

**Laurent Metzger**

**Aleksandr Isayevich Solzhenitsyn and  
Pramoedya Ananta Toer:  
Two Rebels in the Realm of Literature**

Comparative literature has its ups and downs. At times it is very popular among literary critics and at other times it is not so well received by the same critics. Yet comparative literature helps us show that literature is rather universal. So writers, genres, styles, themes can be brought together to give us a new approach to, a new look at world masterpieces. Moreover quite a few literary texts, often because of language barriers, are not as known as others because the latter have been published in more widely known languages.

However we all know that literary themes are not exclusive of one literature or one group of authors. They can be found anywhere in the world as writers often share the same experience although they live in different parts of the world and also at different times. Bringing different writers together could help us understand that literature is not always as parochial as it is commonly assumed, that different literatures do not have to be always different and that better known literatures do share similar themes with literatures which are often considered as marginal or less known.

For instance Solzhenitsyn and Pramoedya Ananta Toer, although they were born into different countries (Russia and Indonesia), although they belong to different literary traditions, although they write in different languages (Russian and Indonesian), have much in common. For the purpose of this article we have selected two similarities; both of them have experienced a long political detention (Pramoedya Ananta Toer became a "tapol" (political detainee)(1) and Solzhenitsyn a "zek") and both of them have produced - when they were finally released from jail or exile - among others, masterpieces in the field of historical novels.

For all detainees - actually the two writers were detained with thousands and thousands of their fellow-countrymen, for instance it has been stated that 400,000 Indonesians were put to jail after the 1965 aborted coup in Jakarta, and out of that number at least 13,000 were sent to the island of Buru (2) - the long process starts with the arrest.

Solzhenitsyn has described in detail how Russians were taken away, most often, in the middle of the night, when the new prisoner does not command all his mental faculties as he just got up from sleep. "The arrested person is torn from the warmth of his bed. He is in a daze, half-asleep, helpless and his judgement is befogged" (3). One reason for the timing of such arrests is given by the writer himself: "During the arrest and search it is highly improbable that a crowd of potential supporters will gather at the entrance." (4). Moreover such arrest is not conducted smoothly. The party sent to arrest such person proceed to undertake a thorough search of the house or flat (5). However according to Solzhenistyn "they are looking for something which was never put there" (6).

The same applied to Pramoedya Ananta Toer, violence occurred too. For the Indonesian writer, the saddest part was the destruction of his library. According to him, Pramoedya tried to plead with the arrest party, but to no avail. He asked them to take away his books if necessary but not destroy them (7).

Coincidentally just before Pramoedya Ananta Toer was arrested in Jakarta, in October 1965, **The First Circle** was "arrested" (The KGB used that term) by the KGB in Moscow. "The seizure of his work had a devastating effect on him" according to D.M. Thomas. Solzhenitsyn himself stated that it was "the greatest misfortune in all my forty-seven years" (8).

Then immediately questions come to the mind of the new prisoner: why me? What have I done to be arrested? Actually these two questions will never be answered for both writers. Yet when they tried many times to get a clear answer to their questions, they were always turned down or given a standard reply which did not reveal any particular reason for such detention. After spending years and years in jail, and in exile in the case of Solzhenitsyn, the two writers are still unclear why they had to be arrested and put away from society for such a long period.

Several times in Solzhenitsyn's works, such question is raised. For instance in **Candle in the Wind**, Philip says to Alex: "We spent ten years at hard labor when we had done nothing" (9).

Actually Solzhenitsyn was arrested in 1945 "for writing private letters critical of Stalin" and Pramoedya Ananta Toer was detained in 1960 because he published a book in which he gave support to the Indonesian of Chinese origin (10).

Of course the best way to describe such situation for the two writers is to mention Kafka's **Trial** in which, the central character, Joseph K. asks others and himself many times why he has been arrested. Like our two writers, Joseph K did not receive any acceptable answer. However we can notice a difference, as the latter's arrest happened on "one fine morning" and not in the middle of the night for Solzhenitsyn (11).

Another similarity between the two writers is the fact that not only both of them were detained for a long period of time, but both of them have been arrested several times. So we can say that they were familiar with such arrests. As a matter of fact Solzhenitsyn has first been arrested in 1945 and was detained for eight years while Pramoedya Ananta Toer went first to jail in 1947, for two years then in 1960, for a few months and finally in 1965, for 14 years.

After the arrest, the new prisoner is sent to jail or to a camp. Solzhenitsyn experienced the Kolyma and he described it as "the greatest and most famous island, the pole of ferocity of that amazing country of Gulag" (12). In **The first Circle**, Solzhenitsyn describes with much detail an arrival to the Lubyanka, according to one of his numerous biographers, D.M Thomas (13). Indonesian prisons are described at length by Pramoedya Ananta Toer in **Keluarga Gerilya** (Family of Gerilla) (14).

While in detention, the new prisoner has to submit to continuous interrogations. But once again, he does not understand the motives behind such meetings. Solzhenitsyn

explains very clearly this point and the futility of such questioning when he wrote: "Given that interrogations had ceased to be an attempt to get to the truth, for the interrogators in difficult cases they became a mere exercise of their duties as executioners and in easy cases simply a past-time and a basis for receiving a salary." (15).

Another impression of the interrogator is given by Solzhenitsyn earlier on in his book: "The interrogator-butcher isn't interested in logic; he wants to catch one or two phrases. He knows what he wants. And as for us - we are totally unprepared for anything." (16).

In the case of Pramoedya, the prisoner is not subjected to numerous interrogations but he has to "serve, pay respect to (the guards), he is always wrong and has admit it" (17). On top of that he has to follow a so-called rehabilitation process. Only when the authorities are satisfied that the prisoner has been fully rehabilitated, such person is allowed to be freed from detention. Of course such a rehabilitation programme is rather long and according to the authorities it takes quite a while to bring back a political detainee to the society he belonged to. Among the criteria applied to be satisfied that a prisoner is fully rehabilitated, the Indonesian authorities used to enquire whether the prisoner had accepted the Pancasila, that is the state ideology which includes five aspects: belief in one God, Nationalism, Internationalism, Democracy and Social Justice (18).

In the camps prisoners are supposed to work. For instance in **One Day in the Life of of Ivan Denisovich**, the hero is a mason while on the Island of Buru, prisoners were required to be farmers and work on the infrastructure, such as road building.

Of course authors need writing tools, even in jails. According to D.M. Thomas, prisoners were allowed pencils and paper in the special camp of Ekibastuz (19). Yet Pramoedya Ananta Toer was denied the same simple writing tools at the beginning of his long stay on the island of Buru. So the novels he created were first oral - Pramoedya Ananta Toer used to recite part of those novels to his fellow detainees to entertain them - and only in 1973 he was given these tools and could use an old type-writer.

Another similarity which can be noticed between the two writers is the fact that probably because they spend long years in jail, they decided to be the recorder or the historiographer of the thousands of political detainees who experienced jails, camps and exile. So, with Solzhenitsyn's writings we have a more comprehensive idea of the whole Gulag in Russia: the names of the camps and jails are given, as well as the names of several political detainees in that country.

As for Pramoedya, he is even more precise as, for instance, he has compiled a list of all the political detainees who died in the infamous camp on the island of Buru. At the end of his account of his detention on that island - **Nyanyi Sunyi Seorang Bisu** (The Silent Song of a Mute) (20) - Pramoedya gives a long list of such prisoners, indicating their place of birth, religion - although Indonesia is the world largest Islamic country in terms of population, nearly half of those who died on the Island of Buru were christians - and how they died, such as suicides, results of being shot at, illnesses, such as hepatitis, malaria, tuberculosis and so on.

So the writer is not only a prisoner trying his best to survive under harsh circumstances, but intends to be a witness of such horror. When his fellow Russians discovered that Solzhenitsyn had decided to record his experience of the camps, he received a lot of information from former detainees who helped him to compile his account of the Gulag. The same applied to Pramoedya Ananta Toer who was known, on the island of Buru, as the recorder of the events happening in the camp. For instance Pramoedya Ananta Toer received a letter giving him some information regarding the death of several detainees on the Island of Buru (21).

