

SAINT-PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY

*A manuscript copy*

Kulko Kseniya Andreevna

**PUBLICISM OF F. M. DOSTOEVSKY  
AND A. I. SOLZHENITSYN: CONTINUITY OF CONSERVATIVE IDEAS**

Scientific specialty 5.9.9. Media communications and journalism

DISSERTATION  
submitted for the degree of  
Candidate of Sciences in Philology

Translation from Russian

Scientific supervisor:  
Doctor of Sciences in Philology, Professor  
Gromova Lyudmila Petrovna

Saint-Petersburg

2023

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER I. RUSSIAN CONSERVATISM OF THE 19th–20th CENTURY AND ITS REFLECTION IN PUBLICISM.....	16
1.1. Defining the concept of "conservatism", principles of conservative ideology.....	16
1.2. Conservative ideology in Russia: emergence and formation .....	19
1.3. The ideas of Autocracy, Orthodoxy and Nationality as key constants of Russian conservatism.....	27
1.3.1. Autocracy .....	27
1.3.2. Orthodoxy .....	30
1.3.3. Nationality.....	32
1.4. Pochvennichestvo as a direction of Russian conservative thought of the 19th century .....	37
1.5. Neopochvennichestvo as a movement of Russian conservative thought ...	48
 CHAPTER II. DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION OF THE POLITICAL AND SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL VIEWS OF F. M. DOSTOEVSKY AND A. I. SOLZHENITSYN: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES.....	 60
2.1. Evolution of F. M. Dostoevsky's political and socio-philosophical views ...	60
2.2. Development and transformation of political and socio-philosophical ideas of A. I. Solzhenitsyn.....	68
2.3. The biographies and worldviews of F. M. Dostoevsky and A. I. Solzhenitsyn: similarities and differences .....	80
2.4. Ideas of socialism: from fascination to repudiation.....	86
 CHAPTER III. CONTINUITY OF CONSERVATIVE IDEAS IN THE PUBLICISM OF F. M. DOSTOEVSKY AND A. I. SOLZHENITSYN .....	 99
3.1. Specifics of genre form and themes of conservative publicism of F. M. Dostoevsky and A. I. Solzhenitsyn .....	99

3.2.	The concepts of "land" and "soil" .....	119
3.3.	The notions of "ordinary people" and "intelligentsia" .....	129
3.4.	The concept of strong state power .....	141
3.5.	Orthodoxy as a key idea of conservative publicism .....	153
3.6.	The historical destiny and mission of the nation. "Russian Idea" .....	168
CONCLUSION .....		184
LIST OF SOURCES AND LITERATURE .....		188
APPENDIX .....		199

## INTRODUCTION

### **Research relevance.**

Currently, in Russia, the worldviews of Westernism and Slavophilism are once again sought after. During the times of political, economic, and social turmoil, the question of the nation's path of development and the ethical well-being of people are always heightened. Together with the aspiration to inherit the best from the experiences of other nations, there are escalating appeals to determine one's own path of development, and the trend of conservative inclination is gaining momentum.

Several researchers consider it crucial to "reflect deeply on the ideological framework of Russian conservatism"<sup>1</sup>. The fundamental idea of conservatism is the desire to preserve historical traditions, a cautious attitude towards ideas that deny past experience. The essence of conservatism is the cult of the strong state, whose priorities are more important than individual interests.

O. According to S. Kruglikova's analysis of 19th-century Russian conservative journalism and a comparison of liberal and conservative concepts, conservatism has a distinct national character. The historical experience of each country is always unique<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, it is possible to speak of different variants of conservatism, including Russian conservatism or Russian conservative thought.

A. According to A. Vasiliev, conservatism shares many aspects with the ideology of Pochvennichestvo<sup>3</sup>. A more contemporary alternative, Neo-Pochvennichestvo, can also be called conservative. It could be a response to various challenges of our time, such as searching for the path of the country's development, the attitude to the Russian people and soil, and the national idea.

---

<sup>1</sup> Shuvalov Yu. E., Posadskii A. V. Rossiiskii konservatizm: tsennostnye osnovaniya i strategiya razvitiya. M.: Atkara, 2010. P. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Kruglikova O. S. Russkaia konservativnaia publitsistika vtoroi poloviny XIX veka: ucheb. pos. / O.S. Kruglikova. SPb: In-t "Vyssh. shkola zhurnalistiki i mass. kommunikatsii" SPbGU, 2017. - 245 p.

<sup>3</sup> Vasil'ev A.A. Mirovozzrenie pochvennikov (F.M. i M.M. Dostoevskih, A.A. Grigor'eva i N.N. Strahova): zabytye stranicy russkoj konservativnoj mysli. M.: In-t russkoj civilizatsii, 2010. - 243 p.

There is already a strong scholarly tradition in the study of the concept of "Pochvennichestvo" as a phenomenon that emerged in the 1960s and reflected a period of searching for the path of Russia's post-reform development. The ideas of Pochvennichestvo largely determined the world view of such a writer as F.M. Dostoevsky. This concept was formed after the moral upheaval the writer experienced in prison. Nevertheless, not everything has been said about the successors of the Pochvenniks, and the term "Neo-Pochvennichestvo" has not yet been introduced into the scientific terminology. The term refers to the features of nineteenth-century Pochvennichestvo, but the prefix "neo" allows to understand that in the 20th and 21st centuries some views of the Pochvenniks were reinterpreted.

The ideas of Pochvenniks and Neo-Pochvenniks are reflected not only in novels, but also in publicism. Publicism, as a cultural phenomenon and form of creativity, has ancient origins. "Publicism" is defined by V. Uchenova as "mass popular political texts with operational and documentary reflection that influence actual socio-political processes based on ideological and political understanding and emotional evaluation"<sup>4</sup>. B.Ya. Misonzhnikov regards publicism as "public self-reflection" while emphasizing that any journalistic work demands high degree of responsibility and independence of thought from the author<sup>5</sup>.

Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn's works share many similarities in terms of form and content. Both authors begin from shared views and build conservative socio-political and philosophical concepts. They conceptualise conservative notions, such as faith, statehood, the historical mission, and the fate of the country and its people. Solzhenitsyn, a Dostoevsky follower, also has a sacral attitude towards Russian soil.

Therefore, the relevance of the study lies in the fact that a number of political, social and philosophical problems are of enduring importance for the country. Analysing the public writings by A.I. Solzhenitsyn and F.M. Dostoevsky, which reflect

---

<sup>4</sup> Uchenova V. V. *Publitsistika i politika* / V. V. Uchenova. 2-e izd. M.: Politizdat, 1979. P. 230.

<sup>5</sup> Misonzhnikov B. Ya. *Fenomenologiya publitsisticheskogo teksta // Publitsistika v sovremennom obshchestve. Materialy nauch.-prakt. seminarov "Sovremennaya periodicheskaya pechat' v kontekste kommunikativnykh protsessov (tragediya publitsistiki v informatsionnom obshchestve)"*, 14 noyabrya 2013 goda. SPb: In-t «Vyssh. shkola zhurnalistiki i mass. kommunikatsii» SPbGU, 2014. P. 5–15.

on the fate of Russia and its people, can help our contemporaries to understand the historical experience of the country and to choose the right coordinates for its further development.

This research investigates the history of the development and theory of Pochvennichestvo. The movement, which emerged in the 1860s after the rise of Westernism and Slavophilism, focused on reflecting on the issues that had concerned Russian conservative thinkers. Although Neopochvenniks continue to reflect on the key ideas of their predecessors, but they assess Russia's historical path differently and draw new political and philosophical conclusions.

### **A scientific approach to the subject.**

The idea that it is permissible to compare the fates and works of F.M. Dostoevsky and A.I. Solzhenitsyn is not new in scholarly discourse. For instance, V.S. Bushin specified several similarities in their biographies<sup>6</sup>. Several researchers have analysed their literary and journalistic works. Among them is V.G. Krasnov, who studied the polyphonic novel and the writing techniques of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn<sup>7</sup>. N.N. Stupnitskaya identified similarities in the authors' worldviews. She demonstrated that both authors depend on world and national ethical, philosophical, and aesthetic ideas<sup>8</sup>. L.I. Saraskina's monograph, which explores the followers of Dostoevsky, was significant for our PhD thesis. One of these followers is A.I. Solzhenitsyn. Saraskina analysed Solzhenitsyn's fate and work within the framework of various ideological coincidences, along with Solzhenitsyn's confrontations with his predecessor<sup>9</sup>.

PhD thesis of S. Sashina is devoted to Dostoyevsky and Solzhenitsyn. Several common issues have been explored, including the challenges faced by the people, the authorities, and the Russian intelligentsia, as well as the fate of the people. Sashina considers Dostoyevsky and Solzhenitsyn to be part of the Christian tradition in Russian

---

<sup>6</sup> Bushin V.S. *Neizvestnyj Solzhenitsyn*. M.: Eksmo, 2009. - 557 p.

<sup>7</sup> Krasnov V. *Solzhenitsyn and Dostoevsky: A Study in the Polyphonic Novel*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1979. - 230 p.

<sup>8</sup> Stupnitskaya N. N. *Ot Dostoevskogo k Solzhenitsynu* // *Nauch. zapiski Khar'k. nats. ped. un-ta*. 2012. Vyp. 1(69). P. 158–164.

<sup>9</sup> Saraskina L. I. *Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh*. M.: Russkii put', 2006. - 608 p.

literature<sup>10</sup>. Nevertheless, the researcher has chosen an empirical base that differs from our study in that it includes both literary and publicistic works. Furthermore, research of Sashina does not examine Solzhenitsyn's work within the context of the development of Pochvennichestvo.

The connection between Solzhenitsyn and Pochvennichestvo, and the attribution of his writings to such a movement of Russian conservative thought as Neo-Pochvennichestvo, is an understudied issue. Y.M. Mikityuk partially researched this question in his PhD thesis on the development of the ideas of Pochvennichestvo, but he did not associate Solzhenitsyn with the Neo-Pochvenniks<sup>11</sup>. E. A. Muzhaylova compared the works of F.M. Dostoevsky and M.A. Osorgin within the realm of the development of pochvennichestvo, but she did not analyse Solzhenitsyn's works<sup>12</sup>. In another study, Muzhailova emphasized the criteria of similarity and difference between Pochvennichestvo and Neo-Pochvennichestvo<sup>13</sup>. The study of V.N. Zakharov is rather controversial: the researcher includes in the group of poverchvenniki more modern authors, as well as V.P. Astafiev, V.I. Belov, V.M. Shukshin, V.G. Rasputin, A.I. Solzhenitsyn<sup>14</sup>. P.E. Spivakovsky, in his study devoted to Solzhenitsyn's creativity, notes that he writes about truth, God, the destiny of Russia, and calls his patriotism "pochvennicheski-oriented"<sup>15</sup>.

The majority of researchers who compare the works of these authors emphasise biographical similarities and certain parallels in their literary works. Despite this, their publicistic works are not always given proper attention. Although some researchers

<sup>10</sup> Sashina A. S. "Dostoevskaya" tematika i forma v publitsistike Solzhenitsyna. Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Tambov, 2007. URL: <https://viewer.rsl.ru/ru/rsl01003162404?page=1&rotate=0&theme=white> (Date of access: 14.12.2022).

<sup>11</sup> Mikityuk Yu. M. Kontsepty khristianskogo i natsional'nogo v kul'turno-istoricheskoi teorii pochvennichestva. Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata kul'turologii. Sankt-Peterburg, 2011. URL: <https://viewer.rsl.ru/ru/rsl01005001160?page=1&rotate=0&theme=white> (Date of access: 14.12.2022).

<sup>12</sup> Muzhaylova E. A. Tipologiya pochvennichestva: F.M. Dostoevskii i M. A. Osorgin // Vestnik Bashkirskogo universiteta. 2008. T. 13. №1. P. 93–96.

<sup>13</sup> Muzhaylova E. A. Neopochvennichestvo: preemstvennost' i novatorstvo // Sotsial'no-gumanitarnye znaniya. 2007. №9. P. 272–280.

<sup>14</sup> Zakharov V. N. O glubinykh sovpadeniakh Solzhenitsyna i Dostoevskogo // Mezhdv dvumia iubileiami: Pisateli, kritiki i literaturovedy o tvorchestve Solzhenitsyna. M., 2005. P. 409–413.

<sup>15</sup> Spivakovskii P. E. Akademik Aleksandr Isaevich Solzhenitsyn (k 85-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya) // Izvestiya Rossiiskoi Akademii nauk. Seriya literatury i yazyka. 2003. T. 62. №6. P. 62–67.

have compared Solzhenitsyn's publicistic works with Dostoevsky's, they have not thoroughly analysed the concept of Pochvennichestvo in Solzhenitsyn's publications, nor have they studied his miniatures "Krohotki", which have often been regarded as literary works. Despite this, Solzhenitsyn's miniatures are similar in form and content to those published in Dostoyevsky's "Diary of the Writer". Both authors' works combine the features of a literary text with a strong publicist orientation. Currently, no scientific work has analysed the various aspects of the similarity between Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's small publicistic form and the idea of Russian national identity developed by authors of different centuries in the context of the development of Pochvennichestvo.

**The scientific novelty** of the PhD thesis lies in the fact that it considers the heritage of writers of different centuries in a single context of the development of Russian conservative thought. This work explores, for the first time, the comparison of several ideas of Pochvennichestvo of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn in many aspects, as well as the similarity of their small publicistic form. The comparative analysis not only reveals the continuity of ideas, but also the innovations of the 20th-century writer and publicist, who seemingly differs from the classic on a number of issues.

**The object of study:** the publicism of F.M. Dostoevsky and A.I. Solzhenitsyn.

**The subject of the study:** conservative ideas in the publicism of F.M. Dostoevsky and A.I. Solzhenitsyn, connected with the concept of Pochvennichestvo.

**Research objective:** to conduct a comparative analysis of Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's publicistic texts containing conservative ideas.

The objective implies achieving the following **goals**:

1. To consider the stages of development of conservative ideology in Russia and the main constants of Russian conservatism;



2. To identify the peculiarities of Pochvennichestvo and Neo-Pochvennichestvo as directions of Russian conservative thought, analysing the continuity and innovation of the ideas of the new century;
3. To observe the steps of formation of political and social-philosophical views of F.M. Dostoevsky and A.I. Solzhenitsyn, having proved the admissibility of comparison of the authors' publicism;
4. To analyse the peculiarities of the genre form and themes of conservative publicism of F.M. Dostoevsky and A.I. Solzhenitsyn;
5. To carry out a comparative analysis of the authors' publicism, comparing how conservative ideas are developed in it;
6. To determine the degree of continuity of certain conservative ideas, some of which have been reinterpreted in the 20th century under the influence of new socio-political and economic realities. To summarise the data in a comparative table.

The theoretical basis of the research are the works on publicism by V.V. Uchenova, L.P. Gromova, B.Y. Misonzhnikov, L.E. Kroychik, E.P. Prokhorov; on conservative publicism and the development of Russian conservatism – studies by V.Y. Grosul, A.N. Egorov, A.Yu. A.Y. Minakov, O.S. Kruglikova, R. Pipes, I.V. Tuplepbaev, M.Y. Chernavsky, G.I. Shcherbakova. The key constants of Russian conservatism have also been studied by D.A. Badalyan, E.V. Bobrovskikh, B.F. Egorov, A.E. Kotov, T.D. Solovey, M.A. Saevskaya.

Such a concept as F. M. Dostoevsky's Poverchvennichestvo has been researched by many scholars, including L. R. Avdeeva, K. A. Barsht, A. A. Vasiliev, V. N. Zakharov, D. A. Kunilsky, A. de Lazari, A. L. Ospovat, V. A. Tunimanov, and others. Neopochvennichestvo is less studied. This concept was analysed, for example, by Y. M. Mikityuk, E. A. Muzhailova, A. Razuvalova.

Many researchers have studied F.M. Dostoyevsky's publishing activity, publicism and the evolution of his socio-political and philosophical views. Among them are the above-mentioned authors who turned to the study of Pochvennichestvo, as well as I.L.

Volgin, K.V. Mochulsky, V.S. Nechaeva, O.V. Sedelnikova, S.S. Surovtsev, V.A. Tvardovskaya, and others. The lawsuit against Petrashevsky and the concept of "Russian socialism" were studied by N.F. Belchikov, I.L. Volgin, S.F. Vititnev, A.V. Shmeleva, E.A. Volkova, I.N. Likhoradova, E.V. Frolova, A.G. Gacheva, A.A. Gorelov, M.V. Zavarkina and others.

The biography, literary and publicistic work of A. I. Solzhenitsyn has also been the subject of many studies. The works of such authors as Zh. Niva, A.G. Manyayev, D.Y. Mahoney, L.I. Saraskina, A.S. Sashina, P.E. Spivakovsky, N.A. Khrenov, E.S. Kholmogorov, K.V. Shevtsov, and A. Yanov have become important in our PhD thesis.

The comparison of literary and publicistic creativity, as well as the fate of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn, is a subject that has attracted the attention of some researchers. Among them are V.S. Bushin, V.N. Zakharov, V.G. Krasnov, O.S. Kruglikova, L.I. Saraskina, A.S. Sashina, and N.N. Stupnitskaya.

**The empirical base consists of:**

1) Publications from F. M. Dostoyevsky's the "Diary of the Writer". They were selected according to key words and topics. The main themes were Orthodoxy, nation, intelligentsia, state power, Russian "soil", socialism, the Eastern Question, the "Russian idea".

2) The empirical base was expanded by the analysis of Dostoyevsky's letters, drafts and notes, the ideas of which were not published in the "Diary of the Writer".

3) Solzhenitsyn's publicistic works included in the empirical base are structured according to the same thematic criteria as well as the specifics of material organisation. Articles, interviews, letters, talks and speeches at press conferences, as well as literary-publicistic miniatures of "Krohotki" are considered.

4) For a more complete analysis of some of Solzhenitsyn's contradictory ideas, we also turn to several chapters of the " Gulag Archipelago".

**The research hypothesis** is that many of Dostoevsky's ideas, reflected in the concept of Pochvennichestvo, are also present in Solzhenitsyn's publicism. Nevertheless, the main difference in their views lies in their understanding of the mission of Russia and its nation. Although Dostoevsky discusses the nation's messianic ambitions, Solzhenitsyn, following a review of his former attitudes, advocates isolation from global goals.

### **Research methods:**

The research relies on traditional methods of general philosophy and general science, including analysis, synthesis and generalisation. Using the comparative and biographical methods allows to observe the connection between the biographies of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn. The method of historical-comparative research helps to analyse certain consistencies in the authors' writings. Since their works were produced in different centuries, we can observe common ideas but also notice Solzhenitsyn's dissent from his predecessor.

Among the methods of information gathering we used document analysis, which included some technical characteristics (circulation, volume; dates of publication of the "Diary of the Writer", Solzhenitsyn's articles), quantitative characteristics (the number of issues published in a certain year, the number of materials devoted to a certain topic), qualitative characteristics (psychological, motivational analysis was used, which allowed to reveal the change of the authors' views), stylistic analysis, which assessed how the publicistic text is constructed. The comparative and structural-semantic analysis allowed us to assess the degree of continuity of conservative ideas in specific publicistic texts.

Among the methods of information processing we used classification and categorisation, which allow to systematise a large amount of empirical data according to topics and sections. Thus, in the third chapter, conservative ideas are not considered chaotically, but are structured according to themes: orthodoxy, ordinary people, power, soil, historical destiny of the country, etc. In addition, the modelling method has been used to create a general comparative table that brings together various conservative

ideas of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn. It was also used to create a table comparing the views of Pochvenniks and Neo-Pochvenniks.

The research is based on the general scientific principles of objectivity, systematicity and historicism.

**The main points of the defence:**

1. Pochvennichestvo and its more modern version, Neo-Pochvennichestvo, are closely related to conservatism. For publicists, the central themes are Orthodoxy, strong state power, the nation, and Russia's destiny.
2. Pochvennichestvo was traditionally associated with the name of F.M. Dostoevsky. Neo-Pochvennichestvo is associated with many of the ideas of A.I. Solzhenitsyn. Nevertheless, the scope of the work of these authors is so large that the ideas of Pochvennichestvo they developed are only a part of their creative heritage, which is not limited to this movement of conservative thought.
3. It is possible to speak not only of the continuity of a number of conservative ideas, but also of the similarity of the small genre form in Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's publicism. Solzhenitsyn's miniatures "Krokhotki" and Dostoevsky's "Diary of the Writer" are not only literary texts. They also have a strong publicist orientation. The texts are united by their dialogical character, strong authorial beginnings, deep philosophical content placed in a small genre form.
4. Among all the conservative ideas, the question of religious faith was the key issue for Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn. They discuss the national idea through the prism of Orthodoxy, polemicise with socialism, and talk about strong state power and the destiny of the nation.
5. In Solzhenitsyn's publicism there is a conflict between socio-political aspirations and religious and moral beginnings, which can be seen not only as a conflict but also as a paradoxical synthesis of these beginnings.
6. Both philosophers, after reconsidering the views of their youth, came to their own understanding of the "Russian idea" and the country's mission. Although the

vision of Russia's global and universal role persisted in Dostoevsky's later works, Solzhenitsyn's ideas transformed in a more complex way. Initially, Solzhenitsyn supported the nation's messianic goals, but in his later publicism, Russia's mission is perceived as being restricted to internal problems and as moving away from a global role in the world.

**Scientific and practical significance of the PhD thesis:** the main findings of the research can be used by various specialists: historians, theorists of journalism and publicism, philologists. The outcomes of the PhD thesis have the potential to establish the author's course for scholars who study journalism, conservative publicism of the 19th and 20th centuries. Practising publicists who encounter issues explored by Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn in their work can also benefit from this study.

**Approbation of the research results.** The main findings of the PhD thesis have been presented for several years at scientific conferences ("Lomonosov" (Moscow State University), "Media in the Modern World. Young Researchers" (SPbSU), at the section "Historical Journalism and Modernity" of the Mitrofanievsky Readings (VSU).

The study on small publicistic forms in the works of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn was included in the volume "Russkaya publitsistika: évolýutsiya idei i form"<sup>16</sup> together with the research of the professors of the Journalism History Department of the Higher School of Journalism and Mass Communication.

There have been published 13 works on the subject of the PhD thesis, including 5 articles in periodicals recommended by the Higher Attestation Commission. Among this list there are two articles in the editions that are included in Web of Science and Scopus (In "Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta". Seriya 10. Zhurnalistika) and "Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. YAzyk i literatura").

---

<sup>16</sup> Kul'ko K. A. Malaya publitsisticheskaya forma F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna: preemstvennost' idei i formy // Russkaya publitsistika: évolýutsiya idei i form. Sb. st. Ser. "Peterburgskaya shkola zhurnalistiki i MK" Sankt-Peterburgskogo gos. un-ta. SPb.: Aleteiya, 2021. P. 220–235.

**Approbation of the research** (list of publications in periodicals recommended by the Higher Attestation Commission, included in the Web of Science and Scopus):

1. Kruglikova O. S., Shapovalova (Kul'ko) K. A. F. M. Dostoevskii i A. I. Solzhenitsyn: preemstvennost' idei v publitsistike // Tetradi po konservatizmu. 2019. №1. P. 103–117.
2. Kul'ko K. A. "Pochvennicheskie" voprosy o zemle i narodnykh nachalakh v publitsistike F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna // Izvestiya Yuzhnogo federal'nogo universiteta. Filologicheskie nauki. 2021. T. 25. № 2. P. 241–253.
3. Kul'ko K. A. Publitsistika A. I. Solzhenitsyna v dialoge s ideyami F. M. Dostoevskogo o pravoslavii // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 10. Zhurnalistika. 2021. №5. P. 162–183.
4. Kul'ko K. A. Sintez obshchestvenno-politicheskikh ustremlenii i religiozno-nravstvennogo nachala v publitsistike A. I. Solzhenitsyna // Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: filologiya, zhurnalistika. 2023. №1. P. 98–100.
5. Gromova L. P., Kul'ko K. A. Publitsistika F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna: ot sotsializma k "russkoi idee" // Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Seriya: Iazyk. Literatura. 2023. № 2. P. 217–234.

### **The structure of the PhD thesis:**

The study follows a conventional structure, comprising an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion, a list of references and literature, and an appendix. The first chapter of the research is devoted to the origin and formation of conservative ideology in Russia. The chapter delves into the main principles of the conservative ideology and describes the most important stages of the development of conservatism in Russia. The chapter examines the key constants of Russian conservatism: autocracy, Orthodoxy, and nationality. Moreover, the chapter analyses movements of conservative thought in Russia, such as Pochvennichestvo and Neo-Pochvennichestvo.

The second chapter is devoted to the study of the development of the political and socio-philosophical ideas of F.M. Dostoevsky and A.I. Solzhenitsyn. The basic facts of

the authors' biographies, which are significant in the context of our study and connected with the transformation of the writers' views, are analysed. In this chapter, various similarities in the fate, worldview and creativity of authors from different centuries are noted. We particularly emphasise the way that Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's fascination with socialist ideas led to gradual rethinking, which had a substantial impact on their coming to conservatism.

The third chapter of the PhD thesis is devoted to empirical material. It analyses such ideas in Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's publicism as Orthodoxy, the state power, the nation and the intelligentsia, the "soil", the destiny and the historical task of Russia. In addition, the chapter focuses on the peculiarities of the themes and genre of conservative publicism of both authors.

## **CHAPTER I. RUSSIAN CONSERVATISM OF THE 19th–20th CENTURY AND ITS REFLECTION IN PUBLICISM**

### **1.1. Defining the concept of "conservatism", principles of conservative ideology**

In the first quarter of the 19th century, Russian conservative thought developed into an original philosophical and political doctrine. It developed alongside the conservative ideas in Western Europe. Several researchers chose the formation of philosophical and political concepts of conservatism as the subject of their studies. For example, A. Minakov in his monograph proves that the conservatism of the late 18th and early 19th centuries originated as a response to the rationalism and individualism of the New Age ideas. E. Burke and J. de Mestre reflected conservative ideas in their literary works. The doctrine had the goal of "upgrading positive traditions and values of the past, while ensuring the organic continuity of the development of society"<sup>17</sup>. The transcendental approach is one of the values of conservatism during this period, and the researcher notes that conservatives depended on religion to give significance to the life of the individual and to history.

An important condition for the emergence of Russian conservatism is the presence of the Russian elite, which, having received a European education, studied and reinterpreted the ideas of the Enlightenment. This idea was developed by T. Egereva, who wrote that Russian conservatives "by the nature and orientation of their Europeanised education were children of the Age of Enlightenment"<sup>18</sup>.

The term "conservatism" is of Latin origin and means "to keep, to preserve". The word was not widely used in Russian for a long time. The conservative movement that was developing during that time was commonly referred to as the "Old Russian Party"

---

<sup>17</sup> Minakov A. Yu. *Russkii konservatizm v pervoi chetverti XIX veka*. Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezhskogo gos. un-ta, 2011. P. 6.

<sup>18</sup> Egereva T. "Starinnye kadety" XVIII veka: vliianie obrazovaniia na sistemu tsennostei russkikh konservatorov // *Rodina*. 2010. № 2. P. 55.



or the "Orthodox Party"<sup>19</sup>. In the Russian language, the term "ochranitelstvo" most closely matches the meaning of the word "conservatism".

Conservatism, also referred to as "ochranitelstvo", is connected with the need to retain tradition and maintain the historical experience of a particular nation. Conservative beliefs, unlike various liberal concepts, always have marked nationalistic traits. This is because each nation's encounters and the customs they aim to conserve are distinct and contingent on the fate of that particular nation. That is why there is no universal version of conservatism: it is always necessary to add to this term an attribute referring to a specific country, for example, "Russian conservatism", "French conservatism", etc. V.Y. Grosul emphasizes that conservative ideology comes in various forms and develops in its own way in different countries, and that a conservative can be perceived differently in another country than in his own. As the researcher notes, "An English conservative who visits Russia may be perceived as the most staunch liberal, or even as a Volterian"<sup>20</sup>.

One of the most recent studies of Russian conservatism through the prism of publicism in the second half of the 19th century is the work of O.S. Kruglikova<sup>21</sup>. She notes that despite the strong national character of conservative ideology, there are a number of common features that can be seen in any conservative doctrine. A special place among them is occupied by:

- **Anti-rationalism**, associated with a constant appeal to the irrational beginning, the conservatives' reference to religion. In this case, the reference should be to the monotheistic world religion in the orthodox format: Orthodoxy, Catholicism or Islam. The process of formation of conservatism in different countries actualised the philosophers' confrontation with atheism and materialism of the 18th and 19th centuries. If knowledge and rationality are the central concepts of Enlightenment ideas, the most important basis of conservatism was faith. The religious and

---

<sup>19</sup> Minakov A. Yu. Op. cit.

<sup>20</sup> Grosul V.Ia. Russkii konservatizm XIX stoletii. Ideologiya i praktika. M.: Progress-traditsiia, 2000. P. 64.

<sup>21</sup> Kruglikova O. S. Russkaia konservativnaia publitsistika vtoroi poloviny XIX veka: ucheb. pos. / O.S. Kruglikova. SPb: In-t "Vyssh. shkola zhurnalistiki i mass. kommunikatsii" SPbGU, 2017. -245 p.

philosophical foundations of Russian conservatism became a specific subject of scholarly research. They have been studied in detail by M. Y. Chernavsky, for example<sup>22</sup>.

- **Anthropological pessimism.** Conservatives are quite sceptical about the idea that human beings are inherently good. Conservative philosophers argue about the dualistic nature of the individual: there are both divine and diabolical elements in him. Thus, the way to improve society is through the spiritual growth and self-improvement of the individual, the gradual eradication of the evil beginning, which cannot be completely eliminated.
- **The desire to preserve historical tradition.** Society and power, according to conservatives, do not have the right to abandon the foundations of the existing order and its complete destruction. Vices and social defects must be fought with a long and gradual struggle, but without a utopian belief in the complete abandonment of tradition for the sake of a harmonious society.

A. Y. Minakov adds a number of other characteristics of conservative ideology in different countries. In his opinion, the **cult of a strong state** is important for conservatives, whose interests are above the interests of the individual, who constantly needs a "guiding hand". **The anti-individualism** of conservatives, which the researcher describes, is linked to the same principle: "From the point of view of most conservative doctrines, the interests of the whole, of non-personal values (God, nation, state, society, etc.), take precedence over the interests of the individual"<sup>23</sup>. In addition to the important role of a strong state and church, conservatives attach great importance to "the cult of the family, the school, the army, patriotism, a distinctive national culture, industriousness, discipline and order, in other words, those social institutions and traditions which acted as the main conductors and guardians of tradition"<sup>24</sup>.

---

<sup>22</sup> Chernavskii M. Yu. Religiozno-filosofskie osnovy konservatizma v Rossii. M.: Ros. zaoch. in-t tekstil. i leg. prom-sti, 2004. - 186 p.

<sup>23</sup> Minakov A. Yu. Op. cit. P. 6.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. P. 6.

In a situation where important changes are taking place in society, conservatism requires a person to be cautious in accepting and understanding these changes. At the same time, conservatives should not be perceived as ardent opponents of all social change. These philosophers are only critical of the recognition of the principle of novelty as a higher priority than something already traditional and time-tested.

To sum up, there is already a certain scholarly tradition in identifying the philosophical basis of all conservative concepts, regardless of their national character. Every conservative doctrine relies on orthodox religion. The primary basis of conservatism is faith, as opposed to rationality or knowledge. Conservative concepts are characterised by an anthropological pessimism that rejects the notion of human innate goodness. Conservative concepts do not endorse any utopian ideal, rather they reject the nihilistic rejection of traditions and continuity. Conversely, each conservative concept is based on the desire to preserve historical tradition and maintain a cautious approach towards radical changes that reject the significance of past experience. It is worth mentioning that conservatives strongly believe in the importance of a strong state and prioritize the nation's interests over those of the individual, demonstrating an anti-individualistic approach.

Based on these common features inherent in any conservative concept, it is possible to divide them along national lines, because conservative ideology aims at preserving traditions, and they depend on a particular nation and its history. Although Russian conservatives were culturally influenced by Western European conservatives, Russian conservatism was original. It developed as an independent philosophical and political concept.

## **1.2. Conservative ideology in Russia: emergence and formation**

Russian conservative thought gradually became an independent philosophical and political concept at the beginning of the 19th century. A number of researchers devoted their scientific works to this century, which was a key one in the formation of Russian

conservatism. For example, A. Yu. Minakov studied Russian conservatism in the first quarter of the 19th century. In his monograph he researched in detail the historical circumstances and the main reasons for the emergence of the conservative ideology in Russia. According to him, the foundations of conservatism in Russia were laid by G.R. Derzhavin, N.M. Karamzin, F.V. Rostopchin, M.L. Magnitsky, D.P. Runich, A.S. Shishkov<sup>25</sup>.

Briefly summarise the stages in the formation of conservatism in Russia. The conservative ideology, which was fully formed in the 19th century, began to develop in Russia at the beginning of the 18th century. Russian society was not ready for such radical changes. Western European models were accepted as a model in various spheres of social life, were often introduced without adaptation to Russian living conditions and without understanding the peculiarities of the Russian mentality.

In the early 18th century, conservatism could not emerge as a fully-fledged philosophical and political concept in Russia, because under the rigorous regime introduced by Peter the Great, there was no open "platform" for discussion and exchange of opinions in society. Such a "platform" could not yet become the first printed publications, which were controlled by the government. Supporters of the preservation of national traditions and culture had to conform to Western European patterns.

A more active development of Russian conservatism became possible during the reign of Catherine the Great and after that. This was the time of the development of national literature, the birth of private journalism. This was largely facilitated by Catherine the Great's decree on free typography in 1783. In society, a necessary "platform" for discussion and dialogue on political issues was created. During the reign of Catherine II, a significant number of intelligent and educated aristocrats began to think about the development of the country and published their thoughts in various print media. For example, the publications of N.I. Novikov and his bold arguments in the journal "Truten" with "Vsyakaya vsyachina" of Catherine II are noteworthy.

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid. P. 5.

At the initial stage of the development of Russian conservatism, the work of M.M. Scherbatov "On the Damage of Morals in Russia" attracts attention. In this publication the author largely condemns the government of Catherine II for many abuses and too liberal views that could lead to the abolition of the serf system. Of course, Shcherbatov's work cannot yet be regarded as a mature version of conservatism.

When discussing the 18th century, it is necessary to mention the activities of Catherine II. Catherine II advocated a conservative political ideology. Under Catherine II, the Ulozhennaya Commission greatly contributed to the creation of historical works devoted to Russia's mission and destiny. For a significant period, the state power in Russia successfully executed a conservative model of governing the country. O.S. Kruglikova notes: "As long as the state power themselves successfully implemented the conservative model of state governance, thanks to following historical tradition and political common sense, and as long as society did not systematically protest against their actions, neither the government nor society had the need to formulate other ideologues"<sup>26</sup>. However, the events of the Great French Revolution brought this need to life and forced the conservative model of state governance to be questioned.

The active development of the ideas of Russian conservatism begins in the 19th century during the reign of Alexander I. This is largely connected with the liberal course chosen by the emperor. The "beautiful beginning of Alexander's days" and the projects of numerous liberal reforms alarmed traditionalists. The Russian aristocracy's admiration for Napoleon also flourished during the reign of Alexander I. Many idealised the revolutionary events in France; the Russian nobility may not have known the Russian language, but they spoke perfect French and followed French fashion. Fascinated by French history and culture, the Russian aristocracy had very vague ideas about the history, culture and people of their own country.

There was also a crisis of faith. Some of the Russian nobility were fascinated by the ideas of the Enlightenment and gradually became indifferent to faith. Others were attracted to Catholicism and forgot about Russian Orthodoxy, gradually widening the gap between Russia's educated classes and the peasantry, who remained Orthodox.

---

<sup>26</sup> Kruglikova O. S. Russkaia konservativnaia publitsistika ... P. 68.

At the beginning of the 19th century, however, there were those among the Russian nobility who were in favour of preserving Russian identity. One such person was N. M. Karamzin, whom many people mistakenly regard as a Westerner because of the famous polemics between "Shishkovists" and "Karamzinists" on the development of the Russian language. The active use of foreign words in the Russian language was supported not so much by Karamzin himself as by those who came to be called 'Karamzinists', who were inspired by the colloquial and easy language of the educated nobility. It would not be quite right to call Karamzin one of the first Russian Westerners. It is not without reason that Yu. Minakov mentions his name among those who influenced the development of Russian conservative thought. Along with respect for the European Enlightenment and regret that Russia does not yet have enough writers of European level, Karamzin's works contain criticism of the Russian nobility for blindly imitating foreign fashions and neglecting the Russian language.

At the beginning of the 19th century, the Russian intelligentsia, concerned about the imposition of foreign fashions, began to fight for the preservation of Russian history, culture, beliefs, national traditions and language. F.V. Rostopchin and A.S. Shishkov were among the conservative thinkers of that time. F.V. Rostopchin wrote a pamphlet in 1807 entitled "Thoughts Aloud on the Red Porch of the Russian Nobleman Sila Andreyevich Bogatyrev", in which he condemned Russian society for blindly copying foreign behavioural patterns. Thanks to A.S. Shishkov, the literary society "Conversation of Russian Word Lovers" appeared in St. Petersburg in 1811. Its aim was to preserve the Russian language, traditions and values of Russian culture. The society widely discussed Shishkov's speech "Discourse on the Love of the Fatherland", in which he called for the careful preservation of the language and reverence for the faith of the ancestors.

A.S. Shishkov's book "Discourse on the Old and New Syllables of the Russian Language" not only called for a categorical rejection of foreign borrowings, but also provided a philosophical understanding of the paths of the country's development. These paths included the Western (neutral) and the native Russian (specific, national). Drawing a contrast between the past and the present, Shishkov criticised Russian

educated society for being detached from Russian soil and accused it of being disconnected from its roots and having a poor knowledge of the language. This idea would be further developed in the publicism of the *pochvenniki*. Therefore, it is necessary to understand that the idea of a ruinous division of Russian society into "peasantry" and "intelligentsia" worried some thinkers even before the emergence of Slavophilism and *Pochvennichestvo*.

The War of 1812 helped Russian conservatives in many ways to gain access to political activity. Special attention can be paid to Shishkov's activities as Secretary of State: "Manifestos written by Shishkov were read all over Russia. In fact, he perfectly fulfilled the role of the main ideologist and propagandist of the Patriotic War of 1812"<sup>27</sup>. Indeed, Shishkov's manifestos were able to strengthen the spirit of the Russian people and give them confidence. In these works he explained the war between Russia and the West as civilisations with completely different ideals and values.

After defeating Napoleon, conservative nobility were convinced that Russia should not be involved in European affairs. However, Alexander I insisted that the war should continue outside Russia. As a result, during the rest of Alexander I's reign, the conservative tendencies were not as pronounced.

Nicholas I paid more attention to conservative doctrine. Having come to the throne after the Decembrist Uprising, he was unable to continue the liberal policies begun by Alexander I. It was under Nicholas I that conservatism became the basis of the official state ideology. After the War of 1812, Russian society learnt the painful lesson of the dangers of neglecting history and culture of native country, of not knowing the problems of the people. At the same time, Russian officers who found themselves in Europe during the Russian army's foreign campaigns saw that the West lived much better than Russia. So in the reign of Nicholas I, society was at a crossroads: the nobility wanted to be like the Europeans again, while at the same time many of them did not want to neglect Russian history and culture.

The period of the 1820s and 1830s is associated with the search for answers to questions such as what is Russia's role in the world, what is the place of the Russian

---

<sup>27</sup> Minakov A. Yu. *Op. cit.* P. 179.

people in world culture, does the country have a historical mission? P.Ya. Chaadaev reflected on this in sombre tones in his famous "Philosophical Letters". The author believes that we are living "without a past and without a future, among dead stagnation"<sup>28</sup>. Russia, situated between the West and the East, could combine such beginnings as rationality and imagination, but, according to Chaadaev, this has not happened. The main goal of the Russian people is to teach other nations a lesson by setting a negative example. Many people disagreed with this understanding of our historical insignificance. One of them was A.S. Pushkin. He believed that there were many problems in Russia, but he could not accept the country's insignificance in comparison with Europe. According to Pushkin, the awakening of Russia and the movement of the nation towards unity began at the time of overcoming the Mongol-Tatar yoke. And in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, thanks to the efforts of Peter I and Catherine II, Russia became a strong power.

Nicholas I realised that the sovereign could not ignore these 'painful questions' for Russian society, which had come to a head even before the publication of the "Philosophical Letter". The Emperor realised that the nobility, the peasantry and the monarch must be united by a common understanding of the country's aims and objectives. In 1833, Count S. S. Uvarov, who headed the Ministry of Public Education, submitted to the Emperor a report whose ideas A. N. Pypin later called "the theory of official nationality". The document outlined a programme for the work of the Ministry of Public Education, but its principles extended to many areas of society. Uvarov's report raised the question of the development of a state ideology. Among the main principles of Russian life, three were singled out: the Orthodoxy, the autocracy and the nationality. "In order for the throne and the church to remain in power, it is necessary to preserve the sense of nationality that binds them together," – Uvarov wrote<sup>29</sup>.

The official model of Russian culture, which developed under Nicholas I, tried to develop a kind of synthesis of European ideas and national traditions. O. C. Krulikova

---

<sup>28</sup> Chaadaev P.Ya. *Filosoficheskie pis'ma*. M.: Eksmo, 2006. P. 25.

<sup>29</sup> Uvarov S.S. *Gosudarstvennyye osnovy / Otv. red. O.A. Platonov*. M.: In-t russoj civilizacii, 2014. P. 136.



writes the following: "In the architecture, which retains the main European features, there are elements of decoration referring to national motifs; the melodies of folk songs are woven into symphonic music by M. Glinka, and even in the European toilets of the court ladies, elements of folk costume are creatively recycled by the imagination of the court masters"<sup>30</sup>.

The Polish uprising and a series of revolutionary events in Europe forced Nicholas I to tighten the regime considerably. The last years of his reign are known as the "Dark Seven years", when censorship was so severe that it not only shielded society from Western influences, but also tried to silence the voices of many Russian writers and publicists. The "Theory of official nationality", the developed concept of the national idea based on Orthodoxy, autocracy and nationality, was far from always being accepted and understood by society at that time, although in its content it really correlated with national traditions.

Another important point associated with the emergence of conservatism in Russia is the reign of Alexander II. Both the government and society were fascinated by the ideas of reform. In those years, Russian conservatism was already mature. It was formed mainly in Russian journalism. "Moscow Vedomosti" by M.N. Katkov, numerous publications of the Slavophiles, "Diary of the Writer" by F.M. Dostoevsky and many other printed media of those years analysed, developed and completed the ideas expressed by Shishkov, Karamzin and Uvarov. After the end of the "Dark Seven years" and during the liberal reforms of Alexander II, the ideas of Russian conservatism found their way into literature and journalism and were widely discussed in society.

Another key figure associated with the development of Russian conservatism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was K. P. Pobedonostsev. His views gradually transformed towards conservatism. Pobedonostsev had a significant influence on Russian domestic policy under Alexander III. The thinker defended the key constants of Russian conservatism, among which the leading place for him was occupied by autocracy and Orthodoxy. Pobedonostsev was in favour of strengthening the role of the Orthodox Church in Russia, his patronage enjoyed parochial schools, he encouraged the

---

<sup>30</sup> Kruglikova O. S. Russkaia konservativnaia publitsistika ... P. 87.

construction of new churches in the country. The power of the monarch was perceived by the thinker as a responsibility not so much to people as to God. To limit the despotism of power, according to Pobedonostsev, can religious and moral norms. Ideas about the reliance of power on religion as a moral basis will be reflected in the publicism of many authors, including Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn.

Russian conservative publicism has more than once been the subject of scientific research. Most contemporary authors are attracted to the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when conservatism matured. For example, I.V. Tulepbaev in his PhD thesis examined the relationship between church and state in Russian conservative journalism of the second half of the XIX century<sup>31</sup>. A. N. Egorov analysed the image of the liberal as the enemy in the conservative journalism of the XIX century<sup>32</sup>. Analyses of conservative journalism often appear in the journal "Tetradi po konservatizmu". For example, in a recent publication G.I. Shcherbakova examined the image of Peter the Great in the context of the metaphysics of reform. The researcher analysed whether conservatives allowed progress, whether conservatism meant the rejection of any changes. The author examined the positions of several conservative publicists, including Karamzin, Uvarov, Katkov and Dostoevsky, and came to the conclusion that the views of conservative writers became more complex in the course of the development of political processes in the country<sup>33</sup>. Other researchers turn to the study of certain ideas of conservatism, which will be reviewed in the following paragraphs of the study.

---

<sup>31</sup> Tulepbaev I. V. Tserkov' i gosudarstvo: problemy vzaimootnoshenii v russkoi konservativnoi publitsistike vtoroi poloviny XIX veka. Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata istoricheskikh nauk. Moskva, 2009. URL: <https://viewer.rsl.ru/ru/rs101003475565?page=1&rotate=0&theme=white> (Date of access: 14.12.2022).

<sup>32</sup> Egorov A. N. Obraz liberala kak "vruga otechestva" v konservativnoi publitsistike XIX veka // Voina i povsednevnaia zhizn' naseleniia Rossii XVII-XX vv. (k stoletiiu nachala Pervoi Mirovoi voiny). Sb. n. rabot po itogam mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii, SPb., 2014. P. 75–80.

<sup>33</sup> Shcherbakova G. I. Obraz Petra Velikogo v kontekste metafiziki progressa – vzglyad russkoi konservativnoi publitsistiki // Tetradi po konservatizmu. 2022. №3. P. 109–122.

### **1.3. The ideas of Autocracy, Orthodoxy and Nationality as key constants of Russian conservatism**

In order to understand which ideas are at the centre of attention of Russian conservatives, including in conservative publicism, it is necessary to analyse the famous Uvarov's triad, which became the basis of the "theory of official nationality". The three key ideas of conservatism - autocracy, orthodoxy and nationality - are opposed in their semantic content to the triad of liberal values - liberty, equality and fraternity. As T. D. Solovey rightly noted, the theory of official nationality "rejected the identification of Russia with the 'false' Europe of revolution, nationalism and democracy, and opposed it to Russia as the stronghold of 'true' Europeanism, the bearer of the 'old' values of legitimism, religiosity and nationality"<sup>34</sup>.

All the concepts in the conservative triad are quite complex and open to ambiguous interpretations. It is necessary to consider in detail what exactly Russian conservatives put into the concepts of "Autocracy", "Orthodoxy", and "Nationality".

#### **1.3.1. Autocracy**

As O.S. Kruglikova shows in her research, a concept such as "Autocracy" was central to the ideas of Russian conservatives in the 19th century. According to the researcher, if the three key conservative ideas were represented graphically, they could be represented as follows: "...an isosceles triangle would have to be drawn, with Orthodoxy and Nationality at the base and Autocracy at the top."<sup>35</sup> In this case, a certain hierarchy of conservative ideas is established, with the idea of a strong state at the top.

Russian conservative thinkers advocate the preservation of the state, which historically has always been authoritarian and centralised. In other words, it is a question of a certain modification of autocracy, although in the more modern version of conservatism we are not talking about monarchy.

---

<sup>34</sup> Solovei T. D. Diskurs o "narodnosti" v XIX v.: struktura i evolyutsiya // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 8. Istorija. 2016. №4. P. 50.

<sup>35</sup> Kruglikova O. S. Russkaia konservativnaia publitsistika ... P. 28.

Conservatives in Russia justified their loyalty to the idea of an autocratic state primarily on the basis of the history of the development of Russian statehood. Over several centuries, autocracy had proved its vitality and ability to rally the people to preserve Russian sovereignty at times when the country was threatened by foreign domination.

However, there is also a more obvious point that proves the necessity of autocratic power in Russia. It is caused by its long borders and vast territories. This peculiarity of the country and the power in it was noted by Catherine II in the "Edict of the Ulozhennaya Commission". In it we find such words: "The sovereign is autocratic, because no other power can exist in the territory of such a large state".<sup>36</sup>

In preparing this document, Catherine the Great studied the political writings of Montesquieu. The thinker rightly pointed out that the larger the territory and borders of a state, the more vulnerable its borders and the greater the need for strict centralisation of power. From the very beginning of its statehood, Russia not only had vast and long borders, but also experienced wars, turmoil and revolts. This has deprived the Russian people of many civil liberties and strengthened the tendency towards the emergence and consolidation of a rigid authoritarian power capable of controlling such vast territories and defending the political sovereignty as well as the cultural and religious uniqueness of the country.

This idea was developed by R. Pipes, an American scholar and professor of Russian history at Harvard University. He noted that conservative ideology emerged in Western European countries as a response to the challenges of the Enlightenment. In Russia, it gradually became the basis of state governance<sup>37</sup>. It was supported by both the authorities and society (although, as we noted in the previous paragraph, it wasn't always that way). According to the researcher, Russia is characterised by authoritarian rule, where people are willing to give up many rights and freedoms in exchange for order and stability in a state with such a large territory.

---

<sup>36</sup> Nakaz imperatricy Ekateriny II, dannyj komissii o sochinenii proekta novogo ulozheniya. SPb.: tip. Akad. nauk, 1907. P. 3.

<sup>37</sup> Paips R. Russkii konservatizm i ego kritiki: Issledovanie politicheskoi kul'tury / per. s angl. I. Pavlova. M.: Fond Liberal'naya missiya: Novoe izd-vo, 2008. - 250 p.

Russian conservatism, while gradually acquiring a state character, has remained a rather flexible ideology, capable not of rejecting, but of studying and even accepting elements of other concepts. For example, conservatives may turn to liberal doctrines when, in a particular historical period, they contribute to the strengthening of national statehood. Conservatives only refuse to cooperate with radical political groups whose ideas are based on the destruction of statehood. It is wrong to assume that conservative thinkers and publicists are opposed to all civil rights and liberties. Conservatives do not deny the importance of these ideas, but they believe that all civil rights and freedoms must be related to the current political and economic situation in a particular country. They can be applied when a strong state authority is consolidated and maintained.

The unity of the tsar and the people was the basis for the existence of autocracy in Russia. In the presence of obvious contradictions between the peasantry and the intelligentsia, the intelligentsia and the government, the tsar and the peasantry were always united by a common mission - the preservation of the country's religious identity. This idea is particularly vivid in the publicist writings of the pochvenniks, such as Dostoyevsky's "Diary of the Writer", which will be discussed in more detail in the following chapters.

The responsibility of power towards the people was perceived primarily as a moral responsibility. And the power of the monarch was regarded as supranational, that is, above the interests of individual estates. Thus, M. N. Katkov argued that "the throne is elevated so that the differences between the estates can be balanced before it"<sup>38</sup>. M. A. Sayevskaya, who studied the concept of zemstvo autocracy in the works of Russian conservatives, noted that for these thinkers autocracy was the form of government that ensured "the development and strengthening of Russian statehood, which most fully expressed the interests of all the estates and preserved the foundations of national life"<sup>39</sup>.

Therefore, conservative thinkers in Russia are united by their loyalty to autocracy as the most appropriate and traditional form of government for this country, one that

---

<sup>38</sup> Katkov M.N. *Sobr. soch.:* v 6 t. T. 2. SPb.: Rostok, 2011. P. 433.

