

Appendix

As an appendix to the article by Philip Walters (pp. 20-26) we print some documents written by neo-slavophiles.—Ed.

A Slavophil Reflects

These are paragraphs from an anonymous article called "Thoughts-Projectors". It appeared in Veche, the Christian slavophil samizdat periodical edited by Vladimir Osipov. Ten numbers of Veche appeared between 1971 and 1974, and provided a forum for all shades of slavophil opinion. This article comes from Veche No. 2, published on 19 May 1971. The "thoughts-projectors" of the author are unconnected reflections on nationalism in general and on Russian nationalism in particular. He points out that true nationalism needs to be rooted in religion and based on brotherly love.

(1) Why is it that when the establishment of Israel is being hailed throughout the world – and we too say that the Jews must have their own State, because exile is hard for them (if an exile has not lost his goodness in foreign lands, he longs for his fatherland) – why then are our love for Russia and our Russian ideas maliciously labelled chauvinist and treated with intolerance?

(2) We wish harm to nobody. We learn to love the whole of humanity only by loving our own kin. We believe that those who do not love their own kin do not love humanity.

(3) [. . .] A healthy being can exist only on his native soil: then he can choose alien things as he has need of them. But if he is brought up on alien

food, he loses his way and turns into a man without kith or kin – "neither fish nor fowl, neither God's candle nor the Devil's pitchfork", as popular wisdom has it. Such a man is an unformed individual.

(4) [. . .] The man who has nothing he can call his own readily concocts all kinds of insane plans.

(6) [. . .] Not only Russian history, but all history consists of crimes, but the difference lies in the fact that Russian history has its repentant thief. . .

(17) Every individual and every nation must develop with its own peculiar qualities. Normally these qualities can grow only on a religious soil. Only base instincts and equivocal people grow on soil which is not religious. Hence on a national soil, Fascism and other abnormal phenomena arise. Such phenomena, however, have their basic origin not in national feelings, but rather in the personal conceptions of one despot.

(18) Cosmopolitanism is spiritual slavery. The Universal Man is a figment of the imagination. There is only one Universal Man – God, Christ. Man as Universal Man is an idol, which sets itself up in the place of God.

(19) On a cosmopolitan soil grows the Antichrist, who promises freedom to all and brings them slavery. Cosmopolitanism prepares the way for the Antichrist.

Osipov Supports Solzhenitsyn

This article (AS 1760) entitled "On the Goals and Methods of Legal Opposition", was written in May 1974 by Osipov and is a response to an article by Roy Medvedev (AS 1680), in which the latter attacked Solzhenitsyn's "Letter to the Soviet Leaders". Osipov maintains that the only reliable path forward for Russia is not through drastic external reconstruction (democratization) but through inner "evolutionary" change as proposed by Solzhenitsyn. A change in the content rather than the form of society is required. (AS=Arkhiv Samizdata, a collection of samizdat documents produced by Radio Liberty.)

Solzhenitsyn's "retrogressive" letter with its slavophilism and patriarchalism will certainly evoke a warmer response in the Russian heart than the democratic alternatives of the intellectuals [. . .] It is senseless to quarrel about any kind of particular goal or about technically worked-out methods. We do not know what tomorrow will bring and are not in control of today; we are in a position only to make a moral assessment of them both [. . .] The goal must not be too ambitious for possible methods, and methods must be designed to suit the goal. In view of this, "The Letter to the Soviet Leaders" may be objectively described as a morally responsible and realistically practical programme for all legal opposition. Sakharov's goal is democracy on the Western model. But he has no faith that this aim will be realized in the near future. Although they declare that they are opposed to authoritarianism, Roy Medvedev and A. Krasnov are essentially at one with

Solzhenitsyn inasmuch as they start by recognizing the authoritarian foundations of the present regime. Medvedev says: "The realization of even the most extreme demands of the present Democratic Movement (for example, the setting up of social and political organizations and of organs of the press which would be independent of the CPSU) would not lead to the downfall of Marxism or induce the CPSU to renounce its leading role."* There is no doubt that the communist Medvedev, the social-democrat Krasnov, the liberal Sakharov and the "conservative" Solzhenitsyn are united in important respects. Medvedev describes their common goal, in my view, quite accurately: "The most realistic course remains that of slow and gradual evolutionary change . . ."

We must convince the administration of the fact that the presence of a loyal opposition is not harmful but beneficial for the Soviet State. Everything which screws itself up to the limit, breaks [. . .] His [i.e. Solzhenitsyn's—Ed.] proposals are realistic, constructive, and can be accepted by the government, because they are the proposals of a man who is profoundly tolerant of all who think differently. Solzhenitsyn is a Christian and champions a Christian ideology for the Russian people, and he believes that freedom of conscience and freedom of the individual must not be infringed. For him, freedom is just as sacred as Christianity. He demands no privileges for his own ideology.

Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

* See AS 1680, p. 10. . . .
** *Ibid.*, p. 9.

Osipov Disagrees with Sakharov

In this article (AS 1696), entitled "Five Objections to Sakharov" and written in April 1974, Osipov objects to an article (AS 1655) by Sakharov which attacked Solzhenitsyn's plans for reform in the Soviet Union. After expressing his distrust for excessive faith in "science" or

"reason", Osipov voices the typical slavophil opinion that "rational" democracy is unnecessary and irrelevant for the Russian people. What is required is a dictatorship; but a dictatorship awakened to an awareness of its responsibilities towards its subjects.

Sakharov the scientist believes in Science, naturally so. Georges Clemenceau once said: "War is too serious a matter to be entrusted to generals". Echoing Clemenceau, we maintain that the fate of mankind is too serious a matter to be entrusted to academics. The 20th century has convincingly proved the correctness of Dostoevsky's statement that no human society can be constructed on the basis of Science and Reason. It is not in spite of Science, but because of it that we exist now, adays "in the stinking confines of a sullied earth". Of course we cannot isolate ourselves from the world and put a stop to economic growth. But it is at least possible not to develop unnecessary and superfluous branches of industry. We could for example, drastically cut back production of light automobiles as a harmful luxury; reduce the production of spirits and tobacco; save the forests which are being destroyed by the paper industry for the sake of propaganda culture, and much, much more [. .]

Sakharov criticizes Solzhenitsyn for "bowing down" before authoritarianism. But Solzhenitsyn, alas, is only recognizing an objective historical fact: a different, non-authoritarian path for Russia

("whether we want it or not!") would be "unsafe and premature". There are various explanations for this. The Englishman, the Frenchman, the intellectual in Moscow or Leningrad who has absorbed Western ideas, all of them find the Russian unwillingness to accept democracy both absurd and repellent. But the Russian is like this. He mocked bureaucrats, rebelled against Governors, but nevertheless loved and honoured the Tsar. To a Russian, the MISTRUST which lies at the basis of an elective system is painful, as is the CALCULATION, the rationalism of democracy [. .] The "Letter to the Soviet Leaders" was written by a sober realist. Politics, as is well-known, is the art of achieving the maximum possible. And what is the maximum possible at the moment? RELAXATION of the dictatorship; regard for legality; tolerance of other people's opinions [. .]

Khomyakov and Kireevsky [. .] were in their time no less genuine liberals than Grigorenko and Sakharov today. And, what is more, no slavophil ever caused Russia as much harm as the Westernizer Peter the Great or the Marxist Westernizers.

Славянофильство и патриотизм

True Russian Patriotism

In the following article (AS 1147), "Three Attitudes to the Homeland", written in March and April, 1970, Osipov distinguishes three attitudes which Russians can adopt towards Russia. The attitude of those who wish to "westernize" Russia and rationalize Russian institutions is seen as one of "hatred". The attitude of hypocritical Soviet careerists and unprincipled camp-followers is called "speculation". The attitude of the true patriot is one of "love" and it is Osipov's basic belief that "love" is essential for any true patriotism or true religion. This article was printed in Vestnik RSKhD No. 103, pp. 216-222.

The first attitude to the homeland is one of hatred [. .] They hate the Russian People for its indifference to freedom [. .] If we are going to try to apportion guilt, then it is not the People which is

guilty, but its intellectual crust, which has betrayed the traditions of its homeland by pursuing foreign Reason [. .]

The second attitude to the homeland is one of speculation [. .] Young and old speculate on their homeland. They all "love" their homeland, the bloody tyrant, the doctor of falsifications, the aspiring caricature, the ignorant dissolute [. .] The modern patriot appears. An atheist, who holds that religion is an affair for unenlightened old women. An advocate of coercion, he desires the suppression of everyone and everything he can't understand [. .] From three centuries of wisdom he has drawn just one conclusion: that he understands more than anyone else and that God does not exist. He teaches others how to live, but as his textbook he takes the crib-sheets of foreign schoolchildren [. .] All this modern patriotism arose

in a moment, at a wave of the conductor's baton. Until that moment it had been obvious what such people were: they hated their native land openly and were not ashamed. After the baton was waved, these nihilists of the fatherland were required to become patriots – and they did so [..]

What is a nation? Faith, blood, language and the land. Religion, and even a certain complex of rites, are a part – indeed, the most important part – of the spirit of a nation. An individual person can get by without religion. But without religion, an individual nation cannot survive as a nation [..] A people disintegrates literally before one's eyes when faith in God disintegrates [..]