We can also notice that the two writers do not limit themselves to the jails and camps they spent time in, but often mention other famous prisoners or infamous jails. In the writings of Solzhenitsyn, the names of Tolstoi and Dostoeivsky appear quite often and the name of Boven Digoel, another infamous camp in Irian Jaya, opened by the Dutch after the communist insurrection in 1926, on the Island of Java, is also often mentioned by Pramoedya, who intends to compile a book on what has been written on that camp (22).

When Solzhenitsyn heard over the BBC on 28-12-1973 that **The Gulag Archipelago** had been published in Russian in Paris he said: "I have fulfilled my duty to those who perished" (23).

Undoubtedly the most interesting consequence of the detention of the two writers is that, because of they became political prisoners, then they became writers and had a lot to write about. In other words the two writers had to endure detention to be able to produce such masterpieces. Of course not all political detainees had the ability to write and to write well such as Solzhenitsyn and Pramoedya Ananta Toer, but without their long detention, their long sojourn out of the main stream society, it is unlikely they would become the great writers as we know them now. It is hard to say but it may be true that without the Gulag and without the repression after the failed communist coup in 1965 in Jakarta, we would be short of two famous writers.

For a literary critic, it is obvious that, for instance, **One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich** has been conceived in a camp. Actually it is stated that: " (the novel) was conceived when the author was employed on general work of the Ekibastuz Special Camp in the winter of 1950-51" (24).

Actually this can also be said of politicians. If they experienced major events and similarly if they had the ability to take advantage of such events or to master them, they would come out like heroes, such as Churchill, de Gaulle, Roosevelt, Zhou Enlai, Mandela and so on...

The fact of having to suffer before producing in the case of writers has been acknowledged before in many literatures. It seems that great writers need to be tested or have to suffer, to suddenly release literary forces, within themselves, which were unused, untapped, but ready to be fully utilized should the need arise. If we were to continue such line of reasoning, could we assume that a writer who has not experienced great events or a writer who has not suffered in one way or the other, cannot produce literary masterpieces? It is rather difficult to agree entirely to such statement but we must at least recognize that there is some truth in it.

Moreover the two writers are quite clear about it and readily confessed that their detention was somewhat necessary to reach that stage of writing great works. So they have had the intellectual honesty to reveal to us that the camps were fundamental in the development of their literary careers.

Actually camps and jails may have had another positive aspect. Restricted in his movements, forced to live with others, the prisoner got to know everyone around him in the camp. "Sometimes he (Nerzhin) did not regret his five years in jail at all; they had acquired their own kind of validity. Where else but in prison could one get to know people so well, where else could one reflect so well on oneself" (25). In **Candle in the Wind**, we find the same idea, when Alex explains: "We're richer than they are...because we've suffered. Suffering is a lever for the growth of the soul. A contented person always has an impoverished soul."(26). That same idea is repeated throughout that play. For instance, in **Candle in the Wind**, Alex says: "I am not ashamed of the years I spent in prison. They were fruitful years" (27). In his memoirs Solzhenitsyn repeats this theme: "Une seule chose m'accablait: la difficulté qu'il y avait selon moi à trouver pour mes récits des thèmes neufs. Il est terrible d'imaginer l'écrivain que je serais devenu (et je le suis devenu) si je n'avais pas été arrêté" (28).

Both writers also felt from the beginning of their detention or exile that their time behind bars or in a foreign land would be temporary and that they would come back to their respective families. "I personally am convinced that in my lifetime I will return to my country" wrote Solzhenitsyn (29).

The last point concerning the political detention of the two writers deal with the fact that nobody can leave the camp or exile overnight. Therefore it takes some time for the political detainee to first realize the fact that finally he is going to be freed and to accept such profound change in his life.

It was assumed that Pramoedya Ananta Toer would leave the detention camp on the island of Buru in 1977, with the first important batch of prisoners freed by the government of President Soeharto. But it was not the case and Pramoedya had to stay another two years before finally being allowed to leave the island for Jakarta. He spent therefore 14 years in political detention. Moreover it took him quite awhile to return from Namlea, the small harbour on the island of Buru, to Jakarta as the ship first called at Surabaya and Pramoedya Ananta Toer again stayed some time in a jail close to the capital of Indonesia before being sent there.

If Pramoedya Ananta Toer was one of the most famous Indonesians to be freed after a long detention, some political figures had to endure a longer term in jail. For instance the former minister for foreign affairs, Dr. Subandrio, had to spend 30 years in jail before being allowed to go home (30).