<sup>39</sup> Saevskaia M. A. *Kontsepsiya zemskogo samoderzhaviya v trudakh russkikh konservativnykh myslitelei vtoroi poloviny XIX – nachala XX veka // Sotsial'no-gumanitarnye znaniya.* 2020. №1. P. 313.

supports and strengthens statehood and fully expresses the interests of the various classes. Russian conservatives recognise autocracy as an important and even inevitable form of government in Russia. Firstly, this is due to geopolitical realities: the country has vast borders and a large territory that is impossible to control without strong authoritarian power. Secondly, autocracy, in alliance with the Russian people, has long been the guardian of the country's religious identity and has preserved its sovereignty in times of disaster. Several centuries of Russian history have proven the viability of this form of government.

### 1.3.2. Orthodoxy

Taking into account the opinion of O.S. Kruglikova that the conservative triad is based on the concept of "autocracy, we admit the possibility of the existence of another point of view. In one of the scientific articles on the topic of PhD thesis, we argue that among all the conservative ideas, it is the question of religious faith that was the key issue for many conservative thinkers, including Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn: "Through the prism of Orthodoxy, both authors consider the issues of state power, nation and the national idea, and polemicise with socialism"<sup>40</sup>.

For Russian conservatives, Orthodoxy was associated with the search for a national idea and the basis on which a united and strong nation could be built. S. Uvarov wrote about the important role of Orthodoxy: "Without love for the faith of the ancestors, the nation, as well as the individual, must perish; to weaken their faith is the same as draining their blood and tearing out their heart"<sup>41</sup>.

It should be noted that for Russian conservatives, the important role of Orthodoxy was not only justified by honouring tradition and respecting the faith of their ancestors. Representatives of Russian conservative thought actively studied other religions and tried to understand why Orthodoxy was the closest to the spirit of the Russian people.

---

<sup>40</sup> Kul'ko K. A. Publitsistika A. I. Solzhenitsyna v dialoge s ideyami F. M. Dostoevskogo o pravoslavii // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 10. Zhurnalistika. 2021. №5. P. 162.

<sup>41</sup> Uvarov S.S. Gosudarstvennye osnovy / Otv. red. O.A. Platonov. M.: In-t russoj civilizacii, 2014. P. 104.

Some conservative thinkers, including Dostoyevsky, as well as many Slavophiles, associated the national idea with Orthodoxy and also noted the exceptional role of Russia as the true keeper of the Orthodox faith. This is discussed in more detail in the third chapter of PhD thesis.

The 19<sup>th</sup> century, with its advances in science and technology, the development of materialist philosophy and the gradual abandonment of belief in the mystical foundations of the universe, made the human path to religion very complex. Children's faith, nurtured in the family, was quickly eroded when the child was confronted with an education system based on the European approach to enlightenment.

This process, which began in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, naturally continued into the 20<sup>th</sup> century, when the persecution of the faith in Russia had already taken on a national dimension. A. I. Solzhenitsyn wrote in his autobiographical poem "Dorozhenka": "Hot-boiled, pale-lampaded, / I grew up confused, difficult, double-truthful"<sup>42</sup>. The "two truths" of the young Solzhenitsyn and his painful ambivalence, which would be reflected in his publicism, are linked to the desire to preserve the "pale lampade" of religious faith brought up in the family. However, the "hot-bloodedness" of communist ideas was increasingly occupying the minds of young people in schools and universities.

Moreover, it is important to recognise that criticism of Catholicism and Protestantism was widespread among conservative Russian thinkers. In the "Diary of the Writer", Dostoyevsky noted that Catholicism, in its attempt to unite secular and spiritual authority, distorted the Christian idea. According to many Russian conservatives, if Catholicism has distorted the true representation of Christ, it is Russia, with its Orthodox faith, which has been able to preserve it.

According to Slavophiles and Pochvenniks, it is the Russian peasantry, who are the true keepers of the Orthodox faith. Orthodoxy forms the system of values and beliefs on which the Russian man builds his life. Thus the Slavophile Y.F. Samarin wrote: "When we speak of the Russian nationality, we understand it in inseparable

---

<sup>42</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch.* v 30 t. T. 18. M.: Vremya, 2016. P. 39.

connection with the Orthodox faith, from which flows the whole system of moral convictions that govern the family and social life of the Russian man"<sup>43</sup>.

Another thinker close to Slavophilism, K. S. Aksakov, argued that the Orthodox faith is the most important for the people, whose whole life "is based on it, inseparably united with it, and their nationality is also builds on it"<sup>44</sup>. Moreover, Aksakov argued: "Therefore, whoever is not Orthodox does not belong to the Russian people, even if he is of Russian origin"<sup>45</sup>.

For Russian conservatives, the Orthodox faith is deeply linked to patriotism and underpins national identity. Numerous wars with conquerors who tried to take away Russian land ended with a Russian victory, largely because the war was perceived as a struggle to preserve not only Russian land, but also the Orthodox faith and cultural identity.

Neither element of the conservative triad could exist without the other. Thus the link between Orthodoxy and autocracy was manifested in the fact that a strong state power promoted the preservation of the true Orthodox faith, protected it and the integrity of the state. In return, the state power enjoyed the support of the Church, which taught the faithful to accept the demands of the state and to respect the power.

### 1.3.3. Nationality

S.S. Uvarov did not give a clear description of the concept of "nationality". However, he noted that it is the sense of nationality that should support a strong state power and the church: "...in order for the throne and the church to remain in power, the sense of nationality that binds them together must also be supported. The question of nationality does not have the common understanding as the question of autocracy, but both spring from the same source and are combined on every page of the history of the

---

<sup>43</sup> Samarin YU.F. *Pravoslavie i narodnost'*. M.: In-t russkoj civilizacii, 2008. P. 429-430.

<sup>44</sup> Aksakov K.S., Aksakov I.S. *Izbrannye trudy / sost., avtory vstup. st. i komment.* A.A. SHirinyanc, A.V. Myrikova, E.B. Fursova. M.: Rossijskaya politicheskaya enciklopediya (ROSSPEN), 2010. P. 194.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.* P. 194.



Russian people. As for nationality, the whole difficulty lies in reconciling old and new concepts"<sup>46</sup>.

The concept of "nationality" is indeed one of the most complex and controversial of the ideas in the conservative triad. Many researchers have written about this concept and its development in Russian culture, including D.A. Badalyan<sup>47</sup>, B.F. Egorov<sup>48</sup>, A. E. Kotov<sup>49</sup>, T. D. Solovey<sup>50</sup> and others.

Thus, T.D. Solovey in her research analyses "nationality" as one of the key concepts in the cultural and intellectual life of our country in the XIX century. As the author notes, the term "nationality" was first used in 1819 in the correspondence of P.A. Vyazemsky and A.I. Turgenev and conformed to the French nationalité. However, in the conservative publicism of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the concept of "narodnost" was not always close to the concept of "nationality". Consider how it was considered by Russian philosophers and writers.

We adhere to T. D. Solovey's view that the understanding of "nationality" is dualistic. On the one hand, it can be seen as "an expression of the personality of the people, as a particular type of morality embodied by the peasantry"<sup>51</sup>. On the other hand, nationality can be understood as "ethnicity, as the possibility of achieving national unity, 'fraternal union between different classes' "<sup>52</sup>.

H. I. Nadezhdin, who published the journal "Teleskop", developed the problem of "nationality". As a critic, he considered nationality in literature precisely as an aesthetic category connected with the expression of the national spirit. Later, as an ethnographer, he did not abandon his interest in the concepts of "nationality" and "narodnost".

---

<sup>46</sup> Uvarov S.S. Gosudarstvennye osnovy ... P. 135–136.

<sup>47</sup> Badalyan D.A. Ponyatie "narodnost'" v russkoj kul'ture // Istoricheskie ponyatiya i politicheskie idei v Rossii XVI–XX vv. Sb. nauch. rabot. Ser. "Istochnik. Istorik. Istorija". Vyp. 5. SPb., 2006. P. 108–122.

<sup>48</sup> Egorov B. F. Évoliutsiia v ponimanii narodnosti literatury v russkoi kritike serediny 1850-kh gg. // Uchenye zapiski Tartuskogo gos. un-ta. 1971. Vyp. 266. P. 53–70.

<sup>49</sup> Kotov A. É. "Narodnost'" i "Soslovnost'": dva poliusa russkogo konservatizma // Khristianskoe chtenie. 2017. №2. P. 288–306.

<sup>50</sup> Solovei T. D. Op. cit. P. 49–63.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid. P. 50.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid. P. 50.

Considering them as ethnographic categories, he wrote: "Ethnography sees only the people in everything and looks only at their meaning and place in the human race"<sup>53</sup>.

Nadezhdin remarked: "The main subject of our attention should be what exactly makes Russia itself; in other words, the 'Russian man!'"<sup>54</sup>. It was this thinker, critic and publisher, according to A.N. Pypin, who was able to "place the study of Russian nationality on the basis of general historical and ethnographic research, covered by criticism, instead of the former dilettantish and sentimental point of view". Thus, Nadezhdin's theoretical views bring the understanding of "narodnost" closer to such a category as "nationality".<sup>55</sup>

The Europeanisation of the Russian nobility, which began in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, widened the gap between the intelligentsia and the peasantry. Gradually, the term 'narodnost' came to be understood by many as referring to the commonality, meaning not to ethnicity as such, but to a particular social group - the peasantry.

The French concept of nationalité (nationality) includes all people living in France or in any other country. "Nationality" in Uvarov's concept is seen differently, it is primarily associated with the ordinary Russian people, the peasantry. They are the ones who feel close to the Tsar, who see him as a wise father, and who remain loyal to Orthodoxy, unlike the oppositional nobility. T. D. Solovey rightly notes that the third concept of Russian conservative thought is connected with the desire of the autocratic power to find support primarily among the peasantry and "leaves the oppositional nobility out of the Great Russian nationality"<sup>56</sup>.

The concept of "nationality" did not receive a deep philosophical foundation in Uvarov's works. However, it was actively used in the works of Slavophiles. It was mainly thanks to these thinkers that nationality began to be understood as a special type of morality embodied by the peasantry. T. D. Solovey notes that it was thanks to the

---

<sup>53</sup> Nadezhdin N.I. Ob etnograficheskom izuchenii narodnosti russkoj (Ch. I) // Etnograficheskoe obozrenie. 1994. №1. P. 115.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid. P. 107.

<sup>55</sup> Pypin A. N. Istoriya russkoi etnografii. V 4 t. T. 1. Obshchii obzor izuchenii narodnosti i etnografii velikorusskoi. SPb.: Tip. M. M. Stasyulevicha, 1890. P. 272.

<sup>56</sup> Solovei T. D. Op. cit. P. 51.

Slavophiles that the peasantry was proclaimed the highest embodiment of nationality and even "the quintessence of 'Russianness' "<sup>57</sup>.

If in Uvarov's conservative triad the autocracy based on Orthodoxy and nationality played an important role, for the Slavophiles "nationality" became the central category. Slavophiles saw the greatness of Russia in the beautiful moral principles that existed in peasant communities.

The meaning of "nationality" in the Slavophile concept was studied by E.V. Bobrovskikh. The researcher writes that it is thanks to the Slavophiles that in Russian socio-political thought the words "people's spirit", "national character", "national personality" were perceived as synonymous with the concept of "nationality"<sup>58</sup>. For Slavophiles, appealing to folk principles was the key to saving the country. For example, I.S. Aksakov, stressing the danger of "Europeanisation" that began in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, argued that: "The measure of the real, not imaginary, strength of the Russian state depends on the mutual attitude of the peasantry Russia and the official Russia. When we were strong in the Western sense, we were weak in our national, Russian sense, and this weakness was not slow to show itself in the war in the East. Now we are returning to the source of our strength, and we are weak in the eyes of the Europeans! This is understandable. It remains for us to show them what our real, not mixed up, strength is"<sup>59</sup>.

Another thinker of the Slavophil trend, D.A. Khomyakov (son of A.S. Khomyakov, the founder of Slavophilism), while discussing the concept of "nationality", wrote that it is difficult to clearly define and rationally describe national origins, but they are felt. "It will never be possible by any analysis to clarify the whole synthesis of the national spirit, which, like any life, is not understood, but only perceived as an a priori fact,"<sup>60</sup> - he wrote.

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid. P. 51.

<sup>58</sup> Bobrovskikh E.V. Znachenie "narodnosti" v koncepcii slavyanofilov // Kontury global'nyh transformacij: politika, ekonomika, pravo. 2015. №4. P. 101.

<sup>59</sup> Aksakov K.S., Aksakov I.S. Op. cit. P. 501.

<sup>60</sup> Homyakov D.A. Pravoslavie. Samoderzhavie. Narodnost'. M.: In-t ruskoj civilizacii, 2011. P. 275-276.

According to the Slavophiles, the concept of "nationality" includes not only the features and characteristics of the people, which have developed under the influence of various climatic conditions and geographical factors. According to these conservative thinkers, in the concept of "nationality" it is important to take into account such features as faith, people's self-awareness, loyalty to the state system. D. A. Khomyakov wrote that it represents "the individuality of the people, its natural abilities and its entire mental (spiritual) structure"<sup>61</sup>.

These ideas were later developed in the publicism of the pochvenniks, who were close in spirit to the Slavophiles. However, unlike the Slavophiles, they did not idealise the peasantry, seeing in them their faults. At the same time, according to Dostoyevsky, it is possible to "see diamonds in the mud"<sup>62</sup>. Publicists of 19<sup>th</sup> century, including F. Dostoevsky, A. Grigoriev and N. Strakhov, wrote about nationality, understanding it not so much from the political point of view as from the cultural, historical and philosophical positions. For Dostoyevsky, nationality represents the spiritual essence of a peasantry. T.D. Solovey notes: "He saw the bearers of nationality in the 'grey Zipuns', who had not lost touch with the historical truth"<sup>63</sup>.

While many Slavophiles, and later pochvenniks, conceived of nationality as a philosophical and cultural-historical aspect, another group of conservative thinkers tended to approach the concept from a socio-political point of view. M. N. Katkov is one of these publicists. He was primarily concerned with the question of how the peoples of a vast empire should interact with each other. For example, in solving the national question, Katkov considered the right of a person to define his or her nationality by correlation with a state or a political force to be important. The thinker defended the principle of the equality of peoples before the law, which is the same for all.

Thus, in the process of the gradual formation of Russian conservatism, three main concepts of Russian conservative thought developed: the Orthodoxy, the Autocracy and

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid. P. 285.

<sup>62</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya: v 2 t. T. 1. M.: Knizhnyj klub, 2011. P. 249.

<sup>63</sup> Solovei T. D. Op. cit. P. 57.

the Nationality. The concept of "nationality" is one of the most complex and multifaceted in this triad, and can be considered in various aspects: ethnographic, cultural-historical, philosophical, socio-political. It is associated with the interaction of different peoples united within the Empire, as well as with the overcoming of the gap that separated Russian educated society from the peasantry, in order to preserve common traditions, language, culture and values for Russian society.

Speaking about the Slavophiles, whose thoughts are close to F.M. Dostoevsky, and more directly about the pochvenniks, it can be noted that for these thinkers the concept of "nationality" is closely connected not so much with the climate and geographical features of Russia, but with religious faith and people's self-awareness. Thanks to the works of Slavophiles, "national spirit", "national character", "national personality" became synonyms for the word "nationality", which was analysed from the point of view of cultural history and philosophy. Pochvenniks continued this series with philosophical concepts such as "soil" and "national soil".

The concept of "nationality", in its close connection with the concepts of "Russian soil", has been one of the main themes of Russian literature and publicism since the first surviving Old Russian monuments, including "The Word about Igor's Campaign", which calls for the union of Russian soul in order to preserve the oneness of the motherland. In the publicism of the Pochvenniks, ideas about the unification of different social class are heard. These conservative thinkers saw the bright beginnings of the soul of the peasantry and the conductors of many important ideas among the Russian nation.

#### **1.4. Pochvennichestvo as a direction of Russian conservative thought of the 19th century**

Pochvennichestvo, which appeared in the 1860s, has been the focus of analyses by many researchers. There is already a certain scientific tradition in the study of Pochvennichestvo in relation to 19th-century authors who were close to Dostoyevsky.

The works of V.A. Tunimanov<sup>64</sup>, A. Lazari<sup>65</sup>, A.A. Vasiliev<sup>66</sup>, K.A. Barsht<sup>67</sup> and other researchers are devoted to this subject.

Pochvennichestvo is a unique phenomenon in 19th-century Russian life, which emerged as an attempt to understand the different ways of Russia's development after the 1861 reform. It is not only a philosophical and literary movement, but also a socio-political concept. It was fully formed in the years when Russian conservative thought was at its height and was reflected in publicism.

Some researchers, such as V.N. Zakharov, use the term "Pochvennichestvo" to refer to literature describing the Russian hinterland and poeticising the peasantry. Zakharov mentions many 20th-century writers such as V.I. Belov, V.P. Astafyev and V.M. Shukshin as Pochvenniks<sup>68</sup>. The new literary movement, according to Zakharov, united the Russian people and the Russian land "in love for the motherland, for Russia, for ideals and values"<sup>69</sup>.

This view is supported by D.A. Kunil'sky, who describes Pochvennichestvo as a literary and publicistic movement whose aim is "the truthful representation of the national past and present"<sup>70</sup>. A.L. Ospovat believes that the "national beginning" of the Pochvennichestvo is not connected only with the peasantry<sup>71</sup>, and that the aim of the movement is broader and more complex than just the poeticisation of the best features of the Russian people.

---

<sup>64</sup> Tunimanov V. A. *Tvorchestvo Dostoevskogo, 1854–1862*. L.: Nauka: Leningr. Otd-nie, 1980. - 294 p.

<sup>65</sup> Lazari Andzhei de. *V krugu Fyodora Dostoevskogo. Pochvennichestvo* / per. s pol'sk. M. V. Leskinen, N. M. Filatova. M.: Nauka, 2004. - 205 p.

<sup>66</sup> Vasil'ev A.A. *Mirovozzrenie pochvennikov (F.M. i M.M. Dostoevskih, A.A. Grigor'eva i N.N. Strahova): zabytye stranicy russkoj konservativnoj mysli*. M.: In-t russkoj civilizacii, 2010. 243 p.

<sup>67</sup> Barsht K.A. *O koncepte pochva v trudah starshih slavyanofilov i tvorchestve F.M. Dostoevskogo* // *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Seriya: YAzyk i literatura*. 2022. T. 19. (1). P. 4–28.

<sup>68</sup> Zakharov V. N. *Pochvennichestvo v russkoi literature: metafora kak ideologema* // *Evangel'skii tekst v russkoi literature XVIII-XX vekov: tsitata, reministsentsiia, motiv, siuzhet, zhanr: sb. nauch. tr. Petrozav. gos. un-t. Petrozavodsk, 2012. Vyp.7. P. 14–24.*

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.* P. 24.

<sup>70</sup> Kunil'skii D. A. *Dostoevskii i brat'ya Aksakovy: spor o russkoi literature*. Petrozavodsk: Izd-vo PetrGU, 2013. P. 113.

<sup>71</sup> Ospovat A. L. *K izucheniyu pochvennichestva (Dostoevskii i Ap. Grigor'ev)* // *Dostoevskii. Materialy i issledovaniya*. T. 3. L., 1978. P. 148.

At the same time, it should be noted that Pochvennichestvo is broader than a literary movement. It is connected with the socio-political concept which was gradually formulated in the works of the Dostoevsky brothers, A.A. Grigoriev and N.N. Strakhov and which declared "the restoration of the unity of the intelligentsia with the peasantry"<sup>72</sup>.

A. L. Avdeeva describes Pochvennichestvo as an ideological movement that, in the period of searching for spiritual foundations that could unite Russian society, supported "the idea of restoring the spiritual connection between the intelligentsia (elite) and the peasantry"<sup>73</sup>. Pochvennichestvo should be understood in a broad sense - not only as a literary movement, but also as a philosophical concept, an ideological trend, a socio-political doctrine. Therefore, these thinkers expressed their views both in literary works and in publicism.

Publicism, as a special cultural phenomenon and a form of creativity, has always reflected "the characteristic features and actual ideas of the development of society, responding to the challenges of its epoch"<sup>74</sup>. The key and "painful" problem of the 19th century was the question of Russia's place among other countries, its role and mission, as well as the ways of development.

P.Ya. Chaadaev was one of the first to try to understand these problems in his "Philosophical Letters". Only one letter was published in 1836 in the journal "Telescope", edited by N. I. Nadezhdin. In his opinion, "we are alone in the world, we have given nothing to other countries, we have taken nothing from the world"<sup>75</sup>. The publicist believed that "on the barren soil of our homeland"<sup>76</sup> not a single useful thought was born, although Russia, situated between the West and the East, could harmonise such beginnings as rationality and imagination. These ideas of P.Ya. Chaadaev

---

<sup>72</sup> Slavyanofily. Istoricheskaya enciklopediya. / Sost. i otv. redaktor O.A. Platonov. M.: In-t russoj civilizacii, 2009. P. 441.

<sup>73</sup> Avdeeva L.R. Russkie mysliteli: Ap. A. Grigor'ev, N.YA. Danilevskij, N.N. Strahov. M.: Izd-vo MGU, 1992. - 195 p.

<sup>74</sup> Gromova L. P. Fenomen publitsistiki v kontseptsiiakh issledovatelei // Russkaia publitsistika: évoliutsiia idei i form. Sb. st. Ser. "Peterburgskaia shkola zhurnalistiki i MK" Sankt-Peterburgskogo gos. un-ta. SPb: Aleteia, 2021. P. 11.

<sup>75</sup> Chaadaev P.YA. Filosoficheskie pis'ma. M.: Eksmo, 2006. P. 34.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid. P. 34.

significantly influenced the minds of the intellectuals of the 19th century. In many ways, it was the "Philosophical Letters" that encouraged the development of polemics between Westerners and Slavophiles, especially acute in the 1840s. Discussions about the place and role of Russia would later be continued by the Pochvenniks.

It should be noted that many of the ideas of the 1830s were reinterpreted by Chaadayev. Therefore, it would not be entirely correct to associate him unambiguously with Russian Westerners. Nevertheless, in his "Philosophical Letter" Chaadayev touched upon the "painful question" of the century about the development of Russia, about the destiny and mission of the Russian people. The "Philosophical Letter" mentions the concept of "soil" not in a literal sense, but as a metaphysical concept: "Not a single useful thought has sprouted on the barren soil of our Motherland"<sup>77</sup>.

The concept of "soil", from which the name of the movement emerged in the 1860s, is still complex and ambiguous for researchers. In the 1860s, it could not be described as completely new and "exotic". It had already been used in the publicism of P. Chaadaev and in the works of the Slavophiles, whose creativity was closely studied by F.M. Dostoevsky. In 1847, for example, the Slavophile thinker K.S. Aksakov used the term in a non-literal sense, writing: "We are like plants that have uncovered their roots from the ground"<sup>78</sup>.

While the words "soil" and "soil-less" were actively used in the publicism of Slavophiles and Pochvenniks, the notion of "Pochvennichestvo" as a term emerged later. Dostoyevsky and his followers did not refer to themselves in this way. In one of the studies on the subject of this PhD thesis, we noted a certain tendency in Russian publicism and literature: it is not typical for publicists and writers to declare their affiliation to any literary style or ideological trend<sup>79</sup>. Slavophiles, for example, only

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibid. P. 34.

<sup>78</sup> Solov'ev É. G. Pochvennichestvo // Novaya filosofskaya entsiklopediya v 4 t. T.3. M., 2001. URL: <https://iphlib.ru/library/collection/newphilenc/document/HASH01e9048940abc946f2d6f1e8> (Date of access: 17.12.2022).

<sup>79</sup> Kruglikova O. S., Shapovalova (Kul'ko) K. A. F. M. Dostoevskii i A. I. Solzhenitsyn: preemstvennost' idei v publitsistike // Tetradi po konservatizmu. 2019. №1. P. 104.



learned that they were Slavophiles from others and adopted the name rather ironically<sup>80</sup>. Pochvenniks do not call themselves that way during their lives. V. Zakharov remarks that Pochvenniks sometimes correlated their ideas with the views of Slavophiles and could even call themselves Slavophiles, although there was a significant difference between the philosophical and socio-political ideas of these thinkers.

Yu. Seleznev notes that many of Dostoevsky's contemporaries did not understand the ideas of the Pochvenniks, which appeared in the journals "Vremya", "Epokha", and later in the "Diary of the Writer", and even perceived them as "Slavophile thought slightly recoloured in a vague concept"<sup>81</sup>. Critics wrote about "the vagueness, the indeterminacy of the idea that the Pochvenniks put forward, and even as a new word..."<sup>82</sup>. The dispute over the meaning of the concept of "soil" even inspired the critic, publicist and philosopher M.A. Antonovich to write a feuilleton "About the soil", in which the author noted that those who argue about "soil" have "a vague, not their own, also allegorical understanding of the subject of the dispute, in other words, they talk about something that none of them has taken the trouble to clarify for themselves"<sup>83</sup>.

It is noteworthy that the polemic with "Vremya" caused even the democratic "Sovremennik" and the conservative "Russky Vestnik" to join in criticism for a time. M. N. Katkov, a future confederate of F. M. Dostoevsky, was rather hostile to "Vremya". N. Katkov was quite against the ideas of Pochvennichestvo: "National beginnings! Roots! And what are these beginnings? What are these foundations? Do you think, gentlemen, that there is anything absolutely clear in these words?"<sup>84</sup>.

K. K. A. Barsht identifies several reasons for which the ideas of the Pochvennichestvo were severely criticised, including by those who might have been supporters of Dostoevsky. Firstly, it was the ideological rejection of the ideas of the new movement, for example, by the journal "Sovremennik", in which M. A.

<sup>80</sup> Koshelev A.I. Zapiski Aleksandra Ivanovicha Kosheleva (1812–1883 gody) M.: Nauka, 2002. - 475 p.

<sup>81</sup> Seleznev Yu. I. Dostoevskii. M.: Molodaya gvardiya, 1990. P. 236.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid. P. 236.

<sup>83</sup> Antonovich M.A. Izbrannye stat'i. Filosofiya. Kritika. Polemika. L.: Hudozhestvennaya literatura, 1938. P. 354.

<sup>84</sup> Russky Vestnik. 1863. № 5. Cited from: Saraskina L. I. Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh. M.: Russkii put', 2006. P. 404.

Antonovich's articles appeared. Secondly, the criticism of the Poverkhniks arose because of "the mental inability of some to assimilate the main idea of the doctrine of the Dostoevsky brothers; ambiguities in the presentation of the main thesis, which was primarily due to the strict censorship supervision of the former political exile F. M. Dostoevsky and his not quite trustworthy brother"<sup>85</sup>. The scope of our research does not include a detailed study of Dostoevsky's intense polemics with his opponents about the ideas of Pochvennichestvo. This issue has been studied in detail, for example, in the studies of V. S. Nechaeva<sup>86</sup>. However, it is necessary to realise how difficult it was for Dostoevsky to defend the positions of Pochvennichestvo.

The difficulty of defining the concept of "soil" was emphasised not only by Dostoevsky's contemporaries, but also by researchers studying the creative heritage of the Pochvenniks. V.N. Zakharov writes that even the staff of the journal "Vremya" had vague ideas about what "soil" was. N. Strakhov, for example, argued very unclearly: "...by the name of soil are meant those fundamental and peculiar forces of the people which contain the germs of all their organic manifestations"<sup>87</sup>.

According to N.V. Snetova, the concept of "soil" refers to the spiritual values of the Russian people, which consist of "humility and mighty spiritual strength, the ability to self-sacrifice"<sup>88</sup>. Another researcher, A. L. Ospovat, assesses the emerging concept of "soil" not as a reference to the spiritual values of the nation, but as a political programme<sup>89</sup>.

V. N. Zakharov writes about "soil" and notes that it is a polysemous word. In its literal meaning it is the earth itself, its fertile layer. However, "soil" is also a common metaphor, which Zakharov defines as the "basis, foundation, support"<sup>90</sup> of national life.

---

<sup>85</sup> Barsht K.A. Op. cit. P. 5.

<sup>86</sup> Nechaeva V. S. Zhurnal M. M. i F. M. Dostoevskikh "Vremya". 1864–1863. M.: Nauka, 1972. 316 p.

<sup>87</sup> Strahov N.N. Vospominaniya o F.M. Dostoevskom // Dostoevskij v vospominaniyah sovremennikov: V 2 t. T. 1. M.: Hudozhestvennaya literatura, 1990. P. 113.

<sup>88</sup> Snetova N. V. A. S. Khomyakov i neoslavjanofil'stvo H. N. Strakhova // A. S. Khomyakov – myslitel', poet, publitsist: sb. st. po m-lam mezhdunar. nauch. konf., 14–17 aprelya 2004 g. T. 1. M., 2007. P. 273.

<sup>89</sup> Ospovat A. L. Op. cit. P. 144–150.

<sup>90</sup> Zakharov V. N. Pochvennichestvo v russkoi literature ... P. 17.

According to Yu. Seleznev, for Dostoevsky the soil is "that spiritual and moral sphere of social and political life, on the basis of which only the meeting and organic connection of the intelligentsia and the peasantry, education and people's morality, culture and nationality is possible"<sup>91</sup>. V. Zakharov gives the following definition of "soil": everything that gives birth and kinship: people, motherland, native language, native soil"<sup>92</sup>.

In one of the scientific articles we also try to consider the concept of "soil" in the publicism of F.M. Dostoevsky and A.I. Solzhenitsyn as a multifaceted and complex symbol. For them, "the idea of 'soil' correlates with both geographical and cultural-historical reality"<sup>93</sup>.

On the basis of these definitions, it can be said that the idea of "soil" must be understood, first of all, as the unity of the geographical and climatic reality of a particular nation. The "soil" is the land on which a people lives, the land it cultivates and at the expense of which it exists. Secondly, it is the unity of the cultural reality that forms the national character as a result of contact with the culture, traditions, language and customs of a people. Thirdly, the "soil" can indeed be linked to a certain political programme, which calls for the unity and harmonious existence of the different classes of the population of a country.

The "Announcement of the publication of the journal 'Vremya' in 1861" can be seen as a kind of programme and manifesto of the Poverkhvenniks. The journal was a joint project of the Dostoevsky brothers and owed its existence largely to the organisational talents of Mikhail Dostoevsky and the ideological leadership of Fyodor Dostoevsky. The subscription announcement stated: "Peter the Great's reform has already cost us too much: it has disconnected us from the peasantry... But now the separation is coming to an end. Peter's reform, which has continued until our time, has

---

<sup>91</sup> Seleznev Yu. I. Op. cit. P. 237.

<sup>92</sup> Zakharov V. N. Pochvennichestvo v russkoi literature ... P. 23.

<sup>93</sup> Kul'ko K. A. Sozvuchie idei o "pochve" v publitsistike F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna // *Istoricheskaya zhurnalistika i sovremennost'*. Sb. nauch. materialov. Voronezh, 2020. P. 51.

reached its last limits. It is impossible to go on, and there is nowhere to go: there is no road, everything has been passed"<sup>94</sup>.

Learning about Europe and Europeans, according to the journal's staff, should not lead Russian society to the point where all its representatives become Europeans as well. Some European principles, the authors argue, are foreign to us. That is why Russia should not try to blindly copy someone else's way of development. National tradition should be reunited with European education - this is the essence of Pochvennichestvo, or "reconciliation" of the intelligentsia, civilisation with the peasantry. The possibility of achieving this unique synthesis, of overcoming the gap between the masses and the intelligentsia, will contribute to the realisation of Russia's special role in the world and the spiritual mission that is common to all our people, without class barriers.

A. A. A. Vasiliev considers the Poverkvenniks to be Russian conservative thinkers<sup>95</sup>. In his study, the researcher analyses the world view of the Dostoevsky brothers, A. A. Grigoriev and N. N. Strakhov, who defended the idea of the return of the intelligentsia to the peasantry during the crisis of values in Russian society. As a conservative thinker, Dostoyevsky criticised rationalist doctrines about the structure of society, which did not take into account the existence of the spiritual nature of the individual. Pochenniki wrote much about Orthodoxy, contrasting it with European Catholicism, which was in a spiritual crisis. Dostoyevsky associated Orthodoxy with the "Russian idea" and the nation's mission to carry the true faith to other nations. Thus V.A. Nikitin argued that Dostoyevsky recognised only the "Russian Christ" and called the thinker "the standard-bearer of Russian Orthodoxy"<sup>96</sup>.

This idea of the messianism of the Russian nation was developed by Slavophiles, especially I. Kireevsky, whose works are analysed by M. M. Panfilov<sup>97</sup>. Kireyevsky,

---

<sup>94</sup> Cit. from: Gromova N. A. Dostoevskii. Dokumenty, dnevniki, pis'ma, memuary, otzyvy literaturnykh kritikov i filosofov. M.: Agraf, 2000. P. 68.

<sup>95</sup> Vasil'ev A.A. Op. cit. - 243 p.

<sup>96</sup> Nikitin V. A. Aktual'nost' "russkoi idei" Ivana Kireevskogo // Ivan Kireevskii: Dukhovnyi put' v russkoi mysli XIX–XXI vv. (K 200-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya): sb. nauch. st. T. 1. M., 2007. P. 128.

<sup>97</sup> Panfilov M. M. Klyuch razuma (Dukhovnyi kodeks Ivana Kireevskogo). V sb.: Ivan Kireevskii: Dukhovnyi put' v russkoi mysli XIX–XXI vv. (K 200-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya): sb. nauch. st. T. 1. M., 2007. P. 203–225.

and later Dostoevsky, feared that the intelligentsia had risen above the peasantry and had become too distant from Russian culture and traditions.

Having declared itself to be conservative as early as in "Vremya", Pochvennichestvo was forced to polemicise with many publications of different tendencies. These included "Sovremennik", "Russky Vestnik" and even Aksakov's "Den". The Pochvenniks occupied a kind of intermediate position between thinkers oriented towards Western models and Slavophiles. Andrzej de Lazari considers it acceptable to call the Pochvenniks "Slavophile" thinkers. According to de Lazari, both the Pochvenniks and the Slavophiles poetised the national soul and searched for the moral foundations of the Russian character in peasant society<sup>98</sup>. Radical social disintegration was not favoured by these thinkers. The abandonment of the national foundations, the loss of contact with the peasantry, was seen by the Pochvenniks as a prerequisite for "future upheavals and revolutions"<sup>99</sup>.

Despite the fact that Andrzej de Lazari calls the Pochvenniks "Slavophilic" thinkers, the position of the Pochvenniks does not copy the ideas of Slavophilism. The views of the representatives of this new trend can be regarded as "an independent system of cognitive, ethical and aesthetic values"<sup>100</sup>.

In contrast to the Slavophiles, the Pochvenniks did not consider it reasonable to return to the pre-Petrine period. The assessment of the Peter the Great epoch was contradictory. According to them, from the beginning of the 18th century, the "gap" between the intelligentsia, oriented towards Western European models, and the peasantry began to widen. However, according to F.M. Dostoevsky, it was in the time of Peter the Great and after him that Russia realised that it was the keeper of the true vision of Christ. Before the reforms of the Emperor, who "turned" Russia towards Europe, the country tried to isolate itself from those who could have a harmful influence on Orthodoxy and distort its essence. After the time of Peter the Great, the Russian Orthodox idea, which had previously been confined to itself, gradually began to expand.

---

<sup>98</sup> Lazari Andzhei de. Op. cit.

<sup>99</sup> Vasil'ev A.A. Op. cit. P. 30.

<sup>100</sup> Lazari Andzhei de. Op. cit. P. 11.

The experience of Europe was not as critical as that of the Slavophiles. The Pochvenniks' publicism was critical of European Catholicism and socialism, which led to the abandonment of faith and the pursuit of material values. At the same time, the Pochvenniks recognised the high level of European culture and education. It should be noted that the thinkers occupied a kind of intermediate position between Westerners and Slavophiles. They did not deny the European experience, but believed that any idea useful for the development of Russia "should not be transplanted, but should grow naturally from the native soil"<sup>101</sup>.

The Pochvenniks paid particular attention to the question of the peasantry and the intelligentsia, stressing that the goal of the Russian educated class was to ensure a reunion with the people, who sacredly preserved Russian traditions and the Orthodox faith, while many intellectuals educated in Europe were carried away by ideas of materialism and atheism. However, unlike the Slavophiles, as A. L. Ospovat rightly points out, the Pochvenniks "refused to ascribe purely positive qualities to the bearers of the 'national beginning' "<sup>102</sup>. According to the Pochvenniks, there was both beauty and superfluous barbarism in the Russian peasantry. But the intelligentsia must forgive "all the impenetrable, superficial mud in which our people is immersed"<sup>103</sup> and be able to "find diamonds in this mud"<sup>104</sup>.

V. Zakharov, analysing the ideas of F.M. Dostoevsky and his followers, suggests that only Dostoevsky should be classified as a Pochvennik. According to Zakharov, A. Grigoriev is closer to the ideas of the Slavophiles: "He is a Pochvennik to the extent that Pochvennichestvo follows Slavophilism"<sup>105</sup>. Another thinker who is usually mentioned among the Pochvenniks - N. Strakhov - did not defend the position of a strictly defined movement: "When Strakhov was in the sphere of Dostoevsky, he became a Pochvennik, with Grigoriev - a Slavophile, in the sphere of L. Tolstoy - a critic of the Church and its

---

<sup>101</sup> Seleznev Yu. I. Op. cit. P. 237.

<sup>102</sup> Ospovat A. L. Op. cit. P. 148.

<sup>103</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 249.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid. P. 249.

<sup>105</sup> Zakharov V. N. Pochvennichestvo v russkoi literature ... P. 18.

doctrine"<sup>106</sup>. L.M. Rosenblum, assessing Strakhov's position, aptly called him a "Pochvennik without soil"<sup>107</sup>.

Acknowledging the fact that the ideas of Pochvennichestvo could be supported by many thinkers of the 19th century, we adhere to the position of V. Zakharov, who believes that it was the Dostoevsky brothers who contributed to the emergence of a new movement in Russian conservative thought - Pochvennichestvo - through their energetic actions in organising the journal and polemics with other periodicals. For them, defending the ideas of this movement meant "loving Russia, the nation, being Russian, following the faith of the fathers, honouring the motherland"<sup>108</sup>.

K. K.A. Barsht formulates the essence of the Dostoevsky brothers' project of Pochvennichestvo: "the transformation of social life in Russia and the whole of humanity through the unchangeable fulfilment of the principles of New Testament ethics in every movement of every person, the establishment of relations of brotherly love between people, and the consolidation of social forces around this idea"<sup>109</sup>.

The Pochvenniks' project of the "return" of the intelligentsia to the peasantry, of the "soil" and the messianic "Russian idea", which partly referred to Slavophilism, but claimed to create a new social doctrine that would correspond to the spirit of the post-reform period of the 1860s, was at first not understood by contemporaries. Many of the members of the staff of "Vremya" can only partially be considered Pochvenniks. V.A. Tunimanov remarks: "...in the minds of the overwhelming majority of readers, Pochvennichestvo has hopelessly outlived itself as an uncertain and vague movement, and 'Vremya' severely damaged its reputation with its September 1862 book"<sup>110</sup>.

This "loneliness" of the idea, its total incomprehension even by those who might have been like-minded, did not lead Dostoevsky to abandon his Poverkennichestvo. On the contrary, after the closure of "Vremya" and "Epokha", Dostoevsky decided to

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid. P. 19.

<sup>107</sup> Rozenblyum L. M. *Tvorcheskie dnevniki Dostoevskogo // Literaturnoe nasledstvo. Dostoevskii. Noveye materialy i issledovaniya*. T. 83. M.: Nauka, 1971. P. 19.

<sup>108</sup> Zakharov V. N. *Pochvennichestvo v russkoi literature ...* P. 23.

<sup>109</sup> Barsht K.A. *Op. cit.* P. 5.

<sup>110</sup> Tunimanov V. A. *Tvorchestvo Dostoevskogo, 1854–1862*. L.: Nauka: Leningr. Otd-nie, 1980. P. 5.

undertake a risky "literary experiment"<sup>111</sup> and began to publish "The Diary of the Writer", which was to become widely known. The concept of Pochvennichestvo, whose ideas were also developed in the pages of "The Diary of the Writer", was certainly not without its critics. However, it is not reasonable to speak of the "failure" of the movement and the concept of Pochvennichestvo. Dostoyevsky, misunderstood by many of his contemporaries, would later find like-minded followers when many of the ideas of Pochvennichestvo would be actualised in the 20th century, and many people would turn to the classical writer as a teacher and prophet.

### **1.5. Neopochvennichestvo as a movement of Russian conservative thought**

Despite its metaphorical nature, the idea of "soil" has once again proved relevant to Russia. Such concept as "neopochvennichestvo" is rarely found in scientific discourse. The term refers to the ideas of pochvenniks of 19th century, but the prefix "neo" makes it clear that not all ideas thinkers are ready to adopt from their predecessors.

It is impossible to give a clear chronological marker to the emergence of neopochvennichestvo. The ideas of the Pochvenniks were not forgotten and then not suddenly revived in the new century. They continued to develop even after the death of F.M. Dostoyevsky, sometimes not so clearly and openly. It is therefore impossible to pinpoint the exact date of the emergence of neopochvennichestvo. In our opinion, it can be assumed that this line was not interrupted, but in the new centuries a number of ideas of the pochvennichestvo of 19<sup>th</sup> century were gradually reinterpreted.

One of the chapters of Yu.M. Mikityuk's PhD thesis is devoted to the development of the idea of pochvennichestvo in the consciousness of Russian society<sup>112</sup>. According to the researcher, the ideas of pochvennichestvo were reflected in the plays

---

<sup>111</sup> Volgin I.L. Poverh bar'erov. Zagadka "Dnevnika pisatelya" // Dostoyevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya: v 2 t. T.1. M.: Knizhnyj klub, 2011. P. 11.

<sup>112</sup> Mikityuk Yu. M. Kontsepty khristianskogo i natsional'nogo v kul'turno-istoricheskoi teorii pochvennichestva. Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata kul'turologii. Sankt-Peterburg, 2011. URL: <https://viewer.rsl.ru/ru/rsl01005001160?page=1&rotate=0&theme=white> (Date of access: 14.12.2022).



of A.N. Ostrovsky, in the works of N.S. Leskov, in the literature and philosophical concepts of the Silver Age, as well as in the culture of the Russian Abroad. Yu.M. Mikityuk uses the term "neo-Slavophilism" when talking about the influence of ideas of *pochvennichestvo* on V. V. Rozanov and V. C. Soloviev. According to the researcher, it was in the ideology of *pochvennichestvo* that important philosophical ideas of "universal humanity" and "universal responsiveness" were developed. The philosophers largely inherited F.M. Dostoevsky's ideas about Orthodoxy as the basis of Russian identity.

Studying Soviet literature of the 1960s and 1970s, Yu.M. Mikityuk uses the terms "Neopochvennichestvo" or "Second Pochvennichestvo". According to the researcher, the Neopochvenniks did not create unique philosophical concepts, but the "second Pochvennichestvo" was vividly reflected in cinema, criticism and publicism. Authors who wrote about the village and the "soil" in the 1960s were also called "neo-Slavophiles". This terminological diversity, highlighted in Yu.M. Mikityuk's PhD thesis, suggests that the concept of "Neopochvennichestvo" in relation to the work of Soviet authors is in many ways innovative and is only beginning to be actively used by researchers. Soviet writers and publicists, whose ideas are close to those of the *pochvenniks*, tried to preserve the spiritual and moral heritage of the country, they did not lose their attitude to the Russian people, the village and the "soil" as something sacred.

Yu. M. Mikityuk also turned to a more modern period and considered the ideas of *pochvennichestvo* at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. According to the researcher, modern *pochvennichestvo*, unlike the *pochvennichestvo* of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, is still a rather fragmented phenomenon: "... it has not developed into a coherent ideology, and in most cases it is eclectically combined with ideas of different origin and other sources"<sup>113</sup>.

The researcher also highlighted the confrontation between traditionalists and modern *pochvenniks*. The traditionalists, according to the author, profess anti-communism and associate themselves with the intelligentsia who found themselves

---

<sup>113</sup> Ibid.

outside Russia after several waves of Russian emigration. The pochvenniks of the 20<sup>th</sup> century are not so unambiguously negative about Bolshevism. Yu.M. Mikityuk included A.I. Solzhenitsyn in the group of Russian traditionalists.

In our view, Solzhenitsyn's figure is so complex and contradictory that it is difficult to include him squarely in the group of traditionalist. He actually left Russia and criticised communism, but after the collapse of the Soviet Union he returned to his homeland. And his attitude to socialism and communism changed in a complex way. This will be discussed in more detail in the second chapter of our study. In our view, thinkers such as Dostoevsky or his follower Solzhenitsyn, who acknowledged his apprenticeship to the classics, cannot be clearly defined in terms of their worldview position. We wrote about this in one of the articles on the subject of the PhD thesis: "The impossibility of fixing a clear characterisation for a serious thinker becomes particularly clear when we talk about paradoxical thinkers, who claimed that the value of a philosopher is not in simplifying the world to the only correct paradigm, but in having, as V.V. Rozanov wrote, a thousand points of view on a subject. Rozanov wrote, for example, that there are a thousand points of view on an object"<sup>114</sup>.

Taking into account the opinion of Yu.M. Mikityuk, we consider the ideas of A.I. Solzhenitsyn to be close to the pochvennichestvo of F.M. Dostoevsky. In the above-mentioned study, we attempted to conceptualise neopochvennichestvo as a movement of conservative thought that rethinks some of Dostoevsky's ideas<sup>115</sup>.

A. I. Solzhenitsyn did not call himself a neopochvennik. Moreover, publicists of the 1990s noted that "Solzhenitsyn said many angry (and fair) words about our neopochvenniks. But they still had reason to consider him a like-minded person"<sup>116</sup>. Many of Solzhenitsyn's ideas do indeed refer to the thoughts of the pochvenniks of 19<sup>th</sup> century, so current researchers are beginning to consider his literary works and publicism in the context of the development of ideas of pochvennichestvo.

---

<sup>114</sup> Kruglikova O. S., Shapovalova (Kul'ko) K. A. Op. cit. P. 104.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid. P. 106-107.

<sup>116</sup> Verhovskij A. Kto pojdet za Solzhenicynym? // Panorama. 1990. №12 (24). Oktyabr'. URL: <http://www.panorama.ru/gazeta/1-30/p24solz.html> (Date of access: 23.04.2023)

One of these authors is V.N. Zakharov, who studied *pochvennichestvo* in literature. His work is very controversial. In essence, he tries to revise the history of *pochvennichestvo* and suggests that the group of authors close to this trend should include more modern writers<sup>117</sup>. Among these writers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and publicists, who maintained a connection with the Russian "soil", faith and traditional values of life of ordinary people, Zakharov names D.S. Likhachev, V.G. Rasputin, V.P. Astafiev, V.M. Shukshin, A.I. Solzhenitsyn. Zakharov places their works on an equal footing with those of the "peasant" writers, who reflected not only on the Russian land but also on the moral values of the peasantry.

In his speech on the occasion of the award of the Solzhenitsyn Prize to Valentin Rasputin in 2000, Solzhenitsyn pointed out that in the 1970s a group of writers stood out in Soviet literature. They began to create "in simplicity, without any favour to the Soviet regime, as if forgetting about it"<sup>118</sup>. These writers wrote about village life and often came from the peasantry itself. Solzhenitsyn noted that a group of these authors are commonly referred to as "peasant" writers, although in Solzhenitsyn's own opinion it would be more correct to call them "moralists", because "the essence of their literary revolution was the revival of traditional morality, and the crushed, dying village was only a natural, illustrative subject"<sup>119</sup>.

Among such authors, Solzhenitsyn himself mentioned V. Shukshin, A. Yashin, B. Mozhaev, V. Soloukhin, F. Abramov, G. Semyonov. However, in his opinion, V. Rasputin deserves special attention. He writes about his native land and its value for different generations, about nature and progress, which destroy morality and distance from the soil. It should be noted that these themes are also present in Solzhenitsyn's work.

It is important to note that Zakharov does not use the term "neopochvennichestvo". This notion appeared in an article by the contemporary

---

<sup>117</sup> Zakharov V. N. *Pochvennichestvo v russkoi literature ...* P. 14–24.

<sup>118</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Slovo pri vruchenii premii Solzhenitsyna Valentinu Rasputinu 4 maya 2000 goda* // *Novyj mir*. 2000. №5. URL: [https://magazines.gorky.media/novyi\\_mi/2000/5/slovo-pri-vruchenii-premii-solzhenitsyna-valentinu-rasputinu-4-maya-2000.html?ysclid=lhszozq9qc752724897](https://magazines.gorky.media/novyi_mi/2000/5/slovo-pri-vruchenii-premii-solzhenitsyna-valentinu-rasputinu-4-maya-2000.html?ysclid=lhszozq9qc752724897) (Date of access: 14.03.2023).

<sup>119</sup> Там же.

researcher A. Razuvalova, who reflects on the relationship between man and animal in prose from the 1970s. In this article, however, the term "neopochvennichestvo" is considered in relation to literature. It is noteworthy that the author, unlike Yu.M. Mikitiuk, does not draw a clear line between the concepts of "prose of neopochvennichestvo", "traditionalist prose" and "village prose"<sup>120</sup>. The researcher considers V. Astafiev, V. Soloukhin, V. Belov and S. Zalygin to be neopochvennik writers. Many of them came from peasant backgrounds and had a rather negative attitude towards technological progress, which destroys nature and distances people from the soil. The processes of urbanisation and industrialisation are increasingly destroying the harmonious relationship between man and nature. It should be noted that these same issues were of concern to A.I. Solzhenitsyn, however, he is not named in the researcher's work.

Thus, a number of contemporary researchers write about the pochvennichestvo in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, but not all of them use the term "neopochvennichestvo", which, in our opinion, is only beginning to be actively included in scientific works. For example, in the above-mentioned article by V.Zakharov, which brings the "peasant" writers closer to the pochvennichestvo, the term "neopochvennichestvo" is not mentioned. Nevertheless, its use seems appropriate to us, since many of the writers mentioned by Zakharov continue the traditions of the pochvennichestvo, but rethink their ideas under new historical conditions. As we noted in the last paragraph, pochvennichestvo cannot be seen narrowly, only as a movement in literature. The ideas of the pochvenniks were reflected in the publicism of writers of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century who responded to the problems of modernity.

Not only publicists of the 1990s, but also more modern writers associate the name of A.I. Solzhenitsyn with neopochvennichestvo. Among them is A. Kapliyev, who is convinced that pochvennichestvo is the basis of Russian conservatism. For him, neopochvennichestvo is "a new conservative ideology based on the sacred right of private property and the natural need of man not to 'live on lies' (as Solzhenitsyn put

---

<sup>120</sup> Razuvalova A. Lyudi i zveri v neopochvennicheskoi proze // Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. 2021. №4 (170). P. 147–166.

it)"<sup>121</sup>. According to the publicist, this ideology is the saviour of humanity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, which has been swept away by the global race for natural resources and the achievements of scientific and technological progress.

Among the few researchers whose work includes such a concept as neopochvennichestvo, we can highlight E.A. Muzhailova. According to her, the ideas of pochvennichestvo became relevant in the 20<sup>th</sup> century after the waves of Russian emigration. A number of philosophers, scientists and cultural figures who left Russia felt connected to Russian soil and continued to consider themselves Russian. Muzhailova notes that the work of Russian emigrant writers is "a nostalgia for Russia, the cult of the Russian soil in the spirit of classical pochvennichestvo of 19<sup>th</sup> century"<sup>122</sup>. The researcher believes that it is necessary to study the work of those who developed the ideas of F.M. Dostoevsky in order to fully restore the national-cultural tradition.

