

## COSMOPOLITANISM AND NATIONALISM IN SOVIET DISSIDENCE: SAKHAROV VERSUS SOLZHENITSYN

**Laura CIUBOTARAȘU PRICOP, PhD, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iași**

*Abstract: To what extent, in a totalitarian regime imposed and maintained by terror, torture, starvation, class hatred, fear can be born and act a free, cosmopolitan consciousness? What form would these actions have, which would be their level of validity, applicability? Can the results of these actions be recovered from a current perspective of cosmopolitan theories? Devious, expired questions lapsed into a world where communism was almost overcome and detached by every thematization. In this paper, I will try to answer these questions through an analysis of the context and form actions (dissenting), although their restructuring in order to understand and justify them.*

*In this context, the dissident action coincides to some extent with what Jhon Rawls meant by civil disobedience and conscientious objection as a form of non-violent action on the edge of fidelity to the law and against the official system. Emerging ideas at the surface that led to the dissident actions of Andrei D. Sakharov, physicist and Nobel Prize Laureate for Peace (1975), the type of actions and their results would be an important step within the present approach by analogy with the dissident work of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Nobel Prize Laureate for Literature (1970). Sakharov - Solzhenitsyn parallel plays the role of a differentiator in the paper economy, unequivocally indicating how the same contexts, performing the same kind of actions with roughly similar results are founded on diametrically opposed values: cosmopolitan - nationalist.*

*Finally I will try to say what elements of cosmopolitan theories of moral origin are to be found in the writings of Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn intended to be integrated and used. At this point, I will try to highlight at least two elements defining Sakharov's thought in connection with the cosmopolitan theories: on the one hand, Sakharov believed that the ideology of human rights is a solid basis to unite people regardless of nationality, political beliefs, religion, and social status. On the other hand, at a higher socio-human level, Sakharov sees the possibility of reconciling the existence of a relationship of convergence between the developed societies based on different political and economic principles, actually the convergence between capitalist and communist societies. Both assumptions, as I will argue, can complete or especially validate some elements of cosmopolitan theories just by their practicality.*

*Keywords: dissident action, convergence, cosmopolitan theories, communism, human rights, Sakharov, Solzhenitsyn*

To what extent, in a totalitarian regime imposed and maintained by terror, torture, starvation, class hatred, fear can be born and act a free, cosmopolitan consciousness? What form would these actions have, which would be their level of validity, applicability? Can the results of these actions be recovered from a current perspective of cosmopolitan theories? Devious, expired questions lapsed into a world where communism was almost overcome and detached by every thematization. In this section, I will try to answer these questions through

an analysis of the context and form actions (dissenting), although their restructuring in order to understand and justify them.

In this context, the dissident action coincides to some extent with what Jhon Rawls meant by civil disobedience<sup>1</sup> and conscientious objection as a form of non-violent action on the edge of fidelity to the law and against the official system. The proposed analogy assumes a certain consistency by simplifying Rawls' theory: the civil disobedience meaning public discourse directed against the communist system, the speech of the Russian intelligentsia<sup>2</sup> both in samizdat<sup>3</sup> and in the international media. The conscientious objection might be seen as a non-public thinking, manifested by non-involvement, nonparticipation or spontaneous reactions. The acts of civil disobedience and conscientious objection, as dissident manifestations in the Communist Russia<sup>4</sup>, were given an indirect materiality through legislation, the famous Article 190 - 1 in 1966 of the RSFSR<sup>5</sup> Penal Code, which anticipated the imprisonment up to three years or corrective labor for a term of one year or a fine in money: "spreading false information knowingly slandering the Soviet state and social system and, equally, the preparation and dissemination of written, printed or other kind of works with the same content."<sup>6</sup> Sakharov called those sentenced to imprisonment, according to this article, prisoners of conscience<sup>7</sup>, designating by this, according to Amnesty International, those deprived of liberty for their beliefs, nonconformity, nonviolent actions consistent with these beliefs, people who do not practice or instigate to violence. Emerging ideas at the surface that led to the dissident actions of Andrei D. Sakharov, physicist and Nobel Prize

<sup>1</sup> John Rawls defines civil disobedience under certain conditions that would give the possibility that these actions to manifest. From Rawls' point of view civil disobedience actions appear in those societies that are mostly „well ordered for the most part but in which some serious violations of justice nevertheless do occur “ or in a „democratic state for those citizens who recognize and accept the legitimacy of the Constitution.” Although Rawls states that the theory does not apply to other forms of government or other forms of dissent or resistance, however, it accepts the possibility of contingencies. From this the possible analogy with the performed dissident actions of Sakharov in a totalitarian regime derives. (John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1999, p. 319.)