The same can be said of Solzhenitsyn, as the Russian writer had long been in exile, his return was announced, then delayed several times. It was said that the writer was negotiating with the authorities, then it was stated that Solzhenitsyn was having a house built, not very far from Moscow - and his wife made several trips to Moscow, to follow the progress in such construction - so he had to wait for the house to be completed. Finally Solzhenitsyn decided not to return by the shortest route but he chose the long journey through Siberia before setting foot again in Moscow after his long exile

in the West (about 20 years).

When finally the two writers were released from the camp or allowed to return home, in the case of Solzhenitsyn, they both chose to write about history. It is as if, living in detention for so long, they realized that history was very important and that history was somewhat neglected in their two countries. So Pramoedya published first what has been called in English, **The Buru Quartet**, and then **Arus Balik** (31). Solzhenitsyn published first **August 1914** and was supposed to continue with the other volumes of **The Red Wheel**. When that project was announced - and the whole world was informed, for instance in 1991, it was supposed to be four times longer than **War and Peace!** (32). Actually Pramoedya Ananta Toer also indicated that he would write a very long literary account of history of modern Indonesia until the time of independence (1945). But that project, like **The Red Wheel** was not completed because, when Pramoedya Ananta Toer was arrested in 1965, his whole library and all his documentation were destroyed by the arrest party (33).

The first feature of these historical novels is their length (34). For both writers, they constitute a long and detailed account of the past as seen by them. One difference however is that while Pramoedya selected past centuries for his historical novels, Solzhenitsyn chose the twentieth century, and actually only a few years in that century.

One of the reasons the two writers started to write historical novels, after their detention and exile, is probably the fact that both were not satisfied with what was available regarding history in their respective country. Moreover historical novels which have long existed in world literature, have been given a boost with the publications of Umberto Eco. Therefore historical novels are more fashionable at present. Historical novels, although neglected or cast aside by historians, can be very useful in our understanding of the past. Too often in historical documents, readers are only informed about great personalities and major events. Most often we are not given any detail about the ordinary people who had to live through that period.

So when we read **Arus Balik**, suddenly the whole picture comes to our mind. Among other themes, **Arus Balik** tells us how Islam and the Portuguese came to the Island of Jawa, through the eyes of the local population. Both foreign influences came roughly at the same time. Through that novel readers discover the impression of surprise felt by the Javanese when these foreigners came to their shores - for instance the local population was really shocked to see that, in a procession, the foreigners were walking in front of their leaders, which never happened before - and the slow embracing of that new religion is clearly described in that novel but never in such detail in historical documents. Actually Pramoedya Ananta Toer helps us understand that because of the Portuguese sort of invasion, the local population accepted Islam more readily to oppose these new self-appointed masters. Another interesting feature of historical novels which can be found in **Arus Balik** is the numerous details readers can notice concerning the ordinary people. For instance the first Arab traders were considered rather arrogant or even ready to betray the Javanese they met. This is the case of Sayid Habibullah Almasawa, as he is portrayed in the novel (35).

The role played by the sea is also a strong point of the novel and Pramoedya Ananta Toer always insists on it (36). Actually the title of the novel **Arus Balik** means

Reverse Flow and Pramoedya Ananta Toer explains why he chose such title: "Pada zaman Majapahit arus mengalir dari selatan ke utara: kapal muatan dan pengaruh. Setelah kejatuhan Majapahit... arus berbalik dari utara ke selatan" (At the time of the Mahapahit empire, the flow was running from the South to the North: ships, cargo and influences. When Majapahit fell, the flow changed course and ran from the North to the South) (37). As a matter of fact Indonesia is an archipelago and therefore all foreign visitors, settlers or influences had to come from the sea in the past.

In writing historical novels, Solzhenitsyn had several models to follow, such as **War and Peace**, but Pramoedya Ananta Toer had to start from scratch as not many Indonesian writers had taken up that genre.

Both in accounts of the camps and in historical novels, Pramoedya Ananta Toer and Solzhenitsyn insist on the human factor. For instance this feature can be found in **One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich**, according to Robert Porter: "The closing words of the novel denote not just the scale of the Stalinist nightmare, but also Ivan Denisovich's continuing ability, in or out of jail, to retain his identity as human being with all its contradictions" (38).

