—I would deduce that later on—and he said, “You know, we have regulations in this country. You really have to go back to Moscow if you want to go to Tashkent.” I eventually got the point, went back to Moscow, and then made that trip to Tashkent. So I was all the time probing the system to see how far I could get. I think by the time that I got through, I had a reasonably good idea of how more or less literate and articulate people felt about the system.

Then the final thing was this: Karpovich’s sister lived in Moscow, and a cousin who was very close to him. Karpovich had given me their addresses before I left, and said, “Try to be careful, but try to get in touch with them if you can.” So I waited a long time, until my Russian got pretty good, and this was later, in probably November, December, and I was looking shabbier with the passage of time, [chuckles] and blending in better with the landscape. I eventually called up—not from the hotel, but from a public phone—to the sister. I said, “I am a student of”—no, it was a young girl, a young woman who answered. It was not Selma Karpovich. You could tell the age by the sound of the voice. I said, “I am a student of your uncle, Mikhail Mikhailovich [Karpovich] from Tiflis.” I didn’t give a last name. The voice paused before she realized just—because Karpovich grew up in Tiflis [Tbilisi].

3-00:48:39

Engerman: In Georgia.

3-00:48:40

Malia: In Georgia. Tiflis—I said it in the old fashion. Maybe I said it in the new form. I don’t know.

3-00:48:50

Engerman: Tbilisi would be the new way.

3-00:48:51

Malia: I guess I said Tbilisi. She understood that I was from her brother, or from her uncle. So, this was the daughter. She said, “Come over immediately.” No, wait a second. No, I guess I spoke with the sister, with the mother. She said, “Come over immediately.” She told me that she had never told her husband or her daughter that she had a relative abroad, especially so visible a relative as Karpovich. So, that is why she—I didn’t say, “your uncle,” I must have said, “your brother.”

3-00:49:59

Engerman: Or you just said the name Mikhail Mikhailovich, which she clearly would have known.

3-00:50:02

Malia: She said, “Come over immediately.” She said, “My family does not know that I have a brother. My daughter does not know.” Then she said, “Come back another time. I would like to have you meet my daughter.” So I came back another time, and met the daughter, and they described their life experiences to me. But more interesting was the cousin, who was widowed I think by then, and who also had a daughter. She asked me to come over, and she said, “I can’t have you meet the daughter, she is a true believer. I never dare tell her that I have relatives—rodstevniki za granitsei [relatives abroad].” She worked in a library, in the library of the gumanitarnye nauki [humanities]. She described the—she talked with great frankness, like Mikhail Mikhailovich, about the regime, what it was like, the anti-Semitism of the late-Stalin years, collectivization, the works. Then I did eventually see the daughter, but the daughter was now told that I was from the Baltic. She wanted me to see someone who was a true believer. So I listened to the daughter spout her line. She really believed it. She was a girl of sixteen, seventeen, maybe eighteen at the outside. When I got back I told Karpovich about all of this.

I picked up a whole lot of anti-Soviet jokes that had been told by these people. There were some other people, younger people, well-connected, they had apartments—they had to be well-connected with apartments of their own—who had invited me to dinner, and they told me these stories.

3-00:52:33

Engerman: Do you remember any of the jokes? It was a classic form of resistance, not resistance, of criticism.

3-00:52:44

Malia: Okay, Caucasians lived to be very old. So one day Stalin was receiving a delegation of Caucasians that were a hundred years old, and they came to him and presented him with a plaque saying, “Thank you Comrade Stalin for our happy childhood.” That kind of thing. Then there is the one—oh, the Pushkin joke. They told the same thing in Germany, but it was Goethe.

3-00:53:23

Engerman: I don’t think I know the joke.

3-00:53:26

Malia: I don’t remember it now.

3-00:53:26

Engerman: Anyway, what else were your—?

- 3-00:53:28
Malia: So, when I got back, Karpovich invited—well, I first told him about his relatives privately. Then he invited a bunch of prominent émigrés, beginning with [Aleksander] Kerensky.
- 3-00:53:45
Engerman: The former head of the provisional government.
- 3-00:53:48
Malia: Former head of the provisional government, and others. Mark Vichniac, of the SR [Socialist-Revolutionary Party], was Iurii Denike there? No, it wasn't Denike. Nicolaevsky. I don't know who else.
- 3-00:54:03
Engerman: Boris Nicolaevsky?
- 3-00:54:04
Malia: Yes. It was a dinner at his house where we all spoke Russian. Well, that pleased Karpovich very much, that I was now quite fluent in not bookish Russian, but everyday Russian, and that I had clearly enjoyed the country, that I was favorably disposed towards Russia.
- 3-00:54:27
Engerman: But not towards the Soviets.
- 3-00:54:29
Malia: Not towards the Soviets.
- 3-00:54:30
Engerman: Oh, both of those would have pleased him, I imagine.
- 3-00:54:32
Malia: Yes, so that sort of finished, solidified my reputation with Karpovich. Coming back from Moscow—oh, Bohlen, Chip [Charles] Bohlen, was the ambassador at the time. I left in December, 1956.
- 3-00:55:07
Engerman: '55, or '56.
- 3-00:55:11
Malia: I left in January of—
- 3-00:55:14
Engerman: Of '56.
- 3-00:55:13
Malia: —of '56. Or maybe, yeah, I guess it was January of '56. Porgy and Bess had come to Leningrad. The exchanges were just beginning, the cultural exchanges were just beginning. Somehow or other I met a group of younger Russians who took me—I was the pervyi zhivoi amerikanets [first living American] [laughs]. They took me to a sumptuous and very bibulous dinner at the Gostinitsa Evropeiskaia [Hotel Europe].

3-00:55:45

Engerman: This is in Leningrad?

3-00:55:46

Malia: Yes.

3-00:55:47

Engerman: Right off of Nevsky Prospect?

3-00:55:49

Malia: Right on the Nevsky Prospect, well, the entrance at Nevsky Prospect. There were six or seven of them. I met them at, I think, a performance of Porgy and Bess, and they invited me to this dinner, and of course spoke very freely about the—. Oh, I had visited the university. No, I had met them at the university because I had negotiated exchanges with the university. That is where I met them. I also met some Russian émigrés who had lived in France until they returned at the end of World War II, and these younger people were very unhappy that their parents had made the choice of coming back. One of them was singing French songs at some nightclub or dance place. Also, for some reason or other, Khaleev was in Leningrad at this time—no, I guess it was on the—well, he took me to the train station. I guess it was in Moscow. Bohlen was taking the same train, and somehow or other, he needed some small change for something or other, and borrowed it from the American ambassador. [laughs] I forget the details.

3-00:57:38

Engerman: Khaleev did?

3-00:57:40

Malia: Khaleev did.

3-00:57:41

Engerman: Borrowed this money from Bohlen?

3-00:57:42

Malia: From Bohlen, which of course was a terribly compromising thing. I don't know if he ever got into trouble afterwards. In any event, by then all sorts of barriers were beginning to crumble—this is why I am citing these students that I met at Leningrad. I tried to find—Schultz was the name of one. I tried to find him later on in 1962 when I returned, but I couldn't. He was in one of the sciences. Okay, so that is roughly what the Russian trip amounted to. The exchanges, I really had little to do with the details of them. It was mostly to establish contact. Oh, I wrote long reports at the Library of Congress. They are probably on file still.

3-00:58:36

Engerman: It is in the Harvard Library.

3-00:58:37

Malia: In the Harvard Library? Oh, so you have read them?

3-00:58:40

Engerman: It is one big report, one big memo.

- 3-00:58:43
Malia: Well, I wrote a lot of smaller ones too.
- 3-00:58:45
Engerman: Maybe then they are not *all* there. But there is one bound volume. It must be about a fifty-, forty- or fifty- page report, and then there is a two- or three- page cover memo.
- 3-00:58:59
Malia: Hand-written?
- 3-00:58:59
Engerman: No, it is typed. I will send you a copy.
- 3-00:59:04
Malia: Did I type it?
- 3-00:59:04
Engerman: I have no idea.
- 3-00:59:05
Malia: Could you send it to me?
- 3-00:59:05
Engerman: I will send it to you.
- 3-00:59:08
Malia: Yes.
- 3-00:59:09
Engerman: That is how I know of your travels around, although you don't explain all the details.
- 3-00:59:16
Malia: Yes, I don't disclose what was going on behind the scenes.
- 3-00:59:19
Engerman: Okay, two questions about it. Your Russia, the Soviet Union at that time, it is really just opening up for the first time. Stalin had been dead for two years. There was a certain optimism, but as you say there was also a certain wariness. There were very, very few Americans who are coming to the Soviet Union for any reason whatsoever, and few young Americans.
- 3-00:59:42
Malia: Yes, well, by the time I got there, there were a lot of journalists.
- 3-00:59:45
Engerman: There were journalists set up there, but—
- 3-00:59:47
Malia: Daniel Schorr was there, Konrad Adenauer came. They all stayed at the Metropol Hotel, or excuse me, the National Hotel. Oh, I also got to meet [Nikita Sergeevich] Khrushchev.

- 3-01:00:05
Engerman: You did? Well, do tell.
- 3-01:00:05
Malia: Well, Maggie Higgins, does that mean anything to you? Margaret Higgins? She was in those days a famous journalist for the *New York Herald Tribune*. She was rather far to the right, very anti-Communist. She had become famous. Look her biography up. I believe someone wrote a biography, in the library. She became famous for her dispatches from Korea during the war. And, also, Khrushchev was coming out of the chrysalis at this time.
- 3-01:00:49
Engerman: So after Stalin's death in '53, it is not really clear who will lead the country, who will succeed Stalin?
- 3-01:00:56
Malia: It was Dim i Bum Khrushchev and [Nikolai Aleksandrovich] Bulganin. Karpovich's cousin said, "We call them Dim i Bum."
- 3-01:01:08
Engerman: Meaning what?
- 3-01:01:10
Malia: They were two clowns, two famous clowns.
- 3-01:01:12
Engerman: Ah.
- 3-01:01:14
Malia: It is in Russian literature. You will find it in [Ilya] Il'f and [Evgenyi] Petrov and so forth. *Dim i Bum*. In any event, Khrushchev was going to all the national days at the various embassies, because he was for the first time coming into contact with outside reality. She took me—Maggie Higgins took me along to—
- 3-01:01:45
Engerman: To July Fourth at the American embassy or to Bastille Day at the French or something.
- 3-01:01:51
Malia: Now, it wasn't July Fourth. I forget what.
- 3-01:01:54
Engerman: Oh, it couldn't have been. It would have been December or January.
- 3-01:01:57
Malia: In any event, she took me to the Kremlin eventually. She had a pass, I forget what the occasion was, and she drove through I forget what gate, Spasskaia Vorota No, not the one on Red Square, but the one—
- 3-01:02:20
Engerman: The one across from the [Hotel] National, I imagine.

- 3-01:02:22
Malia: The one across from the National. That is where we drove in. She had this invitation. She was very cute, with a big smile waved this invitation. We were in the car, waved this invitation at the guard, we drove in, and I walked into the Kremlin—you can't do that at the White House—and translated for Khrushchev when he was talking to Maggie Higgins. She was sort of his favorite, probably because she was a woman, and more or less pretty. So, I got to meet Khrushchev.
- 3-01:02:59
Engerman: Tell me, what were your impressions of him? This is before he gives the Secret Speech only a couple of months before. Vulgar, obviously having a great time flirting with Maggie Higgins.
- 3-01:03:33
Malia: —flirting with Maggie Higgins, and being the boss, being *khoziain* [master], and she had the same instincts that I did about breaking through the Iron Curtain. She would go to grab a taxi, go out to a village—this was in winter—with a bottle of vodka, knock on the door of some hut and say, “Do you have a corkscrew?” Of course, she got in and she got to talk to them. She had her interpreter, and so on and so forth. Well, she was enterprising.
- 3-01:04:19
Engerman: Any more recollections of Khrushchev? I mean, it is a crucial moment in history.
- 3-01:04:27
Malia: No, I saw him about four or five, maybe six times. His ruddy face, very voluble, so that is it.
- 3-01:04:42
Engerman: Now, you mentioned a couple of—
- 3-01:04:47
Malia: No, what was her name?—it was Erica—a famous case, she had just been released from Vorkuta. The Fields, does that mean anything to you? They were American Friends Service Committee workers who disappeared in East Berlin, and this was the daughter of one of them, she was shipped off to Vorkuta. She did not want to talk to any of the—she was released from Vorkuta then, and she was going to go back to the States. She lives in northern Virginia now, I don't know if she is still alive. She wouldn't talk to any of the journalists, but she would talk to me. I took her to the Bol'shoi [Theater].
- 3-01:05:42
Engerman: So she was in Moscow?
- 3-01:05:44
Malia: She was in Moscow. Oh, another ploy that I had, you would get tickets to all sorts of—I went to all sorts of plays, and a lot to the Bol'shoi. From the tourist bureau of the hotel, you could easily get tickets to the Bol'shoi, which were hard to get. So I would order two to the Bol'shoi.
- 3-01:06:17
Engerman: You must have been a very eligible man around town.

- 3-01:06:19
Malia: And then sell the other one to someone on the steps of the Bol'shoi. Sometimes I would have an interesting conversation; sometimes it would be a dud. So, I was interested in coming into contact with the society. I even went to see a football match, the Spartak team [Russian soccer team].
- 3-01:06:45
Engerman: Yes, the army team.
- 3-01:06:46
Malia: What?
- 3-01:06:48
Engerman: Go on. You went to see a football match, you went to the Bol'shoi.
- 3-01:06:52
Malia: No, it was Dinamo [another soccer team].
- 3-01:06:53
Engerman: Dinamo.
- 3-01:06:55
Malia: Dinamo, Dinamo, I was bored stiff. What was her name? It was a famous case, the Fields brothers. And she was Erica Vollach. Does that name mean anything to you? It was on the front page of the *New York Times* at the time. So Erica Vollach, and she told me about life in Vorkuta, but I had already met Mariia Vladimirovna, so I knew about the life in Vorkuta. So I came back with a very realistic picture—well, more or less—of urban Russia. I stopped in Paris on my way back, and called up my socialist friends from the *École Normale*, and we had a long evening where I told them all the anti-Soviet jokes, and of course they were immediately disabused.
- 3-01:08:04
Engerman: So they were convinced by what you said?
- 3-01:08:05
Malia: Oh, yeah.
- 3-01:08:06
Engerman: So they didn't wait for the Secret Speech?
- 3-01:08:07
Malia: They didn't wait for the Secret Speech.
- 3-01:08:11
Engerman: Malia:'s Secret Speech did it.
- 3-01:08:13
Malia: What I think is remarkable about it is the fragility of the whole thing when a little air was let into the room.
- 3-01:08:24
Engerman: The fragility of which thing? Of the Soviet system or of the French Communists' belief?

- 3-01:08:29
Malia: Both. A few facts could demolish the whole ideological structure.
- 3-01:08:39
Engerman: So who were the people who you disabused in Paris?
- 3-01:08:42
Malia: Well, first of all Clemens Heller, does that name mean anything to you? He founded the Salzburg Seminar and later on became sort of [Fernand] Braudel's liaison man with the American foundations. That is why Braudel kept him around. He was a non-entity as a scholar, but as a bureaucrat at the École [?], he was important. Clemens Heller, Alain Tourraine, Jacques Le Goff—who else?—oh, Francois Breuer had been a Communist himself. Of course they spread the word to others.
- 3-01:09:27
Engerman: So who has told this story before? The story of—I mean, people have—Tony Judt, for instance, has told the story for instance of French intellectuals in the forties and fifties and their eventual disbelief, but he attributes it to the Secret Speech. And you are saying that you must have returned through Paris in January 1956—
- 3-01:09:45
Malia: Well, I didn't give a public lecture, I just talked to a handful of people.
- 3-01:09:48
Engerman: Well, *still* you were talking to a really impressive group of people.
- 3-01:09:51
Malia: Well, they weren't then what they later became. They were still junior professors and had not published all that much, and had not become public figures. They had always wanted to be able to hope that the Soviet experiment would straighten itself out and come out okay. I think for the first time they began to see it in somewhat realistic terms. So that was the end of it, that experiment.
- Engerman: As you mentioned earlier, you met Kennan, George Kennan, on this trip.
- 3-01:10:46
Malia: Oh, when I got back to Washington, I had to be debriefed in Washington.
- 3-01:10:52
Engerman: Now, who debriefed you?
- 3-01:10:53
Malia: The librarians at the Library of Congress.
- 3-01:10:57
Engerman: But Kennan was not at the Library of Congress.
- 3-01:10:59
Malia: Oh, as a matter of fact, they took me to see Allan Dulles.
- 3-01:11:05
Engerman: The head of the CIA.

- 3-01:11:06
Malia: The head of the CIA. I was working for the government. I could not say that I did not want to see Allan Dulles. It was a completely uneventful interview. What could I tell him?
- 3-01:11:21
Engerman: Had the CIA spoken with you before you went?
- 3-01:11:23
Malia: No.
- 3-01:11:25
Engerman: And that was actually one of the questions, how the intelligence services dealt with you. Did you feel that you, for instance, were being followed by the KGB?
- 3-01:11:34
Malia: Oh, I knew I was.
- 3-01:11:34
Engerman: Did you ever say hello, and wave to your—
- 3-01:11:38
Malia: No, no.
- 3-01:11:40
Engerman: But you knew?
- 3-01:11:41
Malia: I was not always followed, for instance I—
- 3-01:11:44
Engerman: You would have kept them busy.
- 3-01:11:45
Malia: I got away to Vladimir and Nizhnyi Novgorod, [chuckles] but it was not until Samara that they caught up with me, and they did not know where I was that night in Tashkent. They *did* know that I went to MGU, and to Pasternak. I wasn't supposed to go, but they probably did not want to barge in on that.
- 3-01:12:11
Engerman: So, you have already told one story about returning from Russia to Berkeley, which was with Karpovich, and how pleased he was about your enthusiasm for life in Russia and your lack of enthusiasm for the Soviet system.
- 3-01:12:33
Malia: Yes.
- 3-01:12:34
Engerman: Can you talk more about being on the Harvard faculty as a junior faculty member in the fifties? It was an extraordinary time for that department, I think. It was coming from being a somewhat mixed bag to having this group of—

- 3-01:12:50
Malia: You mean Berkeley?
- 3-01:12:50
Engerman: No, no, no, Harvard. It had this group of junior faculty members there who were just an extraordinary bunch. Were you close or did you connect with any of the Harvard faculty other than obviously senior faculty like Karpovich? Who did you spend time with in the history department?
- 3-01:13:10
Malia: Well, I already told you the main names, the people who were involved in Social Sciences 5.
- 3-01:13:15
Engerman: Yeah.
- 3-01:13:20
Malia: Who were some of the younger people?
- 3-01:13:19
Engerman: H. Stuart Hughes.
- 3-01:13:20
Malia: H. Stewart Hughes, yes, I knew him.
- 3-01:13:22
Engerman: Bernard Bailyn.
- 3-01:13:23
Malia: Bud Bailyn. Well, that is it.
- 3-01:13:29
Engerman: Actually, one other question about a junior faculty member named Richard Pipes.
- 3-01:13:33
Malia: I almost never saw him because he was not teaching. He was a tutor. He was not on the regular faculty. His wife Irene typed a part of my dissertation before I went to Paris to the École Normale. She typed the first part. She worked as Karpovich's secretary. That was really the extent of my contact with Pipes. I barely knew him.
- 3-01:14:10
Engerman: Were there other Russianists there that you knew?
- 3-01:14:14
Malia: Adam Ulam. I became a tutor in Eliot House, a resident tutor in Eliot House, and Adam Ulam was our resident Slavic scholar, and he was a lot of fun.
- 3-01:14:30
Engerman: Tell me about him.

- 3-01:14:30
Malia: We became very good friends. Gerschenkron was a non-resident fellow. I saw a fair amount of him there, too. Some other economists, a guy named Chamberlain, [Gottfried van Haberler ? Unconfirmed].
- 3-01:14:48
Engerman: Chamberlain?
- 3-01:14:48
Malia: Yeah.
- 3-01:14:49
Engerman: I am trying to remember which Chamberlain would that have been?
- 3-01:14:52
Malia: Ed. I don't know what he did in Economics. Gottfried von Haberler, whom I also knew.
- 3-01:14:58
Engerman: A close friend of Gershenkron's also.
- 3-01:15:00
Malia: A close friend of Gershenkron's. Van [W.V.] Quine, who was the philosopher who was in many ways a terribly naïve man. His philosophy is still waiting for its Copernican breakthrough. Even then I knew there was never going to be Copernican breakthrough for philosophy. It is not a science. But he was a very nice guy. John Finley, the classicist, Greek scholar, a good book on Thucydides, who was the master. Walter Frank, an economics tutor. Bill Slottman, who used to teach here.
- 3-01:15:46
Engerman: Did you know Bill well?
- 3-01:15:48
Malia: Yeah. He had a room across the hall from me and he eventually became a senior tutor. So okay, I saw a fair amount of Hughes, well, Bailyn of course, and [John Clive? Inaudible].
- 3-01:16:19
Engerman: Are you still close with, are you still in touch with Bailyn?
- 3-01:16:21
Malia: Oh yeah, when I go into Boston, I stay with the Bailyns. I don't go that often, but we are as close as we can be while being separated by a continent. That was about it, out of the younger fellows. Who else was there?
- 3-01:16:44
Engerman: That is a pretty impressive group, though.
- 3-01:16:46
Malia: Yeah.
- 3-01:16:47
Engerman: How about the Russian Research Center?

- 3-01:16:49
Malia: Well, I went to some of their seminars. I gave a seminar there on my experiences in Russia, but I was not on the staff.
- 3-01:17:01
Engerman: What did you think of the center's operations? Did you talk to people?
- 3-01:17:06
Malia: I did not have any opinion about it. I thought it odd that they should have an anthropologist running the place. Karpovich never mentioned that he felt slighted by these people, but he took his revenge by creating the Slavic department. It was very social sciencey, the center, and I was only moderately interested in that kind of social science. Then I had to start revising my manuscript.
- 3-01:17:39
Engerman: As you said yesterday, that was a full-on project because you wanted to start it and—
- 3-01:17:45
Malia: Well, it was a new book. It was a new book. I wrote it in two summers. I could not go to Paris. I was irritated because I could not go to Paris. I wrote it down in two summers, and then the competition for tenure in a number of universities started. There were four people that were considered everywhere. There was me, Pipes, Riasanovsky, and a guy named Mike Petrovich. Do you know who he is?
- 3-01:18:18
Engerman: He ended up at Wisconsin.
- 3-01:18:19
Malia: Wisconsin, yes. We were all invited to Berkeley. They wanted Riasanovsky, then they offered me [Robert J.] Kerner's job.
- 3-01:18:32
Engerman: So two years later you were—?
- 3-01:18:33
Malia: Yeah, two years later when I had the manuscript. I had written one summer of the new book. I had about half completed when they offered me the job on the basis of that. Then I went back to Harvard and—no, by then I had finished it. I went back to Harvard, and then I finished, the second summer I finished it. That is why I had a completed manuscript.
- 3-01:18:59
Engerman: But just before you started teaching at Berkeley?
- 3-01:19:01
Malia: Why, I had not accepted Berkeley yet. I was going to wait and see what Harvard would do. So, I had the completed manuscript, but I didn't have the notes. They deliberated long and hard, and by then Pipes, in addition to his book on the nationalities, had a little book on [Nikolai Mikhailovich] Karamzin. Do you know that book? Well see, intellectual history was "in" at that time, in part because of Isaiah Berlin and Crane Brinton teaching it. This was when Franklin Lee Baumer, Franklin LeVan Baumer, started at Yale. I think those were the only courses in intellectual history going at the

time. Berkeley certainly did not offer one. I had the completed manuscript, but no notes, whereas Pipes had a published book and this other little thing in intellectual history ready to go. So they took him. So that is why I came to Berkeley.

3-01:20:01

Engerman: Did you resent the situation? I mean, you described that you thought that Karpovich was trying to have you succeed him.

3-01:20:10

Malia: Well, not only Karpovich, but everyone assumed that I was going to be the successor to Karpovich.

3-01:20:17

Engerman: Everyone except Pipes.

3-01:20:18

Malia: Everyone except Pipes, well, he was campaigning for the job. I was not campaigning for it.

3-01:20:22

Engerman: You thought you had it.

3-01:20:23

Malia: No, I was so busy doing all this teaching and going to Russia, that I did not think much about that. I knew that I was in line for it, and that Karpovich and Brinton and others liked me, but I did not feel as though I had to sort of court Langer, say, by going to the 1955 Rome meeting of the World Historical Association or things like that. I did not act professional. I did not realize it was important a contest as it was. It was a major job in the country, and I did not think of it in those terms. I was surprised, and I was not particularly pleased, obviously. I think that on balance, I was better off at Berkeley, because I had more freedom than I would have had at Harvard. But, it is never pleasant to be refused something that you have been expecting and anticipating. So, it was not pleasant, but I wound up in a first-rate place that was then taking off. I did not think that much of Pipes' first book, and the Karamzin thing, I don't think he got Karamzin right.

3-01:22:02

Engerman: Well, it is also very short. The Karamzin is essentially an extended introduction to a translation.

3-01:22:07

Malia: Yes, yes. Well, this is something that has not been told, Bud Bailyn told me this. Harvard has an ad-hoc committee. Both Bailyn—Bailyn was promoted this year that I was not promoted. But the same ad-hoc committee considered the two cases. I have been on Harvard ad-hoc committees since, I know how it works. They have people invited in from outside—from other universities or and outside the department in question at Harvard. One of the people invited in was Perry Miller at Harvard.

3-01:22:55

Engerman: The English professor, who is essentially an American Studies intellectual historian.

- 3-01:22:59
Malia: The Puritans, *The New England Mind*. He told them, the history representatives, that: “You are making a big mistake.” He was an intellectual historian, so he responded to my Herzen manuscript. He said, “I don’t care that the footnotes are not there.” It was [William] Langer, I think, who insisted on the footnotes. He said, “You are making a big mistake, and ten years from now, you will see that it was a big mistake.” Well, I won’t comment on the latter phrase, but Pipes among things cannot handle ideas. Did you see that exchange that I had with him in the *TLS* [*Times Literary Supplement*]?”
- 3-01:23:41
Engerman: I have seen pieces of it, but we can come to that part later. That is much more recent.
- 3-01:23:46
Malia: Okay, that is much more recent. He doesn’t realize that he does not understand Marxism, for instance, in the least bit. Okay, so that is why I came to Berkeley.
- 3-01:24:12
Engerman: One thing actually about Harvard, this was happening just as you were leaving, for Berkeley, was Karpovich’s retirement. He retired in ’57.
- 3-01:24:21
Malia: That is right.
- 3-01:24:22
Engerman: You and not Pipes were sort of the junior representative, as it were, editing the *Festschrift*. It was you and George Fischer.
- 3-01:24:31
Malia: That was done—It was Hugh McLean, George Fischer, and myself. That was done before Karpovich retired.
- 3-01:24:42
Engerman: But it was done essentially in honor of his impending retirement.
- 3-01:24:46
Malia: In honor of him, yes, and his impending retirement. That was before the tenure business came up.
- 3-01:25:04
Engerman: Was there anything about working on this *Festschrift* that was an interesting experience or did it—?
- 3-01:25:11
Malia: Well, everyone was devoted to Karpovich. Everyone contributed but Leo Haimson.
- 3-01:25:15
Engerman: And why didn’t Haimson contribute?
- 3-01:25:16
Malia: Never any explanation. He never got around to writing an article.

- 3-01:25:20
Engerman: What was it like working with Phil Mosely on this, one of Karpovich's very first students before the war?
- 3-01:25:25
Malia: We didn't work much with him.
- 3-01:25:26
Engerman: But he did write one of the pieces for it.
- 3-01:25:28
Malia: He did write one. He wrote the introductory piece, yes, on Karpovich's career. Frankly, Hugh McLean did most of the secretarial work on that. George and I were sort of front-men for McLean.
- 3-01:25:44
Engerman: What was George Fisher like at that time?
- 3-01:25:47
Malia: Oh, we were good friends then. He was sort of plump and jovial, married to the present Mrs. McLean.
- 3-01:25:57
Engerman: Oh, I did not know that.
- 3-01:25:57
Malia: Kitty Fisher, yeah, she began life as Kitty [Hoag] Fischer. Hugh was already secretly in love with her. Then George and Kitty got divorced, and he married a girl named Nell, and I took them to a great dinner in San Francisco. I saw them off and on over the first few years.
- 3-01:26:21
Engerman: He is someone who came out it seemed to me with great guns and great promises.
- 3-01:26:26
Malia: Yes, he wrote two good books.
- 3-01:26:27
Engerman: He did take a junior fellowship with the society [Society of Fellows].
- 3-01:26:31
Malia: He did take the junior fellowship, he wrote two worthwhile books on Soviet opposition to Stalin and Russian liberalism from gentry to intelligentsia. That was obviously in the Karpovich tradition. Then, I don't know, he became an anarchist, he became—
- 3-01:26:54
Engerman: But this is even before he became an anarchist. I mean, his two good books were in the fifties.
- 3-01:26:58
Malia: Yes.

- 3-01:26:59
Engerman: That is what is remarkable, is that he was—
- 3-01:27:00
Malia: Well, he made a bad career choice.
- 3-01:27:03
Engerman: I would hate to hear that coming to Brandeis would be a bad career choice.
- 3-01:27:09
Malia: Brandeis? No, he is not there.
- 3-01:27:11
Engerman: He was. He was for one of his early jobs.
- 3-01:27:13
Malia: No, he was at Cornell, and he did not have tenure, and Columbia offered him something, but without tenure. And he made the mistake of going to Columbia, and then they did not give him tenure. Then he went to Brandeis for a while. Did he ever get tenure there?
- 3-01:27:33
Engerman: He must have.
- 3-01:27:34
Malia: Probably. Then he went sort of, I don't know, bizarre.
- 3-01:27:51
Engerman: Yes, anyway, this is probably not any—
- 3-01:27:55
Malia: We were very good friends for a long time, when he was still normal. I saw him—I tried to get him appointed here to the political science department because his Russian was first-rate, he knew the country.
- 3-01:28:11
Engerman: But he grew up there.
- 3-01:28:11
Malia: He grew up there, he knew the country from the inside. But he was too influenced by modernization theories, “this is the answer.”
- 3-01:28:21
Engerman: Now, you have talked—
- 3-01:28:23
Malia: Oh, to finish on Kennan, after being introduced to Allan Dulles, and that was absolutely insignificant, I was taken to Princeton to meet George Kennan. We had a long session, and not once did he ask me anything about my experiences in the Soviet Union. You would think that he would have been curious.

- 3-01:28:49
Engerman: Well, especially since he wrote so much about his own experiences there in the thirties and the forties.
- 3-01:28:55
Malia: Yeah, but no one that he could have met had been to the Soviet Union for years! He should have been curious. He should have asked me some questions. Cy Black said he was really quite surprised that Kennan did not ask a single question.
- 3-01:29:12
Engerman: How did you get to know Cy Black?
- 3-01:29:15
Malia: Through this Library of Congress thing. He was on the committee.
- 3-01:29:18
Engerman: The Joint Committee [on Slavic Studies].
- 3-01:29:18
Malia: The Joint Committee.
- 3-01:29:23
Engerman: One of the questions on Karpovich is, we have started talking about this, although not very much for the record, about them working on the manuscript of his lectures.
- 3-01:29:35
Malia: Yes.
- 3-01:29:36
Engerman: Phil Mosely thought that you were by far the best person of his students to do it, and you said you started—Karpovich of course had published so little in his career, and yet had worked up this magnificent, apparently magnificent set of lectures on Russian intellectual history?
- 3-01:29:53
Malia: That is right.
- 3-01:29:55
Engerman: Why don't you tell what happened there?
- 3-01:29:58
Malia: Well, you can read it if you want. I started in, I think I revised two or three lectures to turn them into a written text, sort of putting my things from my own lecture notes, but it was such a staggering job, that I eventually gave up, and then the Free Speech Movement happened. I just dropped it, because that became a full-time occupation for two or three years. Because it was not just that Free Speech Movement in '64; the whole revolution lasted six years.
- 3-01:30:37
Engerman: Well, we will turn to that. That we won't get to today. So you started working on the manuscript, but never—

- 3-01:30:45
Malia: Then I abandoned it. Well, first the Free Speech Movement got in the way, and then Carl Schorske left, in part because of the revolution, and I inherited his intellectual history course, which I had to work up. By then I had sort of lost interest in Russia, because I couldn't go there after 1962.
- 3-01:31:09
Engerman: For reasons we will get to in a minute. Tell me about coming to Berkeley then. You were hired in Berkeley. You start in 1957, and you have come in right after the clash of the titans, as it were. What is sort of the feeling in the department?
- 3-01:31:28
Malia: Well, we were going to build a—[Carl]Bridenbaugh, the line was that we were “going to build the greatest department in the country,” sort of an anti-Harvard. See, he had been turned down by Harvard. That was the great drama of his life.
- 3-01:31:43
Engerman: Well, you had been turned down by Harvard too, but it somehow never became that kind of drama.
- 3-01:31:47
Malia: It never became that kind of drama. But for him it was a great drama, and he wanted to build an anti-Harvard, a super-Harvard in the West. He was dynamic and energetic, and he had the better younger people, better Americans on his side, namely Henry May and Ken Stamp. He had the dean, Lincoln Constance, on his side at that time. So, minority appointments were railroaded through to the administration.
- 3-01:32:20
Engerman: Now, when you came to Berkeley, were you tenured? You came as an associate professor.
- 3-01:32:25
Malia: I was tenured, yes.
- 3-01:32:27
Engerman: So you never went through tenure here? You went through it all before you arrived?
- 3-01:32:31
Malia: Yeah, but there were reactionary strides to block my appointment. They tried to block my appointment, but [Dean] Lincoln Constance fixed it up, and I went through.
- 3-01:32:46
Engerman: What would you describe the sort of intellectual and political climate of the department of that time as?
- 3-01:32:52
Malia: Well, a very upbeat atmosphere. We were growing, we were acquiring bright younger people. Joe [Joseph P.] Levenson was one of the acquisitions.
- 3-01:33:04
Engerman: The China specialist.

- 3-01:33:05
Malia: Also from Harvard. Bill Bouwsma.
- 3-01:33:09
Engerman: Whose tenure case was essentially the—
- 3-01:33:11
Malia: Who was the crucial case. That happened the year before I came. The guy that he beat out, Griffith, was a perfectly good specialist, but not as good as Bill. He has a book on sixteenth-century representative institutions. I used it for my revolutions book.
- 3-01:33:32
Engerman: But even using that book, you think they made the right decision?
- 3-01:33:36
Malia: Oh, they made the right decision. Bill was much more creative than Griffith was. Then we acquired David Landes.
- 3-01:33:45
Engerman: Economic history.
- 3-01:33:47
Malia: Economic history, who was very hostile to intellectual history, without a froth. Not serious, not sound, not empirical.
- 3-01:33:58
Engerman: Well, what is interesting, though, is that the department at that point is heavy on intellectual historians, Schorske, you, Riasanovsky, May.
- 3-01:34:05
Malia: Well, Riasanovsky was already there, and then me. I was the one who lobbied for appointing Carl Schorske. It was work because he hadn't published a great deal, and people like Ken Stamp wanted publication.
- 3-01:34:24
Engerman: But he never did publish a great deal.
- 3-01:34:26
Malia: Well, he eventually published his book on Vienna.
- 3-01:34:31
Engerman: It is a wonderful book, but--
- 3-01:34:32
Malia: It is not a book.
- 3-01:34:34
Engerman: It is a wonderful set of essays.
- 3-01:34:35
Malia: A wonderful set of essays. He is a wonderful guy, and he gave a great course on intellectual history. Much better than Brinton's course, and I am sure much better than Baumer's course because Carl is something of an artist. He speaks—have you ever met

him? Well, he is very eloquent. Henry May was in graduate school. He called him “the golden voice,” with a sort of edge of irony. He is very eloquent, and he can talk a great line. He gave wonderful lectures, and they were very thoughtful lectures, quasi-Marxist contextualization. The thinkers were always situated in their time and their society, but not crudely related to class structure or anything like that. But definitely products of their background and of their age, a method I fully endorse. And he put on shows like playing excerpts from Wagner’s *Tristan and Isolde* and commented on this. He gave a first-rate course. So he came here and gave a lecture. He spent the year at the Stanford Center.

3-01:36:13

Engerman: The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

3-01:36:14

Malia: The Center for Advanced Studies, and they made him an offer. Gordon Wright engineered an offer for him, but he really preferred to be here because of the other people, mostly from Harvard, that were here. He gave a guest lecture, which was terrific. So after that, I started lobbying hard. Henry May, who knew him in graduate school, and liked him, but not one hundred percent. Perhaps, he felt a little—well, Carl was more brilliant in many ways. Henry was not wildly enthusiastic but went along. Ken Stampp was the hardest one to convince because of publication. Nash, what is his first name, over in English? Henry Nash Smith, who had also been with Carl and Henry May at Harvard before. He wrote a very strong letter. Bill Bouwsma, as you know was enthusiastic, so we put it through. Ken was then acting chairman. He bought the enthusiasm of his younger colleagues, and he appointed Carl, and it was a great thing we did, because even though he has published slowly, he was a great intellectual asset to the community. He is much more to the left than I am. We had our differences over the Free Speech Movement. And at that, we are going to stop for the day, because I have had it.

[End of Session]

[Interview #4: December 19, 2003]
 [Begin Audio File Malia: 04 12-19-03]

4-00:00:00

Engerman: It is December 19. This is our fourth session with Martin Malia:, and he wanted to start out with a joke.

4-00:00:08

Malia: Well, after each session, in the evening, I think about what I didn't say and might have said.

4-00:00:13

Engerman: Yes.

4-00:00:13

Malia: This is one of the better jokes. What is the difference between *mat* [vocabulary of Russian obscenity] and *diamat* [Soviet-era shortening of "dialectical materialism," official ideology]?

4-00:00:18

Engerman: What?

4-00:00:19

Malia: *Mat*, everyone understands, but pretends he doesn't understand. *Diamat* no one understands, and everyone pretends he does understand.

4-00:00:28

Engerman: He does understand.

4-00:00:29

Malia: And both are mighty weapons in the hands of the proletariat.

4-00:00:32

Engerman: [laughs] That is true enough. Is this one you heard in '55?

4-00:00:36

Malia: Yes. And incidentally, the jokes did the most to demystify the Soviet Union for interlocutors of whatever political persuasion, especially my French friends who were socialist, not communist. But still, for them, this was a brave experiment in socialism. That made it just ordinary, and that was much more effective than explicit criticism of the system.

4-00:01:12

Malia: Okay. Another thing I thought of, with reference to the appointments at Harvard and Berkeley, the four individuals were invited to the—

4-00:01:24

Engerman: Petrovich, Pipes, you and Riasanovsky.

4-00:01:27

Malia: Yes, and Pipes did not get appointed in Berkeley. No one seems to ever notice that.

