Religion, State & Society, Vol. 27, Nos 3/4, 1999

Religious Experiences of the Soviet Dissidents*

PHILIP BOOBBYER

Introduction

The Soviet dissident movement emerged with Brezhnev's coming to power in 1964 and the partial restalinisation that followed it. Starting with the public trials of the poet Iosif Brodsky in 1964 and the writers Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuri Daniel in 1966, the Soviet regime laid down an open challenge to the Soviet intelligentsia to conform to the official line or suffer the consequences. However, the intellectual ferment of the Khrushchev years was not easy to crush, and the result was a variety of dissident activity, embracing political, legal, moral and religious concerns.[1]

To some extent the aims of the dissidents were political in the sense that to expose Soviet injustices always meant finally to challenge the legitimacy of the Soviet state. Nevertheless, activists did not always see their actions in political terms. The purpose of the Moscow Human Rights Committee, for example, founded in 1970 by Valeri Chalidze, Andrei Sakharov and Andrei Tverdokhlebov, was to monitor the regime's compliance with its own laws. Its aims were strictly legal rather than political. At the same time, many dissidents understood their activities primarily in moral terms. For example, the demonstration in Red Square against the invasion of Czechoslovakia on 25 August 1968 was primarily a moral stand. Nataliya Gorbanevskaya, one of the seven demonstrators on that day, wrote that 'the purpose of our demonstration was ... not merely to give expression to our own remorse, but also to redeem at least a fraction of our own people's guilt before history.'[2] The dissident intellectual Anatoli Yakobson suggested in a letter which was widely distributed in *samizdat* that 'the demonstration was not a manifestation of a political struggle ... but the manifestation of a *moral* struggle .... One must begin by postulating that truth is needed for its own sake and for no other reason.'[3]

This moral discourse, embracing terms such as 'guilt', 'truth' and 'evil', was one of the defining features of the dissident movement. Measuring the success of the dissidents involves to a large extent measuring how widespread that discourse became. Becoming a dissident meant becoming a participant in a conversation about truth, refusing to participate in deceitful patterns of behaviour, choosing, in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's phrase, 'not to live by the lie'.[4] Dissident intellectuals believed that the Soviet system they lived in was founded on lies, and that moral opposition was therefore imperative. The prominent dissident activist Aleksandr Ginzburg has suggested that 80 per cent of those involved in dissident activity thought of their protest in moral terms.[5]

*This paper was first presented at the conference 'Religions in Europe in the Twentieth Century' at the Open University, Milton Keynes, April 1997.

0963-7494/99/03/04/0373-18 © 1999 Keston Institute

Where did this moral discourse come from? What were the roots of this intellectual culture which was so concerned with moral issues? There are two pre-revolutionary traditions which stand behind it. Firstly, it had its roots in the language of Orthodoxy, with its profound awareness of 'good and evil', and its strong monastic tradition and emphasis on the interior life. Secondly, it grew out of the more secular values of a Russian intelligentsia which drew much of its inspiration from the socialist tradition and laid the foundations for the rise of Russian Marxism. Both these traditions were in different ways preserved during Soviet rule, and helped to form the moral outlook of the dissidents.

However, as well as being influenced by these traditions, this discourse was also rooted in the particular experiences and struggles of the Soviet era. In the case of a number of Soviet dissidents their moral perspectives were the fruit of profound religious experiences. It is these religious experiences which form the focus of this article. I would like to argue that the religious experiences of some of the Soviet dissidents often had something in common with the traditions of 'desert spirituality'. The pressures of prison and indeed of Soviet life in general were such that dissidents were forced to draw on all their inner spiritual resources in order to survive. All exterior supports were stripped away. The context for these experiences, then, was a certain kind of 'desert'. Furthermore, I suggest, these experiences often led dissidents to an acute awareness of emotions and actions that would undermine the unity of their inner lives. Here, moral and religious experiences were closely intertwined, a factor that led to the emergence of an interpretation of history which stressed moral law. Finally, I would suggest that these religious experiences were often similar to the experiences of secular nonbelieving dissidents. What to one person was an inner conflict or experience that could be interpreted in religious language would be understood by another in purely moral or psychological terms. Thus at the level of experience there was often common ground between religious and secular thinkers, which was not apparent at an ideological level.

The work is primarily based on dissident memoirs, and on a number of interviews which I did with former dissident intellectuals between 1995 and 1997. The essay does not claim to be a comprehensive study. It focuses on Russia and on a small number of Russian dissident intellectuals, the most prominent of whom played an important part in defining the thinking of the wider dissident community.

The Survival of Religious Traditions

Before looking specifically at this body of religious experience, it is important to consider how religious ideas maintained a presence in the atheistic Soviet state. For what one critic describes as the 'Russian religious renaissance'[6] of the late Soviet era occurred in part because of the discrete preservation of Russian religious and moral traditions in Soviet society.

After 1917 the Soviet state made a clear attempt to destroy the religious loyalties of its population. Churches were closed, priests were shot or imprisoned and, with the collectivisation of the peasants, the rural foundations of Russian religious life were all but destroyed. Following Stalin's concordat with Metropolitan Sergi in 1943, however, the Orthodox Church was brought back into national life. It thus survived as an institution. However, it lost much of its spiritual authority, and its ability to pass on Christian values was severely curtailed by legislation which forbade the spreading of religion and by the compromised nature of its hierarchy. Nevertheless, the Church played an important role in the preservation of religious

traditions. The churches themselves, simply by their presence and symbolism, and through the medium of icons, made a clear religious statement. The liturgy represented a different perspective on the world. People continued to be baptised, often in secret. Church services of course took place and could attract the seeking soul. Father Georgi Kochetkov, the controversial Moscow priest who fell foul of the Orthodox establishment in the 1980s and 1990s, grew up in an atheist family, and his religious quest began simply with visits to churches, where he was attracted by the beauty of the services.[7] In addition there were priests, the well-known Fr Aleksandr Men' being just one example, who retained their spiritual independence and exercised an important personal influence on both parishioners and the wider educated public.

In spite of this, the Church played little role in people's daily lives. Significant numbers of people went to church at Easter, but knowledge of religious matters was in sharp decline. The state was officially atheist and there was no positive religious education. Churchgoing could affect one's career prospects. Underground churches were few and hidden. As a result, the family played a particularly important role in preserving religious traditions and values. Most parents of those who grew up in the Stalin era were born before 1917 and their children thus had access through them to the prerevolutionary world and perspectives which were at odds with the Soviet outlook. These parents were the grandparents of the next generation. Many dissidents of the Brezhnev era thus knew something of the presoviet world through the memories and habits of mind of their grandparents. Irina Ratushinskaya, the Russian poet who spent some years in a labour camp in the 1980s, states that, because their parents were so busy, most Russian children of her generation were bought up by their grandparents until they were about seven years old. And she adds: 'Generally grandmothers were more religious.'[8] In general, the family was the crucial institution for the preservation of traditional values. This makes the abandonment of revolutionary family policies in the mid-1930s in favour of a more conservative attitude a crucial date in Soviet history. It provided for a more stable transfer of private memories and allowed for the development of an alternative system of loyalties.

