

Impulsida. His return

Harold Weisberg
Route 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
9/12/73

Editor, Aftenposten
Oslo, Norway

Dear Sir,

My first, shocked reaction to the Associated Press account of Alexander Solzhenitsyn's abandonment of the most sacred obligations of the writer is to wonder if this can be the man who once wrote, "As little truth as there is in the world, the supply is greater than the demand."

I am one writer who believes our fundamental responsibility is to know the truth of what we write and to offer no opinions not amply supported by fact.

The ignorance Mr. Solzhenitsyn fulfills in the context of his opinions make him indistinguishable from a fascist. He knows nothing about The Watergate or contemporaneous American politics or parties, makes virtuous display of this ignorance in your paper and internationally through you, and exploits an alleged Nobel nomination as the vehicle for a defense of tyranny and the police state that cannot possibly be the belief of the author of A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich.

There is no rational way in which a man can expect to be believed when he defends tyranny and the police state simply because he claims not to. There is no way in which Mr. Solzhenitsyn's words can be taken by the rational, particularly those who know what he so clearly does not, as other than a defense of tyranny.

It is obscene to castigate the victim of the rapist as an attractive nuisance.

Were it, as he pretends, that The Watergate is merely the planting of instruments for electronic spying - and this pretense is an incredible self-defamation - it remains the fact that in the sordid history of American politics there is no parallel of The Watergate. Were it that all of what is truly encompassed by the generic, Watergate, has been reported - and this is far from true - he is still self-exposed as a defender of tyranny. He who proclaims himself its victim? How unbecoming!

The author of For the Good of the Cause defames an Ellsberg by defending a Nixon and his Hunt/s and Liddys and Barkers and assorted other political second-story men?

He dares defend those who napalmed wholesale and bombed embassies pinpoint?

Yet he deigns to pontificate about what is "sensational" and what is "hypocrisy" without due regard for the injunction about the casting of stones. It is "sensational" to expose villainy, "hypocrisy" to condemn it? This is doublegoodspeak and ducktalk added!

Can it be that this self-cast god does not know that the mortal he defends while proclaiming he does not actually approved the abrogation of all human and legal rights after they were committed to paper and after he was given the written warning he did not require, that it all was illegal? For this he finds an equal in United States history? If so he is more than omniscient, his pose. He is Goebbels and Orwell, rewriting history with his memory hole.

I have spent bitter, painful years exposing Democrats and Ramsey Clark in particular, so I am not their partisan. But it offends decency for ^{Solzhenitsyn} ~~him~~ to malign Clark, of whom it took considerable political courage and for whom it held no possibility of personal gain to oppose United States bestiality in Southeast Asia ^{Solzhenitsyn} ~~while~~ aligns himself with the man who has the Orwellian ambition to bug an entire nation. Clark, to his credit, refused to authorize electronic surveillance of the Nobel laureate, the martyred Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. And that too, to anyone who understands domestic forces within the United States, is hardly the act of a "fluttering butterfly."

How tragic this all is! Solzhenitsyn has done to himself what others cannot do to him. His words portray a man who has lost his balance, has no perspective and can't or won't distinguish between good and evil.

His "reasoning" is simply. People are killed by motorcars. Therefore, all who drive motorcars are murderers.

It has come to where this wretched man must really conceive himself superman. How can he possibly not know that he does not and apparently cannot know anything about which he writes? A simple test is his, "Yet in the United States there was no criticism of this Clark." This is not merely incredibly false. Your own wire services must have told you it is past the absurd.

All of which leads to a question I hope you will not regard as impertinent, for I do not intend that. How could you be so irresponsible, if the AP's representation is faithful, to print 3,000 words of such factual incompetence, and intellectual garbage that debases reason?

Can it possibly be that you do not know how false it is to allege that "emocrats alone "affected loudmouthed wrath?" Can you possibly regard this as a fair representation of horror over The Watergate in its limited of full sense? Are you unaware that the symbol of "epublican conservatism, Barry Goldwater, from the first and as recently as yesterday, has been a leader in complaint over this extremism? Or that he also does not here speak for a minority of Americans?

Do you or this shell of what was once a man believe that any of the exposures of this frightful and frightening authoritarianism came from anyone other than a Nixonian Republican?

Even those with criminal involvement are today aghast at what they did.

It would appear that Solzhenitsyn and Nixon alone are not.

It would also appear that Denisovitch now lives in his self-created Siberia. It is a more terrifying prison.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg