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ABBREVIATIONS

ASSR & RSFSR
Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. Subordinate to any SSR (see below) and based on the minority nationality whose home is on the territory. The Mordovian ASSR, for example, is subordinate to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) and so named because it is the home of the Mordovian national minority

CPSU
Communist Party of the Soviet Union

EC
Executive Committee

KGB
Committee for State Security

Komsomol
Communist Youth League

MVD
Ministry of Internal Affairs

MVD
Department of Internal Affairs

OVIR
Department (of the MVD) for Visas and Registration

SPH
Special Psychiatric Hospital

SSR
Soviet Socialist Republic, of which there are 15 in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), the largest being the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic)

UVD
Administration for Internal Affairs

UVIR
Administration (of the MVD) for Visas and Registration

PREFAE

A Chronicle of Current Events was initially produced in 1968 as a bi-monthly journal. In the spring of that year members of the Soviet Civil Rights Movement created the journal with the stated intention of publicizing issues and events related to Soviet citizens' efforts to exercise fundamental human liberties. On the title page of every issue there appears the text of Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which calls for universal freedom of opinion and expression. The authors are guided by the principle that such universal guarantees of human rights (also similar guarantees in their domestic law) should be firmly adhered to in their own country and elsewhere. They feel that 'it is essential that truthful information about violations of basic human rights in the Soviet Union shall be available to all who are interested in it'. The Chronicles consist mostly of accounts of such violations.

In an early issue it was stated that 'the Chronicle does, and will do, its utmost to ensure that its strictly factual style is maintained to the greatest degree possible...'. The Chronicle has consistently maintained a high standard of accuracy. As a regular practice the editors openly acknowledge when a piece of information has not been thoroughly verified. When mistakes in reporting occur, these mistakes are retrospectively drawn to the attention of readers.

In February 1971, starting with number 16, Amnesty International began publishing English translations of the Chronicles as they appeared. This latest volume, containing Chronicle 64, is, like previous ones a translation of a copy of the original typewritten text (which reached London during 1983). The editorial insertions are the endnotes (numbered) and the words in square brackets. Also added, to help the general reader, are: the list of abbreviations, the index of names, the bibliographical note and the material on the inside and outside of the covers. None of this material appeared in the original text.

The endnotes have been kept to a minimum, partly because the text itself already refers to earlier issues, and partly because the index of names gathers together all references to a particular person. Ukrainian names are usually given in
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THE TRIAL OF IVAN KOVALEV

At the end of January, Ivan Kovaliev completed his study of the case.

* * *

From 31 March to 2 April the Moscow City Court, presided over by V.V. Bogdanov (he also tried Yu. Grimm - Chronicle 58, A. Lavut - Chronicle 60, I. Grivina and F. Serebrov - Chronicle 63) heard the case of Ivan Sergeyevich Kovaliev (born 1954; arrested 25 August 1981 - Chronicle 63), who was charged under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. The prosecutor was S.A. Zakharov, the defence lawyer V.Ya. Shveisky (he also defended Kovaliev's wife, T. Osipova - Chronicle 62).

* * *

The trial took place in the People's Court of the Babushkin district of Moscow (Lavut and Serebrov were tried there as well). In the courtroom, besides the 'special public', Kovaliev's mother E.V. Tokareva and his sister Maria (Chronicle 63) were present.

Kovaliev was charged with:
- preparing, keeping and circulating Moscow Helsinki Group documents: No. 101 - 'Threats to the Moscow Helsinki Group' (Chronicle 54), No. 111 - 'Sharp Increase in the Persecution of the Civil Rights Movement in the USSR' (Chronicle 56), No. 114 - 'The Persecution of those connected with the Journal Searches continues. Valeriy Abramkin is arrested.' (Chronicle 55), No. 119 (concerning the invasion of Afghanistan - Chronicle 56), No. 121 - 'In Defence of Academician A.D. Sakharov' (Chronicle 56), No. 131 - 'Concerning the Violation of Defence Rights in cases of prisoners of conscience' (Chronicle 57), No. 144 'The Trial of Vyacheslav Bahkim' (Chronicle 60), No. 148 - 'Paruir Airikyan threatened with a new conviction' (Chronicle 60), several collections containing information about events in the USSR;
- writing, keeping and circulating the letter - 'To World Scientists at the 14 International Genetics Conference' (Chronicle 51); the articles - 'The Story of One Hunger-Strike. Sergei Kovaliev' (Chronicle 56), 'The Price of Honesty', 'The
Sixty-fourth?' (Chronicle 61) and 'Unpublished Interview' (Chronicle 62) and the collection 'The Case of T. Osipova'; preparing and circulating issues Nos. 54, 58, 60 of A Chronicle of Current Events; keeping with the intention of circulating The Gulag Archipelago by Solzhenitsyn, Ark for the Uninvited by Maksimov and the newspaper Russian Thought.

In addition, Kovalev was charged with verbal anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda.

On 31 March the indictment was read (32 pages; the reading took about an hour and a half).

Then Kovalev spoke. In detailed explanations to the court on 31 March and 1 April, he analysed and refuted the charges against him, and testified that neither he nor his friends in the civil rights movement had ever aimed, or would ever aim, to undermine or overthrow Soviet power, that they rejected violence of any kind, and considered that it was not their actions which were illegal but the actions of those officials who, in spite of Soviet laws and international agreements, violated human rights in the USSR.

Kovalev presented twenty petitions to the court for documents to be furnished and witnesses to be called. All these petitions were refused.

On 1 April nine witnesses were questioned. Not one confirmed the charges.

On 2 April the evidence of A. Akhutin (Chronicle 63), who did not appear in court, was read out, in which it was stated that Kovalev had shown him an issue of the 'white emigre' paper Russian Thought in the flat of V. Mitskevich (Chronicle 63); Mitskevich himself was not present at the time, he had already gone to bed. Mitskevich replied to the lawyer's question that that was not what had happened, that he had gone to bed only after Akhutin had left.

In his speech the prosecutor referred frequently to Brezhnev's statement which called the present trial 'an important trial of political consequence', but in the main he practically repeated the indictment.

The lawyer stated that he found no substance for a crime under article 70, and asked for Kovalev to be acquitted. If Kovalev were charged under article 180-1 and pleaded guilty, Shveisky added, he, the lawyer, would find motives for a request for a light sentence. 'Keeping single copies of the above-mentioned documents (as the accused said - for his own library) is not a crime'. In his final speech, Kovalev said:

Two Russian poets, both Alexanders, have written 'As I live, so I write - freely - freely' (Alexander Griboyedov, 1825) and 'Like a petrified forest, we stand dumbly on that border-line where the word is not only not action, but not even a word anymore...' (Alexander Galich, 1970s)

He later said:

The prosecutor has called this trial political and he is right - this is a political trial. I have a request to make of the court, but I will come to this later. Now I would like to state that I accept full and sole responsibility for the publication and distribution of the collection 'V' (collections containing information about events in the USSR - Chronicle)...

Here the judge interrupted Kovalev saying that this had nothing to do with the case. 'Yes, it does', replied Kovalev, 'and I would like to explain why - it is extremely important for preserving full and objective information about events'. The judge again interrupted Kovalev. Kovalev tried to continue. Then the judge announced a recess, and the court retired to consider the verdict. Kovalev shouted after them: 'You were asked not to lie in your verdict!'

The sentence was five years in strict-regime camps and five years' exile (the text of the sentence was practically a repetition of the indictment).

While the sentence was being read, Kovalev remained seated. Maria Kovaleva started to cry, and Kovalev leaned over so that he could see her but her guards did not move over, blocking her in. Kovalev shifted his position on the bench. Then the judge stopped reading and demanded that Kovalev stand. He refused, saying that he did not wish to participate in phoney proceedings. The judge called for guards. As Kovalev was being led away, he shouted 'Warmest greetings and love to all those behind walls!' The reading of the sentence was completed in his absence.

In 1977 Kovalev graduated from the Moscow Institute of Rail Transport Engineers. He worked for about two years as a power engineering specialist. He then worked in a bakery and as a fire officer in the theatre. Kovalev has a daughter by his first
marriage (born in 1975).

I. Kovalev became involved in civil rights activity after the trial of his father, Sergei Kovaliv (in December 1975 - Chronicle 38). He joined the Moscow Helsinki Group in October 1979 (Chronicle 54).

...I regarded work...as a necessary nuisance and tried to find a job which would leave me as much free time as possible. People could of course argue that I had not found my place in society and that I had 'gone over to the dissidents'; but I consider that collecting and processing information, which was what I basically did, to be an absolutely professional occupation which I find interesting and which maybe in other circumstances would have been my actual profession. And as for finding my place in society, at the moment I feel that I have found my right place... (from Kovalev's statement 'Why I was arrested' - Chronicle 63).

On 2 April the Moscow Helsinki Group released Document No.194, 'Conviction of Moscow Helsinki Group member Ivan Kovalev':

...Ivan Kovalev's father, the well-known biologist Sergei Kovaliv, was one of the founders of the civil rights movement in the USSR, who, after having served seven years of imprisonment, is now in exile in harsh conditions near Magadan and seriously ill. Ivan’s wife, Tatyana Osipova, a member of the Moscow Helsinki Group, was sentenced exactly a year ago to five years’ imprisonment and five years’ exile under the same article 70 of the RSFSR criminal code, and is suffering behind barbed wire in a strict-regime camp in Mordovia. All the members of this family have been separated for a long period of time and have no chance of seeing each other even occasionally. This is how Soviet 'justice' has dealt with a family of courageous people, who tried to apply the right, formally recognised in Soviet law, of publicly expressing their opinions.

On 3 April, A. Sakharov wrote a letter 'In Defence of Ivan Kovalev':

Ivan Kovalev has been convicted. This is yet another blow for those who defend human rights in the USSR, for the flow of information, for the Helsinki Group and a blow for the principles embodied in the Helsinki Final Act. And it is another, unbelievable act of cruelty against the wonderful

Kovalev family, its third victim. In December 1974, Ivan’s father, Sergei Kovaliv, was arrested. In May 1980, Ivan’s wife, Tatyana Osipova, was arrested. Both of them, like Ivan Kovalev, were severely sentenced for their non-violent, public defence of human rights, for loyalty to noble convictions. Ivan Kovalev has only had one half-hour meeting with his wife since her arrest. Now years will pass before they can see each other again, unless a miracle occurs! Ivan Kovalev has written about himself and his position, in a letter not long before his arrest (Chronicle 63). And in the article 'About my Tanya' (Chronicle 57), he told us about his wife, her fate and her struggle. There is little that can be added to these documents, except to say that what they contain is the truth; I have known Ivan for many years and am convinced of this.

I call on all those who value justice and who sympathise with the tragedy of this young family, to speak out in defence of Ivan Kovalev, his wife and, of course, his father. We must demand that meetings between Ivan and Tatyana be allowed - this is their undeniable human right. And it is very important to demand their freedom, and freedom for all prisoners of conscience!

In Moscow an 'Open Appeal' was published:

Whose actions injure the prestige of the Soviet Union, who is in fact anti-Soviet? The journalist, the public figure, who collects and openly publishes information about the arbitrary and illegal acts of individuals or organisations, or those individuals and organisations... The authorities use any means they can to hide from their own people, and more especially from the world at large, numerous instances involving the violation of their own laws, and the basic human and economic rights of their own citizens, the disregard of international obligations undertaken by the government, and those who hinder the concealment of this kind of unworthy action are hidden as quickly as possible in camps and special psychiatric hospitals...

Today Ivan Kovalev was arrested and sentenced, tomorrow the victim of arbitrary rule could be anyone who tries to defend his rights, even the most insignificant ones.

On 3 June, the RSFSR Supreme Court heard Kovalev’s appeal. The sentence was left unchanged.
The Tomsk Case

On 1 February a search was carried out at the home of Anatoly Alekseyevich Chernyshov (born 1937), chief of the forensic laboratory of Tomsk Regional Procuracy. Samizdat and tools used for book-binding were confiscated. A hunting rifle was confiscated from Chernyshov's place of work. After the search Chernyshov was arrested. He was charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Engaging in a forbidden trade') and article 218 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Illegal possession of a rifle...').

The same day a search was carried out at the home of Alexander Frantsevich Kovalevsky (born 1930), Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences and head of the Biological and Biophysical Research Laboratory at Tomsk State University. Samizdat, two cameras and a typewriter were confiscated (the record mentions 54 items). Following this, Kovalevsky was interrogated several times. On 9 February he was arrested. He was charged under article 190-1.

In the first days of February Valery Mikhailovich Kandel was arrested (approx. 30 years old; a philosopher by training; until 1980 worked at the Specific Sociological Research Laboratory at Tomsk State University; samizdat, two cameras and a typewriter were confiscated (the record mentions 54 items). Following this, Kandel was interrogated several times. In March-April Artsimovich was arrested. He was charged under article 190-1 (he was charged with being the author of the article 'Contradiction upon Contradiction').

In connection with this case searches were also carried out in Tomsk on 1 February at the home of M.A. Kartashev and on 10 March at the home of E.B. Stepanova (it was suggested to her that she retrieve the briefcase containing samizdat she had taken to a neighbour some time previously, which she did); in Barnaul at the home of the grown up sons of Kovalevsky by his first marriage, Evgeny and Pavel; in the town of Mytishch (Moscow Region) on 21 March at the home of Yu.P. Kozhevnikov (old samizdat was confiscated); in Leningrad on 23 March at the home of V.G. Shnitke (an official of the Krasnoyarsk KGB) was present at the interrogation after the search and asked questions about V.G. Sirotinina from Krasnoyarsk - Chronicles 51, 53).

In Tomsk, the following were also summoned for questioning: G.F. Plakhonov (director of the Institute of Biological and Biophysical Research), A.M. Kartashev (laboratory chief of the same institute). V.V. Kolpakov (reader in the Department of Radiophysics at Tomsk State University), V.S. Fast (reader in the Department of Analytical Mathematics at Tomsk State University), L. Anfinogenov (an employee of the Applied Mathematics and Mechanics Research Institute), Kovallevsky's wife, M.P. Kovalevskaya.

On 20 May in Moscow Sergeyev questioned T. Khromova (Chronicle 57) and Ts. Tanengolt's. Tanengolt's said that she knew Khromova and Fast, but did not remember Kovalevsky. The investigator showed an interest in Tanengolt's contacts in the West (see also 'Chats in Moscow').

The same day Sergeyev questioned N.B. Nabokova. (On 24 April, S.R. Andreyev, Investigator of the Moscow City Procurator's Office, carried out a search at the home of Nabokova in connection with the case of the murder of Zoya Fëdorova [Chronicle 63], as Nabokova was a close friend of Fëdorova and had been to her house on the day of the murder. On that day she had arrived at Fëdorova's house earlier than the time she had arranged with her neighbour, but nobody had opened the door. It turned out later that by that time, Fëdorova was already lying dead in her flat. Letters, notebooks and samizdat were confiscated during the search.)

In Moscow, V. Rozin (Chronicle 63) was also interrogated.
The Arrest of Kopysov

On 16 February a search was carried out in the town of Bobrov, Voronezh region, at the home of Ivan Pavlovich Kopysov (Chronicle 43; born 1921; worked recently as a librarian). A large quantity of papers was confiscated during the search; most of them written by Kopysov himself. Kopysov refused to go for interrogation, so he was forcibly dragged into a car. He was arrested after questioning.

In connection with the Kopysov case, a search was carried out on 12 May in the town of Yurev-Polsky, Vladimir region, at the home of V. Fefilov (see 'Persecution of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled in the USSR').

Extract from the report of the Voronezh procurator, Gakkel:

...Kopysov...with the intention of distributing them wrote the novels The Red Raven and The Cauldron and the following works 'The Fourth Civil War in Russia', 'Mirages in the Desert', 'Report from a Madhouse', 'Open Letter to Solzhenitsyn', open letters to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, to the Party Central Committee, and poetry.

The Arrest of Lazareva

On 26 September 1980 in Leningrad, the 'feminist' Natalya Lazareva (Chronicle 60) was arrested. In January 1981 she was sentenced in the Leningrad City Court under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and article 196 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Falsification...of documents...') to ten months' deprivation of freedom (at the trial Lazareva pleaded guilty - Chronicle 61).

On 13 March 1982 she was again arrested. Searches were carried out at her home (only the logo of the feminist journal Maria - Chronicle 57 - was found), at the homes of Galina Grigoreva (Chronicle 60) and of Dmitry Akselrod (from them material for the journal Maria was confiscated). KGB officials told Grigoreva that if she replied to their questions, Lazareva would be allowed to leave for the West and Grigoreva would be allowed to publish the journal; otherwise a case under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code would be initiated against Lazareva.

At the same time in Moscow a search was made at the home of Tatyana Iodkovskaya. On 31 March in Moscow a search was made at the flat of Natalya Voronina (Voronina herself was away at the time); samizdat and material for the journal Maria were confiscated.

During the 'chats' and interrogations the investigators said that Lazareva had testified that she and Voronina published the journal.

The Arrest of Grinev

At the beginning of the year Viktor Grinev (Chronicle 56) sent a statement to the military commissar of the Frunze regional military registration office of Moscow:

For many years when I received call-up papers from the military registration office, I failed to show up. Now, renouncing my Soviet citizenship, I should like to explain the reason for my 'non-appearance'.

I consider it shameful to perform military service in a country whose army destroyed attempts at a free life and free speech in Hungary and Czechoslovakia with its tanks, which has carried out the invasion of Afghanistan and supports the military dictatorship in Poland.

On 21 April Grinev and the daughter of his wife Maria, were detained at about 3pm at the metro station 'Rechnoi Vokzal' and taken to police station No. 12 (their local station). During a personal search of Grinev, several copies of his 'Open Letter' were confiscated:

I, Viktor Ivanovich Grinev, Russian, born 1941, artist, renounce my Soviet citizenship. I have sent a statement to this effect to the Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Court and police station No. 12.

I am not renouncing my Soviet citizenship because I want to become a citizen of another country. I do not want to leave this country. I want to live and die in Russia, where my forefathers have lived and died.

But I cannot and will not remain a citizen of a country where the word 'citizen' is a fiction, as we do not even enjoy those rights guaranteed by our Constitution.
I do not want to call myself a citizen of a country, where the natural human rights - the right to thought, speech, receiving and transmitting information - a right which is fully 'legal', is punished under articles 70 and 190; where the best people are behind barbed wire, such as Orlov, Ternovsky, Marchenko [the list could go on for several pages]; where without trial or investigation it is possible to 'exile' a great scientist, thereby depriving him of the right of human and professional contact, as happened to Sakharov.

I am ashamed to call myself a citizen of a country which crushed attempts at freedom in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, invaded Afghanistan, uses General Jaruzelski to stifle Poland.

I renounce my citizenship of a country in which the 20th Party Congress has remained a voice crying in the wilderness and which since its foundation has been murdering its most honourable and talented children. Some such as Rabel and Mandelstam have just been killed, others have died through ostracism, like Fyodorov and Pasternak, still others, like Galich, through nostalgia and still others - morally (and this is the worst death), by being deprived of their courage, their moral principles, and as a result, their talent. This last category is the most numerous. It includes Mayakovsky, and Olesha, and Gorky, who wrote those shameful pages about the islands and shot himself for fear of exposure by Fadeyev7. But there are even more among 'ordinary' citizens.

Citizenship of the USSR does each one of us to duplicity of speech, emotion and thought. At home we say one thing, another at meetings; we tell mocking jokes about our leaders, and obediently vote for thee.

In our country everything is based on a lie. Even its name is a lie - the country of 'Soviets'. The Soviets have no power - it is a dictatorship of the Central Committee and the KGB, under whose rule Russia is becoming impoverished under our very eyes. A country which fed almost the whole world with its wheat can no longer feed itself.

I renounce my Soviet citizenship, although I realise that individual protest will change nothing immediately. But I have no alternative. I wish to be honest. I can no longer remain silent and lie with each minute of silence.

I am convinced that if all those who think as I do handed in their passports, there would be a vote of no-confidence in the government. And this would be a solution to the problem, because it would mean that the atmosphere of fear, lies and silence would already have been supplanted by the fresh air of citizenship.

And this is essential. Because if we remain silent, silently sanctioning the crimes of the Central Committee, the KGB and the government, the terrible days of Stalinism will return. Our government has no need to introduce martial law. It has existed for a long time - it is within us.

Grinev was put in a preventive detention cell. Maria, held in the corridor until 11pm, was allowed to go home. After several days, Grinev was transferred to Butyrka prison. He was charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. His case is being conducted by A.K. Bumazhkin, investigator of the Moscow City Procuracy.

On the evening of 21 April, Bumazhkin carried out a search at Grinev's flat. Various samizdat and tamizdat4 materials were confiscated.

In April-May Bumazhkin summoned for questioning T. Trusova, M. Trusova, Grinev's sister, Tatyana, and his brother, Nikolai, A. Filimonova (a friend of Maria's who had recently been living with the Trusovs) and three pupils of T. Trusova (she was studying literature with them, preparing them for entry exams to the institute; the search on 21 April had taken place during lessons).

Nikolai Grinev told Bumazhkin that T. Trusova had typed the 'Open Letter', and that she had sent it to the West; that he, Nikolai, read samizdat and tamizdat, which T. Trusova had given him; that his brother had become interested in politics under the influence of his wife. Bumazhkin told N. Grinev that his brother would probably be found 'not responsible for his actions' ('it's a clear-cut case'), he would be put in a psychiatric hospital and treated for no more than three or four months.

The Arrest of Verkhovsky

On 27 April in Kaluga Anatoly Mikhailovich Verkhovsky (born 1944) was arrested. Manuscripts, photocopies of various books, typewritten documents stamped 'For Official Use' were confiscated during the search. Verkhovsky was charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. The case is being conducted by the
Kaluga Procuracy, investigator Terekhov.
The same day in Obninsk (Kaluga Region) searches were carried out at the homes of
E. Frolova and O. Zapalskaya. For the most part, what was confiscated from Frolova (a physicist by training,
now working as a watchman) were Verkhovsky's manuscripts. From
Zapalskaya (a biologist by training, now working as a nursery
teacher in a creche) a large quantity of samizdat and tamizdat (277 items) was confiscated. Frolova was summoned for questioning
on 8 June, Zapalskaya on 10 June. Both refused to give evidence.

On 4 May a search was carried out in Sverdlovsk at the home of
Verkhovsky's wife, Svetlana. (The order was signed on 27 April but
she was in hospital and came out on the evening of 4 May). On 6
and 11 June Verkhovskaya was interrogated in Kaluga. During the
interrogation she suffered the beginnings of a heart attack.
Terekhov ran to get medicine, but did not stop the interrogation.
He showed Verkhovskaya testimony given against her by her
colleagues from Sverdlovsk, Nikulina and Khaielson. At the
second interrogation Verkhovskaya refused to give evidence.

In connection with the Verkhovsky case, searches were carried
out in April and May in Kaluga at the homes of
V. Kataposhin (graduate of the Institute of Historical Archives, works as a
watchman) and O. Markov (graduate of the same institute, works as a
photographer), in Moscow at the homes of E. Polyakov (graduate
of the same institute, works as a watchman), M. Sereda (radio-
electronics engineer), the latter's parents and former wife and
in Obninsk at the home of Niverovsky (geophysicist).

The Administrative Arrest of Khodorovich

On 4 May officials from the Sverdlov District UVD in Moscow
detained Sergei Khodorovich, treasurer of the Aid Fund for
Political Prisoners, as he came out of his home. He was taken
back inside and a search was made 'in connection with intrigues
concerning medical certificates'. They told Khodorovich that he
had been travelling around the country with false medical
certificates (recently Khodorovich had been off sick and had
tavelled to the Crimea to see his parents). Some old (1968)
medical certificates were confiscated, together with three issues
of Russian Thought, typewritten lists of prisoners and some
items connected with Khodorovich's work (perforated filing cards
etc - Khodorovich works as a programmer).

After the search Khodorovich was asked to go for questioning.
He refused to do so without a summons. His arms were then twisted
behind his back and he was driven to Sverdlov District UVD (the
district where he works).

At about 4pm Khodorovich was escorted to police station No. 41
district (his home district), where a report of insubordination
was drawn up. Then he was taken to the people's court of the
Krasnoyarsky district. The judge, Platov, refused to examine
the case, as the report did not explain why Khodorovich was
required as a witness and the nature of his insubordination.

Khodorovich was taken back to the police station No.41, but the
duty officer refused to write out a second report. Then
Khodorovich had his passport taken away and was allowed to go
home. He was told to report to the police on 5 May at 9am.

On 5 May another duty officer wrote a new report. It stated
that during the search at Khodorovich's home documents of a
slanderous nature had been found and that he had therefore been
summoned immediately for questioning as a suspect. Then Khodo-
rovich was taken again to the court.

Judge Platov asked Khodorovich if he had offered any resis-
tance. Khodorovich replied that, on the contrary, the UVD
officials had shown violence towards him. Platov asked Khodorovich
how he had come to become a 'suspect' instead of a 'witness'. Platov replied that he did
not see much difference. He asked if Khodorovich recognised the
request of the UVD officials for him to go for questioning as
legal. Khodorovich again replied that for him to go for
questioning there should be a summons. Then Platov shouted 'Under
the Decree, I sentence you to ten days! That's it.' (According to
point 9 of the resolution of the Plenum of the Supreme Court of
the USSR of 3 July 1963, No. 7, refusal to appear at a police
station even with a summons does not come under this decree.)

On 15 May the term of Khodorovich's administrative arrest was
extended by 15 days, for 'disobeying routine regulations' (he had
refused to work; the decree of the Plenum of the Supreme Court of
the USSR of 15 February 1962 'Increasing the penalty for
infringing the life, health and dignity of police officials...').

Under which Khodorovich was arrested, unlike the USSR Supreme
Court Plenum decree of 26 July 1966 'Increasing the penalty for
hooliganism', does not allow for increasing the term of
The Sixth of April

The Case of the 'Socialists'

On 6 April in Moscow Boris Yulevich Kagarlitsky (born 1958), Andrei Vasilevich Fadin (born 1953), Pavel Mikhailovich Kudukin (born 1953), Yury Leonidovich Khavkin (born 1949) and Vladimir Nikolayevich Cheremsky (born 1950) were arrested. They were all charged under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. The same day in connection with this case searches were carried out in Moscow at the homes of Irena Belli, Konstantin Baramonsky, Ilya Sultanov, Petr Volkov, Aleksandr Zverev, Olga Ivanova, Olga Isakova and Dmitry Mangal.

On 21 April in connection with this case Aleksander Yurevich Shilkov (born 1952), living in Petrozavodsk, was arrested. He was
charged under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

On 8 June Mikhail Germanovich Rivkin (born 1954), living in Moscow, was arrested. Those arrested are charged with publishing the 'socialist' samizdat journals Left Turn, Variations and Socialism and the future.

The Case of the 'Religious Samizdat' People

On 6 April in Moscow the following were arrested: Sergei Aleksandrovich Budyrov (born 1946), Victor Vasilievich Burdyug (born 1946), Nikolai Vladimirovich Blokhin (born 1945) and Aleksander Konstantinovich Sidorov-Rozanov (born 1946).

At the search at Budyrov's house a large quantity of printed matter (the record lists 131 items) was confiscated, mostly of a religious nature (many of them bound photocopies). After the search Budyrov was arrested. He was charged under article 162 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('engaging in forbidden trade'). On 14 April another search was carried out at Budyrov's flat at which several religious books were confiscated as well as a photocopy of The Technology of Power by Avtorkhanov.

From Burdyug religious literature was confiscated. He wasn't present at the search. He had gone out before the search and was arrested somewhere away from home.

From Sidorov many photocopies of religious literature were confiscated.

In connection with this case on 6 April searches were carried out in Moscow at the homes of Sergei Bychkov, Grigory Zaichenko, Natalya Kapitanov, Valery Izyumov, Natalya Maksimova, Boris and Galina Khokhlov, Nikolai Chestnykh, Yury Goryainov (at his dacha) and Vladimir Kokin.

Those arrested have been charged with reproducing religious literature.

The Arrest of Pavlovsky

Case No. 50611/14-79 conducted by the Moscow City Procuracy (Chronicles 53, 55, 60-62) was closed on 30 October 1981. On 5 April 1982 it was reopened under number 50611/19-82.

On 6 April in connection with this case two searches were carried out at the homes of Gleb Pavlovsky (Chronicles 52, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61), one at the flat of his wife M. Pavlovskaya and one at the flat of A. Gorgan (Chronicles 55, 56) where Pavlovsky actually lives. A large quantity of literature and two typewriters were confiscated from M. Pavlovskaya. Pavlovsky, who was at the time at his wife's flat, was taken to Gorgan's flat before the search was completed. There the search was conducted by Yu. Burtsev 'himself'. A lot of literature, various texts containing information, a typewriter, and a tape-recorder were confiscated. At the bottom of the record Pavlovsky wrote:

I have read the record. I would like to point out that items have been confiscated without their contents being mentioned; in particular, paragraph 46 refers to '13 files' which are part of my private archive, containing private letters etc. In view of this and also because I was not present at the search from the outset, I cannot sign the record.

After the search Pavlovsky was taken away. He was put in Butyka prison. He was charged under article 160-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

Gleb Olegovich Pavlovsky (born 1950) graduated from the History Faculty of Odessa university. He was a witness in the case of V. Irgunov (Chronicle 40). He is one of the editors and a contributor to the journal Searches (Chronicles 52-58).

In connection with this case on 6 April a search was carried out at the home of M.Ya. Gefter. In the record Gefter made the following protest:

I consider the second search carried out at my home (the first search was on 4 December 1979 - Chronicle 55) to be an arbitrary act, recorded, each time by the signature of investigator Burtsev

1) I point out that the law was infringed: manuscripts relating to my literary and professional work were confiscated (manuscripts for the literary publication Ograda, not at all political in nature, etc.)

2) I consider the confiscation of books and material which I need for my professional work, including my work on a new
history of the USSR, to be illegal. I note in particular the confiscation of material and texts relating to Stalin.

4) I insist that these books and materials are returned together with those taken in 1979 (including a Bible, a volume of Mandelshtam's works etc.)...

The search was conducted by investigator Lazarev of the Moscow City Procuracy, who attempted to interrogate Gefter immediately, but Gefter declared:

As nothing in the substance of the case has changed since December 1979 (including the case number), I can only repeat the extensive declaration I made during my interrogation by senior investigator Ponomar’ev on 9 June last year (Chronicle 62 - Chronicle). There, together with an explanation of my refusal to give evidence in the given circumstances, I have indicated the moral and legal grounds on which not only did I not agree to play the required role, but also myself submitted a petition in this respect to the Moscow City Court at the trial of V.F. Abramkin.

* * *

At the end of April Angelina Gorgan was given a warning 'according to the Decree'; Gorgan refused to sign the warning.

In May Elena Gordeyeva (a friend of Gorgan; they are fellow students in the same group in the fifth year at the Gubkin Petrochemical Institute in Moscow; for the last few years Gordeyeva has lived with Gorgan) was summoned by the Komsomol committee at the Institute where she was told that the Institute had received material from the Procuracy relating to the search carried out at Gorgan’s home on 6 April. Gordeyeva was asked to condemn Gorgan. When she refused she was read the committee’s decision to expel her from the Komsomol ‘for political shortsightedness and tolerating anti-Soviet activity’.

In June Gorgan announced her decision to leave the Komsomol.

Searches at the Homes of Senderov and Gershuni

On 6 April in connection with case No. 50611/19-82 a search was also carried out at the home of Valery Senderov (Chronicles 56, 57, 60). The search was conducted by S.R. Andreyev, investigator of the Moscow City Procuracy. After the search Senderov made a statement:

To the editor of the journal Possee, to the free press of Russia and the West.

Today a search was carried out at my home. I took no part in the ‘procedure’ but used the time to get on with my work.

As always, everything was taken. ‘Literary men in great-coats with revolvers, a tribe of Pushkin scholars’ stole poetry by Russian poets: Brodsky, Gorbanevskaya, Ratushinskaya’ (one of the ‘comrades’ ‘joked’ that they were taking the poetry ‘to read’!). Printed NTS [Popular Labour Alliance] material, information from the workers’ movement in Russia, information about the intellectual genocide in Soviet sciences were stolen ...My correspondence, including professional letters; manuscripts and offprints of mathematical articles; my letter to Mr Laurent Shvarts; Camus and Shafarevich; The Byzantine Fathers were all confiscated...As usual, the thieves’ range of ‘interests’ was wide...

I regret the loss of books and documents, there is no escaping the fact that some things you need to have constantly to hand for your work.

It goes without saying that neither the search nor my forthcoming arrest will cause our activities to cease. The confiscations are not so substantial as to affect any aspect of our work.

I call upon my friends to intensify their use of all morally justified methods of resistance to violence - both those which are legal and those which in the present conditions of terror are considered illegal; to continue the fight against communism.

* * *

On 6 April in connection with case No. 50611/19-82 a search was also carried out at the home of Vladimir Gershuni (Chronicles 57, 58). Literature, various samizdat documents and personal correspondence were confiscated. Gershuni refused to sign the record. Investigator Sazonov, after conducting the search, noted his reaction: ‘does not intend to reply to any questions and will not make any statements’.

* * *

On 5 May at about 9.30pm near the ‘Airport’ metro station Gershuni was detained and taken to police station No. 120 on the
grounds that he resembled a criminal they were looking for. During the search samizdat was confiscated from his briefcase.

THE SEVENTEENTH OF JUNE

The Arrest of Senderov and Gershuni

In the morning of 17 June they came to Senderov's home to make a routine search. He didn't open the door immediately. In the record it was written that when the door was opened there was a smell of burned paper - Senderov refused to explain the smell. The search was conducted by the Moscow KGB investigator, V.A. Melikhin.

After the search Senderov was arrested and sent to Butyrka Prison; he was charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

Valery Anatolevich Senderov (born 1945) enrolled at the Moscow Physics and Technical Institute in 1962. In 1967 he had 'chats' with KGB officials, who asked him about the lectures on the morphology of culture which he had given at the Turgenev Library. Senderov went to a psychiatric hospital and when he was discharged (at the beginning of 1968) he was expelled from the institute 'for behaviour unbecoming a Soviet student'. After two years of writing complaints, Senderov was allowed to complete his degree. Senderov has written several articles on Functional analysis. In 1979 he was forced to leave the famous (Chronicle 27) No. 2 school, where he taught mathematics (Chronicles 45, 47). Anticipating arrest Senderov made a statement in which he asked the moment of his future arrest to be regarded as the moment of his self-enrolment in NTS 'People's Labour Alliance'. A statement of Senderov's 'position' is circulating in samizdat:

In 1917 the bolsheviks usurped power in Russia. Sixty-five years of communist rule has meant the destruction of Faith and Culture, the destruction of the Russian people and the genocide of 'small' nations, wars of aggression, concentration camps and psychiatric murder.

I feel all this very keenly. And I haven't tried to emigrate: I didn't want to abandon my country to the arbitrariness of its usurpers. But I am not involved with their government, with their empire of lies and violence. I have not participated in their 'elections' or meetings; and, furthermore, I have no intention of participating in a political investigation.

A 'criminal' investigation in connection with any literature or any contacts is an outrage against the Spirit and a violation of Freedom. I do not wish to cooperate with outrage and violence.

My actions have never been contrary to the covenants on human rights nor the laws of civilised countries. Whether my actions comply with a partocratic constitution and a terrorist 'criminal' code has never concerned me. Whether a fictitious case is being 'embroidered' for me or whether I have in fact managed to tear at the muzzle of punitive articles is irrelevant to me.

Not only to me: to the investigator as well. His job is not to investigate but to punish.

Let them punish me. I am not the first, I won't be the last. But the end is near.

On the same day, 17 June apparently (but not later than 18 June) Vladimir Gershuni 'disappeared' (as became clear later, he was arrested). He was also sent to Butyrka Prison where he was also charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

Vladimir Lvovich Gershuni (born 1929) was first arrested in 1949 and sentenced to ten years.

In 1969 he was arrested for a second time (Chronicle 10), declared not responsible (Chronicle 11) and under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code sent to a special psychiatric hospital (Chronicle 13) where he remained until 1974 (Chronicle 34). In the summer of 1980 as part of the 'Olympic clean-up' Gershuni was forcibly detained for six weeks at a psychiatric hospital (Chronicles 57, 60). He is on the editorial board of the journal Searches.
The Arrest of Geltser

On 17 June a search was carried out at the home of Ilya Samsonovich Geltser (born 1964), a first-year student at the Moscow Institute of Steel and Welding. Among the items confiscated were: photocopied leaflets calling for a boycott of a voluntary Saturday [Sobbotnik],1 leaflets about the food programme, memoranda concerning the 'People's University of Mathematics' (organised in 1979 for people who were not accepted by the Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty of Moscow University, the Moscow Physics and Technology Institute, or Moscow Physics and Engineering Institute). Geltser stated that the 'People's University' had been founded by Senderov and that Kanevsky (see below) had given him the memoranda.