- 4-00:01:31
Engerman: I have seen documents, some letters, I don't remember who the letters are from, but I have seen letters that say they decided that they [at Berkeley] didn't want Pipes.
- 4-00:01:43
Malia: Yes. No one knows that, so I just mentioned it for the record.
- 4-00:01:49
Engerman: No, that is a good point.
- 4-00:01:49
Malia: Also, I was sent—it was Langer, he said, “You have got to go, because this is the way things are done.”
- 4-00:01:59
Engerman: You have got to go to Berkeley?
- 4-00:02:00
Malia: To Berkeley. I didn't want to go for the visit, because I had just started writing the book, that summer. And, I had a new course to give in—oh, in Harvard they gave me a new course that fall.
- 4-00:02:16
Engerman: Which was what course?
- 4-00:02:17
Malia: Russian history down to 1800. I had never taught it before, so I had to work that out.
- 4-00:02:25
Engerman: And how much training had you had in that kind of early Russian history?
- 4-00:02:28
Malia: Not much, which meant I had to do it myself. When I got to Berkeley, I had to teach two courses. One was modern Russian history. There were two lecture courses. I think one was Soviet history, and the other was a history of Russia and Poland in the early modern period. I did not know anything about Poland, so I had to work on both.
- 4-00:02:49
Engerman: And the early modern period was still, yes—
- 4-00:02:52
Malia: And I wanted to write the book. You know, I brought all the manuscripts and all the necessary notes with me. Under these conditions, I couldn't get anything done that whole year, so I had to finish the book the following summer. Okay, so what are we going to talk about today?
- 4-00:03:11
Engerman: Well, I have a couple more questions about Berkeley, and then we will take you to France, to Russia in '62, and then we will get to something that will be I imagine the bulk of today, which is the Free Speech Movement, and life in the sixties. We talked a little about the role of intellectual history at Berkeley and how this was a great place to do it, how Riasanovsky was here when you got here. You had lobbied for Schorske's hiring. Henry May was already here, and working on the American side.

- 4-00:03:45
Malia: Yes, Joe Levinson did English with us, too.
- 4-00:03:47
Engerman: Joe Levinson, the intellectual history of China.
- 4-00:03:50
Malia: Yes.
- 4-00:03:53
Engerman: Did you have students? Who were your students in the early years? Who were the people who were working in the—
- 4-00:03:58
Malia: Well, at first I only taught Russian history. Nick Riasanovsky and I taught a Russian intellectual history course.
- 4-00:04:03
Engerman: Did you teach it together?
- 4-00:04:04
Malia: Together.
- 4-00:04:05
Engerman: Do tell me about that.
- 4-00:04:07
Malia: Well, he did the Slavophile national spine, and I did the Western liberal line.
- 4-00:04:17
Engerman: So he gave the perspective of his first book, and you gave the perspective of yours?
- 4-00:04:23
Malia: Yes, except that we began with the eighteenth century, and then went down to 1917. We did not go beyond 1917 until very late. I introduced Soviet dissidence after there had been enough of them to make that a subject. There were books you could read on it at that point. Well, see, the people who appointed the two of us did not know what they were doing. Nick was appointed to succeed [George] Lantzeff in early Russian, it was because he had written an article on the origins of the Russian state. So they put him down as a Medievalist.
- 4-00:05:02
Engerman: Even though almost all of his published work essentially is [on the] Imperial [period]?
- 4-00:05:05
Malia: Yes, and they wanted me to succeed Kerner and do modern Russia. They did not realize that they were appointing two nineteenth-century specialists who were both intellectual historians. So I solved that problem by—then we had lots of FTEs to burn, more or less. Getting the third FTE for Russian history, and bringing Zelnik here.
- 4-00:05:31
Engerman: Who certainly did not do what you were doing.

4-00:05:33

Malia: He certainly did not do what either one of us was doing. But he overdid what he does do, namely labor history and left history. I met him in Leningrad in 1962. He was the brightest of the new crop of young historians coming up, which were [Richard] Wortman, who else was in there? [Robert] Crummey, who was later on at Davis. Reggie. There was a third one. So, that was to give variety to our modern Russian history offering. What we should have had, of course, is someone who is a specialist in pre-Petrine Russia, one who does Imperial Russia, and somebody who does Soviet.

4-00:06:23

Engerman: And so you end up with essentially three nineteenth-century specialists.

4-00:06:28

Malia: Three nineteenth century specialists. But that was better than just two nineteenth century intellectual historians.

4-00:06:33

Engerman: Yes, now you have ended up with—who were the students who came, especially before Reggie, but also after? Who were the students you worked with?

4-00:06:41

Malia: Well, there were loads of students.

4-00:06:43

Engerman: Are there ones you are particularly fond or proud of now?

4-00:06:46

Malia: Well, ones that are good are Charles Ruud. Maybe you pronounce it with an R-u-u-d. Doesn't he have an essay in that *Festschrift*?

4-00:06:56

Engerman: I do not have it with me.

4-00:06:58

Malia: I think he does. It is in my own. [Hovanissian?], the guy who does Armenian history down at UCLA. I do not remember all of their names now.

4-00:07:18

Engerman: Yes, Charles Ruud does have a piece in your *Festschrift*.

4-00:07:21

Malia: Yes. I am pretty sure he did. Wider, George Wider, who wrote a very good thesis, but never published it. There was a guy whose name I cannot remember right now. He was a nephew of Carl Bridenbaugh. He was a Russianist who wrote an excellent dissertation on [Medenskii? unintelligible], and never published it. Then there were a number of others that did not pan out. Well, [Luskashevitch? unintelligible], he wrote a little book on, I forget what it was. Oh, then there was [Martin] Katz, who wrote a little book on [Mikhail] Katkov. Then there was [Lieberstein?], who worked endlessly on a thesis on Lenin that never panned out. Then what was the other guy's name? He wrote a thesis on Mikhail Gershenzon, the historian, which was very good. He never published it. He really, he was—what was his name? He was endlessly serious. He was sort of dull, but he wrote this good dissertation. He believed that all [Soldunetz?] was a CIA agent.

That was his politics. Someone who criticizes the Soviet Union was—even though he was working on Gershenzon, who was certainly no leftie, he held those—Gabriel was his first name. I forget the last name. So, very few of them, well Emmons was the main one.

4-00:09:10

Engerman: Terry Emmons, who spent almost his whole career at Stanford.

4-00:09:14

Malia: His whole career?

4-00:09:15

Engerman: His whole career, right?

4-00:09:16

Malia: No, he went to his undergraduate at Reed College.

4-00:09:18

Engerman: No, no but after.

4-00:09:20

Malia: Then Stanford.

4-00:09:22

Engerman: From Berkeley to Stanford. He got his PhD, went to Stanford, and never left, until he retired.

4-00:09:27

Malia: Yes. Oh, I also gave—my seminars were occasionally on European intellectual history. I had a couple of very distinguished students there; Jim Sheehan.

4-00:09:44

Engerman: The German historian, also at Stanford.

4-00:09:47

Malia: At Stanford, and John Heilbron, the history of science class, yes. He wanted to do a paper on an English scientist in the early nineteenth century, a guy named [Yule?], whom I had never heard of. And, so he asked me if he could be part of this seminar on European intellectual history. I said, “pozhaluista” (please), so I will learn something about [Yule].” And, who else? Oh, one of these seminars was on socialism, and Nick solemnly informed me that we had a great specialist in European socialism, Carl Landauer, whom I later on got to know quite well. I said, “I don’t give a damn, Nick, I want to learn about myself.”

4-00:10:37

Engerman: So you taught a Russian history undergraduate course?

4-00:10:43

Malia: Well, Nick and I alternated the undergraduate—there were then two undergraduate courses. No, three.

- 4-00:10:53
Engerman: Pre-Petrine, Imperial—
- 4-00:10:55
Malia: Pre-Petrine, Imperial, and Soviet. And Nick never wanted to do the Soviet. That was another reason for getting Zelnik. He could do it.
- 4-00:11:12
Engerman: Riasanovsky never wanted to do the Soviet, like his advisor who thought that Russian history ended in 1917.
- 4-00:11:20
Malia: That is right. Yeah, it is roughly that. He did not want to have to talk about the Soviets. That is not the—
- 4-00:11:29
Engerman: And you did not want to talk about the Soviets either?
- 4-00:11:31
Malia: Oh no, I did not mind talking about the Soviets.
- 4-00:11:33
Engerman: But you did not want to teach the course, or?
- 4-00:11:35
Malia: No, no, I did not mind teaching that. After a certain point, I was not too keen on Reggie teaching it. But at the beginning, I did not mind.
- 4-00:11:49
Engerman: So, you were teaching the undergraduate courses only in Russian history, a graduate seminar in Russian intellectual history, and you mentioned—
- 4-00:11:59
Malia: It was not really a seminar. It was a lecture course. We both, we sat together at the head of the table and talked a bit. He did the Right and I did the Left.
- 4-00:12:11
Engerman: Did you enjoy teaching that course?
- 4-00:12:13
Malia: I learned a lot. He talked about people I was not particularly interested in, such as Nikolai Feodorov and Konstantin Leontieff, people like that. And a lot on the Slavophiles, so I knew what he thought on the Slavophiles, because I had read his book. Yeah, it was interesting, but a little constraining because, well, like we could not organize things, change the organization so to fit my interests or understanding, and it changed from one year to the other. So it eventually dwindled away. There was no dissolving of the corporation. As time went on, we gave it less and less frequently.
- 4-00:13:05
Engerman: What was the environment for Russian and Soviet studies? You got there obviously right after Kerner's departure.

- 4-00:13:12
Malia: Yes.
- 4-00:13:13
Engerman: His Institute of Slavic Studies was immediately disbanded.
- 4-00:13:17
Malia: Yes. Well, it was not good. That is why I tried to bring George Fischer here, political science, because we had an old duffer named Towster.
- 4-00:13:26
Engerman: Julian Towster.
- 4-00:13:27
Malia: Julian Towster.
- 4-00:13:27
Engerman: What was he like?
- 4-00:13:28
Malia: Dreary.
- 4-00:13:29
Engerman: Personally dreary?
- 4-00:13:31
Malia: Personally dreary.
- 4-00:13:32
Engerman: Intellectually? Well, that facial expression won't show up on the tape.
- 4-00:13:38
Malia: I did not know him very well, but the few things that I had read had not impressed me.
- 4-00:13:43
Engerman: And politically?
- 4-00:13:47
Malia: I don't know. Well, anyway, we did not get Fischer. The political science department did not want Fischer. They wanted someone else, [John] Armstrong. But that fell through. I do not know what happened there.
- 4-00:14:08
Engerman: He stayed at Wisconsin.
- 4-00:14:10
Malia: He stayed at Wisconsin, and there was a lot of bitterness over that.
- 4-00:14:15
Engerman: Although, didn't you say you were a big fan of Armstrong's?

4-00:14:17

Malia: I had nothing against Armstrong. I tried first with Fischer, and they did not want Fischer. They tried to get Armstrong, and then they went back on the deal or something. There was bitterness between them and him. I don't know what the details were. Well, we had a first-rate Slavic department with Gleb Struve and Waclaw Lednicki, the Polish scholar and former *Kadet*. His father had been a *Kadet* in Russia. He was absolutely fluent in Russian. He could just cite, quote Pushkin by heart, just as much as Yushkevich. But he was very Polish, obviously.

4-00:14:58

Engerman: Gregory Grossman was there in economics?

4-00:14:59

Malia: Greg Grossman, yes. He was one of the sanest people on the subject of the Soviet Union in American academia. He knew what was going on. He was, or still is, too discreet. In a profession, the study of modern Russia, so many of the people were favorably disposed to the experiment; he was not. So he kept a low profile. I think he should have spoken up more, because he really knew what was going on, and was quite lucid in his judgment. He was absolutely scrupulous on his research and writing. Yes, he was an immense asset.

4-00:15:54

Engerman: Were you active in starting up what replaced Kerner's Institute of Slavic Studies?

4-00:16:01

Malia: No, I am not organization man, I do not like that sort of thing.

4-00:16:03

Engerman: But you did work to try and get Fischer here. Did you have other forays outside of the department? Did you have other agendas?

4-00:16:11

Malia: I agitated that they do something. I eventually did something. I don't remember the details of it any more. For a long time, it was just one person. I mean, Grant, the secretary, would get things going. Well, eventually, most of the people in the Slavic department really got it started up again. I don't remember who—do you know the list of who the heads of it were?

4-00:16:47

Engerman: I don't have that.

4-00:16:47

Malia: When Bill Slottman came—

4-00:16:49

Engerman: When did he come?

4-00:16:51

Malia: I don't know.

4-00:16:52

Engerman: Shortly after you did, though?

4-00:16:53

Malia: Shortly after. He wrote a magnificent thesis on the diplomacy around the Hapsburg Reconquest conflict, and the Treaty of Carlowitz. The university presses that he negotiated with, I am not sure whether it was Harvard or Cal, or what. Their readers, do you know this story? Their readers either turned it down, or made sweeping criticisms, and he eventually got discouraged and gave up and never published it. And he came here, I suggested his name, because I knew that his term as a tutor at Elliot House was expiring, and he would have to get a job elsewhere. But the guy who really was gung-ho for Slottman was Poppa Rosenberg, the standards man. He was standards, research, that stuff.

4-00:18:11

Engerman: Which Rosenberg?

4-00:18:11

Malia: Hans Rosenberg--we called him Poppa Rosenberg. He was very much professor ordinarius, even with the other full professors, and he thought Carl Schorske was a lightweight, because he did all this frothy ideas stuff. Anyway, Rosenberg was very impressed by him, and Rosenberg is a man of considerable continence. He was very impressed by Slottman's dissertation, and he lobbied for this, but Bill never got the thing in publishable form, and this meant that—oh, he was so good that we made him a full professor right away, I think.

4-00:19:05

Engerman: Even though he had not published his dissertation?

4-00:19:06

Malia: Yes. This was Rosenberg's doing.

4-00:19:08

Engerman: He had that much sway.

4-00:19:09

Malia: Yes. So Slottman, as a full professor with no publication, was in a terrible position, and he sort of went to pieces over that. His course became—everyone got an A or a B, and it became kind of the Slottman show, and he became embittered and estranged from the department. He felt that he was there under false pretenses. And he refused to take graduate students who were writing dissertations, because he did not feel that he had the overt qualifications to do this. So he was extremely downcast.

4-00:20:13

Engerman: Are there other departmental issues you got involved with? You tried to hire Schorske, you worked to hire Slottman.

4-00:20:20

Malia: And Zelnik.

4-00:20:21

Engerman: And Zelnik.

4-00:20:25

Malia: That is about it.

4-00:20:27

Engerman: What was the atmosphere of the university at the time? Clearly Berkeley was still expanding greatly.

4-00:20:36

Malia: Optimism, “We are the wave of the future. We have endless money, and we can import whoever we want, all you have to do if you have a case is just to go to the dean, and he will give you the FTE and the money,” and so forth. The atmosphere was great, but as we know, things were simmering under the surface.

4-00:20:59

Engerman: Were there any indications of that when you started there in the late fifties and early sixties?

4-00:21:04

Malia: Not to me, no. I did not notice anything.

4-00:21:08

Engerman: And is there anything else about Berkeley, or should we go to France now?

4-00:21:12

Malia: Let’s go to France.

4-00:21:13

Engerman: So you went to France in 1959-60 on a Fulbright, a teaching Fulbright this time.

4-00:21:19

Malia: I was teaching at what was then called *sixieme section* of the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, which was something founded, I forget when it was founded, way back in the 1890s, I think, to be a kind of parallel university to the Sorbonne. There was only one Sorbonne then. Now there are nine. It had a number of sections, ancient archeology, early Christianity, I don’t know what else. Most of them were rather recondite fields. They would not be big teaching fields. Then since the social sciences were not really recognized, you had the faculty of letters and sciences, but no social sciences, and the history at the faculty of letters was old-fashioned political, military, diplomatic, institutional, et cetera, history. So the sixth section was created to be the new social sciences. That was for the *Annales*. The sixth section was the *Annales* school. That was the domain of Lucian Febvre and Marc Bloch, then later on a fellow named Don Fernand we called him—Fernand Braudel. So I was invited for a year to teach there, and I gave a little seminar, just once a week.

4-00:23:07

Engerman: What seminar?

4-00:23:08

Malia: On the Russian intelligentsia. Because after the Herzen thing, what I wanted to do was to write a book on the radical intelligentsia, why the Russian intellectuals were so precociously radical, and why this group was able to have such a disproportionately strong impact on the whole life of the country. It begins in the 1840s. The word *intelligentsia* does not appear really until the 1880s. It was not invented in the sixties by what is his name, the man who is usually credited with it. I forget what his name is. But

the phenomenon is there in the 1840s. So that was one of the big conundrums that Nick and I were wrestling with in that Russian intellectual history course.

4-00:24:16

Engerman: What else were you doing that year?

4-00:24:22

Malia: It was a very small group in the seminar. There was Georges Nivat [spells], he was a Normalien, but he made his career at the University of Geneva, because he liked living in Savoy, he lived across the frontier in France in Savoy and taught in Geneva, where George Steiner also made his career. I would say that that is a very good university. Stoverbinsky, the eighteenth century, and so forth. And a man named Alain Besançon, does that mean anything to you? Well, he is a good friend of mine, and a good friend of Marc Wyatt's, and he was then still a Russianist. He is a very bright guy, he moves around to all sorts of things. He was then a Russianist. It was Georges Nivat, and Alain Besançon, and Aniq Terminassian, she is Armenian. She has a good little popular history of modern Armenia, and a Polish lady, well, they were young women at the time, thirty at the outside. She was married to a Frenchman. Therefore she had a French name, Gerez. Madame Gerez. It was just the four of us, and we would chat once a week about the Russian intelligentsia, and what kind of a phenomenon this was. Well, most of this was making friends with Nivat and Besançon. Besançon was very Communist, also. In with the same crowds as Le Roy Ladurie and Furet and other people, I am going to mention them all.

4-00:26:21

Engerman: So it was quite a continuity from picking up and expanding from your first trip.

4-00:26:25

Malia: So then I went, or every second or third year to teach just one semester, or one quarter, at the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes.

4-00:26:41

Engerman: And Berkeley let you do this?

4-00:26:43

Malia: Berkeley let me do it.

4-00:26:45

Engerman: Why?

4-00:26:45

Malia: I don't know, because I asked for it, I guess. Anyway, I went there fairly often and moved up with my generational group. The next time I went for a year, I frequented the, I think it was the second whole year--

4-00:27:21

Engerman: That was not until 1970-71.

4-00:27:24

Malia: '70-71, okay. What I did that year mostly was to—oh, in '70-71, I gave the first version of my product on comparative revolutions, which I had tried out in a 280 [graduate readings seminar] here in Berkeley. I started it the first time, and gave it as—I think it

was '70-71. In any event, I wound up frequenting the seminar of Remonow, who made an enormous impression on me. I had always wanted to—no, I had met him before. I had met him earlier.

4-00:28:15

Engerman: Had you spent time with him in '59 and '60?

4-00:28:19

Malia: I was first introduced to him by Steve Graubard. We had a lunch way back in I forget when it was. So I had seen him off and on, and I had been to his seminar off and on. But that year I attended the whole seminar, gave a talk myself. Besançon was there.

4-00:28:41

Engerman: That year meaning '70-'71?

4-00:28:43

Malia: Yes, I am not sure which year it was. [Jean Beshler,?] the sociologist, a Norwegian named Lister or Lester or something like that, he is still a Marxist, he has a book in English on Marx which I have at home. The book reconciles Marx with--I forget, I will look at it this evening. Madame [Annie] Kriegel, she is this early modern intellectual history, history of political thought, a very, very bright woman. Also by this time, I had met through Besançon, Annie Kriegel, who, when I was in the Ecole Normale, had the name Annie Besse [spells], and she wrote vitriolic denunciations of people in *L'Humanite*. She was the head of ideological work in the department of the Seine, that was in Paris.

4-00:30:10

Engerman: *L'Humanite* was the Communist Party paper of the day, right?

4-00:30:13

Malia: Yeah, *L'Humanite*. Originally, it was a Socialist paper, but the Communists got it in the 1920s. So she was the local intellectual Stalinist for all the Party intellectuals. But by then, she had left the Party, when I met her. She did not leave with the year of the [Secret] Speech and the year of Hungary, as all the other people had.

4-00:30:40

Engerman: '56, yes.

4-00:30:41

Malia: But she presided over a group with Francois Furet, Le Roy Ladurie, Alain Besançon, [Donir Ishe?], Edgar Moran, a sociologist, a rather good sociologist, and others. She excommunicated a number of them for deviation after Hungary, I think it was. Edgar Moran wrote this up in a book called *Self Criticism, Auto Critique*. It gives his whole experience with the Party. I don't think it has been translated into English, but it is a wonderfully illuminating book about what Communist intellectual life looked like from the inside. And this is a devastating portrait of Annie Besse, Annie Kriegel, but by then, she had left the Party. She had joined the Party in the Resistance. She was Jewish, and had no choice really but to be in the Resistance. She had a very heroic resistance, and that is why she was promoted in the Party. They sent her to—well, she had to do the work herself, to the [Ecole Montsuperior] for women. They had a special--but now they are integrated--they had a special thing for the women then. So she was *agvi-*

steshefneesora, a really certified intellectual. She knew the Party from the inside. So what she did was for the first time, to make Communism, as a movement, into an academic subject. She wrote her dissertation on how the French Communist Party was born in 1920. Then a wonderful sort of ethnography of French Communism called *L'Communist*. So she really knew the thing from the inside. She was a very aggressive woman. She would pound her hand on the table. You could see she would have been a great cell leader for the intellectuals. We became very good friends, and she moved in this same circle with Aron, [Beshler], Besançon, Furet. Furet, to the end of his days, always remained officially a Socialist, because it is tonier to be Socialist. But he was really somewhat to my right by the end of his career. I also attended his seminar.

4-00:33:47

Engerman: On the French Revolution?

4-00:33:50

Malia: On the French Revolution, along with Bob Darnton, who was there. So I had a wonderful time, with the *Annales* group, with Furet, who is the most creative of that whole generation, of Le Goff—Furet had not been a Normalien. He had been ill when he was at the age when you go through competitive exams, so he had never been to the Ecole Normalien. But he was of the same caliber. And he was in the *sexième* section. That was the--

4-00:34:26

Engerman: The social science section.

4-00:34:29

Malia: But he did not believe in it. He could be withering on the subject of Podel, who was a rather pompous, self-important guy, and Furet—but he did one early thing on the quantitative stuff. I forget just what the subject was. But mostly he was interested in the Revolution, because the [historiography of the] French Revolution had been taken over by the Communists. And his whole intellectual career was taking the Revolution back from the Communists and from the Marxists. He was taking it back from George Lefebvre and what is his name? Soboul, Albert Soboul. He and Soboul had a magnificent polemic in the *Annales*, in the journal of the *Annales*. Furet wrote regularly until the end of his life for the *Nuevo Europe*, which is the, let's say, the French *New York Review of Books* on the grounds, I am not quoting him, I am quoting Le Roy Ladurie this time--“What counts is not just what you say, but where you say it from.” He made his career by saying right-center things from a left-center platform. That is much better than saying it from where he really stood. Okay.

4-00:36:11

Engerman: So, one of the things that is striking, though, is that you are in the midst of a highly politicized, and a very explicitly politicized group. You are friends with Stalinist intellectuals, as you put it, and one of the most prominent sort of anti-Communist historians in Furet. Would you still describe yourself as you did earlier as completely unpolitical?

4-00:36:37

Malia: Oh, no, no, no. I became rapidly politicized in the course of all this.

4-00:36:48

Engerman: When? You were politicized in France, would you say?

4-00:36:50

Malia: In France. First of all, I knew I was not a Socialist. I did not know what on earth socialism was supposed to be. It is a meaningless concept, I think now. I knew I was not a Socialist. I was for constitutional democracy, and a welfare state, and you know, all the usual freedoms. I was therefore very against Communism, but I enjoyed arguing with the people on the left. Most of my close friends were either on the left or former leftists.

4-00:37:36

Engerman: And this is what politicized you? These arguments and discussions?

4-00:37:40

Malia: These arguments, yes. So I knew where I stood. Then it depends on what period you are talking about. When I was in France down to 1981, down to the mid-1980s--until Mitterand appeared on the scene, and was going to form the union of the Left, the union of the Socialists and the Communists, in order to get the Gaullists out of power. The Gaullists were in power, and at least it was clear they were going to stay so long as the Left was not united. So there was no great crisis within France. You did not have to take a stand. So I was not a Gaullist. Most of my friends were not Gaullists either. So I knew where I stood. I was quite political. I agreed with Aron, let's say, the opium of the intellectuals, and I would defend it with discussions with people like Le Goff. Not [Alain] Touraine, because—Aron had the habit of sort of adopting promising younger scholars who then betrayed him by turning too far to the left. One of the first of these was Touraine. By the time Touraine defended his thesis at the Sorbonne, Aron was quite against him, and it was a famous scene. I was not there that particular spring, so I did not see it, but Aron was very rough on Touraine during the [inaudible]. Afterwards, Touraine bitterly resented Aron. So I did not talk about Aron in the company of Touraine. Another one of these people that Aron sort of adopted and then they turned against him was Bourdieu.

4-00:39:45

Engerman: Pierre Bourdieu, the sociologist?

4-00:39:46

Malia: The sociologist, or at the end of his life he was a leftist guru. I mean, he was espousing every cause that came along, getting out in the streets and whatnot.

4-00:39:58

Engerman: Including when he came here, I think.

4-00:40:00

Malia: No, our chancellor became enamored of him at the institute, the Princeton Institute. Did Bourdieu visit here?

4-00:40:10

Engerman: In '97-98, or '98-99. One of my last years here.

4-00:40:19

Malia: Well, I had earlier on, when Bourdieu was just a member of the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, I had good personal relations with him, but his main subject is the sociology of education; education disperses intellectual capital, the bourgeoisie therefore is perpetuated by a monopoly of intellectual talent. That is what it comes down to. He has a lot of very interesting, pertinent things to say about the French education system and so forth. It is a transposition of the Marxist paradigm in those terms. At the end of his career—oh, he beat out Touraine for the College du France. They were in competition for the College du France. So Touraine on the left hates Bourdieu. Bourdieu's work adds up to more than Touraine's work does. But Touraine is very good on Latin America, which is his main specialty.

4-00:41:25

Engerman: But then of course Touraine writes about academic systems, too.

4-00:41:29

Malia: He writes about academic systems, too. Clark Kerr commissioned a book from him, you know about that?

4-00:41:38

Engerman: Is it a short story worth telling here? Kerr's commissioning a book from Touraine?

4-00:41:56

Malia: No. Kerr was a little put off by the tone later on, by the reference to certain things about a Marxist vocabulary, ruling class and so forth. But Touraine has his empirical side, and that I think pleased Kerr. So I lived as much in this French intellectual atmosphere, divided between the Aron, and the Left.

4-00:42:37

Engerman: Those that supported Aron, or followed Aron?

4-00:42:40

Malia: Frequenting people like Touraine, who introduced me to the future president [Fernando Henrique] Cardoso, of Brazil. He was a student of Touraine's in Paris, I think he had to leave Brazil, and he went to Chile, which is where Touraine found him, and Touraine married a Chilean woman, and their first child was a daughter, and I was the godfather of the daughter. She wound up as a Socialist debutante.

4-00:43:17

Engerman: Like father, like daughter.

4-00:43:18

Malia: Yes. She is much more moderate than her father. Her father was really, well, he was much farther to the left. He was very close to the Communist Party early on, but moved steadily away, and under the influence of his daughter, I think he has quite calmed down.

4-00:43:40

Engerman: So, anything else about France, or are you still—it sounds like this was an experience that shaped you both as an intellectual as well as it is in the French political matrix.

- 4-00:43:50
Malia: Quite frankly, frequenting people like, let's say Aron, and Moran, and Furet, was intellectually more stimulating than frequenting most of my colleagues here at Berkeley.
- 4-00:44:07
Engerman: Were there others in the States, other intellectual circles in the States that you had sought out or found that were halfway as compelling?
- 4-00:44:17
Malia: Well, the one I was closest to here was Schorske.
- 4-00:44:24
Engerman: From a European Left tradition.
- 4-00:44:25
Malia: Yeah, from a European Left tradition, and then the intellectual history act. I was good personal friends with David Landes.
- 4-00:44:33
Engerman: Even if he did not care much for intellectual history?
- 4-00:44:36
Malia: Even if he did not care much for intellectual history. He was sort of brutal in general. But, he had a bunch of French friends, too. I introduced him to some of mine. His big friend was a guy named Francois Crouzet, who was an economic historian. So I introduced Landes to Le Goff, and to others. He would not find Raymond Aron very interesting, and Aron would not have found him very interesting, I think. So, talking with Landes was not a waste of time. He was a very bright guy. He knows a lot of things. But I found this French atmosphere more stimulating than others.
- 4-00:45:29
Engerman: Oh, go on.
- 4-00:45:30
Malia: Incidentally, I eventually gave the comparative revolutions thing two times in France. Once at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, en Sciences Sociales I gave it as a seminar. It was a handful of people. Again, Besançon. Oh, I gave a Soviet history course at the *Annales*, which was published in French.
- 4-00:46:04
Engerman: What became *Comprendre [la Révolution russe]*?
- 4-00:46:05
Malia: *Comprendre la Révolution russe*.
- 4-00:46:06
Engerman: Okay, but this is all in the seventies now, right?
- 4-00:46:09
Malia: Yeah, they tape-recorded it, and typed it up. It was Besançon that gave it to the publishers.

4-00:46:19

Engerman: With your permission or without?

4-00:46:21

Malia: With my permission, of course. It is still in print. Then I gave this history of the comparative European revolutions, and Furet, much to my great surprise, audited it.

4-00:46:38

Engerman: Now, that must have been an intimidating moment.

4-00:46:42

Malia: It was somewhat intimidating, especially when I had to put France in the pattern. Now, he did not audit all of it. I don't think he came for that part of it. No, he did. Because Besançon argues, and he may just be right, that it is because of that course, that for the bicentennial in 1989, when Furet published his dictionary of the French Revolution, and then published in a series put out by Achet, the history of France, a volume covering things from 1774 to 1875, that is when the Third Republic was at last firmly in the saddle; that he got this idea from me, because one of the points I made was that the Revolution was not over with Thermidor, it was not over with Bonaparte. It was not over really, 1830, and 1848 had to be considered as aftershocks of the main revolution, the same way that 1660 and 1688 were aftershocks of 1640.

4-00:48:07

Engerman: In England?

4-00:48:08

Malia: In England. That is, 1688 made permanent what the Parliament had gotten out of the king in 1641. The permanent gains of the revolution were there.

4-00:48:25

Engerman: And likewise in France, the Third Republic institutionalized--

4-00:48:30

Malia: It institutionalized what had been done in the years 1789-91, plus one other thing, the name Republic. But, it was a bicameral legislature, whereas the revolutionaries wanted, and it was a question of principle, a unicameral system, the people in one body, nothing resembling an elite. The Third Republic was really with the notion of republic added, the settlement of 1789-91, and you could throw in the separation of church and state in 1905. So, Besançon pretends that Furet got this idea from me.

4-00:49:19

Engerman: And you say he might be right?

4-00:49:21

Malia: He might be right. I never asked Furet. It is too late now. I would never have asked him. Well, he argues at the same length, but I overall have gotten much more from him. This is because he really did something that no one in that generation did. He staged a historiographical revolution.

4-00:49:42

Engerman: Or a counter-revolution, as the case may be.

- 4-00:49:44
Malia: A counter-revolution, well, that assumes that what had gone on before him had been progress. Paradigms accumulate; he kept the main parts of what the other guys did, including what Soboul did except in the volume which I was rereading while I was ill in Paris, the volume on the revolution. He credits historians [Laproust], Lefebvre, and so forth as he goes through his narrative, except when he comes to Soboul, the name is not mentioned, even though that is clearly what he is using.
- 4-00:50:24
Engerman: Is that a personal thing or a political?
- 4-00:50:26
Malia: Soboul plagiarized. Soboul and a guy named [Mageric?] plagiarized some stuff that Furet and Riche had done.
- 4-00:50:38
Engerman: And here was Furet returning the favor.
- 4-00:50:41
Malia: In a semi-popular book.
- 4-00:50:42
Engerman: Yeah.
- 4-00:50:43
Malia: It was plagiarism, lifting whole paragraphs, slightly changing them, but basically lifting whole paragraphs. That is what Furet attacked him for in his *Annales* and Soboul answer in [Lezeraine?]. So yes, it was personal.
- 4-00:51:07
Engerman: Shall we leave Paris for the time being? And actually I think I would rather jet right over Berkeley in the early sixties. You spent two years, '60-61 and '61-62, back in Berkeley.
- 4-00:51:19
Malia: I have given you the essence of it.
- 4-00:51:21
Engerman: Yeah. And then you go to Russia again in '62. You have both a Guggenheim Fellowship, and you go, I imagine you go under the auspices what was then the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants.
- 4-00:51:32
Malia: IREX.
- 4-00:51:33
Engerman: It was before it was IREX, but yes, what became IREX. You applied for that trip? You applied through the inter-university committee, which must have meant that you dealt with Robert Byrnes, the longtime director of the IUCTG [Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants]. Did you have any reservations about going back? Were you excited? It would have been your second trip to Russia.

- 4-00:51:56
Malia: No, I wanted to go.
- 4-00:52:00
Engerman: What were you planning on working on there? Your first book when the Herzen book is out--
- 4-00:52:04
Malia: I was working on the Russian intelligentsia, trying to put that together as--.
- 4-00:52:09
Engerman: So your application was to work in archives there?
- 4-00:52:17
Malia: All I really needed was—I applied to work in archives. I arranged the topic. I obviously did not say that I was working on the Russian intelligentsia. I don't remember what I said. No, I know I said that I wanted to work on the revolutionaries of the 1860s, and I put some plausible archives, something safe.
- 4-00:52:47
Engerman: Which you never saw?
- 4-00:52:49
Malia: No, I saw them once. I went once, I think.
- 4-00:52:53
Engerman: When did you get there?
- 4-00:52:55
Malia: I got there in January of '62.
- 4-00:52:59
Engerman: And how long did you stay?
- 4-00:53:06
Malia: Until January of '63.
- 4-00:53:09
Engerman: So it was an off-academic year?
- 4-00:53:12
Malia: It was all I could get from the university here. I don't know what the reasons are anymore. No, I came back to Western Europe in the summer and spent the summer in France. I had to come back to the States for some family reasons, just for a short time. But, mostly I spent the summer in France.
- 4-00:53:32
Engerman: What were you doing your first--
- 4-00:53:38
Malia: In 1962, all hell broke loose. It was the second Khrushchev campaign. Shortly before I arrived, at the Twenty-First Party Congress, he had attacked Stalin for the second time.

He had moved Stalin out of the mausoleum. I had seen Stalin in the mausoleum in '55. He looked much better than Lenin.

4-00:54:04

Engerman: Well, he was younger.

4-00:54:05

Malia: He was younger, and he was better preserved.

4-00:54:08

Engerman: Soviet technology had made advances, apparently.

4-00:54:12

Malia: So Stalin had been dethroned a second time. The society was restless and moving.

4-00:54:21

Engerman: Once again, so you got very lucky. Your first trip in '55 as society is moving, and your second trip too.

4-00:54:28

Malia: Each time, it was going to break loose in a really big way. I was assigned as my *rukovoditel'* [academic advisor] a dull man named [Vildosif?], I think, maybe it was [Feodor?]. I don't know though. He had a book on the revolutionary movement in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. There was not any revolutionary movement in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. He was a Party hack, but in fact I was under the wing of [Pyotr] Zaionchkovskii. I immediately went to see him, and he was more open. At first I was still cautious, and since I was a Herzenologist, I had published the Herzen book by then, he introduced me to one Iulian Grigor'evich Oksman. Have you heard of him? Well, he was a very learned man on early nineteenth century Russian literature and social thought. He had been the editor of the jubilee edition of the Pushkin done in 1937 for the centenary of Pushkin's death. It was '37. After that he was arrested for I don't know what, and he spent ten years in Kolyma [prison camp]. So he was a rather anti-Soviet person. He was then, until his arrest, I think it was in '38, he had been in the *Pushkinskii dom* [Pushkin House museum] in Leningrad. He had witnessed the February Revolution of 1917, as a matter of fact. He had helped the Bolsheviks, oh no, not the Bolsheviks, he had helped get out neutralizing the troops in February 1917. He would go around to the various barracks where the troops were stationed. He was now in Moscow, and a *chlen-korrespondent Akademii Nauk* [corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences], so back in a respectable position.

4-00:56:44

Engerman: More than a respected position, an honored position.

4-00:56:45

Malia: An honored position. He had done a lot of work on Herzen, so he wanted to meet me. And, Zaionchkovskii introduced me. In addition, George Fischer had given me the address of some old friends of his, Kornei Chukovskii. Kornei Ivanovich Chukovskii, who wrote stories for children. He was very much of a literary critic. He has dozens of books on Russian literature. He was then a man of eighty. His daughter, Lidiia Korneevna Chukovskaia, who lived down at the bottom of Gor'kii Street, almost across the street from the National Hotel. Across the hall lived Kopelev, Lev Kopelev. That is

the guy that Luis Martinez translated. I could not think of his name yesterday. Kopelev is Lugen in *rakovoi korpus* [dead body], [Alexandr] Solzhenitsyn's *rakovoi korpus*. He is the true believer Solsheneitzev wrote up in that novel. He lived across the hall. So I went to see Lidiia Korneeva. She had worked on Herzen. She had an unfinished manuscript on Herzen, which I read. It was to be for a popular series called "*Zhizn' Zamechatel'nykh*" ["Life of Exceptional People"]. There were nineteen volumes in that series. I frequented Chukovskii who was out in Peredelkino, just a little down the road from Pasternak. And, so the daughter in central Moscow.

4-00:58:52

Engerman: Did you spend most of your time in these sorts of circles or were you in less time in the archives and libraries? It turned out you were writing about the intelligentsia of the 1960s, not the 1860s.

4-00:59:02

Malia: Yes, that is right, but it was so much more interesting. Well, Ziaonchkovskii then, you read a little portrait I gave him, wanted to open up political history, regime history, and he wanted to talk about other kinds of revolutionaries, or people around him wanted to, students of his, the daughter of [Arsenii Aleksandrovich] Tarkovskii, for instance.

4-00:59:31

Engerman: Tarkovskii?

4-00:59:32

Malia: Yes, of the poet Tarkovskii. And a guy named [Boris Mikhailovich] Eikhenbaum, who I saw in Moscow three years ago. He is now a very old man. He was writing on some of the Populists of the seventies. What these people wanted to do, they had a group at the Academy of Sciences, it was called the Gruppya Eikhenbauma, he was the head. They were trying to open up Russian revolutionary history beyond [Nikolai Gavrillovich] Chernyshevskii and [Nikolai Aleksandrovich] Dobroliubov, which is because of an article of Lenin's, where the official history then stops. They wanted to open up the late sixties and seventies, and eventually SRs and Kadets.

4-01:00:30

Engerman: Those who were the Bolsheviks' rivals.

4-01:00:33

Malia: Everything from Chernyshevskii on, it was a canon. It was a canon from the Decembrists on, from [Aleksandr Nikolaevich] Radishchev. But the Narodniki [Populists] of the late sixties and the seventies were verboten. And of course any opponent of Lenin after the genius appeared on the scene in the early nineties, all that was out. These people wanted to open up the real political history, not on the same level of opposition of Russia. Opposed to them was Nechkina. Melitsa Nechkina, I forget just what it is. Nezhina, who was an Akademik [a member of the Academy of Sciences], she was a full-fledged Akademik. She had written on the Decembrists, and she stood for Orthodoxy. Okay, so Ziaonchkovskii took me over to the Grupa Eikhenberga, because I worked with the intelligentsia, the radicals, and introduces me to them. Then I attend their seminars. Word of this gets around to Nechkina and her group, the guardians of Orthodoxy. So, they organize a meeting where they are going to denounce me, and I was invited. I asked Ziaonchkovskii, "Well, should I go?" He said, "Of course. If you don't go, that is admitting guilt." He did not say what he felt. So I get there, and there

was a woman, I forget her name now, who read a long report, I was sitting in the audience next to Zaionchkovskii, and Nezhina was presiding. She read a long report to the effect that political coexistence does not at all mean ideological coexistence.