<sup>2</sup> According to Berdyaev, the Russian intelligentsia does not represent the intellectuals, but an “entirely different group; and to it may belong people occupied in no intellectual work, and generally speaking not particularly intellectual. Many Russian scholars and writers certainly could not be reckoned as belonging to the intelligentsia in the strict sense of the word. (...) Our intelligentsia were a group formed out of various social classes and held together by ideas, not by sharing a common profession or economic status. They were derived to begin with mainly from the more cultured section of the nobility, later from the sons of the clergy, small government officials, the lower middle class, and after the liberation, from the peasants. That then is the intelligentsia; its members were of different social classes, and held together solely ideas, and, moreover, by ideas about sociology. In the second half of the nineteenth century the stratum of society which is simply called cultured is developed into a new type and is given the name ”intelligentsia”. This type has its characteristic traits which belong to all its present representatives.” Nikolai Berdyaev, *The Origin of Russian Communism*, translated from the Russian by R.M.French, Published by G.Bles, London, 1948, pp. 18-19.

<sup>3</sup> Independent publication – samostoiatelnoe izdanie – a way of clandestine movement of the prohibited writings provided in Soviet censorship.

<sup>4</sup> The recent research highlight, especially after the opening of KGB archives (State Security Committee - Komitet gosudarstvennoe bezopasnosti) two types of dissent – on the one hand an “intellectual dissent” and on the other hand, a “popular criticism of the regime” that is manifested by “spontaneous reaction to some irritation or event”. Vladi Kozolov, A. Fitzpatrick, Sheila Mironenko, V. Sergei, *Everyday Resistance in the Soviet Union under Khrushchev and Brezhnev*, Yale University, 2011, p. 43.

<sup>5</sup> RSFSR - short for Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic.

<sup>6</sup> RSFSR, Editura Iuridiceskaia, Moskva, 1971, apud., Andrei D. Sakharov, *Vospominaniya*, Vol.I., Vremya, Moskva, 2006, p 586.

<sup>7</sup> Andrei D. Sakharov, *Vospominaniya*, Vol.II., p.276.

Laureate for Peace (1975), the type of actions and their results would be an important step within the present approach by analogy with the dissident work of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Nobel Prize Laureate for Literature (1970). Sakharov - Solzhenitsyn parallel plays the role of a differentiator in the paper economy, unequivocally indicating how the same contexts, performing the same kind of actions with roughly similar results are founded on diametrically opposed values: cosmopolitan - nationalist.

Finally I will try to say what elements of cosmopolitan theories of moral origin are to be found in the writings of Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn intended to be integrated and used. At this point, I will try to highlight at least two elements defining Sakharov's thought in connection with the cosmopolitan theories: on the one hand, Sakharov believed that the ideology of human rights is a solid basis to unite people regardless of nationality, political beliefs, religion, and social status. On the other hand, at a higher socio-human level, Sakharov sees the possibility of reconciling the existence of a relationship of convergence between the developed societies based on different political and economic principles, actually the convergence between capitalist and communist societies<sup>8</sup>. Both assumptions, as I will argue, can complete or especially validate some elements of cosmopolitan theories just by their practicality.

### Memory as Dissent Action

The recomposition of a social, cultural, ideologic, political context and of the general actions generated by the individuals, communities, based only on Sakharov - Solzhenitsyn parallel would seem, at first glance, a fall in sophistry - hasty generalization<sup>9</sup>. But looking from the perspective of cosmopolitan theories, this exercise becomes legal as long as „each person acting in ways that have an impact on other”<sup>10</sup> and the result of this enterprise would make visible, as a fabric, two distinct points generated by the same common place – memory – that sometimes interacts, sometimes distances or even disappears. Places of memory were formed in case of Sakharov from different reasons: the memoirs seen as an important part of the mankind memory, writing the truth about itself as “memories free of any constraints of the world of science, from the *objective* world<sup>11</sup> from the dissidents' life and simply from life”<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> Ideas developed by Sakharov in, *Progress, Coexistence, And Intellectual Freedom*, The New York Times Company, 1968.

<sup>9</sup> S. Moris Engel, *With Good Reason: An Introduction to Informal Fallacies*, St. Martin's Press, New Work, 1976, p.69.

<sup>10</sup> David Miller, „Cosmopolitanism: A Critique”, *CRISPP*, Vol.3, Nr.3 (Autumn 2002), p. 83.

<sup>11</sup> What Sakharov calls “objective” in this context is nothing more than an industrial structure / research / intellectual labor camps where the Russian scientist was isolated, along with other researchers from 1950 to 1968, the period in which he worked on nuclear fusion bomb project and then test it. Sakharov devotes an “objective” chapter 6 in , *Vospominaniya*, p.56. Sakharov describes it as a prison: “Suddenly the car suddenly hindered. In front of us was *the area* – two rows of barbed wire on tall pillars, each a strip of plowed earth.” For his part, but from the perspective of a convict labor camp, *Gulag Archipelago* Solzhenitsyn describes, the *charachki* - intellectual labor camps: „Il est légende, de temps à autre, on entend conter dans les camps, rumeur sourde qui ne mérite aucune créance et que personne n'a jamais confirmée: quelque part dans l'Archipel, il existerait de minuscules îles du Paradis. Nul ne les a vues, nul n'y a sé journé ou qui l'a fait se tait, bouche cousue. Ces îles, à ce qu'on dit, sont arrosées de fleuves de lait coulant entre deux rives de confiture, la nourriture n'y descend jamais plus bas que la crème et les œufs; elles sont, dit-on, tout ce qu'il y a de propre, il y fait toujours chaud, le travail y est de nature intellectuelle et archisecret. Et ce fut précisément dans ces îles paradisiaques (dans la langue des camps des «bahuts»), des *charachki*) que je me retrouvai, à mi-temps de ma peine. C'est à elle que je dois d' être resté en vie: dans les camps, je n'aurais jamais duré jusqu'au bout.”