During the search Geltser behaved defiantly and was sentenced to ten days for 'resisting the police'.

On 22 June Geltser was brought home for an 'investigatory experiment' - he had handed in a home-made key with which, according to him, he opened post boxes to distribute leaflets.

On 27 June Geltser was transferred to Butyrka Prison. He was charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

Searches

On 17 June on the order of Burtsev a series of searches in connection with case No. 50611/19-82 was carried out - mainly at the homes of Senderov's acquaintances. Searches were carried out at the homes of Aleksei Ivanter (works as a cleaner); Nikolai Ukhanov, a fifth-year student at the Physics Faculty of Moscow University; Nina Duduchava, a first-year student at the Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty of Moscow University; Vladimir Mandelshtam, a first-year student at the Moscow Institute of Steel and Welding; Yulya Kramskaya and Aleksei Gerlaitis.

Searches were carried out both at Ivanter's home and at his place of work. At work nothing was found. From his home the following were confiscated: cameras and photographic equipment, an invitation to a film at the French embassy, old running shoes, a typewriter and G. Vladimov's book Faithful Ruslan (on 30 June Vladimov was summoned for questioning - the investigator asked how Ivanter got hold of his book). On that day Aleksei's parents had to travel out of Moscow: they were taken to the station by car and on the way were asked: 'He couldn't have arrived at all on his own; Senderov probably taught him, didn't he?' During the search, a man with a briefcase came into the flat; the investigator told Ivanter to give this man the magazine he was reading. The man took the magazine and went to the bathroom where he stayed for more than half an hour; then he left (the same thing happened during the search at Ukhanov's home - judging by the description it was the same man). After the search Ivanter was taken to the police station and questioned, basically about Senderov and Gershuni; Ivanter refused to answer.

From Ukhanov the following were confiscated: a proof of SMOT [Free Inter-Trade Association of Working People - FOTAWP], 'Information Bulletin No.32' (see 'Samizdat News'), a large quantity of literature, and 'People's University' material. After the search Ukhanov was taken to the police station and given ten days, according to the policemen, for 'resisting the authorities' (the state exam which he missed during this time was postponed until autumn). During his detention they 'chatted' with Ukhanov, tried to persuade him to cooperate, and threatened him with article 70.

From Duduchava and Mandelshtam 'People's University' material and the memorandum 'For applicants to Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty' (containing advice to Jews - how to withstand discrimination, how to appeal) were confiscated. After the search Duduchava was interrogated on the spot, at home. The questions related to Ilya Geltser, in particular whether he had any peculiarities. A leaflet about the food programme was also found at Mandelshtam's. At the ensuing interrogation, which lasted until late into the night, he admitted that the authors of this leaflet were himself and Geltser. On 30 June Mandelshtam was summoned to the Dean's office where KGB officials tried to persuade him to 'cooperate' and threatened him.

From Kramskaya material relating to the 'People's University' and several files of research into the acceptance of Jews in the Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty of Moscow University were confiscated. When threatened that the home of her paralysed grandmother would be searched, Kramskaya wrote that Senderov had given her all this material and that at the 'People's University'
courses were held not only in mathematics but also in 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'.

At Gerlaitis' home nothing connected with the case was confiscated. After the search an interrogation took place. A KGB official came to the flat of Yulya Erokhinaia. Under pressure from him she wrote that Senderov had given her a lot of books to read—Nabokov, for instance—and that she knew of his activity in the fight against discrimination against Jews.

On 17 June in connection with case No. 50011/19-82 a search was also made at the flat of Yury Shikhanovich (Chronicle 63). The search was conducted by investigator Borovik, investigator of the Moscow City Procuracy. Among the items confiscated were: 'Selected problems for the oral exam in mathematics. Mechanics and Mathematical Faculty of Moscow University, 1975' (Chronicle 53), 'Selection of Problems set at the Oral Examination in Mathematics at the Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty of Moscow University in 1981' (Chronicle 63), 'Results of Applications to the Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty of Moscow University by Pupils from Five Moscow Schools' (Chronicle 63) and the article by B.I. Kanevsky and V.A. Senderov: 'Intellectual Genocide (Examinations for Jews at Moscow University Physics and Technology Institute and Moscow Physics and Engineering Institute)' (Chronicle 60). Shikhanovich was not allowed to write comments on the search record—Borovik insisted that he made them verbally first. After the search Shikhanovich was taken to the police station for interrogation, but as he refused to answer questions, he was released after five minutes.

On 22 June on Burtsev's order searches were carried out in Kiev in connection with the same case at the homes of the following couples: Igor Gerashchenko and Irina Ratushinskaya (Chronicles 60, 62, 63), Pavel Protsenko and Irina Dyakova, and Boris Shulman and Natalya Kutsenok.

A search was carried out both at the flat of the Varvaks (Chronicle 57), where Gerashchenko and Ratushinskaya were living temporarily (a small quantity of samizdat, an NTS 'Popular Labour Alliance' typographical leaflet, the essay 'First Acquaintance', the Gospels, a novel by Agatha Christie in English and poetry by Ratushinskaya herself were confiscated), and at the flat where they are registered.

On 23 June Kanevskaya was told at the police station that the investigator wanted to see her on 24 June. On the 24th a plain clothes man, who did not give his name, told her that NTS pamphlets and instructions, printed abroad, had been found at Kanevsky's flat and then she was handed a summons for an interrogation on 28 June to be conducted by Yu. Burtsev.
On the evening of 24 June, Kanevsky was transferred to Butyrka Prison. He was charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

Kanevskaya's interrogation by Burtsev lasted five minutes. She demanded a search record. 'There will be no record', said Burtsev. Then Kanevskaya refused to answer any questions.

Boris Ilyich Kanevsky (born 1945) graduated from the Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty of Moscow University, and worked at the State Planning Institute.

Since 1978 Senderov and Kanevsky have been publicising discrimination against Jews in the entrance examinations to higher education institutes in Moscow (especially at the Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty of Moscow University) and have published (mostly anonymously, but see Chronicle 56 and Chronicle 60) comparative statistical data, descriptions of specific cases and selections of special 'Jewish' problems (Chronicles 51, 53, 60, 63), and were involved in organising the 'People's University', where Kanevsky also taught.

‘CHATS’ IN MOSCOW

In April 1977 in Moscow there was a month of preventive ‘chats’ (Chronicle 45). In January 1980 (Chronicle 56) and at the end of January and the beginning of February 1981 (Chronicle 61) there were 'weeks of preventive chats'. In January 1982 another series of ‘chats’ took place.

On 5 January in the evening Elena Sannikova (Chronicle 62) received a summons, signed by Paramanova, secretary of the District EC, asking Sannikova to report to the District EC on 6 January.

On 6 January Sannikova telephoned Paramanova and asked why no reason had been given for the summons. Paramanova said that she could not reply as there were lots of people around, but she asked her to come without fail.

At the EC the office, specified in the summons, turned out to be a hall and four people, including Paramanova, were sitting at the presidium table. Sannikova was told that she had been summoned for a talk, to find out where she was working, the name of her boss, how much she earned, why she was not studying. When Sannikova answered that she earned 70 roubles, it was suggested that she could be helped to get a better paid job. Then Sannikova was asked what she had been doing on 10 December 1981 (Chronicle 63). Sannikova replied that something strange had happened that day: three people she did not know had come up to her and taken her to a police support point, where she was detained for two hours, then released without being told why she had been detained. These 'chatting' with her asked whether she had recognised any of the people detained at the same time. Sannikova refused to answer the question. Then Sannikova was told of the Moscow City Soviet's resolution permitting only registered meetings and demonstrations. When Sannikova asked the number and date of this resolution and where it had been published, she was asked for her telephone number so that she could be given this information later. Sannikova declared that her detention had been illegal. They replied that the action of the police had been humane, as criminal proceedings could have been instituted against her for taking part in an illegal demonstration. When Sannikova objected that she had not even been to Pushkin Square, she was told that proceedings could have been instituted against her for trying to take part in a demonstration.

During the conversation two of these present wrote down Sannikova's replies. Sannikova was also warned not to go 'there' next year.

On 18 January Lev Tanengolts (Chronicle 48) was summoned to the District EC. There the District EC official asked Tanengolts if he had applied to emigrate. Having received a negative reply, he then said that he had been asked to talk to Tanengolts and warn him that the KGB was interested in him. The reasons for this interest were not stated and Tanengolts got the impression that the official himself did not know what they were. After persistent questioning from Tanengolts the official suggested that telling 'inappropriate' anecdotes was the reason.

The same day Tanengolts' wife Tsarina was invited to the
police station: one of the three people who talked to her said he was a District EC official, the other two were MVD officials. They asked Tanengolts about the aid she provided for prisoners (parcels, printed matter, translations) and where she got the money for this from. Tanengolts replied that such aid was not against the law and the expenditure was minimal.

On 18 January the police station chief 'chatted' with Boris Smushkevich (Chronicles 60, 62). The 'chat' was rather incomprehensible as the police chief did not quite know what he was supposed to talk about. He asked Smushkevich why he 'signed letters', but was unable to say what these letters were about, although he knew that they were in defence of convicted people.

He told Smushkevich to draw his own conclusions from the 'chat'. Maria Petrenko (Chronicles 56, 57, 63) was summoned on 19 January to the police station to see investigator Khlamov as a witness. When she arrived, Khlamov left, giving his office over to four people who wanted to 'chat' with her. One said he was a representative of the District EC, another a representative of the public' but the remaining two did not say who they were. Petrenko was asked why she signed letters in defence of convicted people, and she replied that she regarded the people she defended as patriots and the criminal proceedings against them as crimes.

In reply to a question about her relations with Sakharov Petrenko said that she considered him to be one of the greatest people alive and that she and Sakharov had friendly relations. Veiled threats against Petrenko were made during the 'chat'.

Irina Nagle (Chronicle 62) was summoned to the District EC on 20 January together with her mother. One of the people 'chatting' introduced himself as a District EC official, the other as KGB official Medvedev. The first was interested in Nagle's official position, the second in what she was doing on 10 December 1981 in Pushkin Square. In reply to the questions Nagle said that she worked in a private capacity, she did not name her employer, but said she was employed officially. Nagle asked Medvedev why he was interested in her presence in Pushkin Square on 10 December. Was it against the interests of state security? Medvedev said that in general it was all right to go to Pushkin Square, but that some people went there with anti-social intentions which were against the interests of state security. In reply to Nagle's question of what in fact happened in Pushkin Square on 10 December, Medvedev confessed himself to be ignorant.

On 19 January at the District Soviet EC Efim Epshtein had a 'chat' with an EC official and the party organiser of the Special Design Office where Epshtein works. Epshtein was accused of reading, keeping and distributing A Chronicle of Current Events.

During the same period V. Mitskevich, K. Velikanova, I. Kogan (at the Regional Party Committee), V. Lashkova and O. Kalagina were called in for 'chats'. In the 'chats' with the Jewish refuseniks V. Rosin, Ya. Alpert and V. Volik the main question was of employment for themselves and their families.

On 29 March Leonid Vul (Chronicle 61) was summoned to the District KGB for a 'chat'. There he was given a warning 'according to the Decree', about the unsuitability of anti-Soviet activity.

At the beginning of April Viktor Legler (Chronicle 62) was told through a third party that the KGB wanted to close the case which had been instituted against him. Legler was told to telephone B.B. Karatayev who invited him for a 'chat' which took place on 7 April. Karatayev tried to obtain a statement from Legler about his anti-Soviet activities and remarks and a promise to abstain from this kind of thing in the future. Legler said that he had no intention of breaking the law, but he refused to write the statement. The 'chat' lasted about an hour and a half.

On 23 April Smushkevich was summoned to the Cherevushkin District KGB. The KGB officials warned Smushkevich about the consequences of signing 'slanderous' civil rights letters, referred to the publication of an article about the fund for political prisoners in the paper Voice of the Fatherland and said that the awareness of slander started from the time that one was warned about it i.e. from that moment.

On 12 May Lina Tumanova (Chronicle 61) was summoned to see the KGB official, who told her that they had had chats with her more than once in connection with her anti-social activity and that they were now obliged to deliver a formal warning under the Decree of 25 December 1972. In particular she was accused of keeping slanderous and politically harmful literature and giving material help to terrorists. Tumanova refused to sign the warning and made a statement concerning the 'chats' and the 'warning':

On 12 May 1982 I was summoned to see the KGB official,
I.N. Izvekov, from which it appears that I.N. Izvekov, to whom I have sent money in camp, has been convicted for having exploded a home-made device outside the doors of the district military registration office in Kuibyshev. If I.N. Izvekov did in fact explode a device then I must state that I am against all acts of a terrorist nature as they are contrary to my own beliefs. But this does not mean that I will cease to provide such assistance for I.N. Izvekov as I am able, as I believe that aid to any prisoner is an act of charity and humanity. Warnings in connection with providing aid to a prisoner I consider to be illegal and inhumane. I consider it necessary to state that not one of the articles of the RSFSR Criminal Code includes measures to be taken for aiding prisoners.

During the ‘chats’ comrade Rybakov maintained that the Fund was connected with foreign intelligence services and that its money came from, ‘among others’, intelligence services. I categorically deny this statement and see it as an attempt to slander the activities of the Fund for Political Prisoners, activities which are undoubtedly humane and absolutely legal.

Addendum. In point two, by my open letter in defence of A. Marchenko and I. Kovalev I mean the text of the Radio Liberty broadcast of 13 December 1981, which I have seen, and which includes the text of my open letter.

On 14 May Rushania (Roza) Fedyakina (Chronicles 60, 61) was summoned to the district RB. There she was given a warning ‘according to the Decree’. She was accused of ‘contacts with foreigners outside working hours’ and keeping ‘politically harmful’ literature. Fedyakina refused to sign the record.

On 22 June Vladimir Golovach was called to the KGB for a ‘chat’. He was told that the KGB was aware that he was keeping sam- and tamizdat. Then Golovach was taken home accompanied by KGB officials and voluntarily handed over poems by Mandelstam, a book by Nabokov and Doctor Zhivago by Pasternak, saying that he had nothing else and that those books had been sent to him by the Klinsky family who had recently emigrated from the USSR. He was told that it was clear that what he had handed over was not everything and that the KGB knew all about him. It was suggested that he should come back sometime and hand in the rest.
During the 'chat' something along the following lines was said: 'We have new leaders and we will liquidate all samizdat and all stores of anti-Soviet literature'.

Golovach used to work at the Institute of Management Studies at the USSR Academy of Sciences. In 1981 the director of the Institute, Academician Trapeznikov, reprimanded him for absenteeism. Golovach was forced to leave and for a long time couldn't find a job in his field, but two months ago took a job as a programmer.

In the last two or three months many of his present and former colleagues have been summoned to the KGB for 'chats' and asked if Golovach had given them any books of a slanderous or anti-Soviet nature.

Golovach was fired from his new job because of 'staff reductions'. The KGB continues to call him in for 'chats'. The books confiscated from Golovach have been classified by KGB officials as 'decadent and ideologically harmful literature, handed in voluntarily'.

PERSECUTION OF THE INITIATIVE GROUP TO DEFEND THE RIGHTS OF THE DISABLED

On 8 January in Chistopol by order of the Moscow City Procuracy a search was carried out at the home of Initiative Group member Faizulla Khusainova. Among the items confiscated were: several Initiative Group bulletins, samizdat documents, an unfinished open letter to the Soviet government.

The search was conducted by Major A.P. Seriev, of Moscow MVD, Assistant Procurator of Chistopol, Stebo, and police Lieutenant Yakubov.

On 20 January Initiative Group member Valery Fefelov sent an 'Open Letter' to the Politbureau of the Party Central Committee and the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet (with a copy to Andropov):

As a result of neglect by the administration of the Selenergo enterprise in Yuriev-Polsky...I became disabled for life at the age of seventeen...Since then...I have met with open mockery and humiliation...

The organisation which made me a cripple for life has relinquished its responsibility towards me, thereby violating the 'resolution on compensation for injury sustained by workers and employees at work'. For over six months my allowance has not been paid... 'He has already got what was due to him, we've had enough of him...', were the words once spoken...by KGB Colonel Shibayev of Vladimir...

For several years I tried to get work I was capable of doing. When I did (I became a watchmaker working from home for the Rembytomshinbor factory in Kolchugino), I merely became your hostage. This is because although I am not given work (since 15 November 1979...I have been able to earn...3 roubles 97 kopecks!), the factory administration makes sure that I am at home all the time. If I go away...I am given...a strict reprimand for absenteeism...

After fifteen years of life as an invalid I have reached the conclusion that being disabled in the USSR is a double, if not greater, misfortune. It is not only a physical oppression, but a constant battle for survival against inertia, rudeness, effrontery, poverty...

On 23 April a search was carried out at the home of Fefelov. Among the items confiscated were: Initiative Group documents, items intended for disabled people, a letter from Khusainova about the search on 8 January. At the end of the record Fefelov wrote:

A search is yet another oppression of the movement for the rights of the disabled. I declare that the Initiative Group will continue to exist! The Bulletin will appear!

On 12 May a search was carried out at the home of Fefelov in connection with the case of Ivan Kopysov (see 'Arrests'). The search record ends with the words:

V.A. Fefelov refused to sign the record. At the end of the search V.A. Fefelov took the typewriter and threw it on the floor. Then, when it was suggested that he hand over the typewriter voluntarily, he refused. The typewriter was confiscated forcibly. During the confiscation, V.A. Fefelov showed resistance.

As a result of this incident (in fact Fefelov did not throw down the typewriter but held it close and did not hand it over; these
 EVENTS IN THE UKRAINE

The Trial of Malyshyev

On 8 December 1981 the Cherkassy Regional Court sentenced Leonid Nikolayevich Malyshyev (born 1928; arrested 28 April 1981) under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code) and article 211 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ('Preparation or Sale of Pornographic Items') to five years' strict-regime camp and three years' exile.

Leonid Malyshyev's father was the director of a metallurgical factory. In 1936 he was transferred to Moscow, to the People's Committee for Heavy Industry (Narkomtyazhprom). The same year he was arrested. Leonid was sent to a children's home (his mother had died earlier), where he remained until 1940. In 1938 Leonid was asked to renounce his father as an 'enemy of the people' - he refused. Leonid still does not know what happened to his father.

In October 1977 Leonid was given a warning 'according to the Decree'.