Memories, of course, are passed on in language. The Russian language itself preserved religious and secular ethical traditions which were threatened by Soviet power. The moral power of words such as *pravda* and *istina*[9] was not so easy to destroy. Iosif Brodsky writes 'Because civilizations are finite, in the life of each of them comes a moment when centers cease to hold. What keeps them at such times from disintegration is not legions but languages.'[10] Certainly, the Russian language itself preserved something of the ethics of Russian civilisation during the Soviet era.

Literature played a particularly important role in transmitting religious ideas. For the intelligentsia Soviet culture was a reading culture, and popular entertainments were not of sufficient quality to attract intellectuals away from books. Reading itself is, of course, an individual rather than a collective pursuit and this encourages a certain level of individualism. While the Bible itself was hard to get hold of, world literature and particularly Russian literature offered access to religious perspectives. Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky gave new generations access to moral and spiritual questions, many of them very pertinent to the realities of Soviet life. Not only was nineteenth-century Russian literature important. Russian literature's traditional concern with issues of truth, justice and the meaning of life was also the focus of twentieth-century writers whose works were available in *samizdat*: Boris Pasternak, Vasili Grossman, Solzhenitsyn and others. Russian literature past and present was continually engaged with metaphysical issues. Soviet intellectuals frequently cite Russian literature as the crucial formative influence on their system of values.

Making this point, Brodsky wrote: 'If we made ethical choices, they were based not so much on immediate reality as on moral standards derived from fiction. ... This was the only generation of writers for whom Giotto and Mandelstam were more imperative than their own personal choices.'[11]

In spreading the influence of literature the schoolteacher played a central role. Teaching Pushkin or Tolstoy could have discrete political implications. For example, German Andreyev, the deputy director of Moscow's School no. 2 in the 1960s and a famous teacher of Russian literature, was given the job of providing an adequate humanitarian education for young mathematicians. The school's open educative approach was to bear fruit in the Gorbachev era when a number of former pupils became prominent reformers. Andreyev had the freedom to teach 'critical method' to his pupils, and also to focus on the spiritual dimensions of Russian literature, especially Tolstoy.[12]

World literature and thought, moreover, are so permeated with Christian motifs that they come up in all sorts of places. Tat'yana Goricheva, leader of the Leningrad-based '37' group, found Christianity after being encouraged to use the Lord's Prayer at yoga classes.[13] Aleksei Yudin, who was associated with the group of 'Ecumenists' of the early 1980s, discovered the Lord's Prayer in a book about Ingmar Bergman.[14] Soviet museums were filled with Renaissance art, focusing on religious themes. Even in an atheistic and strictly censored environment world culture contains so much of a religious nature that a person can stumble across it at every turn.

Unexpectedly, Marxism itself played a role in this process. At one level, Soviet ideology was profoundly amoral, taking moral absolutes to be part of the bourgeois 'superstructure' and thus a product of class antagonism. Yet at the same time, the system was highly moralistic, calling for loyalty to the Party and State, and in the official literary canon of socialist realism, stressing the importance of heroism and virtue. The practical, educative role of youth institutions such as the Pioneers and the Komsomol was to instill traditional values, although replacing commitment to God with commitment to the Party. Marxism is a metanarrative, in part a materialist alternative to the Christian vision. And a mind which has internalised one metanarrative is already open to the possibility of another absolute. Perhaps that might account for the popularity amongst some of the religious dissidents of the twentieth-century Russian philosophers, such as Nikolai Berdyayev, Sergei Bulgakov and Semen Frank. The religious ideas of these thinkers, who in the 1890s had been revisionist Marxists and had subsequently turned to Christianity, were particularly accessible because they were constructed in reaction to Marxism, and emphasised human freedom.[15]

The same might even be said for the scientific worldview. Andrei Sakharov makes this link. Not thought of as a believer, he states in his memoirs:

> I do not know where I stand on religion. I don't believe in any dogma and I dislike official churches, especially those closely tied to the state. ... And yet I am unable to imagine the universe and human life without some guiding principle, without a source of spiritual 'warmth' which is non-material and not bound by physical laws. Probably this sense of things could be called 'religious'.[16]

Such a belief is clearly informed by the scientific style of thought, by the very idea of law. The Soviet intellectual tradition always claimed to be scientific and encouraged people to think teleologically.

Thus in a variety of ways religious and absolute values retained a discrete presence

in Soviet life. In particular through the Church, the family and literature, people had access to religious ideas that were not openly discussed. There was nothing systematic about this. Circumstances and choice would determine how much people responded to these possibilities.

Prison Experiences

Clearly, religious traditions survived in Russia. The question must therefore be asked to what extent the religious convictions of the dissidents reflected the reemergence of older traditions and to what extent there was something new about them. There is no answer, of course: it is always a matter of degree. However, there is no doubt that the pressures of Soviet life had a crucial impact on dissident religious experience and the language in which they interpreted it. Older traditions survived to provide a framework in which newer experience could be interpreted. The Soviet experience was so particular that traditions were reinterpreted as much as restored.

The social and intellectual context in which religious experiences occurred was very distinctive. Throughout the Stalin era and after, intellectuals faced pressure to conform to the regime's ideology and demands. Those who chose not to conform had to develop strategies to preserve their independence and protect themselves. Consequently intellectuals often gathered in small groups of like-minded people. After Stalin's death 'circles' sprang up to provide a focus for discussion and social interaction.[17] The dissident movement itself was very much rooted in such 'circles', as also in their own way were underground church groups. The very atmosphere of independent intellectual discussion had a religious intensity about it. The religious thinker Oleg Genisaretsky described a positivist philosophical circle of the 1960s and 1970s as having 'the pathos of a religious order'.[18] Since it was indeed state policy to break down or infiltrate all independent civil institutions, dissident circles and religious communities were always on the defensive. This defensiveness often meant the creation of an 'us and them' mentality, or a mentality where the primary purpose was to survive spiritually with one's personal integrity intact. A considerable amount, then, of dissident religious thought focused on 'survival'.