Comparing the works of F.M. Dostoevsky and M.A. Osorgin, Muzhailova notes that the works of both authors belong to Russian pochvennichestvo, but in its different historical and cultural variants. The researcher compares F.M. Dostoevsky's essay "The Soil and Children" and M.A. Osorgin's memoir "The Soil". Muzhailova's conclusions are important in the context of our study because A.I. Solzhenitsyn will repeatedly refer to the image of the soil in his publicism.

One of the most important concepts not only in pochvennichestvo, but also in Russian culture as a whole, is the concept of "native soil", which has its origins in folklore and mythology. In Russian folklore, as well as in Christian literature and publicism, there is an image of the soil as a foremother, and it is not for nothing that the word "soil" is often used together with the words "mother" and "native". The researcher emphasises the sacred significance of the word "soil" for the Russian people: "The further spiritualisation of the soil led to it becoming not only the flesh but also the soul

---

<sup>121</sup> A. Kapliev. Konservatizm v XXI veke: "proryv k zvezdam". URL: [https://fictionbook.ru/author/andreyi\\_sergeevich\\_kapliev/doktrina\\_kosmizma/read\\_online.html?page=8&ysclid=laxyieb1s3112218754](https://fictionbook.ru/author/andreyi_sergeevich_kapliev/doktrina_kosmizma/read_online.html?page=8&ysclid=laxyieb1s3112218754) (Date of access: 13.04.2023)

<sup>122</sup> Muzhaylova E. A. Tipologiya pochvennichestva: F.M. Dostoevskii i M. A. Osorgin // Vestnik Bashkirskogo universiteta. 2008. T. 13. №1. P. 93.

of the world. And the multivalent image of 'soil' becomes a symbol of Russian national culture..."<sup>123</sup>

Dostoevsky, Osorgin, whom Muzhailova classifies as a neopochvennik, and Solzhenitsyn, whose publicism will be discussed in more detail in the third chapter, believe that soil is something intimate that can "rebirth mankind for the better, almost like making people out of beasts"<sup>124</sup>.

The negative attitude of the pochvenniks and their followers - neo pochvenniks – to scientific and technological progress seems quite understandable. In Dostoevsky's "Diary of the Writer" we find: "Well, and all these railways, all these banks, associations, credits - all this, in my opinion, is only a waste for the time being.... The nation, in its great majority, must sprout on the ground, on the soil on which bread and trees grow. And the European proletarians are now all pavement"<sup>125</sup>.

The theme of progress, which destroys the earth and nature as something divine and not made by man, was realised by Solzhenitsyn in the cycle of literature and publicistic miniatures "Krohotki". In one of them he describes a little duckling as a divine creation that cannot be reproduced thanks to the achievements of progress: "And we - we will soon fly to Venus. If we all put our heads together, we could plough the whole world in twenty minutes. But never! - Never, with all our atomic power, will we make up in a flask, and even if we are given feathers and bones, we will not mount this weightless, pathetic yellow duckling..."<sup>126</sup>

Another small krohotka, "Lake Segden", shows how people ruin the beauty of the land for their own sake. Describing the beautiful Segden Lake, Solzhenitsyn notes that people have bought the land and are thoughtless and callous with its riches: "...the slant-eyed scoundrel has seized the lake: there's his dacha, his bathing houses. The little villains are catching fish, beating ducks from the boat. First there is blue smoke over the lake, then a gunshot. <...> And here, so that nobody interferes with them - the roads are closed, here fish and game are bred especially for them. Here are the traces: someone

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibid. P. 93.

<sup>124</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 474.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid. P. 474.

<sup>126</sup> Solzhenicyn A.I. Sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 1. M.: Vremya, 2007. P. 536.

made a fire, which was first extinguished and then thrown out"<sup>127</sup>. In the finale of the fragment, the image of the lake and the ruined homeland grows into the image of the motherland, which can also perish in the hands of thoughtless people.

We agree with Muzhaylova that the negative attitude of *pochvenniks* of different centuries towards technical progress is directly related to people's distance from nature, their detachment from the land: "The total urbanisation of the state is taking place, people stop noticing the beauty of the surrounding living world and do not really need it"<sup>128</sup>. For Solzhenitsyn, such a detachment from the soil is a tragedy that can lead to the loss of national culture and memory, and a decline in morality. Solzhenitsyn reflected on this, for example, in the *krohotki* "Ashes of a Poet", "Journey on the Oka". They show the oblivion of traditions of a sacred attitude to the land, oblivion of respect for ancestors and faith.

In another scientific article, E.A. Muzhaylova sums up what unites the *psochvenniks* and the *neopochvenniks*, noting the innovativeness of new century<sup>129</sup>. A more complete picture of the development of Russian *pochvennichestvo* is provided by historical and comparative analysis: the researcher considers the transformation of the ideas of *pochvenniks* in different centuries.

The time causes the authors to worry about the new economic and political conditions. Muzhailova describes the critical attitude of the *neopochvenniks* towards the processes of globalisation: "The law of 'natural selection', Social Darwinism, takes the 'homeland' beyond human (social) values. There is the World Trade Organisation, the international market, globalisation, the pan-European and even world educational space"<sup>130</sup>. These and other global processes force people to live not national but universal interests, alienate them from their homeland, national traditions and culture. It is therefore understandable that the *neopochvenniks* want to protect the country from the global race, solve internal moral problems, restore national culture and faith.

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibid. C. 534.

<sup>128</sup> Muzhaylova E. A. *Tipologiya pochvennichestva ...* P. 95.

<sup>129</sup> Muzhaylova E. A. *Neopochvennichestvo: preemstvennost' i novatorstvo // Sotsial'no-gumanitarnye znaniya.* 2007. №9. P. 272–280.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid. P. 273.

Solzhenitsyn's "Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union" and "Repentance and Restraint as Categories of National Life", for example, are about this theme. The author notes that Russia has long been engaged in a "spectacularly useless space race",<sup>131</sup> producing weapons and expanding its influence in Eastern Europe. However, he is not named in the researcher's work. According to Solzhenitsyn, the Russian people are tired of global rivalry. For Solzhenitsyn, the way out of this global race and the blind imitation of Western technological progress is to be found in the proximity to the soil. He recommends the development of the north-eastern territories. It is the land, as the main wealth of Russia, that will make it possible "not to destroy Russia in the crisis of Western civilisation"<sup>132</sup>.

As we noted in the last paragraph, pochvenniks of 19<sup>th</sup> century argued for the need to 'return' the intelligentsia to the peasantry. The era of Peter the Great widened the gap between the peasants and the educated Russian society, which aspired to Western European models of development and forgot its own language, culture and traditions. A century later, the idea of the importance of appealing to national origins remains, but after the levelling of social boundaries during the 1917 revolution, the idea of dividing society into "the peasantry" and "the intelligentsia" gradually lost its relevance. Pochvenniks of the new century are looking for another criterion of closeness to the "soil", the native land. For them, it is the ability to be guided primarily by national rather than universal global interests, the connection with the culture, traditions and language of the people.

Pochvenniks and neopochvenniks are united by the idea of the necessity of faith in God. However, while in the 19<sup>th</sup> century the religious crisis in Russian society was just beginning, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century the state publicly criticised faith, destroyed churches and persecuted believers. Neopochvenniks often do not proclaim the importance of returning to faith directly, but emphasise the terrible consequences of unbelief.

Muzhailova also identifies a criterion that distinguishes twentieth-century pochvenniks from their predecessors. According to the researcher, this criterion can be

---

<sup>131</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika: v 3 t.* T.1. Yaroslavl': Verhne-Volzh. kn. izd-vo, 1995. P. 164.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.* P. 163.



seen as a more critical attitude towards Western culture and Westerners in Russia. Nineteenth-century pochvenniks did not deny the merits of Western civilisation, but insisted that the adoption of any Western patterns should not be thoughtless and should be tested by the Russian mentality. According to Muzhailova, the neopochvenniks accuse modern Westerners of being guided not by Christian values but by freedom, which in Western culture begins to border on arbitrariness<sup>133</sup>.

Thus, despite the fact that the term "neopochvennichestvo" is rarely found in scientific discourse, a number of researchers have begun to understand the characteristics of the pochvennichestvo of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. Despite its metaphorical, complex and contradictory nature, the idea of "soil" and the return to the native land, the people's return to their roots, is becoming relevant for the revival of the moral image of the country and for the unification of the nation.

In its spirit, neopochvennichestvo, like pochvennichestvo in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, can be described as a direction of Russian conservative thought. The very name of the movement "neopochvennichestvo" refers to the ideas of its nineteenth-century predecessors. Indeed, it is necessary to note the continuity of a number of ideas. However, new socio-political, economic and cultural changes could not but be reflected in the views of Dostoevsky's followers. In a comparative table, we will attempt to summarise the ideas that unite the pochvenniks and the neopochvenniks, and what is the innovation of the thinkers of new century (Application 1).

It is important to note that the attitude of the pochvenniks of the new century towards strong state power has hardly been considered by researchers, so it is not reflected in this comparative table; however, in the third chapter, related to the analysis of Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's publicism, such an important concept of Russian conservative thought as reliance on strong state power will be analysed.

So, to summarise the first chapter of the study:

1) In all conservative concepts, regardless of their national character, we can identify the following: anti-rationalism, reliance on orthodox religion, anthropological pessimism, the cult of the strong state power, the desire to preserve historical tradition.

---

<sup>133</sup> Muzhaylova E. A. Neopochvennichestvo ... P. 274.

On the basis of these common features, it is possible to distinguish conservative concepts according to their national characteristics.

2) The origin of conservatism in Russia occurred in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century after the forced reforms of Peter the Great. At that time, conservative ideology was perceived as opposition to the state. The full formation of the concept of conservatism occurred in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when newspapers and journals became an important "platform" for discussion.

3) The state began to adopt conservative ideology from the time of Catherine the Great. During the reign of Nicholas I, conservative ideas became the basis of the official state ideology. During the years of liberal reforms of Alexander II, the ideas of Russian conservatism were actively developed in Russian literature and journalism.

4) Since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, three key concepts have stood out in Russian conservative thought: the Orthodoxy, the Autocracy and the Nationality. All of them are inseparable and capable of uniting society and ensuring Russia's political, economic, cultural and religious sovereignty.

5) The ideas of *pochvennichestvo* can be considered as Russian conservative thought. *Pochvennichestvo* is not only a literary movement, but also a philosophical and socio-political concept.

6) Many of Dostoyevsky's ideas were not understood by his contemporaries, but were updated in the publicism of twentieth-century writers. The project of the intellectuals' "return" to the people, to the "soil", and the messianic "Russian idea" refer in part to the ideas of the Slavophiles. Nevertheless, *pochvennichestvo* was an independent concept that corresponded to the spirit of the times.

7) The concept of "neopochvennichestvo" is still poorly researched, but since the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century it has been found in scientific discourse. This movement is also conservative. At the same time, the *Pochvenniks* of the new century are rethinking a number of their predecessors' ideas in the light of new socio-political and economic realities.

8) Solzhenitsyn's figure is complex and contradictory. Researchers who consider his work in comparison with Dostoevsky's ideas have placed him closer to both

"peasant" writers and traditionalists. However, a significant part of Solzhenitsyn's publicism develops the themes of pochvennichestvo begun by his predecessor Dostoevsky. Part of the creative heritage of both authors can be seen in the context of the development of Russian pochvennichestvo and ideas of conservatism.

**CHAPTER II. DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION OF THE  
POLITICAL AND SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL VIEWS OF  
F. M. DOSTOEVSKY AND A. I. SOLZHENITSYN:  
SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES**

**2.1. Evolution of F. M. Dostoevsky's political and socio-philosophical views**

The biography of F.M. Dostoevsky has been studied deeply and in detail. It is not the aim of our study to describe all the significant moments in the writer's life. However, some aspects are important in connection with the subject of the PhD thesis. It is necessary to understand how the political and socio-philosophical views of the thinker were formed, how he came to conservatism.

Dostoyevsky's world view was formed under the influence of many factors. Among them, the family upbringing in his childhood, social contacts in his youth and adulthood, reading Russian and foreign literature are of particular importance. In addition, punishment and communication with ordinary people played an important role in the formation of the writer's views.

F. M. Dostoevsky was born in 1821 in Moscow, in an annex of the Mariinsky Hospital for the Poor. A special role in Fyodor Mikhailovich's life was played by his brother Mikhail, who supported many of his brother's creative and publishing activities. Speaking of Dostoyevsky's family, we can say that it was patriarchal, the children were brought up in a strict way and rarely left the hospital. A harsh and strict atmosphere influenced the future writer. However, Dostoyevsky interacted not only with his strict father, but also with his nanny, Alyona Frolovna, who played an important role in his upbringing. She can be compared to Arina Rodionovna for Pushkin. Dostoyevsky remembered his nanny with the same tenderness and love, from her he heard his first fairy tales and saw in her the simplicity and nobility of a peasant.

The family spent their summers in the village of Darovoye in Tula province. Conversations with ordinary people remained in Dostoyevsky's memory for a long time and even became the basis for future works. Thus, there are interesting childhood

memories in the "Diary of the Writer" Dostoyevsky describes the ploughman Marey who calmed little Fedya, who seemed to be being chased by a wolf<sup>134</sup>. The author writes: "The meeting took place in a secluded place, in an empty field, and only God, perhaps, saw from above what a deep and enlightened human feeling and what a subtle, almost feminine tenderness could fill the heart of another coarse, brutally ignorant Russian peasant, who did not yet expect, did not even suspect his freedom"<sup>135</sup>. Such childhood memories of the nanny, the peasant Marey, will help Dostoyevsky in his mature years to prove in the pages of the "Diary of the Writer" that in the peasantry there is not only backwardness and rudeness, but also a desire for high moral ideals.

Dostoyevsky's mother, Maria Feodorovna, was a religious woman who took her children to church and read them the Old and New Testaments. "I come from a pious Russian family. We in our household knew the Gospel almost from childhood <...> Every visit to the Kremlin and the cathedrals of Moscow was something solemn,"- wrote the author in the "Diary of the Writer"<sup>136</sup>. In addition to religious readings in his parents' house, Dostoyevsky listened to the "History of the State of Russia" by N.M. Karamzin, poems of G.R. Derzhavin, V.A. Zhukovsky, A.S. Pushkin. Pushkin's work particularly influenced the young Dostoyevsky, who felt the poet's death as a personal grief.

In 1837 his father took Fyodor and his brother Mikhail to St. Petersburg to continue their education. At first they were sent to K.F. Kostomarov's boarding school. And from 1838 they were educated at the Main Engineering School. F.M. Dostoyevsky was a rather reclusive person, and during his studies he suffered from loneliness and the military atmosphere, which was alien to his interests. And it was literature that really interested the future writer. In his youth Dostoyevsky read, apart from Russian authors, E. Hoffmann, W. Scott, J. Sand, V. Hugo. It was during his university years that Dostoyevsky's first literary ideas were born. In 1841 he read extracts from his dramatic

---

<sup>134</sup> Dostoyevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 257.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid. P. 257.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid. P. 201.

works, and as early as 1837 the future writer had the idea of writing a novel about life in Venice.

After graduating from school and joining the St. Petersburg engineering team, Dostoevsky resigned within a year and, starting from 1844, dedicated himself to the field of literature. He translated Balzac's works and also wrote the novel 'The Poor People', which became his successful debut in the literary world.

Dostoevsky's social life had a significant impact on the development of his views. It is possible to divide Dostoevsky's social life into two periods, which correspond to the reigns of two emperors from different epochs. The first period is associated with the onset of Dostoevsky's creative work during the 1840s in Russia. The 1830s and 1840s were a period of strict censorship, which was a response by Nicholas I to the Decembrist uprising. As a result of the Decembrist uprising, the emperor developed suspicion towards intellectuals and the educated, as well as towards various secret meetings and societies. The emperor's fear of revolutions and conspiracies resulted in the imposition of an extremely strict regime, which was so severe that the last years of his reign became known as the "Seven Dark Years".

At the same time, in the 1840s there were still a large number of informal groups in Russia studying the heritage of European thinkers. They undoubtedly had a significant influence on the formation of the writer's views: "Reading the novels of J. Sand, and then the groups of Belinsky and Petrashevsky, sharpened in Dostoevsky's mind the social-democratic problematics, acquainted him with the latest utopian theories"<sup>137</sup>.

Participants in the Petrashevsky meetings actively studied the ideas of French utopian socialism of Saint-Simon and Fourier, who proposed "projects of a new socio-political order, free from exploitation and inequality"<sup>138</sup>. S.S. Surovtsev notes that Dostoevsky initially believed that "social tensions in society can be reduced by

---

<sup>137</sup> Sedel'nikova O. V. Formirovanie pochvennicheskikh vzglyadov v mirovozzrenii rannego Dostoevskogo // Vest. Tomsk. gos. un-ta. 1999. P. 45.

<sup>138</sup> Vititnev S.F., Shmeleva A.V. Evolyuciya i idejnye osobennosti social'no-politicheskikh vozzrenij F.M. Dostoevskogo // Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta. 2021. № 3. P. 47.

propaganda and the introduction into public consciousness of utopian ideas of socialism with elements of Christianity"<sup>139</sup>. It is important to understand that Dostoyevsky in his younger years tried to understand socialism through moral values and even brought the ideas of utopian socialism closer to Christianity.

Dostoyevsky repeatedly recalled his participation in Petrashevsky's group in his the "Diary of the Writer", noting that the Petrashevskyites were "infected" with ideas "about the immorality of religion and the family; <...> about the destruction of nationalities in the name of universal brotherhood"<sup>140</sup>. Fascinated by utopian socialism, Dostoyevsky believed that socio-political problems could be solved by reorganising society.

Dostoyevsky's views were greatly influenced by his communication with V. G. Belinsky, as well as with A. I. Herzen and N. P. Ogarev. The writer first met Herzen in 1846, and in 1862 he travelled to London to meet the publisher of "The Kolokol". In his "Diary of the Writer" in 1873, Dostoyevsky recalls Herzen as a "nobleman and citizen of the world"<sup>141</sup> who broke off relations with "Russian soil and Russian truth"<sup>142</sup>. At the same time, the writer emphasised Herzen's virtues: "He was an artist, a thinker, a brilliant writer, an extremely well-read man, a wit, an amazing conversationalist (he spoke even better than he wrote) and a magnificent reflector"<sup>143</sup>.

In 1849, members of Petrashevsky's group were arrested. Among them was Dostoyevsky, who publicly read Belinsky's letter to Gogol, which later became a kind of "manifesto" of revolutionary democrats in Russia. The spread of such ideas in Russia was particularly frightening to the authorities against the background of revolutionary events in Europe. The Petrashevtsy trial has been studied by many researchers. Among them the works of N.F. Belchikov<sup>144</sup>, I.L. Volgin<sup>145</sup> are especially significant.

---

<sup>139</sup> Surovtsev S. S. Razvitie i stanovlenie filosofskikh vzglyadov F. M. Dostoevskogo // Vestnik Murmanskogo gos. tekhnicheskogo un-ta. 2008. T. 11. №1. P. 49.

<sup>140</sup> Dostoyevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 196.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid. P. 47.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid. P. 47.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid. P. 48.

<sup>144</sup> Bel'chikov N.F. Dostoyevskij v processe petrashevcev. M.: Nauka, 1971. - 294 p.

<sup>145</sup> Volgin I.L. Propavshij zagovor: Dostoyevskij i politicheskij process 1849 g. M.: Liberiya, 2000. - 703 p.

In his novel "The Idiot", Dostoyevsky describes how he felt before his execution: "He was dying at the age of twenty-seven, healthy and strong; <...> Not far away was a church, and the top of the cathedral, with its gilded roof, glistened in the bright sun. He remembered that he looked at this roof and the rays shining from it with a terrible persistence; he could not tear himself away from the rays: it seemed to him that these rays were his new nature, that in three minutes he would somehow merge with them"<sup>146</sup>. However, the execution did not take place: instead, he was sentenced to four years of hard labour in the Omsk Ostrog, followed by service in the Siberian Linear Battalion.

The years of hard labour provided Dostoyevsky with a unique experience of moral rebirth. The thinker associated this not so much with his imprisonment as with his gradual recognition of the Russian peasantry. Thus we read in "The Diary of the Writer": "Not the years of exile, not the suffering broke us <...> No, something else changed our views, our convictions and our hearts. <...> This something else was the direct contact with the people, the fraternal bond with them in a common misery, the idea that I had become like them..."<sup>147</sup>. The childhood memories of the ploughman Marey described above, which also appear in "The Diary of the Writer", also come to Dostoevsky during the hard labour. This "contact" with the peasantry, these memories of the bright beginnings of the people's soul, would later allow the writer to formulate the ideas of Pochvennichestvo.

The second significant period of Dostoevsky's social work and the development of his socio-political and philosophical ideas commenced upon his return from Siberia. Following the demise of Nicholas I, Dostoevsky requested permission to return to the European part of the country. In 1859, he returned to St. Petersburg. Hereditary nobility was reinstated to him by Alexander II. During this second period of his career, Dostoevsky's literary, journalistic, and publishing abilities started to flourish.

The social and political activities of M. Dostoevsky were generally varied. Following a period of hard labour in the 1860s, Dostoyevsky became actively involved in publishing. In collaboration with his brother, Mikhail, he published the journals

---

<sup>146</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 8. L.: Nauka, 1973. P. 52.

<sup>147</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 200.



"Vremya" and then "Epocha". He worked with V.P. Meshchersky's journal "Grazhdanin", in which appeared notes published as a separate column under the title "Diary of the Writer" (1873). Then "The Writer's Diary" became a mono-journal and a successful publishing project.

Dostoevsky actively communicated with other writers, including I. S. Turgenev, I. A. Goncharov, N. S. Leskov, and Y. P. Polonsky. After the writer's return from hard labour he had rather tense relations with N. A. Nekrasov because of the refusal of Nekrasov to publish the work "The Village of Stepanchikovo and its Inhabitants" in "Sovremennik". The difficulties of relations between Dostoevsky and Nekrasov became the subject of research by M. M. Gin<sup>148</sup>.

It is important to emphasise Dostoevsky's communication with those authors who are considered his associates and participated in his publishing projects. First of all, these are Ap. Grigoriev and N. N. Strakhov. The writer's communication was not limited to contacts with writers. Dostoevsky also engaged in a dialogue with his readers, creating a unique precedent of feedback in the "Diary of the Writer": in many editions we can find answers to readers' letters. The writer also spoke in public to various audiences, including members of the royal family. His most famous speech, however, was the "Pushkin Speech" of 1880, published in the "Diary of the Writer".

The social life of F.M. Dostoevsky has been studied by many researchers. Among their works we can mention the monograph of V.A. Tvardovskaya<sup>149</sup>. Dostoevsky's publishing activity was studied by V.S. Nechaeva, who devoted her research to the magazines "Vremya"<sup>150</sup> and "Épokha"<sup>151</sup>. I.L. Volgin devoted a great deal of research to Dostoevsky's "The Diary of the Writer"<sup>152</sup>.

---

<sup>148</sup> Gin M. M. Dostoevskii i Nekrasov: Dva mirovozzreniia. Petrozavodsk: Kareliia, 1985. - 184 p.

<sup>149</sup> Tvardovskaya V. A. Dostoevskii v obshchestvennoi zhizni Rossii (1861-1881). M.: Nauka, 1990. - 336 p.

<sup>150</sup> Nechaeva V. S. Zhurnal M. M. i F. M. Dostoevskikh "Vremya". 1864–1863. M.: Nauka, 1972. - 316 p.

<sup>151</sup> Nechaeva V. S. Zhurnal M. M. i F. M. Dostoevskikh "Épokha". 1864–1865. M.: Nauka, 1975. - 302 p.

<sup>152</sup> Volgin I.L. Nравstvennye osnovy publicistiki Dostoevskogo: Vostochnyj vopros v "Dnevnikе pisatelya" // Izvestiya AN SSSR. Seriya literatury i yazyka. 1971. Vyp. 4. Tom XXX. P. 312–322. Volgin I.L. Dostoevskij i carskaya cenzura: K istorii izdaniya "Dnevnika pisatelya" // Russkaya literatura. 1970. № 4. P. 106–120.

It is very difficult to assess Dostoevsky's work and unambiguously place it within the strict framework of a particular movement. The author's complicated life path and gradual transformation of his views complicate the task of researchers. We wrote about this difficulty in one of our articles on the topic of the PhD thesis: "A Christian thinker capable of inspiring apologia of war, a member of Petrashevsky's group, and the author of "Besi" - an unambiguous image has not been formed. The only more or less definite designation that has stuck to Dostoevsky is a Pochvennik"<sup>153</sup>.

The concept of "soil ", discussed in detail in the last chapter of the research, became an important constant in Dostoevsky's world view after his return from hard labour. A.A. Vasiliev highlights several stages in the history of Pochvennichestvo connected with the publishing and journalistic activities of F.M. Dostoevsky and his associates:

1. According to Vasiliev, the first ideas of Pochvennichestvo begin to take shape in the editorship of the journal *Moskvityanin*. Among them, the researcher notes the ideals of nationality and criticism of Western ideology. After "*Moskvityanin*" was closed down, many of its staff members joined the journal "*Vremya*", published by the Dostoyevsky brothers.
2. At A. Milyukov's literary meetings, a group of like-minded people gradually formed: A.A. Grigoriev, N.N. Strakhov, the Dostoevsky brothers. Vasiliev considers the years 1858-1861 to be the most important period when Pochvennichestvo was fully formed as an ideological and literary movement. The first publications of the Pochvenniks appeared in 1860 in Milyukov's journal "*Svetoch*".
3. Development of the programme of Pochvennichestvo. The period of publication of the journals "*Vremya*" (1861-1863) and "*Epokha*" (1864-1865). Among the main themes of the journals, Vasiliev mentions: the

---

Volgin I.L. "Dnevnik pisatelya": tekst i kontekst // Dostoevskij: materialy i issledovaniya. 1978. № 3. P. 151–158.

Volgin I.L. Poverh bar'erov. Zagadka "Dnevnika pisatelya" // Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya: v 2 t. T.1. M.: Knizhnyj klub, 2011. P. 5–40.

<sup>153</sup> Kruglikova O. S., Shapovalova (Kul'ko) K. A. Op. cit. P. 104.

peasantry and the intelligentsia, the moral crisis of Western civilisation, responsiveness to the world, the receptivity of the national soul and character, and Orthodoxy. The ideas of the Pochvenniks were close to many lesser-known authors, among whom we can mention D. Averkiev, V. Krestovsky, A. E. Razin, P. P. Sokalsky, A. P. Shchapov, and a number of former contributors to the journal "Moskvityanin".

4. The closure of "Vremya" and "Epokha", the death of Mikhail Dostoevsky and Apollon Grigoriev, the Dostoevsky and Strakhov controversy. In Vasiliev's opinion, after these events, Pochvennichestvo gradually faded away, the direction disintegrated.

It should be noted that Dostoyevsky lost many like-minded people, but in our opinion we cannot say that the writer abandoned his ideas. Until his death, Dostoyevsky wrote about issues of pochvennichestvo in his unique mono-journal the "Diary of the Writer".

As we noted in the first chapter, the Pochvenniks did not call themselves by this name; it was later adopted by these thinkers. Like many other writers and philosophers, Dostoyevsky did not claim to belong to any particular school of thought. In a study on the subject of PhD thesis, we noted that "when studying complex phenomena, we sometimes tend, for the sake of ease of thought, to group them into some more or less conventional clusters, based on the similarity of a few of the most striking features"<sup>154</sup>. When we consider the complex formation of the views of writers and publicists, "the perception of them is inevitably simplified, the 'ideological periphery' is reduced and the main points of their concept are presented more clearly"<sup>155</sup>.

A thinker can be a person whose scope of work is clearly broader than the framework of a single movement, a label often used by researchers to designate a particular author. It is undeniable, for example, that Dostoyevsky has been called a

---

<sup>154</sup> Ibid. P. 103.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid. P. 103–104.

"pochvennik" in academic discourse. However, the scope of this author's work is so enormous that, in our opinion, it would be more correct to say that it is not Dostoevsky who is part of the movement of Pochvennichestvo, but that the Pochvennichestvo is only a part of the complex and sometimes contradictory work of the 19th-century writer and publicist.

However, within the framework of our research we deliberately did not study all the ideas of Dostoevsky's publicism, which would be impossible within the framework of a PhD thesis. We have focused our attention on the author's conservative ideas, on the second period of his work (the reign of Alexander II, Dostoevsky's return to St. Petersburg after his imprisonment, and the publication of the monojournal the "Diary of the Writer").

## **2.2. Development and transformation of political and socio-philosophical ideas of A. I. Solzhenitsyn**

Solzhenitsyn's biography and work have been the subject of many studies. As in the case of Dostoevsky's biography, we shall consider only a few features of the writer's life that are important in the context of our analysis and that influenced the formation of Solzhenitsyn's political and socio-philosophical ideas. In the context of the study, it is particularly important to understand the author's path to conservatism.

Like Dostoyevsky, Solzhenitsyn's worldview was shaped by many factors. When considering the origins of Solzhenitsyn's worldview, researchers give special attention to the writer's life experiences and the influence of surrounding on him. G.P. Zhidkov, for example, believes that Solzhenitsyn viewed socio-political reality through "gulag glasses"<sup>156</sup>. However, the origins of the writer's worldview are much deeper and more complex. We agree with Daniel J. Mahoney's position: "Solzhenitsyn's creativity is

---

<sup>156</sup> Zhidkov G. P. "Krasnoe koleso" A. Solzhenitsyna glazami istorika // Otechestvennaia istoriia. 1994. № 4–5. P. 216– 221.

rooted in his life experience, but it is by no means limited to that experience or to the author's personality"<sup>157</sup>.

In his speeches, interviews and publications, Solzhenitsyn often referred to his family and childhood experiences, which had a profound influence on his world view. Solzhenitsyn was born on 11 December 1918. As he recalled, he was born "in the shadow of the revolution"<sup>158</sup>. He was brought up by his mother; his father was no longer alive at the time of Solzhenitsyn's birth. The early childhood of the future writer was in many ways spent under the care of his mother's relatives - the Shcherbakov family. The grandfather and grandmother took the child to church. Solzhenitsyn's first childhood memories were of the Chekists, who broke into the church without warning. He recalled this at a press conference in London on 11 May 1983: "I was brought up in the Christian Orthodox faith. The first, really the first memory I have in my life: I was lifted by my hands by adults during the church mass, so that I could see several Chekists, wearing such pointed hats, walking through the church full of people, of course without taking them off, as it should be in church, stomping on the altar and starting to take away sacred objects"<sup>159</sup>.

The relationship in the family and Solzhenitsyn's upbringing has been analysed by many researchers, among whom it is necessary to highlight L. Saraskina<sup>160</sup>. She notes that the writer's childhood was spent in sincere Orthodox faith and prayer. However, Solzhenitsyn remembered with particular sharpness the feeling of "dangerous instability, life's disadvantage"<sup>161</sup>. The family really lived in constant fear of reprisals. Until the age of fifteen or so, the future writer was an opponent of atheism and communism. He was repeatedly persecuted for his Orthodox faith: "In my youth I experienced great persecution in connection with my belief in God. When my mother took me to church, schoolchildren led by Komsomol members would follow us and then

---

<sup>157</sup> Makhoni D. Dzh. Solzhenitsyn-myslitel' / per. s angl. E. A. Shcherbakova // Solzhenitsyn: Myslitel', istorik, khudozhnik. Zapadnaya kritika: 1974–2008. M., 2010. P. 31.

<sup>158</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T. 3. P. 195.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid. P. 107.

<sup>160</sup> Saraskina L. I. Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh. M.: Russkii put', 2006. - 608 p.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid. P. 548.

organise meetings - I was tried for this. And there was a time when they forcibly removed my cross from my neck"<sup>162</sup>.

For a long time young Solzhenitsyn had to resist the Soviet upbringing, which he could not accept inwardly. But gradually "childlike piety and prayerful faith were rudely driven out of the life of Solzhenitsyn, a pre-schooler, schoolboy and student"<sup>163</sup>. The painful ambivalence of his views on childhood and youth was reflected in the autobiographical poem "Dorozhenka":

"My aunt used to take me to church.  
and interpreted the Gospel.  
"Fight for the World October!" - we shouted in excitement...  
We shouted at the pioneer bonfires..... -  
An officer's George buried in the ground.  
Father's George and Anna's sword.  
Hot fire, pale lampade,  
I grew up confused, difficult, double-edged"<sup>164</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn really had to live with "two truths": in his soul he tried to combine the Orthodox faith of his childhood, brought up by his family, and the revolutionary spirit that was increasingly influencing the consciousness of Soviet schoolchildren and students. Solzhenitsyn graduated from school with a gold medal and was admitted to the Rostov State University, Faculty of Physics and Mathematics. Before the Great Patriotic War, he managed to complete two courses at the MIFLI correspondence department, gaining experience in the creative synthesis of humanitarian and scientific thought.

Turning to some of the facts from the biography that changed the future writer's views. In an interview for the magazine "Der Spiegel" on 9 October 1987, Solzhenitsyn stated: "Until I was about 17 years old, I considered myself completely opposed to this system, this state"<sup>165</sup>. In his student days, however, the future writer was fascinated by

<sup>162</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T. 3. P. 107.

<sup>163</sup> Saraskina L. I. Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh ... P. 549.

<sup>164</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 18. M.: Vremya, 2016. P. 39.

<sup>165</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T. 3. P. 319.

the ideas of Marxism, revolutionary theory. Marxism was, in many ways, what Solzhenitsyn needed as a kind of anchor for understanding Russia's lofty, world-embracing goal. The practical side of Marxism was almost unknown to the young Solzhenitsyn: "He saw in the new doctrine not a means (of employment, advancement, well-being, prosperity) but a goal - supreme, ultimate, all-conquering"<sup>166</sup>.

The Great Patriotic War, in which Solzhenitsyn took part, was in many ways the beginning of his liberation from the moral "captivity" of ideology. The future writer went to the front and continued to believe in the ideals of the revolution. At the same time, he allowed himself to be sharply critical of Stalin and the Soviet state in general. His dangerous correspondence with his friend N. Vitkevich was the reason for his arrest.

Like Dostoevsky, Solzhenitsyn was greatly influenced by the arrest and years of imprisonment. Then before the future writer opens the "underside" of life in the USSR. Thus, in "The Gulag Archipelago" we find: "All writers who wrote about prison, but did not sit there, considered it their duty to express sympathy for the prisoners, and the prison to curse. I have been there enough, I have grown my soul there, and I say adamantly: - Bless you, prison, that you have been in my life!"<sup>167</sup>. In the context of such reflections Solzhenitsyn recalls F. M. Dostoevsky, who was on penal servitude, and even the regrets of L. N. Tolstoy that he was not deprived of freedom.

Solzhenitsyn insisted that if he had not been arrested, he would not have understood his own duties as a writer: "If I had not been imprisoned, I too would have become a kind of writer in the Soviet Union, but I would not have appreciated my true tasks or the true situation in the country, and I would not have received that hardening, those special abilities to stand firm and conspire, which it is camp and prison life that produces"<sup>168</sup>.

P. E. Spivakovsky rightly remarks that for a real writer, imprisonment allows him "to overcome all social barriers and 'authentically' understand the peasants' way of life

---

<sup>166</sup> Saraskina L. I. Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh ... P. 553.

<sup>167</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch.* v 30 t. T. 5. M.: Vremya, 2010. P. 497.

<sup>168</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika* ... T. 2. P. 262-263.

and worldview"<sup>169</sup>. According to the researcher, imprisonment allowed writers to fruitfully combine two worldviews: that of the peasantry and that of the intelligentsia. This was emphasised by Dostoyevsky, who was in prison, in his "Diary of the Writer", and the same happened with Solzhenitsyn.

The time in captivity, as well as ideological disputes with other prisoners, proved to Solzhenitsyn that his "beliefs are not firmly established, are not based on anything, cannot stand up to argument"<sup>170</sup>. In one of the interviews, Solzhenitsyn admitted that during his imprisonment he began to return to what he had given up - the Orthodox faith, which gradually became, as he confessed, the basis of his worldview. However, being in prison also leads to disillusionment with communist ideology. Combined with the gradual return of previously lost faith, this would help the writer and publicist to criticise communism in different countries. However, the heightened national feeling will push to write primarily about the Russian people, who voluntarily accepted communism. Daniel J. Mahoney, a foreign researcher of Solzhenitsyn's biography and creativity, calls the writer a moral philosopher and historian who reveals the terrible essence of the Soviet regime<sup>171</sup>. A significant part of Solzhenitsyn's publicistic works about the fate of Russia and its people appeared in the years of his emigration from 1974 to 1994.

Important biographical moments include the Nobel Prize for Literature (1970), the publication of *The Gulag Archipelago* in the West, the withdrawal of Soviet citizenship in 1974 and deportation from the USSR, years of intense creative work and numerous speeches. Solzhenitsyn lived in exile until 1994, when he returned to Russia.

In this way we can see the transformation of Solzhenitsyn's socio-political, philosophical and religious views. He goes through a difficult path from childhood piety and Orthodox faith to the abandonment of these ideals and a fascination with communism. Then prison and communication with other prisoners changed the writer's

---

<sup>169</sup> Spivakovskii P. E. Op. cit. P. 64.

<sup>170</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T. 3. P. 337.

<sup>171</sup> Makhoni D. Dzh. Op. cit. P. 30–47.



views again. After a period of delusion and false fascination with communist ideals, he returns to Orthodoxy, but more consciously.

However, as we have already mentioned, the origins of Solzhenitsyn's worldview are not only connected with his life experience. For example, the artistic origins of the writer's worldview have been studied by L. Saraskina and V. Zakharov. Studies have compared Solzhenitsyn's views with the ideas of L.N. Tolstoy and F.M. Dostoevsky and noted the adherence to the traditions of classical Russian literature. The writer's world view was analysed by such literary critics and publicists as Yu. Niva, D. Sturman, V. Gryaznevich, R. Tempest, Y. Lurie and others. They were also primarily interested in the literary rather than philosophical origins of Solzhenitsyn's worldview. This is why a comparative approach predominates in literary studies: Solzhenitsyn's literary work is compared with that of authors such as Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy and Shalamov. At the same time, Solzhenitsyn's publicism has not been sufficiently analysed in comparison with the ideas of his predecessors and contemporaries.

A. G. Manyae's Ph.D. thesis is devoted to the experience of conceptualising Solzhenitsyn's socio-philosophical views. In the context of our study, however, the historical and philosophical origins of the author's worldview are more important. For example, A.G. Manyae notes that Solzhenitsyn adopted the idea of the nation-personality from the work of N.A. Berdyaev, proving the mystical, non-human nature of both the personality and the nation<sup>172</sup>. In one of Solzhenitsyn's articles we find: "Between the personality and the nation there is the deepest similarity - in the mystical, non-man-made nature of both"<sup>173</sup>.

M. M. Golubkov analysed the historical, philosophical and religious origins of Solzhenitsyn's views. According to the researcher, the writer was significantly influenced by such religious philosophers as N.A. Berdyaev, I.A. Ilyin and V.S. Solovyov<sup>174</sup>. According to A.G. Manyae, Solzhenitsyn's attention was focused on the

---

<sup>172</sup> Manyae A. G. Op. cit.

<sup>173</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T.1. P. 54.

<sup>174</sup> Golubkov M. M. Tvorchestvo A. I. Solzhenitsyna kak itog literaturnogo stoletia //

A. I. Solzhenitsyn i russkaia kul'tura: nauchnye doklady. Saratov: izd-vo Saratovskogo un-ta, 2004. P. 13–23.

national question, which was largely based on the works of V.S. Soloviev. The philosopher analysed the problems of the nation, viewing them "through the prism of humanity's movement towards unity on the basis of Christianity"<sup>175</sup>. Like Dostoyevsky, Solzhenitsyn studied the works of Slavophiles. For example, he was close to A.S. Khomyakov's ideas about inner freedom, which cannot be compared with outer freedom.

A. G. Manyayev considers that Solzhenitsyn's socio-philosophical position can be described as "syncretic". His views synthesise the ideas of existentialism, phenomenology and the Frankfurt School. The researcher notes: "Like the French personalists, the writer, who pays more attention to the individual, nevertheless recognises the primacy of the divine being, which, from his point of view, is the only guarantor of the true autonomy of the individual"<sup>176</sup>. Donald Tredgold, a professor of Russian history, also classifies Solzhenitsyn as a "syncretic thinker"<sup>177</sup>.

A comprehensive approach to the origins of Solzhenitsyn's worldview is needed, taking into account the key facts of the author's biography, the literary, social and philosophical origins of his ideas. As for Solzhenitsyn's socio-political views, researchers have not come to a clear conclusion. The writer has been called a conservative, a liberal, a Slavophile and a monarchist. A. Yanov, for example, believes that many of Solzhenitsyn's ideas are in consonance with the thoughts of the Slavophiles<sup>178</sup>. Daniel J. Mahoney calls Solzhenitsyn a liberal-minded thinker<sup>179</sup>. E. S. Kholmogorov writes about Solzhenitsyn's views as a consistent conservative philosophy<sup>180</sup>.

---

<sup>175</sup> Kudriashev V. Iz istorii obshchestvennoi i istoricheskoi mysli Rossii. Natsiia v sisteme vzgliadov V. S. Solov'eva // Sibirskie istoricheskie issledovaniia. 2014. №3. P. 88.

<sup>176</sup> Manyayev A. G. Op. cit.

<sup>177</sup> Tredgold D. U. Intellektual'nye predshestvenniki Solzhenitsyna // Solzhenitsyn: Myslitel', istorik, khudozhnik. Zapadnaya kritika, 1974–2008. P. 258.

<sup>178</sup> Yanov A. L. Russkaya ideya i 2000 god. N'yu-Iork: Liberty Publ. House, 1988. - 399 p.

<sup>179</sup> Makhoni D. Dzh. Op. cit. P. 30–47.

<sup>180</sup> Kholmogorov E. S. Pominki po poluprosveshcheniyu. "Vekhi", "Iz pod glyb" i ideologiya Solzhenitsyna // Tetradi po konservatizmu. 2017. №4. P. 45–64.

A. G. Manyayev proves in his PhD thesis that Solzhenitsyn's political views are close to the classical version of conservatism<sup>181</sup>. The researcher notes that the writer criticised the philosophy of the Enlightenment with its "ideological brainchild" - liberalism, and also defended the idea of development without revolution. Solzhenitsyn understands that revolutions "destroy only the bearers of evil (and - without haste - the bearers of good), and take the evil itself, even increased, as their inheritance"<sup>182</sup>. In "Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union" we find: "...I must confess that Russian history has made me an opponent of all revolutions and armed upheavals in general <...> Through study I have become convinced that mass bloody revolutions are always disastrous for the peoples among whom they occur"<sup>183</sup>.

While Solzhenitsyn's gradual realisation of the danger of the revolutionary path is quite clear, his criticism of liberalism and democratic freedoms is more complicated. At first sight, Solzhenitsyn writes in his publicist works about the rights of the individual and defends the importance of democratic freedoms. However, it is important to realise that his priority is not the rights of a particular individual, but his responsibilities. Solzhenitsyn believes that the rights of society are more important than personal rights and freedoms. For example, in the article "How We Shall Rebuild Russia" we find: "However, the rights of the individual should not be elevated so high as to overshadow the rights of society"<sup>184</sup>. These ideas do not refer to liberal values, but to the conservative principle of anti-individualism, for which the interests of the whole (nation, state, society) take precedence.

N. A. Khrenov mentions that during the period of Solzhenitsyn's emigration the countries of the West did not expect him to criticise liberalism, but he wrote not only about totalitarianism, but also about liberalism as a danger. "The subject of Solzhenitsyn's criticism was not even liberalism, but something more significant - the whole project of modernity in general, which the West had been pursuing since the 18th

---

<sup>181</sup> Manyayev A. G. Op. cit.

<sup>182</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch.* v 30 t. T. 5. M.: Vremya, 2010. P. 496.

<sup>183</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T.1. P. 179.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.* P. 572-573.

century and which it had imposed on the whole world. But in the 20th century it became clear that this project was utopian and destructive," Khrenov notes<sup>185</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn describes the crisis of liberal values in Western civilisation as "the result of the historical, psychological and moral crisis of the entire cultural and ideological system, which began in the Renaissance and reached its highest formulation with the Enlightenment of the 18<sup>th</sup> century"<sup>186</sup>. In Europe, the cult of earthly prosperity flourished to the detriment of the moral perfection of man. Following the Slavophiles and the Pochvenniks, Solzhenitsyn criticised materialism and irreligious humanism. The highest needs of the individual were excluded from the attention of the state and the social system, and individual freedom became a lack of moral responsibility. In Solzhenitsyn's view, however, a person's task is more important than merely striving for external freedoms and material well-being: "...not for the bread of daily life, not for the best ways of acquiring wealth and then living it cheerfully, but to bear a constant and difficult duty, so that the whole journey of life becomes an experience of moral elevation: to leave life as a higher being than when you began it"<sup>187</sup>. Freedom as a key idea of liberalism is important, according to Solzhenitsyn, but up to a certain limit: "...until it turns into complacency and licentiousness"<sup>188</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn's views can only partly be classified as liberal: he appreciates the ideal of freedom, but at the same time realises that certain political and moral conditions are necessary for the realisation of this freedom for both society and the individual. "The catastrophe of humanistic autonomous irreligious consciousness"<sup>189</sup> Solzhenitsyn contrasts the society in which freedom is present, but it is limited by moral principles, keeping "the inheritance of the Christian centuries with their large reserves of either mercy or sacrifice"<sup>190</sup>. It is important to realise that Solzhenitsyn is not condemning

---

<sup>185</sup> Khrenov N. A. Sud'ba "russkoi idei" v XX veke: A. Solzhenitsyn // Kul'tura kul'tury. 2018. No3 (15). URL: <http://cult-cult.ru/the-fate-of-the-russian-idea-in-the-twentieth-century/> (Date of access: 02.05.2023)

<sup>186</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T.1. P. 152.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid. P. 327.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid. P. 180.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid. P. 326.

<sup>190</sup> Ibid. P. 325.

democratic freedoms as such, but that people's "consciousness of man's responsibility to God and society has faded"<sup>191</sup>.

In an analysis of Solzhenitsyn's complex social and political views, Daniel J. Mahoney notes that he can be described as a liberal-minded conservative who was able to temper "a one-sided concern with issues of individual liberty with a helpful reminder of the moral purposes that should animate responsible human choice"<sup>192</sup>.

The author's political position in his publicism (since the 1970s) can be characterised as conservatism, but in its liberal modification. These views are oriented towards evolutionary transformations with reference to national traditions. The publicist recognised private property, but believed that any activity (including economic activity) should be subordinated to values that are higher and more significant than the rights and freedoms of the individual. As a conservative, Solzhenitsyn wrote about strong state power that should have a moral basis, argued about the dangers of scientific and technological progress, and was critical of the process of urbanisation. In justifying his views, Solzhenitsyn draws on history, uses historical argumentation, and relies on the established traditions of Russian society. The writer and publicist, who followed a difficult path from the adoption of the Orthodox faith to its loss and regaining it, wrote extensively about the terrible consequences of atheism. At the centre of Solzhenitsyn's attention is the national question. He is less concerned with the fate of other countries than with the fate of the Russian people. These themes are discussed in more detail in the third chapter of the PhD thesis.

Liberal conservatism (in other words, a liberal modification of conservatism) is generally relevant and promising for Russia. Such views allow not only to defend the rights of the individual, but also to realise that he or she has responsibilities. However, according to some researchers, including A. G. Manyayev, Solzhenitsyn's neoconservatism takes little account of the realities of modern society and oversimplifies most problems. According to the researcher, Solzhenitsyn's views are even partly utopian.

---

<sup>191</sup> Ibid. P. 325.

<sup>192</sup> Makhoni D. Dzh. Op. cit. P. 44.

E. S. Kholmogorov believes that in his mentality Solzhenitsyn is a man of pre-Soviet Russia, but he does not call the writer's ideas utopian<sup>193</sup>. The researcher considers Solzhenitsyn's gradual approach to conservatism and notes that the ideas of "conservatism" did not destroy in the writer and publicist the respect for freedom and intellectual independence of the individual, which is important to educate in our contemporaries.

Among all conservative concepts, Kholmogorov highlights Solzhenitsyn's ideas about the nation. For the publicist, as for the nineteenth-century pochvenniks, the Russian people and their problems, rather than abstract humanity, were at the centre of attention. According to Kholmogorov, Solzhenitsyn's national feeling became especially acute in the years of emigration. The researcher summarises the writer's attitude to political experiments in Russia: "What multiplies and improves Russian people's life is good, and what does not lead to this main goal is bad"<sup>194</sup>.

According to Kholmogorov, the mature Solzhenitsyn's views represent a consistent conservative philosophy. The publicist supports "a return to God, voluntary self-restraint and self-limitation of the individual, the remembrance of duties instead of rampant 'rights', the priority of inner freedom and the inadmissibility of sacrificing people's lives not only for the sake of totalitarian utopia, but also for the sake of rampant freedom"<sup>195</sup>.

The fact that Solzhenitsyn's ideas are beginning to be considered in the context of the development of Russian pochvennichestvo is largely due to Solzhenitsyn's own frequent references to Dostoevsky's ideas: "The whole tradition of the 19th century has educated us in one way or another. Tolstoy and Dostoevsky have always influenced each of us. <...> And if we talk now about a later age, when moral questions appeared, Dostoevsky puts them sharper, deeper, more modern, more visionary"<sup>196</sup>.

Thus, the contradictory nature of Solzhenitsyn's personality, the facts of his biography, which led the author to abandon certain ideas and return to others, on the

---

<sup>193</sup> Kholmogorov E. S. *Pominki po poluprosveshcheniyu ...* P. 45–64.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.* P. 47.

<sup>195</sup> *Ibid.* P. 47.

<sup>196</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T. 3. P. 445.

contrary, create difficulties for researchers of his artistic and publicistic work. When talking about the origins of Solzhenitsyn's worldview, it is important to adopt a comprehensive approach. Solzhenitsyn's creativity is directly related to his complex biography, but it is not limited to his life experience. An integrated approach should take into account the biographical, literary, social and philosophical origins of the author's worldview.

It is most difficult to unambiguously define the writer's socio-political views. In our opinion, they can only partly be considered liberal. Solzhenitsyn appreciates the ideals of freedom, but understands that for its realisation moral principles, awareness not only of the rights, but also of the responsibilities of the individual and society are important. We consider the ideas of the mature Solzhenitsyn as close to conservatism, but in its liberal modification. It is quite possible to agree with the opinion of P.E. Spivakovsky, who believes that Solzhenitsyn's works cannot be approached from the point of view of a primitive and politicised reading. In the new century, "the intellectual and religious-ethical depth of Solzhenitsyn's texts is becoming increasingly important..."<sup>197</sup> He mentioned that Solzhenitsyn "served justice, God and Russia" and called his patriotism "pochvennicheskii orientated"<sup>198</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn did not consider himself a pochvennik, but many of his ideas are close to the views of these 19th-century Russian conservatives. It is important to realise that, as in the case of Dostoevsky, the scope of Solzhenitsyn's work is so broad that the ideas of the Russian pochvennichestvo can only be described as a part of his multifaceted and complex oeuvre.

---

<sup>197</sup> Spivakovskii P. E. Op. cit. P. 67.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid P. 66.