At Malyshyev's trial the evidence against him was: a letter to the newspaper Izvestia and to the Party Central Committee demanding information about the fate of his father (May 1973); a statement to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet concerning emigration for political reasons (November 1976); a letter to Izvestia in defence of Sakharov and Bukovsky (December 1976; in December 1976 Bukovsky was exchanged for Corvalan - Chronicle 43); an open letter to Izvestia, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Central Committee about the need for democratisation and reforms (April 1977); a letter to Izvestia in defence of Sakharov (December 1976); a letter to Izvestia in defence of Sakharov (1979); a letter to Izvestia in defence of Sakharov (1979); a letter to Izvestia in defence of Sakharov (1979); a letter to Izvestia and Moscow City Soviet EC 'An Injust Decision' (27 January 1980; about the exile
of Sakharov - Chronicle 56; he also sent it to Sakharov; a letter to Sakharov (January 1980); a statement to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet 'I request a free exit visa from the USSR' (January 1981); a statement entitled 'I have decided to take my own life, as I have found no other solution' (confiscated on his arrest) and notes taken from newspapers and foreign radio broadcasts with commentaries (1973-1978). In court Malyshev pleaded guilty.

In June, the Cherkassy Regional Court heard the appeal of Plakhotnyuk and Pozdeyev and upheld the sentence.

On 30 June 1981 in Odessa a search (Chronicle 63) was carried out at the home of Pëtr Butov (Chronicle 51). Among the items confiscated were: several issues of A Chronicle of Current Events and Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church, photocopied sam- and tamizdat, typewritten material (41 items altogether).

The Arrest of Butov

On 10 February 1982 a second search was made at Butov's home. It was conducted by Captain Merezhko, investigator of the Odessa KGB. Only the typewritten collection 'Seventeen Final Speeches' was confiscated. After the search Butov was taken for interrogation, from which he did not return. The next day Butov's wife was told that he had been arrested, as he had refused to hand over his 'library and photo-archive of anti-Soviet literature' and to name the person who had printed the films. Butov was charged under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code). On 15 April in connection with the Butov case several searches were carried out in Odessa: at the home of L. Dobraya, a doctor at the Odessa Regional Health Centre for Psychological and Nervous Diseases, V. Lanovy, psychologist at the same centre, A.
Voroshilov and S. Mazurets, students at the medical institute.

In April and May about thirty interrogations were carried out in connection with the Butov case (some people were interrogated more than once).

In June one of the investigators conducting the Butov case went to Moscow. He telephoned L. Vui and S. Artsimovich (Chronicle 51) and asked them to come for a chat at Lefortovo [Prison] (see 'Chats in Moscow'). Both refused to go. A. Daniel (Chronicle 63) received a summons and said that he knew Butov, that they had met in Moscow and Odessa. Butov had not given him any 'literature'. Daniel refused to talk about people he and Butov knew in common.

A. Daniel (Chronicle 63) received a summons and said that he knew Butov, that they had met in Moscow and Odessa. Butov had not given him any 'literature'. Daniel refused to talk about people he and Butov knew in common.

However, the premises were not allocated and so the theatre has still not been organised.

Par Alekseyevich Butov (born 1946) graduated from the Faculty of Physics at Odessa University, and worked in the Institute of Hydro-Acoustics. After the first search he was forced to leave. Until his arrest he worked as a supply engineer.

Miscellaneous

In 1973 a group of Jews made a request to the Kiev City party committee to be allowed to organise an amateur Yiddish theatre in Kiev. The secretary of the committee V.O. Dobrotvorov refused and they have been trying for several years to get this decision reviewed.

In August 1976 a letter about the Jewish People's Theatre was sent to the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, and from there it was sent on to the USSR Ministry of Culture. The USSR Deputy Minister of Culture O.S. Chernobrintsev and the Secretary of the party organisation at the Ministry of Culture A.I. Sitenkov, stated that the creation of an independent Jewish artistic enterprise was politically and ethically undesirable, since it would inevitably lead to the separation of races.

In November 1977 the people who initiated the founding of the theatre appealed to the Ukrainian Party Central Committee. In September 1978 they were invited to the Centre of People's Art and told that the theatre would be organised officially from 1 January 1979. The city council of trades unions would assign two posts that of manager and, possibly, ballet-master, and the club Metrostroi would be allocated for rehearsals and performances.
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At the beginning of the year a general parents' meeting was called at school No.136 of the Darnitsky district of Kiev. The Director of the school said 'Be careful in your conversations with your children! They often repeat at school the anti-Soviet utterances of grown-ups which they hear at home; on the basis of what they have said several families have already been noted by the KGB'.

A. Daniel (Chronicle 63) received a summons and said that he knew Butov, that they had met in Moscow and Odessa; Butov had not given him any 'literature'. Daniel refused to talk about people he and Butov knew in common.

Former political prisoner Valery Marchenko (Chronicles 62,63) has suffered for several years from glomerulonephritis [a kidney disease]. He recently received an invitation to go to Italy for treatment. But his request for an exit visa was refused by Kiev OVIR.

In a letter of 28 April to the USSR Minister of Internal Affairs Shchelokov, Marchenko wrote: I have talked three times with officials at different levels and each time the refusal has been for irrelevant reasons such as: the invitation has been received from people I only know through correspondence; we have no inter-governmental agreement with Italy for medical treatment; after completing my sentence I have been working for less than a year and I will not get a reference. Finally I was told that people are not allowed to go abroad for treatment and that they will not allow me to set a precedent. This statement from Kiev OVIR officials clearly contravenes the Helsinki Declaration, signed by the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Breshnev, in which such a right is clearly noted. The local leadership is aware of
this clause in the Declaration as a notice in the hall of OVIR gives the days for applications from citizens wishing to travel to foreign countries for treatment. As I realised that the people I spoke to did not want to grant my legal request, I wrote to USSR Minister of Internal Affairs Golovchenko asking him to investigate and help me to establish my right to travel abroad for treatment. But he, in violation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Decree sent my statement to those I was complaining about, i.e. the Kiev OVIR, who again sent me a refusal. This violation of the clause in the USSR Constitution concerning the right to freedom of movement and to look after one's health and of the international commitments of the Soviet government requires your immediate intervention.

I should like to mention that violation of the law by officials of departments of internal affairs is not new in my experience. When I was in camp VS-389/35, Perm region, I fell ill (in addition to the inflammation of my kidneys) with pneumonia and exudative pleurisy. I could hardly breathe, and walked with difficulty but I was only allowed to go to hospital on the seventeenth day, when my condition was critical. My mother inquired about my treatment at the UVD medical department of the Perm Regional Soviet EC as I was literally drawing my last breath, forced out to work every day, and she was told by Major Sadovsky that I was receiving medical aid and treatment as necessary.

It would seem that the right of a prisoner to make a complaint asking for his case to be reviewed is axiomatic and unquestioned. I wrote my complaint in the evenings after work. It was addressed to the Procurator of the Ukrainian SSR Glukh with a copy to the Minister of Justice, Terebilov. It was taken from my bedside table after a search of my personal effects, and despite my repeated requests it was never sent to the addressee (the Procurator!).

In the camp for especially dangerous state criminals, I tried to do some creative work and translated from English into Ukrainian literary prose. I chose a writer who was far removed from modern problems, and more than a century away in time. I translated Thomas Jefferson's 'Declaration of Independence' (18th century), but this translation was confiscated from me. I translated it again but this time Senior Lieutenant Bukin confiscated it from me after a search of my personal effects.

My statements and complaints were returned by the higher authorities to the Skalinsky administration - to those of whom I was complaining - and, of course, truth did not prevail.

At this point it would be appropriate to remind you that an official who is aware of his subordinates' illegal activities shares the responsibility with them. The situation in which I am caught up forces me to resort to the most decisive methods of defending legality. Therefore, if my legal requests to go to Italy for treatment meet with another refusal, I shall be obliged in defence of my rights to report you to the People's Court in Moscow. In addition, in the forthcoming elections of 20 June, I shall appeal to the electorate of your district for assistance and cooperation.

* * *

On 19 May Irina Ratushinskaya and Igor Geraschenko did not spend the night at home (see 'The Seventeenth of June'). Not long before they returned an unknown man and woman came up to the door of their flat and started to spray it from an aerosol can. When Geraschenko's sister opened the door and asked them what they were doing, they shouted that they were from the housing office and ran downstairs, jumped into a white car and drove off.

The flat was then carefully aired and the door washed, but the children living there were rapidly sent to relatives. Despite all these measures, everyone experienced headaches and sickness.

It is quite certain that there are no such employees at the housing office. Geraschenko and Ratushinskaya tried to phone Moscow but they were not able to get through on the phone in their flat.

* * *

On 10 May in Kharkov E. Semyannikova, the wife of E. Antsupov (for his trial see Chronicle 63) was dismissed from her job. Semyannikova is the mother of two children. When she complained that without a job she could not feed them, she was told that it was perfectly possible to do so on the maintenance of a prisoner.

* * *

See also 'Persecution of Believers' and 'The Right to Leave'.

---
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EVENTS IN ARMENIA

The Trial of Navasardyan and Arshakyan

In the autumn of 1981 the Armenian Supreme Court sentenced Ashot Navasardyan and Azat Arshakyan (arrested 25 February 1981 - Chronicle 61) under article 65 part 2 of the Armenian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code) and article 67 of the Armenian Criminal Code ('Organisational activity... and participation in an anti-Soviet organisation') to eight years' deprivation of freedom, the first three in prison, the following five in a strict-regime camp, and three years' exile. Navasardyan and Arshakyan were taken to Chistopol Prison.

EVENTS IN ESTONIA

On 25 May 1981 Algimantas Andreika (born 1953) was arrested in Vilnius under article 68 of the Lithuanian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the RSFSR Code). In the course of the investigation KGB officials interrogated the wife and daughter of A. Terleckas (for his trial see Chronicle 58), the mother and sister of J. Sanauskas (for his trial see Chronicle 58) and the wife of V. Skudis (for his trial see Chronicle 60).

On 9 February 1982 KGB officials dealing with his case in Kaunas interrogated the wife of B. Gajauskas (for his trial see Chronicle 49). The investigator told Mrs Gajauskiene that, according to the evidence, she had received money from Andreika. Gajauskiene replied that she was not acquainted with Andreika. When asked if she knew V. Smolkin (Chronicle 36), Gajauskiene said that she knew him, but only slightly, and that she had received no money from him either.

On 9 May one of the balloons flying above Lenin Square in Vilnius burst, scattering leaflets which called for the independence of Lithuania and contained the phrase 'Russians, clear off home!'

In May the restoration of the Gediminas Tower in Vilnius was completed. After the scaffolding was removed, an inscription was discovered on the fortress wall 'Let each nation live in its own homeland!'. The scaffolding was replaced.

In October 1981 Riimmo Vissak, a second-year student at the Tartu University Faculty of History, was expelled from the university for 'unbecoming behaviour and infringement of academic discipline'. His 'sins' consisted of attending the funeral of Juril Kukk (March 1981 - Chronicle 62) and visiting friends in Lithuania (where he and three of his friends were detained for four days for 'not obeying the police'). A letter in his defence from 75 students to the Minister for Higher Education had no results.

* * *

Issue 13 of the bulletin Additional Materials on the Free Dissemination of Ideas and Information in Estonia (Chronicle 57) has appeared in samizdat.

EVENTS IN LITHUANIA

On 25 May 1981 Algimantas Andreika (born 1953) was arrested in Vilnius under article 68 of the Lithuanian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the RSFSR Code). In the course of the investigation KGB officials interrogated the wife and daughter of A. Terleckas (for his trial see Chronicle 58), the author and sister of J. Sanauskas (for his trial see Chronicle 58) and the wife of V. Skudis (for his trial see Chronicle 60).

On 9 February 1982 KGB officials dealing with his case in Kaunas interrogated the wife of B. Gajauskas (for his trial see Chronicle 49). The investigator told Mrs Gajauskiene that, according to the evidence, she had received money from Andreika. Gajauskiene replied that she was not acquainted with Andreika. When asked if she knew V. Smolkin (Chronicle 36), Gajauskiene said that she knew him, but only slightly, and that she had received no money from him either.

* * *

On 9 May one of the balloons flying above Lenin Square in Vilnius burst, scattering leaflets which called for the independence of Lithuania and contained the phrase 'Russians, clear off home!'

In May the restoration of the Gediminas Tower in Vilnius was completed. After the scaffolding was removed, an inscription was discovered on the fortress wall 'Let each nation live in its own homeland!'. The scaffolding was replaced.

* * *

The following publications have appeared in Lithuania: The Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church No.51 (19 March 1982 - the first issue came out on 10 March 1972), No.52 (25 March 1982), No.53 (31 May 1983); Audra [The Dawn] No.29 (December 1980), No.30 (March 1982); Lietuvos ateitis [Future of Lithuania] Nos. 1 and 2.
Persecution of Catholics

Fourteen kilometres from the village of Zarasai is a lake, which for many years has been visited by pilgrims on 30 June–1 July. In 1981 the lake was visited by 2000 Catholics and 300 Orthodox believers. On 30 June 1982 vigilantes and police were standing 50 metres from the lake and would not allow the pilgrims to pass. Those who nevertheless managed to reach the lake, in order to pray and collect water, had this water taken and poured away.

On 6 May a search was carried out at the home of Maryte Subašiūnė in Vilnius. The Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church No. 51 was confiscated. Subašiūnė was summoned for interrogation twice. It was proposed that she should collaborate with the KGB.

On 6 May a search was carried out at the home of Fr K. Zilys in Alytus. Some catechisms were confiscated. Fr Zilys was interrogated a number of times – he refused to answer questions.

On 11 June a search was carried out at the home of Miss T. Kurtinaitė in Kaunas. A typewriter and a religious book were taken away. No search record was left behind. On 28 June, during an interrogation, Kurtinaitė was told the typewriter would soon be returned – as soon as the case of the Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church was completed.

In December 1981 Frs Bučinškas and Raimundas were fined for organising processions of believers to the cemetery on All Souls' Day. They sent a protest to the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, Griškevičius. The Catholic Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights came out in their defence (Document No. 51).

Fr Krumpliauskas was fined for the same thing. He sent a complaint to the Chairman of the Presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

On 3 February 1982 the administrative commission of the Preseisai District Soviet EC fined Fr A. Grafašis for visiting the flats of believers. Grafašis appealed against the fine but with no result. 1485 believers of Preseisai parish sent a protest to Griškevičius:

Church canon law and the decision of the Vilnius Diocesan synod require a priest to visit the believers of his parish annually.

Responsible representatives of Soviet power have stated more than once in the press, on radio and television, that the Soviet authorities do not interfere in the internal affairs of the Church...

Experience has shown that the atheists of Lithuania, who are a minority of the population, have been unable so far to fight religion ideologically, as Lenin taught, but are only capable of combating it by brute force.

We insist that the godless will not succeed by such means in banishing God from the hearts of Lithuanians...

We have invited, and will continue to invite, our priests to visit our families... for we love and respect the priests, support them and pray for them...

In December 1981 the police broke into the flat of Fr Šulskis as he was saying Mass and the believers were praying (Fr Šulskis has lost the use of his legs and so always says Mass at home). The believers were taken to the police station. They were interrogated, intimidated, some had their homes searched or were summoned by the KGB.

On 11 April 1982, in Vilnius, a Mass for the temperance movement was held at the Church of St Nicholas; many priests from all over Lithuania took part and the church was full of people. Soon afterwards Fr Tumaitis, the rector, was summoned to the District Soviet EC – he was asked to give a written explanation of why such an event had been held without the permission of the Executive Committee.

At the insistence of P. Anilionis, the Commissioner of the Council for Religious Affairs in the Lithuanian SSR, Fr Šemelauskas, vicar of St Michael's Church in Vilnius (whose services are attended by so many people that they cannot fit into
the church), has been asked to move to a church in a distant
village. The Administrator of the diocese, Fr Gutauskas, has been
besieged by delegations of protesting believers. About 2000
believers from Vilnius signed a letter to the exiled Bishop of
Vilnius, Steponavicius:
...Morally compromised priests work in big city parishes but
the zealous ones are isolated from young people and big
centres...
Fr Čerňauskas has refused to subdue and has informed the
believers of this.

On 17 February deputy-chairman Urbonas of the Vilkaviškis
District Soviet EC demanded that Abraltis, deputy chairman of the
Kybartai parish church committee, should sign an order forbidding N.
Matulionis to carry out the functions of a priest in the
Kybartai church, as Matulionis had not graduated from a seminary
and therefore was not a priest. Abraltis refused.
On 28 February Matulionis sent a declaration to Griškevičius,
stating that he had graduated from the external (underground -
Chronicle) theological seminary and had been ordained as a
priest.
...In the Soviet Union the Church is separate from the state,
so all religious questions should be decided by the Lithuanian
church leaders, as they were in this case.
...In Lithuania there is a functioning external theological
seminary. Its existence is made necessary by the situation at
the present time. The Kaunas theological seminary does not
accept all applicants. So, while the suitability of candidates
to the theological seminary is decided by Kaunas, the external
seminary will also continue to exist... Our Pope John Paul II
also studied at such a seminary...
1033 believers of Kybartai parish sent a complaint to
Griškevičius, which ended with the words 'This priest is greatly
needed in our parish and we will not allow him to be driven out
of Kybartai'.

On the night of 2-3 April the 'Hill of Maidens' [Pau kalnas] in
Teltiai diocese - a burial mound and archaeological monument
of some significance in the republic - was desecrated: a military
unit led by V. Matuševičius, director of the Pasrūnai collective
fishery, demolished the chapel and two oratories on the hill
(these are included in a list of cultural monuments preserved by
the state), as well as crosses and five gravestones.
(On the same night crosses along the road from Teltiai to
Varnai and in the villages of Kungiai, Jonantai and Amuleni were
demolished.)
People headed for the hill - they were stopped by the police.
During the night new crosses appeared on the hill - they were
again demolished. On 14 May the hill was laid waste for the
fourth time and planted with fir-trees.
Protests inundated the Central Committee of the Lithuanian
Communist Party, the Ministry of Culture, the editorial office of
the republic’s atheist television programme 'Arguments' (a
protest with nine signatures) and the Military Procurator of the
USSR.
A letter to the Catholic Committee for the Defence of
Believers’ Rights (with 17 signatures) states:
The blows directed at our souls by the godless will make us
more determined to restore the crosses which used to decorate
the roads and crossroads of our country, its small towns and
other historic sites,
The priests’ council of Teltiai diocese sent an appeal to the
bishops, diocesan administrators and deans of Lithuania (10
signatures):
We feel it our duty to protest against the arbitrary violence
of the militant atheists and to condemn the crimes committed by
them. In this case we appeal not to the official authorities,
but to the large community of Lithuanian believers...
We respectfully ask the deans of Lithuania to consider
whether they should continue attending the talks with the
Commissioner of the Council for Religious Affairs, while state
officials make use of such methods to liquidate the Lithuanian
Catholic Church?