In case of Solzhenitsyn, memoirs is seen as a “secondary literature”<sup>13</sup> placed “definitely lower than literature - literature”<sup>14</sup> and the act of writing as a form of personal memory preservation is essential to the whole community and it is directed against secrecy: “I write only not to forget anything, so as the followers to take note of all that was. (...) I hasten to write as smaller and when several sheets were gathering, I was rolling them and the tubules thus obtained I was stuffing them in a glass of champagne, it has a wider neck. I buried the bottle in my garden and during the New Year’s Eve of 1954, I left to die in Tashkent. But I did not die. (...) Ever since, I live my life as a returned good”<sup>15</sup>. This primary, common and discursive basis, provides the necessary tools for referral moments of evolution, stagnation, regression of speeches, performances dissenting shares the same political context through the same means of two greats Russian dissidents: Andrei Sakharov and Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

### Solzhenitsyn Against the Communist Society

That Alexandr Solzhenitsyn attaches a special importance to its opposition movement (not only to the books that he writes, or to their indisputable anticommunist meaning) proves that he writes *The Calf and the Oak*, to which he returns several times, completing each time, taking care not to expose those who helped him, “conspirative” episodes related to his work as an illegal writer. The title, *The Calf and the Oak* sends to a Russian proverb, the calf thinks to move the oak from its place; following this burden a problem occurs with the bull’s horns. The author’s hope is, however, undoubtedly, that this opposition completely uneven, will ultimately, have an effect...

In what concerns his work, Solzhenitsyn is not only aware that it is illegal, opposing the official state policy of Communist Russia, but he develops from his opposition a rigorous program, he establishes rules, techniques, strategies of conspiracy. He sees himself like an activist with an important mission that must take his action to the end. He really does his job as a conspirator, gingerly, coupled with perfect conscientiousness.

It can be said that, in his case, the writer fulfills his mission as a novelist – which pursues as a writer clear anti-totalitarian and anticommunist objectives – on the one hand, to which on the other hand, being added a conspiracy pro in a good Russian tradition, working systematically against the state structure that he is forced to live, which would have never left, because, by his action, he wanted to destroy it. Of course, in another distant and confusing background, there is also a future project, a structure recognized, in everything he does, as utopian and unlikely. Its action focuses on the phase destruction of the society amidst he exactly lives on this purpose.

---

Alexandre Soljenitsyne, *L’archipel du Goulag*, Tome 4 des œuvres complètes. Edition nouvelle revue et augmentée par l’auteur, Traduction entièrement révisée par Geneviève Johannet, Fayard, 1973, p. 636.

<sup>12</sup> Andrei Sakharov, *Vospominaniya*, Vol. I, p.3. (In his “Memoirs” Sakharov recalls that during his exile in Gorky, whenever he had to leave the house, the theme that KGB would take the manuscript memoirs, which actually came true for three times, each time he carried them with him. They had come to weigh in around 10 kg., more than a metaphysical burden.)

<sup>13</sup> Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, *Bodalsya telyonok s dubon. Ocherki literaturnoy zhizni /The Calf and The Oak. Notes of the literary life*, Novy Mir, 1991, Nr. 6, p.6.

<sup>14</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>15</sup> Ibidem, p.8.

*The Calf and the Oak* is therefore dedicated to the side of the Russian conspirator, when he operated against the communist society which he was included. The trajectory of his life, how he arrived at that position are known. Let us just stop to a few significant details. Solzhenitsyn was born in December 1918 in Russia – so his life is fully framed during the communist era, he is a product of the communist society, a society „systematically violated basic political right like the freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion”<sup>16</sup>. Like so many other Russians of his age he is enrolled in the army and fights in the Second World War. Since his twenty years, his education and life experience are due to the Red Army community. At the age of 27, he is arrested in 1945 because he would have criticized Stalin<sup>17</sup> in a letter. He is sent to the camp for eight years, followed by three years of exile. From 1956 he sets at Ryazan, where he teaches Maths. In 1956 the publication with the help of Tvardovski in Novii Mirof *A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* brings his celebrity and, from that moment, his career as a writer started that opposes to the communist regime, which is in conflict with the authorities, who sends his writings to samizdat and then to foreign publishers, in a word, his career as an anti-communist militant. In 1970 he is awarded the Nobel Prize for literature – he does not go to Stockholm to be awarded, for fear that he will not be received again in the USSR when he returns. When in 1973 the first volume of *The Gulag Archipelago* is released he begins to be heavily contested in his country. On February 12, 1974 he is immediately arrested and expelled from the USSR. From these biographical data it appears that Solzhenitsyn never occupied any important place in the Soviet society, he was never a privileged of it, and much less that he would have any role in the party that oppressed the Soviets. He did not turn, for some reason, against social mechanisms that he was part of. He constantly felt as an opponent, a representative of those among whom was a part – of the oppressed, former prisoners, persecuted by the regime and others. In front of him stands the social power that suppresses, and the destiny of his life is to fight against this power, to beware of its actions and to express – as a writer – so as to strike.

His main instrument is the word art. Solzhenitsyn makes no overarching aesthetic fiction. He surely hopes that among the lines he writes to have a literary value – but somewhere he meditates on the writer’s condition that prepares his book in private. Although he is a writer he will use the power of words to strike the social structure that seeks to destroy. ”Writing ten to twelve years in an absolute isolation, you unnoticed lose, the sense of proportion, you start to be too lenient with yourself and simply not to notice that such tirade is

<sup>16</sup> Bolton, Jonathan, *Worlds of Dissent: Charter 77, The Plastic People of the Universe, and Czech Culture under Communism*, Harvard University Press, 2012, p. 30.

<sup>17</sup> The episode of his own arresting is sparingly sketched in *L’archipel du Goulag*, Tome 4 p.31. ”Le commandant de brigade m’avait convoqué à son PC. Il me demanda, je ne sais plus sous quel prétexte, mon pistolet, et je lui remis sans soupçonner la moindre perfidie, soudain, de la suite d’officiers qui, tendue, immobile, se tenait dans un coin, se détachèrent rapidemant deux agents du contre-espionnage qui traversèrent en quelques bond la pièce et, m’agrippant du même geste de leurs quatre mains par l’étoile de ma chapka, par mes épaulettes, mon ceinturon et ma sacoche, s’écrièrent d’un ton dramatique: « vous êtes arrêté !» Brule, transpercé de la tête aux pieds je ne trouvai rien de plus intelligent à dire que: « Moi ? Pourquoi ?»”

The control station volunteer called me, he asked me the gun, I do not know why, and I gave him, without suspecting any treachery, and suddenly from the tense suite of the officers who had stood still in a corner, two counterintelligence agents were drawing; as they would have jumped, they crossed the room, grabbing me with their four hands by the stars from the hat, the epaulettes, belt, the porhart, they cried in a dramatic tone: You are under arrest! And scorched, and pierced from head to foot, I did not find something more intelligent to say than: Me? For what?...”

too shrill, that a certain exclamation is grandiloquent that, finding no other fair point in that passage you put a platitude.”<sup>18</sup>

Whatever the problems of the illegal writer would be, his work is not in vain, it's in a community. "... and then I lived all those years of practicing writing in the underground with the conviction that I was not the only one who is restrained and resort to tricks; that we were a few tens of that kind, solitary natures, stubborn and closed, widespread throughout Russia, writing each as his soul and conscience dictate about what he knows about our time and what is the capital truth.”<sup>19</sup> Their idea is to expose the truth as is at risk “to remain undisclosed.” And there is still hope. “But the day will come (...) and thus our great literature will revive that we have shoved it into the abyss.” “I still did not think that literature can initiate and provoke the overthrow of a society (though, wasn't what the Russian history proved us?!). I thought that the society will have, of different reasons, a shock and it will even renew, that a fault will occur, a gap of freedom, and soon our underground literature will come in action to express to the troubled and bewildered minds why everything was fatal so as to happened as it was, and how does that beginning with 1917 everything constantly twists and twists.”<sup>20</sup>

The covert activity, inevitably waged about this literary aspect thus becomes an important component of its overall activity. In *The Calf and the Oak* the clandestine issues move to the forefront. The disclosures that he makes must protect those in danger. Moreover, ultimately these two volumes are largely a manual of illegal / dissent activity. Each person in the Russian part of the employees is judged from this point of view. Each has strengths and weaknesses for the clandestine specific. Who has too much knowledge is not necessarily recommended for this kind of activity. Solzhenitsyn accurately describes a sequence of illegal camouflage actions<sup>21</sup>, with hours at which the action can take place, with the seat in the bus, with the technique of detecting the “queues” and others. Elsewhere he tells us the lesson he had received from another former prisoner, who was in deportation, who teaches the art of concealing the manuscripts in the walls of some cardboard boxes. Everything is made with such “mastery” that the hideout resists after several years.

Certainly, not everything always comes out great. Sometimes people considered to be trustworthy are not at all to be trusted and are in turn imprudent. This is really what happened to the one of whom he assigned the entire archive. In his turn, he lends a volume to a dubious person and as a card game, the entire archive falls into the hands of the KGB. Solzhenitsyn himself is not free of surprises. One of his most dependable collaborators in Petersburg falls into the hands of the secret police and immediately afterwards she dies. Killed? Suicidal death?