In **August 1914**, Solzhenitsyn introduces several families, while for instance in **Arus Balik**, Pramoedya Ananta Toer makes use of several characters, both important officials as well as several ordinary Javanese.

In **August 1914**, Solzhenitsyn has Leo Tolstoy as one of the numerous characters. During a conversation, the latter stated that "We must explain things patiently" (39). Apparently political leaders have often a hard time explaining their policies to their people. It seems that it is even harder at present. Is it because peoples are more demanding? Or that explanations cannot be easy at present? Anyway both Solzhenitsyn and Pramoedya Ananta Toer believes that more should be done to explain the rational behind such and such policies.

Another aspect found in the two historical novels above mentioned is that wars and battles are described at length and the horror of military operations is explained in detail, especially in **August 1914**. Critics have even indicated that Solzhenitsyn would have been an excellent general, after reading **August 1914** (40).

After considering their time behind bars and their role as writing history from a rather new angle, we have to review some other similarities between Pramoedya Ananta Toer and Aleksander Solzhenitsyn.

One of the first similarities which can be noticed in that respect is the fact that both have always been very critical. For instance they have both criticized the political situation they were living in. We are all aware that Solzhenitsyn never appreciated the communist government which held power for seventy years and Pramoedya never approved the New Order government which controlled Indonesia from 1965 to the fall of Soeharto in May 1998. Moreover the two writers are still not satisfied with their present political leaders. Solzhenitsyn does not seem to approve the presidency of Boris Yeltsin, who is accused of "bungling economic reforms" and who is considered responsible for "a national betrayal" (41) and Pramoedya Ananta Toer does not have kind words for the government of the present president of Indonesia, Jusuf B. Habibie.

Both seem to be very sad when they think of the situation of their respective countries. For Solzhenitsyn, as recurrent statement is "I feel sorry for Russia". That feeling was first expressed by Sanya - that is Solzhenitsyn's father, in **August 1914** (42) - and reappears several times in the author's writings. For instance when he decided to come back to Russia, Solzhenitsyn was fully aware of the condition of that country in the nineties. For instance he declared in Vladivostok: "I know I am coming I am coming to a country that is torn, discouraged, disoriented, changed beyond recognition, convulsively searching for itself, for its own true identity." (43).

Actually the theme of identity of unification is often mentioned by Solzhenitsyn. In one of his most recent publications, he wrote that "il (le peuple) a perdu le sens de ce qui l'unifie."(44).

Pramoedya Ananta Toer is also very sad when he thinks of his country. He declared that at present "all problems are settled with shooting" (45).

The two writers are not only critical of their own countries but extend their criticism beyond the borders of Russia and Indonesia. Many times Solzhenitsyn has expressed his feelings towards the West in critical terms much to the surprise of Western observers. For instance this happened during Solzhenitsyn's commencement speech at Harvard on 8-6-1978. Yet as Ericson puts it, Solzhenitsyn is not against the West but rather against the weaknesses of the West (46). As far as Pramoedya Ananta Toer is concerned, he too did not show too much admiration for the West when he visited the Netherlands in 1953. On the other hand, he was very appreciative of China in 1956 when he was invited at the commemoration of the 20th anniversary of Lu Xun's death (47).

Another field criticized by both writers is the language of their respective country. For Solzhenitsyn "elle (la langue) est grossièrement simplifiée" (48). Actually apart from writing historical novels, plays, poems, essays and so on, Solzhenitsyn also started to compile a dictionary of Russian (49). Pramoedya Ananta Toer is also appalled by the state of the Indonesian language at present (50).

Similarly as the two writers did not mince their words when they did not like such and such point, both had to bear much criticism which was extended to them. For instance in 1995, many Indonesian writers were shocked to discover that Pramoedya Ananta Toer had been given the Magsaysay Literary Award by the Philippines. They felt that the writer did not deserve such award as he had been very critical of a certain kind of literature - especially bourgeois literature - when he was in charge of the literary section, **Lentera** of the left-wing news paper **Bintang Timur**. Solzhenitsyn has also been often criticized for being ungrateful, for instance to the West who received him as a hero in 1974 when he was banished from his home country. Yet both writers are entitled to their views.