## 2.3. The biographies and worldviews of F. M. Dostoevsky and

### A. I. Solzhenitsyn: similarities and differences

In the work of writers and publicists who are separated by long periods of time, there are sometimes ideological consistencies. In addition to the reality faced by a particular writer, he or she also deals with previous texts and their authors. The ideas of writers and publicists who lived in different epochs "can enter into a dialogue if they share a common theme or point of view"<sup>199</sup>. This conventional "dialogue" does not always consist of borrowing a series of ideas. Sometimes it is a polemic, sometimes it is an apprenticeship with a wise predecessor.

Because of Solzhenitsyn's reliance on tradition, Dostoyevsky's ideas are present in his work alongside the influence of other authors. Solzhenitsyn noted which authors influenced his world view: "Pushkin, Lermontov, Alexei Tolstoy <...>, Dostoevsky, Leo Tolstoy, Bulgakov, Bunin. I have also learnt from poets, although I am not a poet, there is Akhmatova and Tsvetaeva. I do not see the possibility of listing them all"<sup>200</sup>.

However, among a large number of great predecessors, Solzhenitsyn always singled out two: Leo Tolstoy and F. M. Dostoevsky. After reading "War and Peace", Solzhenitsyn at a young age conceived something similar. Many years later, the "Red Wheel" will appear. However, the formation of moral values was largely associated with the name of Dostoevsky. Thus, in one of the interviews Solzhenitsyn says: "In his spiritual principles, Dostoevsky is much closer to me than Tolstoy"<sup>201</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn stressed that he was close to both classics, but in different ways: "I am closer to Tolstoy in the form of the narrative, in the form of the presentation of the material, in the multitude of characters, in the real circumstances. And I am closer to Dostoyevsky in the effort to show the spiritual, human side of the process of history"<sup>202</sup>. Solzhenitsyn openly acknowledged the influence of his predecessor. In an interview with the newspaper "Le Figaro" on 19 September 1993, he said "I believe in

---

<sup>199</sup> Krokhin N. P., Volkova T. N., Ershova L. V. M. M. Bakhtin o dialogichnosti slova i kul'tury. Gumanitarnye vedomosti TGPU im. L. N. Tolstogo. 2019. № 4 (32). P. 59.

<sup>200</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T. 3. P. 443.

<sup>201</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T. 2. P. 525.

<sup>202</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T. 3. P. 335.



discipleship. In fact, every writer learns from someone and follows someone in some way, not entirely"<sup>203</sup>.

Modern researchers are beginning to consider Solzhenitsyn's ideas in the context of the development of the ideas of *pochvennichestvo*. This is largely due to the frequent reference to the thoughts of Dostoevsky, who raised the same problems that concern Solzhenitsyn in the new century, "sharper, deeper, more modern, more visionary"<sup>204</sup>. Before entering into a comparative analysis of Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's publicism, which contains conservative ideas, it is necessary to justify the admissibility of comparing the work of writers who lived in such different epochs. The idea that it is possible to compare the fates and works of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn is not new. It is based not only on Solzhenitsyn's confession about his discipleship of Dostoevsky.

In 2014, the exhibition "Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn" was organised in St. Petersburg. It was held at the Dostoevsky Literary and Memorial Museum with the support of the Russian Solzhenitsyn Charitable Foundation<sup>205</sup>. The organisers drew attention to the similarity of the writers' destinies and views of the world. They also compared some of their literary ideas, proving that Solzhenitsyn was largely based on the experience of his great predecessor. The organisation of such events proves that modern people have a need to turn to the works of thinkers of the past. When our contemporaries find something in common in their reflections on the people, the way of Russia's development, they can note that some problems remain important for the country for several centuries.

Many researchers have drawn attention to certain similarities in the ideas and fates of the two writers. Among them, for example, V.S. Bushin, V.N. Zakharov, V.G. Krasnov, L.I. Saraskina, A.S. Sashina, N.N. Stupnitskaya. For example, V.N. Zakharov notes profound similarities in the literary work and world view of the writers. In one of

---

<sup>203</sup> Ibid. P. 442.

<sup>204</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T. 2. P. 445.

<sup>205</sup> Vystavka "Dostoevskij i Solzhenitsyn". Literaturno-memorial'nyj muzej Dostoevskogo. URL: <http://www.md.spb.ru/events/list/n982/> (Date of access: 17.03.2023).

his studies he analyses the similarity of their creative debuts<sup>206</sup>. V.G. Krasnov also turns his attention to the literary creativity of the authors and studies the art of the polyphonic novel. The researcher proves that the similarity of Solzhenitsyn's and Dostoevsky's prose is caused not by the borrowing of writing techniques, but by the conscious use of polyphony as a strategy for the construction of a novel<sup>207</sup>. N.N. Stupnitskaya reveals the similarity of Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's worldviews and perceptions of creativity. She proves that the fictional worlds created by the authors are based on ethical-philosophical and aesthetic thought<sup>208</sup>.

Important in the context of our study was the dissertation of A. S. Sashina, who studied not so much the literary as the publicistic work of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn. The researcher focused on the problems of nation and power in the authors' publicism and the role of the Russian intelligentsia. Sashina also considered Solzhenitsyn as a continuer of the Christian tradition in Russian literature<sup>209</sup>. However, the researcher did not consider Solzhenitsyn's literary and journalistic work in the context of the development of *pochvennichestvo*.

L. I. Saraskina's study "Dostoevsky in Consonances and Attractions" was also a very important work for us. In this monograph, the author examines many of the classic's followers. A separate chapter is dedicated to Solzhenitsyn. In it, Saraskina highlights many biographical and attitudinal similarities, draws attention to the ideological parallels in their literary and some publicistic texts<sup>210</sup>.

B. S. Bushin notes that both Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn were born close to each other in terms of time (November and December) and "time of the century": Dostoevsky was born in the 21st year of the 19th century, Solzhenitsyn in the 18th year

---

<sup>206</sup> Zakharov V. N. O glubinykh sovpadeniyakh Solzhenitsyna i Dostoevskogo // *Mezhdru dvumia iubileiami: Pisateli, kritiki i literaturovedy o tvorchestve Solzhenitsyna*. M., 2005. P. 409–413.

<sup>207</sup> Krasnov V. *Solzhenitsyn and Dostoevsky: A Study in the Polyphonic Novel*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1979. - 230 p.

<sup>208</sup> Stupnitskaya N. N. Ot Dostoevskogo k Solzhenitsynu // *Nauch. zapiski Khar'k. nats. ped. un-ta*. 2012. Vyp. 1 (69). P. 158–164.

<sup>209</sup> Sashina A. S. "Dostoevskaya" tematika i forma v publitsistike Solzhenitsyna. Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Tambov, 2007. URL: <https://viewer.rsl.ru/ru/rsl01003162404?page=1&rotate=0&theme=white> (Date of access: 14.12.2022).

<sup>210</sup> Saraskina L. I. *Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh*. M.: Russkii put', 2006. - 608 p.

of the 20th century<sup>211</sup>. It is interesting that they were arrested at about the same age: Dostoyevsky in his 28th year and Solzhenitsyn in his 27th. Both served part of their sentences in Siberia. Interesting biographical parallels include childless first marriages. Both authors married again at an advanced age, and both had several children in their second marriages.

Both authors wanted to write from an early age. There are also similarities in their debuts. Dostoyevsky's "Poor People" and "One Day of Ivan Denisovich" were sensations. Dostoevsky surprised even the most demanding readers and critics, including Nekrasov, Panayev, Belinsky and Grigorovich. Solzhenitsyn's novel was praised by Chukovsky as a literary miracle, seemingly impossible at the time.

The fate of a Christian writer and publicist in Russia has always been very difficult. Many of them did not escape the fate of being "slandered, defamed, hated"<sup>212</sup>. After successful debuts, the writing careers of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn and their relationship with the authorities did not go well. Solzhenitsyn wrote of his predecessor: "Our Russian public refused to recognise him. And Dostoyevsky was truly world famous only in the West"<sup>213</sup>. In the article "Obrazovanchina" we find: "Dostoevsky was hated by the intelligentsia, he would have been blocked and forgotten in Russia, and would not be quoted at every turn today, if in the 20th century his thunderous world fame had not suddenly appeared in the respected West"<sup>214</sup>. Solzhenitsyn's fate is similar: he was expelled from the Soviet Union, where there seems to be a desire to "crush and forget" him.

Both writers suffered in prisons, camps and hard labour. Both authors defend the ideals of the Orthodox faith in their later publicism. However, their paths to this faith were different. Both writers were raised in the spirit of Orthodoxy, but faced challenging circumstances to prove their faithfulness to the religion. Dostoevsky remained loyal to the ideals of Orthodoxy, despite the influence of Petrashevsky and

---

<sup>211</sup> Bushin V.S. Neizvestnyj Solzhenicyn. M.: Eksmo, 2009. 557 p.

<sup>212</sup> Saraskina L. I. Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh ... P. 587.

<sup>213</sup> Solzhenicyn A.I. Publicistika ... T. 2. P. 524.

<sup>214</sup> Solzhenicyn A.I. Publicistika ... T. 1. P. 92.

Belinsky's groups. Belinsky only instilled doubts in Dostoevsky's mind but could not lead him to abandon the ideals of Christ.

The intricate creative and ideological disagreements between Dostoevsky and Belinsky are thoroughly examined, as seen in V. Y. Kirpotin's study<sup>215</sup>. According to this researcher, Belinsky played a major role in influencing Dostoevsky's worldview, leading him to become an atheist and an advocate of revolutionary ideas. In the "Diary of the Writer," Dostoevsky made a note about Belinsky's ideas, saying, "...I passionately accepted all his teachings"<sup>216</sup>. Nevertheless, V. Y. Kirpotin's statement seems excessively definite as it is not entirely clear that the phrase entirely rejects Orthodoxy and advocates for the revolutionary path. For instance, E. I. Kiyko argues against V. I. Kirpotin's ideas and cites Dostoevsky's novel "The Honest Thief", written in 1848, during which the author may have been a believer in atheism and revolutionary theory<sup>217</sup>. The novel's conclusion includes a call to follow the commandments of Christ. We uphold the perspective that Dostoevsky experienced doubts, but did not adopt atheism even when influenced by Belinsky.

Solzhenitsyn found himself on a challenging path towards religious faith. Although he was brought up in the Orthodox faith, he abandoned it in his youth and began to embrace revolutionary ideas. However, subsequent to his arrest, the author slowly finds his way back to his old faith and is convinced of the harmfulness of the revolutionary route he had once taken. In "The Gulag Archipelago," the following words are found:

"And now, as the measure is restored  
After taking the water of life,  
Supreme Being of the universe! I believe once more.  
And You were with me, even though I denied You"<sup>218</sup>

---

<sup>215</sup> Kirpotin V. Ia. Dostoevskii i Belinskii. 2-e izd., dop. M.: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1976. - 301

p.

<sup>216</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 51.

<sup>217</sup> Kiiiko E.I. Belinskii i Dostoevskii ob utopicheskom sotsializme // Dostoevskii: materialy issledovaniia. 1997. T. 14. P. 234–241.

<sup>218</sup> Solzhenicyn A.I. Sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 5. M.: Vremya, 2010. P. 495.

It is difficult to call Dostoyevsky a revolutionary even in his youth. I. L. Volgin's point of view is that Dostoevsky did not embrace revolutionary methods during his youth and differed with several representatives of revolutionary democracy on this matter. Dostoevsky voiced his disapproval of the 'Russian revolt' in his testimony in the Petrashevsky case, according to Volgin<sup>219</sup>. In contrast, during his youth, Solzhenitsyn believed in the ideals of the revolution but later commented: "Through studying, I became convinced that mass bloody revolutions are invariably disastrous for the peoples among whom they happen"<sup>220</sup>. Both authors eventually arrive at the idea of the peril of the revolutionary path, and both experience doubts or renunciation of faith but return to the ideals of Orthodoxy.

Being prisoners, both writers have experienced suffering and had to rethink many ideas. Over time, Solzhenitsyn grew to view Dostoevsky as a kindred spirit, sharing many of his views. L. Saraskina aptly noted that, "The author of 'Archipelago' can confidently check his watch alongside the author of 'Besy'"<sup>221</sup>.

Therefore, the idea of the possibility of comparing the fates and works of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn is not new. This notion is founded not solely on Solzhenitsyn's acknowledgement of the significance of learning from previous generations and his frequent allusions to Dostoevsky's life and works. Many distinct parallels can be observed in the biographies and worldviews of these writers and publicists. We posit that the allure of socialism, as well as their reevaluation of youthful ideals, had a marked effect on the trajectories of both authors. Thus, we have allocated a separate paragraph in our study to examine this topic more closely, so as to better understand the origins of Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's ideas, as well as their gradual shift towards conservatism.

---

<sup>219</sup> Volgin I.L. Propavshij zagovor ... P. 246.

<sup>220</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T. 1. P. 179.

<sup>221</sup> Saraskina L. I. Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh ... P. 580.

## 2.4. Ideas of socialism: from fascination to repudiation

The writers' socio-political and philosophical views changed according to events in the country and in their personal lives. When they were young, Dostoyevsky and Solzhenitsyn found socialist ideas captivating. Nevertheless, because the writers lived in distinct historical periods, it is important to briefly characterise the stages of development of the socialist doctrine.

We wrote more about this in our study "The Publicism of F.M. Dostoevsky and A.I. Solzhenitsyn: From Socialism to the 'Russian Idea'"<sup>222</sup>. In the research we found that the first stage of the development of socialist ideas can be conditionally called "pre-Marxist". It is associated with the ideas of T. Mor, A. Saint-Simon, Ch. Fourier. The "Marxist" stage includes the views of K. Marx, F. Engels, V. I. Lenin. We can also distinguish the "post-Marxist" stage, associated with the models of socialism in North Korea and China. We will focus more on the first two stages, as they correspond to the formation and transformation of the views of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn.

Socialist doctrines are generally linked with social transformation that intends to eliminate exploitation and class oppression in society. The origin of socialist concepts is associated with utopian socialism. Thomas More criticised private property, capitalism, and human exploitation in his 16th-century work "Utopia". Dostoyevsky was influenced, not only by Thomas More's ideas, but by those of Saint-Simon and Fourier, as well as the works of J. Sand.

Utopian socialism was largely inspired by the negative social consequences of the Industrial Revolution in Europe. The ideal of the followers of utopian socialism was to build a just society in which there was no private property and fair distribution of all benefits. Ch. Fourier, for example, had a very negative attitude towards social inequality and the constant protection of the rich by the state. The philosopher judged the disenfranchised position of the people and proposed the creation of associations or

---

<sup>222</sup> Gromova L. P., Kul'ko K. A. Publitsistika F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna: ot sotsializma k "russkoi idee" // Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Seriya: Iazyk. Literatura. 2023. № 2. P. 217–234.

industrial-consumer societies in which people from different social groups could participate.

During the 1830s and 1840s in Russia, several groups discussed the principles of European thought. Herzen and Ogarev's group and the Petrashevtsy meetings actively studied concepts of Saint-Simon and Fourier, among others. In the "Diary of the Writer", the author recalls that the members of Petrashevsky's group were "infected" with ideas about "the destruction of nationalities in the name of universal brotherhood"<sup>223</sup>. In their youth, many of them did not realise "the causes of their illness"<sup>224</sup>. V.G. Belinsky was also interested in utopian socialism, and in a letter to V.P. Botkin in 1841, he expressed his belief that someday, "there will be no rich, no poor, no tsars and no subjects, but there will be brothers, there will be people"<sup>225</sup>.

The works of J. Sand, actively published in "Otechestvennye Zapiski", also became one of the sources of the ideas of utopian socialism that developed in Russia in the 1840s. They were read, among others, by Dostoevsky and Belinsky, who at the time of their acquaintance, as E.I. Kiyko proves, were united by "a general humanist position and the dream of a golden age of humanity"<sup>226</sup>. From the very beginning of the 1840s, however, Belinsky began to prove that this dream could not be realised peacefully. Dostoyevsky, who turned from reading the novels of J. Sand to Saint-Simon and Fourier, on the contrary, even when interrogated in the Petrashevsky case, declared: "Fourierism is a peaceful system; it charms the soul with its elegance, seduces the heart with the love of humanity that inspired Fourier when he created his system, and surprises the mind with its structure. It does not attract by bile attacks, but by inspiring love of humanity. There is no hate in this system. Fourierism does not believe in political reform; its reform is economic"<sup>227</sup>.

---

<sup>223</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 196.

<sup>224</sup> Ibid. P. 196.

<sup>225</sup> Belinskij V.G. Poln. sobr. soch. v 13 t. T. 12. M.: Izd-vo Akad. nauk SSSR, 1956. P. 71.

<sup>226</sup> Kiiko E.I. Op. cit. P. 236.

<sup>227</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Obyasneniya i pokazaniya po delu petrashevcev. URL: <http://dostoevskiy-lit.ru/dostoevskiy/public/petrashevcy/obyasnenie-m-dostoevskogo.htm?ysclid=lcf5hgrbo271196900> (Date of access: 02.05.2023)

Solzhenitsyn, who had also been fascinated by the ideas of socialism in his youth, did not at first realise "the causes of his illness". But utopian socialism cannot be equated with Marxist-Leninist socialism. The latter actively demanded the revolutionary transformation of society. From utopia, socialism gradually became a scientific theory. And in the twentieth century, Lenin sought to make it not an abstract philosophical concept but a political programme, a guide to action that would free people from exploitation.

Unlike Marx, Lenin believed that world revolution could begin in a single country. Lenin's criteria for socialism were based on the elimination of the exploiting class, the existence of public ownership of the various means of production and the equality of nationalities. As we noted in one of the papers on the subject of the thesis, these ideas were later largely distorted and deformed: "Stalin's methods of strict management and constant repression contradicted the essence of socialism, which is to build a just society of universal equality. The nature of socialism in the USSR under Stalin is bound up with the inevitability of terror, the equation of all in permanent dependence on the will of the state, the suppression of the individual"<sup>228</sup>.

The world revolution and Stalin's distorted socialism are contemplated by the young Solzhenitsyn, who has lived with "bivalence" since childhood, trying to combine the ideals of Orthodoxy with a love of revolution. During his youth, the writer changed his stance from being an opponent of communism and atheism to being a passionate advocate of Marx's ideas. According to Saraskina, Marx became the new "god" of Soviet youth.

We noted earlier that both Dostoyevsky and Solzhenitsyn saw only the ideal side of socialism in their youth. Dostoevsky discussed the naivety of his youthful views in his "Diary of the Writer", claiming that "at that time the matter was still understood in the most rosy and paradisiacal moral light"<sup>229</sup>. Already during the interrogations in the Petrashevsky case, the writer stated that Fourierism could not be applied in practice in Russia: "And Fourierism, and at the same time any Western system, is so inappropriate

---

<sup>228</sup> Gromova L. P., Kul'ko K. A. Op. cit. P. 221.

<sup>229</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 196.



to our soil, so not in keeping with our circumstances, so not in keeping with the character of the nation - and, on the other hand, so much a generation of the West, so much a product of the Western state of things, in the midst of which the proletarian question is resolved at all costs, that Fourierism, with its insistent necessity at the present time, would be hilariously ridiculous in our country, among which there are no proletarians"<sup>230</sup>.

In the 1840s, Dostoyevsky perceived socialism through moral categories and tried to bring the ideas of utopian socialism closer to Christianity. This complex subject has been explored by many authors, including S. F. Vitetnev and A. V. Shmeleva<sup>231</sup>, E. A. Volkova, I. N. Likhoradova and E. V. Frolova<sup>232</sup>, A. G. Gacheva, A. A. Gorelov, M. V. Zavarkina. V. F. Vitetnev and A. V. Shmeleva, E. A. Volkova, I. N. Likhoradova and E. V. Frolova, A. G. Gacheva<sup>233</sup>, A. A. Gorelov<sup>234</sup>, M. V. Zavarkina<sup>235</sup>.

For Solzhenitsyn, the world revolution remained a kind of ideal, belief in which took on an almost religious character. This was written by K.V. Shevtsov, who argued that "Solzhenitsyn's faith in communist ideals assumed a truly religious, stormy ecstatic character during these years"<sup>236</sup>.

For each of these writers, the key moment when they began to rethink the ideas of their youth was their arrest. Despite being sentenced and exiled, Dostoyevsky never lost his belief that brotherhood among people could be achieved. Dostoyevsky's spiritual

---

<sup>230</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Obyasneniya i pokazaniya po delu petrashevcev. URL: <http://dostoevskiy-lit.ru/dostoevskiy/public/petrashevtsy/obyasnenie-m-dostoevskogo.htm?ysclid=lcf5hgbrbo271196900> (Date of access: 02.05.2023)

<sup>231</sup> Vititnev S.F., Shmeleva A.V. Evolyuciya i idejnye osobennosti social'no-politicheskikh vozzrenij F.M. Dostoevskogo // Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta. 2021. № 3. P. 45–58.

<sup>232</sup> Volkova E. A., Likhoradova I. N., Frolova E. V. Dostoevskii i petrashevtsy: spory o revoliutsii i sotsializme // Izvestiia Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta. 2019. №2 (238). P. 171–173.

<sup>233</sup> Gacheva A. G. Tsarstvie Bozhie na zemle v ponimanii F. M. Dostoevskogo // Problemy istoricheskoi poétiki. 2005. №7. P. 313–323.

<sup>234</sup> Gorelov A. A. F. M. Dostoevskii: russkaia ideia i russkii sotsializm // Znanie. Ponimanie. Umenie. 2017. №1. P. 50–66.

<sup>235</sup> Zavarkina M. V. "Sotsializm i khristianstvo": problemy atributsii i publikatsii zamysla Dostoevskogo // Neizvestnyi Dostoevskii. 2020. № 2. P. 69–97.

<sup>236</sup> Shevtsov K. V. Solzhenitsyn-ideolog: k postanovke problem // Vestnik Adygeiskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. 2019. № 4 (247). P. 118.

development is connected with the fact that it was in prison that he found the real bearers of the Christian ideal - the common people. E.I. Kiyko believes that Dostoyevsky found the Christian-socialist ideal because for the Russian people "the feeling of brotherly solidarity is the natural basis of morality, and this feeling has been nourished for centuries, strengthened by the Christian faith the example of Christ's ascetic mission, Orthodoxy"<sup>237</sup>. I. I. Prutskov argued about the same in his study<sup>238</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn's arrest and imprisonment, as well as ideological clashes with other prisoners, convinced him that the essence of the socialism he had dreamed of in his youth had been distorted. Instead of brotherhood and justice, the people of the USSR could expect "barracks socialism" with constant repression of the individual. Gradual disillusionment with the ideas of socialism and the return of previously lost faith will allow Solzhenitsyn to attack the regime in the USSR and ideology in general with sharp criticism.

After their imprisonment, in their later publicism, both authors saw socialism not only as an ideological and political doctrine, but also as society's rebellion against God, as ideas without a moral foundation. For example, Dostoyevsky, in his "Diary of the Writer", recalling conversations with Belinsky, notes that the latter believed in "new moral foundations of socialism"<sup>239</sup>, which included the rejection of religion. According to Dostoyevsky, socialism has no moral basis as such, relying on perversions of "nature and common sense"<sup>240</sup>. Solzhenitsyn generally proves that "morality" and "socialism" cannot be combined: "But nowhere in the socialist doctrines is there an internal requirement of morality as the essence of socialism - morality is promised only as self-delivered manna <...>. Accordingly, nowhere in the world has moral socialism been shown to us in kind"<sup>241</sup>.

One of the studies in this PhD thesis shows that in the conservative publicism of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn there is a polemic with the ideas of socialism, which were

---

<sup>237</sup> Kiiiko E.I. Op. cit. P. 238.

<sup>238</sup> Prutskov I. I. Dostoevskii i khristianskii sotsializm // Dostoevskii: Materialy i issledovaniya. T. 1. L., 1974. P. 58–82.

<sup>239</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 49.

<sup>240</sup> Ibid. P. 49.

<sup>241</sup> Solzhenicyn A.I. Publicistika ... T.1. P. 37.

seen as the antithesis of Christianity<sup>242</sup>. If socialism really deprives society of religion, people will not gain inner freedom but, on the contrary, will be deprived of ideas about moral duty and will be spiritually enslaved. In the "Diary of the Writer" we find a clear contrast between Christianity and socialism: "By making man responsible, Christianity recognises his freedom. By making man dependent on every flaw in the social order, the doctrine of the environment leads man to complete impersonality, to complete liberation from any moral personal duty, from any autonomy, leads him to abominable slavery"<sup>243</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn, who lived in another century, wrote about the consequences of this spiritual "slavery". Turning to history, in his article "Repentance and self-restraint as categories of national life", the author notes that Orthodoxy, by which the country lived for many years, preserved the moral health of the entire nation. Socialism, which subjugated many, began to rely on an "irrepressible, militant atheism"<sup>244</sup> and led to the abandonment of many moral principles.

Both Dostoyevsky and Solzhenitsyn warn of the consequences of abandoning the divine beginning to follow the revolutionary path. In the "Diary of the Writer", Dostoevsky wrote that if revolutionaries destroy society and begin to build a new one without recourse to Christianity, "such darkness, such chaos, something so crude, blind and inhuman will result that the whole edifice will collapse under the curses of humanity before it is completed"<sup>245</sup>. Solzhenitsyn wrote about the realisation of the danger of the revolutionary path in his "Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union", as well as in the chapter "Ascent" of *The Gulag Archipelago*. There we find: "...I have understood the lie of all revolutions in history: they destroy only the bearers of evil (and without taking into account the bearers of good), but the evil itself, even more magnified, is taken as an inheritance"<sup>246</sup>. Religious faith, unlike revolution, seeks to truly "displace" evil in the human soul.

---

<sup>242</sup> Kul'ko K. A. Publitsistika A. I. Solzhenitsyna v dialoge s ideyami F. M. Dostoevskogo o pravoslavii // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 10. Zhurnalistika. 2021. №5. P. 162–183.

<sup>243</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 71.

<sup>244</sup> Solzhenicyn A.I. Publicistika ... T.1. P. 69.

<sup>245</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 198.

<sup>246</sup> Solzhenicyn A.I. *Sobr. soch.* v 30 t. T. 5. M.: Vremya, 2010. P. 496.

At the same time, the attitude to the revolution in Solzhenitsyn's work is more contradictory. From his childhood years Solzhenitsyn was forced to live with the "duality" of his soul, subtly feeling both the Orthodox faith and revolutionary ideals. A number of researchers have suggested that the paradoxical existence of these "two truths" is peculiar not only to the young Solzhenitsyn, but also to the mature writer.

J. Niva drew attention to the contradictory ideas in the author's work, which speak of the existence of two different Solzhenitsyn<sup>247</sup>. In his study, A.O. Bolshev even compared the writer to the two-faced god Janus<sup>248</sup>. The deeply contradictory ideas of Solzhenitsyn are studied in the works of K.V. Shevtsov. In one of the articles, the author puts forward the idea that Solzhenitsyn in his adulthood combined "Orthodox faith and love of revolution, being a true Christian and at the same time a fiery revolutionary"<sup>249</sup>. Noting this contradictory nature of Solzhenitsyn, the researcher uses the chapters of "The Gulag Archipelago" as empirical material. On the one hand, Solzhenitsyn writes that imprisonment makes it possible to learn true friendship, that suffering teaches one to love one's neighbour. He discusses such Christian virtues as patience, omniscient gentleness, the ability to understand the weakness of others, the ability to repent. On the other hand, in a number of chapters, including "Forty Days of Kengir", the narrator actually calls for revenge and struggle against the regime of the camp authorities. The prisoners demand retribution for the murder of an innocent evangelist, and their outrage erupts into a major mutiny. The narrator himself is prepared to take part in this revolt, and Solzhenitsyn's calls for repentance are replaced by "revolutionary rhetoric"<sup>250</sup>. So in this chapter we see a powerful call for revolutionary retribution rather than humility and repentance.

Solzhenitsyn's public writing, which synthesises contrasting ideas, has been overlooked by many researchers. In one of the articles on the subject of the PhD thesis, we consider the socio-political ideas and religious and moral quests in Solzhenitsyn's

---

<sup>247</sup> Niva Zh. Solzhenitsyn. M.: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1992. - 189 p.

<sup>248</sup> Bol'shev A.O. Shedevry russkoj prozy v svete psihobiograficheskogo. SPb: Filologicheskij fak-t SPbGU, 2011. 347 p.

<sup>249</sup> Shevtsov K. V. Solzhenitsyn-ideolog: k postanovke problem // Vestnik Adygejskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. 2019. № 4 (247). P. 116.

<sup>250</sup> Ibid. C. 120.

publicistic works of the 1970s and 1980s. We argue that Solzhenitsyn, as a Christian, considers repentance and constant self-restraint to be necessary for the individual and society. At the same time, the demands of humanity, tolerance and humility disappear when it comes to ideology. Solzhenitsyn calls for a fierce struggle against communism<sup>251</sup>.

To highlight his intolerance towards ideology and critical stance towards his youth views, let's examine a handful of Solzhenitsyn's works. One of the significant articles addressing this subject is "Communism: In Plain Sight - And Not Understood". In the article, he makes extreme allegations against the West, blaming it for the prevalence of communism in numerous countries. At the same time, Solzhenitsyn states that communism is not a "hereditary Russian disease"<sup>252</sup>. He calls for a fight not against Russia, but against the ideology with which Russia has been "infected". Ideology cannot be "appeased, bribed or pacified"<sup>253</sup>. Solzhenitsyn therefore called for a propaganda offensive against communism and "an openly principled and proud defence of freedom throughout the world"<sup>254</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn explains his intolerant attitude towards ideology and his call for a fierce struggle against it by its aggressive nature. The author notes that in all countries that have adopted the communist ideology, it is associated with "the suppression of the individual, of conscience, and even with the destruction of life"<sup>255</sup>. For Solzhenitsyn, however, the humiliation of the Russian people is more terrible than the domination of communism in the world. Turning to historical argument, Solzhenitsyn uses historical analogies and compares Nazism and Communism, stating that they had similar goals: to turn the peoples of the USSR into slaves. However, unlike Nazism, which openly declared its intentions, Communism promised people a happy future but also destroyed

---

<sup>251</sup> Kul'ko K. A. Sintez obshchestvenno-politicheskikh ustremlenii i religiozno-nravstvennogo nachala v publitsistike A. I. Solzhenitsyna // Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: filologiya, zhurnalistika. 2023. №1. P. 98–100.

<sup>252</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T.1. P. 332.

<sup>253</sup> Ibid. P. 399.

<sup>254</sup> Ibid. P. 403.

<sup>255</sup> Ibid. P. 397.

them in the present. Solzhenitsyn believes that as many ordinary people were destroyed under Lenin as during the war with Hitler.

In his publicism, Solzhenitsyn criticises both the West, which allowed communism to spread in various countries, and the USSR leadership, which he blames for "internal lies and external expansion, and the justification of wars and murders, the justification of tomorrow's wars"<sup>256</sup>. Solzhenitsyn's intolerance and lack of humanity towards ideology is also evident in his extended metaphors. Speaking of communism, the author calls it "a cancerous tumour", "an infection in the world organism"<sup>257</sup>. This series of metaphors involuntarily refers to Raskolnikov's vision at the penal colony described by Dostoevsky. It seemed to the hero that the whole world was dying from a terrible plague that had come to Europe. Trichinosis made people lose their minds and believe in the exclusivity of their own ideas. This plague could be compared to theories that subjugate entire countries. For Solzhenitsyn, such a trichinosis was communism, which affected people not only in Russia.

Nevertheless, Dostoyevsky leaves us with the hope of salvation from the plague by pure people, called "the chosen". Perhaps they will be responsible for the moral revival of the world. In Solzhenitsyn's journalism, too, there is hope for the resurrection of the Russian people and purification from the "contagion" of communism. An important idea in Solzhenitsyn's publicism is related to the Christian ability to repent of sins. According to the author, not only the individual but also the nation as a whole is capable of purifying the soul through repentance, because both have an unmanifest divine nature. The consequences of the communist past can only be dealt with through common repentance, "for all are guilty and all are stained"<sup>258</sup>. Not only repentance but also self-restraint is necessary for the further "correction" of the soul and moral life of the nation. This multifaceted concept is explored in the third chapter of this study.

In one of the articles on the subject of PhD thesis we came to the following conclusion: "The conflict between socio-political aspirations and religious and moral

---

<sup>256</sup> Ibid. P. 218.

<sup>257</sup> Ibid. P. 332.

<sup>258</sup> Ibid. P. 62.

beginnings turns out not to be a conflict, but a paradoxical synthesis of these beginnings. This can be explained not only by the complexity and multifaceted personality of the author himself, who revised the ideals of his youth, but also by his incredibly heightened national feeling. At the centre of Solzhenitsyn's attention was always the Russian people, not abstract humanity. Solzhenitsyn calls on the people of our country to repent and be humble. And at the same time he criticises them for succumbing to communism"<sup>259</sup>. In our opinion, Solzhenitsyn's publicism shows the damage of communism to the Russian people, and at the same time reveals in this people the strength for repentance, self-restraint and finding the Orthodox faith.

Dostoyevsky's ideas undergo a more complex transformation. In his youth, as we have seen, the author studied the ideas of the French socialists. If socialism is called "French", it may have a national specificity. The writer believed that the social order was based on certain religious views. This allows Dostoyevsky to reflect "on the national varieties of socialism that result from the peculiarities of the religious denominations that prevail in certain countries"<sup>260</sup>.

"European socialism" is what Dostoyevsky calls the Catholic German and French national models. Western or European socialism is also called "practical" or "political" by the author. It is an outgrowth of Catholicism, not Orthodoxy, and is therefore primarily concerned with the material, not the spiritual: questions of work, redistribution of property and economic relations. "Political" socialism instils in "hungry workers who have nothing at heart <...> a deep disgust for the right of hereditary property"<sup>261</sup>. It is fuelled by "theories of future happiness", but the essence of this socialism, according to Dostoyevsky in his "Diary of the Writer", "is the desire for the widespread robbery of all owners by the poor classes"<sup>262</sup>. Western socialism does not seek to build a new just society, but "to make the present one fail"<sup>263</sup>.

---

<sup>259</sup> Kul'ko K. A. Sintez obshchestvenno-politicheskikh ustremlenii i religiozno-nravstvennogo nachala ... P. 98.

<sup>260</sup> Gorelov A. A. F. M. Dostoevskii: russkaia ideia i russkii sotsializm // Znanie. Ponimanie. Umenie. 2017. №1. P. 58.

<sup>261</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 195.

<sup>262</sup> Ibid. P. 196.

<sup>263</sup> Ibid. P. 196.

In contrast to Solzhenitsyn, Dostoyevsky examined the peculiarities of socialism in different countries in terms of religious denominations. As an antithesis to "Western", "political" socialism, Dostoyevsky cites "Russian socialism", which does not aim at a better distribution of goods, but is imbued with Christian humanism and is "connected with the achievement of such a moral state, when everyone will be able to act according to his conscience, and morality will be unified for the individual and for the state"<sup>264</sup>. According to Vititnev and Shmeleva, for Dostoyevsky "Russian socialism" becomes "a religious doctrine imbued with the spirit of Christian humanism"<sup>265</sup> based on Orthodoxy, the nation's aspiration not to earthly goods but to brotherly love for other peoples and "the necessity of all service to humanity"<sup>266</sup>. Dostoyevsky's understanding of the "Russian idea" is linked to the concept of "Russian socialism", which will be discussed in detail in the third chapter of the PhD thesis.

To conclude the second chapter, it is necessary to summarise some of the findings:

- 1) An important role in the formation of Dostoyevsky's socio-political and philosophical views was played by his family upbringing. Dostoyevsky's views were also influenced by his reading of utopian socialist philosophers and his interactions with Belinsky and Petrashevsky's group. Nevertheless, his imprisonment and subsequent exile provided an opportunity for him to reconsider his youthful ideas and eventually develop a mature version of conservatism.
- 2) Dostoyevsky's conservative ideas in the second period of his creative and publishing activity (after his return from imprisonment) refer to «Pochvennichestvo» as a direction of Russian conservative thought of the 19th century. Dostoyevsky sought to unify Russian society and reintroduce Russian traditions and Orthodoxy to the forgotten intelligentsia. Dostoyevsky's return

---

<sup>264</sup> Gromova L. P., Kul'ko K. A. Op. cit. P. 225.

<sup>265</sup> Vititnev S.F., Shmeleva A.V. Op. cit. P. 54.

<sup>266</sup> Dostoyevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 413.



from prison saw him adopt monarchist views. Dostoyevsky demonstrated the importance of autocracy and defended the value of Orthodoxy.

- 3) In considering the origins of Solzhenitsyn's worldview, we advocate the importance of a comprehensive approach: as in the case of Dostoevsky, it is necessary to take into account the facts of the author's biography, the artistic, social and philosophical origins of his worldview. Solzhenitsyn himself acknowledged his apprenticeship to the classics, in particular Leo Tolstoy and F.M. Dostoevsky.
- 4) The question of Solzhenitsyn's socio-political views is the subject of much debate among researchers. We only partly recognize them as liberal. We consider Solzhenitsyn's ideas after the 1970s to be conservative, but in a liberal modification of conservatism.
- 5) Neither Dostoevsky nor Solzhenitsyn called themselves "pochvenniks". While the origin of Pochvennichestvo is traditionally seen in connection with the ideas of Dostoevsky, the analysis of Solzhenitsyn's publicism from the point of view of the development of Pochvennichestvo is an idea that has not yet been actively developed in science. Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's journalistic works are extensive, beyond the confines of Pochvennichestvo's scope. Nonetheless, this PhD thesis focuses only on the ideas that bring these writers and publicists closer together in the context of the development of the Pochvennichestvo as a direction of Russian conservative thought.
- 6) There are several similarities in the authors' biographies, ideological overlaps and worldviews that we have noticed. Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn underwent years of imprisonment, which altered their perspectives. Both writers were fascinated by socialism and reconsidered these ideas. Solzhenitsyn regarded socialism and communism as a threat and advocated for an active struggle against their expansion. In his journalism, there is no analysis of the national characteristics of socialism, but he presents contradictory approaches: Christian virtues such as patience, humility, and repentance are juxtaposed with calls for a fierce struggle in his works. On the

other hand, Dostoyevsky acknowledged the national specificities of socialism concerning religious denominations. Dostoyevsky criticised "European," "political" socialism based on Catholicism and defended the significance of "Russian socialism", based on Christianity, and the Russian nation's desire for "vsesluzhenie" and "brotherly love".

### **CHAPTER III. CONTINUITY OF CONSERVATIVE IDEAS IN THE PUBLICISM OF F. M. DOSTOEVSKY AND A. I. SOLZHENITSYN**

Solzhenitsyn has referenced the difficult work and fate of Dostoyevsky numerous times in his artistic and journalistic works, speeches, and interviews. S. Zalygin noted: "Sometimes I think that Dostoyevsky's story is now read as a preface to Solzhenitsyn's. It is not us, the readers, nor they themselves, who have reached such conclusions; it is history that has concluded so"<sup>267</sup>. Indeed, Solzhenitsyn, who had a similar experience of suffering and spiritual rebirth, was able to see in his predecessor a like-minded person on many issues that he "sees in the context of Dostoyevsky's visionary choices"<sup>268</sup>.

The third chapter analyses the specific themes and genres of Dostoyevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's conservative publicism. This chapter analyses the empirical material: the publications from Dostoyevsky's "Diary of the Writer" and Solzhenitsyn's articles, speeches, lectures, interviews and his miniatures "Krokhotki".

#### **3.1. Specifics of genre form and themes of conservative publicism of F. M. Dostoyevsky and A. I. Solzhenitsyn**

For our study, we have selected Dostoyevsky's "Diary of the Writer" as the empirical material because it represents the author's most polished works of publicism. During the years of its publication, this unique mono-journal became the catalyst for the writer and publicist's creative productivity as he began to communicate ideas "...to the audience 'across barriers'"<sup>269</sup>. This included discussing several conservative ideas such as faith, the fate of people and the importance of strong state power.

The "Diary of the Writer" has been the subject of numerous scientific studies. Its study has even become an independent branch of "Dostoyevsko-knowledge". Particular

---

<sup>267</sup> Zalygin S.P. God Solzhenicyna // Novyj mir. 1990. №1. P. 236.

<sup>268</sup> Saraskina L. I. Dostoyevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh ... P. 580.

<sup>269</sup> Volgin I.L. Poverh bar'erov ... P. 26.

attention was devoted to the works of I.L. Volgin. Among his numerous publications on Dostoevsky's publishing activities and the "Diary of the Writer", we should note the following: "The 'Diary of the Writer': Text and Context"<sup>270</sup>, "Moral Foundations of Dostoevsky's Publicity: The Eastern Question in the 'Diary of the Writer'",<sup>271</sup> "Overcoming Barriers. The Enigma of the 'Diary of the Writer'<sup>272</sup>, "Metamorphoses of Personal Genre. ("Diary of the Writer" by F.M. Dostoevsky and "Fallen Leaves" by V.V. Rozanov)"<sup>273</sup> and a number of others.

It is significant to comprehend that the title "Diary of the Writer" did not primarily refer to Dostoyevsky's monojournal. Let's contemplate specifically to what this title relates:

- It was originally notes published as a separate section in the journal "Grazhdanin" (1873);
- The appearance of the monojournal. Independent monthly publication (1876-1877);
- A single issue (1880);
- The only issue published after the writer's death (1881).

Therefore, following the closure of "Vremya" and "Epocha", Dostoevsky did not immediately choose to venture into publishing his own journal. The "Diary of the Writer" initially originated as a distinct column in the journal "Grazhdanin" by Meshchersky, where Dostoyevsky published philosophical and literary publicism in 1873-74 and acted as its editor. Having adopted the diary format in the pages of "Grazhdanin", Dostoevsky later used it as his "calling card". The writer's wife A.G. Dostoevskaya recalled that the idea for such an extraordinary format came to the writer

---

<sup>270</sup> Volgin I.L. "Dnevnik pisatelya": tekst i kontekst // Dostoevskij: materialy i issledovaniya. 1978. № 3. P. 151–158.

<sup>271</sup> Volgin I.L. Nravstvennye osnovy publicistiki Dostoevskogo: Vostochnyj vopros v "Dnevnikе pisatelya" // Izvestiya AN SSSR. Seriya literatury i yazyka. 1971. Vyp. 4. Tom XXX. P. 312–322.

<sup>272</sup> Volgin I.L. Poverh bar'erov ... P. 5–40.

<sup>273</sup> Volgin I.L. Metamorfozy lichnogo zhanra: ("Dnevnik pisatelya" Dostoevskogo i "Opavshie list'ya" Rozanova) // Nasledie V.V. Rozanova i sovremennost': Materialy mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii. M., 2009. P. 61–72.

while he was abroad. Unfortunately, his family and financial troubles prevented him from creating an independent edition. Providing Dostoevsky with an opportunity to act as a salaried editor, Meshchersky's proposal enabled the writer to realize his idea without any financial risks.

In 1873, the pages of the "Grazhdanin" featured the column – the "Diary of the Writer", the name of which implied both a conversation about current events and the frankness characteristic of a diary. A few years later, this unusual diary format grew from a column into an independent publishing project.

Dostoyevsky's desire to enter into a dialogue with the reader, while at the same time openly expressing his own thoughts, led him to start a monthly publication. The advertisement for subscription to the "Diary of the Writer" stated: "It will be a diary in the literal sense of the word, an account of impressions actually lived each month, an account of things seen, heard and read. It may, of course, include stories and novellas, but mostly it will be about actual events"<sup>274</sup>.

Dostoevsky's journal was not literally a diary. Thus, I. L. Volgin writes that the "Diary of the Writer" as an "ego-document only imitated the properties of the diary genre, remaining in fact an act of public conversation, a subtle literary game"<sup>275</sup>. Volgin compared the diaries of L. N. Tolstoy and F. M. Dostoevsky. The researcher noted that Tolstoy observes the "purity" of the genre: his diary is really introverted. Dostoevsky, on the contrary, only imitates the diary genre: "His inner world is closed to the reader. Or rather, it is revealed to the extent necessary to achieve purely literary goals"<sup>276</sup>.

Another researcher, K.V. Mochulsky, believes that Dostoyevsky succeeded in creating an unusual genre form, calling it "half-confession, half-diary"<sup>277</sup>. At first glance, Dostoevsky's monojournal does indeed resemble a diary. The published material contains personal observations of the writer and publicist. Dostoyevsky wrote: "But I will also talk to myself and for my own pleasure in the form of this diary, and then

---

<sup>274</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 22. L.: Nauka, 1981. P. 136.

<sup>275</sup> Volgin I.L. Poverh bar'erov ... P.11.

<sup>276</sup> Volgin I.L. Metamorfozy "pisatel'skogo zhurnalizma" ... P. 104.

<sup>277</sup> Mochul'skii K. V. Dostoevskii. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo // Mochul'skii K. Gogol'. Solov'ev. Dostoevskii. M.: Respublika, 1995. P. 35.

whatever comes out. About what? About everything that strikes me or makes me think"<sup>278</sup>. The writer has always closely followed the political, economic, social, cultural and spiritual life of Russia. His "longing for the present" could no longer be confined to artistic creation. Dostoyevsky began to create a unique form of publication.

In one of the studies on the subject of the PhD thesis, we noted that the author combines "artistic-aesthetic, social and journalistic ways of understanding the world" and expresses "his own ideas quite frankly (which is characteristic of the diary form) and with the benefit of Russian society (which is characteristic of journalistic texts)"<sup>279</sup>. The question of Dostoevsky's writing style and the combination of journalistic and literary elements in his work remains controversial among researchers. Thus, G. S. Prokhorov analyses Dostoevsky's the "Diary of the Writer" on the basis of several materials and notes two beginnings in the author's texts: literary and publicistic<sup>280</sup>.

In Dostoyevsky's mono-journal there are indeed literary works, including the stories "Muzhik Marey", "The Boy at the Christmas Tree" and others. At the same time, literary texts were combined quite organically with materials that were in direct dialogue with the acute events of the present. At times, the author would ironise himself and the literary component of the "Diary of the Writer". Thus, after the story "The Boy at the Christ's Christmas Tree", we find: "And why did I compose such a story, so unsuitable for an ordinary, sensible diary, and even for a writer? And I promised to tell stories mostly about actual events!"<sup>281</sup>. However, what Dostoyevsky describes in a literary work is connected with the understanding of acute social problems and "could have really happened"<sup>282</sup>. This is why the author's literary texts take on an acute publicist tone.

---

<sup>278</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 45.

<sup>279</sup> Kul'ko K. A. Malaya publitsisticheskaya forma F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna: preemstvennost' idei i formy // Russkaya publitsistika: évoljutsiya idei i form. Sb. st. Ser. "Peterburgskaya shkola zhurnalistiki i MK" Sankt-Peterburgskogo gos. un-ta. SPb.: Aleteiya, 2021. P. 224.

<sup>280</sup> Prokhorov G. S. Dnevnik pisatelya F. M. Dostoevskogo: publitsistika ili novyi zhanr? // Voprosy literatury. 2013. № 5. P. 82–96.

<sup>281</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 219.

<sup>282</sup> Ibid. P. 219.

Many of Dostoevsky's contemporaries gave him high marks as a writer, but often noted that he was a mediocre publicist. Such contradictory assessments of both the metropolitan and provincial press have been analysed in detail by I.L. Volgin<sup>283</sup>. The "Odessa Vestnik" even accused politics of having "taken away a good novelist and given a bad publicist" in the person of Dostoyevsky<sup>284</sup>. In the "Petersburg newspaper" there was a familiar contradictory reaction to the publication of "Diary of the Writer":

"Here is your diary... What's not in it?

There's genius, there's stupidity,  
and the senile delirium of old age,  
and a sensitive mind and madness,  
Day and night, darkness and light.

O prolific Dostoyevsky!

The reader, confused by you,  
will think from your diary that you're  
some kind of artist.

Or a blessed man from Moscow"<sup>285</sup>.

Dostoyevsky was indeed a gifted writer, a master of the literary word. However, the "longing for the current" could not exist only within the framework of literary creation and was connected with the desire to speak openly about the current situation. In describing Dostoyevsky's creative biography, N.N. Strakhov pays special attention to his journalistic and literary activities, noting that Dostoyevsky "was brought up on journalism from his youth and remained faithful to it to the end"<sup>286</sup>.

For the writer, "eternal", philosophical questions have always been connected with current, everyday life. O. S. Kruglikova, reviewing the "Diary of the Writer", notes that in his mono-journal Dostoyevsky created a fundamentally new approach to

<sup>283</sup> Volgin I.L. Dostoevskij – zhurnalist: ("Dnevnik pisatelya" i russkaya obshchestvennost'): Pos. k speckursu. M.: Izd-vo MGU, 1982. - 75 p.

<sup>284</sup> S.S. ZHurnal'nye ocherki // Odesskij vestnik. 1876. № 237. 2 noyabrya.

<sup>285</sup> O. Dr (Minaev) [Obshchij drug (Minaev Dm.)] F. Dostoevskomu po prochtenii ego "Dnevnika" // Peterburgskaya gazeta. 1876. № 23. 3 fevralya.

<sup>286</sup> Strahov N.N. Vospominaniya o F.M. Dostoevskom // Dostoevskij v vospominaniyah sovremennikov: V 2 t. T. 1. M.: Hudozhestvennaya literatura, 1990. P. 531.

journalism, "reconciling the eternal with the transient, walking a fine line between friendly conversation and holy preaching, accepting journalism as a spiritual achievement and at the same time not denying all the routine aspects of its existence, its simplicity, its provocativeness"<sup>287</sup>.

In contrast to the journalistic works of Gogol and Tolstoy, Dostoevsky did not indulge in detached, preachy moralising in the "Diary of the Writer". On the contrary, he encouraged the reader to reflect together on important issues. Often, when describing many modern vices, Dostoyevsky did not separate himself from society as a whole. Thus, in the "Diary of the Writer", we find Dostoyevsky's peculiar confession: "I have now spoken about myself in order to have the right to speak about others"<sup>288</sup>. Thus the writer, speaking of the Nechaevites, recalls his own experience of participating in Petrashevsky's group and how his companions were "infected by the ideas of the theoretical socialism of the time"<sup>289</sup>. A kind of confession on the part of the author is an important condition for a sincere conversation with the reader.

The subject matter of the publications in Dostoevsky's monojournal is wide: we can find the writer's observations on social life, the problems of the people and intellectuals, descriptions of trials, arguments about state power and the importance of Orthodoxy. A significant part of the publications is devoted to the "Eastern Question", which preoccupied Dostoyevsky, the "Russian Idea" and "Russian Socialism".

Solzhenitsyn's work as a publicist, as well as Dostoevsky's heritage, has repeatedly been the subject of scientific research. The publicism of Dostoevsky's successor is presented in various genres. Most of them are articles by the author. However, Solzhenitsyn's speeches, interviews and lectures are also used as empirical material. Many researchers have thoroughly analysed the compendium "Iz-pod glyb" (1974), which contains three articles by Solzhenitsyn devoted to the present and future of the country. However, two compendium of Solzhenitsyn's miniatures "Krohotki" have often been undeservedly forgotten, although they were close to the author's heart.

---

<sup>287</sup> Kruglikova O. S. *Ruskaia konservativnaia publitsistika ...* C. 154.

<sup>288</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. *Dnevnik pisatelya ...* T. 1. C. 195.

<sup>289</sup> *Ibid.* C. 195.



L.A. Kolobaeva, studying "Krokhotki", even noted that they are "like small children, for the writer perhaps the closest and most native in them – something that makes the heart ache with unrelenting anxiety, excitement..."<sup>290</sup>.