On 12 April the Teltiai District Education Department dismissed
Stefania Jozusaitė, the German teacher and second year
form-mistress at Žarienai Middle School, who had openly been going
to church for two years, for 'not fulfilling the aims of
Communist education'.
Jozusaitė appealed against this in court. On 12 May the court
rejected her appeal. During the court hearing it was stated that
Jouzumaite had passed on information to the Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church and had not observed Soviet festivals.

In November-December 1979 KGB Senior Lieutenant Bimbiris twice had a 'chat' with second-year student Robertas Grigas at the dean's office of the Faculty of Modern Languages at Vilnius Pedagogical Institute. Bimbiris spoke of the dangers inherent in friendship with 'nationalists' and offered his telephone number, inviting Grigas to meet him in town for friendly chats. Grigas refused.

In the summer of 1980, when by tradition students specializing in German went to East Germany for a month, Grigas was not allowed to go, on the pretext that he was not a member of the Komsomol.

In September 1980 the Deputy Procurator of Vilnius, Vilutis, officially warned Grigas not to attend political trials, threatened him with criminal prosecution and called him a descendant of kulaks, a drag of society and an American.

In December 1980 Grigas was interrogated by Melotkin, an investigator from the Procuracy of Lenia District in Vilnius, and an official from the Criminal Investigation Department. When Grigas refused to answer questions concerning his philosophy of life and his friends, the investigator threatened to put him behind bars or in a psychiatric hospital, expressed regret that the days of Stalin were over and promised to find some means of restraining 'such a one'.

In November-December 1997 KGB Senior Lieutenant Bimbiris twice had a 'chat' with second-year student Robertas Grigas at the dean's office of the Faculty of Modern Languages at Vilnius Pedagogical Institute. Bimbiris spoke of the dangers inherent in friendship with 'nationalists' and offered his telephone number, inviting Grigas to meet him in town for friendly chats. Grigas refused.

In other words, when Grigas was to have taken the military oath, he declared instead: 'I, Robertas Grigas, son of Antanas, a citizen of Lithuania, and atheist, believe in God. I refuse to take the military oath, as it is contrary to my religious and patriotic convictions.'
ourselves: where are we living? Efforts are made to persuade us that we are citizens of the most democratic country in the world, but we see democracy only on paper.

Why do state officials dislike sober young people? Why are they worried by faith among the young? On the basis of which laws do young believers have no right to organise excursions or parties or to acquire a deeper knowledge of religion?

Are Soviet officials really so ignorant of the moral poverty prevalent among the young unbelievers who fill the prisons and camps and venereal clinics, that they are devoting all their forces to terrorising young believers? The thought inevitably arises that this is being done deliberately, in the hope of increasing by administrative measures the unsuccessful atheisation of the people.

We legally demand the most elementary of human rights - the right to live according to our own consciences and beliefs.

---

Grigas was sent to the guardhouse in Chinkent. During the night Grigas's cell-mates tried to 'persuade' him with their fists.

Twenty-four hours later Grigas was sent to Oshbik. There he met the Baptist Gumanas, who had also refused to take the oath. Grigas was taken back to Chinkent. Colonel Khutiyev shouted that a believer had no right to proclaim his religious belief publicly, he should merely pray quietly in his cult buildings; if he acted to the contrary he automatically became an enemy of Soviet power and should be eliminated. Another colonel demanded that Grigas should be put on trial immediately or sent to a psychiatric hospital or to the uranium mines, where he would croak after six months. When Grigas told them they were similar to the Fascists portrayed in their own films, they did not take offence: 'Yes, the Fascists used to wipe out their traitors, as we do ours. That's how it should be!'

Grigas was taken to Badam, to work in a brick factory.

At the beginning of 1982, believers in Lithuania (18,341 signatures) sent a 'Protest' to Grinevinus:

We, the youth and believers of Lithuania, call the attention of the Party to the low stratagems, incompatible with morality, which Soviet officials use against young believers. Such occurrences have recently become more frequent...

When we see such a state of affairs, we have to ask ourselves: where are we living? Efforts are made to persuade us that we are citizens of the most democratic country in the world, but we see democracy only on paper.

Why do state officials dislike sober young people? Why are they worried by faith among the young? On the basis of which laws do young believers have no right to organise excursions or parties or to acquire a deeper knowledge of religion?

Are Soviet officials really so ignorant of the moral poverty prevalent among the young unbelievers who fill the prisons and camps and venereal clinics, that they are devoting all their forces to terrorising young believers? The thought inevitably arises that this is being done deliberately, in the hope of increasing by administrative measures the unsuccessful atheisation of the people.

We legally demand the most elementary of human rights - the right to live according to our own consciences and beliefs.

---

In April 21,033 believers from the town of Klaipeda (Chronicle 53, 61) again appealed to Brezhnev, the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to return to them the church which they built and financed themselves.

---

In March and April officials of the Council for Religious Affairs conducted 'seminars' for parish committees (the 'councils of twenty' only; priests were banned from attending), deans and final-year students at Kaunas Theological Seminary.

At the 'seminar' for the deans of Kaunas archdiocese and Vilkavilkis diocese, Anilionis announced that a Lithuanian religious journal was being prepared for publication - but not one like the Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church - it would not serve foreign imperialists. Anilionis was annoyed by the fact that priests and believers write petitions and send them to the Chronicle of the LCC. He said that the Soviet authorities were willing to raise the number of entrants to the Kaunas Theological Seminary, if the underground seminary ceased to function. Anilionis promised that in the coming year Catholics would be allowed to publish about 8000 prayer-books and that a little later the price of electricity in churches would be reduced to the same level as that of other customers (now 25 kopecks per kilowatt).
On 17 June Barauskas, Deputy Procurator of the Lithuanian SSR, told a gathering of bishops and diocesan administrators that severe measures would be taken against violators of the 'Laws on Religious Associations'.

Baptists

**The Trial of Ivashchenko**

In August 1981 the case of Yakov Efremovich Ivashchenko (born 1932, arrested 22 May 1981) was heard in Kiev; he was charged under both 'religious' articles and article 87 (paragraph 1) of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (+ article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code). He was sentenced to 4 years' imprisonment and 4 years' exile.

Ivashchenko is a member of the ECB [Evangelical Christian Baptist] Council of Prisoners' Relatives and belongs to the former congregation of Grigory Vins (Chronicle 53). At the beginning of 1980 a number of searches were carried out at his home, after which he began to lead an underground existence.

**Trials**

In June 1981, in the town of Batalsk, Rostov Region, Viktor Evich (born 1963) was sentenced to two years' ordinary-regime camp, for refusing to serve in the army.

At the end of June 1981 the case of five residents of Dnepropetrovsk Region, who faced charges under both 'religious' articles (articles 142 and 227 of the RSFSR Criminal Code) was heard in Dnepropetrovsk. The children of the accused, who were called as witnesses, were asked whether their fathers beat them, forced them to pray, and so on. They were sentenced as follows: Ivan Shabura (born 1918) - 5 years' strict-regime camp and 5 years' exile; Leonid Litvinenko (born 1942), Semen Tkachenko (born 1942) and Pavel Pavlyuk (born 1937) - 5 years' ordinary-regime camp and 5 years' exile each; Arnold Tatarenko (born 1926) - 3 years' ordinary-regime camp and 3 years' exile.

**Arrests**

On 14 February 1982, Alexei Vasilevich Roshchupkin (born 1925) was arrested in Zhdanov.

In May 1982 Petr Mikhailovich Golikov (aged about 60) was arrested in Rostov-on-Don. Searches were carried out in Moscow in connection with his case.

**Jehovah's Witnesses**

N. Bozhok was expelled from the Mathematics Faculty at Uzhgorod University. For refusing to serve in the army in the spring of 1981, he was arrested and given a three-year sentence.
On 15 January the father Petr Zdrilyuk (Chronicle 63) was summoned by M.I. Donchenko, the Kiev Regional Commissioner for Religious Affairs. Donchenko stated that the Procurator's Office had sent him a document reporting that 'illegally produced literature', which contained 'anti-Soviet fabrications and statements hostile to the October Revolution', had been confiscated from Zdrilyuk's home. 'You behaved dishonestly towards the investigating officials', said Donchenko. 'Write that you repent of what you did and state who gave you the literature'. Zdrilyuk refused. Then the Commissioner told Fr Petr that he had been deprived of his registration.

At the same time, Donchenko told the church 'Committee of Twenty' to break off their contract with Fr Petr.

Petr Vasilievich Zdrilyuk (born 1948) graduated from Kiev Polytechnic. In 1978 he was ordained as a priest by the Exarch of Kiev. His sermons were very popular.

In the village of Rossosh, Svalyava District, Trans-Carpathia, the church burnt down in 1980. The local authorities would not allow a new church to be built.

On 20 June 1982, the villagers protested by refusing to take part in the elections. Representatives of the Uzhgorod Regional Party Committee, who came to the village, promised to give permission, after which the people went to vote.

Permission for rebuilding was never received. The District Party Secretary said 'The Soviet authorities do not build churches'.

The Trial of Marsal
From 6 to 12 August 1981 the trial of Artur Mikhailovich Marsal (born 1936; arrested 19 June 1981 - Chronicle 62), charged under article 203-1 of the Tadzhik SSR Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code) took place in the People’s Court of October District, Dushanbe.

Marsal's relatives and friends were present in court. Tadzhiks were not allowed into the courtroom.

Marsal was charged with disseminating 'deliberately false fabrications' at work, and with writing a letter to his wife's parents (they are Russian and had objected to the Marsals emigrating, claiming that they were materially dependent on their daughter).

The main testimony against Marsal was given by his immediate superior, Yu.N. Andreyev, Candidate of Technical Sciences, who stated that in private conversations with him, Marsal had said 'The Soviet state is chauvinist, it's trying to rule the world; there's no freedom of speech or assembly in the USSR; the USSR will stop at nothing to attain world supremacy'. Andreyev named persons who had been present during conversations with Marsal. However, when summoned by the court, these witnesses avoided answering questions directly, saying 'I don't remember' or 'Maybe, maybe not'. Marsal said that Andreyev had tried to provoke him into making such statements, but that he had not said anything of the kind. (After the trial Andreyev told acquaintances that he had been forced to give evidence against Marsal.) A colleague of Marsal's from work, E.M. Manannikova, stated that she had said in her presence 'Elections in the USSR are a Fiction'; 'The Constitution serves only to make people work harder than ever for the state'. However she did not remember when and under what circumstances Marsal said this. The remaining witnesses also could not remember what Marsal had said or when, but they remembered that he had 'slandered the Soviet state and social system'.

The witnesses called by Marsal refuted the testimony of...
Andreyev and the others. Many witnesses renounced some of the evidence they had given during the preliminary investigation, stating that 'they had not said anything like that'.

A female official of OVIR in Dushanbe was questioned. She stated that, contrary to the assertions of the prosecution, Marsal had not made any anti-Soviet or slanderous remarks in the OVIR office and all his actions had been wholly lawful.

In his speech, Procurator Melchamov repeated all the points made by the prosecution during the investigation. In particular, he accused Marsal of having met a West German journalist in 1979 and of inciting citizens of German origin to emigrate from the USSR to West Germany, and even tried to accuse Marsal of saying (this did not form part of the indictment, however). The prosecutor demanded a sentence of three years' imprisonment. Defence counsel Yakubova examined all twelve points of the indictment in detail, demonstrating that not one of the charges had been proved. In addition, she pointed out the contradictions in the witnesses' testimony and the obvious unreliability of many of them. She expressed amazement at the fact that, although many of the witnesses had higher degrees and all had higher education, none of them had written out their own testimony. Some of them had confessed in court that they had not read what was written in the interrogation record anyway. The defence counsel declared that there was nothing criminal in the actions of the accused and demanded the release of Marsal. In his final statement Marsal declared himself not guilty. The sentence was two and a half years in ordinary-regime camp.

In 1979 Marsal wrote a declaration to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet renouncing his Soviet citizenship. In 1980 he applied for permission to emigrate to West Germany. At the beginning of 1981 he received a refusal.

The Trial of Raush

The Raush family, who live in Kurgan-Tyube, has been trying to obtain permission to emigrate to West Germany since 1972. During this time they have received eight refusals.

The criminal case was brought against Johannes Raush under article 78 of the Tadzhik Criminal Code ('Evasion of Routine Call-up for Active Military Service'). On 12 August 1981 the Moscow Helsinki Group released Document

On 29 August 1981 Raush was arrested.

The trial of Johannes Gukovich Raush (born 1961) took place on 16 October 1981. The sentence was two years in ordinary-regime camps (see 'In the Prisons and Camps').

On 19 October 1981 KGB officials, in a 'chat' with Gertrude Raush, mother of Johannes Raush, threatened her with 'up to seven years' imprisonment.

On 23 February 1982, in the Kurgan-Tyube Regional KGB office, she was made to sign previously drawn-up letters to West Germany and the West German embassy in Moscow, denying that the Raush family was being persecuted.

On the next day Gertrude Raush sent letters to the same addresses, saying that she had signed the others as a result of direct threats from the KGB.

Kishinev

From 22 to 25 September 1981 the trial took place in Kishinev of Osip Arkadievich Lokshin (born 1942; arrested 30 May 1981 - Chronicle 62) and Vladimir Leonidovich Tsukerman (born 1947; arrested 30 May 1981 - Chronicle 62), charged under article 203-1 of the Moldavian Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code) and article 203 of the Moldavian Criminal Code ('Organisation of or Active Participation in Group Activities Disturbing the Peace').

At the trial all the participants in the 'march' from the synagogue to the OVIR office refused the prosecution's assertion that Lokshin and Tsukerman had played a leading role in drawing up a letter to the Moldavian Ministry of Internal Affairs and in organising the 'march'. They also denied that Lokshin, Tsukerman or any other participant in the 'march' (which never actually took place) disturbed the peace. The evidence of the policemen was confused and contradictory. In particular, they could not point out who had disturbed the flow of traffic and became confused when identifying the detained persons.

The sentence was three years' ordinary-regime camp each (see
On 2 March 1982 the Moscow Helsinki Group released Document 192 'Continuing Persecution of Citizens who wish to Emigrate from the USSR', which describes the trials of Lokshin and Tsukerman (the same document mentions the trial of A. Paritsky - Chronicle 63 - and the trial of G. Miller - see below).

Donetsk Region

The Trial of Akhterov

From 24 to 29 December 1981 the Donetsk Regional Court, with the Court's deputy chairman E.N. Zinchenko (Chronicle 46) presiding, heard the case of Pavel Alexeyevich Akhterov (born 1930; arrested 7 July 1981), who was charged under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the RSFSR Code). The prosecution was conducted by Procurator Noskov, the Public Accuser was Kotlyarov; Akhterov refused to have a defence lawyer.

Akhterov was accused of:
- writing and disseminating the book On the way to Eternity (400 pages) with the aim of later sending it to the West;
- producing and disseminating Yu. Orlov's autobiography and sending it to the West through A. Ginzburg (it was printed by the Khronika-Press publishing house);
- producing and disseminating an appeal for help in emigrating (sent, in particular, to E. Berlinguer and Hua Guo-feng);
- carrying on anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda in oral form.

Akhterov said that the book had been confiscated from him the day after it was completed and that it contained no slander: 'Everything in it is taken from my life'; he had never applied to China for help but had certainly sent appeals for help in emigrating to Berlinguer and the Soviet authorities. After this, Akhterov declared that he refused to take any further part in the trial proceedings, as the court had no right to try him, being 'Soviet and therefore prejudiced'.

Three witnesses were questioned for three days. Akhterov's wife and one of his relatives said that they had read his book On the Way to Eternity. Two witnesses showed, using Akhterov's work, that he had complained of being harassed, of not being allowed out of the USSR, of believers being oppressed and had said that he wanted to live in a free country. Pentecostal witnesses from registered congregations were subjected to open pressure by the judge, who tried to obtain testimony from them that would convict Akhterov of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda. However, they merely said that they had heard Akhterov claim that life was better in the West. The court tried to obtain testimony from Philip, who had been brought from a camp, that his father had insisted on his refusing to serve in the army. Philip stated that he was of age and responsible for his own actions. A significant part of the Procurator's speech was devoted to the theme of intensifying the ideological struggle and the work of Western intelligence agencies. He also said that the accused had nothing in common with registered Pentecostals, had sought links and found support among the renegades Ginzburg and Orlov and had made use of their services. Of Akhterov's autobiography he said that 'the slanderous information contained in it was to the taste of the West' and had been published in the West as a separate book. He angrily shouted that Akhterov had not concealed the fact that he felt capitalism was better for the people than socialism. The Procurator alleged that Akhterov had incited believers to emigrate to the West, where 'they would enjoy true freedom'. 'His efforts...his unseemly behaviour...were well rewarded with parcels from the West'. Finally the Procurator demanded that Akhterov be sentenced to seven years' camp and five years' exile.

Akhterov refused to make a defence speech or final statement. The sentence was seven years' strict-regime camp and five years' exile.

Miscellaneous

Invalid Valery Tsorn, a resident of Khartsyzsk, has been trying for three years to obtain permission to emigrate to West Germany.
On 29 April 1982 Tsern was standing at the trolleybus stop. Two unknown men came up to him, began to push him and swear at him, trying to provoke a fight. Tsern did not react. The unknown men, still trying to pick a fight, began to beat Tsern, tearing out a tuft of his hair, and bruising his ribs. At this point a 'Volga' police car drove up. (Fights are common in Khartsyzsk and often the police cannot be summoned for hours, but on this occasion a car came at once.) The two hooligans began to blame Tsern for everything, alleging that he had begun the fight. Other passengers, however, stated the opposite. All three were taken to the police station. The 'hooligans' were released at once, while Tsern was taken before a judge, who sentenced him to 15 days for 'disturbing the peace'.

Tsern was held in isolation throughout the 15 days, no-one else was brought in. On 14 May he was taken before the police chief, who said 'It depends on your conduct whether you'll be allowed to go to West Germany or not. So sit quietly, don't make a noise and don't kick up a fuss!'.

'They might not have given me the 15 days', considers Tsern, 'but they were infuriated by my declaration, which I dictated to them for inclusion in the court record: "I consider this incident a provocation by the KGB"'.