4-01:02:40

Engerman: What on earth did that mean?

4-01:02:44

Malia: Well, this was 1962, political coexistence, Khrushchev's political coexistence. It meant consorting with people like me.

4-01:02:54

Engerman: So it was not actually a denunciation of you as much as a denunciation of those who you were staying in touch with.

4-01:03:01

Malia: It was a denunciation of me, and through me, them. They were engaging in ideological coexistence by harboring me, and by trying to open up the forbidden 1870s, and with of course the Kadets, the outer limit of the permissible, or the hoped for permissible. So, it was a trial, and after it was all over, I turned to Zaionchkovskii, and I said, "What should I do?" He said, "You should answer." So I got up and answered, with such things as saying, "During the war, the Soviet Union was allied with Winston Churchill, who was a rabid anti-Communist. Nonetheless, this was a permissible coexistence. It had its ideological dimensions, and it was good for the Soviet Union. I do not see why we cannot imitate this kind of example now when we are having a new kind of a political coexistence." Then I don't know how I managed to do this, but I somehow got to mention the Kadets, the S-Rs, the whole lot of them. I was not too blunt about it. I did not say that the Russian revolutionary movement was fixed as of 1861-62, but I did manage to say that the whole thing should be opened up, "This is the real history of Russia. We work on it in the West, and we welcome contacts with scholars here who are interested." I don't know just how I did it. But in any event, according to Zaionchkovskii, I won. This was good for the Gruppa Eikhenbauma. You might want to ask Emmons about all of this.

4-01:05:25

Engerman: Emmons was in Moscow?

4-01:05:36

Malia: This was in the spring, but he was there in the fall. Oh, and on my way back from Paris to Moscow, in September, I stopped in Warsaw.

4-01:05:51

Engerman: Your first trip to Warsaw?

4-01:05:53

Malia: My first trip to Warsaw. Oh, one of the important encounters at Berkeley was with Andrzej Walicki, who came through here in the early sixties, before the Free Speech Movement. He visited Berkeley, and we got to be good friends then. I think he came a couple of times to Berkeley. Isaiah Berlin had harbored him at, I am not sure that he invited him to Oxford, anyway, somehow he got to Oxford, and he was under Berlin's wing, and Berlin promoted him. Berlin was very good at promoting the careers of other

people concerned with Eastern Europe. Walicki's first book was called *Controversy over Capitalism*, well, first book in English done for the Clarendon Press, it was his course at Oxford.

4-01:07:00

Engerman: A terrific book.

4-01:07:01

Malia: A terrific book. Now, I am not sure that Berlin brought him to Oxford or what. Anyway, he consorted with Berlin, Walicki did.

4-01:07:12

Engerman: But this is all a little bit later?

4-01:07:14

Malia: Okay, I stopped in Warsaw to visit Walicki. He had a Duchoveou Citroen. Do you know what they were? Well, a very flimsy, cheap car that no longer exists. He was driving me around. The balance of the thing was not right. So he sat the driver's seat on this side, and I had to sit on the back seat on this side, so that we would bring it equilibrium. He was driving, a very poor driver, and leaning back to talk to me all of the time. We spoke Russian. He would talk to me all the time, and he showed me around Pupluck. He introduced me to [Leszek] Kolakowski, this was '62. Kolakowski was already in trouble, but he had not been kicked out. I saw Kolakowski again when he came to Berkeley later. That must have been in the late sixties. He was brought here by [Czeslaw] Milosz. Then when I visited Oxford once, at the invitation of Berlin, I saw Kolakowski again. Kolakowski ultimately was one of the great intellectual influences of my life, *The Main Currents of Marxism*.

4-01:08:44

Engerman: And when did that influence hit you?

4-01:08:49

Malia: When it [the book] came out in the late seventies.

4-01:08:51

Engerman: The late seventies.

4-01:08:52

Malia: The opening phrase, "Karl Marx was a German philosopher." That swept away all the rest of the literature on Marx.

4-01:09:02

Engerman: Well, let's go back to '62.

4-01:09:04

Malia: Okay, '62, Le Goff was getting married to a Polish girl, and a young Polish Communist named Bronislaw Geremek was to be the best man. I was invited to the wedding as sort of a second-string best man. I had met Geremek earlier in Paris. Le Goff had met him, see, Geremek was a Medievalist. He was the Polish cultural attaché in Paris, but by training he was a historian and a Medievalist, so that is how he got to know Le Goff. So since Le Goff was friendly with me and with him, although the guy was still in the Party then, this was before '68, that was when he left the Party, Le Goff got us together for a

luncheon which was somewhat tense. I forget just when this was, it was before '62. So I already knew Geremek, but I got to meet him again in Warsaw in '62. I met Kolakowski, and established my first Polish connection.

To come back to Russia, there had been this thing between the Gruppya Eikhenbauma and the Gruppya Nechkinoi. That was in the spring, and I won that one, according to Zaionchkovskii. But the main thing was Oksman. Oksman was a very embittered opponent of the regime for understandable reasons. He knew that I was in contact with Gleb Struve, and he wanted to tell Struve certain things. Also, Struve wanted me to get certain books into Russia; his history, *Istoriia Russkoi Literatury*, for instance; his edition of Pasternak. So Struve sent me the four-volume edition of Pasternak's complete work, you may have seen that, through the pouch.

4-01:11:38

Engerman: The diplomatic pouch at the embassy.

4-01:11:40

Malia: The diplomatic pouch. The pouch was then held by Jack Matlock, the future ambassador. I got to be big friends with Matlock that year too. See, as a diplomat, he could not have the contacts with Russian society that I did. And, he had to live in that building at, what is it, [Ulitsa] Chaikovskogo? So Struve sent me Pasternak, he sent me a whole bunch of things. I gave these to Oksman. I carried the copy of the *Doctor Zhivago*, which of course Oksman had never seen, with me to Leningrad, and loaned it to various people I could trust overnight. They would stay up all night to read *Doctor Zhivago*. One of these people is, what is his name? Oh, Walicki showed up in Leningrad at this time. I don't know why, what brought him to Leningrad. He showed up in Leningrad at that time, and he introduced me to someone, I will have to ask Greg Grossman's wife, Joan—I met this man much later, in 1988. I remember it was a meeting in a square with Walicki and this guy. He was a scholar at the Pushkinskii dom, a fairly notable scholar. It was a square, it was dark. The KGB witnessed this, I discovered later on. I let him have the book, he kept it overnight. Oh, he told me later, when I met him in 1988, that he had been called in by the KGB after that. Oh, Walicki introduced me to this guy because although he was a reputable scholar, he was a true believer, and Walicki wanted to--

4-01:14:06

Engerman: End his era of true belief.

4-01:14:08

Malia: End his true belief, so he asked me to lend the guy the *Doctor Zhivago*, which he read overnight.

4-01:14:16

Engerman: Did it worry you to do something that risky, or you trusted Walicki on this?

4-01:14:20

Malia: I trusted Walicki as someone who more or less knew the terrain. And, he got called in by the KGB. Nothing bad happened to him. Oh, he was a scholar interested in Italy, I think, and he was forbidden to go abroad. After that, but not just that incident, it was something else. Anyway, to come back to Oksman, so I was the go-between between Oksman and Struve. Struve sent me this émigré literature, and Oksman sent him all

sorts of information, including a long write-up of [Osip] Mandel'shtam's last days that I brought back with me. I got that in the spring. I would go to Oksman's place, and he would put a pillow on the telephone and start in on horror stories about Struve and all the rest.

4-01:15:42

Engerman: What sort of horror stories did he tell about Struve?

4-01:15:45

Malia: Oh, life in the Kolyma, what is going on the Party, he was very well informed. He criticized Zaionchkovskii for being timid. When Zaionchkovskii found out how Oksman was behaving with me, he was horrified, because Zaionchkovskii was slow boring from within, no confrontations, no contact with émigrés or anything like that. Well, Oksman was just fascinating. He had tales to tell about everything from February 1917 down to the present. He knew everybody. I had dinner at his house with people like Ippolit Andronikov and other major scholars. I cannot think of their names right now.

4-01:16:54

Engerman: Is this how you met [Anna] Akhmatova?

4-01:16:59

Malia: No, I met Akhmatova through Lidiia Korneevna. Well, the two of them. Oksman was friendly with Ledka Kunjeva. The two of them—and Lidiia Korneevna was bold, I mean, she was not like Zaionchkovskii, she would stick her neck out. Her father was much more prudent. Incidentally, in the course of this year, Isaiah Berlin engineered an honorary degree for Chukovskii at Oxford, and Chukovskii was let out for the duration to get the honorary degree. He later on did the same thing for Akhmatova, a number of years later on.

4-01:17:55

Engerman: I am actually more interested in your experience with Akhmatova. I have read a story about your meeting Akhmatova in October, '62 when the Cuban Missile Crisis was taking place.

4-01:18:08

Malia: Well, I met her in the spring.

4-01:18:10

Engerman: You met her in the spring? Did you see her again during the Cuban Missile Crisis?

4-01:18:14

Malia: Yes.

4-01:18:14

Engerman: And what happened?

4-01:18:16

Malia: First, I will tell you the Oksman story.

4-01:18:21

Engerman: Oh, I am sorry, I have distracted you.

- 4-01:18:22
Malia: And eventually Oksman gave me the complete works of Mandel'shtam to mail to Struve. That was a big find. However, the copy that I had did not get to Struve. Something went wrong.
- 4-01:18:39
Engerman: You had tried to send it through Matlock and the diplomatic pouch?
- 4-01:18:43
Malia: I did send it, but Struve told me later on that it never arrived. Struve got hold of another copy, and that was the basis of his edition of Mandel'shtam. This was a very important channel.
- 4-01:19:10
Engerman: You were a very important channel?
- 4-01:19:12
Malia: Yeah, and it was fascinating for me. Ippolit Andronikov, Tomash, and these names will come back, I was meeting very interesting people. When I left, this channel was passed on to Katherine Feuer.
- 4-01:19:46
Engerman: Lewis Feuer's wife?
- 4-01:19:49
Malia: Yes. She went there and heard more stories from Oksman and passed stuff back and forth between Oksman and Struve. Then, when she left the Soviet Union, she went by train from Leningrad to Helsinki.
- 4-01:20:15
Engerman: This was when?
- 4-01:20:16
Malia: Sometime in the spring of '63.
- 4-01:20:20
Engerman: So just a couple months after you left?
- 4-01:20:23
Malia: Oh, I don't know exactly when. Probably in May or June of '63.
- 4-01:20:29
Engerman: Now, she had been there for a whole year with Lewis, right?
- 4-01:20:34
Malia: Yes, but she did not become the go-between until--
- 4-01:20:36
Engerman: Until the very end.
- 4-01:20:38
Malia: Until the very end. She had compromising material with her in the train.

4-01:20:43

Engerman: Of what sort?

4-01:20:44

Malia: I don't know, correspondence between Struve and Oksman. Of course the KGB found it. When she went through customs, they found it. So, Oksman got into trouble, not because of me, but because of that. Nothing terrible happened. He was not sent back to the Kolyma or anything like that, but they raided his apartment, confiscated his copy of Pasternak's complete works and so forth. It had been established that I had been involved in this, in these transactions.

I am going to have to stop, because talking is irritating my sinuses, can't you hear that? I think it was Oksman that set me up with Akhmatova. I met her in the spring, and she began by giving me an infected exam about what I knew about her, before she would start talking. Things like, did I know about the Danev Decree? You know, they called me a *pjaat* and so forth. Then, she recited a poem and asked me if I understood it, what is it about. It was clear I understood, so then she recited more poems, including one that became one of my favorites: the Streletskaia luna, which of course had not been printed.

4-01:22:34

Engerman: Now, you saw her—oh, go on.

4-01:22:39

Malia: I saw her in Moscow in the spring. Then in Leningrad in June, I visited her at Komorova, where her summer place was. By then we had become sort of, I wouldn't say chummy, but we were already well acquainted. She was back in Moscow in the fall, and I can't really go on, but very briefly, by then she showed me *Rekvium* [*Requiem*].

4-01:23:11

Engerman: Her masterpiece.

4-01:23:13

Malia: What?

4-01:23:14

Engerman: One of her masterpieces, her most famous works.

4-01:23:18

Malia: Yes. No, her masterpiece is "Poema Bez 'Geroia" ("Poem without a Hero"). She let me read "Poema Bez Geroia." I had to take it across the street, to the café of the National Hotel, and read it. No, that was "Matrionin Dvor" ["Matriona's House", a Solzhenitsyn story]. Also they had unpublished stuff, the two of them. Ledja Kunjeva and Akhmatova, unpublished stuff, and Solzhenitsyn, "Matrionin Dvor'." See, *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* came out in November that year.

4-01:23:55

Engerman: While you were there?

4-01:23:55

Malia: And the Cuban Missile Crisis had been in October, so they decided it would be best not to introduce me to Solzhenitsyn, but they let me read his then unpublished material, and

Akhmatova let me read "Poema Bez 'Geroia.'" Well, all of this was so much more interesting. No, I really cannot finish, and there is more to tell.

[End of Interview]

[Interview #5: December 21, 2003]

[Begin Audio File Malia 03 12-21-03]

5-00:00:06

Malia: More about my experience at the Ecole Normale; not only did it broaden my historical horizon, make it more comparativist than it had been before, but it showed me the overwhelming power of ideology in human affairs. Here there was this group of young people, among the very brightest in the country, and the best educated, and who were all bewitched by this illusion in the East. It was the established religion of the Ecole, no getting around it. That showed me that ideas matter. Secondly, Berkeley before the FSM, when we were building this brave new university in the West, and everything seemed possible because we had unlimited FTEs. The beginnings of something new date from that time until—for a brief moment at the end of the 1950s, beginning of the 1960s, intellectual history had been the “in” thing. That is when the courses were, “you teach it now.”

5-00:01:42

Engerman: This is with Riasanovsky, Schorske, Levenson, May, and you of course.

5-00:01:50

Malia: Very soon universities for the first time began offering intellectual history. It was the “in” thing. But very early in the sixties, intellectual history was displaced by social history, and in particular, labor history. Bringing Reggie Zelnik here was designed to simply diversify the Russian history offerings. It was also the beginning of the high tide of labor history, which would last then for another twenty years. Vicky Bonnell was a part of this. I went along with it at the beginning, because after all, the revolution was more or less made by the working class, or at least in the name of the working class, therefore we had to know what they were doing. In fact, the intelligentsia was a decisive actor in framing the Soviet experience. What gave the intelligentsia the real possibility to do that in Russia was the peasants. The workers are an interesting detail, but certainly that was not decisive. So this was the eclipse of intellectual history, and the beginning of the long reign of social history. Someone like Touraine in France represents the same thing. He wanted to do the sociology of labor. Later on they discovered that there were other things.

Engerman: So those are the things that you wanted to pick up from before?

5-00:03:31

Malia: Yes. I want to anticipate something now for us to concentrate more on, the Free Speech Movement later on.

5-00:03:38

Engerman: We have a little to finish also on 1962 in Russia, but go on. Maybe we should do this now? We left off with the three people you met there that we started off that talking about and did not finish. I will say them, I suppose. They run from A to Z: Akhmatova, and Reggie Zelnik would be two of them, and you started talking about Akhmatova but then I think you ran out of steam last time.

5-00:04:07

Malia: Okay. I met Akhmatova through Oksman. The reason there is so little about my meetings with Akhmatova in Vidchenovska’s book is that I did not meet Akhmatova

ever at Vidchenovska's. She was staying in Moscow at the houses of different people, depending on which part of the year it was. In the spring I met her at the Ardovykh's house.

5-00:04:55

Engerman: At whose house? I am sorry.

5-00:04:56

Malia: Ardovykh. I met her in the spring and did not see a great deal of her. I saw her at Komorova, where she is now buried, which is on the Karelian Isthmus going towards Fenton. I saw a great deal of her in the fall of '62, when she was again in Moscow, because everything was breaking apart at that moment. Khrushchev had de-Stalinized a second time at the Twenty-First Party Congress, the previous year. In the fall, he authorized the publication of *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. You asked about the Cuban Missile Crisis in Moscow? It was a non-event. The Russians did not know it was going on. I knew it was going on, because I went to the American embassy and heard about what was going on. I was worried that I might wind up fried by one of my own atom bombs in Moscow. It so happened that the crucial moment of the Cuban Missile Crisis, I had a couple of tickets to *Boris Gudonov* at the Bol'shoi. An American basso, Jerome Hines, who was singing the role of Boris [Gudonov], because this was a cultural exchange, and there was Nikita Sergeevich [Khrushchev] in the imperial box, almost falling out of the box applauding Jerome Hines. This was the night of the—I forget just which night of the crisis it was, but it was an absolutely crucial moment. In other words, he was sending a message that, "I am not all that mad at you." I do not know how heavily this message weighed in the deliberations from Washington, but I am sure that Llewellyn Thompson, who was advising Kennedy, noted it.

Otherwise, the Cuban Missile Crisis was not an event. No one knew it was happening. They were only told later on, and my dissident friends were rather satisfied that Nikita Sergeevich had lost. Oksman in particular was satisfied that Nikita Sergeevich had lost. Okay, so word had gotten out in Moscow early in September. I have already told you about stopping in Warsaw for the marriage, and Le Goff and meeting Kolakowski and all of that, yes? Word had gotten out that Khrushchev had bought the *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. He had his secretary read it to him in odd moments, and he approved its publication. It was coming out in November, *odinnadtsatyi nomer* [eleventh issue of *Novyi Mir*]. The word was going around that this was not a campaign, but a policy. "*Eto ne kampanii, a politika*" ("It is not a campaign, but a policy"), the words he himself had said. In other words, it was a major turn in cultural policy.

Immediately the Moscow cultural scene began to unravel. All sorts of things came out of the woodwork. People thought it was going to be a new era. That is why Akhmatova was in Moscow at last putting her *Rekviem* in *samizdat* [underground publication]. And she had with her "Poema Bez 'Geroia.'" She recited *Rekviem* to me. Then she was staying at the apartment of Ynika Gen, and I don't know how she felt. I never saw it written. Ynika Gen was a literary journalist figure in Moscow, a youngish woman in her thirties. She recited *Rekviem* or at least parts of it to me. I went to see her there later at the end of the year every week, and just chatted. There were other people there, younger poets very often. I brought her some books, Struve's Russian literature in exile, which she just kept one day and then gave back. She also let me read what is her masterpiece,

“Poema Bez ‘Geroia.” That I read at Lidiia Korneevna’s flat. She had trouble getting around. She could not go to the movies. I was allowed to read “Matrionin Dvor.””

5-00:10:13

Engerman: Solzhenitsyn’s?

5-00:10:14

Malia: Yes, in manuscript. When Ziaonchkovskii found out that Oksman had introduced me to Akhmatova, he was very disturbed, because that is semi-seditious, and Ziaonchkovskii was a cautious man. I was a lot younger, and less to lose, and I was less cautious. I wanted very much to meet Akhmatova. So that was a great experience. She was much better than Pasternak. Pasternak was unfathomable when talking. She was very clear.

5-00:10:58

Engerman: The one question I wanted to ask you about Akhmatova was actually about you in ’62. Adam Ulam tells a story in his memoirs about you visiting her during the Cuban Missile Crisis. Does this ring a bell?

5-00:11:16

Malia: Yes, but I was probably on my regular weekly visit. There was no Cuban Missile Crisis in Moscow. What did Adam say?

5-00:11:27

Engerman: He said that you were alarmed by the fact that she was just going on writing poetry as if the world—

5-00:11:34

Malia: Well see, I was worried, but she was typical of the Russians. They were not worried, because they did not know what was involved. She was a very unpolitical woman. She was aesthetic, and feminine to the core. One of her great subjects is love, after all. Love and religion is not of a political nature. Monakomi Beyatchik, we called her. That is true, she was typical of them. These people did not know.

5-00:12:05

Engerman: But the way Ulam recounts the story is that it very much upset you. Here she was, the world was in grave danger, and there she was just sitting in her room writing poetry. But again, I only heard this.

5-00:12:21

Malia: I think Adam slightly arranged what I said. Stories when they get transmitted usually get changed.

5-00:12:27

Engerman: That is why I wanted to ask.

5-00:12:30

Malia: I was trying to impress on her that this was serious business, but I was not upset that she was still writing poetry. No, that was fine.

So, then came Nikita Sergeevich’s visit to the Manezh, to the art exhibit. He said unprintable things about [Ernst] Neizvestnyi. What he said about Neizvestnyi, the sculptor, who was a hunchback, was “The grave straightens out the crooked. “*Grob*

ispravliaet,” how did he put it? The Western press did not know about this at all. I was the only one who knew about it, and I told the correspondent of *Le Monde*, Michel Tatu, who married a Soviet woman. Eventually I think he got expelled, in part for this. The only newspaper that wrote it up at the time was *Le Monde*.

5-00:13:40

Engerman: This is where Khrushchev tees off on degenerate art.

5-00:13:48

Malia: Degenerate art, yes. He said a donkey’s tail could paint a thing as good as this. Then the crude remark about Neizvestnyi. It has been written up plenty of times since, but the first news of it was this article in *Le Monde*.

5-00:14:04

Engerman: Which came eventually through you?

5-00:14:05

Malia: Which came through me. I told him as soon as I found out from Lidiaa Korneevna and Akhmatova what had happened. Why, Oksman, they were all full of this. See, he was the best foreign correspondent there. I forget who was the *Times* correspondent then. Tatu really knew Russian and knew the Russian scene. He could make sense of this, so I went to him. Also, I had earlier had an experience with the Novocherkassk story.

5-00:14:38

Engerman: The uprising [in 1962].

5-00:14:39

Malia: Yes, I was the first Westerner to find out about that. I found out about it by accident at MGU. Have you ever been to MGU? Do you know where the corridors cross, and there are some desks, the *punkt*? I had to be on duty at that *punkt* every so often like everyone else on the floor. One day all the students were talking about what had happened at Novocherkassk. One of them said to me, “Have you heard about this?” I said, “Of course,” I had heard about it, in order to find out what they were saying. They told me the story, and I checked it out with Lidiia Korneevna. She knew the story too. So I told the recently-arrived American correspondent. This was earlier, I forget when.

5-00:15:29

Engerman: Earlier in ’62?

5-00:15:30

Malia: Earlier in ’62, the correspondent of the *New York Herald-Tribune*, I guess at the time. He printed it, and he was immediately kicked out of the country.

5-00:15:40

Engerman: Who was that?

5-00:15:39

Malia: I forget his name. He was very soon on his way back to the West. So that is why I picked Tatu for the way bigger story of the visit to the Manezh. So after that the hopes were more or less dashed, but not completely. Once again, I fell somewhat victim to the phenomenon of “*golovokruzhie ot uspekha*” [“dizziness with success,” also the title of an infamous speech by Stalin]. Since the regime control of intellectual Moscow

crumbled in the fall of '62 and on into the beginning of '63, I had increasingly dangerous or ill-advised connections. One of these was someone named Oleg Ginzburg. Have you ever heard of him?

5-00:16:35

Engerman: Tell us about him for a bit.

5-00:16:36

Malia: He was a naïve young man, really. He was a kid then, twenty-one or twenty-two then, who edited a completely undistinguished but illegal journal called *Sintaksis*. Yes, it was *Sintaksis*, no, *Feonix*, *Feonix*. I forget, I think it was *Feonix*. *Sintaksis* is later on with someone else. He had spent some time—"on *sideľ*" [literally "he sat," figuratively meaning he served time in prison]; he was in prison for a while. He had just gotten out of prison. And some of my younger poet friends, I had a number of poet friends that I had picked up from the university, invited me to dinner with him at the Tsentral' naia Gostinitsa (Central Hotel) on Gor'kii Street. It is the old hotel, Luks, in the 1930s where they put the foreign Communists. It was one of the better hotels in Moscow in 1960. We had dinner there, and he told his story. Then I was invited by these younger poets to a big New Year's Eve party for the old new year, that is January 13.

5-00:18:01

Engerman: Orthodox.

5-00:18:04

Malia: Orthodox, it was starting over. It was a big party, mostly younger people. I was myself still fairly young at the time. Oleg Ginzburg was there. It got to be quite late, two, three, or something like that in the morning. It was impossible to go back to the dorm because they locked it. Oh, I had to leave Akhmatova's each time at around midnight in order to get back to MGU by one o'clock when they locked up.

5-00:18:33

Engerman: And also the metro stops running and so on.

5-00:18:36

Malia: Yes. Anyway, they had locked up, so I could not go back there. So Ginzburg said, "Come spend the night at my house," with his old mother and himself. So I went to spend what was rest of the night. Of course when I got up in the cold dawn the next day, there were two KGB cars parked in front on the street. I went back to the university and left in a couple of days. But, the son of a general accompanied me to the airport, out of solidarity, just in case anything might happen to me. So, I went a little too far, and that is why I was later on denounced in *Pravda*. Also, I had not been going to the archives. I think I went a couple of times, looked in, and decided that was not for me. Besides, what was going on in Moscow was so much more interesting than what was in those archives.

5-00:19:32

Engerman: So this is an article. I have here an article from the *New York Times* in '64 after you were denounced in *Pravda*, a denunciation in a magazine called *Molodoi Kommunist* [*Young Communist*] which accuses you of two things. One is attempting to get information concerning the attitude of the creative intelligentsia.

5-00:19:50

Malia: It is quite true.

5-00:19:52

Engerman: Which would be hard to plead anything but guilty. Then the other one is that you were mainly interested in, and I am quoting here, "in organizations and the locations of corrective labor camps, and the progress of criminals."

5-00:20:04

Malia: No, that is not true. I was interested in finding out the truth about the place, how it worked; what went on and how it worked. In any other country it would be called journalism.

5-00:20:21

Engerman: But here it was essentially snooping.

5-00:20:26

Malia: It was quite true, they had other cases. [Edward] Ned Keenan behaved in the same way and he got kicked out.

5-00:20:32

Engerman: Now, his story was a little different because he actually was caught out in a lie to Soviet authorities.

5-00:20:39

Malia: Well, no, he went to a place where he was not supposed to go.

5-00:20:42

Engerman: And he also made claim to be Russian.

5-00:20:44

Malia: Oh, he did that? He could get away with it.

5-00:20:48

Engerman: He could get away with it, but only for so long. He could get away with it linguistically, but not logistically as it turned out. So in his case, once he was in trouble, once he was questioned by authorities, as I understand it, he actually lied to them. I have only heard this story.

5-00:21:05

Malia: Well, in any event, as a result of this, I concluded that it would be futile to ask for another visa. Also, even if I got a visa, there would be no point in going.

5-00:21:16

Engerman: Because people would be afraid to talk to you.

5-00:21:18

Malia: People would be afraid to talk to me, and I did not want to sit in an archive, I am a library worker, not an archival worker. I did not want to be restricted to only sitting in a library. I could do that here. So, I did not go back for twenty-five years as a result of all that. Also after Khrushchev was deposed, which happened the next year, the place was closed up for the duration of [Leonid] Brezhnev and company. It would have been no

fun to go there. So the brief Moscow spring was over, and my Russian career was over until 1988.

5-00:22:06

Engerman: Did you stay in touch with some of the people, sort of through correspondence, or in any way with any of the dissidents that you had met?

5-00:22:14

Malia: No.

5-00:22:14

Engerman: You just broke free, broke cleanly?

5-00:22:16

Malia: No, well, I later on heard from Lev Khaleev in New York, who sent me his manuscript. I later on met Oleg' Ginzburg when he was in Paris. He was sort of Solzhenitsyn's man in Paris, along with Nikita Struve, the nephew of Gleb Struve. He eventually was made by legislative action a—oh, he worked with Ilena Eloviska, the editoress, to use a word that you can't say in [English], of *Russkaia Mysl'*, the emigré Russian-language newspaper in Paris. I saw him there.

5-00:22:58

Engerman: But, once you left the Soviet Union in, you said, January 1963, that ended your engagement with this whole dissident world that you had first met in '55, and then even deepened in '62.

5-00:23:13

Malia: In '62, yes.

5-00:23:14

Engerman: Now, this will be a nice way perhaps to segue us from the Soviet Union back to Berkeley. You also met Reggie Zelnik, I guess, for the first time on that trip.

5-00:23:24

Malia: Yes, on one of my trips to Leningrad, I keep thinking it was Petersburg, now you can say that, Petersburg, I was in the dormitory on the *naberezhnaia* [embankment] across the Neva from the Winter Palace. Have you ever seen that?

5-00:23:43

Engerman: I have been there, yes. Where the university is, the dormitories right near the university?

5-00:23:48

Malia: Yes, on the tip of the Petrogradskaia Storona [Petrograd side]. Just a magnificent view of the Winter Palace. There were a lot of—well, I had met among the younger scholars, Wortman I met in Moscow, and Zelnik I met in Petersburg. Where did I meet Crummey? In neither place.

5-00:24:18

Engerman: What were your impressions of Zelnik?

5-00:24:22

Malia: He was a very lively, bright young man, and obviously enjoying his contacts with the Russians there. He was also good friends with a Polish scholar, Andje, what is his name? He later wound up at Columbia. He never published a thing. I can't remember his name. He was a very learned Polish guy who was there, too. Oh, I forgot to ask Joan Grossman the name of the Russian to whom I loaned a copy of *Doctor Zhivago*.

5-00:25:00

Engerman: Well, you will have a chance to fill some of this in in editing, after it is transcribed.

5-00:25:10

Malia: Yes. Well, I had wanted to expand the Berkeley offering, and he seemed like the liveliest. Certainly as an individual, he is livelier than Wortman. I think Wortman has done more important and more interesting things since, but that we didn't know. He seemed like the most promising of the younger generation. At that point, I thought we really should have something about the workers after all. It was a workers' revolution, wasn't it? Therefore when I came back, since we had, as I have already explained, FTEs to burn more or less, I pushed for another FTE and more or less had my eye on him, and that is where things came out. Of course, the year after he arrived, the FSM broke out, and he played the leading faculty role in the FSM. He was just barely beyond the student stage himself, and he fit in, I would say in retrospect, a little too naturally into that.

5-00:26:25

Engerman: Why don't you tell us about—oh, before we get to the FSM, this actually is a question that came, Reggie had mentioned this to me, something about another person you met in Russia in '62. There are rumors anyway about meeting Shirley MacLaine?

5-00:26:42

Malia: Oh, yes, yes, it is absolutely true.

5-00:26:45

Engerman: How did you meet her?

5-00:26:47

Malia: I forget. She showed up in Leningrad. She was going around the world to educate herself on world problems. I think it was Reggie or someone met her in a restaurant downtown on Nevskii Prospekt, and brought her back to the dormitory. Mitinskaia Naberezhnaia. It is the Mitinskaia Naberezhnaia, and brought her back there. There was a certain amount of imbibing, and I remember standing out on the balcony and admiring the Winter Palace and talking about world affairs. It was entertaining to meet Shirley MacLaine, but not very significant.

5-00:27:35

Engerman: Did you play any roles in her education about world affairs?

5-00:27:41

Malia: I don't remember. I don't remember what I said to her.

5-00:27:46

Engerman: Anyway, let us now tackle what I think will be a big topic for the day, which is the Free Speech Movement. Here, I think it is important for you to tell it from your perspective.

Obviously there are lots of other perspectives. Reggie has written on this, other people have.

5-00:27:59

Malia: Yes, I know.

5-00:27:59

Engerman: But we can just let it unfold from your perspective here.

5-00:28:04

Malia: Okay, when I arrived in Berkeley, all I saw was the university, the academic university. I did not realize that there had always been a very lively radical community at Berkeley and across the bay. I did not pay any attention to it when they had the HUAC [House Un-American Activities Committee] hearings in San Francisco. I did not pay any attention to it. When the film *Operation Abolition* came out, I did not pay any attention to it.

5-00:28:34

Engerman: Now, *Operation Abolition* is essentially an FBI-sponsored film, I am just trying to do this for the record, that said that anyone who was protesting against HUAC, the House Un-American Activities Committee, was themselves participating in or contributing to Communist world domination. It is an extraordinary film.

5-00:28:53

Malia: That is right. I never saw it, but my more liberal colleagues were indignant about this. It was a big issue, the hosing down of demonstrators in San Francisco, the film, I did not pay any attention to it. I was then an FDR, Adlai Stevenson, [Arthur] Schlesinger, Jr. liberal, and therefore was automatically fitted into the “correct liberal” camp by all my colleagues here.

5-00:29:22

Engerman: Staunchly anti-Communist as Schlesinger was?

5-00:29:26

Malia: Yes, okay, well, that was all right. That is one of the reasons I threw him in there. We were reasonably well-acquainted. I would not say that we were friends, but reasonably well-acquainted, from Harvard. I had the reputation of being a liberal, though anti-Communist liberal. My first contact with Berkeley politics was when Bettina Aptheker came to me and asked me, this was before the FSM, if I could share a meeting where a black, blind Communist leader was going to talk. I forget his name. Apparently in Communist lore, he is important. Because according to university rules we did not have free speech, there had to be a faculty member who would sort of chaperone an incendiary gathering of that sort. So I had the reputation of being a liberal. Then came the FSM. I did not pay any attention to it. Well, I did eventually, but at the beginning when what is his name, [Jake] Weinberg, was sitting in that police car out there, I had a visiting foreign fireman that I was showing around. We passed by the police car, I said, “Well, something seems to be going on?” I was unaware what was going on. Then the crisis ground on until the fall.

5-00:30:46

Engerman: The fall of '64.

5-00:30:50

Malia: Fall of '64. By December, the university had collapsed. That is when I noticed that I was concerned not about whether or not they had their free speech, but about the collapse of the university. The university was of supreme value for me. To me the task was "How do we overcome the crisis?" It was not how do we get the regents to agree to what the FSM defined as free speech? Which was freedom of advocacy. The real issue was, "Can you mount actions on campus that off-campus might become illegal?" That was the real issue. It was not speech in general.

So, with a group of faculty members, we went to see Clark Kerr.

5-00:31:39

Engerman: Who are the faculty members you met with?

5-00:31:41

Malia: I forget.

5-00:31:42

Engerman: Were there any sort of prominent names?

5-00:31:48

Malia: Oh, a few other members of the history department, and a couple of people from other departments went to see Clark Kerr over in the Alumni House saying, "We are standing behind you." I took a very favorable view of Kerr because he had done wonderful things to build up the university.

5-00:32:09

Engerman: Well, most people had taken one, you were hardly alone in that. Even a lot of the pro-FSM people--

5-00:32:13

Malia: No, I discovered in the course of the crisis that in certain segments of the faculty Left, a deep hatred of Kerr. When he gave a speech at the time of the collapse when he referred to Berkeley as the jewel in the crown of the California system, some people I cannot stand, Howard Schachman, do you know who he is?

5-00:32:42

Engerman: Well, why don't you tell us?

5-00:32:43

Malia: He was a microbiologist, very far to the left. He certainly had a lot of political experience, and some others. Remember, there was a meeting in Delmer Brown's office up here to draft some nasty reply to Kerr for referring to this as the jewel in the crown. I have never understood why they hated him so much. They hated him I think because he went along, he did not work hard to get rid of the anti-Communist things that were in the university's regulations.

5-00:33:20

Engerman: Which is ironic, because he rose to prominence before you got to Berkeley for supporting faculty prerogatives in the loyalty oath controversy.

- 5-00:33:29
Malia: Yes, but he did not go all the way.
- 5-00:33:32
Engerman: Well, he was not against the loyalty ethic. One way to read this would be his opposition to the loyalty oath was more about political meddling rather than the politics itself.
- 5-00:33:41
Malia: He was not pure enough. He would tolerate some anti-Communism. I had already learned from my French experience that the supreme sin is anti-Communism. It is worse than anything else for certain left groups.
- 5-00:34:00
Engerman: So you and this group of scholars, are there any people that, again we hear, I am much more familiar with the pro-FSM side of the story.
- 5-00:34:08
Malia: I am sure you are.
- 5-00:34:09
Engerman: And so I am interested to hear more about the group of people who were against.
- 5-00:34:13
Malia: I did not know what was going on. Since I liked Ken [Kenneth Stamp], and he was a good friend who I respected and so forth, when he asked me to come to this little caucus in Delmer's office, I went along. I could not understand why they were so exercised about it. Charlie Sellers was there, I think, too. So although I understood the French political scene by then, I did not understand the American Left scene. I had never been in contact with it. In all my years at Harvard, I never ran into it. Although I was teaching Soviet history at a time when Senator McCarthy was running loose, I never had any troubles about this sort of thing or any contact with people such as Bob Bellah, who was then at Harvard.
- 5-00:35:01
Engerman: Who got into trouble for his--
- 5-00:35:02
Malia: He got into trouble, yes. So I missed the whole McCarthy thing, and I did not know the Berkeley radical scene. I did not know where Kerr came in. So now the university was collapsed.
- 5-00:35:15
Engerman: What do you mean? When you say the university collapsed, what do you mean by that?
- 5-00:35:19
Malia: After the sit-in, nothing functioned.
- 5-00:35:23
Engerman: Were classes still being offered?

5-00:35:25

Malia: Barely. But no one could keep his or her mind on classes, neither the students nor-- maybe over at engineering, I am sure things did not collapse, or in chemistry they did not collapse, but here in Dwinelle and in Barrows and in Wheeler, things collapsed.

5-00:35:45

Engerman: Social sciences and humanities.

5-00:35:47

Malia: Social sciences and humanities.

5-00:35:49

Engerman: Also, as it turned out, closer to Sproul Plaza, but just coincidence.

5-00:35:52

Malia: In proximity to Sproul Plaza. Things collapsed, so I was concerned for the university. Right after the arrest, there was a meeting over in LSB [Life Sciences Building], in a room that could seat two hundred, of concerned faculty. So I went to the meeting of concerned faculty. I was sitting next to Mike Heyman, who was also concerned. He was in the law school, he understood better than I did what was involved. Oh, Howard Schachman the first time I saw him was presiding. Now, Howard is an old experienced politico. He was either a Trotskyite or maybe even a fellow-traveling Communist or something of the sort. He knew how to manage a meeting. This was not the first political meeting he chaired. I thought the other people were there because they were concerned about the fate of the university and how we were going to get things going again. No, they were not concerned about that. They were concerned about how we could support the FSM. So I more or less adopted the position that we had to do something for the FSM if we were going to get the university back in shape. So I was at the founding meeting of the "Two Hundred." Have you heard the expression, "the Two Hundred?" Since my elders and betters, people like Ken Stamp and Carl Schorske, and [Younger and Frand?], Reggie Zelnik were all convinced that the FSM was a worthy cause, I said, "Well, perhaps they should have what they understand to be freedom of advocacy." It is better to use that term, advocacy, not this vague thing, speech. So, we were heading toward the faculty meeting of December 8. The tactic of the "Two Hundred" was to get the faculty to endorse the FSM's position so as to bring pressure on the regents to accept the FSM position. Without the faculty, it would not get by the regents. So to politicize the faculty. The "Two Hundred" caucus met in Charlie Sellers' office down the hall, which is where Waldo Martin now is, if you know that office. Charlie had a big office. The principal people were Charlie, Sheldon Wolin, I think Ken was, no, Ken was not that close, Carl Schorske, Henry Nash Smith, Phil Selznick, I am not sure I have the whole list right, Bill Kornhauser.

5-00:38:40

Engerman: But you were part of this even though--

5-00:38:42

Malia: No, no, I did not go to this Sellers meeting. John Searle, who was then only an associate professor, a young associate professor. He was the youngest tenured person involved. I think Ken was in that group too because he was on the Academic Freedom Committee. So, poor Joe Gabardino from the business school, who was head of the Academic

Freedom Committee. Ken was on the committee. Oh, [Jacobus] ten Broek, the lawyer ten Broek. I forget his first name. He was blind.