Another interesting similarity between the two writers is their opinions regarding a region of their country. In **La Russie sous l'avalanche**, Solzhenitsyn informs us that Russia should return to Japan the Kouriles Islands as they have never been really part of Russia and such a move would be most welcome by Japan which in return could be more positive towards Russia (51).



Similarly Pramoedya Ananta Toer believes that East Timor - the former Portuguese colony, which was abandoned by the former colonial power in 1975, then invaded by the Indonesian army - should be allowed to be independent (52). For more than 20 years Indonesia maintained that that territory was part of Indonesia so it could not become independent, until January 1999, when the present Indonesian government stated that East Timor could become independent if the territory did not agree with the autonomy proposed by the central government.

Both writers met at one time the top political leader in their respective country. Pramoedya Ananta Toer took part in the delegation who met President Soekarno in Jakarta in March 1957 and Solzhenitsyn met Nikita Khrushchev at the Kremlin in 1962 (53), at the time **One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich** was published. Of course it was just once as both writers did not appreciate the other leaders. As a matter of fact Pramoedya Ananta Toer appreciated Soekarno, although the reverse was not true, according to the former (54).

Both writers also happened to be left-wing at one stage. For instance Solzhenitsyn "was deeply in love with communism" as a young man, according to D.M.Thomas (55). As for Pramoedya Ananta Toer, it has already been mentioned that he was very appreciative of what he saw in China in the late fifties when he made three trips to that country.

Another similarity concerns the most important role of a writer, that is his or her publications. When we think of the two authors it is obvious that both were not well received by the authorities. Solzhenitsyn's **Gulag Archipelago** was first published in Paris, although in Russian, and Pramoedya had many of his works immediately banned in his own country so they had to be published in a neighbouring country, Malaysia. However in both countries copies of the banned books circulated among their followers. Now Solzhenitsyn's works are available in Russia, but only a few of Pramoedya Ananta Toer's.

Should we be surprised to find so many similarities between Solzhenitsyn and Pramoedya Ananta Toer? Actually like the economy, literature tends to be global and therefore same themes, same concerns can be noticed in different parts of the world. So it is our duty to dig, to discover and to find hidden treasures and unknown master-pieces in world literature. Bringing closer Solzhenitsyn and Pramoedya Ananta Toer helps us understand the concerns of writers. Both writers are outsiders but very much concerned by the fate of their fellow-countrymen. Both can be described as humanists. Solzhenitsyn has been called "our Voltaire from Vermont is a spiritual monument!" (56). The same could be said of Pramoedya Ananta Toer.