The Trial of Miller

Since 1973 Margarita Degner from the town of Maisky has been trying to obtain permission to emigrate to West Germany. In 1980 she married Genrikh Miller, who also applied to emigrate.

On 31 December 1980 Miller was dismissed from his job as a metal-worker and on 18 February 1981 he was officially warned that he could be prosecuted for parasitism. On 18 March 1981 he got a new job. Miller travelled to Moscow a number of times in connection with his emigration, although he was refused unpaid leave to do so. In May and July he received two reprimands for missing work and on 6 August he was sacked.

On 22 August 1981, 47 Germans (including Miller) went to the House of Soviets in Nalchik with a collective letter criticising Fatalnik, Foreign Minister of the Kabardino-Balkar ASSR, and complaining about the systematic, unreasonable refusals they had received.

On 22 August 1981 Miller was arrested. He was charged under article 209 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Parasitism').

On 4 September 1981 M. Degner was detained in Moscow and sent to Maisky, after being told 'or else you could find yourself where your husband is'.

140 Germans from the Kabardino-Balkar republic signed a letter in defence of Miller, which was sent to A.P. Sylisik, the Republican Procurator.

On 27 August 1981 Miller was arrested. He was charged under article 209 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Parasitism').

On 4 September 1981 M. Degner was detained in Moscow and sent to Maisky, after being told 'or else you could find yourself where your husband is'.

140 Germans from the Kabardino-Balkar republic signed a letter in defence of Miller, which was sent to A.P. Sylisik, the Republican Procurator.

On 20 May the Kabardino-Balkar Supreme Court agreed to repeal the sentence and to suspend the proceedings for lack of criminal evidence.

On 21 May Miller was released.

The Trial of Angald

Since 1978 the Angald family, living in Nartkal, have been trying to obtain permission to emigrate to West Germany. On 31 December 1980 Miller was dismissed from his job as a metal-worker and on 18 February 1981 he was officially warned that he could be prosecuted for parasitism. On 18 March 1981 he got a new job. Miller travelled to Moscow a number of times in connection with his emigration, although he was refused unpaid leave to do so. In May and July he received two reprimands for missing work and on 6 August he was sacked.

On 22 August 1981, 47 Germans (including Miller) went to the House of Soviets in Nalchik with a collective letter criticising Fatalnik, Foreign Minister of the Kabardino-Balkar ASSR, and
delayed because of their application to emigrate from the USSR. On 13 November Alexander was summoned to the Military Registration Office. The Angalds then travelled to Moscow. At the Ministry of Defence they received a promise that the matter would be investigated and that they would get a reply. On 1 December Alexander Angald was arrested. He was charged under article 80 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Evasion of Routine Call-up for Active Military Service').

His trial took place on 6 January 1982. It was stated in the indictment that, as he had not obeyed the summons issued by the Military Registration Office and had not informed the latter of his journey to Moscow, Angald had deliberately evaded military service. Major Rachuk, an official from the Military Registration Office, said that Angald had behaved properly and that he had not been summoned by the Military Registration Office on 13 November 1981 in order to be sent off to the army. Other conscripts sometimes failed to turn up; they were spoken to and fined. This was the first time that a conscript had been tried on a criminal charge. Rachuk asked the court not to punish Angald severely, as he had always submitted to discipline.

The Prosecutor, after speaking of Angald's favourable references from his place of work and the absence of any criminal record, asked for a sentence of up to three years' imprisonment. In his final speech Angald pleaded not guilty. He was sentenced to two years' ordinary-regime camp.

Sverdlovsk

The Trial of Shafer and Elchin

On 7 April the Sverdlovsk Regional Court heard the case of Lev Grigorievich Shafer (born 1931; arrested in September 1981 — Chronicle 63) and Vladimir Andreyevich Elchin (born 1940; arrested in September 1981 — Chronicle 63), charged under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

In 1963 Shafer and Elchin were also tried together — under articles 70 and 72 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Membership of an Anti-Soviet Organisation'). Shafer was then given four years, Elchin two years, in strict-regime camps.

Shafer was now charged with possessing and circulating poetry, articles and a thesis on 'Authoritarianism'. Elchin was charged with writing articles, circulating 'information defaming...', in oral form and circulating poetry and articles by Shafer. Shafer and Elchin were charged with founding a library of recorded broadcasts by the radio stations 'Deutsche Welle' and 'Voice of America' and keeping and circulating the journals Israel Today, 'The Aliyah of the Seventies', Jews in the USSR and the books History of the Jews by Ratz, This is My God by Buch, Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and the Jews by Linetsky and Notes on the History of Jewish National Values.

The Prosecutor demanded sentences of six years in camp for Shafer and five years for Elchin. The defence counsel asked that the accused be found not guilty.

In his final statement Shafer asked the court to be merciful, while Elchin asked that Shafer’s sentence be reduced, as he had spinal tuberculosis and a sick mother.

The sentence was five years' strict-regime camp each. (See 'In the Prisons and Camps'.)

Uzhgorod

The Trial of Alexander Maksimov

The artist Galina Maksimova (born 1932) and her son Alexander (born 1959), residents of Uzhgorod, have been trying to obtain permission to emigrate since 1976. In 1975, when Alexander reached the age of 16, he refused to accept a Soviet passport (Chronicle 55). On 25 February 1980 he was arrested (Chronicle 56) and sentenced to one and a half years' imprisonment for violating passport regulations and 'parasitism' (Chronicles 62, 63). At the same time Maksimova was sacked from her job. At the beginning of 1982 Maksimova received permission to emigrate to join a foreigner who had adopted her. Her son was not given permission, although he also had a document stating that he had been adopted by a Canadian citizen.

At the beginning of April the Maksimovs went on hunger-strike. On 18 May Maksimova was arrested in the street. That evening Alexander was arrested at home. Both were charged with 'Parasitism' (article 214 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code). The
trial of A. Maksimov took place on 29-30 June. When Maksimov was
asked by the judge why he had not accepted a passport after his
release or taken a job, he replied 'I don't want to build
communism together with you'.
He was sentenced to two years in strict-regime camps.

Leningrad

In June 1981 Mikhail Tsivin (born 1963), a first year student at
the Kirov Institute of Textiles and Light Industry in Leningrad,
was expelled from the Institute for attending lectures on Jewish
culture, history and religion and participating in Jewish
religious festivals and readings.

On 4 August 1981, when Tsivin was returning from the trial of
Lein (Chronicle 63), he was beaten up by four 'hooligans' near
his home.

On 5 September 1981 KGB officials and police detained him at
the International Book Fair in Moscow, after two members of the
Israeli delegation (Arab communists) had quarrelled with him in
the Israeli pavilion, calling him a 'Zionist' and making an
official complaint about his disturbing the peace in the
pavilion. After talking to Tsivin the police let him go, but on
11 October in Leningrad he was taken to court from his place of
residence and charged with 'petty hooliganism', but the court did
not examine the case and suspended the proceedings.

On 24 February 1982 Tsivin was refused permission to emigrate.
On 25 March he wrote in a statement to the KGB and USSR
Ministry of Internal Affairs:

On 24 February 1982 I sent a request to the Executive Committee
of the Leningrad Soviet of People's Deputies to grant me
permission to hold a demonstration. Naturally I have as yet
received no reply. On 15 March 1982 KGB officials and police
prevented me from demonstrating (by detaining me an hour before
the demonstration was to begin). However this did not and could
not affect my determination to fight on to the end - to fight
against the lawless behaviour of the KGB officials, against
the unwillingness of various officials to examine my
complaints, against the practice - which has now become the
norm in the USSR - of violating human rights.
I demand to be allowed to leave for Israel.

On 28 March Tsivin was detained in Moscow while trying to hold a
demonstration in Red Square. The next day the People's Court of
Lenin District sentenced him to 10 days' administrative arrest.
At the special detention centre Tsivin went on hunger-strike for
five days.

After serving this administrative sentence, Tsivin was sent
back to Leningrad in the company of a KGB official who had spoken
to him at the Institute as far back as the spring of 1981.

On 18 April Tsivin again went out in Red Square in Moscow to
demonstrate. He held a placard with an inscription in three
languages - Russian, English and Hebrew - 'Let me leave for
Israel!' and chained himself to the railings of St Basil's
Cathedral. Two or three minutes later policemen and 'officials in
civilian clothes' cut the chains and took Tsivin away in a
'Volga' police car. This time he was sentenced to 15 days, most
of which he served in Leningrad. After serving the sentence he
was called up into the army. At present he is serving with a
construction battalion in the Moscow suburbs.

On 18 May Sevain Frumkin was taken off the train from Leningrad to
Moscow, where he was going in connection with his work. At the
police station he was told that he would not be allowed to go to
Moscow as 'tomorrow a Komsomol Congress is beginning and you have
applied to emigrate to Israel'. Frumkin complained to the
Procuracy about the police action and demanded compensation for
the financial loss he had suffered as a result of his detention
at night, so that he had been forced to take a taxi to get home.
Frumkin's immediate superior received a reprimand from his own
superiors for sending a 'socially dangerous element' to Moscow.

Yoshkar-Ola

In January Nikolai Shakurov applied to OVIR for permission to
emigrate, with the aim of entering a theological seminary in the
USA. He was promised an answer in May.
At the end of January Shakurov was summoned to the police
station; from there he was sent to a psychiatric hospital in the
town of Sovets, Kirov Region.
At the end of March Shakurov was discharged from the hospital.
On 7 March twelve refuseniks sent a letter (over 100 pages long) to the USSR Procurator-General, analysing the situation in Kiev following mass refusals of emigration visas to Jews, describing numerous instances of illegality and repression of refuseniks and proving that the trials of refuseniks in Kiev had been fabricated with the aid of false witnesses and false evidence. The authors of the letter demand:

1. An appeal against the court decisions relating to Pilnikov (Chronicle 57 - Chron.) Zubko (Chronicle 63 - Chron.) and V.G. Kisluk (Chronicle 62 - Chron.).
2. An appeal against the decisions of the USSR and Ukrainian Ministries of Internal Affairs, which illegally refused permission for emigration to Israel on the grounds that the applicants had no close relatives there. Emigration visas should be issued in accordance with the law to those who have received illegal refusals.
3. An investigation into the abuse of power by officials of the Procuracy, the courts and the police in Kiev.

The letter ends with these words:

"Going by previous experience, we fear that no notice will be taken of our appeal, like all those that preceded it. In order to avoid this, to draw attention to ourselves and our complaints, to make sure the questions we have raised will be resolved strictly within legal limits and to put an end to repressions, we declare a 'continuous hunger-strike' until our demands are met.

A similar letter was sent to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

On 15 March the hunger-strike began.

On 25 May KG8 officials issued an official warning 'according to the Decree'11 to Svetlana Efmanova (Chronicle 61), on 11 June to Alexander Kotovsky and on 16 June to Vladimir Tereshchenko (Chronicles 62, 63). All three were taking part in the protest hunger-strike.

Similar protest hunger-strikes have begun in Odessa (see below).

* * *

On 28 March Leonid Bransfeld, a Group 1 invalid (he has an injured spine), sent an appeal to the secretary of the Swedish Invalids' Association and the newspaper Expressen, asking for help in emigrating. He has been trying to leave since 1980 but keeps receiving refusals 'due to the absence of close relatives'.

Odessa

On 27 March A.A. Prudkov sent a declaration to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

...I have been refused permission to emigrate more than once, on security grounds - a groundless reason, in my opinion.

In connection with the continuous protest now being directed at the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet by refuseniks in Kiev (see above - Chron.) and myself feeling that a number of illegal actions have been permitted in Jewish refusenik cases such as my own, I declare my solidarity with their demands and join their protest, which I will carry out in the form of one-day hunger-strikes every week. I will inform the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet in due course of the dates.

On the same day Yu.L. Shvarts (Chronicle 63) sent a similar letter to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

On 2 April Prudkov and Shvarts were joined by A.S. Kushner (Chronicle 63).

Krivoi Rog

In a statement dated 18 January, to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the All-Union OVIR Office, Alexander Shatrukas (Chronicle 61) writes:

I ask you to grant me permission to leave the USSR on the grounds that I do not wish to live in a country whose ideology is alien to me.

In 1974 I lost hope of leaving the USSR by legal means (I shall not list articles from international agreements, as am sure they are known to you). As a result I crossed the Soviet-Finnish border but because of my own carelessness I was detained by Finnish border-guards a few kilometres from the border. I was imprisoned for almost five years.
During the pre-trial investigation, the authorities reproached me with not having tried to emigrate by legal means. So I am still stubbornly trying, three years after my release, to obtain permission to emigrate by 'legal means'. There have been no results - apart from persecution and frequent incarceration in psychiatric hospitals, as well as beatings...

Latvia

On 16 May and 16 June 1981 Yuri Maksimov (Chronicle 61), a resident of Riga who has been trying to obtain permission to emigrate for seven years, sent his regular applications for emigration (the seventh and eighth) to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. On 8 July he sent an appeal for an invitation to the President of the USA.


On 23 November 1981 Maksimov sent a 'Statement' to the Latvian Ministry of Internal Affairs, renouncing his Soviet citizenship. On 30 November he sent a similar statement to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

On 8 April 1982 Maksimov wrote a letter to U. Hearst Junior: ...In listing violations of rights in my own case, I can cite my unlawful dismissal from work, my unlawful confinement in a psychiatric hospital and the fact that those around me were encouraged to regard me with intolerance...

I cannot adapt to communist life and wish to leave the Soviet Union. However it is a characteristic of communism that people are forbidden to do a great many things - including leaving the USSR...

On 3 June Maksimov appealed to the International Red Cross (see 'In Defence of Political Prisoners' in the section 'In the Prisons and Camps').

At the beginning of the year the former political prisoner Maligoma Ravkien (Chronicle 60) addressed an 'Open appeal' to the public and the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He asked to be allowed to leave the USSR. If his request was refused, he intended to adopt the Gandhian position of civil disobedience.

On 23 November 1981, in Kirovakan, Rafael Oganyan (Chronicles 56, 60) was summoned for a 'chat' to KGB headquarters, where he was warned that he might be arrested if he did not stop writing letters and declarations and maintaining contact with people in Moscow. In a statement to Andropov, Oganyan writes:

During the whole of my conscious life I have fought against the anti-social phenomena which exist in our society. And now I have become a victim of my own fight and have been left without work, thrown out on the street and at the moment, three of my children of school age are in a very difficult position and are condemned to go hungry...

Now...they choose the easiest way to silence those who cannot be reconciled to anti-social phenomena. Since things have gone so far, I should like to ask you once again, taking the above into account, to allow me to leave the 'USSR'.

That will be the logical conclusion of my unsuccessful fight.

I wish to get out of the Soviet 'paradise' and into the capitalist 'hell'...

Sirvard Avakyan (Chronicle 62), in a declaration to Brezhnev, writes:

...intransigence in the face of the illegal actions of the administration (at the radio parts factory in Ekhegadzor - Chronicle) has cost me very dear and to the end of my life I shall never be able to forget that closed circle of callousness and meanness, barbarism and absurdity, into which I was driven but remained alive, though perhaps accidentally...

And now, after all these awful, inhuman experiences, I find it necessary to ask you to deprive me of Soviet citizenship and to allow me to go abroad. Even if I find it hard without my homeland, without my friends and relatives, the homeland can be hateful if tyranny and inhumanity rule there.

I shall stop at nothing to achieve this difficult aim, as it is completely senseless for me to go on living in the USSR.
Letters from Refuseniks

Seven Jewish refuseniks (P. Abramovich, V. Prestin, V. Fulmakht and I.E. Sas from Moscow, E. Gorbman and F. Kochubevsky from Novosibirsk and V. Raiz from Vilnius) have sent an 'Open letter' to Brezhnev, Chairman of the Preidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Perez de Cuellar, General Secretary of the United Nations Organization:

...Our aim is to draw the attention of the highest state authorities in the USSR and also of the whole world to the fact that the situation in the Soviet Union regarding the so-called 'refuseniks on security grounds' logically contradicts the legal norms of Soviet and international civil law and is undoubtedly doing great harm to the cause of establishing trust between countries, without which disarmament nor enduring peace on our planet is possible...

...Our aim is to draw the attention of the highest state authorities in the USSR and also of the whole world to the fact that the situation in the Soviet Union regarding the so-called 'refuseniks on security grounds' logically contradicts the legal norms of Soviet and international civil law and is undoubtedly doing great harm to the cause of establishing trust between countries, without which disarmament nor enduring peace on our planet is possible...

In our time...technical information...very quickly goes out of date. Thus, according to the official Soviet viewpoint, 'a whole generation of weapons is changed after five to seven years' (see Military Questions in the Policy of the CPSU. Economics and the Defence of the Country, published in the USSR Ministry of Defence paper Red Star 14/7/80). We ask the Supreme Soviet of the USSR:

1. To instruct the USSR Supreme Court to issue explanations to the People's Courts obliging them to include in the legal investigation, as an established fact with legal significance, the question of how long and on the basis of which documents a particular person may be subject to the limitation of the right to leave the Soviet Union provided for in point No.3, article 12 of the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights, the right to emigrate being guaranteed in point No.2 of the same article in the Pact.

2. To establish a legal procedure a maximum period of five years, to be counted from the moment of acquiring secret information, during which the civil right of the person concerned to leave the Soviet Union may be limited by a court decision, so that only in exceptional cases could this period be extended to eight years, by decree of the Supreme Court of a Union republic.

We ask the United Nations Organization to use its authority to promote the fulfilment of our above-outlined plea, addressed to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in order to assist in establishing greater trust between countries, without which neither disarmament nor enduring peace on our planet is possible.