He was one of the main strategists of the thing. Their tactic, and it was a sensible one, I would have done the same thing in their place, was to get the Academic Freedom Committee to make this an issue of academic freedom. It was not academic freedom, this was ordinary First Amendment freedoms, it had nothing academic about it. To present a resolution to the Academic Senate saying that the university should exercise no control over content, but only over time, place, and manner rules. You have heard these formulas? Resolution in five points, I figure I could work the others out, but that is the main thing: No control of content, only time, place, and manner. To present it to the Academic Senate. And, with such an establishment figure as Joe Gabardino introducing the motion and then Ken Stampp really making the case for it--oh, it was John Searle who took the resolution that they drafted down the hall to the Academic Freedom Committee. Ken Stampp and ten Broek were on the Academic Freedom Committee, and they were for this. They put it through, but Gabardino introduced it. I went to the meeting. I was no longer caucusing with the "Two Hundred."

5-00:40:49

Engerman: But you went to the December 8 faculty meeting?

5-00:40:51

Malia: Everyone did.

5-00:40:52

Engerman: In the Greek Theatre?

5-00:40:53

Malia: Yes. No, the Greek Theatre was before. I went to the Greek Theatre too. It was Bettina who put Mario [Savio] up to going out on the stage and getting tackled.

5-00:41:05

Engerman: Bettina Aptheker?

5-00:41:06

Malia: Yes, she is experienced in agitation. So that of course tipped everything in the direction of the FSM, it was an atrocity, and against Clark Kerr. So, after that we knew we had to go to the Academic Senate meeting. I was going to follow the advice of--I voted for the sacred resolutions of December 8.

5-00:41:35

Engerman: Why did you vote for them if you felt that this was part of university collapsed?

5-00:41:38

Malia: Because I did not understand what was going on, because Ken was making the case for them, and a number of my colleagues, whom I respected, Carl Schorske, Henry Nash Smith. Henry Nash Smith had played a role in bringing Carl here after all. Carl himself, and I was already acquainted with Searle and liked him. Reggie, all of us, everyone was going to vote for it. Even old Papa Rosenberg was going to vote for it.

5-00:42:10

Engerman: But you don't seem like you had staked your career on being a conformist...

5-00:42:14

Malia: No, I was not being a conformist. I genuinely did not understand what was involved in this. I was concerned with getting the university back on its feet.

5-00:42:25

Engerman: And these sessions, as it were--

5-00:42:28

Malia: Yes, if we had to authorize advocacy, then okay, I am for advocacy. Also all these respectable people were for this resolution, so I voted for it. But in the course of the debate, [Lewis] Feuer got up. He introduced the Feuer Amendment, the wording of which I don't remember. But it said, "They can advocate whatever they want, except the use of force or violence." Those were the two key words. Then he went on saying, "We don't want the freedom of the campus misused by the Ku Klux Klan, or by Neo-Nazis or anything like that."

5-00:43:14

Engerman: Very wisely citing conservative groups who would be misusing it, not liberals.

5-00:43:17

Malia: Yes, and of course he was not worried about them. He was worried about left-wing groups. That is what happened. Then Carl Landauer and Bill Peterson got up, in sociology. He is another ex-something or other, Trotskyite or maybe, no, not an ex-Communist. But at least an ex-Trotskyite. He gave a very bitter, self-defeating denunciation of this. Then Carl Landauer went, who I had heard of before. I did not know he had written a book on European socialism yet. He was a very dignified-looking white-haired old man, well into his seventies at the time. He gave an honest speech, unlike Feuer.

5-00:44:03

Engerman: Who was disingenuous.

5-00:44:06

Malia: Yes, he was disingenuous. He said, "I am against this resolution, because it means that we are abdicating control of the campus to the police, and I do not want the police on campus. If we are going to permit illegal organizing on campus, we are going to bring the police here, and that destroys the atmosphere of the university." He said, "It will be misused by left-wing people." I was very impressed by what he said, the argument. We are turning the campus into the public street. The university has no control over--if it does not police itself, everyone will be policed by the outside. That seemed to me a very cogent argument, but I voted for the resolution nonetheless. Then two days later there was another senate meeting, and some elderly faculty member proposed a resolution that said, "Of course we are for free speech, but we should not forget the values of the university." It was a motherhood resolution.

5-00:45:23

Engerman: I am sorry, it was what?

5-00:45:25

Malia: A motherhood resolution. You could not apply it.

5-00:45:28

Engerman: It is hard to be against motherhood, but it is hard to know what to do with it.

5-00:45:32

Malia: Yes. So Charlie Sellers got up and said, "This is a very dangerous motion." He had in mind that it would worry the FSM people and look like a retreat. The FSM's most valuable asset by that point was the faculty endorsement and this would look like backtracking. So, the vehemence with which Sellers and I, say Carl, and a couple of others denounced this motherhood resolution, said, "These guys can't vote a weasely motherhood resolution on the integrity of the university was something very wrong." So I started thinking. Then I gravitated towards people who thought this through before me, namely people like Seymour Martin Lipset, who has a Trotskyite past, like most of the people that were involved on the other side, and knew the mechanisms of this, and who knew who Howard Schachman was, and who knew Leon Wofsy was. Do you know who Leon Wofsy is? He used to run the Communist Youth Movement in New York and later resigned from the Party. He was frequently attacked by Senator Burns who was a famous reactionary senator. I learned all of this later. But he had all of the instincts of a Communist organizer. He was an extremely clever and extremely able guy in bacteriology and immunology, a little department that does not amount to anything. So, Lipset knew all of these guys. Half of them were in sociology or political science, and he knew the mechanisms in this kind of activity. And he is a political sociologist, after all. He was the one who was trying to organize an opposition to this. So I gravitated to that group. Who else was in it? Dale Jorgenson, do you know who he is?

5-00:47:54

Engerman: The economist?

5-00:47:55

Malia: An economist. He was then here. Chuck, what was his first name? Charles Zeimond, he was a scientist of some sort. Now, he later on became president of the University of Texas. What was his name? [Hans] Mark--I can't remember his name. Okay, a second resolution voted at the famous meeting was to establish a faculty executive committee, the purpose of which was to secure approval from the regents of the December 8th Resolutions. Well, the "Two Hundred" had a slate. They were seven people on this, with Jennings, the president of the senate, ex-officio slate of seven names. It was Schachman, Wolin, Selznick, Searle, Carl Schorske, I don't know. Reggie could not have been on there, because he was not a member of the Academic Senate.

5-00:49:22

Engerman: Because he had not been tenured.

5-00:49:23

Malia: He did not have tenure. So, over the weekend, there were going to be elections to this. Well, people like Jorgenson and Lipset, who were more politically savvy than I was, called this the "*Slate* slate." Do you know what *Slate* was?

5-00:49:39

Engerman: No.

5-00:49:40

Malia: *Slate* was a little magazine that put our course evaluations, confidential guide to what courses are good, what professors are good and so forth. But it was run by radicals. So this faculty group was dubbed by our group as the “*Slate* slate.” Relations were very cordial here. At one point, Carl’s office was down the hall here, he said, “Well, if people don’t like what is going on, they are always free to found another political party.” He had named a political party, and I said, “Well, yes, we have to found another political party.” So we organized like mad.

5-00:50:22

Engerman: Who is the “we”? Lipset, Wofsy, Jorgenson?

5-00:50:27

Malia: No, Wofsy is with the “Two Hundred.”

5-00:50:29

Engerman: Oh, I am sorry. Who is the “we” who organized this counter-group?

5-00:50:33

Malia: It was Lipset, Jorgenson, Al Fishlow.

5-00:50:37

Engerman: In economics, Yes?

5-00:50:39

Malia: [Hans] Mark whatever his name was, he was the head of the engineering school at the time. Mark--oh, various people. They came out of the woodwork if you will. They were all over the place, because the “*Slate* slate” would have meant a takeover of the senate apparatus by a left group, a politically motivated group that wanted to reorganize the university. They were interested not just in the FSM but getting rid of Kerr, campus autonomy, new curriculum, all sorts of things that would come out over the years. They all lost except for Carl Schorske, who got by with one vote, mine. I like Carl, and I trust him. I don’t think much of his political judgment any more, but I voted for him. It is just as well that it was at least one *Slate* type in the otherwise conservative group. He would serve as this kind of liaison with the campus.

5-00:52:00

Engerman: And were you active—who were you active in campaigning for this conservative group? Or, how were you active?

5-00:52:06

Malia: By calling up people!

5-00:52:09

Engerman: And what did you tell them?

5-00:52:09

Malia: Tom Barnes in the history department was one of them.

5-00:52:10

Engerman: What did you say?

5-00:52:13

Malia: We don't want the "*Slate* slate" to take over. We were quite blunt about it. "This is a power grab," which it was. So they were defeated, and by then it was the Christmas break, and everything calmed down. The students went away, the regents eventually accepted, you know, the "sacred words:" "We don't contemplate any campus rules that will infringe freedoms guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments." In other words, you could advocate on campus. [Edward] Strong by this time was gone as chancellor. He was swept away. We got a new man, Martin Meyerson, who was head of the environmental design school. He was a nice guy. He was not terribly forceful, but he was a nice guy. Delmer Brown wanted to be a kind of conciliator. He was in our group as the conservative in our group, and he suggested that we take the name Faculty Forum, because we just talk about the issues and so forth. So we held a meeting over the vacation and tried to get ourselves organized because the other guys were organized, but it did not amount to much. Then the new semester opened, the spring semester, and of course, what was only to be expected, the Filthy Speech Movement.

5-00:53:54

Engerman: There is a year in between there, isn't there?

5-00:53:55

Malia: No, no, no, this was the next spring.

5-00:53:58

Engerman: Spring '65?

5-00:53:59

Malia: Spring '65. For six years, there was not a semester without a crisis. The Filthy Speech Movement, do you know about that?

5-00:54:10

Engerman: Before you talk about that, I have one other question for you, which is about the regents' declaration. Did your conservative group take that as a necessary conciliation or as a defeat?

5-00:54:21

Malia: Sure, okay, but draw the line there.

5-00:54:24

Engerman: As long as it did not go any further.

5-00:54:25

Malia: As long as it did not go any further. But of course people like Landauer and Martin Lipset knew they would go farther, and we had to brace for further trouble.

5-00:54:35

Engerman: That was?

5-00:54:36

Malia: I did not. I thought, well, it's probably over now. Of course there were people of the "Two Hundred" saying, "The mere fact of our organizing was itself dangerous because this is the counter-revolution that stimulates—" Well, this is true in the French Revolution.

5-00:54:54

Engerman: Did you try to think about it in those terms?

5-00:54:57

Malia: Yes, I actually did. So the Filthy Speech Movement—people were parading around the plaza with the “F”-word on a placard, and of course this got into the papers. They were arrested, the regents got in a great tizzy because they had really not been enjoying swallowing the December 8th Resolutions at all. The state was up in arms against it too. Berkeley was not popular in California at this point. I tried to explain what was going on to some meetings in San Francisco, and it was really very difficult.

5-00:55:44

Engerman: What kind of meetings were you attending?

5-00:55:47

Malia: Oh, still in the goodwill phase, various faculty members went to various meetings around the Bay Area to explain our case, “We are not a bunch of Reds, we are not anarchists, we are really not all that bad, mistakes were made, the students have something of a point, they went too far, but the administration made mistakes.” So, the regents got on their high horse.

5-00:56:21

Engerman: About filthy speech.

5-00:56:23

Malia: About the Filthy Speech Movement. Kerr and Meyerson then said that they would resign. They wanted to be allowed to calm the campus down if they could. So there was another great meeting of the faculty over in the Pauley Ballroom. There were well over a thousand in attendance. Now this time there were two political parties. There were the “Two Hundred,” and there was the so-called Faculty Forum. Both groups met with the Emergency Executive Committee, separately, and then together.

5-00:57:06

Engerman: What was that meeting like, to be together with the “Two Hundred?”

5-00:57:08

Malia: It was caucusy, it was negotiating a consensus resolution. We did not want Kerr to resign, we did not want to have war with the regents.

5-00:57:19

Engerman: How about the “Two Hundred?” At this point, did they?

5-00:57:21

Malia: They did not want Kerr to resign. You know, they hated him, but they did not want him to resign, because, “Who are we going to get next?” So eventually a resolution was hammered out that said, “We call on the regents not to accept the resignations,” and Schorske threw a clause saying that we want Meyerson to be made permanent, not acting chancellor. Everything was worked out. We were going to have an overwhelming majority for this.

5-00:57:55

Engerman: Were you active in that negotiation?

5-00:57:56

Malia: I was in the negotiation. I was becoming political at this time. Then, the final editing of the thing, which took place at the Academic Senate Office, I was there, and someone from the "Two Hundred" called in, "But the words December 8th are not mentioned in this." So I foolishly agreed to put in some little clause that said that we are not repudiating the December 8th. It was not an endorsement of December 8th to say this. It was just, "December 8th is still on the books as far as we are concerned." Then we had the meeting. Ken is chairman of the Academic Freedom Committee. He introduced the motion.

5-00:58:45

Engerman: He had replaced Joe Gabardino?

5-00:58:46

Malia: He had by then. Anyway, he was the big speaker. Since he hated Kerr, it was a painful moment for him. He had a very sourpuss on his face [laughs].

5-00:58:57

Engerman: But he did it?

5-00:58:58

Malia: But he did it. Then Carl Landauer got up, and gave a terribly dignified speech, saying that he was going to support this motion, that it would be a disaster for the university if Kerr had to resign over such an issue. He hoped the regents would calm down. He said, "However, I wish that the drafters of the motion had had the courtesy not to include in it any mention of December 8th, out of regard for those members of the senate who today want to vote for this motion, but who did not vote for the December 8th Resolutions." The key phrase was "had the courtesy towards those who did not vote for December 8th," not to mention it in this document which is about another matter.

5-00:59:57

Engerman: Now, was that pointed at you, that statement?

5-00:59:58

Malia: No, no, he did not know who I was at that time. The dignity of the speech struck me, and the lucidity of it. Marty Lipset told me afterwards, when whoever it was, Moe Hirsch or some loud man called up the senate office, you should have said, "I am not empowered to negotiate, the resolution has already been negotiated," and they would have shut up, because they did not want the whole thing to collapse around them.

5-01:00:27

Engerman: They needed a consensus, everyone needed a consensus.

5-01:00:30

Malia: Yes, they needed a consensus. You see, I was still naïve, I did not know that that was what you were supposed to say then. So I was immensely struck by Landauer, his dignity that time. And remember the lucidity and sense of what he said, his argument, in a tone.

5-01:00:44

Engerman: On December 8th.

5-01:00:44

Malia: On December 8th.

5-01:00:45

Engerman: Even though you had ultimately voted against him on December 8th?

5-01:00:48

Malia: Yes. See, he came across as absolutely genuine, whereas Feuer was disingenuous. He was right, on the substance, because this would lead to advocacy of force and violence, and that is not a good thing. But he was disingenuous in his presentation. So afterwards when I got home, I called up Landauer and said, "I want to congratulate you on your speech, and I agree with you entirely, we should not have put that thing in there." That is how I got acquainted with Landauer. Do you know who he is?

5-01:01:25

Engerman: Well, tell us about him.

5-01:01:26

Malia: He was a Bavarian Social Democrat in 1918 in Munich.

5-01:01:34

Engerman: During the Spartacan Revolution there?

5-01:01:40

Malia: Yes, he was a Social Democrat, and he was for the overthrow of the monarchy, and the establishment of a republic, but of course, when they got out their troops in the streets, they were overrun by the far Left, which set up a Soviet Republic. So he had been through the whole thing before. Then he had been through the Nazi thing later on in the thirties. Well, already in Munich in the twenties, then the Nazi triumph, and that is why he was in America. So he knew the ropes. He was a very noble person, and very moral. But not oppressively moral the way Madame Gérard was in Paris. When you disagreed with him, you did not feel that you were being sinful, whereas with her, you felt you were being sinful. He was very rational, and he understood politics as well as any of the people of the "Two Hundred," but since he was an emeritus, he could not play that kind of role. He did not have a certain, nasty is not quite the right word for Marty Lipset, but Lipset was very disliked by all sorts of people. He was too close to Kerr, among other things. Anyway, no one could be mad at Carl Landauer. And, his leftist credentials were impeccable. He had written a history of European socialism; it is now a pretty out of date volume. He once said to me, "I never understood Nietzsche. {The herolian thing}. I have obviously never understood Marx either," that sort of thing. We did not understand Marx the metaphysician. Marx was a social scientist. But he [Landauer] was a wonderful man. So that was the beginning of our alliance.

5-01:03:49

Engerman: So you called him. What did he say when you called to congratulate him?

5-01:03:53

Malia: Well, as an emeritus on sort of the sideline, he was delighted to have a younger faculty member in his camp. So, we formed a kind of alliance, and this came out the next year. The next year was the year of the Vietnam Day Committee. It was going to be advocacy in practice. They first in the fall had a big powwow on a field that no longer exists. It is where the lower plaza is now.

- 5-01:04:30
Engerman: This is fall '65?
- 5-01:04:30
Malia: Fall '65, where all sorts of leftist luminaries, including I think Herbert Marcuse, Isaac Deutscher, I don't know who else, assembled to talk about the evil of the war in Vietnam. In the case of Isaac Deutscher, to urge people on to the revolution, because Deustcher was in his, Khrushchev was not yet kicked out, and he felt that Khrushchev--
- 5-01:05:11
Engerman: If this is '65, Khrushchev had already been kicked out.
- 5-01:05:16
Malia: He was kicked out in fall '64. Anyway, during the Khrushchev period, his attitude was, "At last, we are going to get a new Soviet Union."
- 5-01:05:32
Engerman: One that he could like?
- 5-01:05:35
Malia: One that he could like. Then there was one speaker who was not in this group. That was Bob Pincus, Robert Pincus. Have you heard of him?
- 5-01:05:44
Engerman: Tell us about him.
- 5-01:05:46
Malia: He was, I think, probably a pacifist. In any event, his life work was the peace movement; to resolve international conflict without war. He ran an outfit, which did not amount to much. I do not know how it was financed. It was called the World Without War Council.
- 5-01:06:11
Engerman: Now, you were active in this World Without War Council.
- 5-01:06:12
Malia: Through him. He appeared at that powwow then, and I attended some of it.
- 5-01:06:19
Engerman: What was your attitude? Why did you attend? What was your attitude toward the [Vietnam] War?
- 5-01:06:21
Malia: To see what was going on.
- 5-01:06:23
Engerman: Had you had a prior conception about the war in Vietnam?
- 5-01:06:27
Malia: At the beginning I signed some petition against American intervention in Vietnam. But very soon, I was more concerned about the campus than about Vietnam, because that bore in on me every day. Pincus' line was that there is a right way and there is a wrong way about going about peace activity, and taking the side of the enemy of the U.S. is not

the right way to change U.S. policy. That was his line. You have got to agitate so as not to appear or be objectively in the camp of the adversary, and you have got to use non-violent means, and you have to have a specific agenda. You agitate for stop the bombing or whatever, something like that.

5-01:07:29

Engerman: Not “end the war”?

5-01:07:30

Malia: Not “end the war.” All very sensible stuff. Reggie was very impressed by Pincus’ talk. All the rest was agitprop [Soviet shorthand for “agitation-propaganda” against American imperialism, racism, and whatnot. Although as my friend Bill Worthy, the black journalist whom I met in Moscow in ’55, who gave me the address of that woman in Tashkent, he was now a rabid anti-imperialist agitating against American racist war in Vietnam. He radicalized along with the left wing of the black movement. Okay, so the Vietnam Day Committee, which was dominated, though not run, by one Jerry Rubin, have you ever heard of him?

5-01:08:20

Engerman: Tell us about him.

5-01:08:26

Malia: He became a stockbroker. He was a cynic. He was in it for the kicks. He was the moving spirit. They were going to have a giant march from the campus after a daylong rally on that turf down there, down Telegraph Avenue, through Oakland to some army base. Now this is the fall of ’65. The Watts riots had taken place the previous summer. The line of the march went through the Oakland ghetto. And, the idea of people like Rubin was to create a Watts, and I am not exaggerating, to create a Watts in Oakland to show that America is going fascist under the impact of the war. I know I am not making it up, because I heard them say it. They said it on television. He did not say it in so many words.

5-01:09:35

Engerman: What did they say?

5-01:09:37

Malia: “We are going to cause a Watts”—“We are going to cause,” they did not say that, “the Oakland ghetto could very well explode the way Watts exploded,” things like that.

5-01:09:53

Engerman: In a hypothetical sense.

5-01:09:55

Malia: Hypothetical, yes. But, they did a lot of talking, and they wanted a major confrontation with the authorities. By this time, tempers were running very high about the Vietnam War. It was going to be a massive turnout. We then had a new chancellor, Chancellor [Roger] Heyns, who had a government of all the talents. He brought in Neil Smelser. He brought in Carl Schorske. His executive officer was someone solid, Budd Cheit from the business school. Carl Schorske for the softer kind of faculty. Neil Smelser for I do not know what.

5-01:10:55

Engerman: Just a smart guy.

5-01:10:58

Malia: Just a smart guy. Smelser never took strong positions on things. He has never had an enemy, or been associated with a cause. John Searle for the students. So they mobilized various volunteers. Schorske was sent to—oh, Zelnik was liaison with the chancellor's office. Stamp organized various faculty members to try to calm things down. Zelnik was supposed to calm down, and Searle was supposed to calm down the Vietnam Day Committee. I forget who Schorske was working on. I was sent to visit Chief Toothman of the Oakland Police Department. My pitch when I went to see him was, "You really should let the march into Oakland, after all it is their constitutional right." He then laughed in my face. He was quite right. "We are not going to risk public safety and order in Oakland to accommodate those people."

5-01:12:26

Engerman: Now, how is it that you ended up being the emissary to Chief Toothman in the first place?

5-01:12:31

Malia: Well, they probably figured that since I had by then staked out a somewhat conservative position, that I should go deal with the authorities, and that the radicals like Zelnik and Phil should deal with the movement, with the radicals, and Schorske should deal with the faculty. I don't know. In any event, Toothman was not going to let them in. So, what to do? These thousands of people were going to gather, and they were going to march down Telegraph, and there would be a wall of policemen. And they were not going to be let in. So Pincus, I think, saved the situation in so far as it could be saved. Jerry Brown was still governor. It was not yet Reagan. Pincus, like most people, was a Democrat, and he had connections in Sacramento. So he set me up with someone whose name I don't remember anymore who was in law enforcement statewide in Sacramento. And, I was in contact by phone with Reggie--this should be written up, I am going to ask Reggie for the details on it one of these days. He was dealing with the movement, with the Vietnam Day Committee, and an agreement was worked out with me talking to this guy in Sacramento and then talking with Reggie who talked with the Vietnam Day Committee, that the march would go down Telegraph Avenue to the "Oakland wall," as it was called, and it would stop. That Jerry Rubin and a number of others would step forward and try to cross the Oakland line and would be arrested, and that things would end there.

5-01:14:30

Engerman: A choreographed presentation.

5-01:14:32

Malia: Choreographed. Okay, that was the agreement negotiated. No one was face to face. This was all by telephone. Afterwards there was a big dinner party at some faculty member's house.

5-01:14:48

Engerman: To celebrate the agreement?

5-01:14:48

Malia: No, not to celebrate it. It was scheduled before. I got there, I took a double Martini to calm myself down. They marched down, and we did not know what was going to happen. Well, they did not abide by the agreement. They got to the “Wall”--

5-01:15:02

Engerman: The movement, the protesters did?

5-01:15:05

Malia: The FSM, the Vietnam Day Committee. There were five—it was all in the *Daily Cal*, you can check the names of the people. It was Jerry Rubin and several others, maybe Moe Hirsch, the mathematician who was there. They turned right when they got to the Oakland line, and went down a block to try to break in. Again the police, so they went down another block and tried to break in. Again the police. They went down another block. Again the police. Rubin wanted them to storm the police lines. They wanted to have a real riot. They could not get a Watts, but they wanted to have a real riot. The next day they all met down at Provo Park [Martin Luther King Civic Center Park], do you know where that is?

5-01:15:58

Engerman: Where is Provo?

5-01:16:00

Malia: Do you know who the Provos were? They were in the Irish Republican Army. They were the radicals in the Irish Republican Army. It is a square in front of the [Berkeley] city hall. It is called Provo Park. They were all there the next day, arguing about who had betrayed the night before at the time of the march. These were people who wanted a real revolution. I am not kidding. Reggie was there also arguing against the real revolutionaries, “It won’t work, you will compromise the cause, you will set back the cause.” He was arguing, if you will, a Menshevik line with these would-be Bolsheviks. But that was a very dangerous thing, the Vietnam Day Committee.

5-01:16:55

Engerman: Are you still going on Vietnam Day?

5-01:16:57

Malia: I am going to do what comes next. So then, the next semester, Pincus had latched onto—oh no, one major thing I forgot. In the build-up to this march, Carl Landauer wrote a letter, I think to the Vietnam Day Committee, in which he said that, “Yes, this war is a cause for great distress. We should vigorously criticize the Johnson administration, but we should not forget that this is after all a progressive administration.” He went through all of the Great Society programs, “The situation is more complicated than some of you are making out. The use of physical violence to promote the cause of peace would be a mistake.” He wrote a very dignified letter. I have it somewhere. I took this letter, and turned it into a petition. I slightly changed the wording, and made it less academic, and we had oodles of signatures. By then Meyerson was no longer chancellor, but we got his signature. We got Sheldon Wolin, all the “Two Hundred” people signed this thing. It was a very successful, moderate, conciliatory movement. We got an overwhelming faculty response from this. And, the Vietnam Day Committee started to tone down its propaganda. They were no longer going to commit massive civil disobedience. That Sproul Hall sit-in was not civil

disobedience. In civil disobedience, you get arrested to show that the law is immoral and unjust. It was an exercise in coercive force, the sit-in, and that is what they wanted to do.

5-01:18:58

Engerman: But that was already a year before.

5-01:19:00

Malia: I forgot to mention the falsehood of the civil disobedience argument. When they said massive civil disobedience, they meant massive coercive action. So they dropped the rhetoric about massive coercive action. They dropped the rhetoric about forcing the police lines if necessary. So they retreated verbally quite a bit. And I think that, at least Carl Schorske told me this, that the “open letter,” as it was called, did in fact have a moderating effect on what happened that day. It is all printed up in the *Daily Cal*. That was the main thing that we did before, let’s say, the conservative party.

5-01:20:00

Engerman: Was this before the march to the “Oakland Wall,” or is this after?

5-01:20:04

Malia: Before the march.

5-01:20:05

Engerman: But obviously by the time we got to the march--

5-01:20:07

Malia: The leaders were going to try—they wanted to rush the Oakland police anyway, but the open letter did have a calming effect on the campus debate, and the build-up to the march. This took up the whole of the fall. Then in the spring, Bob Pincus—

5-01:20:33

Engerman: Spring ’66 now?

5-01:20:36

Malia: Yes—organized a wonderful program of how to go about real civil disobedience and real peace work. He is a political organizer too. So we had a big auditorium in LSB, in that field auditorium. He invited a whole bunch of very interesting speakers. The main ones were Irving Howe, the editor of *Dissent*, Bayard Rustin—this is not a right-wing reactionary thing—and Carl Landauer. This was a sort of Landauer/Social Democratic/Bayard Rustin kind of thing. It was to instruct. By then, the tactic that I had adopted—which was not Marty Lipset’s tactic, it was Carl Landauer’s--it was to try to civilize the movement, to educate the movement.

5-01:21:45

Engerman: Now, is this because you felt some sympathy with the cause that they were expressing?

5-01:21:50

Malia: It was a mixture of things. I was moderately against the war in Vietnam, I supported Gene McCarthy, for instance, that kind of thing. McCarthy for President Committee. But I was more concerned with the university, because it was a daily reality. You could not avoid it.

- 5-01:22:16
Engerman: How did you feel that daily reality most strongly? Was it the students in your classes or the tide on campus?
- 5-01:22:22
Malia: Well, every day I walked across the campus there was a rally going on. I had to see what was going on, I had to read the *Daily Cal*, every day. The colleagues were talking about it. We had several major politicians in the department, Charlie Sellers, Ken Stampf, Reggie Zelnik, Carl Schorske; it was unavoidable.
- 5-01:22:48
Engerman: You mentioned the politicians in the department, how did this affect the texture of departmental life, which had been, it seems, since the battle of the titans right before you got there, relatively congenial? I would not say unanimous, but a very--
- 5-01:23:05
Malia: It did not affect it much.
- 5-01:23:11
Engerman: So even though people were on opposite sides of this--
- 5-01:23:13
Malia: I continued to have good relations with Carl [Schorske] throughout, with Reggie throughout, with Ken. They were my social circle. With Henry [May] throughout— And, it did not affect appointments or departmental business. It was a very civilized atmosphere.
- 5-01:23:36
Engerman: Remarkable, in terms of the controversies circling around, and how people lined up very differently.
- 5-01:23:44
Malia: Given the fact that I liked both Carl and Reggie, and admired Carl intellectually, that counted as much as politics. So in any event, Pincus put on this wonderful show, and my tactic then, and this was not the tactic of more hard-line people such as Marty Lipset, who left eventually, was to civilize the movement, to argue with them, to talk them into a more moderate and effective approach. Eventually both Pincus and I realized that the movement was hopeless. John Searle came to the same conclusion.
- 5-01:24:37
Engerman: At what point did you realize that? Was there a specific event?
- 5-01:24:39
Malia: I will come to that in a moment. All through '65, we were trying to civilize the movement, educate them, make them more effective, and support Gene McCarthy, this kind of thing.
- 5-01:24:54
Engerman: Well, was Gene McCarthy already running in '65? I thought he was not until the '68 campaign.

5-01:24:58

Malia: He was in the '68 campaign, so this went on, but we were using that as an emblem of the kind of politics.

5-01:25:05

Engerman: Yes, but there are a couple of years going by, in which two things are happening. One is the Vietnam War itself is escalating, or American involvement in it.

5-01:25:11

Malia: Yes.

5-01:25:13

Engerman: And the second thing is the protests nationally, the protests and violence against the war in cities, et cetera. So, is there a moment in the sort of upswing of, '65 to '68 is this moment of the upswing of what we know as the sixties.

5-01:25:31

Malia: Well, '68 obviously is the culmination. Not just nationally, but internationally. But, I will come back to the campus. I took McCarthy as a sort of the symbol of the kind of approach we would advocate, something within the system that would put pressure on the government to change policy with our party line. It did not work. The movement ended itself. It fed on the Civil Rights Movement, it fed on the war, but by '66 or by the next year, it had become an end in itself. The way the revolutionary government of the Jacobins in the last four months was an end in itself.

5-01:26:24

Engerman: Okay, but we are still missing a couple of years here. You are talking about this meeting that Pincus organized in '66, or was that in '66?

5-01:26:35

Malia: Yes, spring '66. Then came the next great crisis. There were navy recruiters on the plaza. Savio and some others physically impeded access to the navy recruiters on the plaza. This is illegal. They were exercising coercive force on the plaza, which was now equivalent legally to the street. So the police came at the request of Vice Chancellor Cheit, and arrested Savio and these people. Police on campus, immediately the fever mounted again. [Crane] Brinton's metaphor of the fever is quite apt. The first great outburst of the fever was the FSM. Then it would subside, but every so often there would be an incident, and immediately the fever would go higher than it had been. So, police on campus, strike, the place was closed down. This was by the time they were saying, "Shut it down." That was the slogan. So again, a great meeting in the Pauley Ballroom. The administration was raked over the coals, because after all, the vice chancellor had called the police from campus. Heyns was out of town, I think, the day of the meeting. Also by then, [Shreider?] had come to the conclusion, and he was saying this in public, no, not in public, in private, that things had been going on for so long that "we now have no choice, we have got to go for broke, and beat these guys, show that we can coerce them." He was supported in this by another ex-leftist, [Robert] Bob McCloskey, in political science.

5-01:28:47

Engerman: Now what did this mean, to "go for broke?"

5-01:28:50

Malia: He never made it very specific. They did an oral history treatment of him, you can look it up.

5-01:28:58

Engerman: How did you understand it? What did you understand it to mean?

5-01:29:02

Malia: Well, the use of police, what Reagan did later on. Yeah, that is what “going for broke” means. Let them have an atrocity, and clobber them. Okay, so the administration was raked over the coals in this meeting. There could be no consensus. So the Left put through a motion for a governance report. Have you heard about that? They were going to have a constitution for the university. Transparency, participation, student participation in running the university, in formulating curriculum, and so forth. It was a political constitution for the university. They got a high-minded naïve New England empirical law professor, Caleb Foote, to be the chairman of this. Dean Newman of the law school was one of the, he was more or less famous in the state, have you ever heard of him? He was a very sharp guy. And of course, people like Reggie Zelnik and whatnot. It was a joint faculty-student governance commission. They labored for months, and produced a document, which would have created a political university. The students in question of course were mainly radical students. Professors of politics would be elected to these various commissions. You can look the thing up.

5-01:30:50

Engerman: Well, again, I am more interested in your impressions and recollections of it than--

5-01:30:52

Malia: So, fortunately they took so long—there were two dissenting members, Al Fishlow, and what was the other one, the mathematician whose name I cannot remember. We were fairly good friends at the time. I cannot remember his name. Something Freeman I think. They wrote a dissenting report, but the majority, which was about ten people, it was ten to two, turned in this political constitution for the university. Fortunately, it was a calm moment at that time. The emergency executive committee had given way to something known as the policy committee, which is to be the kind of politburo of the senate.

5-01:31:42

Engerman: But by not having the word emergency in it, it made it sound a little more stable.

5-01:31:46

Malia: Yes. I was on it by that time. Ken Stamp by then had changed sides. He was chairman.

5-01:31:53

Engerman: Changed sides, he was against the student protests?

5-01:31:56

Malia: Yes, the revolution had to stop. You know one of the leitmotifs in the French Revolution is, “the revolution is over.” Well, Lafayette said it was over at one point, Bernard at another point, Gerond at another point, the Mountain at another point. Ken Stamp had done as Lafayette. He was the first wave of the radicals. We decided to handle this governance report with the connivance of the chancellor. It would have been an absolutely impossible set of arrangements. By farming out different sections of the

report to the relevant committees of the Academic Senate, who were then to report back to it for what to do about it, but of course they never reported back. Nothing was ever done, and it was gladly interred, which was fine. Then the next thing was the visit of Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, who was Johnson's ambassador to the U.N., to the campus. I think that was '66 too. It had been decided well in advance that he was going to get an honorary degree. But when he came here in the spring of '66, it was a hot potato. He had to agree to a debate on Johnson's war policy in the Harmon Gym, with Franz Schurmann. He was a specialist of East Asia. I do not know what has become of him. I have not seen him for years. There was to be a debate between Goldberg and Schurmann about the wisdom of U.S. policy, and then a vote afterwards. Reggie presided. Well, we got Goldberg out of the Greek Theatre alive.

5-01:34:00

Engerman: Oh, the Greek Theatre? I thought it was the Harmon Gym.

5-01:34:02

Malia: No, for the honorary degree.

5-01:34:03

Engerman: For the honorary degree.

5-01:34:05

Malia: Because, we were used to big disruptions in the Greek Theatre. Searle was very proud of that. He said afterwards to the press, "We clobbered them." Searle had also done his Lafayette by then. Well, once he had to deal with the movement in a position of responsibility, he sobered up. So we got Goldberg out of the Greek Theatre alive, and of course there was not any debate. It was an anti-war rally. Zelnik presided. Again, he did not want things to degenerate into chaos and therefore compromise the movement. So he handled it quite adroitly from his point of view. The vote was overwhelmingly against the U.S. position in Vietnam, and Goldberg was told to take that back to Washington, which, of course, waiting for it with bated breath. This was '66. To just stick with my role and the campus affairs, by this time I had given up all hope of educating the movement, of teaching them anything about more moderate protest. So had Pincus, with whom I remained in contact. Carl Landauer, no. We remained in constant touch when we were--

5-01:35:51

Engerman: Landauer was still trying to--

5-01:35:54

Malia: Still very active, yes. He was writing books to the near end, and giving classes and so forth. But, so by '66 we had settled down to a routine where the movement was there, its strength would fluctuate depending on what issues were on the table nationally and internationally. It would flare up, recede, but it was always there, the fever ready to break out at any time. There was no foreseeable end to this. There was no solution to it. There was no point in reasoning with these people, so I stopped writing letters to the *Daily Cal*, and trying to organize things like the Bayard Rustin thing. It had to be lived with the way Al-Qaeda has to be lived with now. You cannot really do anything about that. So, the movement got steadily worse, because the issues became less and less important, and it became more and more provocation. The movement in the sense of people like Jerry Rubin, not so much Savio, really wanted the police on campus,

because that is the best way to radicalize people. What they wanted was a campus enclave to promote the revolution off campus, but hard-core, to flaunt it. So things went from one issue to another. There was the Vietnam Day Commencement, which was relatively restrained, because the faculty had a—that was what, '68—a large role in that. There was the Cleaver course crisis. Well, among the educational reforms voted through this period, students could create courses. So under the guidance of Harry Edwards, I think it was, the black sociologist, isn't that his name? The one who refused to pledge allegiance to the flag at the Mexico City Olympic Games. He invited Eldridge Cleaver to give a course on campus [laughs].

5-01:38:39

Engerman: On campus, yes.

5-01:38:40

Malia: Well, he does not have any academic credentials to speak of, he had written a book, of course. The regents objected to this, and then Chancellor Heyns had left. President Hitch said, "We cannot authorize this course." A big protest in the faculty, interference by the regents, political interference. So Ken Stamp and I were on the stand then. We took the line that you cannot have a successful Dreyfus Affair unless Dreyfus is innocent, and we were not innocent! We were authorizing a course that was not academically respectable. It was in violation of I do not know what university standards. So there was that, the big hullabaloo about that. Then there was the Third World Strike. You have run out? Wasn't here. By then I had retired from [the diamond?]. It was just too--

5-01:39:59

Engerman: Was there any specific event that led you to retire?

5-01:40:01

Malia: No, it was just that it was going on year after year. There was no solution. I tired of drafting memos and letters to the *Daily Cal* and going to meetings and so forth. This is when I got into intellectual history because first when Carl Schorske went into the chancellor's office, he turned over his intellectual history course to me. Then as a result of the Third World Strike, he left for Princeton, because they trashed his office, among other things.

5-01:40:33

Engerman: What was the issue in the Third World Strike from your point of view?

5-01:40:36

Malia: To get ethnic studies. It was Troy Duster and people like that. It was related to the Eldridge Cleaver course. It was to get a position, a department within the formal structures of the university: A department for the movement within the formal structure of the university. Well, by then they had turned violent. They were trashing things. Carl was immensely surprised when they did that to his office. Then there was the People's Park, which was again a violent affair. But now there was Reagan as governor and he was not going to fool around. They got the park, they are still residually there. By this time I was in as much intellectual history as in Russian history. Then came the invasion of Cambodia, and Kent State.

5-01:41:33

Engerman: So we are actually jumping ahead to '71?

5-01:41:36

Malia: Well, I was away during People's Park.

5-01:41:38

Engerman: You were back in France?

5-01:41:39

Malia: Yes.

5-01:41:40

Engerman: Well, you were in France during a particularly tumultuous time [there] as well.

