

Chapter 1 : Traducing Solzhenitsyn by Daniel J. Mahoney | Articles | First Things

But it is true that I do not reject democracy any more than Solzhenitsyn rejected democracy. It is, for better or worse, the political horizon of our age. Our task is to moderate it, humanize it, and prevent its subversion by those who repudiate the liberty under God and the law which is the noblest heritage of the West.

This is a common intellectual trajectory among Western right-wingers who swear by Solzhenitsyn and tend to imply that belief in egalitarianism leads straight to the guillotine or the Gulag. I was caught off-guard by the Solzhenitsyn reference. That said, my acquaintance with his work is thin, mostly to due to a few friends who were fans. One old friend was a huge Solzhenitsyn admirer. In politics, she was a right-leaning centrist, mostly a consequence of her evangelical Christianity. As an aside, she was also a Henry James super-fan. I never knew exactly what to make of the two allegiances, considered together. But I never forgot her curious attachment to Solzhenitsyn. But, on Peterson and his ilk, what is the American right, and alt-right, getting out of Solzhenitsyn? How far back does this go? When did it all begin? First, it appears right-wingers may appreciate his trenchant critiques of Bolshevism, Marx, and Engels. Solzhenitsyn criticized how an atheist Marxism and Bolshevism suppressed the Russian Orthodox Church, which Solzhenitsyn defended and admired. This is, I think, key. With his admiration of the cultural effects of the Russian Orthodox Church, Solzhenitsyn also called for a larger Slavic state pan-Slavism that would include Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus—a call that Putin no doubt has found advantageous. Heimbach, to live out this connection in America, was baptized into the Russian Orthodox Church. The WCF has advocated for the U. Solzhenitsyn also evolved into a critic of Western individualism, materialism, and liberalism. He did so after having witnessed the disruptive effects that accompanied the reintroduction of capitalism into Russia. This aspect of his thought was cemented, for Americans, in a June commencement address at Harvard video and transcript at this link. Here are some excerpts bolds mine—pardon the length: But since my forced exile in the West has now lasted four years and since my audience is a Western one, I think it may be of greater interest to concentrate on certain aspects of the West, in our days, such as I see them. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, circa , courtesy of Wikipedia A decline in courage may be the most striking feature which an outside observer notices in the West in our days. The Western world has lost its civil courage, both as a whole and separately, in each country, each government, each political party, and, of course, in the United Nations. Such a decline in courage is particularly noticeable among the ruling groups and the intellectual elite, causing an impression of loss of courage by the entire society. Of course, there are many courageous individuals, but they have no determining influence on public life. Destructive and irresponsible freedom has been granted boundless space. Society appears to have little defense against the abyss of human decadence, such as, for example, misuse of liberty for moral violence against young people, such as motion pictures full of pornography, crime, and horror. The press too, of course, enjoys the widest freedom. I shall be using the word press to include all media. But what sort of use does it make of this freedom? Here again, the main concern is not to infringe the letter of the law. There is no true moral responsibility for deformation or disproportion. What sort of responsibility does a journalist or a newspaper have to his readers, or to his history—or to history? If they have misled public opinion or the government by inaccurate information or wrong conclusions, do we know of any cases of public recognition and rectification of such mistakes by the same journalist or the same newspaper? It hardly ever happens because it would damage sales. A nation may be the victim of such a mistake, but the journalist usually always gets away with it. One may— One may safely assume that he will start writing the opposite with renewed self-assurance. But there is no awareness of this. Your shortsighted politicians who signed the hasty Vietnam capitulation seemingly gave America a carefree breathing pause; however, a hundredfold Vietnam now looms over you. But if a full-fledged America suffered a real defeat from a small communist half-country, how can the West hope to stand firm in the future? As humanism in its development became more and more materialistic, it made itself increasingly accessible to speculation and manipulation by socialism and then by communism. Even a mere cursory review of the highlighted passages above reveals what might resonate with the American right: The Harvard address may indeed be the point

after which Solzhenitsyn found friends on the American right. Even so, Congdon, in contradistinction to Mahoney, does not dare to argue for Solzhenitsyn as a democrat. Solzhenitsyn with Putin, undated. Putin was an alternative—as were the communal aspects of Russian Orthodoxy. The Moral Vision Eerdmans. Ericson recounted that review and his memories of it in a piece at *The Imaginative Conservative*. Even more than Dante, Solzhenitsyn passed through the Inferno, and was purged of dross. The subject about which knowing my Kirk best prepared me to appreciate Solzhenitsyn was the subject of ideology. I recall an argument that raged among conservatives at one long-ago time about whether conservatism was an ideology or not. As I followed the argument among my betters, with each side populated by writers whose ideas had helped me, I concluded that Kirk was right. Although time has dimmed my memory of the details of the argument because I came to a settled conviction on the matter, I agree with him that conservatism, far from being an ideology, is a negation of ideology. Then I came to Solzhenitsyn, and one confirmation of our consanguinity was his rejection of ideology—not just Marxist ideology but ideology per se. Both Kirk and Solzhenitsyn saw ideology as rooted in utopian thinking and avoided that loose usage common today that employs the term ideology to refer to any well-developed perspective, or world view. Solzhenitsyn is used, then, as some Marxists, or rather Stalinists, used Marx. The Ericson piece draws further parallels between Kirk and Solzhenitsyn, most of which given by Kirk in his book, *The Politics of Prudence*. Returning to Jordan Peterson, what do we make of things, in, when an alt-right, neo-fascist finds inspiration in one of great books of anti-communist liberalism? Alt-right ideologues have to pick-and-choose, at least a bit, to find a political hero in Solzhenitsyn. In any case, the answer to the question of when Solzhenitsyn became important to the American right, generally, was *The Story* above explains why.