Over 100 Jewish refuseniks from Moscow, Leningrad, Kharkov and Riga have sent a 'letter' to Brezhnev, Chairman of the Preidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the leaders of the countries participating in the Madrid Conference:

...We know that at various international conferences Soviet delegates have stated that everyone who wanted to leave for Israel has already left. This document testifies to the contrary. We continue to receive refusals, in differently phrased formulas every time, which often contradict both Soviet laws and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, ratified by the USSR. The very fact of application for emigration to Israel is regarded as a shameful act and puts one outside Soviet society. The whole process of instituting an application for permission to emigrate is based not on the law, but on constantly changing secret instructions. Having received an invitation from Israel, one must prove that the sender is a 'close' relative of the recipient. The invitation remains in effect only for a limited period and new invitations are often not delivered. Artificial categories of 'close' and 'distant' relations, 'complete' and 'incomplete' union of families have been introduced. Relatives who remain in the USSR are forced to promise in writing that they will never apply to emigrate from the USSR. Applications for permission to emigrate result as a rule in dismissal from work or transfer to a low-paid job and later to the loss of qualifications. Students are expelled from institutes; young men are immediately called up into the army and army service leads to refusal of permission to emigrate for many years, on the grounds that 'emigration is contrary to state interests'. Academics are often deprived of their degrees and titles and thus of the possibility of academic work. Teachers and experienced engineers work as stokers, bath attendants, loaders and so on. New instructions have been introduced concerning children, who also need a reference from their school to submit to OVIR. Elderly and even young people die, unable to stand the nervous pressure and constant fear for their children. The right of sick people, invalids and the elderly to by-pass the queue for emigration is disregarded. All this is known to the highest Soviet authorities and moreover is
done on their instructions and with their approval. Despite all this, our determination to fight for our legal right to emigrate from the USSR remains unshakeable. Having signed the Helsinki Agreement and ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the government of the USSR has bound itself to 'examine in a positive and humane light requests from persons who wish to join members of their family and has agreed that 'everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own'. We believed in the reality of these promises. Our collision with real life was all the more shocking. As a result, our families and thousands of others who are unknown to us or did not sign this letter out of fear of putting their apparently fragile well-being in danger, have found themselves in a disastrous situation.

We ask the government of the USSR:
- to allow all families illegally detained in the USSR to emigrate to Israel;
- to end the persecution and restriction of rights in connection with applications for permission to emigrate from the USSR;
- to make public the restrictive regulations concerning persons who apply to emigrate from the USSR.

We call the attention of governments of states which participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to the following:
- The Soviet government, in breach of the international agreements it has signed and ratified, does not allow its citizens the right to freely choose their place of residence and takes discriminatory measures against those who apply to emigrate to Israel.

Continuing our fight for the legal right to leave the USSR, we declare the opening day of the Madrid Conference a Day of Protest. On that day we shall carry out a symbolic one-day hunger strike, which will become permanent when a few of us in turn will refuse food for a number of days specified in advance. On this day we shall organise lectures and seminars on the problems of emigration and collect money to help families who have suffered materially on account of their decision to leave the USSR.

On 13 February thirteen Moscow refuseniks - Candidates and Doctors of Science - sent a letter to the President of Israel, I. Navon:

...in recent years academics have become a special cultural group who are practically forbidden to emigrate from the USSR...

For wanting to emigrate to Israel, we have been punished not only by losing our jobs and our income, but by being deprived of the right to practise our profession.

What worries us is not merely our personal fate but above all the terrible mass destruction of knowledge, which is locked away rotting, instead of being useful to Israel and mankind as a whole.

Can it really be that an attempt is being made to paralyse the intellectual forces of that nation which suffered mass extermination during the Holocaust? The chosen victims now are those who after the Holocaust found the inner strength to go on and advance in the field of higher knowledge.

The nation of Israel cannot be indifferent to attempts to prevent it from gathering together Jewish intellectual forces. We hope for the assistance of all our colleagues, all those who are against attempts to crush learning by administrative bans.

At this difficult time for us, we appeal to you, Mr President and through you to Jewish public opinion throughout the world. Save our knowledge. Help us to free academics from the ban on emigration to Israel.

We live in the hope of returning to the land of our fathers. Fifty academic refuseniks from Moscow have sent an 'Open Letter to Colleagues Abroad':

...As we stand firm in our intention of joining our dear ones in Israel, the situation of our families is growing more difficult and their future more gloomy. We get the impression that our fate is becoming dependent on factors which are not directly linked with us. We want to live and work. We insist on our right to live where we consider it necessary. We want to work for the world, for universal human ideals.

Respected colleagues! Do not forget our situation! We appeal to you and to the world academic community to make use of every opportunity to support our right as academics to emigrate like anyone else.

On 12 February the Leningrad refuseniks M. Beizer and E.I. Erlikh sent an 'Open Letter' to Pravda and the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee:

...Constant violation of the elementary norms of Soviet legality (as a result of applications to emigrate and in
replies to complaints about the actions of OVR - Chron.) cannot avoid shaking and indeed has shaken the real nature of Soviet law and the mechanism of executive power.

It is also generally known that a softening of emigration policy with regard to Jews would help detente.

The emigration of a significant number of people even represents a direct profit for the state from the purely material viewpoint. Among those leaving are a significant number of pensioners, who have left their pensions behind; at the same time, directly cutting down state expenditure, those departing abandon their living space, helping to resolve the acute crisis in urban housing. It could also be said that, in a situation where there is a growing deficit of food products, the emigration of a significantly large group of people would actually benefit the remaining population. To all this we can add the profits from customs confiscations, which deprive those leaving of literally everything - though it is not much - that they have earned during their working lives.

Seizer (a refusenik since 1979; his wife and son have been allowed to leave the USSR) also sent a statement to Brezhnev: The head of the Leningrad OVR, V.P. Bakeev...said that he refused to grant me a visa because the United States of American had failed to sign the SALT-2 treaty...

I firmly declare that I have never been privy to any state secrets. I - and even my small son, who has lived two and a half years without his father - bear no responsibility for the worsening relations between the USSR and the USA.

In April Vladimir Koitzsky (Chronicle 61), a resident of Novosibirsk, left the USSR. In June Irina Korsunskaya (Chronicle 59) left from Moscow.

In April Vladimir Sorokin, son of Viktor (Chronicles 60, 61) and Selikhan (Chronicles 58, 63) Sorokin, a fourth year student at the Faculty of Economics, Moscow University, handed in a statement asking the authorities to take back his Komsomol card and give him a receipt for it, to be used in filling out documents for emigration from the USSR. It was decided that a discussion of his statement would be held at a meeting of his Komsomol group.

Sorokin was then transferred to a different group. The course supervisor, the party organiser and the secretary of the Faculty's Komsomol bureau were present at the meeting. One of those who 'directed' events at the meeting was Shevchuk, deputy secretary of the Komsomol Bureau. The meeting called Sorokin's intention to emigrate 'treason to the Motherland'. Sorokin explained that his parents, not he, had taken the initiative to emigrate. One of the girl students present replied that, if the choice was between one's parents and the Motherland, one should give preference to the Motherland. However, when the vote was taken one person was against the resolution and two abstained.

At a meeting of the Faculty authorities, Sorokin was asked how he understood the concept of the Motherland. Sorokin replied that his Motherland was, above all, his parents, adding that he was leaving the meeting as he had been insulted and accused of 'treason to the Motherland' - a serious crime against the state, in connection with which he would be obliged to apply to the organs of justice. Sorokin outlined all this in a statement.

At a Moscow University Komsomol meeting held after 20 April, provocative statements were again made to Sorokin, calling him a traitor to the Motherland, and asking him if he would fight against the USSR or Palestine, if he joined the Israeli army. On 15 June the Sorokin left the USSR.
The Trial of Vasily Sichko

Vasily was to be tried in the Investigations Prison and succeeded in getting there before the judges; however, she was not allowed in after them. When Kulchitsky came out for the lunch break, Petrash went up to him, but he said 'Go away!'

Petrash went to the Procuracy. After hearing her out, Beseda, Deputy Procurator of Cherkassy Region, told Prokopenko, the procurator in charge of Corrective Labour Institutions, to ensure that the mother attended the trial. After ringing someone, Prokopenko told Petrash 'Go to the Investigations Prison. Tell the guard to call Major Shedko – he'll take you into the courtroom'. At the Investigations Prison Petrash actually managed to get hold of Shedko, but he said 'What's Beseda to me? I've got my own superiors and I obey them'.

On 5 January Kulchitsky would not sign a statement allowing Petrash a meeting with her son and would not return it, either – 'I don't want to!' When Petrash applied again to Beseda she was angry with her: 'What do you want from me? I've had all kinds of trouble because of you!'

On 19 January the Cherkassy Regional Court turned down an appeal by the defence lawyer.

Vasily Sichko is serving his new sentence in Vinnitsa Region – Uchr.IV-301/86.

The Case of Par Sichko

On 4 January the People's Court of Pridneprovsk District in the town of Cherkassy, with A.L. Kulchitsky presiding, heard the case of Vasily Petrovich Sichko (born 1956), charged under article 229-6 part 1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (Tossessing Drugs for Personal Usel). The defence lawyer was M.U. Kramar; there was no prosecutor by Vasily's mother, Stefania Petrash. Included in the following, prior to the trial, my son was beaten up, though they said a criminal prisoner had done it. They beat him so that his eyes were not visible for the bruises and swellings – this greatly amused the judges and they laughed at my son. V. Sichko (Chronicle 63) was accused of possessing hashish in September-December 1981; on 3 December 1981, during a search of his previous room, the final sentence was three years, six months and 20 days, strict-regime, beginning on 11 December 1981.

On 5 January Kulchitsky would not sign a statement allowing Petrash a meeting with her son and would not return it, either – 'I don't want to!' When Petrash applied again to Beseda she was angry with her: 'What do you want from me? I've had all kinds of trouble because of you!

In October 1981, P. Sichko (Chronicle 56) was the victim of a provocation: his fellow prisoner Shumeiko put some papers in the lining of his boot which were confiscated by the camp administration and defined as 'anti-Soviet'. Soon afterwards Shumeiko, who was being threatened with reprisals by P. Sichko's fellow prisoners, was transferred to another camp. On 26 May 1982 P. Sichko was arrested, one and a half months before the expiry of his three-year sentence (5 July – Chronicle 55). He was again charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code. On the morning of 4 January Petrash, who had heard of the new charge against her son only the day before, appealed to Judge Kulchitsky. The latter said that an examination had shown that Sichko's organism was not used to drugs. Kulchitsky also said that the trial would probably begin after lunch and that if Petrash waited he would call her. Half an hour later all the judges went off somewhere. Petrash managed to find out that

---

On the morning of 4 January, the trial of Vasily Sichko began. The People's Court of Pridneprovsk District in the town of Cherkassy, with A.L. Kulchitsky presiding, heard the case of Vasily Petrovich Sichko (born 1956), charged under article 229-6 part 1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (Tossessing Drugs for Personal Usel). The defence lawyer was M.U. Kramar; there was no prosecutor. Vasily's mother, Stefania Petrash, included in the following: prior to the trial, my son was beaten up, though they said a criminal prisoner had done it. They beat him so that his eyes were not visible for the bruises and swellings – this greatly amused the judges and they laughed at my son. V. Sichko (Chronicle 63) was accused of possessing hashish in September-December 1981; on 3 December 1981, during a search of his previous room, the final sentence was three years, six months and 20 days, strict-regime, beginning on 11 December 1981.

On 5 January Kulchitsky would not sign a statement allowing Petrash a meeting with her son and would not return it, either – 'I don't want to!' When Petrash applied again to Beseda she was angry with her: 'What do you want from me? I've had all kinds of trouble because of you!

In October 1981, P. Sichko (Chronicle 56) was the victim of a provocation: his fellow prisoner Shumeiko put some papers in the lining of his boot which were confiscated by the camp administration and defined as 'anti-Soviet'. Soon afterwards Shumeiko, who was being threatened with reprisals by P. Sichko's fellow prisoners, was transferred to another camp. On 26 May 1982 P. Sichko was arrested, one and a half months before the expiry of his three-year sentence (5 July – Chronicle 55). He was again charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code. On the morning of 4 January Petrash, who had heard of the new charge against her son only the day before, appealed to Judge Kulchitsky. The latter said that an examination had shown that Sichko's organism was not used to drugs. Kulchitsky also said that the trial would probably begin after lunch and that if Petrash waited he would call her. Half an hour later all the judges went off somewhere. Petrash managed to find out that
The Trial of Bolonkin

On 8 February the Supreme Court of the Buryat ASSR heard the case of Alexander Alexandrovich Bolonkin (born 1933), charged under article 70 part 2 of the RSFSR Criminal Code (Chronicles 62, 63), and sentenced him to one year's imprisonment (ending in April) plus five years' exile.

On 7 April Bolonkin expressed his 'repentance' in a television appearance. In April the article 'Enlightenment' by L. Molosov and O. Meshchokov was published in The Week Nedlya No.18.

Bolonkin's place of exile is in the Buryat ASSR. He has been given a room (ui.Pavelova 76, kv.11) and a job (as a senior scientific worker in a technical institute).

An anonymous author writes in quasi-Aesopian language:

...A cruel choice was put to him: either 15 years (with the prospect of the work being prolonged afterwards) or he would have to read out the statement...

He was handed the text five minutes before the recording and was not allowed to change a word.

In addition, a report was placed in the wall newspaper. The report attributed to his words which he had never spoken, particularly about himself and A.D. He saw the wall newspaper only when it had already been put up...

The Case of Kukobaka

On 6 October 1981, thirteen days before the expiry of Mikhail Kukobaka's sentence, a new case was brought against him under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

At first Kukobaka was under investigation in Elets. In April he was transferred to the Serbsky Institute, where he was declared responsible. On 25 May he was sent back to Elets.

The Case of Litvin

In March, five months before his three-year sentence (Chronicles 54, 55) was due to end, a new charge under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the RSFSR Code) was brought against Yury Litvin (Chronicles 56, 57). He was held in the Kiev KGB Investigations Prison.

In connection with his case, a search was carried out in the town of Vasylkov, Kiev Region, at the home of Galina Matusevich, sister of Nikolai Matusevich (for his trial see Chronicle 49).

Chistopol Prison

Azat Arshakyan and Ashot Ravanartyan (see 'Events in Armenia') have arrived here.

At the beginning of the year Arkady Tsurkov was transferred here from Perm Camp No.37.

Nikolai Matusevich's high blood pressure has got worse.

In January Yury Shukhevich (Chronicle 63) was transferred to the Leningrad prison hospital. He underwent an operation for a detached retina in his left eye (he cannot see with his right eye and has lost 90% of his vision). In March he was sent into exile (after ten years in ordinary-regime camps, he still has five years of exile ahead of him).

The Mordovian Camps

Camp 3

In July 1981 Oganes Agababyan (for his trial see Chronicle 62) arrived in the men's political zone (uch. ZHH-385/3-5). Nikolai Pavlov is here (for his arrest see Chronicle 62). During the investigation he was beaten up, first in Alekseyevka, then in Belgorod; under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code he was sentenced to five years' strict-regime camp; from 1975-78 he served three years under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

At the beginning of April Yury Badč was again (Chronicle 62) deprived of a long visit, this time for not having fulfilled the daily norm on 31 March: he did not finish sewing three pairs of mittens (until now fulfilment of the norm has been checked only over a month) and for leaving work early. Badč's wife Světšana Kirichenko appealed to 'international women's organisations' for
I therefore am unable to 'restore the quota'. Charyshkin proposed that Osipova send the letter as a regular one. Osipova agreed to this compromise and on 1 June handed the letter to the censor, T.A. Gainichenko. By the end of June the letter had still not been dispatched.

In January a statutory parcel was not accepted from Tatyana Velikanova's children, who had arrived for a visit, as the administration 'could not find' any scales.

Velikanova has gastritis and high blood pressure. In February she was in hospital

On 5 September 1981 Tatyana Osipova (women's political zone - ucr. ZhKh 385/3-4) sent a letter to the Procuracy for the Mordovian camps in which, amongst other things, she complained about the illegal confiscation of her letter to S.V. Kalistratova (Chronicle 63). On 13 January 1982, after sending a reminder, she received a reply from Procurator Ganichev: 'The letter discovered in Osipova's possession (the letter was not 'discovered' but delivered to the censor for dispatch - Chronicle) contained classified information. The letter was confiscated, of which Osipova was notified.'

On 10 May the deputy head of the operations section of the Mordovian camps, Charyshkin, visited Osipova in connection with this statement. He admitted that the text of the letter to Kalistratova attached to the statement did not contain classified information and was subject to dispatch. At the same time, Charyshkin said that he could not determine whether the text of the letter attached to the statement corresponded to that of the confiscated one since the latter had been destroyed; he was

On 6 May Osipova and Velikanova wrote a statement to the RSFSR Procuracy in which they asked for exile to be revoked for Group 2 invalids M. Seminova (b. 1923) and A. Khvotkova (b. 1906), who in July were to start a three-year term of exile (they sent a similar joint statement in November 1981 - Chronicle 63). They again received a reply that it was not permitted to write about other prisoners.

On 3 June Galina Silivonchik completed 13 years of imprisonment. At the beginning of June she was transported to her place of exile. (See 'In Exile'.)

On 11 June Osipova was taken off to the cooler of Mordovian Camp 2 for nine days for refusing to wear a name-tab and for 'criticising the administration's actions in a cynical way'. As a mark of protest, Velikanova refused to work while Osipova was in the cooler since 'sending people to the cooler is contrary to international norms of human rights', and it was particularly intolerable for Osipova because of her kidney illness. Raisa Rudenko declared a hunger-strike for three days. That evening acting camp Commandant Major O separated Velikanova and Rudenko and 'explained' to them that it was forbidden to act 'for others': 'How do you know that Osipova has a pain in her kidneys? Did her doctor tell you? Do you have any personal grievances? Velikanova replied that 'not to intervene for others' was precisely that item of the rules which they did not intend to observe as it was immoral.

On the night of 12 June it was cold but the top window in the
The Perm Camps

Camp 35
Lev Shefer (for his trial see this issue) has arrived here. In January-February Vladimir Poresh was transferred to Leningrad.

* * *
When Stepan Khmara asked canteen head Chaika, wife of the Deputy Head of camp discipline, to give those on washing-up duty loofahs or cloths to wash the dishes, he was sent to the cooler 'for rudeness'. In January Anatoly Marchenko was granted a 'long' visit from his wife and son for twenty-four hours. It was explained to Larissa Bogoraz that the visit had been shortened as part of the punishment incurred by Marchenko for refusing to work (Chronicle 63). Marchenko was not allowed to take his hearing aid to the meeting: 'Never mind, just speak a bit louder, he'll hear.' Before the meeting Bogoraz and her nine-year-old son were subjected to a body search after being shown a directive which said that the camp administration, presupposing that relatives intended handing over unauthorized things to the prisoner, had the right to look through their personal belongings.

From January to March only two postcards from Marchenko arrived at his home, both addressed to his son, although he had also sent letters to his wife.

Osipova insisted that the ambient temperature be taken. The warden on duty said to another: 'Bring her a thermometer!' 'But it's broken'. 'Bring it, let her take it, after that it's nothing to do with us'. Osipova objected that she did not need a broken one. 'But it's the only one we've got!'