At a personal level, the question of moral and spiritual survival was crucial. This is nowhere clearer than in Soviet 'prison literature', in the accounts of life in labour camps and prisons which are so prevalent in dissident literature.[19] These accounts often involve a large measure of moral and spiritual autobiography, and provide instruction on how to survive the Soviet experience with integrity and values intact. In their focus on maintaining a healthy moral and spiritual life, they can sometimes be compared to the classics of desert spirituality, whether of desert fathers or of modern-day mystics.[20] The 'desert' situation is one where men and women find themselves in situations where all dependencies have been stripped away. Experiences occur in conditions where the positive influence of tradition and environment is at its weakest. A person's inner resources must deepen. And a labour camp or prison is, of course, just such a place. Knowledge of church teaching, family memories and Russian literature offer possible frames of reference for interpreting experience. But whether these cultural factors have given rise to real belief, as opposed to superficial habit, is subject to the severest trial.

Soviet prison literature is therefore a kind of 'desert' literature. A good example of this is Zoya Krakhmal'nikova's *Listen, Prison!*. From 1978 Krakhmal'nikova edited the religious journal *Nadezhda*, in which she made available inspirational religious writing, much of it by little-known Russian Christian writers of the twentieth

century.[21] She was sentenced under Article 70 in 1983 to a year in prison and five years' internal exile. In her book she interprets prison in a religious way:

> God stripped the world of its crust layer by layer. The Lefortovo prison gates, as well as the door of my cell, were only a material sign, symbol of the world closed to me forever more. ... My soul must have known this would always happen, that this was necessary, that only there could it find freedom.[20]

Thus, according to Krakhmal'nikova, God is using the prison to strip away her dependency on the world. Prison is a part of God's providential purpose.

A similar approach can be found in the memoirs of Dimitri Panin. Panin, who was the model for Sologdin in Solzhenitsyn's novel *The First Circle*, says that it is in the nature of imprisonment that 'every teaching is tested under the harshest conditions'.[23] Writing on his spiritual life, Panin describes an extraordinary experience of healing from a life-threatening case of diarrhoea, which follows a decision to give his life into God's hands. He says:

> My heart and spirit positively refused to submit to a death sentence. I was even borne up by something akin to joy: it was a unique opportunity to engage in a duel with death on the most unequal terms. Such a feeling came as a result of fervent prayer, during which I promised God to help carry out his sacred will, and thereby to bring aid to all men who had been deceived. ... In some way not understood by me, I had long been prepared to make such a vow. At the moment of self-dedication I experienced a feeling of confidence which has not abandoned me to the present day. I knew with certainty and conviction that God would save my life, that I would have the ability and resolve to move mountains.[24]

Here prison and illness focus Panin's own spiritual struggles. The description of the process, where the experience of 'confidence' follows a decision to yield all to God, is typical of mystical religious narratives.

Solzhenitsyn's *The Gulag Archipelago* also contains descriptions of spiritual discovery. In a chapter entitled 'The Ascent', Solzhenitsyn interprets suffering as part of God's providential design to lead the soul to self-knowledge. There is clearly a mystical dimension to his description of the ascent of the soul to a new level of understanding. At the same time, this ascent involves the discovery of a profoundly moral vision of the world:

> As soon as you have renounced that aim of 'surviving at any price', then imprisonment begins to transform your formal character in an astonishing way. ... Once upon a time you were sharply intolerant. You were constantly in a rush. And you were constantly short of time. And now you have time with interest ... [A] beneficial calming fluid pours through your blood vessels – patience. You are ascending. ... Formerly you never forgave anyone. You judged people without mercy. And now an understanding mildness has become the basis of your uncategorized judgments. You have come to realize your own weakness. ... We are ascending. ... Your soul, which formerly was dry, now ripens through suffering. ... It was granted to me to carry away from my prison years ... this essential experience: *how* a human being becomes evil and *how* good. ... Gradually it was disclosed to me that the line separating good and evil passes not

> through states, nor between classes, nor between political parties either but right through every human heart – and through all human hearts. ... And that is why I turn back to the years of my imprisonment and say 'Bless you, prison!'[25]

Elsewhere in *The Gulag Archipelago* Solzhenitsyn similarly notes that the struggle to come to terms with life in the camps has changed him:

> The day when I deliberately let myself sink to the bottom and felt it firm under my feet – the hard, rocky bottom, which is the same for all – was the beginning of the most important years in my life, the years which put the finishing touches to my character. From then onward there seem to have been no upheavals in my life.[26]

For Solzhenitsyn, then, the labour camps have focused the essential questions of life, and in relation to them have demanded clear moral choices.[27]

In her memoir *Grey is the Colour of Hope*, which is also written with an underlying religious worldview, Irina Ratushinskaya makes similar comments: 'The camp motto is "Back to work with a clear conscience!" An excellent ambition, isn't it? To be released without having been broken, without informing on your friends, without co-operating with the KGB. Camp either cleanses your conscience or destroys it forever.'[28] Again, the process is the same. An extreme situation forces a choice.

Another setting in which moral and spiritual survival is central is that of interrogation. How not to compromise oneself during interrogation was a crucial question in the dissident movement. Tat'yana Goricheva suggests that even the confrontation itself can be understood in religious terms: 'The Holy Fathers recommend fighting with demons by taking no notice of them. I tried the same method of warding off the persistent, extremely varied attempts of the KGB investigators. I did not react to them. I did not allow them into my consciousness.'[29] Here the interrogator is seen as the tempter, and just as Christ under temptation did not enter into a discussion with the devil, so Goricheva suggests a similar strategy.[30] A traditional inner struggle or debate is projected by Goricheva onto the conflict with the interrogator. Describing a similar conflict, Aleksei Yudin, recalling the tensions of his own conversations with the KGB, observed: 'If you don't watch it, they will get you onto their ground.'[31] It should be said, of course, that not all religiously-minded dissidents adopted this strategy or interpreted interrogation in such terms, but many dissidents, religious and secular, who survived interrogation without breaking, felt it necessary to avoid negotiation with the authorities.