Chapter 2 : Ericson â€“ Solzhenitsyn On America | The Philadelphia Society

'Solzhenitsyn and American Democracy' Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, the towering literary figure who gave us the phrase "Gulag Archipelago" and whose life spanned from Lenin to Putin, died on Sunday at the age of

Political notes and cultural commentary from a gay, libertarian, Catholic, Republican author and theatre critic Complete index of postings listed by month in left column Comments and tips always welcome! Solzhenitsyn cut an imposing figure. With his curled beard and high forehead, he resembled a cross between a Biblical patriarch and a 19th-century Mormon pioneer. While he led a brave life, unbowed by the pressures of totalitarianism, he was, apparently, meanspirited personally and loathe to keep friendships alive and active. If there is a photograph of him smiling, I have not seen it -- unless it was taken upon his return to Russia in after 20 years in exile in decadent Vermont. In , Solzhenitsyn delivered a commencement speech at Harvard University that was highly critical of Western culture. He condemned freedom and democracy and accused the West of soullessness. His rare public appearances could turn into hectoring jeremiads. Delivering the commencement address at Harvard in , he called the country of his sanctuary spiritually weak and mired in vulgar materialism. Americans, he said, speaking in Russian through a translator, were cowardly. Few were willing to die for their ideals, he said. He deplored the American way of life, and was not reluctant to say so. At Harvard in , he gave a remarkable speech to the graduating seniors with a clear warning that Western civilization was in grave jeopardy. A fact which cannot be disputed is the weakening of human beings in the West while in the East they are becoming firmer and stronger. In his tirade against Western culture, Solzhenitsyn lamented: The defense of individual rights has reached such extremes as to make society as a whole defenseless against certain individuals. It is time, in the West, to defend not so much human rights as human obligations. Destructive and irresponsible freedom has been granted boundless space. Society appears to have little defense against the abyss of human decadence, such as, for example, misuse of liberty for moral violence against young people, motion pictures full of pornography, crime and horror. Life organized legalistically has thus shown its inability to defend itself against the corrosion of evil. He also said in this speech titled " A World Split Apart ": I refer to the prevailing Western view of the world which was first born during the Renaissance and found its political expression from the period of the Enlightenment. It became the basis for government and social science and could be defined as rationalistic humanism or humanistic autonomy: It could also be called anthropocentricity, with man seen as the center of everything that exists. The turn introduced by the Renaissance evidently was inevitable historically. Then, however, we turned our backs upon the Spirit and embraced all that is material with excessive and unwarranted zeal. This new way of thinking, which had imposed on us its guidance, did not admit the existence of intrinsic evil in man nor did it see any higher task than the attainment of happiness on earth. It based modern Western civilization on the dangerous trend to worship man and his material needs. Everything beyond physical well-being and accumulation of material goods, all other human requirements and characteristics of a subtler and higher nature, were left outside the area of attention of state and social systems, as if human life did not have any superior sense. That provided access for evil, of which in our days there is a free and constant flow. Merely freedom does not in the least solve all the problems of human life and it even adds a number of new ones. In , remember, Americans were in the midst of a "malaise" that many identified as having its roots in the hypermaterialism of the " Me Decade. Others, however, were not so sanguine and suggested that Solzhenitsyn, a virtual recluse, was personally clueless about America and the West. Two years after the Harvard speech, the Ethics and Public Policy Center , where I was working at the time as a Georgetown undergraduate, published a collection of essays called Solzhenitsyn at Harvard. On September 16, , the book was launched at a dinner in Washington with two speakers commenting on it: Will and social philosopher Michael Novak. Their speeches were later collected in a slim pamphlet called Solzhenitsyn and American Democracy. The pamphlet seems to be no longer in print, while the larger volume is still, in theory, available through Amazon. In his remarks, Novak -- who contributed one of the original essays to the larger volume -- began by noting: Like Pius IX, he holds up in contrast some of the models of Christian civilization from the past -- their ideals rather than their

practices. Novak suggested that, for all his emphasis on religion and spirituality, Solzhenitsyn failed to see the link between those and liberal democratic values. The great novelist, however, in concentrating so singlemindedly on soul, sometimes overlooks its necessary political, economic, and social artifacts. Human soul does not live alone. It is embodied in social, political, and economic systems as well as in its own human skin, tissues, sinews, and organs of feeling and sensibility. Solzhenitsyn often seems to wish to reject modernity. He sometimes seems to desire a world of soul alone, leaders infused with virtue, peoples astonishingly and simply committed to the evangelical laws of peace, justice, order, and charity. Its rulers would be saints, its people willing followers, its constitution the very laws of God. The civilization he envisages would be a heavenly city. The state would wither away. There would be a kind of benevolent dictatorship of, not the proletariat, but the gentle Christian community. It is stunning, after all, to see how closely the dream of Solzhenitsyn mirrors the dream of his archenemy, Karl Marx, how he has turned Communism inside out as a vision of effortless Christian civilization, populated not by sinners but by the virtuous, organized not by trial and error, checks and balances, separation of powers, and the differentiation of systems political system, economic system, moral-cultural system, each relatively independent of the other, but by simple righteousness. He guides us to a heavenly city, before we have learned to live in the sinful climes of earth, protecting ourselves against its inevitable tyrannies. Novak goes on to say: Solzhenitsyn does us honor, though he may not think so, by being so affronted by the awful cheapness, vulgarity, and open sinfulness of our way of life. Any system open to human liberty as it actually is must necessarily abound in visible signs of sinfulness. Not even a coercive regime can repress the sinfulness of the human heart. No more can democracy be sinless than can Communism committed, as Solzhenitsyn sees it, to systemic lies, immorality, and lust for power drive out all virtue. One sentence there bears repeating: As Novak approached his conclusion, he proved to be remarkably prescient. Remember, this speech was delivered in September Ronald Reagan had not yet been elected president, and there was no certainty that he would be. Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and other "students" still held American diplomats hostage in Iran. The Cold War had every indication of being a perpetual condition. So what does Novak say? The world is, sadly, split apart. World War III did begin in, and the "correlation of forces" is less in our favor now than then, less so than at any time in the history of this republic. We are at an hour of maximum peril. Yet so, also, is our foe. A system based on lies cannot endure. The world cannot survive half slave and half free. The reckoning rumbles in Poland. Events are picking up speed. The great chapter of our age is drawing toward its climax. Whether Novak was aiming for dramatic effect or was somehow clairvoyant is up to him to reveal; few commentators in would have suggested an "approaching climax" to the Cold War except in apocalyptic terms, predicting nuclear war rather than an outcome favorable to liberty and democracy. Perhaps it can only be read as optimistic in retrospect. It is essential to the understanding of America to realize that it was founded by men who sought explicitly to tame and submerge passion, to drain it into commercial undertakings and away from the ideological and religious and political divisions that had turned the Old World into a boiling pot and that could ruin a melting pot. He began with a progression like this: The problem of any political system is the prevention of tyranny; they tyranny to which democracy is prey is the tyranny of the majority; the way to prevent that is to avoid having a majority, to have only shifting coalitions of minorities that can never become a stable and oppressive majority. Therefore faction is to be celebrated, and the United States is to succeed through a saving multiplicity of factions, made possible by a complex economic system and a continental expanse. Continuing, this widely-syndicated newspaper columnist went on to explain: To find American political thought summarized in two short newspaper columns, read two of the Federalist papers: Number Ten, where Madison celebrates factions, and Number Fifty-one, where he says, "You will see throughout our system the process of supplying by opposite and rival interests the defect of better motives. Will argues that Solzhenitsyn says that statecraft cannot just be a matter of social control; it must be, to some extent, soulcraft. I have to wonder if this was the first time that George Will used the formulation "statecraft as soulcraft," later the title of his collection of essays. Solzhenitsyn, Will says, is understandably startled by the raucousness of American life. George Orwell made the point, not long before he died, that "all popular entertainments have one thing in common: Recreational drugs, I would note, have been with us since man was still a