"Krokhotki" has a controversial and rather complex genre form, so the question of its genre characteristics is still debated among researchers. Let us quote the opinions of just a few of them. For example, B. Kodzis believes that Solzhenitsyn used the creative experience of I.S. Turgenev, I.A. Bunin, M.M. Prishvin and managed to revive the genre of the lyrical miniature<sup>291</sup>. The researcher sees the genre's analogy with lyrics in inversions, the rhythm of repetitions, various intonational interruptions. However, B. Kodzis notes that "Krokhotki" also reflects elements of memoir, journalism and strict documentation.

H. F. Amjad does not give a clear definition of the genre, characterising "Krokhotki" as "philosophical, everyday and lyrical pictures about the past and present of Russia and the fate of the Russian man"<sup>292</sup>. According to L.A. Kolobaeva, in "Krokhotki" Solzhenitsyn comes close to writing a small epic. The researcher believes that the works resemble the genre of novel.<sup>293</sup> However, most of the *krokhotki* are based on impressions from Solzhenitsyn's own travels in Russia, so they cannot be called fiction. Kolobaeva stresses that Solzhenitsyn used the method of "enlarging the moment of life", which is characteristic of the narrative genre. At the same time, the researcher notes the proximity of the miniatures to a journalistic work: in them, "the social issues that concern the writer are outlined more nakedly"<sup>294</sup>.

Our position is closer to ideas of O.S. Makarova, who refers to Solzhenitsyn's works as miniatures. According to the researcher, the genre of the miniature combines publicistic and literary beginnings, which are presented in the form of a "personal

---

<sup>290</sup> Kolobaeva L. A. "Krokhotki" // Fenomen Solzhenitsyna. Literaturnoe obozrenie. 1999. №1. P. 39.

<sup>291</sup> Kodzis B. Liricheskie miniatiury Aleksandra Solzhenitsyna // Literatura: Prilozhenie k gazete "Pervoe sentiabria", 1997. №30. P. 3–4.

<sup>292</sup> Amdzhad H.F. Samaya dorogaya volya: obshchechelovecheskie i hristianskie cennosti v cikle miniatur Solzhenitsyna "Krokhotki" // Obrazovanie i obshchestvo. 2013. №5 (82). P. 121.

<sup>293</sup> Kolobaeva L. A. Op. cit. P. 43–48.

<sup>294</sup> Ibid. P. 40.

conversation with the reader"<sup>295</sup>. The publicist approach in "Krohotki" is connected with the description of real events and the author's own impressions from his travels in the country. In "Krohotki", Solzhenitsyn writes about the "acute issues" of the century: the nation's abandonment of faith, the loss of moral principles, nature destroyed by technological progress. However, the structure of almost every Krohotka includes not only a story about a real event, but also a conclusion of a philosophical nature, where the author turns to artistic generalisations, symbolism and metaphor. This peculiarity of Solzhenitsyn's "Krohotki" brings the works closer to the "Diary of the Writer", whose genre form is also controversial. In Dostoyevsky's monojournal, fiction is published together with acute journalism, and "fiction and journalism often overlap in a single text"<sup>296</sup>. By nineteenth-century standards, the appearance of such a monojournal was "a risky literary experiment"<sup>297</sup>.

"Krohotki" can be seen as a similar experiment. They are two cycles of miniatures that summarise the already mature Solzhenitsyn's reflections on faith, the Russian people and their capacity for moral revival. The title of the miniatures is a neologism of the author. Each krohotka is a small work: from a few sentences to a page. However, the small form contains a deep philosophical content. D.S. Likhachev once remarked: "In the material world, you can't fit the big into the small. In the sphere of spiritual values it is not so: you can fit much more into the small..."<sup>298</sup> This idea of Likhachev can be correlated with Solzhenitsyn's "Krohotki", where the author finds in the most ordinary events and phenomena serious questions that require deep reflection. Therefore, the opinion expressed by J. Niva seems quite justified: "Fragmentation turns into universality, the 'krohotka' into a gigantic mural"<sup>299</sup>.

Two cycles of miniatures on the nature, beliefs and people of Russia were written at different times. The first krohotki appeared before Solzhenitsyn's emigration from

---

<sup>295</sup> Makarova O. S. Strukturno-smyslovoe edinstvo miniatyur tsikla "Krohotki" Solzhenitsyna // *Mir russkogo slova*. 2011. №4. P. 58.

<sup>296</sup> Kul'ko K. A. *Malaya publitsisticheskaya forma ...* P. 224.

<sup>297</sup> Volgin I.L. *Poverh bar'erov ...* P. 11.

<sup>298</sup> Likhachev D.S. *Pis'ma o dobrom*. SPb.: Izdatel'stvo "Logos", 2007. P. 9.

<sup>299</sup> Niva Zh. *Poétika Solzhenitsyna mezhdru "bol'shimi" i "malymi" formami* // *Zvezda*. 2003. №12. P. 145.

Russia: they were written in 1958-1960 under the author's impressions of his bicycle journeys around the country. At that time it was not possible to publish them in the USSR, so they were first published in 1964 in the Parisian journal "Grani", and in Russia as samizdat. Another cycle of "Krohotki" appeared much later – after Solzhenitsyn's return from emigration (1996-1999). Absolutely all the miniatures were written in Russia. Solzhenitsyn even emphasised that he could not have created them away from his homeland: "Only after my return to Russia I was able to write them again; there – I could not..."<sup>300</sup>

According to L.I. Saraskina, Solzhenitsyn's journalism in its various genres is a long and complex dialogue with the thoughts of Dostoyevsky's the "Diary of the Writer". L. Saraskina notes: "Solzhenitsyn-publicist irrefutably proves that the Russian author, writing about Russia of the 20th century, it is impossible to do without Dostoevsky's publicist thought"<sup>301</sup>.

The creative paths of both authors are connected with the history of the country. In the "Diary of the Writer" and in most of Solzhenitsyn's articles, speeches, interviews, as well as in the cycle of miniatures "Krohotki", the central theme is Russia, the fate of nation. This analysis compares the small genre form in authorial publicism, the "Diary of the Writer" and "Krohotki".

Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn reflected on the course of Russia's troubled history in small works, some of which are close to the essay genre. R.P. Milrud and I.R. Maksimova note that the essay genre has indistinct boundaries. Among the general characteristics of this genre the researchers point out the small form, the presence of an initial thesis, the development of this thesis and the conclusion<sup>302</sup>. An essay is a piece of prose that develops the initial thesis and convinces the reader of the correctness of the author's position on a particular issue. For example, the material "Paradoxalist" from "Diary of the Writer" is structured in this way, where at the very beginning the necessity and importance of international war is stated, and then arguments in favour of this idea

---

<sup>300</sup> Novy Mir. 1997. № 1. P. 99.

<sup>301</sup> Saraskina L. I. Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh ... P. 580.

<sup>302</sup> Mil'rud R. P., Maksimova I. R. Ésse kak zhanr, priem obucheniya i instrument pedagogicheskogo izmereniya // Yazyk i kul'tura. 2020. №49. P. 256.

are given. Similarly, Solzhenitsyn constructs the miniature "We Will Not Die", which begins with the thesis that modern man is afraid of death and forgets to honour the memory of the dead, then proves why this is wrong, and comes to an evaluative conclusion.

In an essay, a writer can give his or her impression of an event, describe his or her attitude to something, propose a way of solving a certain problem, explain some facts. Every essay should involve the reader in a joint reflection with the author on a serious issue. In other genres, the writer can outline a chain of events, inform the reader, but in an essay, the writer's task is to change the reader's attitude to something, to convince him or her of the correctness of his or her reasoning. Whereas in other genres it is the objective data that counts, in an essay it is the author's opinion that counts. R.P. Milrud and I.R. Maksimova rightly note that "'not essay' is a photograph of reality, and 'essay' is the author's picture of the world and personal position offered to the reader"<sup>303</sup>.

In Dostoyevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's publicism, the personal element is very strong. In Dostoyevsky's case, the title of the publication suggests that all the events described in the "Diary of the Writer" are presented through the prism of the authorial personality. In their fragmentary nature, Solzhenitsyn's texts in Krohotki resemble a personal diary. The reader is presented with peculiar diary travel notes, "a camp notes in which the text is given in dynamic"<sup>304</sup>. However, a diary is written for oneself and is not intended to be published, so the texts of both authors can only conditionally be called "diariy".

The "Diary of the Writer", unlike "Krohotki", is carefully conceived as a journalistic project: the publication has issues divided into chapters and subchapters. The miniatures "Krohotki" are much smaller than those in the "Diary of the Writer", and there is no strict composition in their arrangement. Nevertheless, in every text from "Diary of the Writer" and "Krohotki" the connection with their authors can be felt. According to I.L. Volgin, Dostoyevsky's monojournal, unlike other publications, had its own hero. It was the writer and publicist himself who gave an assessment of events and

---

<sup>303</sup> Ibid. P. 258.

<sup>304</sup> Volgin I.L. *Metamorfozy lichnogo zhanra ...* P. 63.

phenomena<sup>305</sup>. The hero of "Krohotoki" can also be called the author himself. The works of both writers are closely connected with the experience of their personal involvement in what is happening in the country. Thus, the years of the publication of the "Diary of the Writer" coincided with the aggravation of the "Eastern Question", which became the theme of many of Dostoevsky's materials. The author repeatedly used the first person pronoun ("I") and possessive pronouns ("my", "our"). For example, when discussing the purpose of the Russian nation, Dostoevsky does not separate himself from the people as a whole, considering this purpose to be "our brotherly love for other nations" and the need for "vsesluzhenie to mankind...".<sup>306</sup>

One of the most important problems of the century seems to Dostoevsky to be the alienation of the Russian intelligentsia from the ordinary people. Dostoevsky felt that he was involved in this process and tried to change the situation and the attitude of Russian educated society towards it. In the "Diary of the Writer", the author repeatedly stressed that the intelligentsia should inherit the best qualities of the people and learn from the simple peasants the purity of the soul and the true faith: "We must bow down before the people and expect everything from them, both in thought and in image; bow down before the truth of the people..."<sup>307</sup>

In Solzhenitsyn's publicism, we can also notice the author's personal experience of involvement in what is happening in the country. This is especially evident in "Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union", in which Solzhenitsyn warns of a possible war with China, speaks of the dangers of unrestrained industrial development, and advises Russia on a policy of "isolated salvation" and shifting attention from external to internal tasks. If we analyse the text from the point of view of morphology, the abundance of pronouns "I", "we", "us" can be noted. For example, in Solzhenitsyn's work: "We have followed Western technology too long and too faithfully"<sup>308</sup>. "We have squandered our resources, exhausted our soil"<sup>309</sup>. "These territories give us hope that we will not ruin Russia in the

---

<sup>305</sup> Volgin I.L. Poverh bar'ero... P. 11.

<sup>306</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 413.

<sup>307</sup> Ibid. P. 251.

<sup>308</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T.1. P. 162.

<sup>309</sup> Ibid. P. 162.

crisis of Western civilisation"<sup>310</sup>. The abundance of first-person pronouns emphasises that Solzhenitsyn, like Dostoyevsky, does not separate himself from Russia and its problems, but understands them through the prism of his own personality.

In most "Krohotki", the main character is Solzhenitsyn, through whose eyes we see the event being described. Thus, in the miniature "At the Birthplace of Esenin", we see the author's impressions of his trip to Konstantinovo and his reflections on the genius poet from the peasantry: "I walk through this village, which is many and numerous, where even now all the inhabitants are busy with bread, profit and ambition before their neighbours – and I worry: the heavenly fire once scorched this neighbourhood, and even today it burns my cheeks here"<sup>311</sup>.

In some of Solzhenitsyn's miniatures, the author's image does not immediately appear. For example, the short story "The Bell of Uglich" begins by describing a bell that was about to receive a "strange punishment": exile to Siberia. It was this bell that, centuries ago, heralded the beginning of the Time of Troubles and expressed the people's anger at the murder of the Czarevich Dmitry. On the orders of Boris Godunov, the people of Uglich "were sent to Siberian exile in the case of the innocently murdered Tsarevich Dmitry". Along with them, the great bell of Uglich was punished and sent on a long journey"<sup>312</sup>.

The bell, the main witness of the uprising, was robbed of its tongue and ear and shared the fate of the people of Uglich. The appearance of such a picture in the miniature is not accidental. It is due to the author's experience of his own involvement in the dramas of Russian history and the clash with the authorities that forced him to leave the country. It is interesting that Solzhenitsyn chose to return to his homeland via the Tobolsk Kremlin, where the Uglich bell was imprisoned for several centuries. In the finale of the miniature, the author strikes this bell, in which he sees a symbolic meaning. The ringing heralds the beginning of a new, troubled time: "It fell to me, too, now to strike the suffering bell somewhere in the Dleniya, in the decay of the Third

---

<sup>310</sup> Ibid. P. 163.

<sup>311</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 1. M.: Vremya, 2007. P. 547.*

<sup>312</sup> Saraskina L. I. *Obretnenie zamysla // Vstupitel'naya stat'ya k sborniku rasskazov i krohotok Solzhenitsyna. M., 2006. P. 3.*

Troubles"<sup>313</sup>. The historical analogy used by the author emphasises that the rumble of the "providential alarm of the people" is sounding in the present.

The texts of "Krohotki" and the "Diary of the Writer" have their own character and a strong authorial origin. Nevertheless, sometimes Dostoyevsky does not express some thoughts directly, preferring the literary mask of a certain "paradoxalist", supposedly deliberately detached from the author. This is the case in the essay "The Paradoxalist", which argues for the moral necessity of international war. Solzhenitsyn, on the other hand, expresses his own ideas both in his publicist material and in the miniatures "Krohotki", in which the narrator's world view is inseparable from Solzhenitsyn's own.

The "Diary of the Writer", like Solzhenitsyn's "Krohotki", influences the reader's feelings and excludes 'frontal' solutions to difficult problems. Writers often do not prescribe specific steps to be taken, but try to evoke certain feelings from which action can be taken. Dostoyevsky, developing the ideas of the pochvenniks, defended the importance of returning the intelligentsia, which had lost the true faith, to the ordinary people, who knew Christ better, because "they have suffered through many centuries, and in their sorrow, from the beginning to our days, they have always heard about this God-Christ from their saints, who worked for the people and stood up for the Russian land"<sup>314</sup>. The author urged the intelligentsia to "bow down before the truth of the people and accept it as truth"<sup>315</sup>. At the same time, Dostoyevsky did not propose any concrete steps necessary for the rapprochement of the people and Russian educated society. It is not without reason that many people condemned the ideas of Poverchvennichestvo for the "vagueness" of the programme and the "allegorical concept of the subject of the dispute..."<sup>316</sup>

However, as I.L. Volgin shows, what Dostoevsky was discussing in the "Diary of the Writer" was not the action itself, but the way of acting, which excluded "frontal

---

<sup>313</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 1. M.: Vremya, 2007. P. 559.*

<sup>314</sup> Dostoyevskij F.M. *Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 336.*

<sup>315</sup> *Ibid.* P. 251.

<sup>316</sup> Antonovich M.A. *Izbrannye stat'i. Filosofiya. Kritika. Polemika. L.: Hudozhestvennaya literatura, 1938. P. 354.*

solutions"<sup>317</sup>. The same idea can be applied to many of Solzhenitsyn's publicistic works, including the "Krokhotki". As a follower of Dostoyevsky, Solzhenitsyn also addresses the importance of orthodoxy, but in Krokhotki he does so in a different way, emphasising the terrible consequences of disbelief. In the miniature "The Bell Tower", for example, Solzhenitsyn describes the town Kalyazin, which was flooded by the Bolsheviks and of which only the bell tower survived. The miniature "Ashes of a Poet" depicts the desecration of ancestral graves and a blasphemous attitude to the country's history. The miniature "Journey along the Oka" shows how people thoughtlessly destroy temples, losing centuries of culture and history in the process. In these miniatures, Solzhenitsyn has captured moments of life that show the moral degradation of people. He does not give answers to the questions of how to restore faith in society, his task is to show the consequences of unbelief. At the same time, like Dostoyevsky, who directly demonstrates the importance of returning to Orthodoxy, he does not offer a concrete program of action.

The dialogical nature of the texts is another important feature that unites the "Diary of the Writer" and "Krokhotki", as well as Solzhenitsyn's other publicistic works. The notion of dialogue and the category of dialogicity can be traced back to the work of the philosopher, cultural scientist and literary critic M.M. Bakhtin. He argued that human thought and the process of knowledge have a dialogical character<sup>318</sup>. Therefore, dialogue should be considered not so much as a phenomenon of human communication, but as a phenomenon of being, consciousness and culture. The humanities, according to Bakhtin, always work with texts in the broadest sense. The knowledge of another person is always linked to a sign reality that requires interpretation. The study of the human being outside the text is "no longer the humanities"<sup>319</sup>.

The category of dialogicity can be understood in both a narrow and a broad sense. In the narrow sense, an author's text is dialogical if it contains an attempt to establish contact with the addressee. The text gradually becomes a subject in itself, an address to

---

<sup>317</sup> Volgin I.L. Poverh bar'erov ... P. 25.

<sup>318</sup> Bahtin M.M. Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo. M.: Sov. Rossiya, 1979. - 318 p.

<sup>319</sup> Bahtin M.M. Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva. M.: Iskusstvo, 1979. P. 285.



the reader, a living communication that goes beyond the boundaries of this text. In a broad sense, we can speak of a conventional "dialogue" between the works of writers from different epochs. Dostoyevsky's works were not only created by the author, but also understood and filled with new meaning by Solzhenitsyn in another century. In a literal sense, his publicism is a monologue polemically addressed to Dostoyevsky. In our usual sense we cannot call it a dialogue, because there is no reciprocity: Dostoyevsky could not read Solzhenitsyn's works and respond to them in any way.

Bakhtin, however, interprets the notion of "dialogue" in a broader sense. In his view, texts should be interpreted as cultural communication because they are based on previous texts. More contemporary authors, while constructing their own text, are not free from what their predecessors have written and are in a cultural "dialogue" with them: accepting or rejecting a set of ideas, adapting them to contemporary political, economic, social and cultural realities. In this way, Solzhenitsyn's journalistic work is in many ways based on tradition, inheriting and rethinking the views of many authors, among whom F.M. Dostoyevsky occupied an important place.

In this section we turn to the narrow notion of "dialogue" and "dialogicality". Authors take into account in their texts the factor of the addressee, who can be both real and imaginary. The publicist text is dialogical because it aims at establishing contact with the addressee. Dostoyevsky was one of the first to create a unique precedent of feedback from readers. In 1876-77, Dostoyevsky received hundreds of letters. Their texts, with the author's own replies, sometimes appeared in the "Diary of the Writer". This precedent has led some researchers to propose the bold idea that Dostoyevsky's mono-journal can be seen as a distant prototype of the blogosphere. L. Andrulaitis boldly calls the "Diary of the Writer" a prototype of online journalism and an interactive journal<sup>320</sup>. As an analogue to contemporary comments on bloggers' publications, we can consider numerous letters from readers to Dostoyevsky.

---

<sup>320</sup> Andrulaitis L. "Dnevnik pisatelya" kak proobraz setevoj publicistiki // Oktyabr'. 2005. No12. URL: <https://magazines.gorky.media/october/2005/12/dnevnik-pisatelya-f-m-dostoevskogo-kak-proobraz-setevoj-publicizistiki.html?ysclid=lgfbk7j8gl975136698> (Date of access: 13.04.2023)

The strong personal foundation and trustworthiness of many of Dostoyevsky's publications resonated with readers. In 1876, for example, the circulation of Dostoyevsky's *Monojournal* was 6000 copies, much higher than that of other popular publications. M. A. Alexandrov points out: "Between Fyodor Mikhailovich and his readers arose, and in the second year reached a great communication, unprecedented in Russia: he was flooded with letters and visits with expressions of gratitude for the delivery of excellent moral food in the form of "The Writer's Diary"<sup>321</sup>. I.L. Volgin also wrote about it: "The trustworthiness of the "Diary of the Writer", its powerful personality, its high spiritual tension, its confessionality – all this could not fail to make a deep impression on the reader who was tired of the cold rhetoric of record publicists"<sup>322</sup>.

In his publications, Dostoyevsky took into account the fact that the addressee was real and concrete. It could be an answer to a specific reader. Thus, in 1873, when the "Diary of the Writer" was still associated with the journal "Grazhdanin", we find the material "Half a Letter to One Person", which contains "a certain admonition to an imaginary columnist"<sup>323</sup>. In 1876, when the "Diary of the Writer" became an independent journal, Dostoyevsky continued the tradition of printing letters from readers and replying to them. Thus, in the May issue we find the material "From a Private Letter", dedicated to the trial of Kairova, who had tried to kill a woman. Dostoyevsky wrote: "... I will allow myself to quote a few lines from it, of course, in complete anonymity"<sup>324</sup>. After the publication of the excerpt from the letter, in which Dostoyevsky is asked not to keep silent about the Kairova case, the author of the "Diary of the Writer" actually analyses the course of the trial in more detail and answers the reader.

The "Diary of the Writer" contains answers not only to readers, but also to Dostoevsky's critics, addressed to all readers in general. For example, in the essay "One of the Modern Falsehoods" we find: "Allow me, gentlemen (I am speaking in general,

---

<sup>321</sup> Russkaya Starina. 1892. April. P. 206.

<sup>322</sup> Volgin I.L. Poverh bar'erov ... P. 25.

<sup>323</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 112.

<sup>324</sup> Ibid. P. 363.

not only to a member of the staff of the Russian World)"<sup>325</sup>. Dostoyevsky closely followed the reactions of other publications to the "Diary of the Writer", sometimes commenting on them ironically, thus also establishing a dialogue, but already with his opponents: "'Petersburgskaya Gazeta' hastened to remind the public in a leading article that I do not like children, teenagers and the younger generation, and in the same issue, in its feature section, it reprinted a whole story from my 'Diary': 'The Boy at Christ's Christmas Tree', which at least proves that I do not absolutely hate children"<sup>326</sup>.

Some materials form a long and complex dialogue on acute issues. For example, V.G. Avseenko, a publicist who published critical articles in "Russkiy Vestnik", disagrees with Dostoyevsky on many points. He criticised the author of the "Diary of the Writer" for his call to "bow down before the people". In the monojournal, Dostoyevsky both responds to his opponent and clarifies his own ideas about ordinary Russian people, once again facing criticism from the "Russkiy Vestnik"<sup>327</sup>.

Dostoyevsky's texts are full of appeals to imaginary readers. "Gentlemen, defenders of our youth..."<sup>328</sup> "Think about it and you'll agree"<sup>329</sup>. "Believe me, nowhere in the West, or even in the whole world, will you find such a broad, such a humane religious tolerance"<sup>330</sup> and others. Sometimes the reader is motivated to dialogue with the author by numerous rhetorical questions: "But here is the question: what will Russia do in Europe? What role will it play there? Is it ready for this role?"<sup>331</sup>

For 1876, there are imitations of conversations with an imaginary reader, structured in the form of questions and answers:

- "What are you talking about? – the astonished reader will ask me.
- I wanted to write a preface, because you can't have no preface at all.
- In this case, it would be better to explain your direction, your convictions..."<sup>332</sup>.

---

<sup>325</sup> Ibid. P. 193.

<sup>326</sup> Ibid. P. 245.

<sup>327</sup> Ibid. P. 336-343.

<sup>328</sup> Ibid. P. 201.

<sup>329</sup> Ibid. P. 393.

<sup>330</sup> Ibid. P. 507.

<sup>331</sup> Ibid. P. 347.

<sup>332</sup> Ibid. P. 206.

Solzhenitsyn's publicist texts are also aimed at dialogue with the reader. In "Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union" one can notice a large number of rhetorical exclamations and questions that encourage one to enter into a "dialogue" with the author: "How much more reasonable it is to make this very security turn today! If it is inevitable to make it for the war, is it not more reasonable to make it much earlier - so that we do not have to fight at all!"<sup>333</sup> In the article "Repentance and Self-restraint as Categories of National Life", Solzhenitsyn discusses the need for individual and national repentance. In analysing these philosophical questions, Solzhenitsyn uses first-person plural verbs ("Let us try to answer these questions").<sup>334</sup> Such verbs avoid the sense of an authorial position and invite the reader to join in the reflection.

Like Dostoyevsky, Solzhenitsyn argues with specific opponents in some of his writings. Once in exile, he was forced to engage in political polemics with many Western publicists. Thus, in the article "To Have the Courage to See", Solzhenitsyn tries to respond to some of his opponents, building the material on a consistent refutation of other people's arguments. G. Löbl, one of Solzhenitsyn's opponents, believed that it was not necessary to study in depth how communism appeared in the USSR. In his opinion, it was necessary to assess its threat in the present tense. Solzhenitsyn enters into an open polemic, noting that all phenomena can be viewed objectively if one knows the history of their development. Turning to historical analogy, Solzhenitsyn examines and compares the birth of communism and Nazism: "Mr. Loebel's assertion that communism is as national as Nazism is not at all convincing: the latter never showed itself to be international, but only national, introduced the idea of a "supreme nation", and did not first burn and cut off the life of "its" nation, as every communism does in every country from the first step. That is why Nazism openly declared (as cunning communism never does) that it was coming to make the peoples of the USSR its slaves"<sup>335</sup>. When we speak of some of Solzhenitsyn's journalistic works, we can note that, like Dostoevsky's, they are directed either at a specific reader with whom an

---

<sup>333</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T.1. P. 157.

<sup>334</sup> *Ibid.* P. 53.

<sup>335</sup> *Ibid.* P. 385.

argument is being conducted, or at an imaginary reader who needs to be convinced of the correctness of the author's point of view.

The texts of miniatures "Krohotki" are also dialogical, aimed at a conversation with the readers about the difficult problems facing the country. However, "Krohotki" was not published as a periodical like Dostoyevsky's "Diary of the Writer". Therefore, the precedent of reader feedback in Solzhenitsyn's work is not so obvious. It would be inappropriate to publish reader feedback within the miniatures themselves. How exactly Krohotki influenced readers can only be understood in retrospect. For example, N. A. Struve gave an interview in Paris on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the publication of the first "Krohotki". He pointed out that he often referred to "Krohotki", having read them almost immediately after their publication. According to Struve, Solzhenitsyn had a special style that harmoniously combined outward simplicity with inner depth: "...Solzhenitsyn had a universality in the study of both Russian history and the Russian people. Indeed, "Krohotki" reflects something deep, holistic, natural – the whole dimension of humanity"<sup>336</sup>.

In "Krohotki", Solzhenitsyn encourages a "dialogue" by using historical analogies, succinctly comparing the past and the present. This is the case, for example, in "The Bell of Uglich", where the sound of the bell heralds the beginning of a new troubled time, forcing not only the author but also the reader to reflect on the consequences of the "New Troubles". The author's position in the miniatures is usually openly expressed, but sometimes Solzhenitsyn resorts to irony. For example, in the miniature "Getting Started for the Day", the author ironically compares prayer and exercise.

Like Dostoyevsky, Solzhenitsyn often uses the pronoun "we", "us", "our" in Krohotki to bring himself closer to his readers: "And we – we will soon fly to Venus. Now, if we all get together, we can plough the whole world in twenty minutes",<sup>337</sup> "And

---

<sup>336</sup> Struve N. A. K 50-letiyu pervoi publikatsii "Krohotok" A. I. Solzhenitsyna // Izv. Sarat, un-ta. Seriya: Filologiya. Zhurnalistika. 2014. T. 14. Vyp. 2. P. 106.

<sup>337</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 1. M.: Vremya, 2007. P. 536.

above all, we have become afraid of the dead and of death"<sup>338</sup>, "Who among us is not afraid of the dead and of death".<sup>339</sup> "Who among us hasn't heard that bell? "Like our hope. Like our prayer: no, the Lord will not allow all Russia to be drowned to the end..."<sup>340</sup>

Thus we can argue not only about the continuity of certain conservative ideas, but also about the similarity of the small genre form to which Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn turned to develop ideas of Russian national identity. Since Dostoyevsky mastered the unique form of the diary, he has had many followers. For example, the idea of publishing something similar came to Meshchersky, who revived the journal "Grazhdanin" and began writing a column under that title. O. S. Kruglikova claims that I. S. Aksakov, who stopped publishing the newspaper "Rus" for a while, also thought about such a form of diary.

D. A. Badalyan rightly notes that Aksakov was not "rather presumptuous" for such an unusual format<sup>341</sup>. V.V. Rozanov's "Fallen Leaves" and A.S. Suvorin's "Little Letters" also take the form of an author's diary. "Krokhotki" by A.I. Solzhenitsyn continues this series, proving the relevance and timeliness of the form of the conventional diary, aimed at a public dialogue with the reader about deep and complex problems.

The "Diary of the Writer" and Solzhenitsyn's journalism, including the two cycles of miniatures "Krokhotki", are similar in their themes, most of which are related to the present and future of the country, the fate of the Russian people, its difficulties and problems, the necessity of Orthodoxy for the country. The form of Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's publications is often controversial: in both The Writer's Diary and Krokhotki, fiction can be juxtaposed with topical journalism. The peculiarities of both authors' texts are the strong authorial beginnings, the dialogue as a consideration of the factor of the addressee in the speech.

---

<sup>338</sup> Ibid. P. 550.

<sup>339</sup> Ibid. P. 559.

<sup>340</sup> Ibid. P. 561.

<sup>341</sup> Badalyan D.A. "Kolokol prizyvnyj": Ivan Aksakov v russkoj zhurnalistike konca 1870-h – pervoj poloviny 1880-h godov. SPb.: Rostok, 2016. P. 86.

### 3.2. The concepts of "land" and "soil"

The concept of "soil" is reflected in the name of the conservative trend of thought - pochvennichestvo (and in its later variant - neo-pochvennichestvo). The analysis of the conservative publicism of Dostoyevsky and Solzhenitsyn can be started by considering the concepts of "land" and "soil" in the works of both authors.

In the theoretical part of the study we noted that such a complex and multifaceted concept as "soil" in the works of Russian conservatives should be perceived from different points of view. First of all, soil can be considered literally, speaking of the land cultivated by a peasant, its fertile layer. Soil and land are the unity of the geographical reality of the nation. Secondly, in a metaphorical sense, "soil" is the basis and support of the cultural reality of people. It is the traditions, customs, language and beliefs that make up the national character. Thirdly, the concept of "soil" can be associated with the socio-political programme, the requirement of harmonious existence of different classes of the population.

It is necessary to analyse how exactly Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn consider the concepts of "land" and "soil" in their publicism. In the article "Former Peasants - Future Diplomats", Dostoyevsky wrote about the question of land in the context of the liberation of the peasants. He noted that the peasant reform had left "rural labour without sufficient organisation and provision"<sup>342</sup>. The author bitterly noted that many landlords had sold their land and gone abroad, and that Russian "land ownership is in complete chaos"<sup>343</sup>.

According to Dostoyevsky, the question of the soil is one of the most important issues ensuring the existence of a nation. Taking "land" and "soil" literally, the writer proved that the character of a nation and its ability to solve complex problems in the country depends on the nature of land ownership: "...if land ownership in a country is serious, then everything in that country will be serious, in all aspects"<sup>344</sup>. The health of the nation, the order and laws in the country are largely determined by the correct

---

<sup>342</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 2. P. 164-165.

<sup>343</sup> Ibid. P. 165.

<sup>344</sup> Ibid. P. 165.

organisation of land tenure: "...any correct organisation of the national organism will be organised only when a strong land tenure is established in the country"<sup>345</sup>.

Establishing order in the country means solving the land question. In his work "Land and Children", Dostoyevsky wrote: "If we have the greatest disorder in Russia today, it is in the ownership of land, in the relationship of owners to workers and among themselves, in the very nature of land management. And as long as this is not settled, do not expect a firm arrangement in everything else"<sup>346</sup>.

The land as a field for agricultural work was considered by Dostoyevsky in the article "Muzhik Marey", in which the author describes an incident from his own childhood, when he had a vision of a wolf, and the peasant Marey, who was ploughing the land, was able to calm the boy. Dostoyevsky describes details that help us understand how Russian peasants work the land: "kobylenka", "soha". The author pays particular attention to Marey's finger, soiled in the soil, with which he "softly and with timid tenderness" touched the child's trembling lips and calmed him.

But even in this article, the land and the soil begin to be associated with the peculiarities of the national character and with the best qualities of the ordinary people who work the land. Dostoyevsky describes how the meeting with the simple peasant Marey took place in an empty field, none of the landowners saw him and did not want to praise him for his deed. Yet Marey was able to treat the child with "deep and enlightened human feeling"<sup>347</sup>.

In "The Diary of the Writer", the soil gradually begins to be seen as a metaphysical concept, as something sacred to the Russian man who "takes everything from the earth and from the earth"<sup>348</sup> and knows that "there is something sacramental in the earth, in the soil"<sup>349</sup>. In his article "Land and Children", Dostoyevsky freely interpreted the "Notes of Ivan Dmitrievich Yakushkin", describing him as a landowner who was detached from the "soil" and had little knowledge of the psychology of

---

<sup>345</sup> Ibid. P. 165.

<sup>346</sup> Ibid. P. 474-475.

<sup>347</sup> Ibid. P. 257.

<sup>348</sup> Ibid. P. 474.

<sup>349</sup> Ibid. P. 474.



ordinary people. In the summer of 1819, the Decembrist Ivan Dmitrievich Yakushkin created a project for the liberation of the peasants. He thought it possible to give people cattle, houses and village land for free. The rest of the land would remain in his possession. According to Yakushkin's plans, half of this land could be cultivated with the help of free labour, and the other half could be leased to former peasants. But they rejected such terms: "No, it is better the usual way: we are yours and the land is ours"<sup>350</sup>. Describing this situation in *The Writer's Diary*, Dostoyevsky concluded that the Russian people could not imagine themselves apart from the land, seeing it not so much as a fertile layer of soil to be cultivated, but as something sacred: "If freedom without the land is unacceptable, it means that first of all it has the soil, the basis of everything, the soil is everything, and then from the soil it has everything else, that is, and freedom, and life, and honour, and family, and children, and order, and church - in a word, everything that is precious"<sup>351</sup>.

Discussing the formation of a nation, Dostoyevsky wrote that "a nation, in its vast majority, must be born and grow on the land, on the soil where bread and trees grow"<sup>352</sup>. The author was sure that it was possible to rebirth people for the better by giving them land: "If you want to make men almost out of animals, give them land - and you will achieve the goal"<sup>353</sup>. Dostoyevsky contrasted Russia with Europe. "Little-landed" Europe creates huge cities, alienates the nation more and more from the land, brings up children "on the pavement", detached from national foundations. The ideal future of humanity is associated in the "Diary of the Writer" with the image of the garden, the fertile soil and its gifts, which refers to the image of the Garden of Eden. The renewed humanity, according to Dostoyevsky, will be able to divide the land and begin to live in this garden: "In the garden will be renewed and the garden will be corrected"<sup>354</sup>.

Thus, in "The Diary of the Writer", the concepts of "land" and "soil" are considered not only in the literal but also in the metaphorical sense. Dostoyevsky links

---

<sup>350</sup> Ibid. P. 475.

<sup>351</sup> Ibid. P. 476.

<sup>352</sup> Ibid. P. 474.

<sup>353</sup> Ibid. P. 474.

<sup>354</sup> Ibid. P. 474.

proximity to the soil with the preservation of people's traditions and their faith. In his article "Lovers of the Turks", Dostoevsky wrote that "the teacher of a man's faith is the soil itself, that is, the entire Russian land, as beliefs are innate and reinforced throughout life"<sup>355</sup>.

According to the author of "Diary of the Writer", soil is a spiritual and moral layer of social life which "allows for the connection and organic interaction between intellectuals and the ordinary people, between education and popular morality, between culture and nationality"<sup>356</sup>. In his work "On the Unquenched Truth", M. O. Menshikov highlighted Dostoevsky's call to the intelligentsia to maintain kinship with the peasants and the Russian land, from which the nation cannot separate itself. According to the writer, the root of all problems in the country "lies in the detachment of man from the soil and the subsequent loss of equilibrium in their relationship to it"<sup>357</sup>. The following paragraph will delve deeper into the relationship between the concept of soil and the socio-political program which advocates for the harmonious coexistence of different classes of the population, specifically the intelligentsia and the ordinary people.

L. Saraskina, comparing the life and work of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn, rightly noted that in many ways it is the question of land that brings the two writers and publicists together: "Solzhenitsyn feels his solidarity with Dostoevsky on the main line of social thought - on the question of the soil. Soil is an imperishable value, it is eternal and indispensable in the destiny of man, isolated from it - no life"<sup>358</sup>. In fact, the main idea that allowed Solzhenitsyn to formulate the concept of the development of the country is connected with the land "with its wonderful, blessed quality of being fertile, of having a strong support"<sup>359</sup>.

As in Dostoevsky's publicism, we find in Solzhenitsyn's works an understanding of the concepts of "land" and "soil" in the literal sense, in relation to agriculture and

---

<sup>355</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 2. P. 202.

<sup>356</sup> Seleznev Yu. I. Op. cit. P. 237.

<sup>357</sup> Men'shikov M.O. O neutolenoj pravde. URL:

[http://www.rusky.com/history/library/menshikov3/menshikov31.htm#\\_Toc10454828](http://www.rusky.com/history/library/menshikov3/menshikov31.htm#_Toc10454828) (Date of access: 14.03.2023).

<sup>358</sup> Saraskina L. I. Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh ... P. 582.

<sup>359</sup> Ibid. P. 581.

land ownership. Like his predecessor, Solzhenitsyn is concerned with the question of land ownership. However, unlike Dostoevsky, who analysed the consequences of the agrarian reform and the emigration of many nobles abroad, Solzhenitsyn, who lived in a different century, writes about land rent and the right to private ownership of land. In his work "How Shall We Organise Russia?", the author believes that the current conditions of land tenancy are "deception and mockery"<sup>360</sup>, which may ultimately stifle the human desire for the land. The publicist notes that the tenants are in oppressive dependence on the collective and state farms, which "allocate the worst, deserted land for rent and charge more for it, and overpriced equipment, and are forced to give the products cheaper; then they do not give the promised fodder, or take away the animals taken for fattening..."<sup>361</sup>

Solzhenitsyn pointed out that having a plot of land does not guarantee freedom for the peasantry. Russia needed to develop a free market, accessible transport and rapid repair of agricultural machinery. Solzhenitsyn saw one step that could improve agriculture in the form of personal land leases, which would come not from collective farms but from local government. But private ownership of land is also necessary. In the article "How Shall We Organise Russia?" the author stated: "To deny the village private property is to close it forever"<sup>362</sup>. According to Solzhenitsyn, private ownership of land will help Russian agriculture catch up with Western agriculture.

In regards to soil, Solzhenitsyn presents a specific plan of action which sets it apart from his other conservative publicism works where solutions are not suggested. Solzhenitsyn believes land purchases should come with several benefits and be paid off in multiple instalments over several years, including tax payments. The author suggests distributing small plots of land to "people who want to cultivate their own vegetable crops and urban residents seeking a respite from crowded living conditions"<sup>363</sup>. Solzhenitsyn proposed distributing small plots of land free of charge, and for those who

---

<sup>360</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T.1. P. 553.

<sup>361</sup> *Ibid.* P. 553.

<sup>362</sup> *Ibid.* P. 554.

<sup>363</sup> *Ibid.* P. 555.

can afford to buy a large plot of land, a small part of it (the free minimum) should be added to the size of the area to be bought free of charge.

Like Dostoevsky, Solzhenitsyn does not confine himself to the literal interpretations of the terms 'land' and 'soil', and revisits the ideas of his predecessor: "For the people, the soil is not only a commodity but also carries a moral value. Gleb Uspensky, Dostoevsky and others have written convincingly about this"<sup>364</sup>. The author believes that the increasing distance of human beings from the land weakens their connection to it, which poses a great threat to the character of the people. Dostoevsky noted the nobility's ignorance of the Russian people's character, problems, and customs, despite living in the country or leaving it. In contrast, Solzhenitsyn, writing in a different century, uses the term 'people' to refer to the entire nation. The author notes that "currently the perception and values associated with the peasantry are deeply ingrained in our society, and may no longer be capable of being revived"<sup>365</sup>. The term "peasant feeling" refers more to a sense of affinity for the land and the Russian countryside rather than an individual's belonging to the peasantry. This feeling implies having the ability to appreciate the natural beauty bestowed by the countryside and preserve traditional Russian customs and culture.

Both authors express concern about the alienation of some people from the soil, as well as the loss of Russian traditions and culture. The significance of soil remains in the 20th century, similar to its importance to conservative thinkers in the 19th century. In his "Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union", Solzhenitsyn wrote of the land as the main wealth: "...nowadays, the land is the most valued treasure among the people. Land is a space for settlement. The Earth is the volume of the biosphere. Soil covers deep resources. Soil is essential for fertility"<sup>366</sup>. Solzhenitsyn's publications contain gloomy predictions that by 2030 the growth of the planet's fertility will cease. Nevertheless, the author suggests that there are several countries containing vast amounts of undeveloped land. Specifically, he highlights Russia, Austria, Canada and Brazil as examples.

---

<sup>364</sup> Ibid. P. 553.

<sup>365</sup> Ibid. P. 553.

<sup>366</sup> Ibid. P. 163.

Solzhenitsyn believed that salvation for the people lay in being connected to the soil and developing unused land. "On our expansive northeastern land, we have the opportunity to build a stable economy based on its principles, without the madness of a consuming civilisation focused solely on progress. This will allow people to settle here for the first time, undisturbed by the mistakes of the past four centuries that have not yet disfigured our land with their waste. These territories give us hope to prevent the destruction of Russia amidst Western civilization's crisis"<sup>367</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn often referred to P. Stolypin's ideas to discuss the issue of soil. In 1908, Stolypin presented a prophetic idea in the State Duma, according to Solzhenitsyn. Stolypin noted that the land would ensure the country's future strength<sup>368</sup>. According to Solzhenitsyn, the land is closely tied to one of the main tasks of the country. Solzhenitsyn suggests that Russia should prioritize the development of the Russian North-East rather than global issues. Undeveloped territories will enable the nation to solve numerous internal issues and, according to Solzhenitsyn.

The theme of land and soil is a recurring motif in "Krohotki" and, similarly to "Diary of the Writer", it deals less with peasant farming and more with moral and philosophical dilemmas. By using the miniature "Likhoye zelie", Solzhenitsyn draws a parallel between the patient work of farmers watching over good grains and the demanding task of cultivating human souls. The extended metaphor portrays the cultivation of "the soil of the nation", where the focus is on preserving the vital traditions, history, and culture of the people, not so much on real soil cultivation. In this context, "Likhoye zelie", the weeds, is viewed as an impediment to the preservation and cultivation of the land and soil.

Solzhenitsyn continued his predecessor's ideas about the need for a connection with the Russian land and a sacred attitude towards it, showing the disastrous consequences of refusing to do so. In Krohotka, "Prakh poeta" is about the land that takes many great people into its bosom after their death. However, Solzhenitsyn's contemporaries began to treat the shrines and people buried in Russian soil as

---

<sup>367</sup> Ibid. P. 163.

<sup>368</sup> Ibid. P. 163.

sacrilegious. Thus, under the impression of bicycle rides through the country, Solzhenitsyn describes the monastery where the poet Yakov Polonsky wanted to be buried: "But - no domes and no churches, half of the stone wall remained and completed with a wooden fence with barbed wire, and above all the antiquity - towers, scarecrows ugly"<sup>369</sup>. The watchman's story underlines the careless attitude of people towards the history and holy places of the Russian land: "There was a monastery here, the second in the world. The first was in Rome, I think. And in Moscow it is already the third. When there was a children's colony here, the boys, who didn't know what they were doing, defaced all the walls and smashed the icons. And then the collective farm bought both churches for forty thousand roubles - for bricks they wanted to build a six-row cowshed. <...> A crypt opened under the church, the bishop was lying there, a skull himself, but his robe was intact. Two of us tore the robe, we could not tear it..."<sup>370</sup>

The words referring to imprisonment: "vyshka", "zona", "vahta", sound a clear dissonance in the miniature about the temple. Thus, both the ancient Russian temples and the saints buried in the ground become prisoners of this metaphorical prison. This loss of respect for the soil leads to the moral decline of the personality and its break with the religious and national traditions, culture and history of Russia.

In another Krohotka - "Kolkhozny rucksack" - the wicker box is no longer a symbolic item of great depth. A peasant's rucksack mirrors their remarkable diligence, resourcefulness, and ability to sustain their family's livelihood. In Solzhenitsyn's view, the laborious work of the people on the land is linked with the writer's labor and both are considered an essential duty by the author.

Solzhenitsyn, similarly to Dostoevsky and the writers-derevenchiki, explores the moral values of ordinary people and the writer's relationship with such values. Dostoevsky's "Diary of the Writer" highlights the tragic detachment of the Russian intelligentsia from their national soil. The theme of the Russian writer's destiny and their relationship with the peasants and the Russian soil, without which the people cannot imagine themselves, is a particularly noteworthy aspect worthy of the author's

---

<sup>369</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch.* v 30 t. T. 1. M.: Vremya, 2007. P. 537.

<sup>370</sup> *Ibid.* P. 537-538.

attention. According to Dostoyevsky, writers should bow down before the truth of the peasants, but they themselves do not come from the peasant background<sup>371</sup>. The 19th century presented little opportunity for true talent to develop within the peasantry due to lack of literacy among ordinary people; hence this argument holds some weight. According to Dostoevsky, the people do not directly engage in creative activities but can impart their best traits to the intelligentsia. A noble writer, through interaction with the Russian land and the recognition of ordinary people, ought to imbibe purity and simplicity of soul, and true faith.

According to Dostoevsky, certain Russian writers could achieve this. In the "Diary of the Writer", we read: "The merit of our literature lies in the fact that its best representatives and, above all, intelligentsia, recognized the real beauty in the ideals of the people, and humbly submitted themselves to the truth of the people"<sup>372</sup>. Dostoevsky articulated these ideas in his well-known speech about Pushkin. He presented this speech to the Society of Lovers of Russian Literature in 1880, and it was published in the "Diary of the Writer"<sup>373</sup>. For Dostoevsky, Pushkin was the ideal writer who did not come from a peasant background but was intimately connected to the Russian land, could appreciate and admire the folk characteristics, and "took the soul of the people as his ideal"<sup>374</sup>.

As argued by Dostoevsky, Pushkin was capable of loving the Russian people not because of their many sufferings. Pushkin's affection for both the Russian land and the peasantry had no relation to pity. Pushkin loved and accepted the values of ordinary people. In the "Diary of the Writer," Dostoevsky mentioned: "He loved the Russian nature with passion, almost to the point of emotion. He loved the Russian village. He

---

<sup>371</sup> Kul'ko K. A. "Pochvennicheskie" voprosy o zemle i narodnykh nachalakh v publitsistike F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna // *Izvestiya Yuzhnogo federal'nogo universiteta. Filologicheskie nauki*. 2021. T. 25. № 2. P. 249.

<sup>372</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. *Dnevnik pisatelya ...* T. 1. P. 251.

<sup>373</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. *Dnevnik pisatelya ...* T. 2. P. 434-450.

<sup>374</sup> *Ibid.* P. 406.

wasn't a nobleman, but rather a person who reincarnated himself in his heart as an ordinary man, almost as an image of them"<sup>375</sup>.

According to Dostoevsky, the truth of the ordinary people and their connection with the Russian land is also honoured in N. Nekrasov's work. In the essay "On Love for the People", the author analyzed the works of I. Goncharov and I. Turgenev, noting that their heroes also reflect the best characteristics of ordinary Russian people due to their necessary contact with them. "The contact with the people allowed these heroes to gain extraordinary strength"<sup>376</sup>.

In Dostoevsky's "Diary of the Writer", there is a call to Russian writers to familiarise themselves with folk ideals and study them, in order not to lose their connection to Russian culture, traditions, and values. Unlike Dostoevsky, Solzhenitsyn expanded the idea of a writer emerging from a peasantry background, while acknowledging the historic changes in society. Solzhenitsyn writes within the context of the new historical realities. Over time, the literacy rate among the members of society increases. Following the revolutionary transformations of 1917 and the equalization of social class differences, the Russian author's feeling of separation from the land and the people becomes less intense. In one of the Krohotka, titled "In the Homeland of Esenin", Solzhenitsyn argues that genuine talent arises from the ordinary people who have maintained their connection to the land, in contrast to Dostoevsky. According to the author, the creator must not only gain an understanding of the people's way of life and incorporate the finest characteristics of the peasantry, but also become part of the nation.

Solzhenitsyn analysed the work of the "peasant poet" Sergei Esenin, who was not only close to the Russian soil, but was part of the peasant milieu and was brought up in the Russian soil. In Solzhenitsyn's view, Esenin's talent is remarkable and comparable to the "heavenly fire" that arises within the artist, despite the humdrum of peasant life. That explains the abundance of homely, domestic details in the depiction of Konstantinovo village: Solzhenitsyn describes "the hut of Esenin as a poor dwelling that

---

<sup>375</sup> Ibid. P. 407-408.

<sup>376</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 250.



lacked proper partitions and furniture, to the extent that it could not even be called a room. In the vegetable garden there was a dark shed, and in front of it stood the banya. It was here, in the darkness, that Sergei climbed and wrote down his first poems. Behind the pryaslo lay an ordinary field"<sup>377</sup>. Nonetheless, genuine talent emerged here, notwithstanding the simplicity and 'ordinariness' of the surroundings: "What gift of talent did the maker bestow upon this hut, in this heart of the brawling village boy, that left him awestruck by the abundance of beauty - in the kitchen, in the stable, on the threshing floor, beyond the neighbourhood - a beauty that has been trampled and not noticed for a thousand years?"<sup>378</sup>

Considering the issue of land and soil in the works of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn, it can be noted that this is one of the central themes of their conservative publicism. Solzhenitsyn, inheriting many ideas of his predecessor, also considers land and soil as a multifaceted concept. Soil has not only economic but also moral significance. It is a cultural reality connected with the traditions of the country and the Russian people, customs and faith - that which forms the nation's character and its best traits. The connection between the concept of "soil" and the socio-political programme, which envisages the harmonious existence of the people and the intelligentsia, will be discussed in more detail in the next paragraph.

### **3.3. The notions of "ordinary people" and "intelligentsia"**

The issue of land and soil was a central one for the pochvenniks and is reflected in the name of the conservative movement. However, the question of the ordinary people, the peasantry was no less important. I.L. Volgin analysed the "Diary of the Writer" and argued that most of Dostoevsky's readers understood the most important thing in his mono-journal: "...the fact that Dostoyevsky puts the question of the peasantry at the top of the list, and that the solution of this question is connected with

---

<sup>377</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch.* v 30 t. T. 1. M.: Vremya, 2007. P. 547.

<sup>378</sup> *Ibid.* P. 547.

the whole future of Russia"<sup>379</sup>. The author of the "Diary of the Writer" gave to researchers reasons to prove this idea. In Dostoyevsky's monojournal we find: "The question of the ordinary people and its view and understanding is now the most important question for us, in which all our future lies"<sup>380</sup>.