In her discussion of interrogations Tat'yana Goricheva compares dissident experience to that of the Desert Fathers. 'In our practice', she says, 'the experience of the dissidents and ascetical experience often coincided.'[32] Elsewhere she observes: 'Present day martyrs are often reminded of liturgical prayers and of the world of the ascetics and the holy Church Fathers, for it is precisely in the camps that the reality of the old Christian tradition has been rediscovered.'[33]

In regard to man's ability to withstand pressure, Goricheva suggests that '[man] is stronger than all systems, stronger than any possible external circumstance'. She observes that 'throughout the writings of Solzhenitsyn, Panin or [Abram] Shifrin, we find descriptions of people who in seemingly hopeless circumstances have in some miraculous way been saved.'[34] This is a theme which is also taken up by the Yugoslav dissident intellectual Mihajlo Mihajlov in an essay 'The mystical experience of the loss of freedom' of 1974. He discusses four works: Solzhenitsyn's

The Gulag Archipelago, Panin's *The Notebooks of Sologdin*, Abram Shifrin's *In the Fourth Dimension* and Andrei Sinyavsky's *A Voice from the Chorus.*[35] Mihajlov observes that all these writers find that 'nothing in their lives happens by chance: the providence element again. He notes also that all testify to a choice which has to be taken between physical self-preservation and loyalty to the truth. Their conclusion is that 'those who try to preserve their physical existence at the expense of their souls lose both'. These writers testify, he says, to the existence of an 'inner voice', what he calls a 'mysterious inner compass'. They conclude:

> If a person, regardless of external circumstances, his own wishes and plans, the threat of physical destruction and the conclusions of reason, not to speak of social opinion, follows the voice of his soul, which is not subject to any rational control, then in that person's life, roads open up of their own accord which lead to the preserving of what had been given up, and to the fulfilment of his most secret wishes.[36]

The similarity of the conclusions of these writers, according to Mikhailov, makes their work very significant. 'The phenomena here analysed are of revolutionary importance, not only for psychologists and psychoanalysts in the twentieth century, for Marxists and sociologists of the West, but also for modern man in general, including philosophy.'[37] These are diverse personalities with different worldviews, Mikhailov is observing, but the phenomenology of their mystical experiences is the same.

Soviet prison literature, then, often contains religious insights which are the fruit of 'desert' experiences. Prison is understood as a king of purgatory by those who have gone through it. Yet it was not only camps and prison that offered the circumstances in which desert-type religious experiences might take place. In a certain sense the Soviet state itself did the same thing. Everyone faced the question of whether to accept the official line or to think and act independently. Breaking with the ideology often involved passing through a difficult inner struggle. Certainly that is how Aleksandr Ogorodnikov, a member of the 'Christian Seminar' of the 1970s and 1980s, describes the experience of his circle: '[We] grew up in atheist families. Each of us has undergone a complex, sometimes agonizing path of spiritual questing. From Marxist convictions, via nihilism and the complete rejection of any ideology, via attraction to a "hippy" lifestyle, we have come to the Church.'[38]

The nihilism which Ogorodnikov refers to was very much a feature of the youth culture of the late Brezhnev era, with its sense of stagnation and decay. It was typical of a younger generation, disillusioned with the compromises of its parents. In this climate, western existentialism became for some an unexpected bridge to Christianity. Vladimir Poresh, also a member of the Christian Seminar, said: 'Sartre led me to Christianity'.[39] In a similar vein, Tat'yana Goricheva suggested that Sartre's emphasis on free choice led certain people towards a liberation from state control, then to despair and finally to faith: 'For all his hostility to religion Sartre could bring us to the verge of despair at which faith begins. His central idea, that human beings make a free choice every second, is indeed a Christian notion.'[40]

That Sartre might contribute to this process of conversion is surprising, but the inner journey of Ogorodnikov, Poresh and Goricheva is not unusual. Ogorodnikov traces a journey away from a dependence on the official ideology, via disillusionment, to formal Christian commitment. Such a journey is typical of religious narratives the world over. The moment of despair or profound inner conflict is an essential point in the transition from one set of beliefs to another or from an essen-

tially superficial set of beliefs to an internal commitment. In a broad sense, such narratives frequently occur in descriptions of the passage of a person from childhood through youth to adulthood; they reflect the process of growing up. The well-known Moscow priest Fr Vsevolod Shpiller observed the widespread occurrence of this kind of process in the USSR in a sermon of 1973:

> More and more frequently and unexpectedly you meet people of the most varied ages and situations who have gone through deep inner, spiritual, mental and emotional crises, sometimes through tragic conflicts which they have found insoluble in a non-religious framework, who are asking the Church about different things.[41]

The Soviet state itself, then, offered a particular context in which the religious quest might take place. This does not mean that the influence of the past was absent. Memory and tradition were always there. Andrei Mironov, a human rights activist of the 1980s, 'realised that God existed' while on the *elektrichka* (electric train) reading Solov'yev's book *Three Conversations*. This experience, which took place in the early 1980s, was a process which he described as 'falling into a situation ... a restoration of connections'. Here the past, through the Russian religious philosopher Vladimir Solov'yev, is speaking very overtly in the present, and facilitating an inner moment of revelation. Yet the relevance of past traditions can only be understood in the new circumstances. Mironov had some dramatic encounters with his interrogators in prison after he was arrested in 1985. These included a moment when under torture he realised that it was his interrogator rather than he who had broken, and that whatever happened to him physically his soul would remain intact: 'I realised they could take my body but they could not take my soul.'[42] Mironov's story is a good example of how the past continued to speak and have its influence in Soviet life while at the same time the pressures of Soviet power shaped the kind of spiritual questions which people were asking.

Moral Law and Soviet History

These religious narratives are built around the problem of moral and spiritual survival. The interrogator's task, for example, is to encourage or force a person to give way, to put the demands of the state above his conscience. In this context, much of dissident literature focuses on the inner drives which undermine the unity of the soul. The inner struggle is to avoid the temptation to live on the basis of fear, hatred or deceit, whatever it is that impedes the growth and health of the soul, whatever it is that gives the interrogator or the state a greater margin of control. Where the soul is under threat, what makes for spiritual health and unity becomes crucial. On the subject of hatred, for example, Irina Ratushinskaya writes:

> You must not under any circumstances allow yourself to hate! Not because your tormentors have not earned it. But if you allow hatred to take root, it will flourish and spread during your years in the camps, driving out everything else, and ultimately corrode and warp your soul.[43]

Here, hatred is seen as a destructive force which must be avoided at all costs.

This warning about the destructive power of hatred is expressed in clear moral terms. The destructive power of certain emotions can of course be expressed in an overtly religious discourse. Zoya Krakhmal'nikova, for example, warning of the destructive power of 'fear', suggests that the fear experienced under interrogation is

'a provocation as the Holy Fathers call it. ... The "onslaught of mental demons" is the term used by St Simeon the New Theologian.'[44] Yet in general even the religious dissidents describe these destructive emotions in moral or psychological terms: so they would say, for example, that it is only by avoiding bitterness and lies that a person can get free of the web of power in which the Soviet system is founded. Thus the kind of universalist religious experience which comes up in dissident narratives, much of it related to the preservation of the unity of the soul, is closely intertwined with moral advice and experience.