hunter-gatherer. Back to George Will: Solzhenitsyn understands that there is something profoundly disturbing about the sensory blitzkrieg that is part of our social life. He understands the irony of an age in which self-expression is the ultimate -- and some would say the only -- value, yet all the themes of modern literature seem to converge on the fragility of a sense of self. After quoting historian John Lukacs, who had suggested in his book *Year Zero* that Solzhenitsyn would turn out to be the pivotal figure in the conflict between East and West and perhaps -- remember, this was in the collapse of the Communist East, Will concluded by saying: For two centuries the human race has been assailed by the misconstructions first of physics, then biology, then psychology, more recently sociology, and today biochemistry, all telling us in different ways that man is not free, that he is a creature of vast impersonal forces, and that individuals do not make a difference. None of them singly but all of them interrelatedly through their individual efforts made the difference between liberty and serfdom for millions of human beings. For all his faults, and for all his shortsightedness with regard to Western values and achievements, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn was very much an individual who made a difference that mattered -- even to those he disdained. Posted by Rick Sincere at 5:

Chapter 3 : Rick Sincere News and Thoughts: 'Solzhenitsyn and American Democracy'

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

Dear Readers, This is one of the most important articles I have written, along with this one. If the Russiagate conspiracy against Trump and American democracy goes unpunished, accountable government in the United States will cease to exist. US security agencies have long been involved in coups against foreign governments. Now they are involved in one against America. When we neither punish nor reproach evildoers, we are not simply protecting their trivial old age, we are thereby ripping the foundations of justice from beneath new generations. Solzhenitsyn The American people do not realize the seriousness of the Russiagate conspiracy against them and President Trump. Polls indicate that a large majority of the public do not believe that Trump conspired with Putin to steal the presidential election, and are tired of hearing the media prostitutes repeat the absurd story day after day. On its face the story makes no sense whatsoever. Moreover, the leaked emails are real, not fabricated. The emails show exactly what Hillary and the DNC did. All polls show that large majorities of independents, Republicans, and youth distrust the mainstream media. In some polls about half of Democrats trust the media, and that is because the media is servant to Democratic Party interests. Russiagate is a dagger aimed at the heart of American governmental institutions. This conspiracy has the full backing of the entirety of the mainstream media. In other words, it was a coup not only against Donald Trump but also against American democracy and the outcome of a presidential election. All of this information has been posted on my website for some time. The FBI and DOJ pretended that their deception of the Court in order to obtain surveillance warrants for highly partisan political purposes was not due to their intent but to procedural mistakes. The full scope of non-compliant querying practices had not been previously disclosed to the Court. For example, the Court Memorandum and Order says: The Court was not satisfied that the government had sufficiently ascertained the scope of the compliance problems or developed and implemented adequate solutions for them and communicated a number of questions and concerns to the government. Schiff is so partisan that he lies to the hilt in the face of hard documented evidence from both the FISA Court and his own House committee. Schiff is so totally devoid of all honesty and integrity that he is the perfect leader for a shithole country, something that he and his ilk are turning the United States into. The honest leftâ€”not the Identity Politics left, which is a collection of deranged idiotsâ€”does not believe a word of the concocted Russiagate conspiracy against Trump. They object to the Russiagate conspiracy not because they like Trump, which they most certainly do not, but because they understand that it is a lie directed against truth. The release of the memo once again underscores the fact that the US intelligence agencies have massively intervened in US politics. When the justice and police authorities have no respect for the truth, as the Russiagate conspiracy proves, the people are doomed. The important question before us is: Or do high government officials get a pass as do the police who rob and murder citizens and never face justice for their crimes? From the sound of things, it looks like they will get a pass. President Trump says he will not fire the conspirator against him, Robert Mueller, even though both Trump and Mueller know that the Russiagate investigation headed by Mueller is a concocted conspiracy against American democracy and the President of the United States. Once the Court knew about it, the Court did not let them get away with it, as the Memorandum and Order makes clear. Former US Attorney Joe DiGenova believes that continuing investigations will result in high officials being indicted, convicted, and sent to prison. If the US is to have any future as a country in which government is accountable to law, it is essential that DiGenova be correct. However, I will believe it when I see it.

Chapter 4 : SPIEGEL Interview with Alexander Solzhenitsyn: 'I Am Not Afraid of Death' - SPIEGEL ONLINE

But it is true that I do not reject democracy any more than Solzhenitsyn rejected democracy. It is, for better or worse, the political horizon of our age. Our task is to moderate it, humanize it, and prevent its subversion by those who repudiate the liberty under God and the law which is the noblest heritage of the West. .