Pochvennichestvo, as it was noted in the theoretical chapters of this PhD thesis, is largely based on the ideas of the Slavophiles. For example, Dostoyevsky noted that since the time of Peter the Great a clear division of Russian society into two opposing groups had begun: "the ordinary people" and "the intelligentsia". Dostoyevsky was in many ways in solidarity with the Slavophiles in that a significant part of the Russian intelligentsia had been torn away from the national base, the Russian "soil", by the reforms of Peter the Great, and had become distant from Russian culture, increasingly oriented towards the ideals of Western European civilisation. In the "Diary of the Writer", the author understands the tragic process by which some Russians lose touch with the soil: "Our detachment began with the simplicity of looking from one Russia to another. It began a terribly long time ago, as we know, in the time of Peter the Great, when for the first time an extraordinary simplification of the views of the highest Russia on the peasantry Russia was developed"<sup>381</sup>. This division of society, according to Dostoyevsky, prevents its harmonious structure.

Solzhenitsyn's publicism is also critical of Peter the Great, which is noteworthy. According to the author, under Peter's rule, Russia's attempts to draw closer to Europe had a devastating effect on the Russian intelligentsia, which is similar to Dostoyevsky's idea. Solzhenitsyn writes critically of Peter the First: "He did not come to the understanding that it is impossible to transfer (from the West) individual results of civilisation and culture without the mental atmosphere in which they matured (there). Yes, Russia needed to catch up with the West technically and to open up access to the seas, especially the Black Sea. <...> It needed – but not at the cost of trampling on ... the

---

<sup>379</sup> Volgin I.L. Poverh bar'erov ... P. 27.

<sup>380</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T.1. P. 251.

<sup>381</sup> Ibid. P. 526.

historical spirit, the faith, the soul and the customs of the people for the sake of accelerated industrial development and military power"<sup>382</sup>.

Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn acknowledge that Russian society has been divided into two groups since the 18th century: the intelligentsia and the ordinary people. They both regard this as a tragic outcome of a section of society being estranged from Russian customs and culture. It cannot be claimed that Peter the Great's role was always depicted in negative terms in the writers' publications. In the following paragraph, we will also analyse Dostoevsky's positive attitude towards the Peter the Great epoch, in the context of Orthodoxy as a key concept of Russian conservative thought. This research part purposely concentrates on Peter's critical reassessment.

In the "Diary of the Writer" we find a clear division of society into "ordinary people" and "intelligentsia". Dostoevsky considers the Russian nobility to be the "intelligentsia". As a representative of the Russian educated class, the author's attitude towards the peasantry is contradictory in many aspects. For example, in the work "On Love for the People. A Necessary Contract with the People", Dostoevsky writes about the dark beginnings of the peasantry's soul: "I, for example, wrote in the January issue of 'The Diary' that our people were rude and ignorant, devoted to darkness and depravity, 'a barbarian waiting for the light'"<sup>383</sup>. In the same article, however, we find the opposite opinion: the ideals of the peasantry, according to the author, "are strong and holy, and it is these that have saved them in the centuries of torture; they have been fused with their soul from the beginning and have rewarded it forever with simplicity and honesty, sincerity and open-mindedness"<sup>384</sup>.

The complex circumstances of Russian history meant that the people were "corrupted, seduced and constantly tormented"<sup>385</sup>. For Dostoevsky, it is astonishing that after all this suffering, the peasantry have managed to preserve both the human image and its beauty. The great ability of the people to preserve the beauty of the national image despite all the difficulties can excuse all its shortcomings. Thus we read

---

<sup>382</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T.1. P. 619-620.

<sup>383</sup> *Ibid.* P. 249.

<sup>384</sup> *Ibid.* P. 250.

<sup>385</sup> *Ibid.* P. 249.

in the "Diary of the Writer": "...who once had a heartbeat for the suffering of the people, he will understand and apologise for all the impenetrable mud in which our peasants are immersed, and he will be able to find diamonds in this mud"<sup>386</sup>.

In addition to Dostoyevsky's contradictory attitude towards the ordinary people, we can see that the author's understanding of the people's soul and their problems involves three temporal levels: the past, the present and the future. Dostoyevsky writes that the Russian peasants cannot be judged only by what they are in the present: "Judge the Russian people not by the abominations which they so often commit, but by those great and holy things for which, even in their abominations, they constantly sigh <...> No, judge our people not by what they are, but by what they would like to become"<sup>387</sup>. The author of the "Diary of the Writer" not only assesses the present situation of the people, but also refers to its past, noting how many hardships the Russian people have gone through. It also focuses on the future: Dostoyevsky believes that it is necessary to judge people by what they would like to become in the ideal.

Dostoyevsky's contradictory attitude towards the peasantry has been emphasised by many researchers of his work. Yu. Seleznev, for example, writes: "He did not share the 'Don Quixote', as he called it, and the Slavophiles' belief in the pure, unadulterated and uncultured life of the ordinary people – he saw too well and too closely the real representatives of the people's environment".<sup>388</sup> In fact, Dostoyevsky was far from idealising the common man. In the "Diary of the Writer" we find both admiration for the folk character and reproaches for the peasantry.

Discussing the attitude of intellectuals towards the ordinary people, Dostoyevsky notes that the peasantry deserve not only pity and sympathy. One tries to pity the people "for their misery, poverty, suffering, hardship and every barin"<sup>389</sup>. But the Russian common man needs the intelligentsia to love not his suffering and bitter fate, but himself. Dostoyevsky believes that this was achieved by Pushkin, who "loved the

---

<sup>386</sup> Ibid. P. 249.

<sup>387</sup> Ibid. P. 249-250.

<sup>388</sup> Seleznev Yu. I. Op. cit. P. 243.

<sup>389</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 2. P. 406.

peasantry as the peasantry demanded"<sup>390</sup> seeing his dignity. Ironically, Dostoyevsky points out to the sceptics who fail to notice the best beginnings of the folk soul and see only darkness and corruption in the Russian peasantry that "the heart of another coarse, brutally ignorant Russian serf, the man"<sup>391</sup> can nevertheless be filled with beautiful, light feelings, tenderness and unpretentious kindness.

In the previous paragraph, speaking about how Russian conservatives assessed "soil", we noted that this concept is multifaceted, associated, among other things, with a certain socio-political programme. The 19th century Pochvenniks believed that in order to unite the nation, it was necessary to "reconcile" the intelligentsia and the peasantry's beginning, to reduce the gulf between these layers of society, which had been widening ever since the times of Peter the Great. In the 18th century, as Dostoevsky proves, "the class of the 'best' had become very distant from the people in its ideals of the 'best man'"<sup>392</sup>.

The author discusses how to overcome this abyss in "On Love for the people. A necessary contract with the nation". Dostoyevsky believes that the intellectuals are not good enough to set themselves up as a model for the ordinary people. On the contrary, the model for the intelligentsia can be the peasants who, through centuries of torture and suffering, have preserved the simplicity of their souls and the purity of the true orthodox faith.

When talking about the intelligentsia, Dostoyevsky does not separate himself from this group of Russian society and often uses the personal pronoun "we". The author of the "Diary of the Writer" is certain that the representatives of Russia's educated class have much to learn from the people: "We must bow down to the people and expect everything from them, both in thought and in image; we must bow down to the people's truth and accept it as truth, even in the terrible case that it's partly from the Chet'ya-Mineya"<sup>393</sup>.

---

<sup>390</sup> Ibid. P. 406.

<sup>391</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 257.

<sup>392</sup> Ibid. P. 541.

<sup>393</sup> Ibid. P. 251.

At the same time, Dostoyevsky proves that it is not only the ordinary people who should have a positive influence on the intelligentsia: the reverse process is also important: "...so that the peasantry may also accept from us much of what we have brought with us. We cannot completely destroy ourselves before him, nor before any of his truths; ours, let it remain with us"<sup>394</sup>.

Dostoyevsky believes that the Russian people and the intelligentsia, as the two main groups of society, should influence each other, but not mix: a nobleman can be close to the ordinary people, know and love their peculiarities, learn a lot from the simple peasantry, but he will never be a native of this environment. The author of the "Diary of the Writer" outlines a certain program of action for the Russian intelligentsia, which can revive the Russian man's characteristic connection with his native land, its traditions and culture.

In the mono-journal, Dostoyevsky quoted the opinions of his opponents, who accused him of Slavophile idealisation of the folk soul. These skeptics believed that folk ideals could not be a model for the Russian intelligentsia. Thus, in the article "About the same" we find the opinion of Dostoevsky's critics: "... our people cannot even now be competent to create the ideal of a better man, and not that they are not competent, and not even that they are incapable of participating in this feat, that it is necessary first to teach them to read and write, to educate them, to develop them, to establish schools"<sup>395</sup>. Many intellectuals believed that Orthodoxy could not be deeply understood or appreciated by an illiterate and uneducated Russian man.

The author of the "Diary of the Writer" responded to criticism, often building his material on the basis of refuting the opinion of his opponents. For example, he argued that the Russian people were Christian by virtue of their eternal suffering. Representatives of the intelligentsia did not see the true Christian spirit in the simple peasantry because they themselves have long since lost this spirit. The author condemns many nobles for not being able to "look at the people without spitting"<sup>396</sup> and for having

---

<sup>394</sup> Ibid. P. 252.

<sup>395</sup> Ibid. P. 543.

<sup>396</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... P. 335.

"only a dozen or two liberal and profligate anecdotes"<sup>397</sup> about the people's faith and orthodoxy. At the same time, the intellectuals are "much worse than the ordinary people, and in almost every aspects"<sup>398</sup>.

In polemicising with his critics, including the publicist V.G. Avseenko, to whom Dostoevsky repeatedly responded in the pages of the "Diary of the Writer" the author observed that the intelligentsia had limited comprehension of true Orthodoxy, making the people's soul distant and incomprehensible to them. Nevertheless, "even the darkest class of our people are much better educated"<sup>399</sup> than the intelligentsia in its cultural ignorance.

The author of the "Diary of the Writer" in many ways shared the ideas of Slavophiles that it is necessary to look for points of reference in national traditions, saw the beautiful features of the folk soul. In Dostoevsky's opinion, the intelligentsia should be closer to the Russian people, learn from them kindness, unkindness and even true faith, which will be discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs of the study. However, unlike the Slavophiles, Dostoyevsky did not idealise the ordinary people; the author wrote openly about the contradictory nature of the people's soul, which had long to be enlightened from the "darkness of illiteracy". Therefore, according to Dostoevsky, the narrowing of the gap between the people and the intelligentsia is a two-way process: representatives of the Russian educated class should adopt the best features of the people, but the people should also learn a lot from the intelligentsia.

The concept of "intelligentsia" remains in Solzhenitsyn's work, but he writes that in the Soviet Union it was distorted and took on a "perverted meaning". In "The Gulag Archipelago", the author notes that the intelligentsia gradually came to include all those who "do not work with their hands". This category included all Party and state officials, military officers, all teachers and doctors, as well as those who "only walk around in editorial offices, publishing houses, film factories and philharmonics, not to mention those who publish, make films or play the violin"<sup>400</sup>. In the author's opinion, a person

---

<sup>397</sup> Ibid. P. 335.

<sup>398</sup> Ibid. P. 333.

<sup>399</sup> Ibid. P. 336.

<sup>400</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch.* v 30 t. T. 5. M.: Vremya, 2010. P. 222.

cannot be classified as an intellectual on the basis of professional affiliation or occupation. Even a good education and a decent family do not guarantee the emergence of a true intellectual. For Solzhenitsyn, the most important pursuit of a true intellectual is the spiritual side of life. The author gives the following definition: "An intellectual is someone who has a persistent and constant interest and will towards the spiritual side of life, not something that is forced by external circumstances and even in spite of them. An intellectual is someone whose thoughts are inimitable"<sup>401</sup>.

A. G. Manyayev, who has studied Solzhenitsyn's socio-philosophical views, focuses on how Solzhenitsyn understands the intelligentsia. According to the researcher, three main approaches to the intelligentsia can be distinguished: "activity, structural-functional, ethical"<sup>402</sup>. Solzhenitsyn is close to the last approach, suggesting that the key criterion for belonging to the intelligentsia is the presence of moral and ethical consciousness.

The article "Obrazovanchina" is an important journalistic work in which Solzhenitsyn conceptualises the notion of "intelligentsia". In it, the author refers to the collection of articles "Vekhi", in which Russian philosophers of the early 20th century such as N.A. Berdyaev, S.N. Bulgakov, P.B. Struve, S.L. Frank, A.S. Izgoev and others discussed the Russian intelligentsia and its role in the history of the country. Despite the fact that the collection "Vekhi" was published in 1909, Solzhenitsyn still considers it important to refer to the ideas of "Vekhi" when analysing the problems and attributes of the modern intelligentsia: "Historical retrospection always gives and understands the best"<sup>403</sup>.

The authors of "Vekhi" criticised the intelligentsia and spoke of its vices and shortcomings, which hindered Russian development. Solzhenitsyn believes that many of the flaws of the intelligentsia highlighted in "Vekhi" are now almost perceived as virtues. When comparing the intelligentsia at the beginning of the century to the contemporary one, the author notes that the former exhibited traits of martyrdom and a

---

<sup>401</sup> Ibid. P. 222.

<sup>402</sup> Manyayev A. G. Op. cit.

<sup>403</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T.1. P. 87.



willingness to sacrifice. Solzhenitsyn identifies a tendency towards "preservation" in his contemporaries. If the pre-revolutionary intellectual aspired to be the saviour of humanity or the Russian people, the Soviet intellectual's way is "submission, patience, waiting for mercy"<sup>404</sup>. The modern intellectual, according to the author, has no wider concerns and is even willing to sacrifice the truth if it preserves his life and that of his family. Among his contemporaries, Solzhenitsyn notes the ability to adapt to the political situation, panicky cowardice before the state, atheism, which is widespread among the educated classes.

The publicist pays special attention to the shortcomings of the intelligentsia, which they inherited from their predecessors. Among them, the author notes a lack of interest in national history, an exaggerated sense of self-righteousness, spiritual arrogance and opposition to the common people. In listing these shortcomings, Solzhenitsyn himself refers to Dostoyevsky's ideas in the "Diary of the Writer", and adds cowardice and hasty pessimistic conclusions to the list of problems and vices of intellectuals of different eras.

In an attempt to understand how the intelligentsia has changed from the late 19th and early 20th centuries to the present day, Solzhenitsyn briefly reviews its history. In the revolutionary years of 1918-1920, the intelligentsia was dealt a blow: it faced shootings, prisons and hard labour. Part of the Russian intelligentsia went into exile, and those who remained in the Soviet Union were denied freedom of thought and expression. By the end of the 1920s, the fate of the intelligentsia was sad: they had to "either accept the state ideology as their heartfelt, favourite ideology, or perish and scatter"<sup>405</sup>.

In the 1930s, the composition of the intelligentsia changed and expanded. It began to include the technical intelligentsia. Another form of expansion and "decomposition" of the intelligentsia is what Solzhenitsyn calls "the hasty creation of the Rabfak intelligentsia, with poor scientific training"<sup>406</sup>, as well as the inclusion of

---

<sup>404</sup> Ibid. P. 90.

<sup>405</sup> Ibid. P. 95.

<sup>406</sup> Ibid. P. 97.

millions of state officials in the intelligentsia. and the inclusion of millions of state officials in the intelligentsia. Summing up the changes, Solzhenitsyn notes ironically that the word "intelligentsia" now means "the entire educated class, all those who have received an education above seven grades of school"<sup>407</sup>. Solzhenitsyn considers the modern concept of "intelligentsia" to be distorted and uses a personal neologism – "obrazovanshchina" – to refer to it.

If the intelligentsia of the late 19th and early 20th centuries was opposed to the state, up to an open break with it, then Solzhenitsyn's contemporary "obrazovanchina" has become soulfully involved in the universal lie, "submitted –to complete humiliation, to spiritual self-destruction"<sup>408</sup>. According to Solzhenitsyn, the modern "obrazovanchina" is characterised by a "thirst for awards, prizes and titles"<sup>409</sup>. The author accuses the Soviet intelligentsia of inaction: "Our intelligentsia is unanimous in the idea of a desirable future for our country (the greatest possible freedoms), but it is equally unanimous in its complete inaction for that future. Everyone is waiting, hypnotised, to see if something will happen. No, nothing will happen"<sup>410</sup>. The author condemns the cowardice of the intelligentsia and its agreement to "live a lie". Solzhenitsyn divides society into the working class and the intelligentsia, but does not draw a clear line between them. Both the working class and the intelligentsia are excessively law-abiding, indifferent to spiritual life and withdrawn into material concerns.

When speaking of the intelligentsia of today, Solzhenitsyn, like Dostoyevsky, uses the pronoun "we" without separating himself from its vices and shortcomings. In the work "Obrazovanchina" we find: "We have by no means renounced arrogance. We insist on the high hereditary rank of intellectuals, on the right to be the supreme judges of everything spiritual"<sup>411</sup>.

---

<sup>407</sup> Ibid. P. 99.

<sup>408</sup> Ibid. P. 101.

<sup>409</sup> Ibid. P. 103.

<sup>410</sup> Ibid. P. 148.

<sup>411</sup> Ibid. P. 109.

Similar to Dostoyevsky, Solzhenitsyn frequently resorted to criticising other writers' ideas in his publicism. For instance, in his article "Obrazovanchina", he critiques the ideas of publicists such as Telegin, Gorsky, and Pomerantz (pseudonyms). Those people were of the opinion that the intelligentsia's path towards higher values remained disconnected from merging with the people. Solzhenitsyn believed ironically that the views of his adversaries were directed against people born on earth. He thought that those people were "people of the air who had lost all roots in everyday life"<sup>412</sup>. Solzhenitsyn criticises these publicists for thinking that there is no nation, that the peasantry has become too small and that the nation will not be able to revive itself by regaining its spiritual values. The publicist quotes the opinion of his opponents: "There is no nation anymore. There is a mass that retains a vague memory that it was once a people and that it carried God within it, but it is now completely empty"<sup>413</sup>. "There are neurasthenic intellectuals – and the masses"<sup>414</sup>. The publicists criticized by Solzhenitsyn believe that the Russian people, who were once a great historical force and a source of inspiration for many writers, no longer exist.

Solzhenitsyn thinks it is premature to conclude that the Russian people no longer exists. Like his opponents, he sees many problems: "Yes, the village has dispersed, and what remains is muted, yes, on the outskirts of the cities – the clatter of dominoes and broken bottles, no costumes, no round dances, and the language is corrupted, and even more distorted and misdirected thoughts and aspirations"<sup>415</sup>. But Solzhenitsyn believes that the people are alive and will contribute to national revival. Unlike the intelligentsia, the ordinary people do not take part in the government's lies, which means, according to the publicist, that the people have not completely forgotten God and "have not forgotten the place that has not been burned, that has not been trampled in the heart"<sup>416</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn also recognises the hasty conclusion that the true Russian intelligentsia has disappeared. He associates the hope for the spiritual renewal of the

---

<sup>412</sup> Ibid. P. 116.

<sup>413</sup> Ibid. P. 120.

<sup>414</sup> Ibid. P. 120.

<sup>415</sup> Ibid. P. 123.

<sup>416</sup> Ibid. P. 123.

country with a certain "intellectual nucleus": people of purity of aspiration, of soulful devotion, brought up not in libraries but in spiritual ordeals. These people retained a thirst for truth and a thirst to purify their souls. Nevertheless, Solzhenitsyn recognises that the already distorted word "intelligentsia" will probably be replaced by another, more appropriate concept. These will be people who have passed through a special soul "filter": "And this filter is a terrible, frequent, fine, has holes like the ears of a needle".<sup>417</sup> But it is through such a complex purification from lies and cowardice that the passage to the spiritual future of the nation is opened.

Acknowledging that the concepts of "ordinary people" and "intelligentsia" still exist in Russia, although they are now largely blurred, Solzhenitsyn, like Dostoyevsky in the "Diary of the Writer", stresses the alienation of the intelligentsia from the common people: "And the majority of the intelligentsia is now quite aware – some fearfully, some indifferently, some arrogantly – of its estrangement from the present people"<sup>418</sup>.

Nevertheless, in Solzhenitsyn's publicism, society is not as clearly divided into "ordinary people" and "intelligentsia" as it is in Dostoyevsky's the "Diary of the Writer". Solzhenitsyn sometimes contrasts the intelligentsia with the working class, emphasising that it is in fact impossible to draw a clear line between them. This blurring of concepts and lack of a clear division of society is largely due to historical reasons. The class system ceased to exist after 1917. An interesting division of contemporary society is found in Solzhenitsyn's miniatures "Krohotki". The author considers people who live in big cities and those who remain in the hinterland and maintain a connection with "Russian soil". In the miniature "Shame" there is hope for the revival of the country, which is associated with ordinary people from the backwoods: "No, the other depth – those quarter of a million regions where I have been – that breathes hope into me: there I saw the purity of thought, and the unkillable quest, and the lively, generous, good-hearted, native people. Would they not break through this line of doom? They will!

---

<sup>417</sup> Ibid. P. 127.

<sup>418</sup> Ibid. P. 101.

They still have the strength"<sup>419</sup>. Like Dostoyevsky, Solzhenitsyn sees the best qualities in the ordinary people, thanks to which the country can be revived. The authors believe that despite all the hardships and trials the Russian people have gone through, they have preserved the purity of their ideals, and that purity, honesty and sincerity can be found in the Russian countryside.

Questions about the ordinary people and the intelligentsia are among the key themes in Dostoyevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's publicism. In the "Diary of the Writer" there is a clearer division of society into these two groups. In the 19th century, the class structure of society had not yet been destroyed. When Dostoyevsky speaks of the intelligentsia and the "intellectual class", he is referring primarily to the Russian nobility. Solzhenitsyn, writing in another century, understands the extent to which the concept of "intelligentsia" has blurred its boundaries.

Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn are far from idealising the ordinary man. But they both note the best qualities of the people and link them to the hope for Russia's future. Moreover, this hope is linked to the behaviour of the intelligentsia. Dostoyevsky calls on Russian educated society to "return" to the peasantry, to learn much from them and, on the contrary, to teach and enlighten them. Solzhenitsyn associates his faith in the moral revival of the country not with the Soviet "educated", but with the true "obrazovanchina", which will be able to give an example of its non-participation in the universal lie.

### **3.4. The concept of strong state power**

Throughout the theoretical chapters of the PhD thesis, we've focused on the anti-individualism espoused by conservatives. According to these thinkers, the interests of the state and the reliance on strong power are of utmost importance. One of the prominent concepts in Russian conservative thought was "autocracy" which was highly favoured among the publicist ideas of 19th-century conservative thinkers.

---

<sup>419</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch.* v 30 t. T. 1. M.: Vremya, 2007. P. 563.

Conservative thinkers believed that the unity between the tsar and the people was a crucial aspect of autocracy in Russia. Misunderstandings between the government and the intelligentsia were possible. Furthermore, due to their inclination towards Western models, the intelligentsia could become increasingly distant from the ordinary people. Despite the apparent contradictions, the conservatives considered the tsar and the peasantry a unified entity due to their shared responsibility of preserving the country's religious identity and true faith. Dostoyevsky's "Diary of the Writer" also explores these ideas further.

It is necessary to examine how the author approached autocracy. To begin with, it's worth noting that Dostoevsky's attitude towards the Tsar and the monarchy, in general, underwent a change caused by the experiences of his biography. Tsar Nicholas I, who was terrified by the Decembrists and afraid of conspiracies and revolutions, was very suspicious of people who could think critically. We only need to think about P. Ya. Chaadaev, who was adjudged insane for his "Philosophical Letter". The time of the reign of Nicholas I coincided with Dostoevsky's participation in Petrashevsky's group and the writer's arrest.

Dostoyevsky was granted permission by Alexander II to return to the European part of Russia. He also returned to St. Petersburg. The emperor restored Dostoyevsky's hereditary nobility. The author of the "Diary of the Writer" spoke with great respect of the new emperor. Dostoyevsky wrote a poem about Alexander II, which closely resembles an ode. The following words can be found in the work "On the Coronation and the Peace Treaty":

"Peace with Europe, won in battle,  
The Russian land is meeting.  
A new age is before us.  
The sweet dawn of hope  
Rises brightly before our eyes.  
God bless the tsar!"

After hard labour and exile, Dostoevsky found himself in a different Russia, where peasant reform was being actively prepared. But the writer himself had changed.

E.A. Volkova notes that "from a supporter of Fourier's ideas of utopian socialism, he became a consistent monarchist"<sup>420</sup>.

On 21-22 March 1868, the writer sent a letter to A.N. Maykov, in which we find lines about the sincere love of the people for Alexander II: "With us, if anyone has done anything, it is, of course, he alone (and not only because of that), but simply because he is the tsar, loved by the Russian people, and personally because he is the tsar"<sup>421</sup>. In the same letter, Dostoyevsky wrote that he had "finally become a perfect monarchist for Russia"<sup>422</sup>.

According to Dostoyevsky, the attitude of the people towards the tsar is a kind of "sacrament, priesthood, anointing"<sup>423</sup>. The writer remarked: "And ours, and Alexander's, God grant that he may live and live more than forty years. He has done almost more for Russia than all his predecessors put together. And the main thing is that he is so loved"<sup>424</sup>. Dostoyevsky linked the renewal of social and political life to the people's sincere love for the ruler and the emperor's own talent for transforming the country.

Dostoyevsky's wife's recollections further verify the writer's respectful approach towards the emperor: "He admired Emperor Alexander II fervently for the liberation of peasants and his other reforms. In addition, Fyodor Mikhailovich considered the Emperor as his benefactor: during his coronation he reappointed him as part of the hereditary nobility, which he valued. The Emperor permitted my husband to return from Siberia to St Petersburg where he could recommence his literary work, something very dear to him"<sup>425</sup>.

At the same time, it was a paradox of Russian history that tensions grew as social change unfolded. Later this led to terror against the Tsar, who was assassinated several times. Dostoyevsky died a month before the assassination of the Tsar. According to

---

<sup>420</sup> Volkova E.A. Vliyanie obshchestvennoj deyatel'nosti F.M. Dostoevskogo na formirovanie ego istoricheskikh vozzrenij v 1850-1870-e gody // Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Ser.: Istorija, politologiya, sociologiya. 2017. №2. P. 34.

<sup>421</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 28 (2). L.: Nauka, 1985. P. 281.

<sup>422</sup> Ibid. P. 281.

<sup>423</sup> Ibid. P. 281.

<sup>424</sup> Ibid. P. 282.

<sup>425</sup> Dostoevskaya A.G. Vospominaniya. M.: Pravda, 1987. P. 177-178.

A.G. Dostoevskaya's memoirs, if her husband had lived, he would not have survived after such a moral shock<sup>426</sup>.

E. A. Volkova has summarized in her study the particular members of the Romanov family whom Dostoevsky had a personal acquaintance with<sup>427</sup>. Among such members of the royal family were, for example, Tsesarevich (the future Emperor Alexander III) and his wife; Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich; the sons of Alexander II; the sons of Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich. The future Emperor Alexander III and his wife had great respect for Dostoyevsky's talent and read his "Diary of the Writer".

Dostoyevsky wrote several letters to the future emperor. One of them is dated 16 November 1876. In the letter, the author discusses his contemporary epoch: "The present great forces of Russian history have raised the spirit and heart of the Russian people with incomprehensible force to the height of understanding many things that they did not understand before, and have illuminated in our minds the sanctities of the Russian idea brighter than ever before"<sup>428</sup>. Dostoyevsky also writes that he sees changes in the "fair and beautiful" Russian peasantry. It is noteworthy that the author sent the Tsesarevich an edition of the "Diary of the Writer" with the following signature: "Although I have not yet finished my annual edition, I have long thought and dreamed of the happiness of presenting this modest work to Your Imperial Highness. Forgive me, Your Gracious Majesty, my impertinence, do not condemn me, who love you to the utmost, and allow me to send you every further edition of the Writer's Diary on a monthly basis from now on"<sup>429</sup>.

Dostoyevsky's relations with the royal family were quite contradictory. His attitude to the tsar changed with the accession to the throne of Alexander II, whose social changes won Dostoevsky's respect. Questions about the monarchy and the Tsar's union with the peasantry could not but become one of the important themes of the author's later publicism.

---

<sup>426</sup> Ibid.

<sup>427</sup> Volkova E.A. Op. cit. P. 34-35.

<sup>428</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 29 (2). L.: Nauka, 1986. P. 132.

<sup>429</sup> Ibid. P. 132-133.



Having gone through the difficult process of revising the views of his youth, in his later journalistic works Dostoyevsky began to consider conservative ideas, among which the question of strong state power was an important one. Dostoyevsky's "Notebook of 1876-1877" suggests that he intended to include detailed information about Russian autocracy and monarchy as a crucial form of governance in Russia in his "Diary of the Writer". Thus, in the section relating to the November issue of "Diary of the Writer" we read: "On autocracy as the cause of all Russian liberties. (Here is the difference in the views of Russian foreigners and Russians – Russian, in foreign – tyranny, in Russian – the source of all freedoms). <...> In this sense Russia may be the freest of all nations. This is the Russian understanding of autocracy"<sup>430</sup>.

In the notes to the "Diary of the Writer" from the author's workbooks of 1875-1877, with an important note in the margin ("Without fail!"), there is a remark, the ideas of which could be developed in further editions of the "Diary of the Writer": "We are an unlimited monarchy, and perhaps the freest of all.... With such power in the hands of the Emperor – we can only be free. Towards the end. Tyranny and Freedom"<sup>431</sup>. The key words in this sentence are "tyranny" and "freedom". In discussing the monarchical form of government, Dostoyevsky recognised its ambiguity. According to the author, monarchy can be a tyranny, but only if its essence is distorted; ideally, it can bring many freedoms to society. The idea of autocracy as the cause of freedom in the country does not indicate an idealisation of this form of government. Dostoyevsky was also confronted with the "tyranny" of the former Tsar, but, looking at the positive changes in society and the reforms of Alexander II, he believed in the possibility of realising many freedoms at the will of the tsar.

In his "Notebook of 1876-1877" for July-August, Dostoyevsky stressed the peculiarity of the supreme power in the country, capable of guaranteeing many freedoms, and called it the Russian "peculiarity": "Russian autocracy. About the security of autocracy. All freedoms at once and all zemstvo councils, because power is

---

<sup>430</sup> Dostoyevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 24. L.: Nauka, 1982. P. 291.

<sup>431</sup> Ibid. P. 107.

too secure. We alone. Our peculiarity"<sup>432</sup>. Dostoyevsky discussed the specificity of the tsar's power in Russia as an unlimited ruler in earlier notes, which can be found in his "Notebooks of 1872-1875": "But our European glory did not come from Peter's reform at all, but from the old Russian people's view of the tsar's power (as an unlimited ruler) – a power which Peter did not interfere with, because it was too obvious to his own disadvantage, and which astonished Europe and the world with its strength and integrity (the last manifestation of this strength was the liberation of the peasants by the tsar's word alone)"<sup>433</sup>.

The liberation of the peasantry, carried out "from above", by the will of the tsar, as an accomplished fact, allows Dostoyevsky to hope for other transformations in Russian society that the autocrat will be able to achieve. The liberation of the peasantry is the merit of Alexander II, but, according to Dostoevsky, this was made possible by the Tsar's alliance with his people, who not only loved the Emperor but also appreciated the freedom they had been given. In the "Diary of the Writer" (1881), Dostoyevsky wrote of the tsar's union with the people, likening it to a powerful organism: "... here is an organism, alive and powerful, the organism of the people fused with their tsar. This idea is power. This power has been created by centuries. <...> But it is the attitude of the people to the tsar as a father, and we have this real, unyielding foundation on which any reform can be based and built"<sup>434</sup>.

Moreover, the liberation of the peasantry and many of the reforms of those years could not have taken place without the support of the Russian intelligentsia, which also had to realise its unity with the Tsar. Thus, in the April 1876 issue of the "Diary of the Writer", Dostoyevsky wrote: "No, we have liberated the people and the land not because we have become cultural Europeans, but because we have realised in ourselves the Russian people with the tsar at its head, just as the landowner Pushkin dreamed of forty years ago, when he cursed his European education and turned to folk principles. In

---

<sup>432</sup> Ibid. P. 221.

<sup>433</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 21. L.: Nauka, 1980. P. 268.

<sup>434</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 2. P. 505.

the name of these national principles, the Russian people was liberated with the land..."<sup>435</sup>.

More than once in the "Diary of the Writer", Dostoevsky compared the Emperor to a wise father and the Russian people to his children. In addition, the author emphasised the people's childlike love for the Russian ruler and his benevolent and attentive attitude, "...for children can be allowed to do much that is unthinkable in others, <...> children can be entrusted with much and allowed to do so much as has never been seen anywhere else, for children will not betray their father and, like children, will lovingly accept from him any correction of any mistake..."<sup>436</sup>

For the Russian people, according to Dostoyevsky, it is the tsar who is "the all-national, all-unifying power, which the people themselves wanted, which they nurtured in their hearts, which they loved, for which they endured..."<sup>437</sup> This attitude towards the ruler distinguishes the Russian people from the peoples of Europe. Therefore, Dostoyevsky's reasoning about Russia's special way of development is natural, because its history, as well as its people, cannot be an exact copy of what is happening in Europe.

It is essential to emphasize that Dostoevsky, in his "Diary of the Writer", elaborates on the concept of the link between the monarchy and the Orthodox doctrine. The author suggests that the Tsar and the Russian people share a united spiritual obligation associated with religion. It is the people's duty to serve Christ, while the Tsar is responsible for preserving the nation's faith, cultural, and religious identity. The recognition of the crucial role of the Tsar as the defender of orthodoxy elevated the importance of the issue of the destiny of the intelligentsia and the Russian people in the author's conservative publicism. We believe that the relationships between the Russian emperor, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia could be depicted conventionally in a triangular shape. The two main points at the base are the tsar and the people. It is the tsar and the people who preserve Orthodox Christianity. At the top of this conventional

---

<sup>435</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 342.

<sup>436</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 2. P. 506.

<sup>437</sup> Ibid. P. 505.

triangle, far from its base, is the Russian intelligentsia. It is distant from the people and carries the ideas of materialism and irreligious consciousness. This antagonism appears as a tragic and unique feature of Russian society. Overcoming this problem is the key to achieving a harmonious structure in the country.

It is essential to comprehend that, unlike Solzhenitsyn, Dostoevsky saw the monarchy as a tangible part of his time, setting the coordinates of the country's development. The author of the "Diary of the Writer," met with the future Emperor Alexander III and his wife. This meeting occurred in December 1880 at the Anichkov Palace. Dostoyevsky behaved informally, as if he deliberately disregarded accepted etiquette conventions when communicating with the Royal family. Dostoyevsky's daughter, L.F. Dostoevskaya, recalls how her father engaged with the royal family. He would initiate the conversation, conclude it at his discretion, and walk around the room excitedly during long conversations. In L.F. Dostoevskaya's memoirs, she writes: "Perhaps it was the only time in Alexander III's life when he was treated as a mere mortal. He was not offended and later spoke of my father with respect and sympathy"<sup>438</sup>. Dostoevsky's seemingly unacceptable behaviour is due to his special attitude towards the Tsar and the royal family, his awareness of the commonality of the Tsar and his people in the broadest sense. Leaders, present or future, ought to consider these individuals like children who deserve forgiveness on many accounts.

Russian society, particularly the ordinary people, had for centuries developed an attitude towards the Tsar as a wise father. This suggests that the ruler feels a reciprocal sentiment towards the people as his children. The unique bond between the tsar and the people allowed Dostoyevsky to write about the uniqueness of autocracy in Russia, to see the prospects for the development of Russian society along the path of democratic reforms that could be carried out "from above", at the will of the monarch. The orthodox faith is fundamental to the connection between autocratic power and the people of the country.

Twentieth-century Russian conservative thinkers also support maintaining a powerful state, which has always been authoritarian and centralised throughout its long

---

<sup>438</sup> Dostoevskaya L.F. *ob otcze* / publ. S.V. Belova // *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*. M., 1973. T. 86. P. 307.

history. Solzhenitsyn had a more difficult time understanding the pros and cons of strong state power. He did not immediately reach the concept that Orthodoxy and conventional state structures were directly linked. Unlike Dostoevsky, Solzhenitsyn had never observed the royal family as he lived in a different epoch. During his time, the monarchy did not exist, and it was initially seen through the prism of Soviet ideology, which did its best to instil hatred not only for the old system, but also for the religion on which autocracy was based.

Following his involvement in the Great Patriotic War and his subsequent arrest, Solzhenitsyn became a staunch adversary of authoritarian power, which was an integral part of his fight against communism. Nevertheless, a thorough analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of liberal-democratic systems yields an alternative formulation of the issue: "In long human history there have not been many democratic republics, and people have lived for centuries, and not always worse"<sup>439</sup>. It can be noted that Solzhenitsyn begins to differentiate systems that are based on submission to authority. The author understands the term "authoritarianism" broadly: "...from power based on undoubted authority to authority based on undoubted power)"<sup>440</sup>.

The famous 'Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union' reflects Solzhenitsyn's views on both the authoritarian system and democratic freedoms. In the letter, the author suggests that the introduction of democratic freedoms would be instrumental in developing Russia. At the same time, Solzhenitsyn recognizes the danger of the social chaos that unfolded under the Provisional Government in 1917. According to the author, Russia was unprepared for democracy and a multi-party parliamentary system at that time. In the subsequent decades, this unpreparedness would only have diminished. Solzhenitsyn deems the sudden introduction of democracy in Russia to be perilous, for it may lead to "a new, sad repetition of 1917"<sup>441</sup>.

In a specific historical period, conservative thinkers may turn to liberal ideas if they believe they can contribute to the strengthening of the state. It is incorrect to think

---

<sup>439</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T.1. P. 46.

<sup>440</sup> *Ibid.* P. 46.

<sup>441</sup> *Ibid.* P. 181.

that conservatives are opposed to the people's civil rights and freedoms. However, intellectuals, including Solzhenitsyn, acknowledge that enhancing state authority can lead to the extension of all rights and freedoms to the people. As Solzhenitsyn observes, the sudden introduction of democracy in Russia would do nothing to consolidate power and would most likely lead to a new chaos, as in 1917. Democratic rights and freedoms are themselves positive when the country is ready for them.

Solzhenitsyn states that when political freedoms are achieved, people must know what to do with these freedoms in order to avoid political confusion and chaos. The publicist recognises that many people in search of political freedom make an important mistake by considering such freedom as primary, but not understanding what to do with it: "We got such freedom in 1917 (and more and more from month to month) – and how did we understand it? For everyone to go with a rifle where they think it is right. And to cut wire from telegraph poles for their own economic needs"<sup>442</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn believes that external, political freedom cannot be the main goal of an individual. The priority is the inner freedom of the person. Solzhenitsyn writes: "External, social freedom is very desirable for our undistorted development, but no longer as a condition, as an environment; to regard it as the goal of our existence is nonsense. We can firmly realise our inner freedom even in an outwardly unfree environment"<sup>443</sup>. Solzhenitsyn is certain that even in the face of external restrictions, man cannot lose his inner freedom and continue to move towards high moral ideals.

Solzhenitsyn is also critical of the European model of development, noting that the multi-party system that has developed in Europe over the centuries is increasingly facing political crises, "when the tiny preponderance of a tiny party between two large ones determines for a long time the fate of a nation and even of its neighbours; when unlimited freedom of discussion leads to the disarmament of a country in the face of imminent danger and to capitulation in unwinnable wars; when historic democracies are powerless against a bunch of snotty terrorists"<sup>444</sup>.

---

<sup>442</sup> Ibid. P. 45.

<sup>443</sup> Ibid. P. 45.

<sup>444</sup> Ibid. P. 45.

Like his predecessor Dostoyevsky, Solzhenitsyn criticised society's desire to imitate the West. He believes that Russia must seek its own path of development. Western democracy is not an ideal to be aspired to; moreover, it is in political crisis, in "spiritual confusion". Solzhenitsyn notes that "today, less than in the last century, it is less appropriate for us to see the Western parliamentary system as the only way out for our country"<sup>445</sup>.

In his publicistic works, Solzhenitsyn often refers to historical arguments and considers the development of the country in historical retrospect. The author connects the strong physical and spiritual health of the nation in the past centuries with a strong power, the moral basis of which was orthodoxy. He wrote in the "Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union": "...for a thousand years Russia lived with an authoritarian system – and at the beginning of the 20th century still very much preserved the physical and spiritual health of the people. But there was one important condition: this authoritarian system had a strong moral foundation – not the ideology of universal violence, but Orthodoxy, the ancient, seven centuries-old orthodoxy of Sergei Radonezhsky and Nil Sorsky, not worn out by Nikon, not denied by Peter I"<sup>446</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn, like Dostoevsky, recognises that Orthodoxy should be the moral foundation of strong state power. Criticising the Soviet authoritarian model, the author notes that it, unlike the monarchy, was not built on power based on authority, but on authority resting on an unquestioning and rigid power that rejected Orthodoxy as the basis of the state system.

Despite the unlimited power of monarchs in past eras, Solzhenitsyn notes their responsibility before God, the people and their own conscience. The rulers of Soviet Russia have no such responsibility. For all their power, they have no concept of higher values. In the article "On the Return of Breath and Consciousness" Solzhenitsyn writes: "The autocrats of the past, religious, centuries, with seemingly unlimited power, felt

---

<sup>445</sup> Ibid. P. 45-46.

<sup>446</sup> Ibid. P. 45.

their responsibility before God and their own conscience. The autocrats of our time are dangerous because it is difficult to find the highest values that bind them"<sup>447</sup>.

Russia existed for several centuries with the authoritarian power of monarchs. But this did not prevent it, according to Solzhenitsyn, from preserving the moral health of the people. In the previous centuries, the Russian people had not experienced such torment and persecution as under Soviet rule. Given these facts, Solzhenitsyn comes to the ambiguous conclusion that authoritarian systems are not always harmful: "...in a certain sphere of power they can be tolerable for the lives of people, not only for a democratic republic"<sup>448</sup>.

Among the positive aspects of authoritarian systems of state structure, Solzhenitsyn notes stability, continuity, independence "from political upheavals". It is important to note, however, that the writer does not consider such a system to be ideal. He sees its vices, including "the danger of false authorities, their violent maintenance, the danger of arbitrary decisions, the difficulty of correcting such decisions, the danger of slipping into tyranny"<sup>449</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn believes that the danger of the authoritarian system in today's Russia lies not in its undemocratic nature or physical coercion, but in the requirement for individuals to completely surrender their souls, and to continuously participate in the lies imposed on everyone. Solzhenitsyn argues that no person has the right to live while agreeing to such spiritual enslavement: "When Caesar, having taken from us Caesar's things, immediately, even more insistently, demands to give God's things as well – we dare not sacrifice this to him! The main part of our freedom, the inner part, is always in our will. If we ourselves give it up to corruption, we have no human rank"<sup>450</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn does not explicitly advocate for a return to the old system. However, he acknowledges that a transition to a democratic republic in our country is unlikely to be smooth or without difficulty. In his work "On the Return of Breath and Consciousness" he wrote: "And if Russia has habitually lived in authoritarian systems

---

<sup>447</sup> Ibid. P. 47.

<sup>448</sup> Ibid. P. 46.

<sup>449</sup> Ibid. P. 46-47.

<sup>450</sup> Ibid. P. 48.



for centuries, and in the democratic system suffered such a collapse for eight months in 1917, then perhaps – I am not saying this, I am only asking –perhaps we should realise that the evolutionary development of our country from one authoritarian form to another will be more natural, smoother, painless for it?"<sup>451</sup>

To sum up, conservative thinkers of different centuries often conceptualise strong state power and consider autocracy as the most appropriate form of government for such a huge country as Russia. Being a traditional form of government, it has proved its stability over several centuries, and its ability to strengthen the state, represent the interests of diverse classes while relying on orthodoxy as a moral foundation.

As conservative thinkers, both Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn support the idea of strong state power, considering it vital to the destiny of Russia and the ethical wellbeing of its people. However, even Solzhenitsyn wrote about the benefits of a monarchy based on orthodoxy in his later publicism. His works, distinct from Dostoyevsky's "The Diary of the Writer", take on the character of a confrontation with the current regime.

### **3.5. Orthodoxy as a key idea of conservative publicism**

The 19th century posed a challenge to religious faith due to advancements in science and the rise of materialistic philosophy. The aristocracy adopted a sceptical attitude towards anything not based on scientific principles. Moreover, Europe's enlightenment-based education system often undermined the religious values instilled through traditional, patriarchal home education.

Gradually, the self consciousness of the Russian aristocratic intelligentsia began to form outside the Orthodox worldview, based on the European Enlightenment. According to V. Aksyuchits, the response of religion, which was gradually declining in influence, towards the "rationalistic, materialistic and atheistic atmosphere of the

---

<sup>451</sup> Ibid. P. 47.

Enlightenment"<sup>452</sup> was reflected in the religiosity of Freemasonry, which was characterised by "dark mysticism, intricate rituals and secretive plotting"<sup>453</sup>. The interest of 19th century Russian intellectuals in Freemasonry stems from the spiritual and ethical pursuits of the aristocracy; however, these pursuits were essentially anti-Orthodox and anti-nationalist. V. Aksyuchits accurately observed that by rejecting the Church, "propagating universal ideals of love and brotherhood, Freemasons dismantled national cultures and Christian sects that fostered authentic love and brotherhood"<sup>454</sup>.

In addition to abandoning religion or joining the Freemasons, it was not unusual for Russian aristocrats to convert to Catholicism. This could not fail to be reflected in the conservative thinkers writing. For instance, Dostoevsky frequently denounced the intelligentsia, which was distancing itself from the faith, and Catholicism, which he compared to Orthodoxy, in his "Diary of the Writer". The author stated that Catholicism attempted to combine secular and spiritual power, and "sold Christ for an earthly possession" without considering the consequences<sup>455</sup>. European civilisation substituted spiritual pursuits with materialistic ideals, deviating from the "to Caesar is Caesar's" principle and ultimately distorting and irreparably damaging the true depiction of Christ<sup>456</sup>.

If the image of Christ is distorted "in all other faiths and all other nations"<sup>457</sup>, it has been preserved in the Orthodox faith, which according to Dostoevsky, is the true guardian and is represented by Russia. Continuing the ideas of the Slavophiles, author of the "Diary of the Writer" emphasized that preserving faith wasn't possible by the noble intelligentsia but the ordinary Russian people who kept themselves away from atheism, Freemasonry and Catholicism. In "Diary of the Writer" Dostoevsky expressed that the peasantry may be uneducated, immersed in darkness and debauchery, but common people have a better understanding of Christ. "The people are acquainted with

---

<sup>452</sup> Aksyuchic V.V. *Intelligenciya vs obrazovannaya burzhuaziya: rodovye bolezni russkoj intelligencii* // *Tetradi po konservatizmu*. 2019. №1. P. 261.

<sup>453</sup> *Ibid.* P. 261.

<sup>454</sup> *Ibid.* P. 261.

<sup>455</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. *Dnevnik pisatelya ...* T. 1. P. 304.

<sup>456</sup> *Ibid.* P. 304.

<sup>457</sup> *Ibid.* P. 412.

their God, Christ, and perhaps even better than us, notwithstanding their lack of formal education. Their knowledge derives from centuries of suffering and their continual hearing about God-Christ from their saints, who worked for the people and stood for the Russian land, from past to present"<sup>458</sup>.

According to Dostoevsky, the typical Russian man is considered a Christian due to their suffering. The author acknowledges the predominant religion among the people as being influenced by "the centuries of innumerable and continuous hardships they underwent throughout their history. They were abandoned by everyone, trampled on by all, and yet they persevered with Christ the Comforter as their sole companion, who they embraced in their souls forever and who saved them from despair"<sup>459</sup>. Over the centuries of persecution in the name of Christ, a distinct cultural identity has emerged, characterized by traits such as "simplicity, purity, gentleness, open-mindedness and fortitude"<sup>460</sup>. The author elaborates on the community's origins: "Our people, although affected by depravity, have not always been so, and there are enduring ideals that remain steadfast in the face of adversity. Circumstances may change, and improvements may come, but even as depravity may fade from the people, the bright and sacred origins of our ideals will remain unshakeable"<sup>461</sup>.

It was the Christian principles that were able to provide solace to the people during difficult times. These principles were "deeply ingrained in their souls, rewarding them with honesty and sincerity"<sup>462</sup>. The exemplary figures for the nation were the saintly ascetics, who shone as beacons of hope: "But not all are scoundrels; there are saints among us, shining and lighting the way for all!"<sup>463</sup>. In "Diary of the Writer", Dostoevsky recalls such saints who were revered by the people, including the Monk Theodosius of Pecherskiy and Tikhon of Zadonskiy.

Dostoevsky, guided by the ideas of the Slavophile K. Aksakov, believed that the people were already enlightened in various ways. If Christ is the true light of salvation,

---

<sup>458</sup> Ibid. P. 336.

<sup>459</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 2. P. 452 - 453.

<sup>460</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 250.

<sup>461</sup> Ibid. P. 248.

<sup>462</sup> Ibid. P. 250.

<sup>463</sup> Ibid. P. 249.

then those who believe in Christ are truly enlightened. Even though the Russian people have no written language or literacy training, they possess genuine knowledge of good and evil, which comes from God. Therefore, in "Diary of the Writer," we can read: "...even the most disadvantaged members of our society are likely to be better educated than you assume due to your lack of understanding, and perhaps even more educated than yourself, despite your study of religious teachings"<sup>464</sup>.

This paradox truly angered numerous Russian intellectuals who debated with Dostoevsky, highlighting that purity of ideas and religious belief cannot be deemed as true education. In discussing this in an article on the topic of the PhD thesis, we noted: "Sceptics argued that in the illiterate Russian peasant, Orthodoxy could not be deep and conscious. The peasant, who never read the Gospel, was seen as the bearer of a complex conglomeration of superstitions, folk traditions, and echoes of Christian teaching. According to Dostoevsky's critics, this could not be considered a truly religious worldview"<sup>465</sup>.

The author of the *Writer's Diary* not only tried to justify his own point of view in his publication, but also engaged in an active dispute with his opponents. One of these opponents was the publicist V.G. Avseenko, who more than once published articles in *Russky Vestnik* critical of the publications in *The Writer's Diary*. Both authors focused on the question of people and faith. V.G. Avseenko first noted, in the spirit of the "Diary of the Writer", that the independence of our country was created largely thanks to the patience of the people and their willingness to sacrifice for the sake of Christ. Ordinary Russians have preserved the purity of the Christian ideal and high heroism. However, Dostoyevsky highlights the contradictory views of his opponent, who in the same work writes the exact opposite: V.G. Avseenko argues that the Russian people are not the only ones who have been able to preserve the purity of the Christian ideal and high heroism. G. Avseenko argues that the people did not show the intellectuals the ideal of a strong and active personality; Russian literature, in this case, unnecessarily idealised the people, so, according to Dostoyevsky's critic, sooner or later the charm

---

<sup>464</sup> Ibid. P. 336.

<sup>465</sup> Kruglikova O. S., Shapovalova (Kul'ko) K. A. Op. cit. P. 106–107.

will disappear and the real essence of the people will be revealed "in the unattractive form of a world-eater, a kulak, an autocrat"<sup>466</sup>. Avseenko believed that there were no active ideals in the people, and that they had nowhere to go.

Dostoyevsky cannot accept such an attitude towards ordinary people and their ideals. The author of the "Diary of the Writer" tries to point out the logical contradiction in his opponent's position. If Russia's independence was built on the shoulders of the people and the strength of their self-sacrifice, then the people cannot be deprived of active ideals that can serve as an example to the intelligentsia. Dostoevsky believes that the people, after centuries of suffering and slavery, have managed to preserve the purity of their faith and do not deserve "this arrogant spittle about kulaks and swindlers"<sup>467</sup>.