Much of the writer's collaborators are women – that help him with typing after which the volumes are assigned to the samizdat, he puts manuscripts where needed or fail to remove them abroad. But sometimes the closest collaborators have opinions, sometimes even contradictory opinions. Liusa, one of the most faithful women to the novelist and one of the

<sup>18</sup> Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, *Bodalsya telyonok s dubon. Ocherki literaturnoy zhizni/ The Calf and the Oak, Notes from literary life*, Nr. 6, p. 12.

<sup>19</sup> Ibidem, p. 11.

<sup>20</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>21</sup> Idem, Nr. 11, p. 139.

most trusted without personal reactions, reveals her political choices when she asks him, in February 1972, to type the letter to the Patriarch. In that letter (before Solzhenitsyn addressed other letters of effect to the Writers' Union leadership or the leadership of the Communist Party) the author invites the "orthodoxy to participate in real life with all its religious system."<sup>22</sup> Even the writer acknowledges the betrayed supporters reasoning: "This really was ironically, that the educated people could not accept so much Orthodoxy."<sup>23</sup> With the approach of Orthodoxy Solzhenitsyn notes that he lost much of his supporters - who kindly saw the Orthodox Church. "...in my favor there was still a slim consistent minority across new social strata and the new generation."<sup>24</sup> Therefore, around Solzhenitsyn a strong opposition raises to the intention to involve the church in fighting against the power<sup>25</sup>. His collaborator was "...my monologue against my unimaginably shameful orthodox patriotic orientation, from the depths"<sup>26</sup>. It is an important point during Solzhenitsyn's resistance movement, one in which he thinks he can lead the resistance movement to the Russian Orthodox Church. At this point it appears that the anti-totalitarian movement that he was very involved in was one secular, unrelated to orthodox ideas. With that letter to Patriarch Pimen and the way he was approaching the 'national' issue in the description of the World War I, on *August 14*, a restructuring among Solzhenitsyn's supporters occur, a situation that is fully conscious. "With this letter, nay, even in *August*, a process of division among my readers begins, I begin to perish some of the followers and those that remain with me are less than those who left me. They were praising me as long as the appearances reinforced the belief that I was only against Stalin's abuses; in that moment the whole society was with me." And the author explains why the public had been deceived by his behavior, leaving him when he leaked the options. "In my early writings I masked against police censorship, but through it, against the public, too. The actions that were following to be taken by me, I must necessarily discover myself: it was time to speak more loudly and to go to an increasingly higher depth. And to do so, it was inevitable to lose my readership, to lose my contemporaries, putting my hope in their offspring."<sup>27</sup>

It is a moment that was, apparently, less emphasized, although decisive to define the dissident Solzhenitsyn. Is the fact that it proves that his supporters were in the opposition movement against the communist not for the aesthetic value his writings, nor for a patriotic and Orthodox line. Those who supported him were the communist regime opponents from a civic position of direct political opposition; the author hopes that his reveals orthodox and nationalist position to have an impact over ... the next generation.

---

<sup>22</sup> Idem, Nr.12, p. 18.

<sup>23</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>24</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>25</sup> The communist morality in Lenin's version, as Philip Boobbyer noticed, (Conscience, Dissent and Reform in Soviet Russia, Routledge, 2005, pp. 26-27.) although it is derived from "the struggle for the consolidation of communism", defends religious freedom, at a certain level, by the Constitution of 1918, although religion is a traditionally Marxist tool „by which the exploiting class kept the proletariat in a passive state in which they could continue to be exploited."

<sup>26</sup> Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, *Bodalsya telyonok s dubon. Ocherki literaturnoy zhizni/ The Calf and the Oak, Notes from literary life*, Nr.12, p.20.

<sup>27</sup> Idem, Nr.8, p.27.

### **Solzhenitsyn Against The Shattered World**

Is tracking how this eminently Russian position acts after the expulsion of Solzhenitsyn. This may be the explanation for the writer's attitude on the West. Two years after he settled in Vermont, United States, he is invited to take the floor at the end of year meeting of Harvard University. The invitation coincided with the desire to manifest, to publicly and direct act, on his contemporaries. He prepares his speech, which will be mentioned after June 8, 1978, when it will support, as Solzhenitsyn's speech at Harvard (although the author had given the title of *The Shattered World*).