Mahoney August Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn is one of the great souls of the age. He is also among its most maligned and misunderstood figures. It is hard to think of another prominent writer whose thought and character have been subjected to as many willful distortions and vilifications over the past thirty years. Things were not always so. Until the early s Solzhenitsyn was widely admired in the West as a dissident and as a critic of Communist totalitarianism. On the left he was appreciated as a defender of human rights against an undeniably illiberal and autocratic regime. But with the publication of works such as August , Letter to the Soviet Leaders, and the cultural-spiritual anthology From Under the Rubble both published in the West in , it became impossible to claim Solzhenitsyn as a champion of left-liberal secularism. But this antitotalitarian writer clearly did not believe that a free Russia should become a slavish imitator of the secular, postmodern West. Some of his critics soon reasoned that if Solzhenitsyn was not a conventional liberal, then he must be an enemy of liberty. Podhoretz simply assumed that Solzhenitsyn was an authoritarian or anti-democratic thinker, though he did acquit Solzhenitsyn, a strong supporter of the state of Israel, of the charge of anti-Semitism. Podhoretz was in no position to do so at the time since he did not have access to any of the finished volumes of that great work. Unfortunately, other American conservatives have succumbed to the facile consensus that has developed about Solzhenitsynâ€™a consensus that has, as we shall see, little connection with reality. My experience has been that even those who are well disposed toward Solzhenitsyn are genuinely surprised to learn that he is, in fact, an indefatigable advocate of democratic self-government, a critic of illiberal nationalism in all its forms, an erudite historian who has defended authentic Russian liberalism against its reactionary and revolutionary opponents, and an Orthodox Christian who does not take an exclusivist view toward other Christians and recognizes the wisdom inherent in all the great religions of the world. There is, to be sure, a good deal of impressive scholarship about Solzhenitsyn in all the major European languages, but such work rarely gains the kind of public hearing that would alter the reigning public perceptions about the Russian Nobel laureate. This shameful comparison dishonors Pipes, who here lends his considerable authority to the vituperative campaign against Solzhenitsyn. Volume one was published in and volume two in ; there is as yet no English translation. See the July-August issue of Society for my extensive discussion of this work. Nor would one learn about his moving and somber discussion in chapter twenty-one of Two Hundred Years Together of the Holocaust unleashed against Jews on Soviet territory. In that chapter Solzhenitsyn narrates the truly mind-boggling facts regarding the extermination of Soviet Jews in the western territories of the Soviet Union. It is true that he refuses to choose between the two terrible totalitarianisms of the twentieth century: Solzhenitsyn refuses to set the sufferings of Russians and Jews against each other. Throughout these two volumes, Solzhenitsyn is emphatic in his condemnation of all bigoted and hostile depictions of Jews qua Jews, and he expresses the deepest respect for the spiritual greatness of the Jewish people. In his view, Russians and Jews must both come to terms with the members of their peoples who acted in complicity with the Communist regime. They should also stop blaming others for all of their misfortunes and discontents. Solzhenitsyn does not slight what Russians can learn from the Western and American experiences of democratic self-government. Unfortunately, we do not have this in Russia, and that is still our greatest shortcoming. As any charitable reader of the Gulag will discern, Solzhenitsyn is no collectivist. But it is dishonest, and worse, to accuse him of anti-Semitism or to label him an enemy of human freedom. How does one begin to break out of this interminable recycling of distortions and misrepresentations? To begin with, it is necessary to recognize that the defense of human liberty and dignity is not exhausted by the categories or assumptions of late modernity. Solzhenitsyn is a liberal in the sense that he is acutely aware of the myriad moral and cultural prerequisites of human liberty. Menshikov are highlighted in James H. As Billington points out, the most illuminating Russian thought of the past yearsâ€™from Soloviev, Bulgakov, and Berdiaev, to Solzhenitsyn and

D. Likhachev todayâ€”has attempted to draw on the best of the Western and Russian philosophical, theological, literary, and political traditions. This synthesizing current, which is suspicious of Western nihilism and scientism as well as of Eastern despotism, is all but ignored by Western elites today, who reflexively identify liberalism with materialism, relativism, and political correctness. Solzhenitsyn has meditated on this problem of conjugating Russia and the West, liberty and the moral contents of life, with great penetration and finesse in the various volumes of *The Red Wheel*. These books include profound reflections on the character of political moderation and the requirements of a statesmanship that would unite Christian attentiveness to the spiritual dignity of man with an appreciation of the need to respect the unceasing evolution of society. But he never turns the classical or Christian virtues into an antimodern ideology that would escape the reality of living with the tensions inherent in a dynamic, modern society. He is not, however, unduly sanguine about the prospects for these virtues in the contemporary scene. His more modest hope is to claim a hearing for the Good amidst the cacophony of claims that vie for public notice. Solzhenitsyn is, in truth, a conservative liberal who wants to temper the one-sided modern preoccupation with individual freedom with a salutary reminder of the moral ends that ought to inform responsible human choice. Moreover, his stature and moral authority remain high where it most counts: He merits our continuing gratitude, respect, and admiration. Mahoney is chairman of the political science department at Assumption College in Worcester, Massachusetts and the author of *Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: The Ascent From Ideology*

Chapter 5 : Solzhenitsyn's Prophecy | Robert P. George | First Things

Solzhenitsyn's insistence that democracy--and freedom itself--rests upon a religious foundation is anathema to the general run of our history professors and other assorted intellectuals. Religion, they are sure, restricts the range of our liberties as it thunders its "Thou shalt nots."

Solzhenitsyn was born into a family of Cossack intellectuals and brought up primarily by his mother his father was killed in an accident before his birth. He attended the University of Rostov-na-Donu, graduating in mathematics, and took correspondence courses in literature at Moscow State University. He fought in World War II, achieving the rank of captain of artillery; in 1945, however, he was arrested for writing a letter in which he criticized Joseph Stalin and spent eight years in prisons and labour camps, after which he spent three more years in enforced exile. Rehabilitated in 1953, he was allowed to settle in Ryazan, in central Russia, where he became a mathematics teacher and began to write. *V krughe pervom*; *The First Circle* was indirectly based on his years spent working in a prison research institute as a mathematician. The book traces the varying responses of scientists at work on research for the secret police as they must decide whether to cooperate with the authorities and thus remain within the research prison or to refuse their services and be thrust back into the brutal conditions of the labour camps. The main character, like Solzhenitsyn himself, was a recently released inmate of the camps. In 1958 Solzhenitsyn was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature, but he declined to go to Stockholm to receive the prize for fear he would not be readmitted to the Soviet Union by the government upon his return. The novel centred on several characters in the doomed 1st Army of the Russian general A. Samsonov and indirectly explored the weaknesses of the tsarist regime that eventually led to its downfall by revolution in 1917. *Gulag* is an acronym formed from the official Soviet designation of its system of prisons and labour camps. Upon publication of the first volume of *The Gulag Archipelago*, Solzhenitsyn was immediately attacked in the Soviet press. Despite the intense interest in his fate that was shown in the West, he was arrested and charged with treason on Feb. 25, 1958. Solzhenitsyn was exiled from the Soviet Union on the following day, and in December he took possession of his Nobel Prize. *Priglasenie v kazn*, appeared, as did *Bodalsya telyonok s dubom* *The Oak and the Calf*, an autobiographical account of literary life in the Soviet Union. The second and third volumes of *The Gulag Archipelago* were published in 1968. Solzhenitsyn traveled to the United States, where he eventually settled on a secluded estate in Cavendish, Vt. The brief *The Mortal Danger*, translated from an essay Solzhenitsyn wrote for the journal *Foreign Affairs*, analyzes what he perceived to be the perils of American misconceptions about Russia. In the Soviet literary magazine *Novy Mir* published the first officially approved excerpts from *The Gulag Archipelago*. Solzhenitsyn ended his exile and returned to Russia in 1974. He subsequently made several public appearances and even met privately with Russian Pres. In Solzhenitsyn established an annual prize for writers contributing to the Russian literary tradition. Installments of his autobiography, *Ugodilo zernyshko promezh dvukh zhernovov*: Learn More in these related Britannica articles:

Chapter 6 : Will The Conspiracy Against Trump And American Democracy Go Unpunished? | Zero Hedge

Aleksandr Isayevich Solzhenitsyn (/ ɛːs ɒˈlʃɪn ɪˈtʃɪn iːˈsɪn, ɛːs ɪˈ- /; 11 December - 3 August) was a Russian novelist, historian, and short story writer. He was an outspoken critic of the Soviet Union and communism and helped to raise global awareness of its Gulag forced labor camp system.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn in So what exactly are we feeling right now? Perhaps it might be useful to take a trip to the past, 40 years ago to be exact. To their disappointment, however, Solzhenitsyn had no such intentions. It all seemed an overwhelming success, with no geographic limits. Western society expanded in a triumph of human independence and power. Society has turned out to have scarce defense against the abyss of human decadence, for example against the misuse of liberty for moral violence against young people, such as motion pictures full of pornography, crime, and horror. Every citizen has been granted the desired freedom and material goods in such quantity and in such quality as to guarantee in theory the achievement of happiness, in the debased sense of the word which has come into being during those same decades. In the process, however, one psychological detail has been overlooked: This active and tense competition comes to dominate all human thought and does not in the least open a way to free spiritual development. In the pre-modern worldview that ended with the Renaissance, mankind was inherently evil and had to be made better. That is, freedom was given to the individual conditionally, in the assumption of his constant religious responsibility. Ending his speech, the former Gulag inmate tied his visions together: In the East, it is destroyed by the dealings and machinations of the ruling party. In the West, commercial interests suffocate it. This is the real crisis. The split in the world is less terrible than the similarity of the disease plaguing its main sections. The Western world cheered the triumph of freedom and markets. The final battle between world ideologies was over. The future would be democracy across the world. World peace was at hand. Nuclear weapons kept the peace. The American experiment in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is about to turn years old. In the Bible the number 40 represents a time of trial and testing, or even a probationary period. I hope that no one present will suspect me of expressing my partial criticism of the Western system in order to suggest socialism as an alternative. No; with the experience of a country where socialism has been realized, I shall not speak for such an alternative. But should I be asked, instead, whether I would propose the West, such as it is today, as a model to my country, I would frankly have to answer negatively. No, I could not recommend your society as an ideal for the transformation of ours. Through deep suffering, people in our own country have now achieved a spiritual development of such intensity that the Western system in its present state of spiritual exhaustion does not look attractive. Even those characteristics of your life which I have just enumerated are extremely saddening. On the anniversary of his speech it is worth examining the American system after many trials and tests over the last 40 years. Where do we stand today? Materially speaking, there is a lot to be proud of. Our supermarkets are stocked to the brim, abundant and cheap fossil fuels power our cars and homes, 4 soon to be 5 G networks keep us connected at all times, diseases have been eradicated, and any consumer good our hearts desire is at the touch of our fingers with Amazon Prime. But despite these luxuries that make America the envy of the free world, the average citizen has had second thoughts. Domestically we are facing racial and economic tensions, a demoralized middle class, record deficits, and a polarized electorate to name a few. Notable writers at The American Conservative have commented on our pathologies , and the shift from democracy to nationalism. He is the author of American Cobra Pilot:

Chapter 7 : Solzhenitsyn and the American (Alt-)Right | Society for US Intellectual History

To the American right, then, Solzhenitsyn's call for Russia to return to its Orthodox roots coincides with the right's view that America return to traditional Christianity and cultural mores. Solzhenitsyn also evolved into a critic of Western individualism, materialism, and liberalism.

Text version below transcribed directly from audio English translation] I am sincerely happy to be here on the occasion of the th commencement of this old and most prestigious university. But even while it eludes us, the illusion of knowing it still lingers and leads to many misunderstandings. Also, truth seldom is pleasant; it is almost invariably bitter. Three years ago in the United States I said certain things which at that time appeared unacceptable. Today, however, many people agree with what I then said. Any of our contemporaries readily identifies two world powers, each of them already capable of entirely destroying the other. However, understanding of the split often is limited to this political conception: The truth is that the split is a much [more] profound [one] and a more alienating one, that the rifts are more than one can see at first glance. This deep manifold split bears the danger of manifold disaster for all of us, in accordance with the ancient truth that a kingdom -- in this case, our Earth -- divided against itself cannot stand. There is the concept of "Third World": Undoubtedly, however, the number is even greater; we are just too far away to see. As a minimum, we must include in this category China, India, the Muslim world, and Africa, if indeed we accept the approximation of viewing the latter two as compact units. For one thousand years Russia belonged to such a category, although Western thinking systematically committed the mistake of denying its autonomous character and therefore never understood it, just as today the West does not understand Russia in Communist captivity. It may be that in past years Japan has increasingly become a distant part of the West. I am no judge here. On the face of it, it was an overwhelming success. There were no geographic frontiers [limits] to it. Western society expanded in a triumph of human independence and power. And all of a sudden in the 20th century came the discovery of its fragility and friability. We now see that the conquests proved to be short lived and precarious -- and this, in turn, points to defects in the Western view of the world which led to these conquests. Relations with the former colonial world now have turned into their opposite and the Western world often goes to extremes of subservience, but it is difficult yet to estimate the total size of the bill which former colonial countries will present to the West and it is difficult to predict whether the surrender not only of its last colonies, but of everything it owns, will be sufficient for the West to foot the bill. But the blindness of superiority continues in spite of all and upholds the belief that the vast regions everywhere on our planet should develop and mature to the level of present day Western systems, which in theory are the best and in practice the most attractive. There is this belief that all those other worlds are only being temporarily prevented by wicked governments or by heavy crises or by their own barbarity and incomprehension from taking the way of Western pluralistic democracy and from adopting the Western way of life. Countries are judged on the merit of their progress in this direction. However, it is a conception which develops out of Western incomprehension of the essence of other worlds, out of the mistake of measuring them all with a Western yardstick. It is a soothing theory which overlooks the fact that these worlds are not at all developing into similarity. Neither one can be transformed into the other without the use of violence. But since my forced exile in the West has now lasted four years and since my audience is a Western one, I think it may be of greater interest to concentrate on certain aspects of the West, in our days, such as I see them. A decline in courage may be the most striking feature which an outside observer notices in the West in our days. The Western world has lost its civil courage, both as a whole and separately, in each country, each government, each political party, and, of course, in the United Nations. Such a decline in courage is particularly noticeable among the ruling groups and the intellectual elite, causing an impression of loss of courage by the entire society. Of course, there are many courageous individuals, but they have no determining influence on public life. Political and intellectual bureaucrats show depression, passivity, and perplexity in their actions and in their statements, and even more so in theoretical reflections to explain how realistic, reasonable, as well as intellectually and even morally worn it is to base state policies on weakness and cowardice. And decline in

courage is ironically emphasized by occasional explosions of anger and inflexibility on the part of the same bureaucrats when dealing with weak governments and with countries not supported by anyone, or with currents which cannot offer any resistance. But they get tongue-tied and paralyzed when they deal with powerful governments and threatening forces, with aggressors and international terrorists. Should one point out that from ancient times declining courage has been considered the beginning of the end? When the modern Western states were created, the principle was proclaimed that governments are meant to serve man and man lives to be free and to pursue happiness. See, for example, the American Declaration of Independence. Now, at last, during past decades technical and social progress has permitted the realization of such aspirations: Every citizen has been granted the desired freedom and material goods in such quantity and of such quality as to guarantee in theory the achievement of happiness -- in the morally inferior sense of the word which has come into being during those same decades. In the process, however, one psychological detail has been overlooked: Active and tense competition fills all human thoughts without opening a way to free spiritual development. The majority of people have been granted well-being to an extent their fathers and grandfathers could not even dream about. It has become possible to raise young people according to these ideals, leaving them to physical splendor, happiness, possession of material goods, money, and leisure, to an almost unlimited freedom of enjoyment. So who should now renounce all this? Even biology knows that habitual, extreme safety and well-being are not advantageous for a living organism. Today, well-being in the life of Western society has begun to reveal its pernicious mask. Western society has given itself the organization best suited to its purposes based, I would say, on the letter of the law. The limits of human rights and righteousness are determined by a system of laws; such limits are very broad. People in the West have acquired considerable skill in interpreting and manipulating law. Any conflict is solved according to the letter of the law and this is considered to be the supreme solution. If one is right from a legal point of view, nothing more is required. Nobody will mention that one could still not be entirely right, and urge self-restraint, a willingness to renounce such legal rights, sacrifice and selfless risk. It would sound simply absurd. One almost never sees voluntary self-restraint. Everybody operates at the extreme limit of those legal frames. I have spent all my life under a Communist regime and I will tell you that a society without any objective legal scale is a terrible one indeed. But a society with no other scale than the legal one is not quite worthy of man either. A society which is based on the letter of the law and never reaches any higher is taking very scarce advantage of the high level of human possibilities. The letter of the law is too cold and formal to have a beneficial influence on society. And it will be simply impossible to stand through the trials of this threatening century with only the support of a legalistic structure. A statesman who wants to achieve something important and highly constructive for his country has to move cautiously and even timidly. There are thousands of hasty and irresponsible critics around him; parliament and the press keep rebuffing him. As he moves ahead, he has to prove that each single step of his is well-founded and absolutely flawless. Actually, an outstanding and particularly gifted person who has unusual and unexpected initiatives in mind hardly gets a chance to assert himself. From the very beginning, dozens of traps will be set out for him. Thus, mediocrity triumphs with the excuse of restrictions imposed by democracy. It is feasible and easy everywhere to undermine administrative power and in fact it has been drastically weakened in all Western countries. The defense of individual rights has reached such extremes as to make society as a whole defenseless against certain individuals. Destructive and irresponsible freedom has been granted boundless space. Society appears to have little defense against the abyss of human decadence, such as, for example, misuse of liberty for moral violence against young people, such as motion pictures full of pornography, crime, and horror. Life organized legalistically has thus shown its inability to defend itself against the corrosion of evil. And what shall we say criminality as such? Legal frames, especially in the United States, are broad enough to encourage not only individual freedom but also certain individual crimes. The culprit can go unpunished or obtain undeserved leniency with the support of thousands of public defenders. There are many such cases. Such a tilt of freedom in the direction of evil has come about gradually, but it was evidently born primarily out of a humanistic and benevolent concept according to which there is no evil inherent to human nature. The world belongs to mankind and all the defects of life are caused by wrong social systems, which must be corrected. Strangely enough, though the best social conditions have been

achieved in the West, there still is criminality and there even is considerably more of it than in the pauper and lawless Soviet society. The press too, of course, enjoys the widest freedom. I shall be using the word press to include all media. But what sort of use does it make of this freedom? Here again, the main concern is not to infringe the letter of the law. There is no true moral responsibility for deformation or disproportion. What sort of responsibility does a journalist or a newspaper have to his readers, or to his history -- or to history? If they have misled public opinion or the government by inaccurate information or wrong conclusions, do we know of any cases of public recognition and rectification of such mistakes by the same journalist or the same newspaper? It hardly ever happens because it would damage sales. A nation may be the victim of such a mistake, but the journalist usually always gets away with it. One may -- One may safely assume that he will start writing the opposite with renewed self-assurance. How many hasty, immature, superficial, and misleading judgments are expressed every day, confusing readers, without any verification. The press -- The press can both simulate public opinion and miseducate it. The right not to have their divine souls [stuffed with gossip, nonsense, vain talk. Hastiness and superficiality are the psychic disease of the 20th century and more than anywhere else this disease is reflected in the press. Such as it is, however, the press has become the greatest power within the Western countries, more powerful than the legislative power, the executive, and the judiciary. And one would then like to ask: By what law has it been elected and to whom is it responsible? In the communist East a journalist is frankly appointed as a state official. But who has granted Western journalists their power, for how long a time, and with what prerogatives? There is yet another surprise for someone coming from the East, where the press is rigorously unified.