In another publication of the "Diary of the Writer", Dostoevsky debates with V. G. Avseenko about the possible reconciliation between the intelligentsia and the common people. Avseenko suggested that the nobility did not recognize the admirable attributes of the people and "firmly believed that the muzhik is a dog and a kanal'ya"<sup>468</sup>. The author contends that in practice, it is challenging to discuss any educational worth of folk ideals, which should not be sought after as examples to follow nor as a source of spiritual deliverance for the nation. According to V. G. Avseenko, the mere veneration of folk ideals appears to be "an assimilation of European culture". Without it, the Russian nobility would have been unable to imbibe the concept of the presence of attractive qualities of the people.

Dostoevsky expressed his indignation towards his opponent's conclusion that folk origins, as well as Orthodoxy, closely linked with them, have no cultural or educational worth for the intelligentsia. In the "Diary of the Writer", he comments: "Mr Avseenko is as unwise as an infant here: while not every uneducated person was corrupt and despised the people, some of them held these beginnings in high regard due to their exceptional educational value. There were many individuals, perhaps even a significant

---

<sup>466</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 324.

<sup>467</sup> Ibid. P. 325.

<sup>468</sup> Ibid. P. 337.

number, who experienced culture and later embraced the people and their ideals without forfeiting their own cultural heritage"<sup>469</sup>.

Dostoevsky felt genuinely remorseful that the Russian intelligentsia often assumes that the ordinary man "lacks knowledge about religion or Christ, not even... being able to recite the most commonplace prayers"<sup>470</sup>. However, according to Dostoevsky, the nobility fails to recognize that "our people may not be acquainted with prayers, but the heart of Christianity, its values and principles, have been preserved and reinforced within them in a capacity that perhaps no other people in this world, despite their flaws"<sup>471</sup>. The memory of holy ascetics is honoured by the Russian peasantry who, despite appearing uneducated, know the fate of Christian martyrs. They believe that "those who suffer unjustly for Christ's sake will ultimately be exalted above the powerful and noble when God's judgment is pronounced"<sup>472</sup>.

So, it is important to note that Dostoevsky wrote about faith during a challenging period when doubt towards religion was increasing among the noble classes. Some of the intelligentsia became interested in Masonic concepts, while others rejected Russian Orthodoxy in favour of Catholicism. Those who remained faithful to Orthodoxy often saw no example of true religiosity in the ordinary people.

These processes of gradual rejection of faith or scepticism towards it by a part of the educated society continued into the 20th century, during which state-sponsored persecution of religion in Russia was prevalent. Talking about faith during Solzhenitsyn's century was more difficult. In an interview with Spiegel magazine, Solzhenitsyn compared the early 20th century to Dostoevsky's time while discussing the Orthodox faith: "Orthodoxy is integrated into our system of thinking and feeling. And when Dostoevsky wrote, it was still largely preserved. However, from the end of the 19th century, particularly in the 1890s and early 20th century, it began to deteriorate, even in the rural areas. This contributed to the eventual revolution in Russia"<sup>473</sup>.

---

<sup>469</sup> Ibid. P. 338-339.

<sup>470</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 2. P. 82.

<sup>471</sup> Ibid. P. 82.

<sup>472</sup> Ibid. P. 82.

<sup>473</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T. 3. P. 290.

Solzhenitsyn acknowledged that the abandonment of faith played a significant role in the revolution. He believed that "the decline of the peasantry was a direct consequence of the decline of the priesthood"<sup>474</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn disagreed with Dostoevsky's idealisation of the soul of the common man, which refers in many ways to Slavophilism. He believed that his predecessor had exaggerated the "myth" of the Russian people. Solzhenitsyn had the opportunity to view pictures of the revolution which showed the opposite: "A total madness overtakes the masses, and everyone begins to rob, beat, break, and kill as it happens precisely in the revolution. This holy "God-bearer," as Dostoevsky saw him, seems to have disappeared altogether"<sup>475</sup>.

Discussing the terrible causes of the revolution that took place in the country, Solzhenitsyn concludes: "The troubles were sent to us because the people had forgotten God"<sup>476</sup>. Indeed, the era in which Solzhenitsyn had to live was far removed from any attempt to idealise the Russian people. The theme of the necessity of Orthodoxy takes on a different tone in Solzhenitsyn's journalism: the author does not so much assert the necessity of faith as show the disastrous consequences of abandoning it. His publicistic and literary works describe "the catastrophe of humanistic, autonomous, irreligious consciousness"<sup>477</sup> and people who have "lost the consciousness of man's responsibility before God and society"<sup>478</sup>.

In the series of miniatures "Krohotki", Solzhenitsyn writes about destroyed temples, the deadening of the earth, describes people who have forgotten the history and traditions of their people. In one of the miniatures ("Approaching the Day"), the author is forced to admit, to his regret, that his contemporaries' concern for the soul has replaced their concern for the body and its physical condition. Solzhenitsyn describes a group of young people exercising with such diligence that they seem to be praying. In describing the exercise, the author deliberately uses vocabulary associated with prayer:

---

<sup>474</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Razmyshleniya nad Fevral'skoj revolyuciej*. Cherty dvuh revolyucij. M.: KoLibri, Azbuka-Attikus, 2017. P. 64.

<sup>475</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T. 3. P. 288.

<sup>476</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Razmyshleniya nad Fevral'skoj revolyuciej ...* P. 65.

<sup>477</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T.1. P. 326.

<sup>478</sup> *Ibid.* P. 325.

everyone began to "lie down" and "raise their hands"<sup>479</sup>. These ironic details create a profound symbol of a society that "patiently and attentively serves its body"<sup>480</sup> rather than its spirit.

The church becomes a significant image in many miniatures. The bell tower, according to L. Kolobaeva, is a philosophical symbol of "uniting people and pacifying the spirit"<sup>481</sup>. According to Solzhenitsyn, the key to the tranquillity and grandeur of the Russian landscape lies in the churches: "...they nod to each other from afar, they rise from separate villages, invisible to each other, to a single sky"<sup>482</sup>. In the miniature "Traveling Along the Oka", Solzhenitsyn describes in metaphorical terms how important faith has been for the Russian people throughout the centuries in preserving morality: throughout history, the church bell has "lifted people from sinking on their four legs"<sup>483</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn depicts a society that has already fallen "on its four legs": the crosses of the churches have long since been torn down, the dome is rusty and collapsed, "weeds grow on the roofs and in the cracks of the walls; the cemetery around the church has seldom survived, or even its crosses have been dumped, the graves uprooted; the altar pictures have been washed away by the rains of the decades, written over with obscene inscriptions"<sup>484</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn bitterly reproaches, "Our ancestors placed their best and highest understanding of life in these stones and bell towers"<sup>485</sup>. The destruction of these temples is not merely seen as the loss of faith but as the extinction of centuries-old culture and history. The miniature ends with these words: "Pick, Vitya, pick, don't spare! The cinema will be at six, the dancing at eight"<sup>486</sup>. The use of these unpleasant and loud words disrupts the peaceful and harmonious surroundings, highlighting the

---

<sup>479</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch.* v 30 t. T. 1. M.: Vremya, 2007. P. 551.

<sup>480</sup> *Ibid.* P. 551.

<sup>481</sup> Kolobaeva L. A. *Op. cit.* P. 42.

<sup>482</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch.* v 30 t. T. 1. M.: Vremya, 2007. P. 552.

<sup>483</sup> *Ibid.* P. 553.

<sup>484</sup> *Ibid.* P. 552.

<sup>485</sup> *Ibid.* P. 553.

<sup>486</sup> *Ibid.* P. 553.



extent of the moral decay of individuals who have eroded not only the church and faith but also the people's sense of self.

A significant position in the "Krohotki" is held by the miniature entitled "The Bell Tower". Here, Solzhenitsyn depicts the town of Kalyazin, which was inundated by the Bolsheviks due to their refusal to construct a dam. The bell tower is the only remnant of the devastated town. And today it remains much as Solzhenitsyn described it: "And there it stands, rising up from the water, made of the finest masonry and white brick, in six tiers that taper upwards...with no inclination or warping, spanning five arches, and topped off with a bow and a spire – reaching towards the sky!"<sup>487</sup>

The vision of this destroyed bell tower appears to us as if from the depths of time. Solzhenitsyn intentionally incorporates the depictions of Atlantis and Kitezh, the lost continent and city that vanished without a trace, drowned, like Kalyazin, and left a memory of themselves. The image depicted by the writer is not a work of fiction, but rather a shift from journalistic particulars to philosophical abstractions. The partially damaged yet standing bell tower serves as a symbol of Russia, which was almost destroyed by the Bolsheviks but has persevered through the trials of the century. The tower's preservation offers optimism to those who champion the "Orthodox cause", a movement that although forgotten by many, still resonates with the Russian people. The tower represents a glimmer of hope for the country, with the author proclaiming: "For them, and for all those who have witnessed this miracle, the bell tower looms as a beacon of hope. Like our faith. Like our prayer: for we trust that the Lord will not permit the complete demise of Russia"<sup>488</sup>.

Why was Russia in the 20th century morally ruined by the revolution? Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn identified the roots of the revolutionary upheavals as stemming "from the same self-deception of the Enlightenment idea of the harmony of natural man, from which a dangerous inference was made, as if the remaking of the social order would contribute to the improvement of the human soul, and the liberation

---

<sup>487</sup> Ibid. P. 560.

<sup>488</sup> Ibid. P. 561.

of man from the external pressure of the social environment would give him inner harmony"<sup>489</sup>.

During Dostoevsky's era, the concept of the social environment shaping one's consciousness and impacting their spiritual realm was emerging. This concept presents a logical contradiction to the Christian belief in individual accountability for each moral and ethical decision. Dostoevsky, publishing in his "Diary of the Writer" reflections on various trials, repeatedly wrote about people's desire to shift responsibility to terrible circumstances or the social environment that influenced the person who committed the crime. However, the notion that such responsibility cannot be shifted is subtly implied in the subtext of "Diary of the Writer". Solzhenitsyn addresses this issue more directly. "It was a mistake to subjectively declare that a person is naturally good, and that they are only negatively influenced by their environment and circumstances... The division between good and evil is not determined by states, parties or nations, but is a matter of each individual's conscience"<sup>490</sup>.

Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn argued about individual freedom, emphasising that in a society that tries to deny the idea of God, freedom is realised as willfulness. Within Christian morality, freedom is a unique concept that is linked to an individual's ability to exercise self-restraint. Dostoevsky explored this idea of freedom in "Diary of the Writer," writing about it in the following manner: "In the contemporary world, many consider freedom to be synonymous with licentiousness, but true freedom can only be achieved by overcoming one's own desires and impulses. Through this process, one can attain a moral state of being in which they are able to maintain self-control at any given moment. "In the contemporary world, many consider freedom to be synonymous with licentiousness, but true freedom can only be achieved by overcoming one's own desires and impulses. In contrast, living a licentious lifestyle ultimately leads to enslavement"<sup>491</sup>.

---

<sup>489</sup> Kruglikova O. S., Shapovalova (Kul'ko) K. A. Op. cit. P. 109.

<sup>490</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. Publicistika ... T. 3. P. 459.

<sup>491</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 2. P. 73-74.

In the new century, Solzhenitsyn further expounds on the notion of self-restraint as the foremost rational act of a liberated individual. He posits that "it is the most effective path towards actualising one's freedom. According to him, indulging in one's desires does not yield the ultimate spiritual contentment; rather, abstaining from them does"<sup>492</sup>.

Both writers critique the Enlightenment paradigm and the materialist doctrines of Western Europe. Dostoevsky stresses that the humanism of the Enlightenment, predicated on atheism, suits bourgeois civilization that aspires to acquire material wealth. In his speech at Harvard, Solzhenitsyn elaborates on these concepts and critiques a society that rejects God, instead placing an imperfect human at the centre of the world model. This human "is never free from tendencies such as self-love, self-interest, envy, and vanity, among many other vices"<sup>493</sup>.

From his monojournal, Dostoevsky repeatedly stated that the meaning of human life cannot be reduced to earthly pleasures and material well-being. According to the writer, people require a great idea, for which one could die without hesitation, to comprehend the higher meaning of existence, rather than a satisfying life. Dostoevsky identifies the error of European civilization in its abandonment of a sophisticated spiritual quest for a preference of material wellbeing.

In a more objective tone, Solzhenitsyn's work presents the idea of a crisis in atheistic humanism: "If, according to humanism, man existed only for happiness, then he would not have been created for death. But since he is mortal, his earthly mission must necessarily be more spiritual"<sup>494</sup>. This mission is linked to the idea that humans must "leave life in a higher state than when they entered it"<sup>495</sup>. During the ongoing scientific and technological advancements, Solzhenitsyn made the argument that "our life cannot be explained by material laws alone"<sup>496</sup>.

---

<sup>492</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T.1. P. 610-611.

<sup>493</sup> *Ibid.* P. 327.

<sup>494</sup> *Ibid.* P. 327.

<sup>495</sup> *Ibid.* P. 327.

<sup>496</sup> *Ibid.* P. 455.

This philosophical metaphor is also present in Solzhenitsyn's miniatures. For example, in the story "The Duckling", a vulnerable and delicate creature overcomes all the modern technical advances. The duckling's superiority lies in the mysterious divinity of its natural existence, which humans cannot understand or replicate.

In the miniatures, Solzhenitsyn comprehends the human existence and the surrounding nature "through a religious and ethical lens"<sup>497</sup>. The description of nature in the miniatures serves as a testament to God, the creator of this magnificent masterpiece, and the vulnerability of mankind, who contributes nothing but forms a mere part of this creation. For instance, the approaching thunderstorm in miniature "The thunderstorm in the Mountains" evokes the creation story from the Bible: "Darkness, with no top, no bottom, no horizon...", "...and the darkness was separated from the light...", "...there is already solid earth...", "...everything was darkness and abyss..."<sup>498</sup>. This recollection highlights the might and resilience of the elements, beyond the control of humanity, who are "a minor and grateful fragment of this world"<sup>499</sup>. This miniature illustrates Solzhenitsyn's notion that it is unacceptable to regard humans as the ultimate standard for all things.

Solzhenitsyn was surprised by the enthusiastic reception of his first cycle "Krohotki" for its outspoken defence of faith: "These "Krohotki" <...> were a great success, spreading soon after to hundreds of copies and even reaching the provinces. What was most unexpected to me was the warm welcome of the intelligentsia to my frank defence of faith, which was considered so shameful in Russia that no writer's reputation could have withstood it"<sup>500</sup>.

Thus, a significant and deep inquiry, which brings Solzhenitsyn's publicism closer to the work of his forerunner, is the inquiry of religious belief. According to N. Berdyaev, Dostoevsky "uncovers Christ within man's depths, through man's suffering

---

<sup>497</sup> Makarova O. S. Op. cit. P. 60.

<sup>498</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 1. M.: Vremya, 2007. P. 541.*

<sup>499</sup> *Ibid.* P. 541.

<sup>500</sup> *Ibid.* P. 659.

path, through freedom"<sup>501</sup>. The comprehension of the world of such a multifaceted author and journalist like Dostoevsky can be described as "Christocentric"<sup>502</sup>. In the religious philosophy of late 19th to early 20th century Russia, Christocentricity was perceived as the "understanding of all humanity through Christ and in Christ"<sup>503</sup>. Christ was elevated to the position of an ideal, with all things revolving around him.

Christianity is not merely a simple and abstract theory for Dostoevsky. Orthodoxy, to him, is not solely a collection of rituals and commandments but rather the foundation of the nation's life. It is the moral force that has the potential to make an individual's and society's life harmonious. The "Diary of the Writer" confirms this viewpoint. Orthodoxy encompasses "more than just churchiness and ritualism; it is a vital sentiment that has made our people one of the fundamental living forces without which nations cannot exist"<sup>504</sup>. Various scholars have explored the evolution of Dostoevsky's beliefs and his gradual acceptance of Christ and Christianity as an ultimate moral ideal rather than a mere collection of abstract principles to be obeyed by individuals. Notable among these researchers are N. O. Lossky<sup>505</sup> and V. A. Nikitin<sup>506</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn's worldview is also largely based on Christian ideals. During one of his interviews, he recounted his miraculous recovery from cancer and his deep appreciation for the restored life, stating: "The doctors claimed it was impossible to save me, but I defied the odds. Naturally, this experience left an indelible impact. It also compelled me to devote myself tirelessly towards making the most of this second chance"<sup>507</sup>. In the same interview, Solzhenitsyn explained that "his writing frequently stems from a Christian outlook"<sup>508</sup>.

---

<sup>501</sup> Berdyaev N.A. *Mirosozertsanie Dostoevskogo* // *Sobr. Soch.*: V 5 t. T. 5. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1997. P. 226.

<sup>502</sup> Saraskina L. I. *Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh ...* P.6.

<sup>503</sup> Buzuk G.L., Semaeva I.I. *Idei hristocentricheskoj antropologii v ruskoj filosofii* // *Vestnik Poleskogo gos. un-ta*, 2016. №2. P. 62.

<sup>504</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. *Dnevnik pisatelya ...* T. 1. P. 510.

<sup>505</sup> Losskii N. O. *Dostoevskii i ego khristianskoe mirop nimanie*. N'yu-Iork: Izd-vo im. Chekhova, 1953.

<sup>506</sup> Nikitin V. A. *Dostoevskii: Pravoslavie i "russkaya ideya"* // *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya*. 1990. №3. P. 125–131.

<sup>507</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T. 3. P. 338.

<sup>508</sup> *Ibid.* P. 338.

In our view, a comprehensive grasp of Orthodoxy is crucial to the worldviews of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn and is evident in their journalism. While acknowledging the perspective of scholars who contend that autocracy held a central position in the conservative triad for Russian journalists, we acknowledge the existence of alternative viewpoints. In one of the articles on the topic of the PhD thesis, we put forward the hypothesis that among all conservative ideas for Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn, it was the question of faith that was the key issue for Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn. By examining religious concepts, both authors explored political, social, and moral matters in-depth<sup>509</sup>.

The similarities in the perspectives of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn have been investigated with a narrow thematic approach, which often disregards the other themes found in their journalistic writings such as the question of the ordinary people, the soil, and the attitude towards the revolution. Out of the focus of attention of researchers remained the fact that it was the question of faith that was the point of reference for analysing many issues of socio-political, economic and spiritual life of the country.

The section discussing Orthodoxy as a crucial notion in the conservative publicism of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn appears last in the dissertation, serving as a summary of the previously examined topics. Ascertaining that faith is the central focus for the discussion of other ideas, let us review the development of this theme in the prior sections.

### **1) Strong State Authority and Orthodoxy**

The study observed the correlation between the monarchical concept and the Orthodox perspective of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn. According to Dostoevsky, the monarch's responsibility was to protect the Orthodox belief. This task establishes a connection between the monarch and the common Russian people who also safeguard the authentic portrayal of Christ, thereby bringing them closer together.

While for Dostoevsky the power of the Orthodox Tsar was a reality of his time, Solzhenitsyn never lived under a monarchy, so, as we have noted, he did not

---

<sup>509</sup> Kul'ko K. A. Publitsistika A. I. Solzhenitsyna v dialoge s ideyami F. M. Dostoevskogo ... P. 164.

immediately come to the idea that traditional forms of government in Russia and Orthodoxy were linked. Both Dostoyevsky and Solzhenitsyn are in favour of a strong state power with a strong moral foundation in the form of the Orthodox faith, which makes the government accountable to the people as well as to God.

## **2) The question of freedom and religious belief**

This section has examined how both authors value freedom. Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn conceptualise freedom in the context of Christian thought. Freedom in a society that has abandoned God is perceived as willfulness. Freedom in the Christian understanding is associated with the individual's capacity for self-restraint, personal responsibility.

## **3) Challenging the Enlightenment paradigm, the materialist doctrines prevalent in Europe, and religious faith**

Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn critique the materialistic teachings of Western Europe. They argue that man's weaknesses and vices should not be at the centre of the world model, and life's purpose should not solely consist of satisfying material and earthly desires. According to both authors, the noble objective of man is to embark on a spiritual evolution, attaining moral purity and moving towards the values of Orthodoxy.

## **4) Socialism and religious faith**

The study examined Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's attitudes to socialism, which they saw as the antithesis of Christianity. Both authors see the danger of socialist rebellion against God and oppose the revolutionary path, which may lead not to true freedom but to greater spiritual enslavement.

## **5) Ordinary people and religious beliefs**

Dostoyevsky's attitude to the faith of the nation can be described as somewhat idealised. He sees the Russian people as a God-bearing people called to preserve the ideals of the Orthodox faith. Dostoyevsky believes that the simple peasantry understand more than the intelligentsia in matters of faith and can set a worthy example.

Solzhenitsyn, working in a different era, saw how the people themselves were destroying the faith, robbing themselves of their historical and cultural roots.

Whereas the author of "Diary of the Writer" called for a return to popular ideals and Orthodoxy, Solzhenitsyn takes a different path, demonstrating the disastrous results of the nation's abandonment of faith. Nevertheless, in Solzhenitsyn's "Krohotki" there is hope that the "Orthodox cause" has not yet been finally destroyed in the country.

### **6) The historical destiny of the people. The Russian Idea and Orthodoxy**

The historical destiny of the people, the Russian national idea, is also linked to Orthodoxy for both authors. This issue requires a separate consideration and is presented in the final section of the study, but it continues to reveal the previously stated idea that many conservative ideas of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn are viewed through the prism of Orthodoxy.

### **3.6. The historical destiny and mission of the nation. "Russian Idea"**

The ideas of Pochvennichestvo are closely connected to the fate of the Russian people and the mission and destiny of the nation as a whole. These conservative thinkers sought a national idea that was largely based on Orthodoxy and would form the foundation for building a strong nation. For Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn, the search for an idea that could unite the people is closely linked to the concept of the 'Russian Idea'.

Research on the concept of the "Russian idea" in Dostoevsky's works has already become a traditional topic of study. B. N. Tikhomirov, who analyzed Dostoevsky's artistic and publicistic works, observed that the concept of the "Russian idea" is the central theme that frames Dostoevsky's worldview. The author connects the concept of



the "Russian idea" with the philosophical notion of "Russian destiny"<sup>510</sup>. A. V. Gulyga, who studied the creators of the "Russian idea", argues that for Dostoevsky, it was primarily based on Orthodox Christianity<sup>511</sup>. According to A. G. Gacheva, the socio-utopian ideas from Dostoevsky's youth did not directly influence the formation of the concept of "world harmony" and politics that is rooted in brotherhood and *vsesluzhenie*<sup>512</sup>.

Nonetheless, recent studies associate the origin of Dostoevsky's "Russian idea" with his involvements in Petrashevsky's group, his imprisonment, and subsequent reevaluation of utopian socialism<sup>513</sup>. Studies suggest that Dostoevsky attempted to merge certain concepts of socialism and Christianity<sup>514</sup>. M. V. Zavarkina's study on Dostoevsky's idea called "Socialism and Christianity" is of particular interest. The researcher analysed Dostoevsky's notes from the 1860s, found in the author's copy-books and notebooks, which reveal these ideas<sup>515</sup>.

There are few studies that examine Solzhenitsyn's views transformation as he reconsidered his interest in socialism and developed his understanding of the "Russian idea". L. Saraskina presents the evolution of Solzhenitsyn's views based on his biography in comparison with the fate of Dostoevsky<sup>516</sup>. However, in this comprehensive study, there is no emphasis on the formation of the "Russian idea". Recently, researchers attempted to examine the main elements of the philosophical

---

<sup>510</sup>Tikhomirov B. N. *Nasha vera v nashu russkuyu samobytnost'* (K voprosu o russkoi idee v publitsistike Dostoevski) // *Dostoevskii. Materialy i issledovaniya*. T. 12. SPb.: IRL RAN, 1996. P. 108–124.

<sup>511</sup>Gulyga A. V. *Tvtortsy russkoi idei*. M.: Molodaia gvardiia, 2006. 314 p.

<sup>512</sup>Gacheva A. G. *Tsarstvie Bozhie na zemle v ponimanii F. M. Dostoevskogo* // *Problemy istoricheskoi poétiki*. 2005. №7. P. 313–323.

<sup>513</sup>Volkova E. A., Likhoradova I. N., Frolova E. V. *Dostoevskii i petrashevtsy: spory o revoliutsii i sotsializme* // *Izvestiia Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta*. 2019. №2 (238). P. 171–173.

<sup>514</sup>Vititnev S.F., Shmeleva A.V. *Op. cit.* P. 45–58.

<sup>515</sup>Zavarkina M. V. "Sotsializm i khristianstvo": *problemy atributsii i publikatsii zamysla Dostoevskogo* // *Neizvestnyi Dostoevskii*. 2020. № 2. P. 69–97.

<sup>516</sup>Saraskina L. I. *Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh*. M.: Russkii put', 2006.

concept of the "Russian idea" in Solzhenitsyn's work. However, the analysis was based on a comparison between G. I. Gazdanov and A. I. Solzhenitsyn's works<sup>517</sup>.

One of the articles on the subject of the PhD thesis put forward the hypothesis that Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn, having revised the views of their youth, came to their own understanding of the goal of the nation and the 'Russian idea'. Furthermore, it is assumed that Dostoevsky, in his later publicism, still envisioned Russia as having a global, messianic role and believed in its divine tasks. Solzhenitsyn's understanding of the "Russian idea" and the national objectives undergoes a more intricate transformation. In our opinion, these notions evolve and are initially perceived as Russia's messianic tasks, but in Solzhenitsyn's later publicism, the task of Russia is seen as focused solely on internal problems, a departure from its global role in the world<sup>518</sup>. Further examination is required to comprehend how both authors viewed the "Russian idea" and the national mission.

Thanks to his dialogue with ordinary people during his hard labour, Dostoevsky begins to have a better understanding of the contradictory nature of their souls. Apart from the backwardness and rudeness of ordinary people, Dostoevsky observes their high mental qualities, simplicity, aspiration to a high moral ideal, and their ability to preserve Orthodoxy. By understanding the best spiritual qualities of the Russian people, Dostoevsky will be able to formulate the "Russian idea" and comprehend the spiritual path intended for the nation.

A. According to A. Gorelov, the spiritual path of a nation can be defined as: "The way in which the nation realizes its primary idea"<sup>519</sup>. The researcher himself understands the primary national idea as a moral and ideological reference point. According to Dostoevsky, such a reference point can be traced to the Russian people's responsiveness, their brotherly affection for other nations, and their ability to preserve the true image of Christ.

---

<sup>517</sup> Shitakova N. I. "Russkaya ideya" v tvorcheskoy nasledii A. I. Solzhenitsyna i G. I. Gazdanova // Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya Filologiya. Zhurnalistika. 2019. №4. P. 70–74.

<sup>518</sup> Gromova L. P., Kul'ko K. A. Op. cit. P. 217–234.

<sup>519</sup> Gorelov A. A. F. M. Dostoevskii: russkaia ideia i russkii sotsializm // Znanie. Ponimanie. Umenie. 2017. №1. P. 51.

A. A. Gorelov's idea of the "Russian idea" distinguishes two developmental stages: These two stages are classified as Orthodox and Soviet. Dostoevsky's views have been analysed by the researcher. This classification will be applied to analyse the ideas of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn. The initial modification of the "Russian idea", or its first developmental stage, is associated with Christianity, universal salvation, and equality of individuals. This aligns with Dostoevsky's philosophical conception of Russia's mission.

We examine the concept of the "Russian idea" in Dostoevsky's "Diary of the Writer" and how he envisioned the role of the Russian nation. The author of "Post scriptum" argued that our nation has historically been marked by love for brotherly nations, especially when they suffer oppression. Dostoevsky's idea of the "Slavic idea" as connected to the Orthodox cause was strongly influenced by the Eastern question and the willingness of the Russian people to make sacrifices in order to save and defend other Slavic nations. The Slavic idea is based on "the belief that the strongest Slavic tribes have a voluntary duty to support and defend the weakest, in order to create a pan-Slavic unity based on freedom, political independence and Christian principles"<sup>520</sup>. Dostoevsky's observation that the Slavophile perspective on the highest sense of the Slavic idea is noteworthy. However, as tensions around the Eastern question increased, the idea suddenly became embedded in Russian society, and "it expressed itself clearly in the popular consciousness and coincided with the national movement"<sup>521</sup>.

Dostoevsky argued in his "Diary of the Writer" that the Russian people were oppressed by serfdom for a long period. Nevertheless, they have not forgotten the 'Orthodox cause' and their readiness to protect fellow nations. They avoided "becoming utterly insane or self-absorbed egoists solely concerned about their own welfare"<sup>522</sup>. The author of "Diary of the Writer" associates this with the superior qualities of a Russian individual, namely to fortify their spirit during times of suffering and to not abandon the truth of Christ even under political oppression. Although the Russian people have

---

<sup>520</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 481.

<sup>521</sup> Ibid. P. 480.

<sup>522</sup> Ibid. P. 481.

undergone oppression and suffering, Dostoevsky asserts that the nation is still quick to answer the call for help from oppressed nations.

The primary objective of the Pochvenniks was to reduce the growing divide between the Russian peasantry and the intelligentsia. Dostoevsky believed that the Eastern Question crisis and the notion of "Orthodox service", designed to assist brother nations, had for a time been able to unite the ordinary people and educated Russian society in a single impulse. In the "Diary of the Writer" on this matter, we read: "We felt our mutual understanding grow, and were able to clarify many past misunderstandings, which strengthened our self-awareness", stated Dostoevsky in the "Diary of the Writer"<sup>523</sup>. In the publication "Zastarelye lyudi", Dostoevsky observed that those who genuinely love Russia were troubled by the disunity between the upper and lower echelons of society, but noted that this issue had been overcome by unity that developed later on. "In my opinion, the current all-Russian movement on the Slavic issue has partly suppressed and weakened this disunity,"<sup>524</sup> wrote Dostoevsky.

In the publication "Utopian Understanding of History", which is significant in this context, Dostoevsky argued that the task of the country, which had been bequeathed to it by a number of centuries, was "the unity of the Slavs"; however, it should not be a conquest and violence against other nations, but, on the contrary, fraternal assistance to them and "vsesluzhenie to humanity"<sup>525</sup>. The author of "Diary of the Writer" focused on the history of ancient Russia. Dostoevsky believed that prior to the epoch of Peter the Great the country was isolated from the rest of the world, but he realised that it preserved the true Orthodox faith, which was distorted in many other countries and peoples. The author of "Diary of the Writer" strongly asserted that Russia was mistaken in maintaining such isolation because "it cannot keep its preciousness, its Orthodoxy, to itself and shut itself off from the rest of Europe and humanity, as other schismatics have done"<sup>526</sup>.

---

<sup>523</sup> Ibid. P. 481-482.

<sup>524</sup> Ibid. P. 500.

<sup>525</sup> Ibid. P. 413.

<sup>526</sup> Ibid. P. 413.

After the reforms of Peter the Great, Dostoyevsky noted the "unprecedented widening of the horizon". Russia made its first move in elevating Russian Orthodoxy to a prominent role in the concept of "vsesluzhenie". Peter's reforms, which shifted Russia's focus towards Europe, expanded the previously insular concept of Russian Orthodoxy and aided in the gradual development of the Russian nation's purpose: "Our fraternal affection towards other nations, honed over a century and a half of interaction, is the reason behind our mandate for vsesluzhenie towards humanity..."<sup>527</sup> Russia's understanding of its "world purpose"<sup>528</sup> can be traced back to the early 18th century.

Dostoevsky wrote in "The Dream of Reconciliation Beyond Science" that the supreme pledge of a nation's life is its belief that it can have the last word in the world, that it can bring benefit to humanity<sup>529</sup>. In "Diary of the Writer", it is mentioned: "Every nation believes, and must believe if it wishes to survive, that it stands as the saviour of the world and is destined to lead other nations in unity to achieve a final goal"<sup>530</sup>. The belief held by nations that they can lead other nations elevated them and entitled them to shape the destiny of humanity. Dostoevsky claims that this was true for ancient Rome as well as for Rome during Catholic times. France was considered to be at "the forefront of the world, both morally and politically, for nearly two centuries after adopting the Catholic ideology"<sup>531</sup>.

Dostoevsky refers to the thoughts of the Slavophiles and their belief that Russia can lead other nations. "Russia, along with Slavicism and in a leading position, will speak the most significant message the world has ever heard", declares Dostoevsky<sup>532</sup>. P. L. Chuikov accurately highlights the similarity between Slavophilism and Pochvennichestvo, both attempting to understand the historical responsibility of Russians for the spiritual deliverance of humanity<sup>533</sup>. Dostoevsky believed that only the

---

<sup>527</sup> Ibid. P. 413.

<sup>528</sup> Ibid. P. 414.

<sup>529</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 2. P. 24.

<sup>530</sup> Ibid. P. 21.

<sup>531</sup> Ibid. P. 22.

<sup>532</sup> Ibid. P. 25.

<sup>533</sup> Chuikov P. L. Problema "Rossiya" i "Zapad" v istoriosofskoi publitsistike N. V. Gogolya i F. M. Dostoevskogo, redaktora zhurnala "Vremya" // Aktual'nye voprosy sovremennoi filologii i zhurnalistiki. 2018. №3 (30). P. 98–104.

Russian nation was capable of fulfilling the role of a bogonossec. Russia was able to preserve its inner jewel - true Orthodoxy, which it can share with the world.

In a philosophical sense, Dostoevsky described Russian destiny as follows: "Whoever wants to be above all in the kingdom of God, become a servant to all"<sup>534</sup>. The author believes that the initial step towards global cohesion could be the unification of all Slavs "under the wings of Russia". This isn't, nevertheless, linked to the concept of conquest or violence. On the contrary, Russia will be capable of assisting other Slavic nations and supporting them in "recreating themselves to establish a proper connection with Europe and humanity. This would, ultimately, enable them to calm down and rest after their innumerable centuries of suffering"<sup>535</sup>.

An open call for capturing Constantinople can be heard from the pages of "Diary of the Writer": "Yes, we will have the Golden Horn and Constantinople, but not for occupation or violence. <...> This is the natural course of events, to put it simply, it is nature's will"<sup>536</sup>. Dostoevsky's position on Constantinople needs separate elucidation.

The essay 'Utopian Understanding of History' presents a dispute between the author and a hypothetical opponent who questions Russia's moral right to capture Constantinople. According to Dostoevsky, in answering this question, Russia is the only defender of true Orthodoxy and the peoples who profess it. Dostoevsky believed that Russia had been destined to play this role since pre-Petrine times: "Russia is the leader, guardian, and patron of Orthodoxy", as intended by Ivan III, who symbolised it with the Tsar Grad double-headed eagle, and was confirmed after Peter the Great's reign when Russia realised its destiny and became the true and only defender of Orthodoxy and its followers"<sup>537</sup>.

Dostoevsky argued that Russia's right to the ancient Tsargrad is justified by its patronage of Orthodoxy. Russia should treat other Orthodox nations as children. Russia is "the patroness and leader of other Orthodox nations, but not their ruler; it plays a

---

<sup>534</sup> Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya ... T. 1. P. 414.

<sup>535</sup> Ibid. P. 414.

<sup>536</sup> Ibid. P. 415.

<sup>537</sup> Ibid. P. 416.

maternal role, not a domineering one"<sup>538</sup>. The capture of Constantinople should not be seen as a political conquest, but as "the exaltation of Christ's truth preserved in the East. Russia has long been at the head of Orthodoxy, and this capture represents a new exaltation of the cross of Christ and the final word of Orthodoxy"<sup>539</sup>.

Dostoevsky's argument regarding the moral permissibility and necessity of war is of significant importance. The publication called "Paradoxalist" can be found in the 1876 edition of "Diary of the Writer". In this publication, Dostoevsky presents an unusual argument about the significance of war for humanity. The author put his own thoughts into the mouth of a certain Paradoxalist, with whom he had a fictional dispute. In fact, the publication reveals an imitation of a polemic with another person to justify Dostoevsky's uncommon views, which might be condemned by many, in his search for truth. Considering that Dostoevsky invented a fictional dialogue, we will use the term "author" instead of "familiar of the author", as used in the publication.

Dostoevsky vehemently opposes a specific kind of war - civil war: "Internecine, fratricidal war is the only type of warfare that is truly hateful and detrimental. It debilitates and disintegrates the state, often persisting for extended periods of time, and embittering the populace for centuries"<sup>540</sup>. According to Dostoevsky, political and international warfare can have a constructive effect on the nation and population and therefore, it is deemed "absolutely necessary"<sup>541</sup>. Dostoevsky formulated these ideas while reflecting on the Eastern Question and the imperative to safeguard fraternal communities. Dostoevsky observed that extended periods of peace lead to the demise of generosity in a nation and spawn cynicism, ennui, and apathy in its people. During war, individuals sacrifice their lives to "defend their brothers and their fatherland"<sup>542</sup>. War is believed to "bring people together, creating a shared sense of duty and brotherhood"<sup>543</sup> that promotes mutual respect. The author indirectly presents his opinion by simulating a conversation with an unnamed paradoxical thinker. Dostoevsky avoided refuting the

---

<sup>538</sup> Ibid. P. 416.

<sup>539</sup> Ibid. P. 417.

<sup>540</sup> Ibid. P. 347.

<sup>541</sup> Ibid. P. 347.

<sup>542</sup> Ibid. P. 347.

<sup>543</sup> Ibid. P. 350.

paradoxalist's perspective during the fictional dialogue, instead simply seeking clarification. As a result, the author blends his voice with that of the paradoxalist, who advocates for a war that could foster brotherhood, while also discussing the critical Eastern issue.

In Dostoevsky's publicism, the goal of finding a "Russian idea" that could unite society, we find the belief in the necessity of the Christian religion (Orthodoxy), the desire to bring this idea to the whole world (messianic idea), the realisation that this is the destiny of the Russian nation, which has preserved the light of true Orthodoxy, can bring it to other countries, and can protect and unite the oppressed brotherly nations that profess it.

Returning to A. A. Gorelov's classification, we find two stages in the development of the "Russian idea". The first stage, known as Orthodox, aligns with the opinions of Dostoevsky and the Slavophiles concerning Russia's unique obligation in spiritually redeeming humankind and illuminating it with the true teachings of Orthodoxy. A. A. Gorelov refers to the second stage in the "Russian idea's" evolution as Soviet. This advancement of the "Russian idea" deviates from Orthodoxy and leans towards atheism, which aims to establish an earthly paradise devoid of the divine<sup>544</sup>.

Important features of national character and psychology are associated with the basis of the "Russian idea" in any of its forms. The belief in the possibility of universal happiness, the conviction that it is Russia destined to bring this happiness to other countries, and the associated maximalism in achieving this goal quickly, even if it means sacrificing for the greater good - all these elements are characteristic of the Russian idea that aligns with socialism. The characteristics described above are typical of the socialism that started developing in Russia. N. A. Berdyaev was opposed to the Soviet government. He was expelled from the country in 1922. Berdyaev assessed the communist regime that emerged in Russia as a continuation of the "Russian Idea" in his work of the same name<sup>545</sup>. Russia sought to spread the ideas of world revolution to other nations instead of the light of the Orthodox faith.

---

<sup>544</sup> Gorelov A. A. Op. cit. P. 60.

<sup>545</sup> Berdyaev N.A. *Russkaya ideya*. SPb.: Azbuka-klassika, 2008. - 318 p.



Solzhenitsyn's work is part of the development and transformation of the "Russian idea". Solzhenitsyn had to live in the challenging 20th century with ideas such as the world revolution (messianism) and the exclusive role of Russia in creating a bright future for mankind. Solzhenitsyn's views in his youth are consistent with a modification of the "Russian idea". Solzhenitsyn's disappointment in socialism and his sharp criticism of the existing regime, which we analysed in detail in the second chapter of the study, were the starting points for a better understanding of the task of the Russian nation. Eventually, Solzhenitsyn moves away from the idea that the country needs to solve global problems and carry ideas to other nations.

The main topics of interest for the pochvenniks of various centuries are thoughts on Russia, its spiritual path, and a national idea that could unify society. Nevertheless, Solzhenitsyn, who lived during a different epoch, held a distinct perspective on these ideas. Considering that Solzhenitsyn derived and reinterpreted many of his forerunner's concepts, it is worthwhile to analyze how he regarded Dostoevsky's messianic philosophy concerning Russia's significant role in the world.

L. Saraskina compared the ideas of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn and noted a significant difference of opinion: "The notorious Constantinople is the only point in Dostoevsky's political publicism that Solzhenitsyn does not agree with, and it causes him genuine regret"<sup>546</sup>. Solzhenitsyn rejects his predecessor's messianic ideas that Russia should capture Constantinople and make it the center of the Slavic world. In "The Red Wheel," Vorotintsev agrees with Solzhenitsyn's view and refers to the idea of leading the Slavic world as naive, saying: "The whole idea of leading the Slavs is false, together with Constantinople!" Our conflict with the Germans arose because of the Slavs. They travelled to the Balkans and Mesopotamia. Why should we be concerned? It is a matter concerning England. What have we accomplished for the Serbs? ...What a terrible greed - almost complete inability to see beyond Constantinople! Dostoevsky is of the same mindset. From the far-right to the Cadets, and even to Shingarev - they cannot imagine life without Constantinople!"<sup>547</sup>

---

<sup>546</sup> Saraskina L. I. *Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh ...* P. 589.

<sup>547</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 9. M.: Vremya, 2007. P. 18.*

In his publicistic work "'The Russian Question' at the end of the 20th century", Solzhenitsyn criticised Dostoevsky for his naive belief in Russian exceptionalism. He argued that "it was accurate to reproach the Russian state and their thinkers for messianism and the belief in Russian exceptionalism. Furthermore, Solzhenitsyn argued that Dostoevsky, despite his incomparable insight, was not immune to this conquering influence. There is the dream of Constantinople, and 'peace from the East will win over the West', to the point of contempt for Europe, which has long been a disgrace to read"<sup>548</sup>.

Solzhenitsyn, who witnessed the Russian nation being ravaged by war, was unable to justify the moral necessity of international warfare. For him, the destiny of the nation is one of the key points in his writings, viewed from a distinct perspective. For Solzhenitsyn, the 20th century was a time for many nations to confront the consequences of their revolutionary passions and liberal delusions. The author deemed that the Russian people did not live up to the name of "God-bearer", assigned by Dostoevsky, and were swept up by communism's ideology, becoming "the primary mass of slaves to this regime"<sup>549</sup>.

Contrasting with Dostoevsky, in his later publicism, Solzhenitsyn reconsiders the messianic ideas about Russia's exceptionalism and maintains that the Russian people are exhausted from global issues. In his work titled "Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union", the author demonstrated that Russia had been through countless arduous trials during the 20th century, depleting much of its strength. Solzhenitsyn demonstrated that the Russian people, exhausted and nearly destroyed, should not bear responsibility for the destiny of other nations: "Our foreign policy in recent decades appears to be intentionally contrary to the actual needs of our people. Regarding the destiny of Eastern Europe, we have taken on a responsibility beyond our current spiritual level and our capacity to comprehend the needs and ways of Europe"<sup>550</sup>. According to Solzhenitsyn, we must "step away from this smoldering global rivalry"<sup>551</sup>.

---

<sup>548</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T.1. P. 661.

<sup>549</sup> *Ibid.* P. 334.

<sup>550</sup> *Ibid.* P. 82.

<sup>551</sup> *Ibid.* P. 83.

"For half a century we have been engaged in: world revolution; expansion of our influence in Eastern Europe; on other continents; <...> But our people should not live in space, nor in Southeast Asia, nor in Latin America, but in Siberia and the North - our hope and our lagoon"<sup>552</sup> - notes Solzhenitsyn, stressing the need for the country to turn to internal problems, not foreign ones, but its own interests. Solzhenitsyn believed that the key to Russia's further reorganisation was the land. The author regards the undeveloped lands of the North-East as crucial to the salvation of the Russian people.

Dostoevsky associated the moral wellbeing of the country with the global objectives of a dominant country that aims to propagate Orthodoxy to other nations and unite the mankind. Solzhenitsyn believed that the spiritual health of the nation and global goals were incompatible. He introduces the noteworthy concept of "saving the nation", associated with a chaste retreat "into one's own home". Such self-containment can assist Russia in tackling the arduous issues of the 20th century as well as initiating the resuscitation of the nation.

Solzhenitsyn lamented that the idea of physically saving the Russian nation has almost never been successful in Russian history. In his "Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union", Solzhenitsyn defended the significance of "the policy of isolated salvation" and demonstrated the experiences of our people in the 20th century. "Apart from the two world wars, civil strife and turmoil alone resulted in the loss of 66 million people due to the destruction caused by a single internal 'class,' i.e., political and economic"<sup>553</sup> - Solzhenitsyn wrote. No other nation has sustained such losses in the same period. According to Solzhenitsyn, Russia must "heal its wounds, preserve its national body and spirit"<sup>554</sup> after enduring such losses.

According to Solzhenitsyn, the primary concept is to "save the people" in the literal sense, the policy of "isolated salvation" that would allow the nation to come to its senses after the terrible upheavals of the century. However, it is essential to note that Solzhenitsyn is not advocating for complete isolation forever. Instead, this should only

---

<sup>552</sup> Ibid. P. 164.

<sup>553</sup> Ibid. P. 165.

<sup>554</sup> Ibid. P. 166.

be done outside the period of moral recovery: "Once we recover and rebuild our home, we will have the ability and willingness to assist the underdeveloped nations"<sup>555</sup>.

From a spiritual perspective, the 'Orthodox cause' could potentially rescue a nation that has suffered from moral corruption due to socialist ideas for nearly a century. Nevertheless, while Dostoevsky connected the 'Orthodox cause' with bringing authentic Orthodoxy to the world, Solzhenitsyn ties it to principles such as repentance and self-restraint.

Solzhenitsyn's work explores the important theme of repentance for sins. These sins can include both personal sins and those of the whole nation. Solzhenitsyn's early works, including the previously mentioned poem "Dorozhenka", reveal the theme of repentance for personal sins. The article "Repentance and Self-Restraint as Categories of National life" contains passages concerning penance. In this essay, Solzhenitsyn argues that the nation, like the individual, has a divine, non-manifest nature. Moral revitalization of the country necessitates the repentance of the entire nation, rather than just individual personalities: "Repentance is the primary step, without which we cannot progress towards harmony and must continue to stumble into new animosity. Spiritual growth can only commence through repentance"<sup>556</sup>.

According to Solzhenitsyn, the Russian people's ability to repent of their sins is attributed to the faith they have internalised over several centuries. In his analysis of Russia's past, the publicist examines historical arguments and notes that "repentance movements were among the leading national traits of the country until the 17th century"<sup>557</sup>. Solzhenitsyn highlights how the Russian people were able to mercifully forgive debts and set slaves free based on V. O. Klyuchevsky's research. The author draws an interesting historical parallel by comparing the terror of Ivan the Terrible and Stalin, stressing that the former was not as terrible and widespread because the tsar was able to repent for what he had done.

---

<sup>555</sup> Ibid. P. 86.

<sup>556</sup> Ibid. P. 52.

<sup>557</sup> Ibid. P. 59.

This paragraph discusses Dostoevsky's favorable evaluation of the Peter the Great era, which marked the widespread growth of the self-contained Russian Orthodox notion. In contrast, Solzhenitsyn critiques the Peter and Nikon's reforms. According to the author, the reforms initiated a slow transition away from religious beliefs and a denial of repentance, without which the political and economic circumstances in the country could not be fully transformed.

According to Solzhenitsyn, the "gracious rains of repentance" did little to soften the Russian soil in the 20th century. People lost the ability to feel remorse after giving up faith, and instead, they attributed fault to groups such as "tsarism, patriots, bourgeois, social democrats, White Guards, popes, emigrants, saboteurs and kulaks...", but not to themselves. The author believes that only through a general repentance, since "all are guilty and all are stained"<sup>558</sup>, can the burden of the terrible past be lifted and the country's moral revival begin.

Nonetheless, repentance only creates a foundation for future moral development. The subsequent step involves exercising self-control. Solzhenitsyn scrutinised this concept from economic and political viewpoints in his letters to the Soviet Union's Leaders. In his article, "Repentance and Self-Restraint," he highlights the requirement to isolate and limit the nation's politics and economy from attempting to tackle global issues.

The concept of "self-restraint" can be viewed through both philosophical and religious perspectives. In 1976, while accepting the Freedom Foundation Prize, Solzhenitsyn said: "True human freedom is the inner freedom given to us by God, which allows us to make decisions with the spiritual responsibility that accompany them. To truly understand freedom, one must have the conscience to restrain oneself"<sup>559</sup>. Solzhenitsyn later elaborated on these ideas in a speech at the International Academy of Philosophy, where he explored the concept of true freedom as a moral responsibility rather than permissiveness. Therefore, self-restraint is considered "the initial and most

---

<sup>558</sup> Ibid. P. 62.

<sup>559</sup> Solzhenitsyn A. I. Slovo pri vruchenii premii "Fonda Svobody". Sobr. soch.: v 9 t. T. 7. M., 2001. P. 232.

practical action for someone who has achieved freedom"<sup>560</sup>. Solzhenitsyn argues that genuine spiritual contentment arises not from permissiveness, but from self-restraint and voluntary abstinence. Restraining oneself based on remorse for past transgressions has the potential to foster spiritual development. This notion was conveyed during a speech to graduates of Harvard University: "Only by voluntarily nurturing a mentality of mild self-restraint, could individuals rise above the materialistic currents of the world", as stated in the speech<sup>561</sup>.

To summarise, Solzhenitsyn advocates for the concept of "saving the people", a policy of "isolated salvation", as an important goal for the country. Solzhenitsyn's stance demands critical evaluation: a nation as vast as Russia, with numerous foreign policy neighbours, is improbable to concentrate solely on itself and internal issues.

Solzhenitsyn, similarly to Dostoevsky, linked the moral well-being and survival of the nation with the "Orthodox cause". However, in his interpretation, it is not the potential to disseminate Orthodoxy worldwide that matters, but rather the ability to address internal issues, the repentance of the nation, its self-restraint and, as a result, the recovery of the lost faith, which would prevent the society from a possible downfall.

In conclusion of Chapter 3, we observe several important characteristics of Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's publicism:

- As part of the empirical evidence, we analysed Solzhenitsyn's "Krohotki" miniatures. The debate around the genre form of these miniatures remains controversial. Although we recognize the views of researchers who liken the genre form of "Krohotki" to that of a short story or lyric poem, we are inclined towards the notion that these miniatures possess a potent publicistic beginning, a strict documentary character, and a reliance on real facts rather than fiction.
- The reference to "Krohotki" is not arbitrary. The similarity of the small genre form in the works of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn can be mentioned. In our view, "Krohotki" bears similarity to "Diary of the Writer" by its themes of texts, reflection in a small genre form, close relation to the essay, and exploration of

---

<sup>560</sup> Solzhenitsyn A.I. *Publicistika ...* T.1. P. 610.

<sup>561</sup> *Ibid.* P. 327.

deep and complex issues. Both "Diary of the Writer" and "Krohotki" can integrate a literature component with current publicism. A strong authorial voice and a tone of trust unify the texts. These written records can be referred to as a "diary," as they depict events through the authors' perspective. However, these "diaries" are quite conventional in nature as they are not introspective but instead tailored for a public discourse with the reader.

- Overall, Solzhenitsyn's publicism and Dostoevsky's "Diary of the Writer" are united by the publicist's sense of involvement in what is happening in the country, a strong authorial origin, and dialogicity as a consideration of the factor of the addressee in the speech situation: real or imaginary.