This speech aroused much controversy and it positioned Solzhenitsyn among the most obstinate anti-Western. The Western media was directly attacked in speech. Later there were also voices that sustained the Russian outlaw's submissions. The commentators of this speech were polarized to extremes, either opposing to that one who exhibited the defects of the Western world or accepting certain Western defects reported in his speech. In reality this manifestation of the Soviet opponent is directly related to what Solzhenitsyn began to reveal the last part of his opposition in Russia. Some of the author's observations reveal facts and putting them out would not have aroused such indignation. The speech is a mixture of empirical observations about the Western way of life and the theoretical hints of completely different importance. It could be an incidental comment on finding the decline of Westerners statesmen's courage in each country and the UN. That one who consistently reviews the international political events may notice this without problems. In general, important decisions, especially those concerning other countries are taken cautiously by the Western leaders – leading, when these decisions are taken, however, to large and very large delays. This was the also the case in what concerns the UN, not once criticized for inertia. This is not necessarily courage, but of those, often limited possibilities that lead to involve the state they represent. The initiative and at the same time the ability to convince at the level of such great institutional bodies such modern states is generally poor. In change, courageous attitudes toward the weak, the small, economically dependent states, with the powerful ones afford gestures of arrogance are known. Another observation is related to social psychology. People living in the West live in certainty and this leads to an increase ambition, to want to accumulate more. Consumerism is ultimately a sign of social success, hence some emulation. But Solzhenitsyn was witnessing an episode of wellbeing. Nowadays, Westerners "anxieties" go mainly to job security, finding a job, pensions and so on. Another limitation would be a spirit of the laws, of the whole dominating social attitude. The observations in this regard are meaningless. The compliance with laws cannot only be a boon. Discussions held in these companies look the wrong way in which the laws are applied, and in recent democracies (but not only) the issue regarding the laws is corruption.

### **Rational Cosmopolitanism in Sakharov' Dissenting Actions**

Andrei Sakharov recognize that at the basis of its cosmopolitan thought, seen rather as a free conscience, social, economic, ideological and moral elements that have been developed in the area of family relationships and upbringing are interwoven: "living in another era than my parents, in other circumstances, with a different philosophy and financial situation, with a new biography, I became more cosmopolitan, more global, more active in the social life than

my parents. But I am deeply grateful to them that they gave me the necessary starting point to become so.”<sup>28</sup> As for Solzhenitsyn, the individual conscience seems to be sealed in a limited space and communist ideology, this idea seems to outline through the main character (Nerjin) from the novel “Love Revolution!”, which was lucky to live “...in the best country. A country that had passed all the crises in history, and it was already held by the basic principles of the scientific thinking and social justice. This fact was exempting his mind and consciousness of the need to defend the miserable and humiliated because they were not unhappy and humiliated. It was the best country to be born in it for a man thirsty for knowledge. (...) All their generation was born to lead the revolution of the Earth’s sixth part to that of the whole earth.”<sup>29</sup> Although this book was first published in 1999, Solzhenitsyn began to write more in 1940, while he was in the concentration camp, the shadow of nationalism; in this early stage it is easily felt. What appears at the surface is that conscience reassured by the ideology of the party, channeled in one direction: the theoretical research, ripped, separated from the social dimension. This fragment, in case of Sakharov – Solzhenitsyn’s analogy becomes symptomatic. Sakharov, in turn goes through a period of nearly 20 years (1948 -1968) in which he only dedicates to his research and sees in the Soviet state that “kind of prototype (though imperfect) for all countries (even in so strong is the ideology of mass).”<sup>30</sup> From this unemployed peaceful social conscience, Sakharov reaches the consciousness able to judge them from a broader, more balanced perspectives backed by what he calls in this context, the theory of symmetry: “I started later to watch our state on an equal footing with the other - they all just have shortcomings (...). It is what the theory of symmetry may be called. All governments and regimes are in first approximation bad, all the people are oppressed, all are threatened by the same dangers”<sup>31</sup>. This step, in terms of Rawls, conscientious objection can be considered as a preparatory one for the actual dissenting actions. Sakharov will overcome this stage and will reject the delicate but plausible balance that seemed to exist between states: “...during my dissent I came to the conclusion that the theory of symmetry must be clarified. We cannot speak of symmetry between the cancer cell and the normal one. And our state is like a cancer cell with the annihilation of the totalitarian and unorthodox opinions with an authoritarian power structure, which lacks full control of the most important decisions on the adoption of domestic and foreign policy; a closed state – without informing citizens on key issues closed to the outside world, without the freedom of movement and exchange of information.”<sup>32</sup> The year 1964 becomes for Sakharov that moment of openness to the world, extremely important, it is the year in which he starts his dissident shares appointed by Sakharov in his memoirs as the first time that “I took a stand outside the specialization”<sup>33</sup>. In fact it is about editing, signing a letter to Khrushchev<sup>34</sup> in which the author defends the song

<sup>28</sup> Sakharov, *Vospominaniya/Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 64.

<sup>29</sup> Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *Iubește revoluția/Love Revolution*, Editura Art, 2012, p.39.

<sup>30</sup> Sakharov, *Vospominaniya/Memoirs*, Vol.I, p. 363.

<sup>31</sup> Ibidem, pp. 363 - 364.

<sup>32</sup> Ibidem, p. 364.

<sup>33</sup> Ibidem, p. 440.

<sup>34</sup> Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev (1894 -1971). Since 1953 till 1964 First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the period 1958 -1964 the function of prime minister of the USSR. During the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, Khrushchev denounces the secret report by the cult of personality of Stalin and accuses him of crimes during the Great Purges of 36’-39’. In 1964 he was dismissed by conservatives in DC.

“Guests” - Zosin being found in a full media scandal. The result of the intervention is null, he receives from Khrushchev “an official elusive reply”<sup>35</sup> It should be noted that in his memoirs, Sakharov makes the difference between his contesting attitudes as a scientist, nuclear physicist and his dissident, supportive attitudes in front of the oppressive apparatus of individuals or groups. Attitudes of appeal “within the specialization” began after 1953, i.e. after the time of the hydrogen bomb invention, with tests carried out on the ground or in the air. The effects arising from testing put Sakharov in front of some moral realities that he could not ignore them, the more so as these effects derived from a purely mathematical calculation: “The number of injury cases is determined by the product of the irradiation dose and the number of persons subjected to the radiation. If the radiation dose is reduced by a hundred times, but simultaneously increases a hundred times the number of irradiated persons, the number of those affected will not change. This is precisely the situation of the non-threshold effect – if genetic injury, similar to the other cases.”<sup>36</sup> Considering the nuclear tests “a direct crime against humanity”<sup>37</sup> Sakharov will be involved and actively participate in the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty prohibiting nuclear experiments in water, air and space. These contesting actions are rationally based, which is why their applicability becomes ubiquitous and Sakharov’s dissenting actions may be associated with a rational cosmopolitanism. This objector episode to halt nuclear tests with nuclear products is conjugated by Sakharov through public attitude against N.J. Nujdin to enter the Academy. These two moments, acknowledges the Russian scientist, will seal the fate of “Why I stepped so alien from my way of being, like that of taking a public action against the candidacy of a man who I did not know him personally? Probably because I put very much at heart the issue of freedom of science, the scientific honesty – science seemed (and seems to be now) the most important part of civilization and therefore any attack against it is inadmissible (...).”<sup>38</sup> Sakharov’s dissidence, although it was part of some association or he signed petitions and letters of protest, appeal along with other dissidents, that of Solzhenitsyn’s remains as an individual dissidence<sup>39</sup>. Against this kind of dissidence Sakharov structures all his actions in relation to that type of general or specific event following different levels: public and non-public. Sakharov believed that intervening discursively in a general problem allows the formulation of an alternative viewpoint to the official, stresses the importance of the issue and draws attention to them. In case of common issues, the dissenting action aimed at defending individuals or groups, thus preventing amplification of human rights violations. Solzhenitsyn criticized this form of individual dissenting action and labeled it as waste of energy, and seemed to be the one who actually gave to Sakharov “complete freedom in terms of both the content and means of expression, it

<sup>35</sup> Sakharov, *Vospominanya /Memoirs*, pp. 439 - 440.

<sup>36</sup> Ibidem, pp. 435 – 436. There is here an excerpt taken from the article “Nuclear explosions and radioactive carbon in non-biological effects thresholds” *Atomnaia Energhia*, September, 1958 published in several international languages with Khrushchev’s acceptance.

<sup>37</sup> Ibidem, p. 497.

<sup>38</sup> Ibidem, p.522.

<sup>39</sup> Guy Scarpetta, *Eloge du cosmopolitisme*, Bernard Grasset, Paris, 1979, p.199. Scarpetta brings into question that in the case of the dissidence from east, the case of Russia, it would be difficult to speak of a dissident group, both Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov distancing from the totalizing discourse.

was the most appropriate taking into account my very special situation”<sup>40</sup>. In line with this clear structure of action Sakharov will be involved in the struggle for freedom of religion and the rights of believers in the USSR., human rights, the right to freedom of belief and the exchange of information, the problem of using psychiatry for political purposes, the death penalty, environmental issues. On the other hand, in case of the specific problems Sakharov gave a tremendous job, wrote petitions, open and closed letters to the party leaders, he wrote articles to press conferences, attended trials, as a supporter of the judged, and he unfairly entered three times in a hunger strike. He was one of the few dissidents who went on hunger strike for two young men that loved to be together, to initiate calls for humanitarian release although useful in its policies and visit labor camps. Despite the failures, of his personal not only physically suffering, Sakharov said: “I think that taking my position contributes to promoting a pluralistic approach of these cardinal issues, and thus they do not jeopardize, but rather support the safeguarding peace clause.”<sup>41</sup>

### Conclusion

Although Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn defended themselves against attacks each regime, they were trying to sustain and to work together, their meetings were few, they saw each other face to face only three times<sup>42</sup>, and their views on certain actions, motivations and justifications for dissenting shares distanced themselves up to incompatibility. Sakharov wrote about Solzhenitsyn: “I find that he underestimates the overall approach, general human of the essential, cardinal, contemporary problems, that he manifests certain “anti-Occidentalism”. That is why the “principled isolationism”, the insufficient attention to problems and the destiny of other people, apart from the Russian, Ukrainian, and other countries are related; sometimes the presence of some elements of Russian nationalism, the idealization of religious and Russian lifestyle, from which is only one step to disregard and hostility to other people.”<sup>43</sup> Solzhenitsyn’s dissidence manifested through by writing, which has turned into a weapon against silence, and this form of dissent to manifest need a cosmopolitan dimension otherwise “the words become silent and start flowing like water, tasteless, colorless, odorless, without a trace.”<sup>44</sup>

The dissident actions, both in case of Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn could, ultimately, be seen as active democratic memory exercises<sup>45</sup>, as democratic memory of the past, the memory being filtered through a present critical thinking, but directed toward future.