However, in dissident thought there is another element. Not only does the individual soul become free and whole as it moves beyond fear and deceit, so also does society. In an essay of 1974 Solzhenitsyn suggests that 'human society cannot be exempted from the laws and demands which constitute the aim and meaning of individual human lives', and argues for an 'examination of social phenomena with reference to the categories of individual spiritual life and individual ethics'.[45] He thus argues that the laws that govern personal spiritual development also govern the development of society as a whole. Just as there is an underlying moral or providential interpretation of the struggles of the soul in dissident writing, then, so there is also a moral or providential view of Soviet history as a whole. Much of dissident thought implicitly takes the view that the whole of Soviet society is a kind of camp, held together by fear and deceit. It is only when people start to break with these officially-sanctioned 'rules of the game' that society itself can start to become healthy. Accepting the 'lie' leads to dictatorship; but the decision 'not to live by the lie' leads out of it, because personal inner freedom is the condition of external political freedom. The task for individuals is to acquire a real inner freedom, to 'live in truth' as Václav Havel was to say. And this affects the historical process. Soviet history is thus seen not as the fruit of long-term social and economic trends or contradictions, but as the outcome of a multitude of moral choices.

Fear and deceit play a crucial role in this way of looking at history. In his memoirs Panin, for example, looks at the early years of the communist autocracy in the light of the theme of honesty: 'Until 1917, in Russia, the concept of honesty was drilled into the children of families professing to be Christian. After the disaster of 1917, this traditional process went into sharp decline. The very word honesty became unfashionable and was used only in a tone of cynicism.'[46] His view is that the capacity to be truthful or the lack of it plays a part in the historical process.

Nadezhda Mandel'shtam, wife of the famous Russian poet, emphasises the moral dimension of the historical process in her memoir *Hope Abandoned.*[47] 'Everything we have been through was the result of succumbing to the temptations of our era.'[48] On the subject of fear, for example, she notes that '[fear] can be passed on from generation to generation'.[49] Then she distinguishes between two types of fear. There is the fear which leads to being silent in the face of evil and which held the Soviet system together: 'From the very first days ... fear began to stifle everything in us that makes life what it is. ... It was cowardice that led to the horror we have lived through.'[50] And there is a healthy fear, a fear of losing one's fundamental moral identity: 'It is the sense of shame that gives fear its healing power and offers hope for regaining inner freedom.'[51] Soviet history, in her view, saw the triumph of the former over the latter: in effect the triumph of fear for one's exterior well-being over the fear for the inner loss of one's moral personality.

Nadezhda Mandel'shtam's moral vision is rooted in what appears to be an underlying religious worldview. She argues that 'the European world based its culture on the symbol of the Cross, to remind us of the one crucified on it. At the centre of this

culture, hence, was the notion of the personality as the highest value.'[52] The diseases of Soviet history, she argues, were rooted in an abandonment of that position. People came to believe that, in the face of the process of history, their lives and choices were not important: 'The fateful years were the twenties: it was then that people not only became convinced of their helplessness but even exalted it, learning to ridicule as old-fashioned ... the very idea of intellectual, moral or spiritual resistance.'[53] People lost touch with their moral personality: 'Their inner voices ... had been stilled by the victory of the new'.[54]

As Mandel'shtam's diagnosis of the problem is moral, so is her cure: 'A man possessed of inner freedom, memory and a sense of fear is the blade of grass that can alter the course of the swiftly flowing stream.'[55] Here the unity of the soul is connected with knowledge of the past and a sense of one's own moral identity. Such are the ingredients, in her mind, of moral survival.

Dissident thinkers, such as Panin, Nadezhda Mandel'shtam and Solzhenitsyn, thus see history in moral and spiritual terms and are fiercely hostile to seeing events in terms of impersonal historical forces. It is not surprising, therefore, that they should appeal strongly to individual moral resistance. In effect, they are saying that Soviet history itself is a kind of desert experience, or time of trial. There are daily opportunities to choose freedom and truth and reject fear, to break with the tyranny of Soviet power. One dissident religious writer, F. Korsakov, in an essay in *From under the Rubble*, a collection of essays edited by Solzhenitsyn in 1974, actually describes Soviet history as a providentially-ordained test for the Russian people, by comparing Russia's fate with that of Job: 'Surely Job's fate can be seen as a prophetic analogy to the fate of Russia throughout her history. ... The Lord knew and loved his servant Job, and marked him out by testing him.'[56] It is out of such a conviction that there is a spiritual struggle going on in Soviet history that Mikhailov concludes his analysis by saying that 'the battle being fought in the totalitarian states is in reality not political but religious'.[57]

There is, then, at the heart of Soviet dissident thought a stress on moral law. It is not that these writers deny the importance of institutions. Solzhenitsyn, for example, has much lamented the collapse of the tsarist state and the decline of the Orthodox Church. However, they are inclined to see the health of institutions as rooted in moral and spiritual life. Here they follow in the footsteps of *Vekhi* (*Landmarks*), the famous collection of essays by Russian religious philosophers of 1909 which stressed that moral and spiritual culture precedes politics.[58] Such an approach is entirely consistent with dissident experience. These writers are telling their own story of moral struggle and applying it to the nation as a whole. Russian religious philosophy has the reputation of lacking philosophical rigour, and it would be easy to see this dissident thought as simply a continuation of the non-analytical tradition of philosophers such as Solov'yev and Berdyayev who see history in broad religious categories. Nevertheless these moral and religious views of history do not reflect only the survival of an older tradition. They are rooted in experience and, in the context of Soviet life, have a clear inner logic.[59]

Religious and Secular Discourses

Here, then, is a religious perspective which emphasises natural or moral law. At the same time it is also clear that this concern with moral values is not peculiar to dissidents with a religious outlook. It is typical of the dissident movement as a whole. When it comes to history, for example, the political dissident Andrei Amal'rik, writer

of the famous essay *Will the Soviet Union Survive until 1984?*, whose ideology was essentially humanist, took the view that the Soviet system was held together by the mentality and morality of the population at large: 'It is not that people do not change the government because the government is good but because we ourselves are bad. We are passive, ignorant and fearful.'[60] Or, on the subject of 'ends and means' in the revolutionary struggle, Roy Medvedev, a Marxist and fierce opponent of Solzhenitsyn's ideological position, states in his great critique of Stalinism, *Let History Judge*: 'Some objective criteria of morality are above the practice of a given moment and set limits to the choice of methods.'[61] Moral experience and philosophy are central, then, to the Soviet dissident discourse as a whole.