Chapter 8 : Left, Right and wrong: Solzhenitsyn and Jewish politics - Opinion - Jerusalem Post

In Rebuilding Russia, written a year before the collapse of the Soviet Union, Solzhenitsyn observed that "Tocqueville viewed the concepts of democracy and liberty as polar opposites. He was an.

Alexander Isayevich, when we came in we found you at work. What do you derive your strength from? I have always had that inner drive, since my birth. And I have always devoted myself gladly to work -- to work and to the struggle. There are four tables in this space alone. In your new book "My American Years," which will be published in Germany this fall, you recollect that you used to write even while walking in the forest. When I was in the gulag I would sometimes even write on stone walls. I used to write on scraps of paper, then I memorized the contents and destroyed the scraps. And your strength did not leave you even in moments of enormous desperation? I would often think: Whatever the outcome is going to be, let it be. And then things would turn out all right. It looks like some good came out of it. I am not sure you were of the same opinion when in February the military secret service arrested Captain Solzhenitsyn in Eastern Prussia. Because, in his letters from the front, Solzhenitsyn was unflattering about Josef Stalin, and the sentence for that was eight years in the prison camps. It was south of Wormditt. I was always optimistic. And I held to and was guided by my views. Of course, my views developed in the course of time. But I have always believed in what I did and never acted against my conscience. Thirteen years ago when you returned from exile, you were disappointed to see the new Russia. You turned down a prize proposed by Gorbachev, and you also refused to accept an award Yeltsin wanted to give you. Yet now you have accepted the State Prize which was awarded to you by Putin, the former head of the FSB intelligence agency, whose predecessor the KGB persecuted and denounced you so cruelly. How does this all fit together? The prize was to be for "The Gulag Archipelago. I replied that I was unable to receive an award from a government that had led Russia into such dire straits. The current State Prize is awarded not by the president personally, but by a community of top experts. The Council on Science that nominated me for the award and the Council on Culture that supported the idea include some of the most highly respected people of the country, all of them authorities in their respective disciplines. The president, as head of state, awards the laureates on the national holiday. In accepting the award I expressed the hope that the bitter Russian experience, which I have been studying and describing all my life, will be for us a lesson that keeps us from new disastrous breakdowns. Vladimir Putin -- yes, he was an officer of the intelligence services, but he was not a KGB investigator, nor was he the head of a camp in the gulag. As for service in foreign intelligence, that is not a negative in any country -- sometimes it even draws praise. All your life you have called on the authorities to repent for the millions of victims of the gulag and communist terror. Was this call really heard? I have grown used to the fact that, throughout the world, public repentance is the most unacceptable option for the modern politician. The current Russian president says the collapse of the Soviet Union was the largest geopolitical disaster of the 20th century. He says it is high time to stop this masochistic brooding over the past, especially since there are attempts "from outside," as he puts it, to provoke an unjustified remorse among Russians. The elder political generation in communist countries was not ready for repentance, while the new generation is only too happy to voice grievances and level accusations, with present-day Moscow a convenient target. They behave as if they heroically liberated themselves and lead a new life now, while Moscow has remained communist. Nevertheless, I dare hope that this unhealthy phase will soon be over, that all the peoples who have lived through communism will understand that communism is to blame for the bitter pages of their history. If we could all take a sober look at our history, then we would no longer see this nostalgic attitude to the Soviet past that predominates now among the less affected part of our society. Nor would the Eastern European countries and former USSR republics feel the need to see in historical Russia the source of their misfortunes. One should not ascribe the evil deeds of individual leaders or political regimes to an innate fault of the Russian people and their country. All these regimes in Russia could only survive by imposing a bloody terror. We should clearly understand that only the voluntary and conscientious acceptance by a people of its guilt can ensure the healing of a nation. Unremitting reproaches from outside, on the other hand, are counterproductive. There is no doubt, however, that a revolution in