5-01:41:45

Malia: Well, I was in France right after the Vietnam Day Committee here, I spent the vacation with Touraine and his family, and briefed Touraine on the two years at Berkeley, and he listened wide-eyed to this. The revolution is back! He had always wanted the revolution. Of course in '68, the next year it was, it must have been summer of '67, in '68 he was the Searle or the Zelnik of May '68 to the Mario Savio of Daniel Cohn-Bendit. He was the faculty guy, I would not say behind the thing, but beside Cohn-Bendit. So he had been to hear all about indirect input in May. Okay, then came Cambodia.

5-01:42:41

Engerman: So we are jumping ahead to '71?

5-01:42:43

Malia: I will finish the whole thing. This time, the fever broke the thermometer. Sheldon Wolin took to the Greek Theatre and said, "The university has failed. We must reconstitute the university. All classes must change and become relevant." In other words, all classes were to be devoted towards agitating against the war in Vietnam, turned into little agitprop institutions. They fanned out from the Greek Theatre, and the university was going to be reconstituted. In other words, closed down, and all classes turned into agitational units. Well, I was not going to bow to this. I was teaching the Russian Revolution. I was talking about 1917, so what I did was invite all of the history faculty to come to my class. It was Larry Levine, Charlie Sellers, Ken Stampp, not Reggie, oh, not Charlie Sellers. The respectable faculty were there. It would be harder to disrupt a class like that. I also had a guy who had served in the army who was a graduate student, who was in another department, sitting in the front row just in case they tackled me.

5-01:44:18

Engerman: Did you have any particular reason that you were a special target?

5-01:44:22

Malia: Of course I did.

5-01:44:23

Engerman: What was that?

5-01:44:24

Malia: Because I was a well-known reactionary. And then, they by now were trashing faculty offices. Everyone was so overwrought, you could never tell what would happen. Tom Barnes was sitting there with a walkie-talkie to the police, to the campus police.

5-01:44:47

Engerman: Now, why do you think that your class was a special target?

5-01:44:51

Malia: Because it was a big class, and they were going to close down all of the classes. No class should meet on campus. The idea was that if they should meet at all, it should be off campus. There was a mob in the back. It was in the famous room of the “Two Hundred,” and a mob at the back door with Reggie and Charlie Sellers trying to keep the mob out. The mob had come to close the place down. To keep the mob out--not to protect my academic freedom, but so as not to discredit their movement. So I gave my lecture. John Searle was closed down that day. They just invaded. He was giving a big course, and they closed it down, because he did not take any precautions. The arguments I gave were, well, they were elementary arguments and self-evident, that it is not necessary to be against the war in Vietnam to take this course. It is not a qualification. If you want to close down the—the activist students in the course wanted me not to give the lecture. They wanted me to stop the course and go off campus. I said, “No, I am going to give the course. It is my obligation as a professor, it is my obligation to the academic freedom of the students. If I close this down, I am depriving them of their academic freedom. It is not necessary to have certain political positions to be here,” and so on, endlessly, endlessly. That took up half the hour and a half that I had, and then I talked about how Lenin took over Russia in 1917 [laughs].

5-0With Reggie and Charlie Sellers in the back trying to keep the mob out. The two most satisfying moments for me in all of this were that performance, it was the only large class not shut down on campus that day, and the “open letter,” and the course on how to do civil disobedience right, organized by Pincus.5-0

5-01:47:05

Engerman: So those are your high points of the era.

5-01:47:08

Malia: Those are my high points.

5-01:47:09

Engerman: From '66 to '71.

5-01:47:12

Malia: Then as you know, the whole of the American university system collapsed in the spring of '71. Even my football-playing un-intellectual nephew took off from his college in protest against everything. All schools were shut down. Then, *mirable dictu*, the next year, nothing. The movement had died.

5-01:47:41

Engerman: Why was that?

5-01:47:42

Malia: No one knows.

5-01:47:44

Engerman: What do you think?

5-01:47:45

Malia: Student generations are short-lived. With new students, new times. I don't know. Also, the movement had achieved its ultimate aim. Its ultimate aim was to take over the university, to make all the courses political. That is not a viable formula. This is the real explanation. They had gone to the ultimate limits towards which they had been moving from the very beginning. This is true of all of those sixties movements. They all ended in things like Nihilism, the Weathermen, Bader-Meinhoff Gang, that sort of thing, in futility. The biggest of these movements, of course, was May '68.

5-01:48:42

Engerman: In Paris?

5-01:48:43

Malia: In Paris. But the same thing happened in '68 in Germany, in Italy. The goal of these movements was not something—they were playing at revolution. There could not be a revolution in these advanced industrial societies. The situation did not lend itself to that. The working class was not interested. No one was interested in real revolution. They could not make a revolution. All they could do was to take over the universities, and turn them into institutions for agitprop, but that is an utterly empty formula.

5-01:49:23

Engerman: Now, you say that they succeeded in this by 1971, and this may be one cause for the sort of diminution of--

5-01:49:28

Malia: This I think is the real cause.

5-01:49:30

Engerman: Except you are still teaching in the university, and your courses were not politicized in the way that you have--

5-01:49:35

Malia: No, no, they wanted all of them. All of the courses not to talk about history or political science or geography or English literature, but to talk about American fascism, American imperialism, racism, things like this, to beat the drums.

5-01:49:55

Engerman: Did all of the courses do that?

5-01:49:56

Malia: Most of them did.

5-01:49:58

Engerman: So you are suggesting that courses like yours were an exception?

5-01:50:01

Malia: I did not. I stayed on campus. I refused to go off campus. A lot of the courses, the professors, in order not to hurt the interests of their students, went off campus. Reggie pleaded for me to go off campus. I said, "No, I am going to stay here. This is academic

freedom. This is where my responsibility is.” So he prevailed on me to give a parallel course off campus. Of course they did not want to talk about history.

5-01:50:28

Engerman: They wanted to talk about revolution?

5-01:50:29

Malia: They did not want to do anything. They were sort of shell-shocked.

5-01:50:33

Engerman: So you did do a parallel course off campus as long as you could—

5-01:50:38

Malia: I met with them. Perhaps I should not have. But, the main course was here, and I made clear that the main course was going to be here. There is a little book you might want to look at. Paul Berman, *The Story of Two Utopias*. It is a good book. He wonders about “why this burnout?” No one has ever written up this story of the Berkeley campus.

5-01:51:11

Engerman: The story that has been told is the story that goes from 1964.

5-01:51:14

Malia: [Yes, that bliss was it him that had gone to be alive.] That sort of thing. Did you look at that book that Zelnik has made [on the FSM]?

5-01:51:23

Engerman: I have looked at it. What did you think of it?

5-01:51:24

Malia: Agitography. It is utterly without interest. They stopped in December '68 as if they had arrived at something.

5-01:51:39

Engerman: So what did they miss by stopping?

5-01:51:41

Malia: They missed the truth, the reality. That the movement eventually became a movement for its own sake, for the sake of having the movement, of pursuing the utopia of revolutionizing America through revolutionizing the universities, and that is an impossible agenda, so you had the burnout. They don't want to see it. They will be eternally in denial. It is no more use arguing with them now than it was when we had Bayard Rustin and Irving Howe here to convert them. This is what John Searle thinks now too. Carl, no. Carl still hopes that someday, maybe there will be something.

[End of Session]

[Interview #6: December, 22, 2003]
 [Begin Audio File Malia: 06 12-22-03]

6-00:00:01

Engerman: Start them right here.

6-00:00:03

Malia: Now we have finished with the FSM, right?

6-00:00:05

Engerman: We are just about done. It is Monday the twenty-second. This is our sixth session with Martin Malia. We left more or less finished with the sixties, although you said on your way out that there was a little more that you wanted to talk about. And, I had one question for you after that. So why don't we—

6-00:00:23

Malia: Well, on further reflection, the idea I had advanced at the end of the session last time is I think the correct one. The movement ended after the reconstitution, which may have been '72 rather than '71. "The movement" first became an end in itself. Its original objective had been to revolutionize external society. That failed completely.

6-00:01:03

Engerman: By what year?

6-00:01:05

Malia: By '68 it failed completely. In turn it became directed towards the university itself to create an ever-greater space for revolutionary activity. Things like the Third World Strike, the ethnic studies program, the Cleaver course, things like that. The movement was directed inward, and with reconstitution, they at last achieved their objectives turning all educational activity, all the classes and activity over to political agitation. Agitation about what? To accomplish what? You could not sustain that beyond a couple of weeks, and this is what happened in the spring of '71 or '72. It ended. Then the off-campus spin-off of this, the violent things like the Weathermen and so forth, which were just violence for the sake of violence. How to explain this? Explanation number one is that the real issues—civil rights, Vietnam War, and so forth—that is what created the sixties. But the same thing happened in Europe where there was no civil rights struggle, no Vietnam. In Germany it started because of the visit of the Shah of Iran to Berlin. In Paris, because the Ministry of Education closed a swimming pool at Nanterre. Only in France did this have any impact in the off-campus society, because there it touched off a nationwide industrial strike and a great big pay increase, and almost overthrew the Gaullist Regime. Then things in France and throughout Europe settled down for what was known as "Creeping May," throughout the 1970s. Okay, so it is not the real issues. Another explanation that we have heard, and was acted upon, was that we were doing a bad job of educating them. Our education was not relevant. There was not enough *community*. Things were too hierarchical. Students were just asked to regurgitate, [magister, corfos?]. Therefore community should be created and we should have a participatory university. This led to the Muscatine Report. Do you know what that is?

6-00:04:00

Engerman: Tell us about that.

6-00:04:01

Malia: It was how to make our education more relevant and more participatory. Such things as taking courses pass or fail, letting students set up their own courses. As Carl Schorske said, "They pose the questions, we give the method." But you can't run a class on that basis. He never ran a class on that basis. All sorts of gimmicks to have more participatory courses. This of course led to things like the Cleaver course. Oh, and student grading of instructors, writing comments on instructors. Do they have that at Brandeis now?

6-00:04:49

Engerman: Very much so.

6-00:04:49

Malia: They have that here. It does not really make much of a difference in the way things work. So, the Muscatine Report dribbled off into nothing much, and the university did not become more participatory or more relevant, and the students don't care about this anymore. So those were the main explanations that were given at the time. I think they are erroneous. I do not have an explanation of my own, but I do know that the phenomenon of the sixties was related to the extraordinary expansion of higher education throughout the globe. I used to know the figures, but I do not know any of them anymore.

6-00:05:35

Engerman: Places like Berkeley were in some sense on the forefront of that.

6-00:05:41

Malia: Clark Kerr's multiversity is the great forerunner of this. The same thing happened everywhere. The country that has had the least trouble was England, and that is where they expanded their university system the least [laughs]. So, it is related to that. Touraine wrote a bad book.

6-00:06:05

Engerman: *The American University System?*

6-00:06:08

Malia: No, no, to explain May, in which he was one of the participants. The model, it was a revision of Marxism. He had in his head the erroneous notion that 1848 was the breakthrough of the proletariat into world history, the way that 1789 had been the breakthrough of the bourgeoisie into world history, and that May of '68 was the breakthrough of the new exploited class, the workers of the knowledge industry, that is the universities. This was a line that we heard from Savio and company around here.

6-00:06:42

Engerman: But in this sense, it is a revision of the line that Kerr would himself use in describing the knowledge industry. The irony is that the critics did not invent the term.

6-00:06:55

Malia: If Kerr invented that, I did not know that. But it still does not work. This is not the new proletariat.

6-00:07:03

Engerman: So it did not work for Kerr and it did not work for Savio?

6-00:07:05

Malia: It did not work for Savio, and Touraine's theory does not work either. Marcuse came forth with a variant of this. So all I know is that it is related to this phenomenal expansion of higher education, but nowhere, except in the French case, did this lead to any change in the outside society. It all remained within the university, and it still removed—the deeper causes for this explosion, I do not know, and I have not seen any convincing explanation. But there was a major cultural shift in the sixties. It was the revolution in the sense that everything was politicized. Every Academic Senate meeting was a political meeting. When there was a crisis, there would be huge crowds of people there, "What do we do about the crisis?" When there was not a crisis, the radical minority would try to put through, and often succeeded in putting through some reform or some resolution or something or the other. And then the anti-radical minority, to which I belonged, would learn how to stymie that. For instance, when Howard Schachman finally got to be chairman of the policy committee, he stacked it entirely with his partisans.

6-00:08:41

Engerman: Now, you were a member of the policy committee?

6-00:08:43

Malia: At different times. It had different memberships each year. I was in the first policy committee. So this was later on. Somehow Schachman got a hold of it, so at the first meeting when the new policy committee was there, Ken Stamp, Reinhard Bendix, myself, Joe Tussman and some others, we arrived au mass, so to speak, and overthrew the Schachtmanite policy committee. So, everything was politicized, which is the way things are in a revolution. The least little incidents become a political matter. In the course of Berkeley, it was whether or not we can preserve the conquest of December 8th, and the degree of faculty and student participation that the golden revolution had not changed. After '71 or '72, whichever it was, all of this went away. Oh, the politicization of the Academic Senate was solved by creating a representative assembly, so that minorities could not take over a slightly attended meeting and put through whatever it was that they had in mind.

6-00:10:15

Engerman: Now, you are talking right here about this is a revolution. What is striking to me in our conversation yesterday was a number of analogies you would use to revolutions in history. First of all the Trotskyists and Social Democrats involved, Crane Brinton's notion of a fever, the Dreyfus Affair, Jacobins, Mensheviks, Bolsheviks, 1917, I probably missed some too.

6-00:10:41

Malia: Yes.

6-00:10:42

Engerman: And today you are saying that it is a revolution like those other revolutions.

6-00:10:45

Malia: But it was not in the real world. It was in this special world which was the academic cloister.

6-00:10:53

Engerman: But do you understand it then? Is the goal to understand it in the same way that you understand these other revolutions, 1917, 1789?

6-00:11:02

Malia: No, it enabled me to understand the revolutions of the past that had occurred in the real world, yes. Because the psychological mechanisms were the same. The politicization, the universal politicization, everything becomes a matter of, “Are you for or are you against the revolution? Are you still with it, or have you betrayed?” That, you get in all the revolutions of the real world. Only in that sense is it like a revolution.

6-00:11:34

Engerman: Are there insights you took from being part of one revolution, being present at one revolution that has helped you to understand other revolutions? You had already been interested in writing, if I am not mistaken, about comparative revolutions, before this.

6-00:11:51

Malia: Well, I was interested in writing. I had already given, no, I had not given my—I gave the comparative revolutions course twice in France. Once at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes. That is the one that Furet attended. Then once, I believe in '77, at the College du France. What year was I at the College du France?

6-00:12:18

Engerman: Let's see, '79 and '81.

6-00:12:20

Malia: Okay, it was '79. '79, then.

6-00:12:25

Engerman: But had you been interested in comparative revolutions before the events of the sixties?

6-00:12:29

Malia: All my life. That is why Russian history has dominated my career, the revolutionary movement and the revolution.

6-00:12:38

Engerman: But what did you learn from participating? I should not say participating, from observing up close a revolution that helped you?

6-00:12:45

Malia: The phenomenon of universal politicization. Everything becomes, potentially at least, political; that there is a fever; once again, the power of ideology. Because, what was the struggle? They initially wanted to mount actions on campus in order to go down and stage a sit-in at the Oakland Tribune against Senator [William F.] Knowland. That was the initial thing. Then they wanted to march into Oakland for the Vietnam Day affair. What was the point I was trying to make here?

6-00:13:41

Engerman: You said that everything is about ideology.

6-00:13:45

Malia: Okay, they had a very limited practical program. They could not stop the war in Vietnam themselves, they could not put Senator Knowland and the Oakland Tribune out of business, so they were sustained by an ideological quest for a revolutionary transformation of society. In other words, they were ideologically driven. They were not driven by practical causes. I am not making this very clear.

6-00:14:26

Engerman: Well, I am a little confused because you said at the beginning, yesterday and today again you said the revolution or the events of the sixties began as a response to two important issues, civil rights and Vietnam. You were active in sort of—

6-00:14:47

Malia: Well, it started with civil rights, and then Vietnam came the following year.

6-00:14:50

Engerman: Yes, which are both real-world issues and responsible for significant injustice. I am trying to keep it in relatively neutral terms, but we can still say that. So, in this sense, advocacy for civil rights is a good thing. Advocacy at some times against the Vietnam War is a good thing. You yourself were participating in some kinds of anti-war activities. It seems that that is not only about ideology, that there are issues.

6-00:15:28

Malia: No, but very quickly, and I am not expressing this well, very quickly, the means to do something about civil rights and about the war in Vietnam became the end. The end became preserving the enclave, the university enclave, from which you could mount actions. Mounting actions was the main thing. This was sustained by an ideological faith in that we are going to someday make “the revolution.” Revolution was defined in somewhat mystical terms as a total transformation of the human condition. It is in that sense that they were ideological. This applies to Rudi Dutschke, it applies to Daniel Cohn-Bendit, it applies to Touraine, and to all these other cases. The idea that logical commitment, that expectation explains the fever.

6-00:16:39

Engerman: I guess my last question about the sixties may be a segue out of the period. So if there are other things you want to talk about, this is a good chance to bring them up. But one of the things that struck me in the middle of your conversation yesterday about sort of proceeding through the sixties, I think around '68, you said, “Well, then I took over the intellectual history course.” On the one hand, this is for obvious reasons when Carl Schorske leaves, right?

6-00:17:11

Malia: Yes.

6-00:17:11

Engerman: So you were taking over European intellectual history?

6-00:17:14

Malia: Well, half of it. Marty Jay did the twentieth century, and I did the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries down through Nietzsche.

6-00:17:22

Engerman: Yes. But it also made me wonder in what ways the events of the sixties, from say '64 to '71, I already asked how they affected your intellectual development, how did they affect your sense of being at Berkeley, your professional commitments, et cetera?

6-00:17:44

Malia: As regards to professional commitments, remember after the Herzen, I was trying to write a book on the Russian intelligentsia. That was interrupted by the revolution. The revolution took up two years. The FSM year, the Vietnam Day Committee year, down to 1966. By then, I had written some stuff for the Russian intelligentsia book, but not a great deal. When I inherited the intellectual history course, then I had to teach myself intellectual history. I had to do a great deal of reading for that. I did not spend all of my time, obviously, on trying to hold back the revolution. I spent most of my time writing, reading, and writing for the intellectual history course. Oh, the Herzen book makes it clear, because you can't talk about Russia without talking about the rest of Europe.

6-00:18:52

Engerman: This is an insight that reinforced an insight from Karpovich himself.

6-00:18:57

Malia: Yes. So I instructed myself in general European history, and intellectual history, which is where I spent most of the seventies, and indeed a good part of the early eighties on. But I did not put any of it in written form because I can only do one thing at a time, and during the school year, there was not time to write it up, and then I took lengthy vacations in the summer. So I did not do any writing on that, but a lot of it comes out in *Russia Under Western Eyes*. It is a book about Europe, it is not about Russia. And, the central figure, the central country in it is Germany, which is the most interesting nineteenth, early twentieth century country anyway. So I was learning all of that, and I was not doing much with Russia, because I could not go there. Nothing was going on there. It was a graveyard for the Brezhnev years. It looked hopeless; there was no way of changing it, and there was no way of getting rid of it. It was not very interesting. So, I re-made myself, if you want, as a general Europeanist and as an intellectual historian capable of working comparatively, and this added to the influence of the *Annales* school, which as I said earlier, has as its subject Europe from the year 1000 to the nineteenth century. It furnishes the background for the book that I am working on now.

6-00:20:49

Engerman: Now another thing that is striking in here is through the sixties when you fill out these bio-bibliographies, those annual reports, you are quite active in university and extra-university issues. You sit on the policy committee, you are chair of an organization called Radic-Cal.

6-00:21:06

Malia: What?

6-00:21:08

Engerman: Radic-Cal, I think it was called. Obviously, I cannot ask you much about that.

6-00:21:16

Malia: *The Daily Cal*.

- 6-00:21:19
Engerman: You were active also in *The Daily Cal*, '67-'68.
- 6-00:21:21
Malia: Budd Cheit asked me to be on the board of that.
- 6-00:21:22
Engerman: Then after 1968, that stops. You were involved, as this shows, in almost no university politics again.
- 6-00:21:33
Malia: Yes. As I said, it was hopeless, so I was—
- 6-00:21:41
Engerman: Another question related to this, putting this back in the context of your career, were you still visiting France a lot in this time?
- 6-00:21:49
Malia: Yes.
- 6-00:21:50
Engerman: Were you kind of following the revolution in both places as it were?
- 6-00:21:52
Malia: Yes!
- 6-00:21:57
Engerman: And how did that aspect of observing comparative revolutions fare?
- 6-00:22:01
Malia: As I said, after May '68, and it existed everywhere, there was this creeping May. The seventies were the decade of Euro-Communism. Communism was going to become less revolutionary, and was going to try to enter into popular fronts. In Italy you had the *Apertura a Sinistra*, the opening to the left [Socialist political strategy in 1962]. In Chile you had the [Salvador] Allende Popular Unity Movement, which was a popular front, it was Socialist, Communist, and then what the French called Gauchistes [spells], which means, Lenin would have called them infantile Leftists. The SDS [Students for a Democratic Society] is Gauchiste in sentiment.
- 6-00:22:50
Engerman: How so?
- 6-00:22:58
Malia: It means that revolutionism beyond communism. Communism is ossified. It is bureaucratic, it is Stalinist. "The Stalinist pigs" is what we called them in France. What Cohn-Bendit would call them. He wanted to have a New Left, if you want. It is a New Left. It is Gauchistes. But Gauchistes implies a certain fuzziness, an anarcho-syndicalist mentality. Okay, so the big deal in France was the union of the Left, Communists and Socialists. Remember, the Socialists had supported the Algerian War, they had supported De Gaulle's efforts to end the war by negotiations. They had sold out. They were compromised. So it was an effort to disband the old SFIO [French Socialist Party], and create a new Socialist party. This was started by ideological Socialists, and I will

not go into the details. François Mitterand, who had never been a Socialist in his whole life before, he took it over, because he wanted to be president. So the new Socialist party is Mitterand's party. Remember, this was shortly after May '68, and shortly after the Chilean thing did not work. It was ended in '73. He wanted to have a popular unity in France, or a popular front, because that was the only way the Left could come to power. So long as the Left was divided between Communists and Socialists, it could never come to power, and the Gaullists as the Right would be there forever. The Socialists were the weaker of the two parties, so it was dangerous. But remember, this is the Euro-Communism decade, and also the decade of the violent after-phase of the May explosions everywhere.

6-00:25:14

Engerman: Especially in Germany and Italy.

6-00:25:15

Malia: Especially in Germany and Italy.

6-00:25:17

Engerman: France did not have quite the same—

6-00:25:18

Malia: France did not have as much. So Mitterand came up with the “common program,” which was negotiated in 1972, with George Marchez. It was a really dangerous program. “We are going to nationalize a whole bunch of things, have it planned.” And they were really going to make, I am quoting, “the transition from capitalism to socialism.” And Mitterand really believed that could be done. Well, to abbreviate things, the first effort to have a new popular front failed. The demands of the Communists were too high. I forget what year it was. It was '75, '76, '77, around there. Mitterand got scared and broke off the negotiations. Then the balance of forces between Communists and Socialists changed to be more favorable to the Socialists. So a new agreement was—no, Mitterand lost the first, it must have been '74 or '75, lost the first—subtract seven years from '81 and what do you get?

6-00:27:00

Engerman: That is '74.

6-00:27:02

Malia: '74. Okay, the first common program was '72, with an aim to get Mitterand elected president in '74 as representative of the two parties. As Marchez put it, not a candidat commun [common candidate], but a candidat unique [sole candidate]. It was not a common candidate, but a single candidate. It was much the candidate of the Communists as of the Socialists. That did not work. Mitterand got scared and backed off from the common program. So [Valéry] Giscard d'Estaing got elected president. Then they try again for the elections of 1981. This time they got a more moderate, but still quite radical common program. I was there during that election in '81. The Socialist Party and the Communist Party both, the slogan was “change life,” “change la vie.” We must change society, “change la société,” [change society] is not enough. We must “change du société” [change of societies]. We must change societies, have a new society. So the election campaign was fought on the issue of the transition from capitalism to socialism. Remember, in the background there had been May '68, an enormous explosion of the Left, and in the background there had been the violence in

Germany and Italy, especially in Italy, and the failure of the popular unity of Allende in Chile. As Annie Kriegel put it, popular fronts are not coalitions, as my more optimistic French Socialist friends kept alleging. They are intrinsically unstable arrangements. They cannot be coalition governments. They can end only one of two ways. Either the Communists using the Salami tactic eventually take over--

6-00:29:46

Engerman: The Salami tactic?

6-00:29:48

Malia: Yes, that was [Matyas] Rakosi, in Hungary. Remember all the popular democracies were originally popular fronts.

6-00:29:54

Engerman: Talk about the Salami tactic. What was the Salami tactic specifically?

6-00:29:58

Malia: Well, you have a coalition government of Socialists and Communists. The Communists get the interior ministry and the defense ministry, and they slice off bits of the Socialist and democratic parties, and then eventually they have the whole enchilada to use a--

6-00:30:21

Engerman: A mixed culinary metaphor.

6-00:30:21

Malia: A mixed culinary metaphor. And eventually the Socialist parties absorbed into a unitary people's workers party. That is what you had in East Germany. That is what you had in Poland, what you had in—they were not in Communist parties. They were Communist parties, of course, but they were called unified worker's parties, something of that sort.

6-00:30:50

Engerman: In Germany it was SED [East German Socialist Unity Party, Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands].

6-00:30:53

Malia: SED, Sozialistische Einheits--

6-00:30:57

Engerman: Einheitspartei.

6-00:30:57

Malia: Einheitspartei, yes. So they can end in one of two ways, that way. And that is where Allende was heading. They did not know it until late, but that is where he was heading. Or they could end the way the French Popular Front of '36 ended, the Socialists could break off. Or the way the post-war popular front ended, the Socialists and the Christian Democrats kick out the Communists, and you just have a normal sort of Social-Democratic kind of regime. So, it was dangerous, and what people like Furet and Annie Kriegel were afraid of was that once the popular front won, the Gauchiste, and a part of the workers would behave the way the French workers did in June '36, sit-down strikes, great pressure for a really radical economic program, and this would disorganize the national economy and the national political system. Mitterand knew all of this history. He knew what happened to Allende, and he knew what happened to the popular fronts

of Eastern Europe. His gamble was to neutralize the Communists by taking them into the government, and eventually absorbing a good part of their clientele. Well, his gamble paid off politically. But, in order to have the gamble, he had to make enormous economic concessions that came near to leading to economic disaster. His program was demand-side economics. You stimulate the economy by increasing demand, that is, increasing wages, you nationalize a whole bunch of key industries, you go for some measure of workers' participation in management, a big tax on large fortunes. And this leads to capital flight. It leads to inflation. Eventually it leads to scarcities. This is essentially what happened in Chile. In Chile it was not the Communists that were driving the popular unity forward. It was the Gauchistes. Chile had an enormous Gauchistes element, and they were occupying factories, and sitting in, things like that. And the economy was being radically disorganized as a result of this. So, in June '81, Mitterand won, and the atmosphere, he won the presidency, and he just took four Communists into the government. He would have to take in far more if he had won in '74.

6-00:34:31

Engerman: In June '81, is that when you were in the College de France?

6-00:34:34

Malia: I am in the College de France. I was lecturing on something else. I forget what I was lecturing on. Oh, I was lecturing on Russia and the West, an advanced version of *Russia Under Western Eyes*. Well, the atmosphere in Paris and the circles I frequented was jubilant afterwards. We are at last going to make the transition from capitalism to socialism. I mean, Mitterand, who had very limited knowledge of economics, really thought that meant something. There was an enormous jubilation on the left among my friends, well, my left-wing friends. I agreed with people like Furet and Annie Kriegel, and Raymond Aron, that this was extremely dangerous, and could not last. So, this was the time when Solidarity was going on. It started in August of 1980. Oh, there's one little thing that I should have mentioned earlier; on a previous visit to Paris, I participated in a radio talk show run by Le Goff, called "Lundis de l'Histoire." A Monday talk about history. He had invited, he had put together a panel to talk about student movements. He had invited Raymond Aron, who wrote a book against the student movement, against May '68. He invited Edgar Moran, this former Communist who was now just a plain leftist, a Socialist, but who had approved of May '68 the way Touraine had, and me, as someone who knew about the American one. Moran, predictably, this is the kind of atmosphere that you had--

6-00:36:41

Engerman: What year are we talking about?

6-00:36:44

Malia: This must have been '69 or '70, right after May '68.

6-00:36:53

Engerman: Sorry, go on.

6-00:36:55

Malia: And Moran predictably said that the '68 movement was universal, the U.S., Germany, France, and Czechoslovakia. Of course, Raymond Aron went up in smoke. He said, those people were fighting a real fight about something real, for real liberation, whereas

this thing in the West, or as he called it, “La Révolution Introuvable,” an untranslatable word, unfindable, introuvable. In 1815, King Louis the Eighteenth had the first elections to the Chamber of Deputies. The Bourbons had granted them when they were restored. The people who won were ultras. That is, the ultra-royalists. And the king was slightly more moderate. The assembly said this was a chambre introuvable [elusive chamber]. I mean, it is so far-out, you could not expect it to exist. Aron’s book was called the *Révolution Introuvable*, in other words, a fantastic and unreal revolution. And there was something unreal about this. Especially in Europe, because there was no war and no Soviets. It was revolution for the sake of revolution. Revolution as an end in its self. And Aron got furious with Moran for equating this real liberation struggle in Prague with this phony one in the West. Of course I agreed with Aron, and Le Goff was very diplomatic. He tried to keep peace, but it was difficult that day. Okay, this is the attitude of responsible people who were supporting Mitterand: “We must change life for the sake of changing life. Therefore we will take the risk.” So I found this triumph of unreason in Paris.

6-00:39:25

Engerman: Take the risk of consorting with Communists?

6-00:39:27

Malia: Take the risk of consorting with the Communists on the grounds that they are just a party like the others. They are not a party like the others. Any Communist party is a conspiracy. They are not a party. But they were then a weakened conspiracy in France. But we did not know that until Mitterand won his gamble. So I went to Poland.

6-00:39:52

Engerman: Was this your first time in Poland since ’62?

6-00:39:54

Malia: Yes, but I have to finish with France before that. Of course, the following March, this took place in June, the following March--

6-00:40:03

Engerman: March of ’82.

6-00:40:06

Malia: ’82, the economic situation, if Mitterand continued with this transition to socialism, he would have had to close the frontiers and shut France off from the common market and all the rest because the economy was collapsing. He would have had to use political means to keep the economy afloat. And his finance minister, a very responsible person, Jacques Delors, he had made the gamble, consciously as a gamble, he later became head of the European Union, Delors [spells], he was a very nice man. He had to threaten to resign, and he was the only one that would keep the business community from revolting against Mitterand. He had to threaten to resign. Mitterand never understood what was involved. And, by the time Mitterand got through, the whole transition program had been liquidated, and the Socialists started denationalizing in Mitterand’s next term, and by the time you get to [Lionel] Jospin, the whole thing is liquidated.

6-00:41:22

Engerman: So this is through the eighties that you are taking us?

6-00:41:24

Malia: Yes, well Jospin was there in the nineties. So this is Europe's last fling at a popular front. It occurred in the eighties. That is not too long before the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. So this was Europe's last fling at a popular front. But it was a big fling. 1981 and 1982 were scary years. People like Touraine, he had an article in *Le Monde* then entitled "Aperture," after all it is the unity of the Left, we have to hope for it even though it is risky. "Aperture" was the operative word, because you cannot be an honest man and oppose the unity of the Left. So it was a mixture—we had been out of power for twenty-five years, the side of the Left, therefore we have to do it to get back in power. That was a part of the people involved in this. Another part wanted really to make the transition from capitalism to socialism. Okay, so this is the last fling at a popular front. So I went to Poland.

6-00:42:49

Engerman: How is that you came to return to Poland at this time?

6-00:42:54

Malia: I just went down to a travel agency and bought a ticket.

6-00:42:56

Engerman: But why?

6-00:42:58

Malia: I wanted to go—I found the atmosphere in Paris insufferable, the people around me rejoicing in what I felt was a very dangerous and risky enterprise, and Mitterand carrying his rose up to the Pantheon, putting it on I forget whose grave, and so forth. So I went to Poland.

6-00:43:22

Engerman: This is summer '81?

6-00:43:26

Malia: Summer in '81.

6-00:43:29

Engerman: So the Solidarity movement has been going very strong.

6-00:43:32

Malia: Going on for a while, for almost a year.

6-00:43:33

Engerman: But starting to run into some trouble.

6-00:43:36

Malia: It had always been in trouble, but it was running into--

6-00:43:39

Engerman: Deeper and deeper trouble.

6-00:43:40

Malia: No, no, in the summer of '81, it looked like it might stand a chance of digging in. There, of course, I discovered my friend [Bronislaw] Geremek, who was now one of the leaders of Solidarity. I saw Adam Michnik again. I had met him earlier in Paris when he

and a young guy named Niteemski, Yevinski, I forget which it was, Letinski. Jan, Jan Letinski, who was a member of KOR [Polish Worker's Defense Committee]. I forget what the letters stand for. It grew out of the Warsaw and Radom strikes of 1970. I wrote all of this up at one point, but I do not know the dates. They were a coordinating committee of intellectuals to help workers. Michnik was back in business. I knew Geremek. I knew a few other people. This was when I met Elbieta Kaczyska, who has an article. I stayed at her house. She has an article in that *Festschrift*. Roman Zieman, a Polish ex-Communist who would talk in Paris at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes. I had met him in Paris. So I knew a fair number of Poles when I went there.

6-00:45:15

Engerman: Were your academic friends still there, [Andrzej] Walicki, [Leszek] Kolakowski?

6-00:45:19

Malia: No, Kolakowski had had to leave. He was then alternating between the Committee on Social Thought in Chicago, and also some school or someplace else.

6-00:45:36

Engerman: And Walicki had come already to Notre Dame?

6-00:45:38

Malia: No, Walicki was there, but he was not in Warsaw. I thought he would welcome us. He was vacationing up at the Mazurian Lakes. So I rented a car and went to visit him at the Mazurian Lakes, and he was against Solidarity, because they were upsetting the apple cart. He turned out to be utopian in his way. He thought that you could have a gradual transformation of the party into a constitutional body. He was very upset that [Edward] Gierek had been fired as secretary general of the party, without due process. He had just been fired.

6-00:46:28

Engerman: Yes, so Walicki was worried about the procedural grounds?

6-00:46:33

Malia: Yes, the rule of law would not come out of a reformed communism. Walicki wound up very unpopular among the Warsaw intelligentsia. He refused to use the T-word.

6-00:46:47

Engerman: Totalitarian?

6-00:46:48

Malia: Yes, because that was propaganda of Solidarity intellectuals. In order to have a proper foe, you had to be fighting totalitarianism. He wanted a gradual, British-style transition from communism to constitutional government through the party, which was completely to my mind a utopian notion. So I stayed a couple of days with Walicki up in the Mazurian Lakes. It was nice to see the sights there. Then I immediately drove back to Warsaw and more congenial conditions, and consorted with my Solidarity friends, and made a whole bunch of new friends. A guy named Jakob Karpinski. It is the *Respublika* crowd. The chief figure there is someone named Martin Krol [spells], which means king, in Polish.

6-00:47:54

Engerman: Did you learn Polish at this time?

6-00:47:57

Malia: I learned enough to get around. It is similar enough to—I have forgotten it all. It is similar enough to Russian so it is easy to get a hold on it.

6-00:48:06

Engerman: Just don't tell the Poles that.

6-00:48:10

Malia: And I could more or less understand the television, and I could go to Solidarity meetings, and more or less understand the debate. Then the country was just full of people, well the intellectual class, who spoke French. Now it is English, but then, this was back in the eighties, it was French. Almost all of the people—Geremek spoke perfect French. He wrote a couple of books in French and so forth. With Michnik, he would speak a kind of pidgin-French, and I would answer in Russian, because he understood Russian better than he understood French. But Karol Modzelewski, who was important, he was very far to the Left—most of these people were former Communists too.

6-00:49:05

Engerman: Although in the Polish context, being a former communist means something different than in the French context, no?

6-00:49:10

Malia: Yes, because they were in the party that was in power. But Karol Modzelewski and another Medievalist, and a terrific orator, I had heard him a number of times, and who else? Elbieta Kaczyska, Roman Zieman introduced me to a lot of these people. Zieman had at one point been the head of the Communist Youth Movement in Poland, and had been expelled from the Party. Oh, what is his name? I cannot remember what his name was. Then, the people in Krakow, the people who worked for the Catholic monthly *Znac*. There were two, no, Krakow is *Zneitch*, the link. In Warsaw, it was *Znac*, the society of Catholic intellectuals. Rosnekowski, the father and son, a Krakow intellectual named Gelski, who was big on [Friedrich] von Hayek. The opposition in Poland was very pro-Hayek, because they were anti-plan. So the *Zneitch* people in Krakow were the Rosnekovskis, the father and the son; Gonczarowski, the director of the university, who had been a friend of Bill Slottman, who I had met here at Berkeley; Tudorowicz, an elderly patriarchal kind of Catholic intellectual, who had great moral authority in Poland: Father [Joseph] Tischner, who was kind of the chaplain of Solidarity, and a friend of John Paul the Second, who was the chaplain at, well, he was attached to Krakow University; Kwachowski, at the University of Lublin where I also visited. It was the Catholic University of Lublin. He was a noted church historian, his two sons, one of them--they were called Peter and Paul. The one I knew best was Paul, who was an assistant professor of English at Krakow University. He spoke perfect English. He was writing on, who was it? I don't know, interesting subjects.

6-00:52:25

The foreign journalist, there was a guy, the correspondent of *Le Monde*, Bernard Guetta, who wrote wonderful dispatches from Warsaw. He was very gung-ho for—he was a semi-Gauchiste. You could construe Solidarity as a Gauchistes sort of thing. So I had a great time in Warsaw throughout the summer. I spent July, August, into September, just observing Solidarity. Oh, I drove to Gdansk with a rented car, because Solidarity was run by a committee of intellectuals, in which Geremek was member, Modzelewski was

a member. A guy named Timovski was a member. Modzelewski, the first non-Communist prime minister in '89. It was the Warsaw intelligentsia, some people from Krakow, all intellectuals, who were the advisory committee. No, it was not all intellectuals. [Lech] Walesa, whom I met, was the president of this. It was called the coordinating committee. Maybe the advisory committee. I don't know. There were workers. [Andrzej] Gwiazda, which means star. If you have ever read a history of Solidarity, you might recognize the name Gwiazda. What was the name? The radical's name, he was from Wodgush. He got beaten up at one point. I should have checked these names before our meeting today. Michnik was not a member of this coordinating committee because these people like Geremek and Modzelewski, [Jaek Kuro]. He later ran for president, and did not win, Kuro. He drank incredible quantities of whisky.

6-00:54:53

Engerman: Not a very Polish drink.