There is here much common ground between religious and secular thinkers. Most obviously, the dissident movement was united in its moral opposition to Soviet infringements of human rights, and in its sense that under Stalin at least something had gone terribly wrong at the moral as well as the political level. That unity was always shaky, as the sharp ideological division between Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov in the early 1970s showed, but it existed at a certain level. It is also true that the experiences of religious and secular dissidents were frequently similar, if not the same. Writers with different ideological commitments might equally aspire, for example, to possess the quality of 'inner freedom'. Solzhenitsyn, with his religious outlook, asks 'How can we free him who is unfree in his soul?'[62] Yet Amal'rik also, in his letter to Anatoli Kuznetsov of 1969, writes 'You constantly speak of freedom, but of external freedom. You say nothing of inner freedom. ... Such freedom and the responsibility attributed to it is a necessary prerequisite of external freedom.'[63] Both Solzhenitsyn and Amal'rik, then, aspire to the same quality, although each brings to it a different intellectual position. For some, unity of the soul would imply a religious approach; for others religion need not come into it. At the phenomenological level, then, religious and secular dissidents have similar moral experiences.

Here also there is common ground between the languages of religion and psychology. For example, Tat'yana Goricheva's strategy for dealing with the interrogator, which she compares to ascetical experience, can be seen simply as a psychological technique for moral self-preservation. And vice versa: what are simple psychological observations can be understood using a religious discourse. Irina Ratushinskaya suggests that to declare a fear is to conquer it: 'To articulate your fears is already half the battle won. After that all you have to do is face the fear methodically a second at a time.'[64] In this case, what at one level could be understood as a psychological strategy is at another level a kind of 'confession'. Andrei Sinyavsky writes that 'A man is entirely happy when he forgets about himself and no longer belongs to himself. Alone with himself he is bored. ... In our happiest moments we have no memory of ourselves.'[65] This is a psychological observation, but the mystic would surely endorse it.

To a large degree, then, these spiritual observations reflect the laws of human personality the world over. There is much to suggest that they apply in all cultures and societies. They certainly apply if the comparison is made with Nazi Germany. Writing about his experiences in Dachau and Buchenwald, Bruno Bettelheim observes: 'Blaming others, or outside conditions for one's own misbehavior may be the child's privilege; if an adult denies responsibility for his actions, it is another step towards personality disintegration.'[66] This is exactly the kind of psychological observation about the pressures of confinement which Soviet dissidents with various ideological positions could easily have penned and applied to their society as a whole.

The fact, however, that Solzhenitsyn and Amal'rik, for example, are talking the same language should not conceal major differences in the worldview of such thinkers. In this case, Solzhenitsyn has nothing but contempt for the French revolutionary tradition and its attitude to the Church.[67] Amal'rik, on the other hand, on being awarded a prize in 1976 by the International League for the Rights of Man, expressed his enthusiasm for the French Revolution and declared that he was 'in favour of a humanistic revolution'.[68] The common language can indicate common experiences but conceal very different beliefs.

At the heart of this problem is the fact that there was always common ground between the moral traditions of the Russian intelligentsia and of Orthodoxy. Both would declare allegiance to 'conscience', 'truth', 'justice' and 'freedom', even if giving the words different meanings. Thus while socialist and Christian moral traditions could come together to form one discourse when in opposition to Soviet totalitarianism, that discourse would conceal serious differences. So while the language of 'good and evil' pervades dissident thought it is vital to dig deeper to find out what is behind it. Where someone uses such moral rhetoric it might indicate a religious perspective, or a concern for moral self-preservation; or it might simply mean a hostility to the Soviet system and its methods. Solzhenitsyn himself illustrates the problem beautifully in his description of one of his 'invisible allies', Yelena Chukovskaya, who helped him with the administration of so much of his work. It was only after some years that it suddenly became clear to him that Chukovskaya did not share his religious and patriotic outlook at all, and that her commitment to moral values was rooted in the Russian intelligentsia tradition, rather than in a religious framework. In contrast to his own approach, Solzhenitsyn suggested, the Chukovsky family were 'psychologically wedded to the non-religious tradition of the Russian nineteenth-century liberation movement'.[69]

It can be argued, of course, that some secular moral viewpoints have emerged from within a Christian culture and that this accounts for similarities of language. At least this is how the political activist Vladimir Bukovsky has described it. While not a religious believer, Bukovsky comments that 'the ethics of civilisation are Christian at foundation'. He suggests that the Christian model was an inspiration for him and the dissident movement as a whole. The dissidents, he argues, 'were atoning for the sin of another, offered [themselves] as victims. ... The model of Christ is the great and basic one. Other models are lesser.'[70]

Bukovsky's comments are an indication of how difficult it is to distinguish between religious and secular elements within this discourse on 'conscience'. They are intertwined and it would be absurd to try to separate them. Words carry meaning in the context not only of different discourses, but also of individual lives. Each person's attitude is unique. Bukovsky uses some of the Christian terminology, but is not a believer. Sakharov did not identify with the Orthodox tradition at all, yet was open to a form of universalist religious belief. Others moved from one position to another. Natal'ya Gorbanevskaya had been involved in dissident work for some time before she was baptised in the autumn of 1967.[71]

Each person's position thus reflects a different set of experiences and circumstances. It can happen that in those with differing political beliefs there is a common experience; and amongst those whose perspectives seem to be the same the experiences may be different. This applies not only to the language of morality, and what it conceals, but to the religious discourse itself. Within religious nationalist circles, for example, similarities of language could conceal very different approaches. The religious nationalism of some was rooted in some kind of personal

experience; for others, the experience behind the rhetoric was weak, and the new ideology was in reality simply a new external security.

Conclusion

Prison memoirs offer vivid examples of the struggle faced by all Soviet citizens to preserve their integrity in the face of state pressure to conform. The Soviet state created conditions in which 'desert' experiences became typical, and in which it became natural to see history itself in moral or spiritual terms. Although pre-revolutionary Russian traditions were preserved as a hidden yet important presence in Soviet life, dissident religious experience cannot be understood as simply a rediscovery of the past. Traditions were rediscovered in the context of a moral and spiritual struggle for survival. Clearly the moral ideas of people such as Solzhenitsyn and Panin were rooted in deep religious experience. And to the extent that the ideas of these men influenced the dissident intelligentsia, it is possible to see the moral discourse of the dissidents as having some of its origin in religious experience. These experiences were shaped by the particular features of Soviet rule. The argument put forward by one scholar that 'contemporary Soviet dissent ... is the product of a pattern of development Russia has been following since the eighteenth century'[72] cannot be fully sustained at the level of religious experience. The outlook of the dissidents was the product both of an older tradition and of a newer experience.