archives took place in Russia over the last 20 years. Thousands of files have been opened; the researchers now have access to hundreds and thousands of previously classified documents. Hundreds of monographs that make these documents public have already been published or are in preparation. Dmitri Volkogonov, the military historian, and Alexander Yakovlev, the ex-member of the Politburo -- these people had enough influence and authority to get access to any files, and society is grateful to them for their valuable publications. As for the last few years, no one has been able to bypass the declassification procedure. Unfortunately, this procedure takes longer than one would like. These documents remain available for both citizens and researchers. Researchers all over the world rely on this edition. About 90 years ago, Russia was shaken first by the February Revolution and then by the October Revolution. These events run like a leitmotif through your works. A few months ago in a long article you reiterated your thesis once again: If one follows this line of thinking, then Lenin was only an accidental person, who was only able to come to Russia and seize power here with German support. Have we understood you correctly? No, you have not. Only an extraordinary person can turn opportunity into reality. But allow me to correct you: It was brilliantly and thoroughly planned by Leon Trotsky -- Lenin was still in hiding then to avoid being brought to justice for treason. And the greatest responsibility, then, of course falls on the authorities: Who if not the captain is to blame for a shipwreck? There was nothing natural for Russia in the October Revolution. The Red Terror unleashed by its leaders, their willingness to drown Russia in blood, is the first and foremost proof of it. These two volumes have provoked mainly perplexity in the West. You say the Jews are the leading force of global capital and they are among the foremost destroyers of the bourgeoisie. Are we to conclude from your rich array of sources that the Jews carry more responsibility than others for the failed Soviet experiment? I avoid exactly that which your question implies: I do not call for any sort of scorekeeping or comparisons between the moral responsibility of one people or another; moreover, I completely exclude the notion of responsibility of one nation towards another. All I am calling for is self-reflection. You can get the answer to your question from the book itself: Answer by what means? By attempting to comprehend: How could such a thing have been allowed? Where in all this is our error? And could it happen again? It is in that spirit, specifically, that it would behoove the Jewish people to answer, both for the revolutionary cutthroats and the ranks willing to serve them. Just as we Russians must answer -- for the pogroms, for those merciless arsonist peasants, for those crazed revolutionary soldiers, for those savage sailors. In our opinion, out of all your works, "The Gulag Archipelago" provoked the greatest public resonance. In this book you showed the misanthropic nature of the Soviet dictatorship. Looking back today, can you say to what extent it has contributed to the defeat of communism in the world? You should not address this question to me -- an author cannot give such evaluations. To paraphrase something you once said, the dark history of the 20th century had to be endured by Russia for the sake of mankind. Have the Russians learned the lessons of the two revolutions and their consequences? It seems they are starting to. A great number of publications and movies on the history of the 20th century -- albeit of uneven quality -- are evidence of a growing demand. It was not watered down. And, for instance, since last February I have been surprised and impressed by the large-scale, heated and long-lasting discussions that my previously written and now republished article on the February Revolution has provoked. I was pleased to see the wide range of opinions, including those opposed to mine, since they demonstrate the eagerness to understand the past, without which there can be no meaningful future. It was not governance but a thoughtless renunciation of power. The admiration of the West in return only strengthened his conviction that his approach was right. But let us be clear that it was Gorbachev, and not Yeltsin, as is now widely being claimed, who first gave freedom of speech and movement to the citizens of our country. In his haste to have private rather than state ownership as quickly as possible, Yeltsin started a mass, multi-billion-dollar fire sale of the national patrimony. Wanting to gain the support of regional leaders, Yeltsin called directly for separatism and passed laws that encouraged and empowered the collapse of the Russian state. This, of course, deprived Russia of its historical role for which it had worked so hard, and lowered its standing in the international community. All this met with even more hearty Western applause.

Chapter 9 : When Solzhenitsyn presaged Fukuyama and Huntington | IndiaFactsIndiaFacts

Asinine or no, Solzhenitsyn's speech must be read in the context of Russian conservatism, a tradition which differs in key respects from its American counterpart.

Russian writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Nevertheless, traditional business models are no longer sustainable and high-quality publications, like ours, are being forced to look for new ways to keep going. Unlike many other news organizations, we have not put up a paywall. We want to keep our journalism open and accessible and be able to keep providing you with news and analyses from the frontlines of Israel, the Middle East and the Jewish World. As one of our loyal readers, we ask you to be our partner. The Nobel Prize winning author, in both his novels and his masterwork, *The Gulag Archipelago*, exposed the tyranny of the Soviet penal system and a dictatorship that suppressed religious belief and freedom of conscience. The Solzhenitsyns, the Sakharovs and the Sharanskys played a significant role in the toppling of the Soviet empire – the brutal political system under which they lived never cowed them into submission or surrender. Be the first to know - Join our Facebook page. The Russian genius was an enemy not only of Soviet communism. He was also an acid-penned critic of Western democracy and an opponent of freedom of the press. Solzhenitsyn was a religious fundamentalist who yearned to overthrow the gains humanity made in modernity in the Renaissance, the Reformation and the French Revolution. If he did not specifically want to return Russia to the rule of the Czars, he did yearn for a pre-Bolshevik golden age in which the anti-Jewish, conservative Russian Orthodox Church would dominate politics, theology and morality. Like his great predecessor Fyodor Dostoevsky, Solzhenitsyn was no friend of democracy or the liberalism of modernity. Solzhenitsyn censured the immorality of the West and condemned both democracy and communism. This sounds like the rhetoric of fundamentalists in the Islamic world regarding the role of Islamic law in modern societies and the condemnation of the West as decadent and immoral. But the parallels are not precise. Perhaps there is something important we can learn from the celebrated 20th-century Russian author. Solzhenitsyn made no secret of his beliefs. The commencement speech at Harvard drew much praise and an equal amount of criticism. The ideas presented by Solzhenitsyn at Harvard remained an essential core of his beliefs till the end of his long life. Cold War America presented Solzhenitsyn as an anti-Soviet hero in much the same way the United States supported the Muslim mujihadeen fighting the Russians decades ago in Afghanistan. Neither Solzhenitsyn nor the Muslim fighters turned out to be friends of the West in the end, despite their fierce anti-communism. Zionism, while a movement that owes a great debt to traditional Jewish faith and theology, is a modern movement that has fostered democracy and basic freedoms. While Judaism should play a public role for Jews living in Israel, the Jewish state should not be a theocracy ruled by Torah law. Both Solzhenitsyn and Teitelbaum were reactionaries who wanted to turn back the clock and reject the legacy of modern life, politics and ideology. I will not deny that Western capitalism has sometimes created societies driven by an empty consumerism that have bred vice and mediocrity. We must hope that the State of Israel, having lost the Socialist spirit and politics that drove the Zionist movement and the early years of Jewish sovereignty, will not replace that outworn ideology with a vacuous mimicking of the worst American culture and life has to offer. In that way, Solzhenitsyn had an important statement to make relevant to Jews. However, the West has always had more to offer than just crass materialism and immorality. Despite all my caveats regarding Solzhenitsyn, I learn an important lesson from his stance on the world. Alexander Solzhenitsyn posed an intriguing challenge to Jews to look beyond the politics of the Left and the Right and to find a political life and society rooted in 4,000 years of Jewish history, rather than the modern revolutions in France and America. Who are our role models: Burke and Marx, or Saadiah and Maimonides? Perhaps the time has come for Jews to find political solutions not within conventional liberal or conservative standpoints – these are foreign imports from outside of Judaism – but within Jewish history itself. We can still be staunch defenders of democracy in Israel and America yet still search for alternatives to the political movements of modernity. There should be an alternative to Right and Left that taps into the riches of Judaism and Jewish history. We do not need to descend into the realm of fundamentalism. We simply need to search for authentic Jewish voices from our past

that will allow us to shape ideologies and theologies beyond those limited by the politics of our own day.