6-00:54:57

Malia: He was something of a character himself. These were responsible people who did not want these young people like Michnik and Letinski to be in the coordinating council. The slogan was that this was a self-limiting revolution. That was Kuro's expression, a self-limiting revolution. We cannot overthrow the regime, but we can stake out a space for civil society parallel to the regime, and if we keep up the pressure long enough, we can get a situation where the party will be like the Queen of England, reigning but not ruling. So I went to Gdansk, and sat in the corridors while the coordinating committee deliberated. Eventually they would come out and there would be some news. Geremek introduced me to Walesa, and I met large numbers of the people. I became quite close to Modzelewski. He was extremely impressive, and to his mother in Warsaw, who spoke fluent Russian because she had lived for a long time in Russia. She was an ex-Communist also. So it was wonderful. I educated myself about the history of Solidarity, I learned more about the history of Poland. I visited some sights in Poland, and I had a very good summer. What was his name? He later became defense minister of Poland. The person who ran the foreign bureau of Solidarity in Warsaw was a woman named Yarushevka. She was a niece, I believe, of Marshall Pilsudski, who had spent years in England and spoke perfect English. She later married this guy who also spoke excellent English. He was a mathematician. I forget his name. I knew him quite well at that point. He later was defense minister in the first Solidarity government. Okay, so then I came back to France, and the situation there had yet reached a crisis situation. By then I was completely hooked on Solidarity. They were going to have in the fall, their first national convention.

6-00:57:56

Engerman: Fall '81?

6-00:57:57

Malia: Fall '81, shortly after the party had its reform congress. So the official position was that there would be a diarchy between Solidarity and the party. The party was going to liberalize itself somewhat, and Solidarity was going to organize itself. See initially, when the strike started in Gdansk in August--

6-00:58:29

Engerman: August 1980?

6-00:58:32

Malia: August 1980, the rest of Poland did not know what was happening. Somehow they got word to other places, and soon there were strikes in Szczecin and Pozna and elsewhere. Also in the summer they were building their *pomniki*, these monuments. There is one in Gdansk, there is one in Pozna, there is one Gdynia. These were sacred shrines.

6-00:58:58

Engerman: What were they commemorating?

6-00:59:00

Malia: The victims.

6-00:59:01

Engerman: Of?

6-00:59:02

Malia: The victims of 1956 in Pozna, when the workers rioted, were shot down, and the victims of 1970 in Gdansk and Gdynia, who had strikes in 1970. That was Walesa's baptism of fire. That is when he vowed that he would work to overthrow the system if ever he could. So these were the martyrs, these were the sacred martyrs. I went to a play in Gdansk when they read from the transcript from the trial of the people in Pozna, the trial of the people in Gdansk and Gdynia. It was a tremendously moving occasion. I had a Skorsovski, an elderly gentleman who was the relative by marriage of Le Goff, who I spent a fair amount of time with. He translated in my ear this play that I listened to. It was a religious atmosphere.

Before we come to congress, the Solidarity conference, on August 15, I went on the pilgrimage to Czestochowa, which is as you know the national shrine of Poland, the Magdeburg Czestochowa is the Queen of Poland. It is a pilgrimage on foot from Warsaw to Czestochowa. It is a fair walk. I went by car, of course. I drove. But when I arrived at the pilgrimage entrance in the city of Czestochowa, there was an enormous, it was the biggest pilgrimage that they had ever had. Well, all throughout the Communist years, it was a focus of unspoken resistance. Remember this took place the year after John Paul II became the Pope. So the pilgrimage was a focus of Polish national religious resistance to communism. Well, the entry was an enormous procession into Czestochowa, going up to the monastery on a Jasna Góra, as you call them, a bright hill. Jasna Góra was immensely impressive. They were carrying palm fronds. Is that the name for it? They looked like the entry of Christ into Jerusalem. It was staged to look like that. They were singing hymns, very catchy hymns, some of which I knew at the time, all of these people looking tired and dirty and dusty and so forth after a four or five-day march, coming into Czestochowa, and then spreading out into this enormous field in front of Jasna Góra, the monastery which is a fortified monastery, and then various dignitaries addressing the crowd, it was after all a religious pilgrimage, addressing the crowd below. And then filing in to see the church, it was an enormous mass of people. This was immensely impressive. So I came back to Paris, and I knew that the fall in Poland was going to be interesting. So I took--

6-01:02:55

Engerman: You had no obligations back at Berkeley?

6-01:02:58

Malia: I was on leave, and I forget just what my status was. Oh, I had been teaching. This is '81. I had been teaching at the College de France, and I think I had a Rockefeller grant that year to write on comparative revolutions, but of course I did not do anything except observe them.

6-01:03:26

Engerman: This says that your Rockefeller Fellowship was '80-'81, though, and we are now in the academic year '81-'82.

6-01:03:37

Malia: In any event, I was still in Paris. I do not know under what auspices. Maybe I just called on staff, could have stayed here. So immediately took a quick look at the French scene, and it looked so phony, their transition from capitalism to socialism, which was already bogging down, compared to this real thing. So I bought a car, and headed east again, because I wanted to be really mobile. Crossing East Germany was always a moving experience, because you really passed an iron dictatorship. When you got to the Polish frontier, the guy on guard duty was relaxed. He asked, "Do you have any cigarettes," this sort of thing.

6-01:04:31

Engerman: That is when you were already inside the Eastern Bloc, though, so it is--

6-01:04:34

Malia: But in Poland you were no longer inside the Eastern Bloc, whereas you were in East Germany. Passing by Magdeburg, I was always intrigued by the towers of Magdeburg, the cathedral, which I wanted to see, which I eventually did see in 1984, or maybe it was '86. I don't remember. So I went to Warsaw. I went to the congress, the Solidarity Congress in Gdansk, which was a very moving thing. They had to draw up a program. The day would begin with a mass on the presidium of the congress. Then the oratory would start. It was translated in your earphones into English and French.

6-01:05:31

Engerman: Now, how did you get to be in that room? Did you have any official auspices at all or was it just that friends got you in?

6-01:05:38

Malia: Oh, I just asked Geremek to give me a pass. I was in the tribune with people like Adam Michnik. Michnik was another delegate. Well, it was a carnival and a political meeting, where they debated furiously what sort of constitution they would have. All sorts of people disliked Walesa's leadership. They wanted a more democratic organization of Solidarity. It was a debate between centralists and federalists, if you want. The argument of the centralists was, "We are in a struggle, therefore we have to be united. There cannot be too much grass-roots initiative. The foe will try to provoke us into doing things that would justify a crackdown." I do not remember the details of the thing. But, that was roughly the debate. Behind the scenes, there were apparently violent scenes between people like Walesa and Koreni. Modzelewski was a tremendous orator in this situation.

6-01:07:04

Engerman: Was he a centrist or a federalist?

6-01:07:05

Malia: No, he was a centrist, because he had had experience with party organizing. He knew that in this kind of situation, you needed firm control, but he did not like Walesa. He wanted to be the senator of the centrists. He did not like Gwiazda. But later on when Poland had real politics, after the fall of communism, he became a leader of the participatory far-left and really dropped out of politics, because there was really no space for that and it was just too utopian. Of course, Geremek was a moderate centralizer, and trying to get unity, as much unity as you could get, around the necessary centralization. He is a diplomat, a born diplomat. He never raised his voice. He is not a good public orator, but he is very good at arranging things, at least behind the scenes. So, Solidarity got itself a national organization. Then I drove around Poland to visit a number of local Solidarity places at [Olsztyn?], at Katowice. I went again to Krakow. I went again to Lublin. I did not get to Borgehsh. I wanted to visit a number of—I went to Pozna.

6-01:09:00

Engerman: And was travel within the country then fairly unrestricted for a foreigner? You could just hop in the car and go?

6-01:09:05

Malia: Yes. Well, one of the lessons I drew from this experience was that communism is mortal. No matter how the Solidarity thing comes out, communism is mortal. Because the regime had de facto been overthrown in Poland, but you could not throw it out, because of the Soviets. You could not take over the governmental building, things like that, but the people were—you had to put up with the regime for all sorts of practical reasons, but morally it was gone. It's hold on the country was shattered, and you had built up this parallel organization of Solidarity units in each of these cities. So I went from one to the other, and in each of these Solidarity strongholds, there was a fever of anticipation, anxiety. Are we going to get away with this? How long can this self-limiting revolution last? That is a contradiction in terms. We are trying to square the circle. We are doing the impossible, but we have no choice but to do the impossible. This was the rhetoric, these were the slogans that you heard. So everyone was anxious and high-spirited, and semi-exuberant all at the same time. It was an extraordinary atmosphere. So, in the fall, shortly after this, [Stanislaw] Kania, the party secretary, do you recognize all of these names?

6-01:10:55

Engerman: Some.

6-01:10:55

Malia: It means mushroom. There are all sorts of jokes about Kania. He was cashiered, and [Wojciech] Jaruzelski, a general, was put in. Well, normally, anyone seeing that would have concluded that a crackdown is brewing. But no, this was not the attitude of the Solidarity advocates.

6-01:11:19

Engerman: Well, how else could they interpret the installation of a general at the head of the government?

6-01:11:28

Malia: To appease Moscow, he will protect us more than hurt us. It is better to have a general than to have an [obotchik?]. It was wishful thinking. They were in a state of semi-denial, because you could not run Solidarity unless you were in denial of reality. It is a situation of dual power, just as there was here on the campus. This is what some of the FSM activists said, "We have dual power; the plaza, and Dwinelle Hall." That is where the chancellor's office then was before he moved to California Hall. And it is true. There was a dual power on the campus, but a mini-dual power. A dual power is like a popular front. It cannot last. It will break down one way or the other, but if you have been in a dual power situation and you are making steady gains over what turned out to be eighteen months, you just managed to hold a congress? Sixteen months before that, you were lucky that your strike committee was not arrested! So they did feel that they were hollowing out the old system and that perhaps they would make a transition to who knows what could deliver them from this.

6-01:12:52

Engerman: Transition from socialism to capitalism, as it were.

6-01:12:55

Malia: Yes, from socialism to capitalism, but they did not put it in those terms. What they talked about was civil society. That was the big buzzword.

6-01:13:07

Engerman: More than economic change?

6-01:13:10

Malia: No, they wanted political change. They wanted civil society. They wanted the autonomy of civil society from the state. They wanted a normal state, not a party state, but a normal state. Perhaps we can force this system to become just a normal state, and if Russia does not intervene, then we will get away with it, and you have to hope in order to live. We are doing the impossible, but we have no choice but to attempt the impossible. So, they did not panic when Jaruzelski was appointed, and by this time, for some reason or other I had to go back to—oh, no, I went to Rome.

6-01:13:53

Engerman: This is still in fall of '81?

6-01:13:56

Malia: Still in the fall of '81. The high command of Solidarity was going to Rome to meet with the Pope. So I drove to Berlin, put the car in a garage, and took a plane to Rome, and went to the meeting with the Pope. Nothing—they had confidential meetings with him. They weren't necessarily believers. Geremek was there, for instance, who was not a believer, and Koreni, and I don't know who else was there, and Walesa of course. They obviously met with him off-stage, let us say, but I was at the public reception of these people. He jokingly said he was going to use the universal language in his address, by which he meant Polish. So he addressed them. He was very amiable. Then I took Geremek to one of the best restaurants in town to get a debriefing, because obviously all of these people were broke. I do not know who financed this. So I took the plane back to Berlin and took a leisurely drive to Paris.

- 6-01:15:17
Engerman: How did the Solidarity leaders treat you at this point? What were you to them?
- 6-01:15:24
Malia: They treated me like a friendly journalist.
- 6-01:15:27
Engerman: Were you writing articles at this time?
- 6-01:15:31
Malia: I called up Bob Silvers and said, “Would you like an article on Poland?”
- 6-01:15:35
Engerman: For the *New York Review of Books*?
- 6-01:15:36
Malia: For the *New York Review*, and he said, “Yes! We have been dying to get someone in there.” So I came back to Paris to write the article.
- 6-01:15:43
Engerman: But you had no journalistic connections in France at this point or anything?
- 6-01:15:46
Malia: No. Well, since I knew—Poland is not that big of a country, and what I frequented was the Warsaw and the Krakow intelligentsia, who are a fairly small, cohesive group, and since I had friends among them, and since they were more or less running the show in Solidarity, it was very easy to get in contact with them. Then they were hoping for publicity. So I wrote an article. Have you seen it?
- 6-01:16:17
Engerman: Two articles on Poland.
- 6-01:16:18
Malia: All right, two articles on Poland, have you seen them?
- 6-01:16:20
Engerman: Yes, the second is after the crackdown.
- 6-01:16:21
Malia: Is after the crisis. Well, Abe Brumberg, whom I do not particularly like, do you know who he is?
- 6-01:16:28
Engerman: He was the editor of *Problems of Communism*, from the fifties until the nineties.
- 6-01:16:34
Malia: He was one of the people who wrote on Eastern Europe for Silvers for the *New York Review*.
- 6-01:16:43
Engerman: You seem to be quite enthusiastic about Brumberg’s work, at least in print, when you write about it.

6-01:16:49

Malia: Well, it depends on which work? On Solidarity, yes.

6-01:16:55

Engerman: And then actually on *glasnost*' too.

6-01:16:57

Malia: Oh no, oh no, we will come to that later on. He was a Gorbaphile, and my attitude was that the only way to reform communism is to get rid of it, not to reform it. But he thought, he told Silvers that he felt that article on Solidarity was the best summary that anyone had ever done. Taking his view as correct, there has been a better one since, that was Timothy Garton Ash, who had the same experience with Solidarity that I did.

6-01:17:34

Engerman: Did you know him from the same circles?

6-01:17:36

Malia: No, I did not know him at the time. He was at that time he was at the congress also. He was vacationing in Italy. Well, he started in 1980. He was vacationing in Italy when Solidarity happened. So he dropped his vacation and went to Poland, learned Polish, followed Solidarity, bought a car and followed Solidarity all over the place and fell in love with it. It was a very contagious movement. If you got in contact with it and approved of it, you could be absorbed into it. That is what happened to him.

6-01:18:15

Engerman: And to you?

6-01:18:15

Malia: And to me, obviously.

So then the inevitable occurred.

6-01:18:22

Engerman: December 1981.

6-01:18:23

Malia: December 1981, and it was all over.

6-01:18:27

Engerman: You had by this point gone back to Paris?

6-01:18:29

Malia: I was in Paris by that time. And of course, everyone was saying, Annie Kriegel was saying, "Well, now they are going to be normalized just like the Czechs" had been normalized. That was the word used after the Prague Spring [in 1968].

6-01:18:42

Engerman: How sort of an Orwellian expression.

6-01:18:45

Malia: They have got to be normalized. That is what always happens in Communist systems. I was trying to argue, "No, they are not going to be normalized, this is different. This is qualitatively different." They had lived for eighteen months in a parallel non-

Communist universe, and that cannot be wiped out. But of course, I looked like a loser then. No one would buy that line. Everyone would say, “Uhhhhh...” Ulam wavered a bit. He said that the party took so long before the crackdown that perhaps this time it was going to be different. But in general, the consensus of the experts was that it is all over, and that it is over for good. But, my experience there convinced me one that it was not over in Poland, and two, that communism in general was mortal. That the long frozen years of Brezhnev were not going to last forever. Do you want me to continue? Okay, I will come to the next logical step. I returned once to Poland. I think it was in the middle of the 1980s. I forget just what year. I visited East Germany at the same time. I had a car. I bought a car, and toured East Germany. Absolutely impenetrable walls, impossible to get in touch with anyone there.

6-01:20:27

Engerman: Was East Germany harder than it had been, or was it the same?

6-01:20:31

Malia: The same, but I at least got to see what was attached to the Spires at Magdeburg. It is a good thirteenth century, late thirteenth century Gothic cathedral. The city of course was largely Baroque and completely destroyed during the war. But East Germany was just sad, drab, real socialism in full bloom, if you want, completely intact. Then I went to Poland. This was the people who had been arrested, people like Michnik and Geremek, and Sliveenski. I did not tell you about Sliveenski. Sliveenski was the Warsaw secretary of the club of Catholic intellectuals, the KKI it was called. It was KOR, which was secular, and the KKI. These were the two constituent intellectual elements in Solidarity. Sliveenski, Geremek, Michnik, Modzelewski, the works. They spent a year and a half in jail, and they were just out.

6-01:21:53

Engerman: So this must have been '83 or '84, right? If the crackdown is December '81, they are imprisoned say some time in 1982--

6-01:22:01

Malia: They were just out.

6-01:22:03

Engerman: Then this would have been probably '84?

6-01:22:05

Malia: Yes. They were just out. So I saw all of them again. There was no trouble getting around Poland. I went back to Poland twice, no once, once. I saw all of them, talked about things. It was clear that it was not over, that Poland was still disaffected.

6-01:22:39

Engerman: And they were still willing to talk to you, to a sympathetic foreigner, even just after their release from prison?

6-01:22:45

Malia: Sure. They were just out of jail. I stayed at Elzbieta Kaczyska's again. She was not arrested. She had a high enough level in the hierarchy. She was a member of Solidarity, but higher up in the hierarchy. So this confirmed my impression that communism was mortal. Okay, that is '84. Gorbachev becomes first secretary when?

6-01:23:13

Engerman: In '85.

6-01:23:22

Malia: Come to '85. I had not paid much attention to Soviet studies in this country during the years I was recycling myself, retreading myself as an intellectual, comparative historian. But I did notice that there had been such phenomena as Moshe Lewin and Steve Cohen's biography of Bukharin, and I even did notice [Stephen] Kotkin was one of my students by this time, that there was such a person as Sheila Fitzpatrick, who had published a book called *The Cultural Revolution in Russia*.

6-01:23:59

Engerman: Which was published in 1978.

6-01:24:01

Malia: '78. But I did not pay attention to it at the time. I did read Moshe Lewin, because everyone was reading Moshe Lewin. I said, "This is the answer."

6-01:24:12

Engerman: *Russian Peasants and Soviet Power*, or which?

6-01:24:14

Malia: No, no, that is reasonably okay.

6-01:24:20

Engerman: *The Making of the Soviet System*, which came out I think in '85.

6-01:24:25

Malia: '85, yes. Well, this was the bible of the new Bukharin, because that is what they were. They felt that after Brezhnev goes, we will at last have what Isaac Deutscher thought Khrushchev was going to do after Stalin goes. We are going to have at last socialism with a human face.

6-01:24:52

Engerman: And they are using Bukharin as an example here of a direction that the Soviet system could have gone away from Stalin and toward a humane socialism.

6-01:25:00

Malia: That is right. So I noticed towards the end, the mid-eighties, mid to late eighties, mostly because I decided to give a course, a 280 course [a graduate reading seminar] which Steve Kotkin took on the explanations of the Soviet experiment. I discovered that I was way out of date. I had read Cohen's biography of Bukharin, which is a very good book, but the political lessons he drew from it I think are another matter. I read Moshe Lewin's *Soviet Power and Russian Peasants* or whatever the exact title of it is, which is useful, but already ideologically bloated. The other book that I have never been able to read all the way through is--

6-01:25:58

Engerman: *Making the Soviet System*.

6-01:25:59

Malia: *Making the Soviet System*. Well, I know what the thesis is.

6-01:26:06

Engerman: What is the thesis in your reading?

6-01:26:11

Malia: The thesis is that the, what did he say, these aren't his words, that in Russia, because the country was backward in peasants, the superstructure, i.e. the Party, got ahead of the base, i.e. the peasant society, and therefore had to build a modern industrial urban society by coercion from above. But now that it is built, the superstructure is out of date, and it is going to wither away, and you can get a return to Bukharin after Stalin, is what it adds up to. He wrote a second book after that. What did he call it? Discussions about the political implications of economic debates in the Soviet era. The same thesis. He does not understand Marx. He thinks Marx believed in the market. He thinks that Bukharin—well, one that Bukharin was committed to the market per se. He was not. He was committed to the market as a transition. Grossman in reviewing Moshe Lewin points this out.

6-01:27:31

Engerman: Gregory Grossman, you mean?

6-01:27:32

Malia: Greg Grossman. That is the only place that I have seen it. But, he did not understand Bukharin. It was only a provisional commitment. And he did not understand Marx, because he felt that Bukharin had read Marx correctly as a market Socialist. He was not. Marx really felt that money would wither away. Okay, so I was aware that all of this was going on. After Gorbachev came to power, I was dimly aware that Sheila [Fitzpatrick] went beyond the new Bukharinists. I later discovered that she hated them because they were spoiling, they did not recognize the necessity of a cultural revolution. They hated her because she was a crypto-Stalinist. She was defending the coercive policies that ended the glorious dream. Well, they had in meetings of the AAASS [American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies], there were stormy scenes.

6-01:28:37

Engerman: Were you attending these meetings?

6-01:28:40

Malia: No, I did not go to those meetings, but I heard from other people.

6-01:28:44

Engerman: Who were your sources on this?

6-01:28:45

Malia: One of them is [Bertrand] Bert Patenaude. Others are Steve Kotkin, younger people going to those things.

6-01:28:53

Engerman: How did you know Bert?

6-01:28:55

Malia: Because he was a student of Terry Emmons.

- 6-01:28:58
Engerman: And therefore a grand-student, if you will, of yours.
- 6-01:29:01
Malia: A grand-student of mine. He sent me his dissertation.
- 6-01:29:04
Engerman: It is a nice piece of work, that dissertation.
- 6-01:29:05
Malia: It is a very nice piece of work.
- 6-01:29:07
Engerman: Never published, I don't think.
- 6-01:29:08
Malia: Never published it. He should have published it. I read it and I said that he should publish it, but he did not do it. But he put out this fine book, *The Big Show in Bolaland*.
- 6-01:29:18
Engerman: We can talk about that later.
- 6-01:29:20
Malia: Okay, all right. We will talk about it. Anyway, he is a good person. There was a real conflict between the neo-Bukharinists and the soft-Stalinists, to use the proper names that should be applied to them.
- 6-01:29:40
Engerman: And who else were in the camps? The first camp would have been Moshe Lewin and Steve Cohen.
- 6-01:29:47
Malia: Steve Cohen, of course Reggie Zelnik, Gail Lapidus, the works.
- 6-01:29:53
Engerman: So other people at Berkeley?
- 6-01:29:56
Malia: Across the country. Jacques [Hoptnik?], do you know who he is? He is a Czech who does political science. He is in Paris. He attended a meeting of the AAASS shortly after Gorbachev came to power, and he wrote an article describing how all of these people were moonstruck, going around muttering, "Gorbachev, Gorbachev, at last we are going to get the second coming of Bukharin." There was tremendous excitement. It was nationwide. You are too young to have noticed this, but--
- 6-01:30:26
Engerman: I was reading this stuff at the time.
- 6-01:30:28
Malia: Okay, it was the state religion here in Berkeley. The meetings up in Stephens Hall were occasions of devotion about the great promise of Gorbachev. Greg Grossman did not share in this, but of course as usual he kept his mouth shut. He did not say anything. So I began to get concerned, and started reading this literature, and made the connection

between the social history, the worker's history, the cult of Gorbachev as the second coming of Bukharin. All of this was a package.

6-01:31:07

Engerman: What was wrong with the social history per se?

6-01:31:10

Malia: They were trying to explain—no, I am not against people doing social history, but they tried to derive the politics of the Soviet system from its social base. The party was really the workers, in some sense, the workers in power after October 1917. Ronald Suny's famous essay, "October as a Social Revolution." There was no social revolution in October. There was a social collapse in Russia in 1917 that made it possible for a very small ideological minority to stage a coup in October, sure, but the coup was not the product of the social revolution. It is grafted on to it. Sheila, with her cultural revolution, is trying to explain the first five-year plan as initially something that comes from workers and party intellectuals, as a product of the base. And then Stalin half-spoils it after 1932, but not totally spoils it, because at least we get the Brezhnev generation out of this, and the Brezhnev generation was running a viable outfit, which could conceivably evolve into something a little bit more democratic, but she unlike her then-husband, Jerry Hough, was cautious not to sing the praises of Gorbachev and imminent democracy and all the rest that Steve Cohen and company were singing or Reggie Zelnik or Victoria Bonnell. A lot of them. I was the only one together with Greg who did not say anything.

6-01:32:57

Engerman: Did you say anything?

6-01:32:59

Malia: Did not say a thing.

6-01:32:59

Engerman: So, there was a silent minority of anti-Gorbachevites?

6-01:33:04

Malia: Yes, and at this time, well shortly before this Leon Wofsy, who is still there, was trying to use the Slavic Center to organize a campaign against what he called the Second Cold War, mainly the Reagan policy in the early 1980s. They brought in Steve Cohen for a big lecture. They brought in Zhores Medvedev, not Roderdeniv, who filled Wheeler Auditorium to argue against Reagan's foreign policy. Wofsy was eventually kicked out of the Slavic Center. He was using the stationary, a great Soviet expert Leon was, a great student of Russian history. He was trying to use an organ of the university for his political purpose.

6-01:33:57

Engerman: Is that why he was kicked out of the Slavic Center?

6-01:34:00

Malia: He was kicked out, and Greg and I and a couple of others protested. They said he has no business.

6-01:34:06

Engerman: Who are the others working with you on this?

6-01:34:08

Malia: I forget, maybe it was—it was not Gleb Struve, he was dead by that point. It was someone else. No, it was bad enough. Steve Kotkin called it the “*krasnyi ugolok*,” [Russian for “little Red corner,” a spot for Socialist memorabilia, shrines to Lenin, etc.] that room up there.

6-01:34:29

Engerman: The “red corner.”

6-01:34:30

Malia: The “red corner.” Okay, so I realized—well, I had never bought the explanation that this was a worker’s regime in any meaningful sense of the word. This was a party regime, and obviously it had to function in terms of the society in which it was. But you cannot derive the politics from the social structure of old Russia or its evolution after 1917 from the social and economic problems that it confronted. Obviously, they would have to industrialize, but this did not mean that it had to industrialize in the way it did. That was dictated by other political and ideological considerations. So I decided that I would have to return to Russian history. I would have to look into this, which meant that I would have to go to Russia to see what was going on there. So I went in 1988 for the first time in twenty-five years. I had not been there since.

I stayed at the Intourist Hotel. This was the summer of ’88. Gorbachev was having his party conference, remember when Yeltsin tried to make a comeback. He was preparing for the party congress the next year. Oh no, the *Kongress Narodnykh Deputatov* [Congress of People’s Deputies] the next year. And, I went to see Lidiia Korneevna, who was still there. Akhmatova was not. I saw especially a lot of her daughter, what is her name? I forget her name. I read the newspapers, I looked at television, I met some new people, I frequented the journalists.

6-01:36:47

Engerman: Who did you meet there that are new people?

6-01:36:50

Malia: Mostly people that Steve Kotkin introduced me to.

6-01:37:01

Engerman: That Kotkin had met in his research?

6-01:37:02

Malia: Yes. No, that he had met during his year at MGU. Not that he had met in--

6-01:37:09

Engerman: Magnitogorsk.

6-01:37:12

Malia: In Magnitogorsk. Well, people like what is his name? The son-in-law of Khrushchev who wrote the article on freeing prices. An economist. He is an academic. I will remember it by tomorrow--a well-known name. After two weeks in Moscow, I listened to the party conference on television. I could not get in. After two weeks in Moscow, talking with people, I came to the conclusion that the regime was not going to survive this. That you cannot permit people the kind of *Glasnost*’ that they were engaging in—I more or less knew this from reading the stuff I had been reading.

- 6-01:38:19
Engerman: What had you been reading that convinced you of this?
- 6-01:38:22
Malia: The *Novyi Zhurnal* [*New Journal*], the usual publications.
- 6-01:38:26
Engerman: Western publications.
- 6-01:38:28
Malia: *Moskovskie Novosti* [*Moscow News*].
- 6-01:38:28
Engerman: Oh no, Russian publications.
- 6-01:38:30
Malia: Yes, we were reading the Russian press. *Moskovskie Novosti*, *Ogonek* [a Soviet weekly, *The Little Fire*]. What was the name of the guy who was running *Ogonek* then?
- 6-01:38:38
Engerman: I do not remember.
- 6-01:38:40
Malia: He was famous for a moment and then—I will have to look up all of this stuff. Reading this stuff, this is not a system that can survive this kind of close examination. And it was—*Revoliutsiia s verkhu, bardak v nizu* (“Revolution from above, chaos below”). “Bardak” meaning “Boden,” a mess, below. The society was visibly escaping control of the regime. Across the hall from Lidiia Korneevna, the elite building on Gor’kii Street, where—Kopelev—Kwere the people who used to live there before. He is the guy that Luis Martinez translated. The one that served as the model of Solzhenitsyn’s--
- 6-01:39:35
Engerman: The “true believer.”
- 6-01:39:37
Malia: Yes, the “true believer.” That this system is going the way the Polish regime was going ten years earlier. So I spent the whole summer there. I went to Leningrad and met-Landa is his name. Semen Semenovich Landa. These names are coming back. The guy who I had lent *Doctor Zhivago* to years earlier, that is when he told me about the KGB calling him in, and he was no longer allowed to go to Italy and things like that. He was now completely cured from the regime. He introduced me to [Anatolii] Sobchak.
- 6-01:40:20
Engerman: The future mayor.
- 6-01:40:23
Malia: The future mayor of Leningrad. I had a long talk with Sobchak, who told me that he had just entered the party, and he entered the party because he wanted to change the system. If you want to change the system, you have got to enter the party. I had a long talk with [Anatolii] Chubais in Leningrad, who worked in a technological institute on the Ulitsa Marata [Marat Street], the incendiary French revolutionary. He was quite blunt. He said, “The whole system has got to go.”

6-01:41:03

Engerman: Meaning the economic system or the political system?

6-01:41:07

Malia: The two. They have got to go. I met [Egor'] Gaidar in Moscow, who then worked for the magazine *Kommunist*. His mentor, the editor, he later on edited *Izvestiia*, or was a columnist for *Izvestiia*. What is his name? A well-known name. I saw the, what is his name, the guy who ran the Institute of the USA and Canada?

6-01:41:49

Engerman: [Georgii] Arbatov.

6-01:41:54

Malia: Arbatov. I talked with Arbatov at great length, who was reasonably frank. I met his son, who is now a prominent political scientist. He visited Berkeley last year. He is a very sensible guy. Who else did I talk to? Well, all sorts of people. People of that sort. The way they were talking, it became clear to me that, this was a system in a society moving close to where Poland had been during the self-limiting revolution. So, I came back to Paris. That is where I was based. I called up Silvers, and said, "Do you want an article on what is going in Russia?"

6-01:43:00

Engerman: This is in '88, still?

6-01:43:02

Malia: This is 1988, it was right after the conference. [inaudible], and he says, "Go ahead and try." But he then had Brumberg, who was singing the praises of Gorbachev and Perestroika, but not understanding, to my mind, a thing of what was going on. And Peter Reddaway, who was obdurately saying, "In that system, nothing can change." Things obviously were changing [laughs]. Both of these two discordant voices being printed in the *New York Review*, both of them wrong.

6-01:43:39

Engerman: But not your discordant voice.

6-01:43:41

Malia: Not mine, so I sat down and I tried to write. What I wanted to say was, on the basis of the new constitution for the party that Gorbachev proposed in that conference, the Party conference, on the erosion occasioned by Glasnost', that this system was moving towards crisis, and that therefore, Gorbachev was not the answer. Since I knew that Silvers already committed to the hilt to Gorbachev, I could not get this out in acceptable form. Also I did not have the full evidence. I would not get the full evidence until the party, the *S'ezd Narodnykh Deputatov* [Congress of People's Deputies] for the next year, which I attended.

6-01:44:36

Engerman: Under whose auspices did you attend that?

6-01:44:40

Malia: I had Silvers send me some sort of thing that got me a press accreditation so that I could get into the Kremlin.

6-01:44:47

Engerman: Even if he would not print your work, he would at least help you out?

6-01:44:49

Malia: Well, the article had not been written yet. He had confidence in me, because the articles on Poland had been praised by competent observers, and on the whole he has had good experiences with me. I have written articles on a number of things over the years. He did not have anyone else in Moscow, so he was willing to back me. So I could not write the article that year. The next year, I went to the Congress of People's Deputies. This has got to be a separate discussion. I attended the whole thing, and stayed through the summer.

6-01:45:30

Engerman: '89.

6-01:45:31

Malia: '89. And I saw that the regime had had it to my mind after that. So I came back, and in the fall, I at last broke the article, and it was the Z article, which I could never have gotten published in the *New York Review of Books*, because Silvers rewrites the articles when he does not like them, as Fred Crews here in the English department. Crews wanted to criticize Freud, and Silvers rewrote the article to praise Freud. So Steve Graubard from *Daedalus* called me up, and asked for an article in a number of his that needed an additional article, and so I wrote the Z article. We will talk about that tomorrow.

[End of Session]

[Interview #7: December 22, 2003]
 [Begin Audio File Malia: 07 12-22-03]

7-00:00:06

Engerman: We left with the Z article that you had written in '88.

7-00:00:20

Malia: Okay, well, the build-up to the Z article.

7-00:00:23

Engerman: The build-up to the Z article.

7-00:00:24

Malia: I will have to backtrack a bit. Russians had been coming through Berkeley since about '86, among them such people as Nikolai Smelov. That is Khrushchev's ex-son-in-law. He was married for a time to one of Khrushchev's daughters, an economist. He is the guy who first raised the questions, we have got to have real prices, i.e., the market, in an article in I think '86, in *Novyi Mir* [*New World*], which caused a sensation. In fact, he was expecting Gorbachev to be a new Bukharin, introduce some prices, and not completely change the system. And various other Russians went through here. By the time I went to Russia in '88, it was banal to have Russians running around. In the year, the spring of '89, the decisive year, the year of the collapse of Eastern Europe and so forth, I was teaching at Sciences Po [a nickname for L'Ecole de Sciences Politiques]. I had the Elie Halévy Chair of History at the Institute d'Études Politique, which was the last of these French institutions that I frequented. I gave a big lecture course on Soviet history, and I put the final touches on my version of Soviet history at that time. It so happened that this was the two hundredth anniversary of the French Revolution. So a great big delegation of Russians arrived in Paris for that, including such people as Iurii Afanas'ev, the guy who later founded that [humanities university – Russian State University for the Humanities] it is called, [RGGU]

7-00:02:27

Engerman: RGGU [Rosiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Gumanitarnyi Universitet, Russian State Humanities University].

7-00:02:30

Malia: Yes. Smelov, a whole bunch of these Moscow intellectuals that were going to play a role in the Congress of the People's Deputies. They were joking that the Congress of the People's Deputies was going to be like the meeting in the estates general in the spring of 1789, and so forth. It so happens that Afanas'ev made his career denouncing bourgeois historiography, in particular the *Annales* school. He spoke reasonably good French, and there was a meeting at the Ecole des Haute Etudes en Sciences Sociales, which is the *Annales* school, which he addressed. And Besançon very aggressively questioned this member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and so forth. A little footnote here, among the stranger things that go on in our profession, Besançon who had made excellent analyses of how Soviet ideology works. His *Intellectual Origins of Leninism* is a first-rate book. He was a big friend of Mikhail Geller, of Geller and [Aleksandr] Nekrich. Geller knew the Soviet Union obviously from the inside. He knew it very well. They were very close friends. Well, as soon as Gorbachev came to power, the whine of the two of them was Gorbachev is Stalin. He is a return to Stalinism. Which is absolutely mad!

7-00:04:08

Engerman: I think the Gorbaphiles had the much closer call on that. They may have been wrong, but they could not have been farther off than Besançon, or than Geller and Nekrich.

7-00:04:22

Malia: Well, the Gorbaphiles were right in that they were saying things were changing, but they thought things were changing in the direction of reform. In fact, things were changing in the direction of collapse. That is what they did not see.

7-00:04:30

Engerman: But it is still closer than calling—

7-00:04:32

Malia: They were much closer to the ground. And of course, Nekrich thought I was a dupe of the Gorbaphiles, and what he felt was the tendentious reporting of the Western press. Besançon kept this up right to the bitter end. He refused to recognize that anything was changing. Heller also. This blindness was absolutely incredible. What they were worried about was that the West was going to be taken in by these wily Soviets, that were doing this just to get a little bit stronger so that they could cause us more trouble. But there was a real phenomenon. All of the people, such as my friends Le Goff and Touraine, and the people running the *La Nouvelle Observateur* for years had been hoping for socialism with a human face in the East, in order to bolster up Mitterand's then completely stalled, finished experiment in making the transition from capitalism to socialism. As soon as Gorbachev started reforming, they immediately flipped. The Nouvellettes went to Moscow to edit its, I don't know, some important number right at the source. They all, Pierre Mauroy, the first prime minister of Mitterand, and Mitterand still thought he was going to get to socialism. No, Mitterand was I think fundamentally a cynic. He did not think he was going to get to socialism. He just wanted to stay president for fourteen years, which he managed to do. But Pierre Mauroy, a true believer, he went along. At last, the wayward brothers, communists in their eyes were wayward brothers. They were not foes. The Right was the foe. But the wayward brothers were at last starting to see the light, and we are going to have socialism with a human face. There was an awful lot of that around in the Western press. It was the line of the *Le Monde*, it was the line of the Parisian intelligentsia. Raymond Aron was then safely dead, so he did not have to answer to this one, but there was a lot of this stuff, and Heller and Besançon tried to resist that, but they went way overboard with this maddening "Gorbachev is Stalin" line. It is pardonable in a sense for Besançon because he was French and he was responding primarily to the French atmosphere. But for Heller to interpret Gorbachev as a return to Stalin is absolutely mad.

Eventually he and Nekrich quarreled over this because Nekrich saw that things were very well changing, and Nekrich took off for the Soviet Union. Heller would not set foot in that perverse place. That is just to give you an idea of the kind of passions that run in this field. Of course the whole social history revisionist historiographical movement in the U.S. was wild about Gorbachev because they too were expecting socialism with a human face.

7-00:08:10

There was this little introduction to the Estates General in the spring of '89. So then I went to the congress, and I already explained to you that I got press accreditation and sat through—well, it was on television, even when you were not there, you could see

it—two extraordinary revolutionary weeks. Gorbachev had already destroyed the system *in potentia* the previous September in '88, when he in effect liquidated the apparatus of the Central Committee. And that is what held the Soviet Union together, the Soviet system together, and the so-called federal union together. Both were held together by the Central Committee. He dismantled it, and his strategy was to replace it with these new revived Soviets. That would be his power base. He would get himself elected president of that, and he could then rule from that base against the Party. It was a crazy scheme. It was a kind of built-in dual power in the system that of course destroyed the system. But you had to have Glasnost for that, and he had only a minority of pro-Gorbachev people at that Congress. The majority was against him. So the Moscow intellectuals were given free rein to say anything they wanted, and all of this on national television.

7-00:09:48

Engerman: So Glasnost then is a tactic of the minority?

7-00:09:52

Malia: A tactic of Gorbachev to pressure the party initially, and then at the congress since he did not have the majority of reformers, what he called the reformers. He had to let the Moscow intelligentsia go ahead. And they went ahead with a vengeance. It was not just the Moscow intelligentsia, people from the provinces also. They went ahead with a vengeance. And in two weeks, they completely took away the illusion that the emperor had clothes. Every grievance was aired publicly. I wrote it all up in the *New York Review* and in the Soviet press. A lot of this focusing around [Andrei] Sakharov. Gorbachev was visibly afraid of Sakharov, and every time the man got up to talk, Gorbachev really wanted to ignore him or get him to sit down. He had to put up with, I do not remember the details anymore, Sakharov violating the rules and speaking more often than he was allowed, out of turns. So then it was summer, the strikes, the wave of strikes. It became absolutely clear to me the regime was heading towards a major crisis. Then of course, when I got back to Paris, and later in the summer I started to write, I really could not put this in terms that would get by [*New York Review of Books* editor Robert] Silvers. I had already—no, that was later. So I came back here, and *Daedalus* called up.

7-00:11:33

Engerman: Stephen Graubard.

7-00:11:33

Malia: Stephen Graubard.

7-00:11:34

Engerman: An old friend of yours from Harvard?

7-00:11:35

Malia: An old friend of mine from Social Sciences 5. We were in graduate school together. He called up. He had a special issue of *Daedalus* on Central Europe, which was the big hobby horse of Garton Ash, and of the Poles and the Czechs. It was, “We are not East. We are Central Europe, and we are on the way to becoming full-fledged Europe.” “We are not barbarous, Oriental, muscouite” was the line, and Timothy Garton Ash bought the ideology of Central Europe as a special zone, and yeah, it is special.