Most secular dissidents had the same moral commitment as religious dissidents, and thus the moral discourse of the Soviet dissident movement was only in part rooted in religious experience and ideas. There were many other formative influences. However, the similarity of the moral or psychological experiences of religious and secular dissidents, and the different ways in which these experiences can be interpreted, raise important questions about how to classify what is a religious experience. An experience of 'inner freedom', for example, can be described satisfactorily in religious, moral or psychological terms. The borderline between these words suddenly becomes blurred. What is clear is that to understand the words of these dissidents fully, it is necessary to understand the personal experiences that lie behind them.

It would be wrong to suggest that all dissidents went through 'desert' experiences. Men such as Ginzburg and Sakharov never thought of giving way and withstood pressure with comparative ease.[73] Yet it is certainly true that many dissident memoirs do focus on this kind of highly individual inner struggle. The pressure to conform and the difficulty of resisting help account for the fact that, in some cases, dissidents came to identify the state itself as something 'evil'. After all, it was representatives of the state who were trying to undermine their moral integrity. They also explain the highly combative nature of some dissident thought and behaviour. In this connection it would be wrong to canonise the dissidents. To some extent the dissidents had all the flaws of an isolated community overly focused on its own experience. Often abrasive personalities, they had a tendency to get into disputes with one another. And not surprisingly they were marked by their experiences. In his memoirs Solzhenitsyn refers fondly to some friends whom he describes as 'eternal zeks': people whose lives were in 'perpetual transit'.[74] '*Zek*' is the Russian term for an inmate of the labour camps. Solzhenitsyn means it here in a positive sense, but the term is appropriate. Labour camp experiences were sometimes so intense that it was subsequently difficult to move on from them. In addition, being a 'dissident' became something of a badge of honour. Andrei Mironov humbly observed that this affected him so much

that he became a 'holy cow ... [having] a false feeling of euphoria'.[75] Yet, surely, it could not have been otherwise. The Soviet system itself was so demanding that only such singlemindedness could have withstood the pressure.

The refusal to conform and the price paid as a result made it difficult for dissidents to come to terms with the Russian Orthodox establishment. The Moscow Patriarchate never accepted or defended the dissident movement, and it was very difficult for there to be a real dialogue as a result. The compromises that the Church made with the regime were exactly the ones which the dissidents would not approve of. However, many of the dissidents were still attracted to the Church, and through priests like Fr Aleksandr Men' and Fr Dmitri Dudko, were baptised. Yet even then the religious dissidents frequently belonged culturally and intellectually to the Russian intelligentsia rather than to the Orthodox Church. Literature rather than church services was the formative influence. The result of this is that the religious and moral traditions of the Russian dissidents did not permeate the official Church in any deep way. So although the Orthodox Church acquired a new authority with the collapse of Soviet ideology and power, it still remained divided from a community which had much to offer at a spiritual level. The Orthodox Church looked back to the prerevolutionary era for its inspiration, when there was a new body of experience closer at hand.

Notes and References

1. The word 'dissent' has become the accepted term to describe the oppositional activity of the Brezhnev era, but it is not very satisfactory. An alternative term is the Russian word 'inakomysliye' which can be translated as 'alternative thinking' and conveys well the importance of intellectual noncompliance in dissident circles. Ludmilla Alexeyeva uses 'inakomysliye' in the Russian version of her *Soviet Dissent* (Wesleyan University Press, Middletown, Connecticut, 1987). In addition, the dissidents themselves never liked the term 'dissident' because it implies a narrowness and abnormality of outlook which they would not accept.
2. Natalia Gorbanevskaya, *Red Square at Noon*, trans. A. Lieven (Andre Deutsch, London, 1972), p. 282.
3. Anatoli Yakobson, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 284.
4. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, 'Zhit' ne po lzhi!', *Publitsistika: stat'i i rechy* (YMCA Press, Paris, 1981), pp. 168–72.
5. Interview with Aleksandr Ginzburg, Paris, March 1997.
6. Jane Ellis, *The Russian Orthodox Church: a Contemporary History* (Croom Helm, London, 1986), p. 287.
7. Interview with Father Georgi Kochetkov, Moscow, April 1996.
8. Interview with Irina Ratushinskaya, London, November 1995.
9. For a discussion of the meaning of these words, see Nikolai Berdiaev, 'Philosophic truth and the moral truth of the intelligentsia', in B. Shragin and Todd (eds), trans. M. Schwartz, *Landmarks* (Karz Howard, New York), pp. 3–22.
10. Joseph Brodsky, *Less than One* (Farrar, Straus, Giroux, New York, 1986), p. 165.
11. *ibid.*, pp. 28–9.
12. Interview with German Andreyev, Paris, March 1997.
13. Tatiana Goricheva, *Talking About God Is Dangerous*, trans. J. Bowden (SCM Press, London), 1986, p. 17.
14. Interview with Aleksei Yudin, Moscow, April 1996. For reference to the 'Ecumenists' see Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 449; also Sandr Riga, 'The Society of Ecumenical Christians before and after the dissolution of the Soviet Union', *Religion, State and Society*, vol. 22, no. 4, 1994, pp. 379–90.

[15] See, for example, Philip Boobbyer, *S. L. Frank: The Life and Work of a Russian Philosopher, 1877–1950* (Ohio University Press, 1995).

[16] Andrei Sakharov, *Memoirs*, trans. Richard Lourie (Hutchinson, London, 1990), p. 4.

[17] See on this Alexeyeva, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

[18] Interview with Oleg Genisaretsky, Moscow, April 1996.

[19] For a study of moral life in Nazi and Soviet concentration camps see Tzvetan Todorov, *Facing the Extreme: Moral Life in the Concentration Camps* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1999).

[20] For modern 'desert' spirituality, see the writings of Carlo Carretto, Thomas Merton and Henri Nouwen. A useful book on these issues is Father Walter Ciszek, *He Leadeth Me* (Doubleday, Image, Garden City, NY, 1975). The author spent four years in the Lubyanka and interprets his experiences within the Jesuit system of discernment. For a systematic study of the 'ascent' of the soul, see St John of the Cross, *The Ascent of Mount Carmel*, which offers a vision of the liberation of the soul from false dependency on the world.

[21] See Tatiana Goricheva (ed.), *Cry of the Spirit* (selections from the journal *Nadezhda*), trans. Susan Cupitt (Collins Fount, 1989).

[22] Zoya Krakhmalnikova, *Listen, Prison!*, trans. Olga Koshansky (Orthodox Publishing Society, Redding, CA, 1987), pp. 8–9, 34.

[23] Dimitri Panin, *The Notebooks of Sologdin*, quoted in Mihajlo Mihajlov, 'Mistichesky opyt nevoli', *Kontinent*, vol. 5, 1976, p. 226.

[24] Dimitri Panin, *The Notebooks of Sologdin*, trans. John Moore (Hutchinson, London, 1976), p. 167.