## Notes

- (1) "Tapol" is an acronym for "**Tahanan politik**" (political detainee).
- (2) According to the Malaysian Newspaper, *The New Straits Times*, 21-12-1977, and *Time*, 15-11-1976, p 16.
- (3) **The Gulag Archipelago. 1918-1956. An experiment in Literary Investigation**, London, Collins and Harvill Press, 1974, p 6.
- (4) *Ibid.*, p 7
- (5) *Ibid.*, pp 6-7.
- (6) *Ibid.*, p 6.
- (7) **Indonesia**, (Cornell University) No 61, 1996, p 11.
- (8) **Alexander Solzhenitsyn. A Century in His Life**, St Martin's Press, New York, 1998, pp 299-301. The quotation by Solzhenitsyn is from **The Oak and the Calf**, p 104.
- (9) Published by Bantam Books, University of Minnesota, 1974, p 78.
- (10) **Solzhenitsyn and the Modern World**, by Edward E. Ericson, Regnery Gateway, Washington DC, 1993, p 47. The book published by Pramoedya Ananta Toer is **Hoakiau di Indonesia** (The Chinese in Indonesia) first published in 1960, then banned and launched again in Jakarta in 1998.
- (11) Franz Kafka, **The Trial**, London, Secker and Warburg, 1956, p 7.
- (12) **The Gulag Archipelago**, *op.cit.*, pp IX-X.
- (13) **Alexander Solzhenitsyn. A Century in His Life**, St Martin's Press, New York, 1998, p 123.
- (14) First published in Indonesia, in 1950 then in Malaysia by Pustaka Antara, in Kuala Lumpur, in 1970. The novel has become a classic and has been for many years a text book for schools in Malaysia.
- (15) **The Gulag Archipelago**, p 138.
- (16) *Ibid.*, p 121.
- (17) **Nyanyi Sunyi Seorang Bisu**(The Silent Song of a Mute), Jakarta, Lentera, 1995, p 265.
- (18) **The Far Eastern Economic Review**(Hong Kong), 28-10-1977, p 9.
- (19) **Alexander Solzhenitsyn. A Century in His Life**, *op.cit.*, P 195.
- (20) Published in Jakarta by Lentera in 1995.
- (21) *Ibid*, p 269 and sq.
- (22) This was confirmed to me by the writer himself when I visited Pramoedya Ananta Toer, in his house in Jakarta on December 5th, 1998.
- (23) **Alexander Solzhenitsyn. A Century in His Life**, *op.cit.*, pp 401-402.
- (24) **Solzhenitsyn' One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich**, p 19.
- (25) **The First Circle**, London, Collins, Fontana Books, 1974, p 306.
- (26) P 128.
- (27) *Ibid*, p 47.
- (28) **Le chêne et le veau**, by Solzhenitsyn, Editions du Seuil, Paris, 1975, p 10.
- (29) Quoted by Ericson in **Solzhenitsyn and the Modern World**, *op cit.*, p 10
- (30) **The Straits Times** and **Berita Harian** (Singapore), 17-8-1995.
- (31) **The Buru Quartet** consists of **Bumi Manusia** (1980), (This Earth of Mankind) ,**Anak Semua Bangsa** (1980) (Child of all Nations), **Jejak Langkah** (1985)(Footsteps) and **Rumah Kaca** (1988) (Glass House). **Arus Balik** has been published by Hasta Mitra, in Jakarta and by Wira Karya, in Kuala Lumpur in 1995. In Jakarta the novel was launched at the writer's residence on 15-8-1995, **The Straits**

**Times**, 17-8-1995.

(32) For instance in *The Straits Times* (Singapore), 28-9-1991.

(33) **Pemikiran Pramoedya Ananta Toer dalam Novel-Novel Mutakhirnya** (Pramoedya Ananta Toer's Ideas in His Latest Novels), by Koh Young Hoon, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur, 1996, pp 58-59.

(34) **August 1914, The Red Wheel/Knot I**, published by The Noonday Press, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York, 1989 has 854 pages, while **Arus Balik** 724.

(35) **Arus Balik**, p 71, 101 and 104

(36) The writer criticized the present government of Indonesia for being insensitive to this maritime role which should be played by Indonesia, personal communication with the writer, December 1998.

(37) **Arus Balik**, p 99.

(38) **Solzhenitsyn's One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich. A critical Study**, London, Bristol Class Press, 1997, p 98.

(39) P 17.

(40) Solzhenitsyn "could have become a general" in **Alexander Solzhenitsyn. A Century in His Life**, p 48.

(41) **The Straits Times**, 16-4-1994 and 30-5-1994 respectively.

(42) P 11.

(43) **The Sunday Times**, 29-5-1994 and **Alexander Solzhenitsyn. A Century in His Life**, op.cit., p 513.

(44) **La Russie sous l'avalanche**, by Soljénistyne, Librairie Arthème Fayard, Paris, 1998, p 124.

(45) Such statement was made by the writer when I visited him in early December 1998, in Jakarta.

(46) **Alexander Solzhenitsyn. A Century in His Life**, p 99 and p 126.

(47) Hong Liu, Pramoedya Ananta Toer and China: The Transformation of a Cultural Intellectual, **Indonesia**, No 61, Cornell University, April 1996, p 126.

(48) **La Russie sous l'avalanche**, p 268.

(49) **The Straits Times**, 28-9-1991.

(50) Private conversation with the writer in Jakarta, in December 1998.

(51) Pp 78-79.

(52) Private conversation with the writer in Jakarta in December 1998.

(53) **Alexander Solzhenitsyn. A Century in His Life**, p 274.

(54) Private conversation with the writer.

(55) **Alexander Solzhenitsyn. A Century in His Life**, p 75.

(56) *Ibid.*, p 514.