7-00:12:12

Engerman: You sound skeptical.

7-00:12:14

Malia: Yes, but it is not as big a deal as he made out. It was mostly a device for the Poles and the Czechs to get rid of the Soviets, to emphasize their Europeaness. For some reason or other, he was lacking an article, someone who was supposed to write on Russia. So he called me up and asked me to do it. And, I let fly. I just said exactly what I thought. This was the fall of '89. Walls were coming down. Oh, on my way back from Moscow, I stopped in Warsaw on the way to Paris.

7-00:12:53

Engerman: And what was that situation like?

7-00:12:54

Malia: It was after the June elections, when Solidarity, after the roundtable talks of the previous winter had cut a deal with the regime: "We will have elections in June, and the party will get so much, and Solidarity will get so much, and we will have a kind of diarchy." That was all they could hope for. Besançon thought that this was treason for Solidarity to negotiate with the evil regime. It was sensible politics. So more or less it advanced the elections. They divvied up who would get what seats in the Siem [parliament] and in the upper house. I forget the proportions. It is all in the Soviet transcript. Of course Solidarity won embarrassingly big. So, they came up with a new scheme. It was Adam Michnik that came up with this, that the party, you have the presidency, we will have the parliament. And Modzelewski became the first post-Communist prime minister of Poland. But Poland was not home free, because Russia was still there, I mean, the Soviet system was still there. So they had to be cagey. They could not talk about denationalization or ending the party's primacy or anything of the sort until the Soviet system collapsed. Then, of course, in the fall, beginning with Czechoslovakia and down to the Berlin Wall and sort of the epilogue of Romania, communism was liquidated in Eastern Europe, and it was absolutely obvious now that Russia, it was just a question of time. So I just let fly, and said exactly what I thought. No pussyfooting around to please Silvers. I sent it off to *Daedalus*, and Steve asked me, "Do you want to be anonymous?"

7-00:15:05

Engerman: Why did he offer you that in the first place?

7-00:15:08

Malia: I had done a couple of anonymous things for him earlier in commenting on Russia, well, because I had just been there. It was not clear that there would not be—even though the spring and summer of '89 had fatally wounded the system, it was not clear that there would not be a reaction. There of course was in '91, a successful reaction, a successful restoration. Then people I had consorted with could conceivably get into trouble. Some of them were younger people who were not—I did not give [inaudible]. They could get in trouble the way Oksman had gotten into trouble, because I had a past of dealing with these people. "Would you want to be anonymous?" I said, "Yes, I will think it over. I think given what I have said in this article, it might be a good idea." So I picked as a pseudonym N. Perestroikin. Of course being the Latin and Russian initial for anonymity, for X in other words, and Perestroikin, well what Pushkin wrote [inaudible], N. Perestroikin. And, that is the way it was printed. Well, Steve of course wants to promote his journal, and somehow through a friend of his in New York, he got a copy of

this to *The New York Times*. *The New York Times* was interested. They wanted to excerpt it. Safire wrote this was his, what he—he is intensely anti-Communist, and now he is intensely anti-Russian. This is what he needed for his corner of the op-ed page. So it got to the *Times*, and they wanted to know who—they decided they were going to print it. Safire wrote an accompanying column. They wanted to know who N. Perestroikin was. They thought it was a real person. This was done by telephone. They telephoned *Daedalus*, and Steve telephoned me, and then it was the *Times* that suggested “Z”.

7-00:17:40

Engerman: What was wrong with N. Perestroikin, from their point of view?

7-00:17:43

Malia: They thought it was a real person, and of course it is the letter Z that created the sensation, because of the parallelism with the Mr. X article [“Sources of Soviet Conduct,” written by George Kennan in 1947, published as “X”], and because there was a fight in the Bush administration about whether to continue supporting Gorbachev or not. There had been some resistance to this. Bill Gates, the director of the CIA, apparently was skeptical about it.

7-00:18:18

Engerman: Bob Gates.

7-00:18:19

Malia: Robert Gates, yes. Bill Gates is the Microsoft [founder]. Well, we have not heard about Bob for a long time so I had Bill in my mind. He was suspected, General [William] Odom was suspected, was suspected of being “Z”.

7-00:18:37

Engerman: In the same way that the X article was covering up Kennan’s role in the government, they assumed that “Z” was—

7-00:18:46

Malia: Someone in the government, dissenting from the official policy of support for Gorbachev, making an end-run around the authorities. That is why I think the *Times* printed it, because they wanted to argue against it, because they were like *Le Monde*, very Gorbaphile, but not expecting socialism with a human face. Then the *Times* wrote editorials against it. There were at least three. I was called a neo-con, which I definitely was not, and a disturber of the peace, and—

7-00:19:25

Engerman: How do you plead to disturber of the peace?

7-00:19:27

Malia: I did not say anything.

7-00:19:29

Engerman: How do you plead now?

7-00:19:29

Malia: What?

7-00:19:30

Engerman: Innocent of the neo-con label? I am asking you to respond to these critics. Respond to these criticisms. You said you were criticized as being neo-con, and you would say, well, that is not at all accurate.

7-00:19:41

Malia: No, they thought I represented a reactionary current in the government that was against peaceful accommodation of the reformed Soviet system. How would I answer? I am just telling you the truth. That is what the system is like, and it is not going to last. And instead of fooling around with how to prop it up, we should try to think about what to do next when it goes. The IMF would have to [inaudible], we have to do something to bail the place out, was my real line. It is right there in the article.

7-00:20:18

Engerman: It is. In the article, though, it suggests that you need to bail the place out but not through the government.

7-00:20:23

Malia: Not through the government, yeah. We should—in other words, Yeltsin, the opposition, a democratic Russia, which came out, which was formed in the fall. It was already in gestation when I left Moscow. I had lunch, *obed'* [lunch], with Afanas'ev-told me the whole thing, what they were going to do next. They were going to run the local elections. They were going to infiltrate the system. They were really going to democratize. At first I thought Afanas'ev was going to be another one of these new Bukharinists. But no, when he came to Paris in the spring of '89, I was a little cautious with him. I had somehow met him in '88. So when he came to Paris, I took him to lunch, and I was cautious that he was going to defend like Smelov was. The line that we need a new Bukharin. He said, "No, we need a new system. We need to chuck the whole thing and start over again." This was the line of quite a few people in the future democratic Russia. So, they were forming this just when I left Russia to go to Warsaw. It must have been sometime in September. They were already planning to get rid of the system, which is another reason why or feeling that in fact it was going. So, I got that off my chest. I was eventually found out.

7-00:22:10

Engerman: Let's talk, how were you found out?

7-00:22:12

Malia: Well, I really should have thought the thing through. Once the thing had become a sensation, I had to plan for how I was going to surface. In the meantime, I kept denying that it was me, although a fair number of people who knew me already suspected it was me.

7-00:22:33

Engerman: Who had already suspected?

7-00:22:34

Malia: My colleagues here. Terry Emmons, he called up and said, "Is this you?" I said, "No, of course not."

7-00:22:44

Engerman: So you denied it to him.

7-00:22:46

Malia: Well, for a while while I made up my mind of what to do next, which would depend on what was going to happen there. By then, since the Berlin Wall had fallen and all sorts of things had happened, I was much firmer. I wrote it in September, essentially, before the Berlin Wall.

7-00:23:04

Engerman: It is dated as December, I think.

7-00:23:07

Malia: Yes, but I wrote it in September, but it takes a while for them to get an issue out.

7-00:23:11

Engerman: No, no, it actually appeared in 1990, but it is dated in the issue as if you finished it in December.

7-00:23:17

Malia: Well, maybe I put some final touches on it. I don't know. And I do not remember when it got in *The New York Times*. Some British reporter called up the history department, because the word, well, a fair number of people had guessed, I guess. She said, do you have any record—she talked to Janet what is her last name, I forget. Oh, it was typed by the department chairman's secretary, as part of the secrecy, and then by a neighbor down the street, a former graduate student who had been in journalism. The two together. She asked her, "Do you have any record of Martin Malia's writing this article." Janet astutely looked in her computer. Of course there it was. She said, "Yes."

7-00:24:17

Engerman: They had come to suspect you?

7-00:24:20

Malia: I was already suspect. I was outed in that way. Then people wanted a book.

7-00:24:30

Engerman: Well, before we get to the book, I want to dwell on this anonymity issue a little bit more. Now, how did the people react? You mentioned Terry Emmons called you and said, "Are you Z?" I understand that Professor Riasanovsky had also asked you more or less point blank if you were "Z". How did you—

7-00:24:52

Malia: I just said, "No." I should have given up a lot earlier than I did. I should have figured out some way to say this gracefully, but I did not. Because events were rushing very fast. Silvers called up and said, "There is an important article you should see. It is by someone named Z. People think that it is General Odom," or something like that. But then I was trying to write for the *New York Review*.

7-00:25:23

Engerman: Okay, I still have one other question on the anonymity.

7-00:25:27

Malia: Sure.

- 7-00:25:28
Engerman: Now, why is it that you felt that you needed to keep anonymity and start with N. Perestroikin and eventually go to Z?
- 7-00:25:39
Malia: Because once there was a published *fait accompli*, I did not know what to do with it.
- 7-00:25:49
Engerman: No, but why is it in the first place that you wanted to keep the—
- 7-00:25:52
Malia: I have already explained. In case the Perestroika movement was crushed by some sort of reaction, that was the initial reason for picking N. Perestroikin in September or October. I do not know exactly when I picked it. Then events moved beyond the likelihood of any kind of immediate reaction, so it became superfluous.
- 7-00:26:30
Engerman: What was your fear, though, if there had been sort of a reactionary movement that crushed Perestroika. What was at risk for you in having your name known?
- 7-00:26:40
Malia: Not so much Afanas'ev, but younger people, younger journalists who were sitting in the press cabinet with me at the convention, most of whom were for liquidating the system. People like that could get in trouble, I guessed.
- 7-00:27:04
Engerman: From having sat in the press box with you?
- 7-00:27:08
Malia: Assuming that the KGB was keeping tabs on someone like me, which was not an unrealistic assumption, although in retrospect, I do not think they were. They were just overwhelmed with what was going on.
- 7-00:27:20
Engerman: They had a lot of business [laughs].
- 7-00:27:23
Malia: I was thinking in terms of my own past there when they did keep tabs on me. They knew everything that I did. Since I was known as somewhat hostile since a long ways back, conceivably people I had consorted with might get into trouble. That was the initial reason. Then I stuck with it because I had set things up that way.
- 7-00:27:54
Engerman: How did you feel having to deny to people who had been so close to you for a long time, like Emmons?
- 7-00:28:03
Malia: It did not bother me. Once you make a decision like that, you decide to drop the anonymity and you are more or less stuck with it. But it called attention to my reviews. In retrospect, I think it was a good move.
- 7-00:28:26
Engerman: The anonymity was a good move as marketing?

7-00:28:30

Malia: It turned out to be excellent for marketing. That is not why it was adopted. I did not pick the incendiary letter Z. I had sought the anonymity, N. Perestroikin. It was the *Times* that did that.

7-00:28:48

Engerman: For their own marketing purposes, I suppose.

7-00:28:51

Malia: Well, they wanted to unmask who this hidden foe was in the administration. This hidden foe of reasonable policy choices. That is why they wanted to give it publicity. They gave it the whole op-ed page. They wanted to start a controversy, which they did.

7-00:29:22

Engerman: Yes. So that controversy is in early 1990.

7-00:29:27

Malia: Early 1990. It did not last long.

7-00:29:29

Engerman: Then your name, you are quickly outed.

7-00:29:32

Malia: I was quickly outed in *Newsweek*. Was it *Newsweek*? Yes.

7-00:29:38

Engerman: You said it was a British reporter.

7-00:29:39

Malia: No, *New Republic*, *New Republic*, but he published the article in *The New Republic*. Or maybe it was *Newsweek*, I do not remember. His name was, I met him later on in Warsaw, Barrows or something like that. He is a nice guy.

7-00:29:53

Engerman: He did his homework.

7-00:29:56

Malia: He did his homework. So then I tried to write for the *New York Review*, and I got ahold of a document from *Democratic Russia*, and wrote an exegesis of it. The burden of this was that Perestroika is really over and has failed, and that democratic Russia is what comes next in Russian history.

7-00:30:29

Engerman: Yes, and Yeltsin was the person to bring that in?

7-00:30:31

Malia: Yeah, I mentioned—oh, I thought Yeltsin or Sakharov. I didn't like Sakharov because he was the great saint of the *New York Review*. But Yeltsin was looked at with suspicion as a tough party guy, not really moral. [inaudible] was very moral. But it pointed towards democratic Russia, the leaders of which were Yeltsin, Afanas'ev, Sobchak, Sakharov, who were some of the other ones, Popov; I forget the rest. But the four major, I have given you the major names there, and of course Silvers took this as [his credentials]. But

what about Gorby? I said, “Well, Gorby’s Perestroika is not doing very well,” so he took it and rewrote it to put Gorby in the center of it as the role about Yeltsin. I swallowed that. You know, it contradicted what I said in the article. In order to get a little propaganda in print in the left-liberal quarters, propaganda for a democratic Russia. *The Soviet Tragedy* is dedicated to my friends in Solidarity and in democratic Russia. So I swallowed that. Then Elena Bonner [Sakharov’s widow] came through Berkeley, and gave a talk in Zellerbach Auditorium over there where she gave exactly my kind of analysis. That Perestroika has had it, the regime is not worth saving, and we have got to think—Sakharov was by this time dead.

7-00:32:30

Engerman: And to have Sakharov’s widow come—

7-00:32:33

Malia: And have Sakharov’s widow do it, say exactly what I had said in this article that Silvers rewrote. So I got a transcript of it at the talk, sent it to Silvers, and said, “Would you print this?” Since it came from Bonner, he printed it with some reluctance. Of course, Brumberg was campaigning against me, because he was for socialism with a human face, and Gorbachev stood for that. He was feeding Silvers one line, and I was feeding him another. Silvers favored what Brumberg was saying. But [Abraham] Brumberg clearly, reading the articles he wrote at that time, he did not understand beans about what was going on in the Soviet Union. Peter Reddaway, by this time he noticed that things were changing. I do not know what his line became or was at that point. Silvers was probably genuinely confused, but he had in mind a successful Gorbachev outcome. Then I went the next summer to Russia.

7-00:33:53

Engerman: Summer of ’90 or ’91?

7-00:33:55

Malia: Summer of ’90. I went every summer from ’88 on. Of ’90, to the Party Congress, which was Gorbachev’s last effort to save his system. By then, there were open demands for the end of the Communist Party. I remember it. I had become friends with political commentators like Andranik Migranian. He was one of these Russians who came West. He taught for a while at San Diego State. They paid him a lot of dollars. And he was here in Berkeley. He did a very good job, a very bright guy. Igor’ Zaslavskii, a political scientist. Iurii Nevada, people like that. Andranik took me to one of these marches. I forget where we started from. Some were on the Kol’tso [Ring Road], and then came into Manezh Square from the south. We started in the Kol’tso, went down to the river, then up, what is the name of that street? Volkhonko. Where the cathedral is. Where the historic cathedral is, to the Manezh Square. And the chant was, “Doloi KPSS” [“Down with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union”]. The idea of marching through the streets of Moscow—

7-00:35:38

Engerman: Saying down with the Communist Party.

7-00:35:42

Malia: Down with the Communist Party, and a foreigner in this cortege was just mind-boggling. I forget when that was. That must have been the summer of 1990. No, I was there in the winter once because I remember going to Vilnius. I had made some friends

in '88, beginning of '88. I was talking to this group of students in a gentry estate in the cold winter. They wanted to know about education in America, so they asked me to give a talk. They were all Lithuanians or Poles, but they spoke perfect Russian. This was a cold winter. So I was there at some point in the winter. In any event, by the visit of 1990, it was beginning to be a bit—the death throes of the Soviet system were getting to be a bit tiresome, because beginning in the fall of '91, Gorbachev started talking about the transition to the market, there was the five-point program, [Grigor] Yavlinskii's program. I have written all of this up. I forget the details now. And at the last minute, Gorbachev drew back from moving towards the market. Things were blocked in the winter of—

7-00:37:29

Engerman: '90?

7-00:37:34

Malia: '90-'91 that I was there.

7-00:37:34

Engerman: That was the hardest winter, economically and politically.

7-00:37:39

Malia: And that is when the march took place. When the “Doloi KPSS” march took place. That is when I went again to Lithuania again to see if you could get there from—because by then it was independent. I had done the Baltic states in '88, and I had gone back one other time to Lithuania and Latvia. We were waiting for the thing either to reform or to crack up. It got to be sort of tiresome, so I stayed here in the summer of '91.

7-00:38:14

Engerman: This is right after you have retired then, from Berkeley?

7-00:38:19

Malia: I had retired. By then I had a book contract for *Soviet Tragedy*—

7-00:38:36

Engerman: Now, why retire at that point?

7-00:38:38

Malia: Because I had had enough teaching. I had been at it for some forty years, and I wanted to do some writing. I said, I have a one-track mind. I cannot teach one thing and go home in the evening and write on something else. It is a total occupation. So I wanted to do other things. I wanted to do *The Soviet Tragedy*, I wanted to do the revolutions book, I wanted to finish the *Russia Under Western Eyes*, which was a manuscript I had been kicking around for a long time. That is why I retired. So I stayed here. Then of course in June of, I have already told you this story, in June of '91, Yeltsin got elected president. Well, the whole business of getting the Supreme Soviet, his takeover of the Russian Supreme Soviet against Gorbachev. Well-known things. I followed that in the press. But you did not need to be there to follow this. If you knew the players and the problems, you could figure out pretty well what was going on.

So when he got elected president, this was a rival pole power, he had a strong base to move against the system, so I called him, Silvers, and said, “This is it. This is the major

turning point, the beginning of the process.” He said, “Okay, you can have twelve hundred words.” He was so fixated on Gorbachev and that solution that he refused to see what was going on, as was Brumberg, as were most of my colleagues. They were still rooting for Gorbachev, as was the, is it the Commonwealth Club that is the foreign policy thing in San Francisco?

7-00:40:39

Engerman: That is one of them. There is also the Committee on Foreign Relations has an office out here, and World Affairs Council. There are a few.

7-00:40:46

Malia: World Affairs—well, in any event, they invited me for a talk, and they were dismayed at what I had to say. It was almost unpatriotic. So he gave me twelve hundred words, and I eventually finished it in three thousand words. Then in August, the August Coup at last, the belated and very weak and incompetent reaction. So I called him up and I said, “This time, this is it, definitely.” He said, “Okay, you can have twenty-five hundred words.” But it was something that unfolded over what, ten days? So I turned on CNN, I read all the newspapers every day, and I wrote it up as we went along. Eventually, the article went to seven thousand five hundred words, something like that. He told me later on that when they gave me, when they increased the number of words that I could have, that in fact, the outer limit was higher than what they told me, because they knew that I was going.

7-00:41:59

Engerman: So you had words to spare, you just did not know it.

7-00:42:00

Malia: I did not know it. And, this time I fought with him over anytime he tried to change anything. “This is a world historical event. It is the major event of the second half of the twentieth century, for heaven’s sake.” He was not faxing things to me. I don’t know. He had a copy of this stuff as we went along. We were in some sort of communication. I would send him a text, I would get it back, and if he changed anything that I did not agree with, I changed it right back. He could not turn to Brumbleberg or Reddaway, who would have written something absolutely awful. So he was more or less stuck with me. He eventually gave up crossing out things and changing things. I told him the final night—he told me this much later, they had to keep the staff there until the middle of the night to get the thing in print. Of course it appeared on the cover. There was “Yeltsin’s Revolution” on this side of the page, and “Bush’s War” with a great big nuclear missile on his back on that side of the page. “Yeltsin’s Revolution” and “Bush’s War,” that meant 1990, the Gulf War, as if the two were equally important. And a very threatening cartoon of Yeltsin [which] made him look like, he was giving a kind of Hitler [salute]—

7-00:43:49

Engerman: But this is a David Levine cartoon. David Levine does not have any generous cartoons.

7-00:43:54

Malia: Some are less generous than other ones. This was—Bush was caricatured with a nuclear missile on his back, and Yeltsin was made to look like a [fascist?]. No, some of the cartoons are more affectionate, more positive than others. Silvers was swallowing hard to take this. He tried to downplay it as much as he could. As a matter of fact, at the end, he did cross out—the last thing I sent him was from the xerox place down at the foot of

this street, and he did cross off something. He was very irritated with something I said that reflected negatively on Gorbachev. So it appeared, and I think it was the fullest account published anywhere of what had gone on. I looked over it last night, and it stands up. It is what went on. He has never forgiven me for writing that article.

7-00:45:04

Engerman: Even though he published it?

7-00:45:06

Malia: Even though he published it, and even though he got plenty of compliments from competent people. He is still defending that cause. Three or four years ago, there was some book on [Eduard] Shevardnadze, and Shevardnadze got into some, I don't know what it was, in [Peorche?]. This was on the front page, "Shevernadze Wins!" He is still beating that drum, and he does not want me to talk about the revisionists because the revisionists one way or another are supporting Perestroika, socialism with a human face. So after the collapse of the Soviet Union, we had a sort of rough exchange over the phone. I went back, obviously, in the fall of '91. I was retired, I could go anytime I wanted. To look in on how the regime was proceeding. Brumberg went back, and he wanted to put Brumberg first, to comment on this. Brumberg of course when he commented, he said, "These Democrats are not Democrats. This is a great failure," and so forth. So I got irritated, and we had a slightly huffy exchange over the phone, and I moved to the *New Republic*, where I tried to explain the new order, or the new experiment in Russia in favorable terms, or at least understandable terms.

7-00:46:44

Engerman: Which has an irony in it, of course, because the *New Republic* treated the old experiment in Russia with such enthusiasm.

7-00:46:54

Malia: But [in] the end, they were not favorable. So Brumberg continued in this line, producing some awful articles. Reddaway was now predicting disaster. He was a student of Leonard Schapiro. In other words, a die-hard anti-Communist. That is why he refused to see any change in the system. That was the hard-line of people like Heller or Besançon, or Annie Kriegel until I talked her out of it. That the system cannot change; it is not divided between hawks and doves, or liberals and conservatives; it is monolithic.

7-00:47:54

Engerman: So Schapiro is probably the best of a particularly hard-line totalitarian school?

7-00:48:00

Malia: Reddaway was his student, so it was normal that he would take the line that nothing is changing and nothing can change. So he was taking it as absolute catastrophe, market altruism, Russia on the brink. And Silvers printed a lot of the articles Reddaway wrote. "Russia on the Brink," which I answered in *The New Republic*, with an article. They entitled it, I did not title it, "Apocalypse Now." It was sort of a campaign against *The New York Review* from *The New Republic*, and then eventually I lost interest. No, first from *Commentary*. I did a couple of pieces for *Commentary*, which is the unkindest cut of all for the point of view of *The New York Review*.

7-00:48:55

Engerman: Especially for its both very Jewish groups, Silvers and—

7-00:49:01

Malia: Yes, and at one time his colleague. This is what Fred Crews [did] when Silvers was rewriting his anti-Freud thing to make it a pro-Freud thing, Crews punished him by going to *Commentary*.

7-00:49:21

Engerman: So you burned your bridges with *New York Review*?

7-00:49:24

Malia: No, we eventually made it up, but I am not interested in that sort of thing anymore. I am going to finish the revolutions book. Journalism just takes too much time. By the mid-1990s it became clear that the transition was much more complex than I or anyone else could imagine, or that anyone really understood.

7-00:49:47

Engerman: Looking back now, if it is more complex than you now understand it, where do you think your mistakes were earlier?

7-00:49:55

Malia: Not to take into adequate account that you cannot take a Soviet-type society and remake it into a market democracy short of a generation. I did say this in theoretical terms in *The New Republic*. They have to do everything at once. You cannot piecemeal reform the wreckage of the old Soviet system. You have to recreate everything at once. That is extremely difficult, and you have to do it with people who were formed under the old system. But it would have been a full-time job to go stay there, nose around to find out what was going on, just how the transition was taking place.

7-00:50:50

Engerman: So when did you lose interest in the journalistic coverage? Because you were quite prolific for this period from '89 to the mid-nineties, even while you are writing *The Soviet Tragedy*, you are still very active in the journalistic mode. At what point did you decide that you had to leave this behind?

7-00:51:12

Malia: I think when the Yeltsin regime, at the end of his first term was veering toward I do not know what you call it, not the Right, but old cronies from the Urals, I don't remember their names anymore, were being put into positions of responsibility. Gaidar had gone. There remained only Chubais as a reformer. Yeltsin, after he had to shoot up the Supreme Soviet, and everyone forgets that they were trying to stage a coup d'etat, no one mentions that anymore. The only thing that is mentioned is that he shot up the *Belyi Dom* [White House, nickname for House of Parliament]. His reforming zeal, he was naive the way that Gaidar and I were, all of the people that supported, the democratic Russian people. His reforming zeal was broken by that incident.

7-00:52:27

Engerman: And your reforming zeal?

7-00:52:29

Malia: Well, I began to see that this was going to be an awful lot rougher than I had anticipated. There was so much of the old system there. And of course, eventually all of these, the reformed liberals were squeezed out. The last group, the Soiuz Pavykh Sil [Union of Right Forces], lost the elections just a few days ago. The same thing has happened in

Hungary and Poland, everywhere. The liberal intellectuals who spearheaded the transition are eventually forced out. My friend Geremek is no longer in the cabinet. His party is not getting any seats. The same pattern everywhere. Someday someone will figure out the pattern of post-Sovietism.

7-00:53:19

Engerman: Is that something that you are going to tackle?

7-00:53:21

Malia: No, I want to finish the revolutions book.

7-00:53:24

Engerman: And after that?

7-00:53:24

Malia: Well, we will see. I first have to—that is an enormous project. I have got two very rough chapters to go, and a whole lot of revising. Let us leave that aside. So that is it.

7-00:53:41

Engerman: That is it? That is the end of—

7-00:53:45

Malia: No, then there was the problem of reforming the field.

7-00:53:52

Engerman: And you said that you had first grown aware of that when you dove back into the literature in the mid-to-late eighties, mid-eighties, '86, '87, '88.

7-00:54:01

Malia: In the mid to late eighties, and the Soviet tragedy book is framed as a critique of those people. Since then I have developed a number of articles. The real problem is not Pipes and patrimonialism. He has no disciples, and does not play a role in the field. The broad public goes for this line of eternal Russia.

7-00:54:32

Engerman: As it always has.

7-00:54:33

Malia: As it always has. So he gives a veneer of scholarly respectability. But in the field, it does not count. He has no followers. Within the field, it was the people who believed in the Bukharin alternative, they were the majority.

7-00:54:34

Engerman: Cohen and Lewin.

7-00:54:52

Malia: Cohen and Lewin. And also, I did not mention the Lewin book. The notion that it was the peasant's backwardness that is responsible for the cult of Stalin, and that Stalin and the Stalin autocracy was really pretty obscene. That is not why you had the cult of Stalin. There was that group, and then a minority which was much more active, Sheila and J. Arch Getty and company. Both of these groups were falsifying history. There was no Bukharin alternative, or rather, it was based on a misreading of what the regime was,

and what the party, all of them, not just Stalin, but all of them wanted. There was never any cultural revolution at all, that is a pipe-dream that Sheila cooked up to make Soviet socialism overall look more progressive.

7-00:55:59

Engerman: Let's go back to the Bukharin alternative. Just yesterday you said that Cohen's Bukharin book was actually a very good book.

7-00:56:06

Malia: Oh, the biography, yes. As a narrative of Bukharin's career, yes, this was very good. But there is a political moral that follows from it; that Bukharin was right, and Stalin was wrong, and that Bukharin was—he developed elsewhere in essays and so forth, that Bukharin's views had been a real alternative to what Stalin and the party did—it wasn't just but the party after 1928, '29. No, as a piece of historical scholarship on the career of Bukharin, it was very good. Whereas the sociological analysis of Lewin is not, or how does he pronounce it?

7-00:56:58

Engerman: Moshe Lewin.

7-00:56:59

Malia: Moshe Lewin is not good. It is a naïve misreading of a political process in sociological terms.

7-00:57:11

Engerman: So you set about the task, especially in *Soviet Tragedy* and afterward, I am quoting here, "of reforming the field."

7-00:57:23

Malia: And it did not work.

7-00:57:24

Engerman: Why didn't it work, do you think?

7-00:57:29

Malia: The basic reason, I give this in the "Nonsense and Communism" article, is that communism is on the left. Its initial intentions were good. Its values were universal and egalitarian. Therefore, you cannot be against that too vehemently, without playing into the hands of the Right. Since it is the soft Left that dominates the intellectual world in all the Western countries, and it has pretty uniformly for a very long time, it is very hard to take a firm stand in unmasking the Soviet fraud. Because it was a fraud. It was a lie, as Solzhenitsyn and Michnik and a number of others reiterated. Besançon was very good on explicating that it was a fraud. It was not what it pretended to be, because what it pretended to be cannot possibly exist. Therefore it only could be maintained only by force and ideological propaganda. If you try to explain that, you are viewed as someone who is against universal values and equality. You are on the right, you are a conservative. Once the label conservative is pinned on you, that is the end of you. This is why Furet was always so careful to set forth his views in the *Nouvelle Observateur*.

The result is that I am now pigeonholed with Pipes as the conservative opposition to the revisionists. That is why I insist so much on the difference between me and Pipes. Even

someone like Furet at the beginning did not see that Pipes and I were saying radically different things. I had to explain to him. Kotkin had to explain this to him, to a number of journalist people such as well, David Remnick.

7-00:59:57

Engerman: From the *New Yorker*.

7-00:59:59

Malia: Yes, whom we both knew in Moscow. We both knew Remnick and Bill Keller.

7-01:00:04

Engerman: You and Pipes both knew him?

7-01:00:06

Malia: No, Pipes was not there at all. Me and Kotkin both frequented Remnick and Keller when we wasted time on Western journalists. And Bernard Guetta, the man from *Le Monde*, who had been the great reporter on Solidarity, he thought that Gorbachev was a kind of Solidarity in power. It was impossible to explain to him the difference between Solidarity and Perestroika. The difference between me and Pipes has to be pointed out to people. They do not get it, which puts me in a difficult position, because I have to tend to a classic critique of Pipes, because Pipes does not realize that he is contradicting himself. That is what the letters, the exchange between us that is in *The New Republic* after that review that he wrote.

7-01:01:08

Engerman: “East is East”

7-01:01:12

Malia: Okay, well, he does not realize—he is saying on the one hand, it is Russian patrimonialism that explains communism. The state is the proprietor of the land and all of its inhabitants. On the other hand, they are trying to start a whole new world. They tried to change humanity. He does not see that the two things are incompatible as explanations of what the system was. I sent him my answer to his review. I got a telephone call from *The New Republic*, “Can you give us the page numbers of these citations?” Now, that request did not come from *The New Republic*.

7-01:02:00

Engerman: It came from Pipes.

7-01:02:01

Malia: It came from Pipes, because he was amazed when he saw this. He said, “Where does he get this stuff? He must be distorting my line.” So I gave them the page numbers. They are in *Russia Under the Old Regime* and the beginning of *The Russian Revolution*. He does not understand. We also had an exchange in the TLS. Did you see that?

7-01:02:31

Engerman: The one that happened through Paul Johnson’s review?

7-01:02:33

Malia: No, no, they asked me to review his, *The Unknown Lenin* book. And on the basis of things in it, I made a little critique of Pipes. I said he presents Lenin as viewing the

Soviet Union as his *votchina* [estate], his patrimony. That is a lot of baloney. I went after the patrimonialism thesis in my answer to him, and he answered me, and so forth.

7-01:03:10

Engerman: Now, Pipes has more or less given up on reforming the field. He seems to mostly just ignore it.

7-01:03:16

Malia: Yeah, well, I have given up on it too.

7-01:03:18

Engerman: There is one thing that you will have in common, then.

7-01:03:23

Malia: Yes. It is like converting my Socialist friends to the point of view of [inaudible].

7-01:03:32

Engerman: Did you ever stop trying to convert them?

7-01:03:36

Malia: I just don't talk about it. I just tease Touraine about it, about his right-wing friend Cardoso in Brazil. He won't answer to that. I am also a friend of Lula [Brazil's president Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva], who is turning rightward too. I just tease them a little bit about it. He now knows that he is not going to live under socialism, so there is no point in—with Le Goff, I do not bother, but Le Goff now believes in Europe. We have to have a goal, we have to have something to hope for. I have given up on arguing the moral equivalence of Nazism and communism. Oh, I did not go into that.

7-01:04:27

Engerman: No, let's hear.

7-01:04:28

Malia: Did you see the introduction I did for *The Black Book of Communism*?

7-01:04:34

Engerman: No, I have not seen that, but I have seen the essay you wrote comparing Nazism and communism from fall 2002.

7-01:04:42

Malia: Okay, I will explain how I wrote that essay. When *The Black Book of Communism* came out—

7-01:04:48

Engerman: The French edition?

7-01:04:49

Malia: The French edition, the original.

7-01:04:50

Engerman: Which was in what year?

7-01:04:53

Malia: '91, something like that. That [Ronald Grigor] Suny article I gave you was written for *The White Book of Communism*, which came out in France later on. It came out in 1990—I don't know. It is in my office, we can look it up, I think. Tony Judt jumped on this immediately. He used to be here, when he was on the left. Now he is no longer on the left, but not all the way. I mean, he is very anti-neo-con, and anti-Bush. He has written some very good things on that. He jumped on this, and wrote an op-ed piece in the *New York Times*, pulling only from the introduction of the *Black Book* written by Courtois, a disciple of Annie Kriegel, and another ex-Communist. No, he is an ex-Maoist. Now he is really on the right. So, Judt quotes only that part, which establishes a very mechanistic moral equivalence between communism and Nazism. They both kill an awful lot of people, and that is it. He jumped on that immediately. I was afraid he was going to write a full review of it somewhere. I could not call up Silvers for that, so I called up the TLS, which does review things in foreign languages, and wrote a review, the last line of which was the operative line, I forget just how I put it. Anyway, it was—oh, first of all, I go through the arguments on whether or not there is moral equivalence, and I mentioned what Lynn Moran said, that Nazism is worse because communism killed not for the sake of killing, but for the sake of a given policy, a political dream however misguided, whereas Nazism exterminated for the sake of exterminating. This was Furet's position too. Besançon—I was writing this about a book, published in France, actually. Besançon's position is that from the point of view of the people who were killed, they were equally guilty.

7-01:07:33

Engerman: It does not matter whether people were in—

7-01:07:36

Malia: The motivation does not matter. Then I said that I am not going to take a position on these. All I want is that Soviet communism receive its fair share of absolute evil. In other words, I was spoofing the absolute evil, how we measure absolute evil. How can we tell it was absolute, because—and I was not making a case for communism being worse, which is what Courtois did, because it killed more people overall than Hitler did. But of course the TLS, when they printed it, put Hitler and Stalin on the cover, with the caption, "As Bad as Each Other." And of course, various people went up in smoke, one of them a former—I did not go into my German intellectual history students with you?

7-01:08:38

Engerman: No, you never mentioned German intellectual history.

7-01:08:40

Malia: Well, Larry Dickie, who has an article in our *Festschrift*, who has a superb book on Hegel, and John Zimeto, who is now at Rice, who has a superb book on Councilor Treatus, and then a guy named Gabriel Motzkin, who is now at the University of Jerusalem wrote a monstrous and not-all-that-good thesis on Heidegger, which he never was able to publish because it was just too formless, he now teaches at Hebrew University. He and his colleague, Avishai Margalit, do you know who he is? He writes in *The New York Review*. They went up in smoke, I was "relativizing the Holocaust." So they got together a conference at Schloss—what is its name? Schloss—it is in the Bavarian Alps. It is a famous conference center. The name will come back to me tomorrow. Schloss-something or other. It is a kind of—it is a resort place in the Bavarian Alps. It is very nice. And Gabriel got a hold of money from someone, because

we were all put up there for a couple of weeks, fare paid and everything. And, some people from *The Black Book* [*Le Livre Noir du Communisme, The Black Book of Communism*] from Paris attended. A guy named Michael Burleigh who has written on Hitler, a very good book on Hitler. He wrote me a fan letter for the—

7-01:10:24

Engerman: Burleigh has also written about German Ostforschung [German for Scholarship on Eastern Europe and Russia/USSR].

7-01:10:27

Malia: That is right. Reinhart Koselleck was there.

7-01:10:36

Engerman: One of the deans of intellectual—

7-01:10:38

Malia: The dean of German historiography. A couple of younger guys whose names I cannot remember right now. I will remember them by tomorrow. Myself, Gabriel, Geremek, who was himself Jewish, and a victim of both the Nazis and the Communists, so he was covered all around. Oh, what is his name? He is a big chum of Marty Jay's who teaches part-time in Germany and part-time in Beersheba. He is a rather well known figure. So we got together and had a conference. It was written up in *Die Zeit* [German newspaper]. There were journalists from *Die Zeit* there.

7-01:11:42

Engerman: When was this?

7-01:11:43

Malia: I have got all of this somewhere in writing.

7-01:11:47

Engerman: In the late nineties?

7-01:11:47

Malia: Late-nineties. And then, that was in August. Then, a smaller group, including again Geremek and me, in Jerusalem, with other people added, over the break at the end of the year, that must have been in—what year was that? '99? 2000? I do not know which. Then two years ago, at NYU in New York. Then, one of these younger Germans, who was then occupying the Max Weber Chair at NYU, Dietrich is his first name. I cannot remember the second name. I can look it up. He had a big conference in New York. All sorts of people, including the people invited to the earlier conferences, and a bunch of other people. Amir Wiener was one of the people invited to this. An old-timer. Oh, Todorov, Tzvetan Todorov, the Franco-Bulgarian. He was a literary philosophical who has written a lot of things. It was a big deal in New York, and those papers were supposed to be published in a volume, which is still in the works. But, the organizational capacity of Dietrich X, whose name I cannot remember, and Gabriel, is not very high. The volume is not yet out. So, I took my paper and sent it into *The National Interest*, to get it published somewhere. As you can see, I am sort of weary of the whole thing. There is no point continuing with this argument because since communism was on the left, it is never going to be judged as harshly as Nazism on the right, if indeed "Right" is the right place to put Nazism since it is not quite clear. So

there was that. And I have given up trying to reform the field. People like Suny are going to dominate, no matter what I say. Most people will not accept comparing Nazism and communism too readily, although it is becoming more frequent than it used to be. After the Soviet regime, there was sort of a break-through period. That is why they did *The Black Book*, and it is all former Communist or fellow travelers. Alexander Werth [spells], do you know who his father was?

7-01:14:53

Engerman: No, tell us.

7-01:14:56

Malia: A British big fellow traveler who wrote a book on the Soviets in the war. Somehow or other, he wound up in France so his son who grew up in France is a Normalien. He grew up in Russia and in France, so he has perfect Russian. The son, Alexander, Nicholas, whom I know, [inaudible], he wrote the section on Russia, which is excellent. He used to be a kind of fellow traveler himself. He wrote a history of the Soviet Union published in French and in Russian. He looked forward to Gorbachev as the second coming of Bukharin, and the resolution of [problem]. So that is where things stand now. Now I am trying to situate socialism and revolution in the *longue duree* of Western history, which means you have got to go back to the first thing that looks like a revolution, the term of course emerging only at the time of the French Revolution, in its modern meaning, which is the Hussites. And, it originates in religious, let's say, heterodoxy objecting to society of two swords. Empire and papacy, or secular and spiritual.