[25] Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, vol. 2, trans. P. Whitney (Collins & Harvill Press, London, 1975), pp. 611, 615–16.

[26] Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, vol. 3, trans. H. Willetts (Collins/ Fontana, London, 1978), p. 98.

[27] On Solzhenitsyn's moral vision see E. Ericson, *Solzhenitsyn: The Moral Vision* (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1980). In a critical comment on Solzhenitsyn's moral outlook Fr Vsevolod Shpiller suggests that his Christianity was limited to a moral perspective and did not embrace the spiritual depths of the soul. See Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

[28] Irina Ratushinskaya, *Grey Is the Colour of Hope* (Sceptre, Sevenoaks, 1989), pp. 212–13.

[29] Goricheva, *Talking About God is Dangerous*, p. 5.

[30] *ibid.*

[31] Interview with Aleksi Yudin, Moscow, April 1996.

[32] Goricheva, *Talking About God is Dangerous*, p. 5.

[33] Goricheva, *Cry of the Spirit ...*, p. 10.

[34] *ibid.*, p. 11.

[35] Abram Shifrin, *Chetvertoye izmereniye* (Possev, Frankfurt am Main, 1973); Abram Tertz (Andrei Sinyavsky), *A Voice from the Chorus*, trans. K. Fitzlyon and Max Hayward (Collins & Harvill Press, London, 1976).

[36] Mihajlo Mihajlov, 'Mistichesky opyt nevoli', *Kontinent*, vol. 5, 1975, pp. 224–25. There is a translation of this text entitled 'Mystical experiences of the labour camps' in *Kontinent2* (Hodder and Stoughton, Coronet Books, London, 1978), pp. 103–31.

[37] *ibid.*, p. 221.

[38] Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 383.

[39] Interview with Vladimir Poresh, St Petersburg, April 1996.

[40] Goricheva, *Talking About God is Dangerous*, p. 14.

[41] *Religion in Communist Lands*, vol. 1, no. 3, May–June 1973, quoted in R. Mowat, *Decline and Renewal* (New Cherwell Press, Oxford, 1991), p. 182.

[42] Interview with Andrei Mironov, Caux-sur-Montreux, July 1995.

[43] Irina Ratushinskaya, *Grey Is the Colour of Hope*, p. 278.

[44] Krakhmalnikova, *Listen, Prison!*, p. 19.

[45] Alexander Solzhenitsyn, 'Repentance and self-limitation in the life of nations', A. Solzhenitsyn *et al.*, *From Under the Rubble*, trans. under direction of M. Scammell

(Fontana/Collins, London, 1976), p. 106.

[46] Panin, *Notebooks of Sologdin*, p. 174.

[47] Brodsky described Nadezhda Mandel'shtam's memoirs as 'a view of history in the light of conscience and culture'. See Brodsky, *Less Than One*, p. 154.

[48] Nadezhda Mandelstam, *Hope Abandoned*, trans. Max Hayward (Penguin, Harmondsworth, Middx, 1976), p. 690.

[49] *ibid.*, p. 201.

[50] *ibid.*, pp. 205, 206.

[51] *ibid.*, p. 203.

[52] *ibid.*, p. 396.

[53] *ibid.*, p. 191.

[54] *ibid.*, p. 202.

[55] *ibid.*, p. 206.

[56] F. Korsakov, 'Russian destinies', *From Under the Rubble*, pp. 162, 164. See also William van den Bercken, *Christian Thinking and the End of Communism in Russia* (Interuniversity Institute of Missiological and Ecumenical Research, Utrecht/Leiden, 1993), p. 68.

[57] Mihajlov, 'Mistichesky opyt nevoli', p. 228.

[58] *Vekhi* (Moscow, 1909): a collection of essays on the Russian intelligentsia, which included contributions from Nikolai Berdyayev, Sergei Bulgakov, Semen Frank and Petr Struve. Solzhenitsyn openly acknowledges the influence of *Vekhi* on him in the collection of essays *Iz-pod glyb* (*From Under the Rubble*) of 1974. See his 'The smatterers', *From Under the Rubble*, p. 229.

[59] For Christian perspectives on history from western historians see C. T. Mcintyre (ed.), *God, History and Historians* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1977). At a psychological level some dissident thought has something in common with Erich Fromm's *Fear of Freedom* (1942): he sees the rise of modern totalitarian regimes as a symptom of a mass desire for security amidst the rapid changes of lifestyle in the twentieth century. Another comparison might be made with the work of Henry Drummond, the Scottish natural scientist of the late nineteenth century. In his *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* (1883) Drummond suggests that the laws of the spiritual realm and the laws of biological and psychological well-being are the same. In his *Ascent of Man* (1894) he proposes a Christian evolutionary view of history. More recently, Paul Johnson's *A History of the Modern World* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1983), which sees totalitarian systems as rooted in moral relativism, also invites comparison.

[60] Andrei Amalrik, 'An Open Letter to Kuznetsov', in *id.* (Hilary Sternberg (ed.)), *Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?* (Harper Colophon Books, New York, 1981), p. 69.

[61] Roy Medvedev, *Let History Judge* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989), p. 572.

[62] Solzhenitsyn, quoted in Mihajlov, 'Mistichesky ...', p. 247.

[63] Andrei Amalrik, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

[64] Irina Ratushinskaya, *In the Beginning* (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1990), p. 156.

[65] Abram Tertz (Andrei Sinyavsky), *op. cit.*, p. 73.

[66] Bruno Bettelheim, *The Informed Heart* (Avon Books, New York, 1971), p. 189.

[67] Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *The Templeton Prize Address 1983* (Lismore Press, Grand Cayman, BWI, 1983).

[68] Andrei Amalrik, quoted in *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*, RL 420/80, 13 November 1980, p. 3.

[69] Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *Invisible Allies*, trans. A. Klimoff and M. Nicholson (Harvill Press, London, 1997), pp. 113–14.

[70] Interview with Vladimir Bukovsky, Cambridge, June 1995. For further material on a similar theme, see interview with Jacek Kuroń in Jolanta Babiuch and Jonathan Luxmoore, 'Dilemmas of faith and ideology in Eastern Europe', *Religion, State and Society*, vol. 21, nos. 3/4, 1993, p. 338.

[71] Interview with Natal'ya Gorbanevskaya, Paris, March 1997.

[72] Marshall Shatz, *Soviet Dissent in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge University Press,

Cambridge, 1980), p. 11.

[73] Interview with Aleksandr Ginzburg, Paris, March 1997.

[74] Solzhenitsyn, *Invisible Allies*, p. 80.

[75] Interview with Andrei Mironov, 1995.