The third attitude to the homeland is one of love [..] A man has a mother, a wife, brothers, relatives, friends: people both close to him and more distant who think like he does. This is part of a nation. Concrete, living people, whom it is possible to love. For love is

always concrete. How can you love a native of a distant land if you have never seen him face to face? [..] The only way in which love for mankind will be born is through one's own nation [..] Every tribe has its own destiny [..] Let others worry about their own. [..] Renounce cheap fashionable scepticism, unprincipled cosmopolitanism, corrupting progress. If you follow the fashionable road you could lose everything, even yourself. There is no goal at the end of it, apart from the collapse of mankind. It is a crime to strut onwards in the same old way. Back! Turn back! Return to the place where things started going wrong, and then you must get your breath back, put everything in order and set off again along a different road [..]

Only the homeland, the homeland alone is capable of transforming its People. No rights or freedoms will of themselves change anything [..]

Slavophil Journal's Preface

After Veche was closed down, Osipov joined V. S. Rodionov in founding a new samizdat periodical, Zemlya (Land), which was to cover the same ground as Veche but placed even greater emphasis on the religious theme in Russian life. Once again, the journal asserted its loyalty to the Soviet regime. The following excerpt comes from the preface to the first number of Zemlya (AS 1909), published on 1 August 1974. The excerpt lists three themes which the editors considered should guide the policy of the new journal.

[..] (1) Nationalism is inconceivable if divorced from religion. Any form of pagan or atheist nationalism is of the Devil. For Russians, such nationalism is a new abyss and would mean final ruin. People without charity, generosity of spirit and love of God and Man are not Russians.

(2) The chief task for Russian nationalism today is to regenerate the moral life

of our people and our national culture.

(3) The absence of free speech and of guarantees of the rights of man is hindering the fulfilment of our national tasks.

We shall be guided along our road, as before, by the slavophiles and Dostoevsky. We are concentrating our direct efforts on the working out of a national Russian ideology. Raising serious objections to contemporary civilization, we are fighting for a return not only to our NATIVE LAND, but also to our MOTHER EARTH. Without a resurgence of social and moral strength amongst the peasantry, the salvation of the Russian nation is inconceivable. While specifying loyalty to the existing system and readiness to support the State in the face of outside aggression, we reserve the right to appeal to the LAND. Times change, powers come and go, but the PEOPLE is eternal, as is the truth it carries. No good seed cast to the earth will perish.

Russian Nationalist's Diary

These excerpts from a diary by someone who signs himself "N.V." appeared in Veche No. 4, which was published on 31 January 1972. They express opinions on Russian nationalism which are more chauvinist and less tolerant than those held by Osipov. The author asserts that it is necessary for Christianity to inspire national sentiments. Yet he has some uncompromising views on national isolationism.

(2) Destroy the partitions which divide people from each other, and everyone will descend to the level of savages. . . . An attempt to pull everything down, to deprive man of his natural inner boundaries is essentially nihilism, a covert denial of the world as created by God.

(3) Cosmopolitans, aesthetes, immoralists, emancipators and purveyors of smoking perpetual motion machines patented abroad – these are the scourge of the modern world, the multiple varieties of parasite who cling on all sides to the tree of our Russian life. They all proclaim freedom, but forget about their duties to their neighbours, to their People, to their State. But freedom understood as a denial of duty is freedom only in appearance: in reality it is the lowest form of servility before one's passions; it is slavery to the lower world [. . .]

(6) We must appreciate the value of being close to our own nation, and not associate unnecessarily with foreigners: national organisms must be closed and inaccessible to each other – this is the sign of a nation's health. But this does

not mean that patriotism completely excludes intercourse with other nations. It merely means that such intercourse must have a strictly localized and necessary character, and of course excludes situations where one nation sits on the shoulders of another, and vice versa. The only justification for international relations is not sovereignty and conceit, but help – spiritual and material – in Christ.

(7) Nationalism can be zoological, which we have once and for all rejected, having accepted Christ, or it can be deeply humanitarian – "patriotism" – recognizing as a principle the equal rights of all nations [. . .]

(8) Mixed marriages destroy the national structure of mankind, are one of the scourges of mankind [. . .]

(12) Foreigners fear Russian patriotism, but despise Russians for lacking such patriotism [. . .]

(16) The Russian patriotic movement, which is being born in the hearts of individuals, must become a mass movement in the next few years and decades: it must be capable of saving Russia from moral and spiritual disintegration, those terrible symptoms of the imminent degeneration of a nation, of its complete paralysis and death. To hope for this movement means to believe in a miracle and to hope for a miracle. But without this kind of belief on earth there has never yet been, and never will be, any great event. For it is just by faith in miracles and faith in God's help that all history has progressed [. . .]

CORRECTION

The article "Monasticism in the Soviet Union" (RCL Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 28-34) refers on p. 31, l. 33, to a convent at Zhirovitsy. This is situated in Belorussia and not in the RSFSR as stated. There is therefore no convent in the RSFSR. Footnote 8 (p. 34) should read: "From an account given to a visitor, translated by the latter. Russian account published in *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* No. 7, 1967, pp. 18-21".—Ed.