The three orders, the three estates that are still there in 1789, which has gradually eroded through a series of explosions from the Reformation in three places, Germany, France, Netherlands, to the Puritan Revolution, to the French Revolution, and the American Revolution is made possible when the British try to enforce an imperial system on something that has been spun off from the mother country, with too much of the heritage from the Puritan Revolution already safely onto the continent. Therefore it is in the series, although it does not follow anything like the scenario of action that you have in the other ones. And the French Revolution, which at last brings out into the open what revolution is. It gives us our modern concept of revolution. It is a new world, a new man, through a millenarian cataclysm. And, it is thoroughly modern. It liquidates completely the world of heritage of which the British in large part preserved, of the two swords and the three orders. But of course fails to produce the just, free, equal, and fraternal society it promised. Therefore you get the super dream, which is socialism. And, anticipation of scenarios that will at last bring us a socialist 1789, in the 1830s, 1840s are the seedbed of this theorizing. Marx is the guy who produced the winning theory, and he produced it because he expected the next revolution to begin in Paris. The socialists had already had bourgeois revolution. The English then had a more or less bourgeois revolution in 1688. Engels told him that Manchester was ready to revolt for socialism, so it would begin somewhere between Manchester and Paris as a socialist revolution, and move into Germany, and you could have a bourgeois revolution, and a socialist revolution all in one. That was his position in *The Communist Manifesto*. If you read it carefully, it is there. The whole system is there as of the "German Ideology" [essay written by Marx] in 1848. This is where Kolakowski comes in. This is where Kolakowski is better than Raymond Aron. Raymond Aron had argued very persuasively that modern socialism is a secular religion.

7-01:19:43

Engerman: *Opium of the Intellectuals.*

7-01:19:44

Malia: *Opium of the Intellectuals.* Well, he goes through empirically, showing the various things—he has in mind that Social Democrats are people—and he’s right—who had to give up on their dreams, and settle for half a loaf, and Communists are the ones that persist in trying to get there. They need a religious mythology in order to keep up the faith, because the quest is never-ending. So he goes through the myth of the proletariat, the myth of the Left, the myth of world revolution, and shows empirically that the things that they believe do not correspond to historical reality. And, just take an example, one of his arguments is this: Marx in the “Eighteenth Brumaire” says that Orleanists represent new capitalist money, and Legitimists represent old landed wealth. The two political positions come from economic positions. But you have to have a House of Orleans, and you have to have a House of Bourbon for this to take place. And historically speaking, you almost did not have a house of Bourbon. The heir of Charles X was assassinated by a guy named Ruvel, I think. His wife was pregnant at the time. Was it going to be a boy or a girl? If it had been a girl, she could not, according to the Salic Law, inherit. In other words, there would have been no elder Bourbon line, and the Duke of Orleans automatically would be the heir of both lines, if you take the Legitimists’ position. So this is a political variable quite independent of capitalist wealth versus landed wealth. So the two groups split really over this political and ideological issue, not over an economic issue. Most people do not see this. It is so plausible, the Orleanists are the new money. They want to build railroads. The Legitimists are the old regime stalwarts, landed wealth.

I once bought that kind of analysis. This is the way Aron argues. But Kolakowski, who knows his German philosophy better than the philosopher—Aron was a trained philosopher and knew German very well. He spent a good part of the thirties in Germany, together with Jean-Paul Sartre. That is where their rivalry starts. Kolakowski understood that Hegel is already a secular religion. This Aron more or less suspected but did not pursue. Larry Dickie does a great job on showing the religious origins of Hegelianism in his book on Hegel. So, Kolakowski did, by taking the particularity of German philosophy very seriously, remember, the opening phrase is “Karl Marx was a German philosopher,” and this means ultimately the divinization of man. [Ludwig] Feuerbach shows that God is a projection of an idealized humanity. That is his argument. Marx then uses this as a kind of argument for the socialist divinization of man, raising man to the level of an imagined divinity. This can be worked out in Marx’s texts. We could not understand this about Marx until around 1930.

7-01:23:49

Engerman: Because of the manuscripts?

7-01:23:51

Malia: Until the early writings were discovered. The first person to write a book on this was Robert Tucker, the Sovietologist. His first book, which you can look at, it is sometime in the 1950s. He exploits rather crudely these manuscripts, to show that, yes, Marxism is a secular religion. And people ignored it. People like Sheldon Wolin here, scoffed at it as a crude character-like misreading of Marx.

7-01:24:26

Engerman: Well, you yourself just called it crude.

7-01:24:28

Malia: I said caricatured. When I said crude, I meant not as good as Kolakowski. Kolakowski does this with exquisite sophistication. It is a beautifully written, beautifully thought out and constructed book. This I think is the first time we really understood Marx in his basic terms. Now, Marxism the movement is another matter. Not everyone who is a Marxist has obviously shared in the redemptive vision that he sets forth. But, this is—no, [Georg] Lukacs gets this very well. Lukacs got this without seeing those manuscripts simply by getting at the spirit that is behind the mechanistic Marxism of the second international, which was really late [Friedrich] Engels' "Anti-Dühring" [1877 essay]. Okay, so I am using the Kolakowski reading of Marx, together with this idea of telescoping the bourgeois and the proletarian revolution, which is a mid-nineteenth century German invention, which then gets into Russia when the conditions make it possible for Lenin and company to act on this fantasy of telescoping the two, because you have got the advanced West there to help you out. Marx was counting on France and England to bail out prematurely Socialist Germany, Lenin and Kautsky were counting on the Western proletariat to bail out a prematurely Socialist Russia. It is no accident that Marxism has caught on not in advanced countries, but in backward countries. From Russia, it has then spread all over the place.

To end the whole sermon, this is what modern history is all about, socialism was the great theoretical project, I have said this before, you may have heard it, of the nineteenth century. And, all of our key sociological theorists—Marx, de Toqueville, Durkheim, Weber, are concerned in one form or another with this. With de Toqueville, it is called equality or democracy. By that he means social levity, egalitarianism. With Marx it is called socialism. With Durkheim—he was a socialist, it is called the religion of humanity. The sociology of religion is at the heart of his work. Weber is against socialism and is against Marxism. But he highlights the historical importance of a secularized form of religion as the key to modernity with which he is somewhat unhappy.

7-01:27:57

Engerman: In *The Protestant Ethic*, you mean?

7-01:27:58

Malia: In *The Protestant Ethic*, but he is unhappy with capitalism. It is the iron cage. He is unhappy with its rationalist approach. So, the socialism as the great theoretical project of the nineteenth century then became the great practical endeavor of the twentieth century, in either a Social-Democratic, or a Communist form. The great Social-Democratic versions of this were Sweden, of course, but more important than that, the British Labour victory in 1945. They were really going to build socialism. The millenarian anticipations. But unfortunately, for them, in England you have to have elections every so often, and you can have permanent socialism only if you do away with periodical elections, because most of society—well, what socialism amounts to in practical terms is the end of private property, and the end of the market, all varieties. Social Democrats never go to those lengths, but that is the goal towards which they are working. When we have periodic elections, you cannot do that. So, the Western Social-Democratic variant of the practical endeavor of socialism in the twentieth century leads

to the welfare state, and Socialists who make big reforms, and then get kicked out and come back, and re-lance. But now that the welfare state is built, the problem is to keep financing it. In America, you only had a mini-welfare state. Socialism never became legitimate in America. Here I base myself on Louis Hartz's to my mind remarkable book. [*The Liberal Tradition in America*] Do people still read that?

7-01:30:02

Engerman: As intellectual history more than as social theory.

7-01:30:05

Malia: Well, he is repeating de Toqueville. De Toqueville understood that—he did not put in [the sense of those terms] that America was born free. It was born post-old regime. And you have socialism only where you have an old regime. Okay, so that hard version of socialism, as non-capitalism, that is, a non-market. No market and no private property, of course, is the Soviet Union, and it is the people who imitate it. Well, both of these things ended in the 1980s. The Social Democratic variety peters out into Blairism, which is not socialism at all. It is hardly even the American Democratic party in its heyday. Or it peters out into [Gerhard] Schroeder. Or [Lionel] Jospin, who was an ex-Trot, as it came out. And of course he lost the presidential election in ignominious fashion. My friend Touraine has to write a book called *La Place Societalista After Socialism*.”

7-01:31:19

Engerman: I am going to turn it back on, so that you can conclude appropriately.

7-01:31:23

Malia: Okay, I have really got to the end of my lecture. In the eighties, the New Deal peters out in Clintonism.

7-01:31:33

Engerman: Well, it is assaulted under Reaganism.

7-01:31:39

Malia: But Clinton comes up with a Blair-like liquidation of the old dream. It peters out in Clinton, Blair, Shroeder, and Jospain. Because there is not anything more to do. Once you have the welfare state built, and once it has become clear that you have to have a market, it is a question of how much you regulate, how you can pay for the whole thing. Only in America do people like Bush and company dream of doing away with the welfare state if they can.

7-01:32:13

Engerman: Didn't Reagan try to do away with the welfare state?

7-01:32:20

Malia: He reduced taxes, but what were the programs that he tried to dismantle?

7-01:32:25

Engerman: The Education Department.

7-01:32:27

Malia: That is a peripheral department. That is the periphery. He did not touch Social Security, any of the core things. Whereas these guys, if you buy [Paul] Krugman's line, and I more or less do, they want to starve the beast, as he says. You notice those columns?

7-01:32:41

Engerman: I think that much of what he says might apply to Reagan as well.

7-01:32:45

Malia: He may be exaggerating.

7-01:32:49

Engerman: I think some of this applies back to Reagan.

7-01:32:51

Malia: Neither Eisenhower nor Nixon really tried to roll [back the New Deal]. Reagan nibbled at it around the edges. These guys really want to assail it. But only in America do you have that, because only in America do you have the kind of society that makes that possible. In Europe, no. Schroeder is having tremendous difficulty in keeping the welfare state financed by cutting back some of the benefits. The effort which began under Mitterand to create a Socialist order had to be completely liquidated by the time you get to Jospin. So, that is no longer an option. Communism has failed. Only Castro still thinks that it might be viable. So for the first time in two centuries, we are without a viable utopia. These third-world people, which in French is much better, the *autre-mondialiste*, the other-worldly people, they never pronounce the word socially. They are just against globalization, and they are for, what are they for? The Tobin Tax relieving third-debt and things like that, that is not the millenarian dream. So the world is without a usable utopia. This is an unprecedented situation in modern times. How it is going to end, I have no idea, because I think the empirical evidence is that we need some sort of transcendent goal. And if one embodiment of this goes broke, another one emerges. There is not one on the horizon now, so I do not know what—we must expect it to return in some form, but what form is absolutely impossible to predict. So that is it.

[End of Session]

[Interview #8: December 23, 2003]

[Begin Audio File Malia: 08 12-23-03]

8-00:00:02

Engerman: Okay, so this is sort of an addendum tape. We are finished with the main part of [our interview], and you said you want to start with one anecdote, and then we can talk more freely about other things.

8-00:00:10

Malia: Well, the anecdote is this. Norman Ferrera, who was one of my graduate students at Berkeley, who contributed to the *Festschrift*, was very involved in the movement during the sixties. He and his sidekick who was in British history, and whose name I do not remember, were big fans of mine as a teacher, but of course disapproved of my politics. And the line they kept running with me is this: “Don’t you see that America is heading towards fascism? Why don’t you professors speak up? You are acting like the professors in Nazi Germany when the Fascists were taking over.” They really believed that. Just a little sample of how ideological—

8-00:01:05

Engerman: How did you respond?

8-00:01:07

Malia: I said, “The parallel is just crazy. We are not on the verge of anything like that. It is anti-historical, ahistorical.” But they really believed that, and they were trying to stimulate their professors to take a stand against the Lyndon Johnson Fascist project. It is a sample. It is in category with Besançon and Heller believing that Gorbachev was like Stalin. The power of a priori ideological stances in practical life. This I think is a thread that runs all through my career. I was introduced to politics, beyond modest American regional politics, at the Ecole Normale in its hardest version, namely communism. I was struck in that case by the power of ideological delusion to influence intelligent people in real life. As I said, I’m okay, I understood this. It is behind me. Raymond Aron thought the same thing when he wrote *The Opium of Intellectuals*. Okay, I have scotched all of the arguments now that remained on the problem of Soviet power. Daniel Bell, in this country, with his *End of Ideology*, thought it was the same thing, we put ideology behind us. I thought I would put ideology behind us because people like Aron and Bell were telling us the age of ideology is over.

8-00:03:07

Engerman: Edward Shils actually coined the term first.

8-00:03:10

Malia: He was the one who pointed it out first?

8-00:03:12

Engerman: He had an article about the Milan Conference of the Congress for Cultural Freedom that appeared in *Encounter*. It was called “The End of Ideology.”

8-00:03:19

Malia: Well, I was not following this.

8-00:03:20

Engerman: So you were a part of that—

8-00:03:21

Malia: I heard about it through—it is Bell that made it a slogan.

8-00:03:26

Engerman: In '59, well '60, with the publication of that book.

8-00:03:30

Malia: Yes, okay. A few years later, the ideological outburst in Berkeley. I said, “Oh, here it is again,” in a situation that I thought was immune to it. Aron recognized too that it is the same old thing. It is not the same people. It is another generation, but it is the same phenomenon. Then, in the late sixties and the seventies, beginning in the seventies, I realized that the field of the historical inquiry I was engaged in Russia had been ideologized. First with the new Bukharinists, and then with the soft-Stalinists. This is roughly what I said to Remnick in that letter that I cannot find, to explain that the hard stand I took on ideology in *The Soviet Tragedy*, that ideology is the sine qua non of this kind of phenomenal history. The reason I am so sensitive to it is because I have lived through it first in France, and then in Berkeley, and I find it dominating similar views, dominating Americans studying the Soviet Union, and that is why I emphasize this so much. Remnick did not really get the point, because in his review of the book, what he latches onto is the continuity between the reformism of Gorbachev and the reformism of Yeltsin. He did not adequately see that Yeltsin for all of his failures understood the one essential thing, that you have to chuck the whole old system. Gorbachev never did see that. Even though in terms of actual policy implemented by the two there is a continuity to be seized, he does not see that the magic has broken, the lie is denounced, the fraud is abandoned when you get to Yeltsin. Kotkin sees this very well in *Armageddon Averted*, but he goes a little too far sort of congratulating Gorbachev, saying how grateful we should be to him for his misguided idealism which led to the destruction of the Soviet system for us. I think he is a little bit torn himself. He wants to hold onto—there was that idealism there. But, I have discovered that this is a very hard point to make. Incidentally, a very favorable review in this edition of *The Slavic Review*, a very favorable review of Kotkin's *Armageddon*, by a political scientist named Rutland. The eternal return of ideological intoxication has been the leitmotif of my intellectual—

8-00:06:51

Engerman: And now you say that that moment is done. Ideology requires a utopia.

8-00:06:57

Malia: No, it is going to come back in some form. The Socialist form is dead. After two centuries, it is dead. In both its hard and in its soft version. What form is going to come back, I do not know. But, it has always been there. There is no reason that it is going to go away. So I have said all really I have to say.

8-00:07:17

Engerman: Yes, and you said that you had some questions for me that you were saving up.

8-00:07:20

Malia: Well—

- 8-00:07:21
Engerman: I am just going to leave the tape running, and we will decide what to do with this material later.
- 8-00:07:24
Malia: As a card-carrying American historian, why did you develop such an intense interest in Russia?
- 8-00:07:29
Engerman: My interest in Russia came about, I suppose, for what you might see as ideological reasons. My high school and college coincided with the Reagan administrations.
- 8-00:07:42
Malia: Okay, all right.
- 8-00:07:43
Engerman: And, I started with something of a knee-jerk anti-Reagan reaction. I don't know, did you vote for Reagan or were you a Mondale person? Where did you stand?
- 8-00:07:55
Malia: I voted for Reagan the first time.
- 8-00:07:57
Engerman: Over Carter.
- 8-00:07:57
Malia: Because Carter had been such a mess. And I voted for Nixon against McGovern, because McGovern would have been an absolutely impossible president. Otherwise I have voted Democrat.
- 8-00:08:13
Engerman: In any case, I was reacting very strongly against Reagan's "evil empire" with some sort of the notion that it cannot really be as bad as he thought. Now, this is the sort of notion that one can have when one is seventeen and has not really studied it. But it got me interested in studying Russia.
- 8-00:08:32
Malia: It was impolitic of him to say it. He should have let his vice president say it. But I approved of his actual policies towards the Soviet Union.
- 8-00:08:42
Engerman: Which Pipes in his memoirs now takes some credit for.
- 8-00:08:46
Malia: Well, I think that is an exaggeration.
- 8-00:08:47
Engerman: In any case, I started studying it, and I found two things. One is that I was not sure that Reagan was right, but I was sure that I was wrong in dismissing the notion.
- 8-00:09:03
Malia: When did you make sure of that?

8-00:09:04

Engerman: Even just in my first course in Russia, which is Russian history, which was in 1987 or '88 with Andrew Verner. He wrote a very solid book on the 1905 Revolution. He was at Swarthmore where I went to college.

8-00:09:28

He was a grad student [at Columbia University]. He was roughly the same cohort as people like Ziva Galili.

8-00:09:35

Malia: Where was this?

8-00:09:36

Engerman: At Swarthmore College. He then did not get tenure my last year at Swarthmore, went to the University of Illinois, started over on the tenure clock, did not get tenure there and left the field. But in any case, he was hardly sympathetic to the cause, the Soviet cause. But as I took the course, I found the topic just absolutely compelling. I feel like all of the things that historians should try to explain are abundant in complex ways in studying Russia and the Soviet Union. So that is how I got interested in Russia in the first place, and so then I took a few years off, started graduate school.

8-00:10:19

Malia: Where did you go to graduate school?

8-00:10:20

Engerman: I started at Rutgers, actually, mostly interested in American history, and then transferred here because I decided I really wanted to do much more on the Russian stuff, and I realized what a difference it made to be at a place that had bought into the area studies model, in terms of the number of scholars around, the library resources, the general resources. The intellectual climate here was so much better than at Rutgers for Russian history, even though Rutgers had a very strong, in fact debatably even stronger program in American history than Berkeley did.

8-00:10:52

Malia: They had a good program in Russian history too.

8-00:10:54

Engerman: Well, they had Ziva Galili and Seymour Becker, but that was not a program. I never really worked much with Becker. Ziva was terrific. But the problem was that there was no group of students. The library holdings were terrible. The Slavic Literature department was an embarrassment. It turns out that it was important, I felt, to have an intellectual center for Russian studies in particular.

8-00:11:20

Malia: When did you come to Berkeley?

8-00:11:21

Engerman: I started in '93. I did my master's [at Rutgers], I wrote my master's thesis on American relief to the Russian famine [of 1921-23], using mostly documents from the Hoover, but some documents from Russian libraries. As I was working on that thesis, I got very interested in sort of conceptions of Russia, and how that shaped policies toward Russia during that famine. And, I expanded that. I originally—

8-00:11:53

Malia: During the famine?

8-00:11:53

Engerman: During the famine, '21 to '23. I envisioned doing a dissertation that would be looking at four famines in modern Russian history, 1891, '21 to '23, '32 to '33, and '46, and looking at the famines, their causes, and Western responses in all four of those.

8-00:12:11

Malia: What attracted you to the problem of the famine?

8-00:12:14

Engerman: I would say it was just one of those highly contingent things. I think in college I had taken a course on food and history with a Chinese historian, and I wrote my end of semester papers for that on the Russian famine, and found it very interesting. So when I was applying to graduate schools, I said, "Well, this is something I would be interested in working on." I started working on it, and it actually was interesting to work on it. But I eventually shifted away from emphasizing the famines. So what I did for my dissertation, now first book, is to take more or less that first time period, from the late nineteenth century until the middle of the twentieth century, and look at American ideas about Russia. So, it has in some sense some parallels with *Russia Under Western Eyes*, although it is more limited, I suppose, in two senses. One, is that it is really only about American writers, and the other is that it is a little restricted in terms of I try not to deal too much with party people. One of my points there is that there are a lot of people who were attracted to the Soviet Union who had no particular interest in party politics and knowledge of the capital-P, Party. Then the other way it is limited is that I deal less with kind of artistic representations, and deal with people I call Russia experts, diplomats, journalists and scholars who were paid and trained to interpret Russia for American audiences.

8-00:13:49

Malia: Was there great interest in Russia in America at that time?

8-00:13:52

Engerman: Well, in the twenties and thirties there was a great deal.

8-00:13:55

Malia: Well, obviously, I am sure—

8-00:13:56

Engerman: But not all of that is party. No, the book is very back-heavy, I suppose. The chapters around the Five-Year Plan and the famine are by far the biggest chapters in the book.

8-00:14:10

Malia: But you begin in the 1890s?

8-00:14:11

Engerman: I begin a little earlier, actually. I begin with the elder George Kennan, and deal with a couple of second- and third-rate people who were writing; William Dudley Foulke; Isabel Hapgood, who was sort of an interpreter of the day, that sort of people. Then I follow that into the academy of people like Archibald Cary Coolidge and Samuel

Harper. Also gentlemen Socialists like William English Walling and his cohort into the Revolution.

8-00:14:42

Malia: Well, what fascinated you about Russia in the first place?

8-00:14:45

Engerman: As I said, ideas about—I thought Russian history is just so compelling. It offers the problems that every historian should be trying to address.

8-00:14:59

Malia: Such as?

8-00:15:00

Engerman: Well, in a broader sense, here I suppose, the tension if not conflict between egalitarian goals and terrible results.

8-00:15:18

Malia: Well, this is Soviet history?

8-00:15:19

Engerman: I have been more interested in Soviet than in Russian. One of the concessions I made to try to be a dual citizen in American and Russian history is not going back as far. I am interested in Russian history as well. I think some of these same issues apply, because I think—this is something I think would be consistent, more or less consistent with your views—that there are a variety of social crises in late Imperial Russia, and those social crises do not automatically lead to Bolshevism, but they lead to a situation in which Bolshevism could take over.

8-00:15:57

Malia: Yes.

8-00:15:57

Engerman: So in this sense, the origins of those social crises are themselves very interesting. I have been long interested in economic issues. My father is an economic historian.

8-00:16:11

Malia: I have met him a couple of times.

8-00:16:12

Engerman: Oh, really? He never mentioned that.

8-00:16:14

Malia: I forget where. Well, no, he probably would not. It was when he was famous because of *Time on the Cross*, and I was in the audience with him. So, it was a discussion but I don't remember.

8-00:16:27

Engerman: Anyway, so I have always been interested in economic issues, and I think those are particularly interesting in late nineteenth-century Russia. Thinking about people like Gerschenkron, and their ideas, and what economic history—

- 8-00:16:42
Malia: Well, Gerschenkron was very interesting.
- 8-00:16:44
Engerman: Yeah. I think he was very interesting, although the more I started reading him in detail, the less enthusiastic I am about him. I think that he—
- 8-00:16:52
Malia: He is better as a general idea than as a—
- 8-00:16:55
Engerman: I think he really only has one idea, and I think it is a very interesting idea. But, I think that he squeezes far too much out of that idea.
- 8-00:17:04
Malia: It is a very easy idea to have when you are a Russian, when you look at the world from the East.
- 8-00:17:09
Engerman: Well, when you are Russian, living in Austria, writing about, and have an Austrian experience, and coming to the States and writing about the war in Germany, *Bread and Democracy*. I do not think that he was a genius, but I think he was a very knowledgeable, very erudite man. He thought and conceived of problems broadly. I admire that.
- 8-00:17:29
Malia: And he has had a big influence.
- 8-00:17:31
Engerman: That is true. So anyway, that is where I come from in this.
- 8-00:17:37
Malia: Okay, so it was the contradiction between aspiration and reality in the Soviet experiment that—
- 8-00:17:44
Engerman: That would be one aspect, but I also think that—you know, there was this debate about Arno Mayer a number of years ago when he refused to call it a Holocaust and referred to “Judeocide,” and about *Why The Heavens Not Darken*. One of the responses there I just found so offensive, which is the idea essentially that the Holocaust is beyond history, outside of history. It seems to me that nothing—
- 8-00:18:08
Malia: Is beyond history.
- 8-00:18:10
Engerman: Yes, and in some sense these issues need to be addressed, both in terms of their operations, their proximate causes, and their longer term circumstances.
- 8-00:18:20
Malia: Yes. Well, there is a certain religion, if you want, of the Holocaust. It is beyond history, it is something sacred in a negative sense. No, nothing is beyond history. The thrust of that remark negates Russia’s fair share of absolute evil.

- 8-00:18:43
Engerman: Yes.
- 8-00:18:47
Malia: It was a big fuss over Arno Mayer?
- 8-00:18:51
Engerman: He had a Jewish group at his campus at Princeton organize for boycotts and protests and so on.
- 8-00:18:58
Malia: Oh, really?
- 8-00:18:58
Engerman: Yeah. And he responded by writing a piece, contrasting in memory and history. Memory is basically for amateurs and we are professional historians. Which ultimately is not a bad answer, but it is not a particularly generous one in that setting.
- 8-00:19:13
Malia: Yes, well, the book apparently is not a good book. I have never read it.
- 8-00:19:17
Engerman: No, but I think the one task it has, and I think it is a crucial task to do, is to remember that the Holocaust [has a history], I mean in the same way that there are genetic fallacies that are prominent in American Sovietology, which is to say that Stalin was simply Lenin. Stalin was the fulfillment of Lenin. I do not think that that is the case. I think that there are contingencies along the way. I think there is also a genetic fallacy—so that genetic fallacy says, “You read [Lenin’s] *What Is to Be Done* and you understand 1937,” and I think that is a terrible mistake. There is a genetic fallacy about the Holocaust, which is you read *Mein Kampf*, and you understand Treblinka. I think that is a fallacy too. The one thing that Mayer did that seems so valuable, I have not followed the literature in the last few years, but what seems so valuable is to say, “Yes, Hitler was always anti-Semitic, yes, the Nuremberg Laws, et cetera, et cetera, but let us look specifically at when and therefore why the mass killings began.”
- 8-00:20:21
Malia: Well, this is what lots of historians do now.
- 8-00:20:22
Engerman: It is.
- 8-00:20:24
Malia: There is a whole literature.
- 8-00:20:24
Engerman: Yes, but it seems to me a valuable and important question, and I thought he was one of the first to bring that.
- 8-00:20:29
Malia: Oh, he was one of the first to do that?
- 8-00:20:30
Engerman: I think so. Again, this is not a field I read in widely, but that was my impression.

- 8-00:20:35
Malia: Well, I was vaguely aware, I may have been out of the country when it came out, that the book had been very controversial. It was not an item that I ever looked at. I did not know what the controversy was about.
- 8-00:20:48
Engerman: He refused to call it a Holocaust. That is another thing.
- 8-00:20:52
Malia: He went out of his way to refuse.
- 8-00:20:53
Engerman: Yeah, now he of course has the experiential credentials that are unshakeable on this. He is the child of survivors. And yet, he was still accused of being self-hating Jew, an anti-Semite. Some of this is obviously particular to Jewish politics in America in this period vis-à-vis the Holocaust.
- 8-00:21:15
Malia: Well, I have objected to his views on revolution and on the Soviet Union [in *The Furies*].
- 8-00:21:22
Engerman: In the *L.A. Times*.
- 8-00:21:26
Malia: It is a lousy book.
- 8-00:21:28
Engerman: Your review did not inspire me to run and pick it up [laughs].
- 8-00:21:30
Malia: Well, he knows nothing about the Russian Revolution. He relied on the Revisionists as if they were giving him the straight facts and nothing else. What do you think of the field?
- 8-00:21:45
Engerman: I guess I am a little less inclined to see it in political terms than you do. It seems to me that there are a variety of different revisionisms.
- 8-00:21:55
Malia: Yes, exactly.
- 8-00:21:56
Engerman: That were circulating from the late sixties onward, and the first was from Jerry Hough in political science—notion of pluralism as a version of anti-totalitarianism. Now, I think what they did is they relied on, as we all do when we are making points against enemies, relied on an over-simplified view of totalitarianism.
- 8-00:22:15
Malia: Yes.

8-00:22:15

Engerman: I think that the totalitarianism of Zbigniew Brzezinski and [Carl] Friedrich is much less interesting than that of say [Merle] Fainsod. Fainsod is deeply historical in his approach.

8-00:22:24

Malia: Fainsod is very good, that stands up.

8-00:22:26

Engerman: I think that stands up very well. And, I actually have been in this argument lately. I have to refine this as I try and get this ready to actually write, that, if you look at his Smolensk book, it actually has the same structure as any good work in Soviet history did in that era, which is that if the beginning and the end of each chapter are full of invocations not to Comrade Lenin or Stalin, but to totalitarianism, but the inside of the book is full of tensions and conflicts and reasons for dynamism. I think there is a lot of totalitarianism school which is not really worth resuscitating or rescuing, but I think Fainsod is often mislabeled.

8-00:23:12

Malia: It was long ago. We knew very little about the Soviet Union. It began when Stalin was still in power. What did we know? Not very much. And we really are in a position to discuss the Soviet experiment's meanings only now that Minerva's owl has taken flight and this is all over.

8-00:23:31

Engerman: I think the one thing that you are quite hard on, is the social scientific approaches to understanding the Soviet Union. Because it seems to me from what I have been looking at is that the literature in the fifties all across the disciplines was really quite ingenious and creative. Some of it has stood the test of time.

8-00:23:49

Malia: In the fifties? Such as?

8-00:23:51

Engerman: Well, I think the social system project, the Alex Inkeles's work, is really quite remarkable.

8-00:23:56

Malia: It is very informative.

8-00:23:58

Engerman: And, it is actually the social system folks who brought the study of Soviet society into the field and did it professionally.

8-00:24:10

Malia: Yes, you are right.

8-00:24:11

Engerman: For the first time, and so that the Revisionists, these later groups of Revisionists, because I would also say once among the historians there are at least two kinds of revisionism. One is revisionism over 1917, and one is over Stalinism. There are somewhat figures in it, and they have somewhat different roots intellectually, and

implications. Suny has been more of a 1917 Revisionist, Fitzpatrick, Getty, are writing about Stalinism.

8-00:24:40

Malia: Stalinists, yes.

8-00:24:42

Engerman: So anyway, I think we can find a lot of common ground if we were to explore. I think we will find some differences too.

8-00:24:49

Malia: Well, let me explicate a little bit. I reacted so strongly because of what I perceived as the return of ideology to a field in which I was interested. It was an invasion of something alien. So I took a very strong position against it, and probably overreacted to what they were doing, and I did not look enough at the nuances of what they were doing. But having said that, and looking back now, and especially after having spent two years reading very high level historiography for the French Revolution, the Puritan Revolution, for the Protestant Reformation--

8-00:25:51

Engerman: They had a couple hundred years head start.

8-00:25:53

Malia: I know. They had a lot longer time, and distance from the events.

8-00:25:57

Engerman: Availability of sources.

8-00:26:01

Malia: The historiography about twentieth-century Russia is abysmally dull. Debating with Sheila Fitzpatrick, Moshe Lewin, and Jerry Hough, these characters—it is just so boring after reading this other stuff.

8-00:26:24

Engerman: Well, but I think it is an unfair comparison.

8-00:26:26

Malia: I know.

8-00:26:27

Engerman: Because I think these other revolutions which you are talking about are not just longer ago, which allows for more time for more histories to be written. There is plenty of bad work on the French Revolution.

8-00:26:37

Malia: Indeed there is.

8-00:26:38

Engerman: As there is in any topic. Unfortunately, it seems to be ubiquitous. But it allows more time for things to come up and sort of stand up more. Another is a point that you almost make implicitly in here, which is that the social theories that we use to analyze certain events are in fact based on those events themselves, and that a lot of the debates about

understanding the French Revolution are debates that go back to the participants. And, what we now think of as classic social theories, even like Marx's, are ones that were rooted in, as you say, an effort to explain the French Revolution.

8-00:27:19

Malia: And events of the time.

8-00:27:20

Engerman: Yes, and so not only have we not had long enough time and clear enough access to sources that made twentieth-century Russian history a very difficult subject, but we do not yet have a set of social, sort of contemporary social theorizing that allows us to leverage our knowledge of Russia, of Russian events, or Soviet events, outside that. I think some of the people that have been interested in doing that, I don't think you find them successful, but I imagine you at least admire their intent. Barrington Moore's *Social Origins [of Dictatorship and Democracy]*, for instance, which maybe you would not admire the attempt. I do.

8-00:28:02

Malia: You do?

8-00:28:04

Engerman: I do. Eventually, he is trying to explain the Russian Revolution, and he is doing so—what I just learned this week, actually, is that he had written a chapter on Russia for that book, but he said that the sources were not good enough, and so it was by far the weakest chapter in the book.

8-00:28:22

Malia: Well, I thought it was rather bold of him to substitute China with Russia, saying it is essentially “The same thing, I do not need a chapter on Russia.” The way the book was published.

8-00:28:32

Engerman: But I think that is an after-the-fact kind of—he had written on that. He obviously was as well-equipped as anyone to write that chapter on Russia. There was no one else in the American field who--

8-00:28:43

Malia: Well, he had one good book on Russia, that was *Terror and Progress*, whatever that time was. *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* I do not think is a good book.

8-00:28:56

Engerman: Well, but you would not like the premise, because it is the social origins of dictatorship and democracy.

8-00:29:02

Malia: Well, the only origins are social. There are no ideological ones.

8-00:29:07

Engerman: Ah, it is consistent with its claim. That is what it is trying to do.

- 8-00:29:12
Malia: You have not seen this. The second chapter of the book is on the various explanations. Once stasiology got airborne after World War II--
- 8-00:29:29
Engerman: Stage theories.
- 8-00:29:31
Malia: What?
- 8-00:29:31
Engerman: What is stasiology?
- 8-00:29:33
Malia: The study of revolutions. It begins with [Crane] Brinton and goes down through the various theorists of the sixties, seventies, eighties, and indeed some people going into the nineties. Jack Goldstone in the eighties is now a leading sociologist, actually. The criticism that I make of all of them is the absence of the ideological motivation for various revolutions. All except for [Charles] Tilly. Also, the lack of historical sense. Neither Moore nor [Theda] Skocpol can tell the difference between the eighteenth century and the twentieth century.
- 8-00:30:28
Engerman: I think that is truer of Skocpol than it is of Moore.
- 8-00:30:32
Malia: He has the English and American Revolutions, which are seventeenth and eighteenth century. Nothing there about the—and the French Revolution, nothing there about the completely different cultural climate of the eighteenth century and the twentieth century in France and China, or America and China, all taking place in a timeless world. Well, Skocpol is really very bad. And there is no state in Barrington Moore. It is all social process. Tilly knows there is a state, and he knows there are social classes both. Where he is short on is motivation. He knows things are different in the sixteenth century. His latest book on revolutions, which goes from 1492 to 1991, which he did for the series on Europe that Le Goff edits. He knows there is a difference between the sixteenth century and the twentieth century, but he does not get it down very firmly. I am not against sociology, but what I am against is the long hegemony of social class in the mid-twentieth century, which I think fundamentally distorted the whole stasiology circuit. So if I keep going along and have to finish this book, you will see these critiques. Don't I mention something about Moore in that short course? I do about Skocpol.
- 8-00:32:21
Engerman: I think you do just a little bit. I think I am remembering Moore from your *L.A. Times* write-up.
- 8-00:32:26
Malia: What happened to poor Louis Hartz? That is not a classic case.
- 8-00:32:29
Engerman: He is a consensus historian, which is this terribly misleading category. He and Richard Hofstadter and Daniel Boorstin are lumped together.

- 8-00:32:40
Malia: Oh, I forgot to tell about Hofstadter's visit here when we were once being beleagued by the regents. I guess it was after Reagan was elected. We had a great university day, and Hofstadter was invited in as the main speaker, and gave a rousing sermon in the Greek Theatre about how he rose to fame.
- 8-00:33:01
Engerman: Academic freedom.
- 8-00:33:02
Malia: Academic freedom and so forth. That was one of the numerous episodes that I forgot to mention. That was Ken Stampp's doing because he and Ken were at College Park [University of Maryland at College Park]. They were together.
- 8-00:33:21
Engerman: The historians now—it is so changing in the last five or ten years, but Americanists just look back at that and say, "Oh, it is an era of American exceptionalism," of consensus historians. Anyway, I think what they miss in Hartz, and also in Hofstadter, is a sense of lament over the consensus. Boorstin celebrates a consensus of practical, non-ideological Americans to the point of saying, "Well, there might have been a civil war, but at least there were not competing ideologies."
- 8-00:33:50
Malia: I read Hofstadter, excuse me Hartz, I read it when it came out, as a historical commentary on America. In many very real senses, there is American Exceptionalism.
- 8-00:34:02
Engerman: Yeah.
- 8-00:34:03
Malia: De Toqueville got it for the first time, and Hartz has developed it over a reasonably *longue duree*.
- 8-00:34:15
Engerman: No, but there are a lot of people who resist that as well, this American exceptionalism. And, among the groups who resisted are those who would not surprise you, but the sort of movement of labor and social historians.
- 8-00:34:27
Malia: That does not surprise me in the least.
- 8-00:34:30
Engerman: Reading E.P. Thompson, reading the *Annales* school and--
- 8-00:34:35
Malia: The question remains: why no socialism in America?
- 8-00:34:42
Engerman: Yeah, it is striking how old questions are still around. It is a century old, and still not resolved.

8-00:34:47

Malia: It has a lot to do with the naivete of our foreign policy now. “We can plant democracy. Any old [country] have some elections and you will have democracy.” The total lack of historical depth in this kind of thinking. It is behind the naivete in good intentions of Wilson, and in part of FDR. I thought it was a first-rate historical vision.

8-00:35:14

Engerman: Yes, I find it really interesting to read as a lament, though. He is saying that there is no socialism because there is no feudalism. That I do not entirely take that as praise, in the way that Boorstin when he is talking about the sort of centrism of American politics, he is very enthusiastic about it.

8-00:35:30

Malia: Well, what were Hartz’s politics? Was he--

8-00:35:32

Engerman: He was quite conservative, but--

8-00:35:35

Malia: Then he was not lamenting the lapse of--

8-00:35:37

Engerman: Of socialism, but I think he was lamenting the lack of a true conservatism.

8-00:35:42

Malia: Of an old regime.

8-00:35:44

Engerman: Well, I think in some sense, his deepest lament was that there was no room for an Edmund Burke in a country that did not have an old regime.

8-00:35:55

Malia: They did not need a Burke.

8-00:35:57

Engerman: Yes, but he wanted one made-to-order, I think.

8-00:36:03

Malia: Okay, I did not read it that way. I did not read it as a tract in the American political debate. I read it as a historical analysis. De Toqueville was involved in the political debate of his day. He examined American exceptionalism to see if France and Europe could have American results, could have equality without extinguishing liberty. In the first book, he came back out in *Democracy in America*, there was hope for Europe, but for the revolutions, the French Revolution and the old regime, he was deeply pessimistic because they just went through ’48, and France and Europe had failed again. But he was very *engage*. Everyone is. It is impossible to avoid.

[End of Session]

David Engerman

David Engerman, assistant professor of history at Brandeis University, studies twentieth-century American history, especially its international and intellectual aspects. His first book, *Modernization from the Other Shore* (Harvard University Press, 2003), demonstrates the centrality of both racial categories and economic development in American ideas about late imperial and early Soviet Russia.

Trained in both American and Russian history, Engerman received his Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley in 1998, after first earning an M.A. from Rutgers University. He has received fellowships from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Kennan Institute, the Charles Warren Center at Harvard, and other organizations.