<sup>40</sup> Sakharov, *Vospominanya/Memoirs*, Vol.II, p. 299.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 118.

<sup>42</sup> Gennady Gorelik with Antonia W. Bouis, *The World of Andrei Sakharov. A Russian Physicist’s Path to Freedom*, Oxford, University Press, 2005, p. 296.

<sup>43</sup> Sakharov, *Vospominanya /Memoirs*, vol. II, p.165.

<sup>44</sup> Alexander Solzhenitsyn, “Banquet Speech”, [www.nobelprize.org/liteature/laureates/1970/Solzhenitsyn-speech74-e.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/liteature/laureates/1970/Solzhenitsyn-speech74-e.html).

<sup>45</sup> An active democratic memory, in Keane’s terms, “recognizes that the development of fresh and stimulating perspectives on the present depends upon the criticisms that break up habitual ways of thinking, in part through types of criticism which remember what is in danger of being forgotten. Hence, the democratic remembrance of things past is neither nostalgic nor atavistic. It turns to the past not for the sake of the past – as if the secrets of present miseries were hidden there – but for the purpose of securing more democracy in the present and future. An active democratic memory knows that past traditions of political discourse can furnish us with more than a few surprises and provoke us into enlightening disagreements. They can remind us of some of the “perennial” problems of social and political life. And thereby, they can help us understand who we are, where we stand, what

## Bibliography

- Berdyaev, Nikolai (1948) *The Origin of Russian Communism*, translated from the Russian by R.M.French , Published by G. Bles, London.
- Bolton, Jonathan (2012) *Worlds of Dissent: Charter 77, The Plastic People of the Universe, and Czech Culture under Communism*, Harvard University Press.
- Boobbyer, Philip ( 2005) *Conscience, Dissent and Reform in Soviet Russia*, Routledge.
- Engel, S. Moris (1976) *With Good Reason: An Introduction to Informal Fallacies*, St. Martin's Press, New Work.
- Falk, Barbara J. (2003) *The Dilemmas of Dissidence in Est – Central Europe*, Central European University Press.
- Gorelik, Gennady, Bouis, Antonia W. (2005) *The World of Andrei Sakharov. A Russian Physicist's Path to Freedom*, Oxford, University Press.
- Kozolov, Vladi, Fitzpatrick, A., Mironenko, Sheila, Sergei, V. (2011) *Everyday Resistance in the Soviet Union under Khrushchev and Brezhnev*, Yale University.
- Kulavig, E. (2002) *Dissent in the Years of Khrushchev: Nine Stories About Disobedient Russians*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Miller, David (2002) „Cosmopolitanism: A Critique”, *CRISPP*, Vol.3, Nr.3, pp. 80 – 85.
- Rawls, John (1999) *A Theory of Justice*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Robertson, G. (2011) *The Politics of Protest in Hybrid Regimes: Managing Dissent in Post-Communist Russia*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Sakharov, Andrei, D. (1975) *My Country and the World*, New York, Vintage Books.
- Sakharov, Andrei, D. (1968) *Progress, Coexistence, And Intellectual Freedom*, The New York Times Company.
- Sakharov, Andrei, D. (2006) *Vospominaniya/Memoirs* Vol. I., Vol. II., Moskva ,Vremya.
- Scarpetta, Guy (1979) *Eloge du cosmopolitisme*, Paris, Bernard Grasset.
- Shatz, M. (1980) *Soviet Dissent in Historical Perspective*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr (2012) *Iubește revoluția/Love Revolution*, Editura Art.
- Solzhenitsyne, Alexandre (1973) *L'archipel du Goulag*, Tome 4 des œuvres complètes. Edition nouvelle revue et augmentée par l'auteur, Traduction entièrement révisée par Geneviève Johannet, Fayard.
- Solzhenitsyn, Alexandr (1991) „Bodalsya telyonok s dubon. Ocherki literaturnoy zhizni /The Calf and The Oak. Notes of the literary life”, *Novy Mir*, Nr. 6, pp. 6 -116; Nr. 7, pp. 65 – 158; Nr. 8, pp. 5 – 124; Nr. 11, pp. 119 – 146; Nr. 12, pp. 5 – 76.

---

we might hope for”, apud. Barbara J. Falk, *The Dilemmas of Dissidence in Est – Central Europe*, Central European University Press, 2003, p. 322.