By focusing on the content rather than the form and genre features of Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's texts, we can observe the continuity of several essential conservative ideas. In the third chapter of the study, we considered the authors' attitudes to the land and the soil, to the Russian peasantry and intelligentsia, to strong state power, and to Orthodoxy. Furthermore, during the comparative analysis, we observed that thinkers from different centuries, although sharing similar views on various issues, still hold diverse assessments on the task of the country and the Russian nation. The primary ideas of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn, analyzed in the third chapter, are systematised in a comparative table (see Appendix 2).

## CONCLUSION

The comparative analysis of F.M. Dostoevsky's and A.I. Solzhenitsyn's publicistic texts containing conservative ideas has been carried out. We have examined the stages of formation of conservative ideology in Russia, the key constants of Russian conservatism, and the features of Pochvennichestvo and Neo-Pochvennichestvo as directions of Russian conservative thought. The innovativeness of the Pochvenniks of the new century is summarized in the comparative table in the appendix. Furthermore, the formation stages of Dostoevsky's and Solzhenitsyn's socio-philosophical and political views were traced, and their works' comparability was justified. The third chapter of the PhD thesis, based on empirical material, analyses the specificity of the genre form and themes of the conservative publicism of F.M. Dostoevsky and A.I. Solzhenitsyn, as well as the comparative analysis of the publicism of the authors in which conservative ideas are developed. The appendix includes a comparative table reflecting the degree of continuity of several conservative ideas.

The study has shown that Pochvennichestvo and Neo-Pochvennichestvo are related to conservative thought. Publicists focus on themes such as Orthodoxy, the destiny of the nation and the country which are accompanied by a strong state power. After analysing an extensive theoretical research base, it was observed that the ideas of Pochvennichestvo are usually linked with the name of F.M. Dostoevsky. Studying Solzhenitsyn's publicism in the context of developing views of Pochvennichestvo is an idea that has not yet been widely developed in science. The issue of Solzhenitsyn's approach to conservatism is a rather complex one and is still controversial among researchers. Solzhenitsyn's ideas after the 1970s are viewed as being closely related to conservatism, but sometimes in a liberal modification of that.

The empirical part of the research compares the ideas of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn that can be attributed to Pochvennichestvo. However, it's crucial to realise that the wide scale of literary and publicistic creativity of these authors surpasses the limits of strictly one direction of thought. It's more accurate to mention that Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn are not part of Pochvennichestvo, but Pochvennichestvo is only a small facet of the complex and contradictory work of these authors. Despite the



limitations imposed by the study's scope and theme, we intentionally concentrated on ideas that unite Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn in the context of the development of Pochvennichestvo and Russian conservative thought.

In the course of the study we came to the conclusion that it is possible to speak not only of the continuity of a number of conservative ideas, but also of the similarity of the small genre form in the publicism of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn. We concentrate specifically on comparing texts from the "Diary of the Writer" and the "Krohotki" miniatures by Solzhenitsyn. Previously, Solzhenitsyn's miniatures were often regarded as purely literary works. Nevertheless, the literary component is juxtaposed with a powerful publicistic and topical beginning, reminiscent of Dostoyevsky's unique experiment with his mono-journal, in which literary texts were juxtaposed with sharp publicism. The dialogical character, the trusting tone, the attempt to put deep philosophical content into a small form, and the strong authorial beginning bring the texts of "Krohotki" and the materials of "The Diary of the Writer" closer together.

The empirical basis for the PhD thesis is not limited to merely the "Diary of the Writer" and "Krohotki". During the analyses, several of Dostoevsky's letters and drafts from his notebooks were examined. Solzhenitsyn's publicism was considered, including articles, interviews, speeches, and press conferences. In certain cases, we referred to chapters from The "Gulag Archipelago" to analyse the author's contradictory ideas.

Solzhenitsyn acknowledged his discipleship to earlier literature and singled out Dostoyevsky, whose ideas had a great influence on him, among Russian writers. The authors' conservative publicistic works reveal their shared veneration of the land and soil and a sincere apprehension about the nation's destiny, which both writers refuse to romanticise. Aside from the sombre aspects, both Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn recognised admirable traits in the national character that can aid the country's moral revival. The intelligentsia, which is becoming increasingly distant from ordinary people, was condemned by both authors. The writers argue in favor of establishing a powerful state based on the moral authority of the ruler and on Orthodoxy, which inspires a sense of moral responsibility. The importance of Orthodoxy is acknowledged as the primary theme of the conservative publicism of the authors. Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn

examine various themes, including power, ordinary people and intelligentsia, socialism, and the historical mission of the nation, through the prism of Orthodoxy.

One of the features of Solzhenitsyn's publicism is the conflict between socio-political aspirations and religious and moral principles. Upon consideration of this issue, it was revealed that it may not be seen so much as a conflict but rather as a paradoxical synthesis of these contrasting principles.

The research hypothesis was confirmed. Solzhenitsyn's publicism reflects many ideas related to the concept of Pochvennichestvo, originally proposed by Dostoevsky. However, the crucial difference in their viewpoints is the interpretation of the nation's and country's mission. In contrast, Dostoevsky justified Russia's participation in world fate, including capturing Constantinople, whereas Solzhenitsyn could not agree with Russia's messianic tasks. Solzhenitsyn advocates the notion of "saving the people" and advises a policy of "detached salvation". Solzhenitsyn believes the nation can gradually regain its lost faith, through repentance and self-restraint, by temporarily focusing on itself and its problems.

Similar to most conservative thinkers, Dostoevsky had a perception of Russian history as a "historiosophy of success"<sup>562</sup>. The author wrote during the post-reform boom in the economic and political spheres, and was able to assert the importance of the international war and the capture of Constantinople. Solzhenitsyn, who saw the immense depletion of the Russian people's strength after living through multiple world wars, the civil war, and the atrocities of Soviet power, could not emphasise the significance of defending spheres of influence in world politics. Although agreeing with his predecessor in many ways, Solzhenitsyn strongly opposed Dostoevsky's messianic ideas, describing the dreams of Slav unity as somewhat naive. Solzhenitsyn rejected his youthful views that included ideas of messianism, world revolution, and the importance of Russia in spreading this idea to other nations after re-evaluating his own beliefs.

Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn each have their own comprehension of the "Russian idea" and the purpose of the nation. Both thinkers propose two distinctive paths for

---

<sup>562</sup> Kholmogorov E. S. Staryi poryadok i restavratsiya. Ideologiya Solzhenitsyna v koordinatakh anti-prosveshcheniya // Tetradi po konservatizmu. 2018. №2. P. 179.

Russia. The path realised by Dostoevsky is connected with the uniqueness of the Russian nation and its spiritual mission to preserve Orthodoxy. It is outward-looking, building connections with other nations, rather than being self-contained. The alternative path, suggested by Solzhenitsyn, is centred around the awareness of the self-sufficient nature of Russian culture and its refusal to solve global problems.

Studying the ideas of two esteemed writers and publicists makes it possible to recognize that many of their concepts, including various roles for the nation, remain particularly relevant in challenging political and economic circumstances of interacting with other countries. It also enables modern society to reflect on the national idea that could bring people together and safeguard their physical and spiritual well-being.

The research topic could be expanded through participation in scientific conferences and forums. The findings may be used as a reference while teaching students the 19th and 20th-century conservative publicism. Moreover, the PhD thesis may be useful for historians, journalism theorists, philologists and publicists – all those who, in their work, raise the problems that once concerned Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn.

## LIST OF SOURCES AND LITERATURE

### Sources:

1. Aksakov K.S., Aksakov I.S. Izbrannye trudy / sost., avtory vstup. st. i komment. A.A. SHirinyanc, A.V. Myrikova, E.B. Fursova. M.: Rossijskaya politicheskaya enciklopediya (ROSSPEN), 2010. - 888 p.
2. Andrulajtis L. "Dnevnik pisatelya" kak proobraz setевой publicistiki // Oktyabr'. 2005. No12. URL: <https://magazines.gorky.media/october/2005/12/dnevnik-pisatelya-f-m-dostoevskogo-kak-proobraz-setевой-publicizistiki.html?ysclid=lgfbk7j8gl975136698> (Date of access: 13.04.2023)
3. Antonovich M.A. Izbrannye stat'i. Filosofiya. Kritika. Polemika. L.: Hudozhestvennaya literatura, 1938. - 583 p.
4. Belinskij V.G. Poln. sobr. soch. v 13 t. T. 12. M.: Izd-vo Akad. nauk SSSR, 1956. - 596 p.
5. Verhovskij A. Kto pojdet za Solzhenicynym? // Panorama. 1990. №12 (24). Oktyabr'. URL: <http://www.panorama.ru/gazeta/1-30/p24solz.html> (Date of access: 23.04.2023)
6. Vystavka "Dostoevskij i Solzhenicyn". Literaturno-memorial'nyj muzej Dostoevskogo. URL: <http://www.md.spb.ru/events/list/n982/> (Date of access: 17.03.2023).
7. Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya: v 2 t. T. 1. M.: Knizhnyj klub, 2011. - 800 p.
8. Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya: v 2 t. T. 2. M.: Knizhnyj klub, 2011. - 752 p.
9. Dostoevskij F.M. Obyasneniya i pokazaniya po delu petrashevcev. URL: <http://dostoevskiy-lit.ru/dostoevskiy/public/petrashevcy/obyasnenie-m-dostoevskogo.htm?ysclid=lcf5hgbrbo271196900> (Date of access: 02.05.2023)
10. Dostoevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 8. L.: Nauka, 1973. - 514 p.
11. Dostoevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 21. L.: Nauka, 1980. - 554 p.
12. Dostoevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 22. L.: Nauka, 1981. - 410 p.
13. Dostoevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 24. L.: Nauka, 1982. - 521 p.
14. Dostoevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 28 (2). L.: Nauka, 1985. - 617 p.
15. Dostoevskij F.M. Poln. sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 29 (2). L.: Nauka, 1986. - 377 p.
16. Dostoevskaya A.G. Vospominaniya. M.: Pravda, 1987. - 541 p.
17. Dostoevskaya L.F. ob otce / publ. S.V. Belova // Literaturnoe nasledstvo. M., 1973. T. 86. P. 300–307.
18. Zalygin S.P. God Solzhenicyna // Novyj mir. 1990. №1. P. 232–238.

- 19.A. Kapliev. Konservatizm v XXI veke: "proryv k zvezdam". URL: [https://fictionbook.ru/author/andreyi\\_sergeevich\\_kapliev/doktrina\\_kosmizma/read\\_online.html?page=8&ysclid=laxyieb1s3112218754](https://fictionbook.ru/author/andreyi_sergeevich_kapliev/doktrina_kosmizma/read_online.html?page=8&ysclid=laxyieb1s3112218754) (Date of access: 13.04.2023)
- 20.Katkov M.N. Sobr. soch.: v 6 t. T. 2. SPb.: Rostok, 2011. - 893 p.
- 21.Koshelev A.I. Zapiski Aleksandra Ivanovicha Kosheleva (1812–1883 gody) M.: Nauka, 2002. - 475 p.
- 22.Lihachev D.S. Pis'ma o dobrom. SPb.: Izdatel'stvo "Logos", 2007. - 256 p.
- 23.Men'shikov M.O. O neutolenoj pravde. URL: [http://www.rusky.com/history/library/menshikov3/menshikov31.htm#\\_Toc10454828](http://www.rusky.com/history/library/menshikov3/menshikov31.htm#_Toc10454828) (Date of access: 14.03.2023).
- 24.Nadezhdin N.I. Ob etnograficheskom izuchenii narodnosti russkoj (Ch. I) // Etnograficheskoe obozrenie. 1994. №1. P. 107 –117.
- 25.Nakaz imperatricy Ekateriny II, dannyj komissii o sochinenii proekta novogo ulozheniya. SPb.: tip. Akad. nauk, 1907. - 175 p.
- 26.Novyj mir. 1997. № 1.
- 27.O. Dr (Minaev) [Obshchij drug (Minaev Dm.)] F. Dostoevskomu po prochtenii ego "Dnevnika" // Peterburgskaya gazeta. 1876. № 23. 3 fevralya.
- 28.Russkaya starina. 1892. Aprel'.
- 29.Samarin YU.F. Pravoslavie i narodnost'. M.: In-t russkoj civilizacii, 2008. - 716 p.
- 30.Slavyanofily. Istoricheskaya enciklopediya. / Sost. i otv. redaktor O.A. Platonov. M.: In-t russkoj civilizacii, 2009. - 733 p.
- 31.Solzhenicyn A.I. Publicistika: v 3 t. T.1. Yaroslavl': Verhne-Volzh. kn. izd-vo, 1995. - 720 p.
- 32.Solzhenicyn A.I. Publicistika: v 3 t. T. 2. Yaroslavl': Verhne-Volzh. kn. izd-vo, 1996. - 624 p.
- 33.Solzhenicyn A.I. Publicistika: v 3 t. T. 3. Yaroslavl': Verhne-Volzh. kn. izd-vo, 1997. - 560 p.
- 34.Solzhenicyn A.I. Razmyshleniya nad Fevral'skoj revolyuciej. Cherty dvuh revolyucij. M.: KoLibri, Azbuka-Attikus, 2017. - 112 p.
- 35.Solzhenicyn A.I. Sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 1. M.: Vremya, 2007. - 672 p.
- 36.Solzhenicyn A.I. Sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 5. M.: Vremya, 2010. - 560 p.
- 37.Solzhenicyn A.I. Sobr. soch. v 30 t. T. 18. M.: Vremya, 2016. - 544 p.
- 38.Solzhenicyn A.I. Slovo pri vruchenii premii Solzhenicyna Valentinu Rasputinu 4 maya 2000 goda // Novyj mir. 2000. №5. URL: [https://magazines.gorky.media/novyi\\_mi/2000/5/slovo-pri-vruchenii-premii-solzheniczyna-valentinu-rasputinu-4-maya-2000.html?ysclid=lhpuzoq9qc752724897](https://magazines.gorky.media/novyi_mi/2000/5/slovo-pri-vruchenii-premii-solzheniczyna-valentinu-rasputinu-4-maya-2000.html?ysclid=lhpuzoq9qc752724897) (Date of access: 14.03.2023).

39. Strahov N.N. Vospominaniya o F.M. Dostoevskom // Dostoevskij v vospominaniyah sovremennikov: V 2 t. T. 1. M.: Hudozhestvennaya literatura, 1990. - 623 p.
40. Strahov N. Iz istorii literaturnogo nigilizma 1861-1865. SPb.: tip. br. Panteleevyh, 1890. - 596 p.
41. S.S. ZHurnal'nye ocherki // Odesskij vestnik. 1876. № 237. 2 noyabrya.
42. Uvarov S.S. Gosudarstvennye osnovy / Otv. red. O.A. Platonov. M.: In-t russoj civilizacii, 2014. - 600 p.
43. Homyakov D.A. Pravoslavie. Samoderzhavie. Narodnost'. M.: In-t russoj civilizacii, 2011. - 576 p.
44. Chaadaev P.YA. Filosoficheskie pis'ma. M.: Eksmo, 2006. - 541 p.

#### **Books and Researches:**

1. Avdeeva L.R. Russkie mysliteli: Ap. A. Grigor'ev, N.YA. Danilevskij, N.N. Strahov. M.: Izd-vo MGU, 1992. - 195 p.
2. Aksyuchic V.V. Intelligenciya vs obrazovannaya burzhuaziya: rodovye bolezni russoj intelligencii // Tetradi po konservatizmu. 2019. №1. P. 260–275.
3. Amdzhad H.F. Samaya dorogaya volya: obshchechelovecheskie i hristianskie cennosti v cikle miniatyur Solzhenicyna "Krohotki" // Obrazovanie i obshchestvo. 2013. №5 (82). P. 121–123.
4. Badalyan D.A. "Kolokol prizyvnyj": Ivan Aksakov v russoj zhurnalistike konca 1870-h – pervoj poloviny 1880-h godov. SPb.: Rostok, 2016. - 359 p.
5. Badalyan D.A. Ponyatie "narodnost'" v russoj kul'ture // Istoricheskie ponyatiya i politicheskie idei v Rossii XVI–XX vv. Sb. nauch. rabot. Ser. "Istochnik. Istorik. Istorija". Vyp. 5. SPb., 2006. P. 108–122.
6. Barsht K.A. O koncepte pochva v trudah starshih slavyanofilov i tvorchestve F.M. Dostoevskogo // Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Seriya: YAzyk i literatura. 2022. T. 19, (1). P. 4–28.
7. Bahtin M.M. Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo. M.: Sov. Rossiya, 1979. - 318 p.
8. Bahtin M.M. Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva. M.: Iskusstvo, 1979. - 423 p.
9. Bel'chikov N.F. Dostoevskij v processe petrashevcev. M.: Nauka, 1971. - 294 p.
10. Berdyaev N.A. Mirosozertsanie Dostoevskogo // Sobr. Soch.: V 5 t. T. 5. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1997. - 580 p.
11. Berdyaev N.A. Russkaya ideya. SPb.: Azbuka-klassika, 2008. - 318 p.

12. Bobrovskih E.V. Znachenie "narodnosti" v koncepcii slavyanofilov // Kontury global'nyh transformacij: politika, ekonomika, pravo. 2015. №4. P. 101–106.
13. Bol'shev A.O. Shedevry russkoj prozy v svete psihobiograficheskogo. SPb: Filologicheskij fak-t SPbGU, 2011. - 347 p.
14. Buzuk G.L., Semaeva I.I. Idei hristocentricheskoy antropologii v russkoj filosofii // Vestnik Polesskogo gos. un-ta, 2016. №2. P. 62–68.
15. Bushin V.S. Neizvestnyj Solzhenicyn. M.: Eksmo, 2009. - 557 p.
16. Vasil'ev A.A. Mirovozzrenie pochvennikov (F.M. i M.M. Dostoevskih, A.A. Grigor'eva i N.N. Strahova): zabytye stranicy russkoj konservativnoj mysli. M.: In-t russkoj civilizacii, 2010. - 243 p.
17. Vititnev S.F., Shmeleva A.V. Evolyuciya i idejnye osobennosti social'no-politicheskikh vozzrenij F.M. Dostoevskogo // Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta. 2021. № 3. P. 45–58.
18. Volgin I.L. "Dnevnik pisatelya": tekst i kontekst // Dostoevskij: materialy i issledovaniya. 1978. № 3. P. 151–158.
19. Volgin I.L. Dostoevskij – zhurnalist: ("Dnevnik pisatelya" i russkaya obshchestvennost'): Pos. k speckursu. M.: Izd-vo MGU, 1982. - 75 p.
20. Volgin I.L. Dostoevskij i carskaya cenzura: K istorii izdaniya "Dnevnika pisatelya" // Russkaya literatura. 1970. № 4. P. 106–120.
21. Volgin I.L. Metamorfozy lichnogo zhanra: ("Dnevnik pisatelya" Dostoevskogo i "Opavshie list'ya" Rozanova) // Nasledie V.V. Rozanova i sovremennost': Materialy mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii. M., 2009. P. 61–72.
22. Volgin I.L. Metamorfozy "pisatel'skogo zhurnalizma". Dostoevskij – Gogol' – Tolstoj // Russkaya literatura i zhurnalistika v dvizhenii vremeni. Ezhegodnik 2014. M.: Fak-t zhurnalistiki. 2015. P. 103–115.
23. Volgin I.L. Nравstvennye osnovy publicistiki Dostoevskogo: Vostochnyj vopros v "Dnevnikе pisatelya" // Izvestiya AN SSSR. Seriya literatury i yazyka. 1971. Vyp. 4. Tom XXX. P. 312–322.
24. Volgin I.L. Poverh bar'erov. Zagadka "Dnevnika pisatelya" // Dostoevskij F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya: v 2 t. T.1. M.: Knizhnyj klub, 2011. P. 5–40.
25. Volgin I.L. Propavshij zagovor: Dostoevskij i politicheskij process 1849 g. M.: Liberiya, 2000. - 703 p.
26. Volkova E.A. Vliyanie obshchestvennoj deyatel'nosti F.M. Dostoevskogo na formirovanie ego istoricheskikh vozzrenij v 1850-1870-e gody // Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Ser.: Istoriya, politologiya, sociologiya. 2017. №2. P. 30–36.
27. Volkova E. A., Likhoradova I. N., Frolova E. V. Dostoevskii i petrashevtsy: spory o revoliutsii i sotsializme // Izvestiia Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta. 2019. №2 (238). P. 171–173.

28. Gacheva A. G. Tsarstvie Bozhie na zemle v ponimanii F. M. Dostoevskogo // Problemy istoricheskoi poétiki. 2005. №7. P. 313–323.
29. Gin M. M. Dostoevskii i Nekrasov: Dva mirovozzreniia. Petrozavodsk: Kareliia, 1985. - 184 p.
30. Golubkov M. M. Tvorchestvo A. I. Solzhenitsyna kak itog literaturnogo stoletiiia // A. I. Solzhenitsyn i russkaia kul'tura: nauchnye doklady. Saratov: izd-vo Saratovskogo un-ta, 2004. P. 13–23.
31. Gorelov A. A. F. M. Dostoevskii: russkaia ideia i russkii sotsializm // Znanie. Ponimanie. Umenie. 2017. №1. P. 50–66.
32. Gromova L. P. Fenomen publitsistiki v kontsepsiakh issledovatelei // Russkaia publitsistika: évoliutsiia idei i form. Sb. st. Ser. "Peterburgskaia shkola zhurnalistiki i MK" Sankt-Peterburgskogo gos. un-ta. SPb: Aleteiia, 2021. P. 11–26.
33. Gromova L. P., Kul'ko K. A. Publitsistika F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna: ot sotsializma k "russkoi idee" // Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Serii: Iazyk. Literatura. 2023. № 2. P. 217–234.
34. Gromova N. A. Dostoevskii. Dokumenty, dnevniki, pis'ma, memuary, otzyvy literaturnykh kritikov i filosofov. M.: Agraf, 2000. - 238 p.
35. Grosul V.Ia. Russkii konservatizm XIX stoletiiia. Ideologiia i praktika. M.: Progress-traditsiia, 2000. - 439 p.
36. Gulyga A. V. Tvtortsy russkoi idei. M.: Molodaia gvardiia, 2006. - 314 p.
37. Egereva T. "Starinnye kadety" XVIII veka: vliianie obrazovaniia na sistemu tsennosti russkikh konservatorov // Rodina. 2010. № 2. P. 53–55.
38. Egorov A. N. Obraz liberala kak "vruga otechestva" v konservativnoi publitsistike XIX veka // Voina i povsednevnaia zhizn' naseleniia Rossii XVII-XX vv. (k stoletiiu nachala Pervoi Mirovoi voiny). Sb. n. rabot po itogam mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii, SPb., 2014. P. 75–80.
39. Egorov B. F. Évoliutsiia v ponimanii narodnosti literatury v russkoi kritike serediny 1850-kh gg. // Uchenye zapiski Tartuskogo gos. un-ta. 1971. Vyp. 266. P. 53–70.
40. Zhidkov G. P. "Krasnoe koleso" A. Solzhenitsyna glazami istorika // Otechestvennaia istoriia. 1994. № 4–5. P. 216–221.
41. Zavarkina M. V. "Sotsializm i khristianstvo": problemy atributsii i publikatsii zamysla Dostoevskogo // Neizvestnyi Dostoevskii. 2020. № 2. P. 69–97.
42. Zakharov V. N. O glubinykh sovpadeniakh Solzhenitsyna i Dostoevskogo // Mezhdvumia iubileiami: Pisateli, kritiki i literaturovedy o tvorchestve Solzhenitsyna. M., 2005. P. 409–413.
43. Zakharov V. N. Pochvennichestvo v russkoi literature: metafora kak ideologema // Evangel'skii tekst v russkoi literature XVIII-XX vekov: tsitata, reministsentsiia,



- motiv, siuzhet, zhanr: sb. nauch. tr. Petrozav. gos. un-t. Petrozavodsk, 2012. Vyp.7. P. 14–24.
44. Kiiiko E.I. Belinskii i Dostoevskii ob utopicheskom sotsializme // Dostoevskii: materialy issledovaniia. 1997. T. 14. P. 234 – 241.
  45. Kirpotin V. Ia. Dostoevskii i Belinskii. 2-e izd., dop. M.: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1976. - 301 p.
  46. Kodzis B. Liricheskie miniatiury Aleksandra Solzhenitsyna // Literatura: Prilozhenie k gazete "Pervoe sentiabria", 1997. №30. P. 3–4.
  47. Kozhevnikov A. Iu. Nastoiashchee i budushchee Rossii v publitsistike A. I. Solzhenitsyna i I. R. Shafarevicha: sbornik "Iz-pod glyb" (1974) // Tetradi po konservatizmu. №4. 2015. P. 179–189.
  48. Kolobaeva L. A. "Krokhotki" // Fenomen Solzhenitsyna. Literaturnoe obozrenie. 1999. №1. P. 43–48.
  49. Kotov A. É. "Narodnost'" i "Soslovnost'": dva poliusa russkogo konservatizma // Khristianskoe chtenie. 2017. №2. P. 288–306.
  50. Kroichik L. E. Printsipy publitsisticheskogo tvorchestva // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Serii 10. Zhurnalistika. 2014. №5. P. 130–144.
  51. Krokhin N. P., Volkova T. N., Ershova L. V. M. M. Bakhtin o dialogichnosti slova i kul'tury. Gumanitarnye vedomosti TGPU im. L. N. Tolstogo. 2019. № 4 (32). P. 58–69.
  52. Kruglikova O. S., Shapovalova (Kul'ko) K. A. F. M. Dostoevskii i A. I. Solzhenitsyn: preemstvennost' idei v publitsistike // Tetradi po konservatizmu. 2019. №1. P. 103–117.
  53. Kruglikova O. S. Russkaia konservativnaia publitsistika vtoroi poloviny XIX veka: ucheb. pos. / O.S. Kruglikova. SPb: In-t "Vyssh. shkola zhurnalistiki i mass. kommunikatsii" SPbGU, 2017. - 245 p.
  54. Kudriashev V. Iz istorii obshchestvennoi i istoricheskoi mysli Rossii. Natsiia v sisteme vzglia-dov V. S. Solov'eva // Sibirskie istoricheskie issledovaniia. 2014. №3. P. 88–107.
  55. Kul'ko K. A. Vlast', otvetstvennaia pered Bogom: otnoshenie k monarkhii v publitsistike F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna // Sovremennaia mediasreda: traditsii, aktual'nye praktiki i tendentsii. Vzgl-iad molodykh issledovatelei. Mezhvuzovskii sb. n. rabot po itogam 20-i mezhdunarodnoi konf. "Media v sovremennom mire. Molodye issledovateli" SPb., 2021. P. 158–164.
  56. Kul'ko K. A. "Krokhotki" A. I. Solzhenitsyna: zhanrovaya forma tekstov i spetsifika pochvennicheskikh voprosov // Sovremennaya mediasreda: traditsii, aktual'nye praktiki i tendentsii. Vzglyad molodykh issledovatelei. Mezhvuzovskii sb. n. rabot po itogam 21-i mezhdunarodnoi konf. "Media v sovremennom mire. Molodye issledovateli" SPb., 2022. P. 130–138.

57. Kul'ko K. A. Malaya publitsisticheskaya forma F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna: preemstvennost' idei i formy // Russkaya publitsistika: évol'yutsiya idei i form. Sb. st. Ser. "Peterburgskaya shkola zhurnalistiki i MK" Sankt-Peterburgskogo gos. un-ta. SPb.: Aleteiya, 2021. P. 220–235.
58. Kul'ko K. A. "Pochvennicheskie" voprosy o zemle i narodnykh nachalakh v publitsistike F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna // Izvestiya Yuzhnogo federal'nogo universiteta. Filologicheskie nauki. 2021. T. 25. № 2. P. 241–253.
59. Kul'ko K. A. Publitsistika A. I. Solzhenitsyna v dialoge s ideyami F. M. Dostoevskogo o pravoslavii // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 10. Zhurnalistika. 2021. №5. P. 162–183.
60. Kul'ko K. A. Sintez obshchestvenno-politicheskikh ustremlenii i religiozno-nravstvennogo nachala v publitsistike A. I. Solzhenitsyna // Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: filologiya, zhurnalistika. 2023. №1. P. 98–100.
61. Kul'ko K. A. Sozvuchie idei o "pochve" v publitsistike F. M. Dostoevskogo i A. I. Solzhenitsyna // Istoricheskaya zhurnalistika i sovremennost'. Sb. nauch. materialov. Voronezh, 2020. P. 51–54.
62. Kunil'skii D. A. Dostoevskii i brat'ya Aksakovy: spor o russkoi literature. Petrozavodsk: Izd-vo PetrGU, 2013. - 151 p.
63. Lazari Andzhei de. V krugu Fyodora Dostoevskogo. Pochvennichestvo / per. s pol'sk. M. V. Leskinen, N. M. Filatova. M.: Nauka, 2004. - 205 p.
64. Losskii N. O. Dostoevskii i ego khristianskoe mirop nimanie. N'yu-Iork: Izd-vo im. Chekhova, 1953. - 406 p.
65. Makarova O. S. Strukturno-smyslovoe edinstvo miniatyur tsikla "Krokhotki" Solzhenitsyna // Mir russkogo slova. 2011. №4. P. 57–61.
66. Manyayev A. G. Sotsial'no-filosofskie vzglyady A.I. Solzhenitsyna: opyt kontseptualizatsii. Av toreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata filosofskikh nauk. Volgograd, 2004. URL: [https://new-disser.ru/\\\_avtoreferats/01002744352.pdf?ysclid=lggpi91p86271682099](https://new-disser.ru/\_avtoreferats/01002744352.pdf?ysclid=lggpi91p86271682099) (Date of access: 13.04.2023)
67. Makhoni D. Dzh. Solzhenitsyn-myslitel' / per. s angl. E. A. Shcherbakova // Solzhenitsyn: Myslitel', istorik, khudozhnik. Zapadnaya kritika: 1974–2008. M., 2010. P. 30–47.
68. Mikityuk Yu. M. Kontsepty khristianskogo i natsional'nogo v kul'turno-istoricheskoi teorii pochvennichestva. Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata kul'turologii. Sankt-Peterburg, 2011. URL: <https://viewer.rsl.ru/ru/rsl01005001160?page=1&rotate=0&theme=white> (Date of access: 14.12.2022).

69. Mil'rud R. P., Maksimova I. R. Ésse kak zhanr, priem obucheniya i instrument pedagogicheskogo izmereniya // *Yazyk i kul'tura*. 2020. №49. P. 255–275.
70. Minakov A. Yu. Russkii konservatizm v pervoi chetverti XIX veka. Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezhskogo gos. un-ta, 2011. - 560 p.
71. Misonzhnikov B. Ya. Fenomenologiya publitsisticheskogo teksta // *Publitsistika v sovremennom obshchestve. Materialy nauch.-prakt. seminarov "Sovremennaya periodicheskaya pechat' v kontekste kommunikativnykh protsessov (tragediya publitsistiki v informatsionnom obshchestve)"*, 14 noyabrya 2013 goda. SPb: In-t «Vyssh. shkola zhurnalistiki i mass. kommunikatsii» SPbGU, 2014. P. 5–15.
72. Mochul'skii K. V. Dostoevskii. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo // *Mochul'skii K. Gogol'. Solov'ev. Dostoevskii*. M.: Respublika, 1995. - 606 p.
73. Muzhaylova E. A. Neopochvennichestvo: preemstvennost' i novatorstvo // *Sotsial'no-gumanitarnye znaniya*. 2007. №9. P. 272–280.
74. Muzhaylova E. A. Tipologiya pochvennichestva: F.M. Dostoevskii i M. A. Osorgin // *Vestnik Bashkirskogo universiteta*. 2008. T. 13. №1. P. 93–96.
75. Nechaeva V. S. Zhurnal M. M. i F. M. Dostoevskikh "Vremya". 1864–1863. M.: Nauka, 1972. - 316 p.
76. Nechaeva V. S. Zhurnal M. M. i F. M. Dostoevskikh "Épokha". 1864–1865. M.: Nauka, 1975. - 302 p.
77. Niva Zh. Poétika Solzhenitsyna mezhdru "bol'shimi" i "malymi" formami // *Zvezda*. 2003. №12. P. 143–147.
78. Niva Zh. Solzhenitsyn. M.: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1992. 189 p.
79. Nikitin V. A. Aktual'nost' "russkoi idei" Ivana Kireevskogo // *Ivan Kireevskii: Dukhovnyi put' v russkoi mysli XIX–XXI vv. (K 200-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya)*: sb. nauch. st. T. 1. M., 2007. P. 113–136.
80. Nikitin V. A. Dostoevskii: Pravoslavie i "russkaya ideya" // *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya*. 1990. №3. P. 125–131.
81. Ospovat A. L. K izucheniyu pochvennichestva (Dostoevskii i Ap. Grigor'ev) // *Dostoevskii. Materialy i issledovaniya*. T. 3. L., 1978. P. 144–150.
82. Paips R. Russkii konservatizm i ego kritiki: Issledovanie politicheskoi kul'tury / per. s angl. I. Pavlova. M.: Fond Liberal'naya missiya: Novoe izd-vo, 2008. - 250 p.
83. Panfilov M. M. Klyuch razuma (Dukhovnyi kodeks Ivana Kireevskogo). V sb.: *Ivan Kireevskii: Dukhovnyi put' v russkoi mysli XIX–XXI vv. (K 200-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya)*: sb. nauch. st. T. 1. M., 2007. P. 203–225.
84. Prokhorov E. P. *Publitsist i deistvitel'nost'*. M.: Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta, 1973. - 317 p.
85. Prokhorov G. S. Dnevnik pisatelya F. M. Dostoevskogo: publitsistika ili novyi zhanr? // *Voprosy literatury*. 2013. № 5. P. 82–96.

86. Prutskov I. I. Dostoevskii i khristianskii sotsializm // Dostoevskii: Materialy i issledovaniya. T. 1. L., 1974. P. 58–82.
87. Pypin A. N. Istoriya russkoi etnografii. V 4 t. T. 1. Obshchii obzor izuchenii narodnosti i etnografii velikorusskoi. SPb.: Tip. M. M. Stasyulevicha, 1890. - 424 p.
88. Razuvalova A. Lyudi i zveri v neopochvennicheskoi proze // Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. 2021. №4 (170). P. 147–166.
89. Rozenblyum L. M. Tvorcheskie dnevniki Dostoevskogo // Literaturnoe nasledstvo. Dostoevskii. Nove materialy i issledovaniya. T. 83. M.: Nauka, 1971. - 727 p.
90. Saevskaia M. A. Kontsepsiia zemskogo samoderzhaviia v trudakh russkikh konservativnykh myslitelei vtoroi poloviny XIX – nachala XX veka // Sotsial'no-gumanitarnye znaniia. 2020. №1. P. 311–317.
91. Saraskina L. I. Dostoevskii v sozvuchiyakh i prityazheniyakh. M.: Russkii put', 2006. - 608 p.
92. Saraskina L. I. Obretenie zamysla // Vstupitel'naya stat'ya k sborniku rasskazov i krokhotok Solzhenitsyna. M., 2006. P. 3–16.
93. Sashina A. S. "Dostoevskaya" tematika i forma v publitsistike Solzhenitsyna. Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Tambov, 2007. URL:  
<https://viewer.rsl.ru/ru/rsl01003162404?page=1&rotate=0&theme=white> (Date of access: 14.12.2022).
94. Sedel'nikova O. V. Formirovanie pochvennicheskikh vzglyadov v mirovozzrenii rannego Dostoevskogo // Vest. Tomsk. gos. un-ta. 1999. P. 45–54.
95. Seleznev Yu. I. Dostoevskii. M.: Molodaya gvardiya, 1990. - 541 p.
96. Snetova N. V. A. S. Khomyakov i neoslavyanofil'stvo H. N. Strakhova // A. S. Khomyakov – myslitel', poet, publitsist: sb. st. po m-lam mezhdunar. nauch. konf., 14–17 aprelya 2004 g. T. 1. M., 2007. P. 262–275.
97. Solovei T. D. Diskurs o "narodnosti" v XIX v.: struktura i evolyutsiia // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 8. Istoriya. 2016. №4. P. 49–63.
98. Solov'ev É. G. Pochvennichestvo // Novaya filosofskaya entsiklopediia v 4 t. T.3. M., 2001. URL:  
<https://iphlib.ru/library/collection/newphilenc/document/HASH01e9048940abc946f2d6f1e8> (Date of access: 17.12.2022).
99. Spivakovskii P. E. Akademik Aleksandr Isaevich Solzhenitsyn (k 85-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya) // Izvestiia Rossiiskoi Akademii nauk. Seriya literatury i yazyka. 2003. T. 62. №6. P. 62–67.

100. Struve N. A. K 50-letiyu pervoi publikatsii "Krokhotok" A. I. Solzhenitsyna // Izv. Sarat, un-ta. Seriya: Filologiya. Zhurnalistika. 2014. T. 14, Vyp. 2. P. 106–109.
101. Stupnitskaya N. N. Ot Dostoevskogo k Solzhenitsynu // Nauch. zapiski Khar'k. nats. ped. un-ta. 2012. Vyp. 1(69). P. 158–164.
102. Surovtsev S. S. Razvitie i stanovlenie filosofskikh vzglyadov F. M. Dostoevskogo // Vestnik Murmanskogo gos. tekhnicheskogo un-ta. 2008. T. 11. №1. P. 49–54.
103. Tvardovskaya V. A. Dostoevskii v obshchestvennoi zhizni Rossii (1861-1881). M.: Nauka, 1990. - 336 p.
104. Tikhomirov B. N. Nasha vera v nashu russkuyu samobytnost' (K voprosu o russkoi idee v publitsistike Dostoevski) // Dostoevskii. Materialy i issledovaniya. T. 12. SPb.: IRL RAN, 1996. P. 108–124.
105. Tulepbaev I. V. Tserkov' i gosudarstvo: problemy vzaimootnoshenii v russkoi konservativnoi publitsistike vtoroi poloviny XIX veka. Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoi stepeni kandidata istoricheskikh nauk. Moskva, 2009. URL: <https://viewer.rsl.ru/ru/rsl01003475565?page=1&rotate=0&theme=white> (Date of access: 14.12.2022).
106. Tredgold D. U. Intellektual'nye predshestvenniki Solzhenitsyna // Solzhenitsyn: Myslitel', istorik, khudozhnik. Zapadnaya kritika, 1974–2008. P. 235–259.
107. Tunimanov V. A. Tvorchestvo Dostoevskogo, 1854–1862. L.: Nauka: Lenigr. Otd-nie, 1980. - 294 p.
108. Uchenova V. V. Publitsistika i politika / V. V. Uchenova. 2-e izd. M.: Politizdat, 1979. - 271 p.
109. Kholmogorov E. S. Pominki po poluprosveshcheniyu. "Vekhi", "Iz pod glyb" i ideologiya Solzhenitsyna // Tetradi po konservatizmu. 2017. №4. P. 45–64.
110. Kholmogorov E. S. Staryi poryadok i restavratsiya. Ideologiya Solzhenitsyna v koordinatakh anti-prosveshcheniya // Tetradi po konservatizmu. 2018. №2. P. 169–202.
111. Khrenov N. A. Sud'ba "russkoi idei" v XX veke: A. Solzhenitsyn // Kul'tura kul'tury. 2018. No3 (15). URL: <http://cult-cult.ru/the-fate-of-the-russian-idea-in-the-twentieth-century/> (Date of access: 02.05.2023)
112. Chernavskii M. Yu. Religiozno-filosofskie osnovy konservatizma v Rossii. M.: Ros. zaoch. in-t tekstil. i leg. prom-sti, 2004. - 186 p.

113. Chuikov P. L. Problema "Rossiya" i "Zapad" v istoriosofskoi publitsistike N. V. Gogolya i F. M. Dostoevskogo, redaktora zhurnala "Vremya" // Aktual'nye voprosy sovremennoi filologii i zhurnalistiki. 2018. №3 (30). P. 98–104.
114. Shapovalova (Kul'ko) K. A. Idei neopochvennichestva v publitsistike A. I. Solzhenitsyna na primere tsiklov "Krokhotki" // Sovremennaya mediasreda: traditsii, aktual'nye praktiki i tendentsii. Vzgl'yad molodykh issledovatelei. Mezhvuzovskii sb. n. rabot po itogam 18-i mezhdunarodnoi konf. "Media v sovremennom mire. Molodye issledovateli" SPb., 2019. P. 149–155.
115. Shevtsov K. V. Solzhenitsyn-ideolog: k postanovke problem // Vestnik Adygeiskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. 2019. № 4 (247). P. 116–122.
116. Shitakova N. I. "Russkaya ideya" v tvorcheskom nasledii A. I. Solzhenitsyna i G. I. Gazdanova // Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya Filologiya. Zhurnalistika. 2019. №4. P. 70–74.
117. Shuvalov Yu. E., Posadskii A. V. Rossiiskii konservatizm: tsennostnye osnovaniya i strategiya razvitiya. M.: Atkara, 2010. - 150 p.
118. Shcherbakova G. I. Obraz Petra Velikogo v kontekste metafiziki progressa – vzglyad russkoi konservativnoi publitsistiki // Tetradi po konservatizmu. 2022. №3. P. 109–122.
119. Yanov A. L. Russkaya ideya i 2000 god. N'yu-Iork: Liberty Publ. House, 1988. - 399 p.
120. Krasnov V. Solzhenitsyn and Dostoevsky: A Study in the Polyphonic Novel. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1979. - 230 p.

## APPENDIX

Appendix 1. Comparative tables. Pochvennichestvo and Neopochvennichestvo as directions of conservative thought

	<b>Pochvennichestvo</b>	<b>Neopochvennichestvo</b>
<b>I. Similarity of ideas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The concept of "native soil" becomes an important philosophical constant of the whole direction;</li> <li>• The land as a metaphysical concept (not just the literal economic meaning);</li> <li>• Attitude towards the Russian people, village, "soil" as something sacred;</li> <li>• Detachment from the "soil" and national principle can lead to oblivion of national culture, traditions, moral decline;</li> <li>• The idea of the need for faith in God;</li> <li>• Negative attitude towards technological progress that destroys the world of nature and alienates man from the land.</li> </ul>	

### II. Differences (innovation of Neopochvennichestvo)

	<b>Pochvennichestvo</b>	<b>Neopochvennichestvo</b>
<b>1. Isolation from other countries</b>	Do not call for isolation from other countries. On the contrary, according to Dostoevsky, the Russian Orthodox idea should expand and be connected with "vsesluzhenie for mankind."	They write about the dangers of globalization, which can lead to the loss of national identity and forces people to live by global rather than national interests. Calls to solve domestic problems.
<b>2. Ordinary people and intelligentsia</b>	They write about the gap between the ordinary people and the intelligentsia and call on Russian educated society to turn to national principles.	There is no clear division of society into "ordinary people" and "intelligentsia" (leveling of social boundaries). The criterion of closeness to the Russian "soil": the ability to live by national interests.
<b>3. Faith in God</b>	Religious crisis in Russian society. However, the Pochvenniks writer more often about the need for faith in God, that the people retain the true faith.	They do not directly declare the importance of faith in God. More often show the terrible consequences of unbelief.

<b>4. Attitude to the West</b>	Contradictory attitudes towards the West. Recognize the merits of Western civilization. But not ready to inherit all Western ideas.	More negative attitude towards the West and representatives of Westernism in Russia.
--------------------------------	---	--

Appendix 2. Comparative tables. Conservative ideas in the publicism of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn: similarities and differences

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Dostoevsky's publicism</b>	<b>Solzhenitsyn's publicism</b>
<b>1. Land and "soil"</b>	<p>One of the central themes of the conservative publicism of Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn. For the authors, the concept of "soil", reflected in the name of the analyzed conservative direction, is a deep and complex symbol, a multifaceted concept. This is not just a field for agricultural labor. The land has economic and moral significance. Both thinkers agonizingly experienced the weakening in Russian society of the attraction to the soil. Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn associate the future of Russia and its fate with resolving the land issue, the proper organization of land tenure. "Soil" in a metaphorical sense is the cultural reality of the country, which is connected with the preservation of Russian traditions, faith, culture.</p>	
	<b>Differences:</b>	
	<p>Reflecting on land tenure, Dostoevsky analyzes the consequences of the peasant reform and the departure of many nobles abroad.</p> <p>According to Dostoevsky's idea, writers should bow before the people's truth, be close to the peasantry and the land, but they themselves are not from the peasant background.</p>	<p>Solzhenitsyn, who lived in another century, writes about the lease of land and the right of private ownership of it.</p> <p>Solzhenitsyn emphasized that true talent can be nurtured by the Russian soil and manifests itself despite the simplicity and apparent poverty of the peasant life.</p>



	<b>Empirical material:</b>	
	<p><i>"Land and Children", "Former Peasants - Future Diplomats", "Muzhik Marey", "On Love for the People. A Necessary Contract with the People", "Pushkin", "Pushkin, Lermontov, Nekrasov".</i></p>	<p><i>"How Should We Organize Russia?", "Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union". Krokhotki "Wicked Potion", "The Poet's Ashes", "Collective Farm Backpack", "At the Birthplace of Esenin".</i></p>
<b>2. Nationality. People and intelligentsia</b>	<p>Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn recognize that since the time of Peter the Great, the tragic division of society into ordinary people and intelligentsia began, which was increasingly oriented towards Western models.</p> <p>Both authors are far from idealizing the simple Russian man, however, they see his best traits. The hope for the future revival of the country is associated by Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn not only with the common people, who still retained the purity of soul, but also with the intelligentsia.</p>	
	<b>Differences:</b>	
	<p>"Intelligentsia" is understood by Dostoevsky as the educated noble class.</p> <p>In the "Diary of the Writer", remains a clearer division of society into these two groups: the class structure had not yet been destroyed.</p> <p>The call for the intelligentsia to return to the ordinary people, to learn from them the best traits.</p>	<p>Solzhenitsyn noted the erosion of the boundaries of the concept of "intelligentsia".</p> <p>In Solzhenitsyn's publicism, the distinction between "ordinary people" and "intelligentsia" is not so obvious, except for a very conditional division of society into "intelligentsia" and "working class".</p> <p>Another criterion of closeness to the Russian land, faith and Russian culture: people are divided into those who living in big cities and those who remained in the provinces.</p>

	<b>Empirical material:</b>	
<p><b>3. Strong state power</b></p>	<p><i>"A Few Notes on Simplicity and Simplification", "On Love for the People. The Necessary Contract with the People", "Pushkin, Lermontov, Nekrasov", "Muzhik Marey", "The Best People", "About the Same", "The Russian People Have Grown Too Much to a Healthy Understanding ...", "Inconsistency and Inaccuracy of Controversial Points".</i></p>	<p><i>"The Russian Question" by the End of the 20th Century", "The Gulag Archipelago", "Obrazovanchina", "Repentance and Self-Restraint as Categories of National Life", Krokhotki: "Disgrace", "At the Birthplace of Esenin".</i></p>
	<b>Differences:</b>	
	<p>Monarchy is a reality of Dostoevsky's time. He was personally acquainted with some members of the imperial family.</p> <p>He gradually becomes a monarchist. He respected Alexander II, who carried out reforms in the country.</p>	<p>In Solzhenitsyn's publicism, the comprehension of the dignity of the monarchy is of the nature of a confrontation with the current regime.</p> <p>He does not openly call for a return to the monarchy, but shows that decent ways of transition to a democratic republic have not appeared in Russia.</p>

	<b>Empirical material:</b>	
<b>4. Orthodoxy</b>	<p><i>Letter to A.N. Maikov dated March 21-22, 1868, letter to Tsarevich, future Emperor Alexander III dated November 16, 1876, "Notebook 1876-1877", workbooks for 1875-1877, "Notebook 1876-1877", "Notebooks 1872-1875", From "Diary of the Writer": "Let the first ones speak, and we will stand aside for now", "The benevolent Swiss who liberates the Russian peasant".</i></p>	<p><i>"Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union", "Repentance and Self-Restraint as Categories of National Life", "On the Return of Breath and Consciousness".</i></p>
	<p>The most important theme of conservative publicism. The question of faith is considered by us as an important reference point for considering other issues of the social, political, economic and spiritual life of the country. It is Orthodoxy that should underlie a strong state power with moral authority. In the context of Christian thought, Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn analyzed the question of freedom, understanding it not as the arbitrariness of the individual, but as a sense of personal responsibility, the ability to restrain oneself.</p> <p>Religious faith has become a reference point for considering the issues of the Enlightenment paradigm and the materialistic doctrines of Europe. Dostoevsky and Solzhenitsyn recognize that God, not weak man with sins and vices, is at the center of the worldview model. Both authors considered socialism as an antithesis to Christianity and warned of the danger of the revolutionary path, which, in rejecting God, would lead to spiritual enslavement.</p>	
	<b>Differences:</b>	
<p>Dostoevsky somewhat idealized the simple Russian man, considering him a "God-bearer", the true keeper of Orthodoxy.</p>	<p>Solzhenitsyn showed the terrible results of the people's rejection of faith, while in his publicism there remains hope that after such a moral fall, the revival of the country is still possible.</p>	

	<p>The national idea and the task of Russia are associated with Orthodoxy.</p>	
	<b>Empirical material:</b>	
	<p><i>"Dead Force and Emerging Forces", "Utopian Understanding of History", "Inconsistency and Inaccuracy of Controversial Points", "On the Most Fundamental Thing", "On Love for the People. The Necessary Contract with the People", "Ideals of Vegetative and Stagnant Life ...", "The Benevolent Swiss Liberating the Russian Peasant", "The Russian People Have Grown Too Much to a Healthy Understanding ...", "Old People", "The Russian Solution to the Question", "Environment", "Continuation of the Previous One".</i></p>	<p><i>Poem "Dorozhenka", "The Gulag Archipelago", Interview with Rudolf Augstein for Spiegel magazine, "Reflections on the February Revolution", "Harvard Speech", Interview with the German weekly Die Zeit, Interview with David Aikman for Time magazine, "Word on the Vendee Uprising", "On the Return of Breath and Consciousness", Krokhotki: "Approaching the Day", "Traveling Along the Oka", "The Bell Tower", "The Duckling", "The thunderstorm in the Mountains".</i></p>
<p><b>5. "Russian idea" and the task of the nation</b></p>	<p>For both authors, this theme is also connected with Orthodoxy, but it develops differently in their publicism.</p>	
	<b>Differences:</b>	
	<p>The "Russian idea" is associated by Dostoevsky with dreams of universal unity. Faith remains in the country's messianic tasks and its spiritual mission associated with preserving Orthodoxy is substantiated. For Dostoevsky, it seems important for Russia to participate in the destinies</p>	<p>Solzhenitsyn came out sharply against such messianic tasks of the country. Revising his own youthful views, he calls for "preserving the people", a policy of "isolated salvation".</p> <p>The most important task of the</p>

	<p>of the world, the return of Constantinople, access to the Mediterranean Sea. As a result - Russia could gain the status of a great power, increase its international authority and become the center of the Slavic Orthodox world.</p>	<p>people is to solve domestic problems and the moral revival of the country through the repentance of the nation, self-restraint and the return of the previously lost Orthodox faith.</p>
<b>Empirical material:</b>		
	<p><i>"Post scriptum", "Obsolete People", "Utopian Understanding of History", "Conciliatory Dream Outside of Science", "Dead Force and Emerging Forces", "War Is Not Always a Scourge, Sometimes Salvation", "Paradoxalist".</i></p>	<p><i>"The Russian Question" by the End of the 20th Century", "Communism: Obvious to Everyone - And Not Understood", "Repentance and Self-Restraint as Categories of National Life", "Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union", "How Should We Organize Russia?", "On the Return of Breath and Consciousness", Speech upon receiving the Freedom Award, "Harvard Speech".</i></p>