On 12 June Rudenko was summoned by the Head of the hospital Major Tsoyev, who said that her hunger-strike was damaging her health. Rudenko replied that in any case she could not eat anything in the camp but that they refused to give her a special diet. Tsoyev proposed that he substitute certain food products (for example, milk for meat and fish) and said: 'Write a statement.' The Deputy Commandant of the Mordovian camps Colonel Uvarov, who came in at that moment, said that he had come to meet her and would do so again. Rudenko replied that there would be no compromises and, if the statement about the food-stuffs was connected with this, she would withdraw it. Uvarov assured her that the food had nothing to do with him.

A few days later the doctor told Rudenko that Tsoyev had instructed him to tell her that he did not have the right to make any substitution.

On 16 June detachment chief L.N. Podust imposed penalties on Velikanova for 'absenteeism' (not going out to work); a warning, a reprimand, loss of access to the camp shop for July and eight days in the cooler (one penalty for each 'absence'). After the cooler Osipova's kidneys began to hurt (the doctor gave her sick-leave, prolonged it for a week, but refused to let her receive a parcel of medicines 'from outside'); the joints in Velikanova's knees began to ache.

Osipova asked Podust: 'Do you really hope with the aid of the cooler and other punishments to make us wear name-tabs?' Podust replied: 'No, I don't, but if I make you a little less obstinate I'll have achieved something.' Podust also admitted that name-tabs were less important as identification than as punishment; when prisoners in criminal camps were asked: 'Which of the requirements of prison discipline do you find the hardest to bear?', most of them replied: 'Wearing name-tabs.'

In winter the temperature in the barracks dropped to 10-11°C.

Camp 36 (Special-Regime)
In January Ivan Gil was transported to his place of exile (see 'In Exile'). The wife of Aleksei Murzhenko inquired of the camp administration why there were no letters from her husband. Camp Commandant Buravkov replied that the camp administration had not sent the letters written by Murzhenko in November 1981 and in January 1982; they would tell Murzhenko to write to his wife himself about the reasons for the confiscation of the letters.

Camp 36 (Strict-Regime)
In March Leonid Malyshov (for his trial see this issue) arrived here, and in June Vladimir Elchin (for his trial see this issue). On the night of 17-18 July 1981 Ishkhin Murtyshyn (for his
trial see Chronicle 62) and his two cell-mates (criminals) escaped from a transit cell in Rostov prison (Chronicle 63). Eight days later Mkrtchyan was arrested at Usman station in Lipetsk Region. During this period one of those who escaped with Mkrtchyan stole a car and the other robbed a shop. Although they both denied that Mkrtchyan had taken part, he was convicted together with them under article 212-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Theft of a motor vehicle') and under article 89 part 2 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Misappropriation of state...property, carried out by means of theft'). Under these articles and under article 188 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Escape from Custody') he was sentenced to another four years. During the investigation Mkrtchyan was beaten up many times in Rostov prison - by everyone from the prison Commandant Major Ovchinnikov down to the wardens on duty; arms, legs, a wooden hammer and a truncheon were used in the beatings. Ovchinnikov beat his head against a wall with his own hands. Mkrtchyan lost consciousness; water was poured over him and he was beaten again. His whole body was covered with bruises, a rib was cracked, for two weeks he spat blood. In June 1982 Mkrtchyan arrived in Camp 36.

In February Nikolai Rudenko (his time in the punishment block was stated wrongly in Chronicle 62) and Genrikh Altunyan came out of the punishment block, in March Victor Nekipelov and in April Alexander Ogorodnikov.

There is no dental surgeon in the camp. The specialist who came opened up Victor Nekipelov's painful tooth, took the broken denture for repair, promised to insert a filling the next day and bring the denture back a month later, then disappeared altogether.

From the letter dated 5 April written by Nekipelov's wife to the Chief Administration of Internal Affairs (copies to the USSR Procurator-General and the Head of the Administrative Department of the CPSU Central Committee):

My husband has been ill since September 1981. Because of the state of his health, in October he was placed in the central camp hospital where he stayed until that critical day when the term of his prescribed punishment expired. Then, without having completed the treatment, without having undergone the required examination for a discharge, my husband was transferred straight from hospital to the punishment block with a discharge note saying the state of his health was satisfactory, he was fit for work. I was informed of this from Perm and from Moscow in reply to my inquiries.

The treatment prescribed for my husband by the doctor of the camp hospital was continued for four months in the punishment block. The treatment is continuing to this day. The pains come back as soon as the medicines are stopped.

The doctor's diagnosis, cervico-lumbar osteochondrosis with back pains and chronic pyelonephritis, is extremely doubtful. During the whole course of the illness a blood analysis has only been done once. What is the basis of the conclusion that his state of health is satisfactory? Incidentally, this was upheld by the Medical Work Fitness Board [VTEK] which examined my husband on 11 February of this year. Without any analyses, ignoring the complaints of the patient, the Board decided that my husband's state of health was satisfactory...

The illness has lasted for over six months. During this time my husband has been taking drugs (Bruphen, Ibuprophen, Voltaren) which are contra-indicated when there is kidney trouble and should be administered only in conjunction with constant blood assays.

My husband has enlarged submandibular lymph nodes and enlarged lymph nodes around the groin. Osteochondrosis has nothing to do with this.

In 1956 he suffered a severe attack of polyarthritis. It is possible that his present illness is a recurrence of that illness long ago, and that uncontrolled treatment is damaging his health.

I insist that he be properly examined in hospital conditions where it is possible to carry out such an examination.

Diary (November 1981-June 1982)

12 November. For two days Terleckas had talks with a Lithuanian KGB official named Staškevičius. Terleckas confirmed his renunciation of anti-Soviet activity and put in a request for a transfer to a building-site of the national economy ('chemistry')24. Staškevičius promised him this.

17 November. Nekipelov was transferred from hospital to the camp and immediately placed in the punishment block for four months.

19 November. For various infringements of camp discipline Aliyev was placed in the cooler for 15 days. For infringements in the cooler his time there was extended for a further three days.
twice attempted to hang himself in his cell.
26 November. Despite his poor state of health, O. Shevchenko was given a reprimand for not fulfilling the norm. Doctor Pchelnikov dismissed the diagnosis made earlier by a medical attendant and the conclusion that Shevchenko was healthy, admitted the presence of neuralgic pains in the kidneys, but did not do anything to reduce his output norm.
29 November. After the publication in Literary Gazette of the article 'Dear friend', Grigoryan declared a hunger-strike and a work-strike, demanding the rehabilitation of his unjustly convicted father. He sent corresponding statements to the Presidium of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and to the editorial board of Literary Gazette. The statements were not confiscated.
30 November. Veduta was placed in the cooler for 20 (7 - Chronicle) days for a conflict with Major Chugainov.
3 December. Grigoryan stopped his hunger-strike and work-strike. Balakhonov was deprived of access to the camp shop for not fulfilling the norm. Ivanenko was transferred to Camp 35. As a protest against deception on the part of the administration, Vasilev declared a hunger-strike and wrote a statement to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet renouncing his Soviet citizenship.
5 December. Bogin, who had received an injury at work, was sent to the infirmary.
7 December. Aliyev was transported to an unknown destination.
Gyosuva was transferred to 'chemistry'. Investigator Turov of the Poltava KGB, interrogated Marinovich in connection with Straitsov's case. Marinovich refused to give evidence.
9 December. Zaslav was sent to the medical unit because of an injury at work. He came out a few days later.
10 December. Luban, Marinovich, Nilsson, Osipov and Oleh Shevchenko declared a hunger-strike on Human Rights Day. Statements were written in support of Ogorodnikov's demands for the right to possess a Bible, and also demanding the abolition of item 33 of the camp rules which prohibits the writing of statements on behalf of others and about others, and the prohibition of the use of cold and hunger to punish prisoners. In the punishment block Altunyan, Nikiforov and Rudenko declared a hunger-strike (Ogorodnikov continued his hunger-strike).
12 December. Altunyan was sent to the cooler for 10 days for demanding an improvement in living conditions for Rudenko, an invalid of the Great Patriotic War. Captain Rak used physical force on Altunyan while he was changing; he twisted his arms. Altunyan wrote a complaint to Zhuravkov and the USSR Procurator General.
14 December. Balakhonov was given a reprimand for not fulfilling the norm and Shevchenko was deprived of a regular visit (at the end of November he had been deprived of access to the camp shop for the same thing).
16 December. Terleckas was interrogated in connection with the case of Muscovite Ivanov (Skuratov - see Chronicle 63); he gave partial evidence.
18 December. On completion of his sentence, Mitinsh was released straight from the camp.
19 December. Luban was placed in the cooler for 10 days for refusing to work (the refusal, according to Luban, was caused by the effects on him of ultra-sound).
30 December. Baranov was transferred to Camp 35. Zagirnyak and Ivanenko arrived from Camp 35.
1 January. Dmitry Evgeniyevich Donskoi (b. 1958; Russian; arrested in 1979 in the army; the military board of the USSR Supreme Court sentenced him to seven years under article 64 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, the first two years of which he served in Chistopol Prison) arrived in the camp.
2 January. Pushkar was urgently transported to hospital with a diagnosis of 'general peritonitis of the intestines and a bleeding ulcer'.
9 January. Nilsson refused to work due to the poor working conditions.
10 January. Saigyshov (convicted 'for war crimes') died. There were five months left until his release. He had long been promised release on medical grounds on account of, amongst other reasons, his heart disease.
14 January. Kazachenko (convicted 'for war crimes') died of heart disease. Nilsson was given a reprimand for refusing to work.
23 January. Bogin was deprived of access to the camp shop for rudeness in a conversation with the duty officer. In connection with attempts by doctors to deny the existence of a leg injury sustained at work (see '5 December') and to recommend the leg for amputation, Bogin declared a hunger-strike.
25 January. When Bogin was offered light work, he ended his hunger-strike.
31 January. In connection with his forthcoming birthday,
4 February. Chepilov was put in the cooler for 10 days for being rude to the free workers. Kalinin was installed in the cooler for five days for wearing a beard - a regular occurrence. Gavrilov, Dadonov, Lazaruk and Oyes were transported to hospital in Camp 35.

9 February. After four months in the punishment block Rudenko returned to camp. Kalinin came out of the cooler.

10 February. Pushkar returned from hospital.

11 February. Balakhonov was deprived of access to the camp shop for not fulfilling the norm. The temperature in the work-shop is very low and it is very difficult to handle parts which have been washed in brine. 25-year-old Strelen was transported to an unknown destination.

12 February. Cherepanov came out of the cooler.

15 February. Chepilov spread a rumour that, at Marinovich's instigation, Bogin, Veduta and Zagirnyak had attacked him physically. In the presence of Oleg Shevchenko he threatened to kill Marinovich.

16 February. Bogin, Veduta and Zagirnyak were sent to the cooler for a day as a result of a statement by Chepilov. In conversation with administration officials, Marinovich denied Chepilov's accusations against Bogin, Veduta, Zagirnyak and himself; he stated that if Bogin, Veduta and Zagirnyak were severely punished, he would regard this incident as a KGB provocation. During dinner Chepilov spat at Marinovich and Grigoryan several times, for which Grigoryan beat him up.

17 February. Grigoryan was sent to the cooler for five days; Bogin, Veduta and Zagirnyak's time in the cooler was extended to 15 days. An investigator from the Leningrad KGB interrogated Berdzhiiev, Zasiny and Osipov in connection with the case of the Solzhenitsyn Fund; the names of Shcharansky and Tsurkov were mentioned; those interrogated declared their involvement in the affairs of the Fund. The investigator stated that numerous transfers which had come through for the above-named persons had been 'written off'.

19 February. After four months in the punishment block Altunyan returned to the camp; he had received time in the punishment block for 'rudeness to ensigns' (in actual fact, for indignation at their foul language). On the instructions of the Lvo V KGB an investigator of the Preobrazhensky interrogated Marinovich and Rudenko in connection with the case of M. Goryn (Moryn).

21 February. Allyev returned to the camp after spending a long time in Perm for 'prophylaxis'; there he was twice examined by a psychiatrist.

28 February. For celebrating A. Shevchenko's birthday six people, including Shevchenko, were punished with extra duty details. Dordzhi Evbeyev (b. 1922; Kalmyk; in 1945 a military tribunal sentenced him to 20 years under article 58-1A of the RSFSR Criminal Code; in 1955 Evbeyev was released under an amnesty; in 1974 a military tribunal sentenced him to be shot under article 86 of the RSFSR Criminal Code; this was commuted to 15 years' special-regime camp) was transferred to this camp from a special-regime colony.

1 March. Mykola Rudenko was deprived of group 2 invalid status and forced to work eight hours a day. Chepilov was transferred to camp 37.

3 March. Bogin, Veduta and Zagirnyak came out of the cooler.

8 March. The administration prohibited the organization of a tea-drinking party in honour of Zagirnyak's birthday; prisoners drank tea outside, and each one was reported for infringing camp discipline. Malyshev arrived in the camp.

9 March. Four letters from Balakhonov were dispatched; before this his letters had repeatedly been confiscated. Trefimov was pardoned after serving a little over half his sentence (12 years under article 64 of the RSFSR Criminal Code); he was a KGB informer. Trefimov took 40 boxes of books out with him. (After his departure Mikhail Monakov was given the job of artist; since autumn 1981 he has been seeking a pardon, and so has cut off all communication with dissidents, officially refused to sign certain documents which have left the camp by illegal means, attends political lessons, took part in a Leninist 'subbotnik'.

10 March. Allyev was put in the cooler for 15 days for refusing to work. Osipov described how the deputy political instruction officer proposed that he write a statement that dissidents were preventing him from embarking on the road to reform, or rather - the administration would write it and Osipov would sign. For the first time in many months the Procuracy held receiving hours; the
deputy head of section of Perm Regional Procuracy, Vychuzhaninov, on the morning of 10 April Balakhonov was sent to the cooler for not fulfilling the norm. For a number of trivial infringements Niiitsoo was deprived of a visit.

14 March. After four months and ten days Beckiplov came out of the punishment block. He was deprived of a regular visit for not fulfilling the norm.

16 March. Malyshev returned to the camp.

18 March. Balakhonov was sent to the cooler for 10 days for not fulfilling the norm and infringing the rules on dress.

22 March. Osipov was deprived of food norm 2; he refused to work and declared a hunger-strike.

23 March. Beckiplov received a 'short' visit - two hours in a dark room, through glass, with five people from the administration present.

26 March. Balakhonov left the cooler.

30 March. Rudenko was deprived of access to the camp shop for not fulfilling the norm. Niiitsoo was deprived of access to the camp shop for answering in Estonian at a roll-call.

31 March. A senior lecturer from Kharkov Law Institute, Semnov, a senior executive of the Kharkov KGB, Major G. Dolskikh, and Garus, investigator of especially important cases at the Kharkov KGB, arrived from Kharkov. They summoned O. Shevchenko and Altunyan for a talk. Shevchenko refused to take part. After the KGB representative for the zone, Captain Surouvev, had stated that Altunyan was conducting anti-Soviet agitation in the zone, Altunyan broke off the talk and left. After a lecture by Semnov, deputy political information officer Major Kalinovich announced that work was now being carried out in accordance with a government resolution on relations between prisoners and their families.

1 April. For being late for supper, replying in Estonian at a roll-call and an altercation with the detachment during a search in the corridor, Niiitsoo was deprived of access to the camp shop.

In protest Niiitsoo stated that during April he would speak only in Estonian with administration officials of officer rank.

6 April. For refusing to work Ailiyev was sent to the cooler for 10 days. For various trivial infringements Grigoryan was deprived of a regular short visit. Balakhonov was given a reprimand for not fulfilling the norm.

13 April. For not fulfilling the norm and not appearing at work on the morning of 10 April Balakhonov was sent to the cooler for 10 days. (On the morning of 10 April Balakhonov was waiting for the doctor. The doctor prescribed him some medicines but did not give him a sick-note. At ten in the morning Balakhonov was taken out to work.)

16 April. Ailiyev came out of the cooler; for various infringements he was sent to the punishment block for four months. Altunyan, Niiitsoo, Marinovich, Rudenko, Shevchenko, Niiitsoo, farlekas and Zagirnyak sent a statement in defence of Balakhonov. Zagirnyak was put in the punishment block for six months. Veduta for four months for various infringements, including committing an act of violence against Cherapanov.

17 April. 14 prisoners gathered at table to celebrate the Orthodox Easter; Mareevich read a prayer, after which the duty guard ordered this 'sedition' to stop and the participants to disperse. Marinovich, Niiitsoo and Rudenko were put in the cooler for 15 days for 'organizing and taking part in a disorderly gathering'. Altunyan, Niiitsoo and Rudenko sent a statement of protest in their defence. When he had served his time in the punishment block Ogorodnikov was put in the cooler for 10 days for 'arguing with the guards'. (In the punishment block Ogorodnikov kept up a hunger-strike from 26 October 1981 to 29 December 1981, demanding the right of prisoners to possess a Bible, the right to confidence, communion and service with a priest, the right to subscribe to religious publications issued in the USSR, the right to receive religious literature from close friends and relatives and the right to study by correspondence in ecclesiastical colleges of higher education, as well as in protest against the lack of light in the dark cells of the punishment block. On 28 October 1981 Altunyan supported this hunger-strike, also as a protest against the lack of light. On 2 November 1981 Ogorodnikov was interrogated in connection with the case of Nikolai Stepanovich Ignatenko, who was arrested in Keneva, Cherkassy Region under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code [article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code].)

29 April. For celebrating Easter A. Shevchenko was deprived of a regular (long) visit, and Berdnichuk was deprived of access to the camp shop. The Jew Lubman, who wished to greet Orthodox believers on Easter Day, was given extra duty details.

26 April. A general search was carried out; a considerable proportion of prisoners' personal property (clothes, footwear, lines, dishes, food) was confiscated. Under the guise of drawing
up an inventory, several lorry loads of property taken from prisoners were taken away.

27 April. It was announced that the granting of visits had been terminated in connection with the spring thaw.

28 April. For being in the changing-room of the work zone during working hours Shevchenko was deprived of access to the camp shop (he invariably fulfils the norm). For ‘rudeness to an official of the administration’ he was put in the cooler for 10 days (while talking to the deputy political information officer, Shevchenko said to the censor who interrupted the conversation: ‘I’m not talking to you’).

29 April. For ‘insulting the duty officer’ Ogorodnikov’s time in the cooler was extended by five days (in reality, it was because he shared his food with his cell-mates).

1 June. Bogin returned from the central hospital (Camp 35).

2 June. Malyshev received an injury at work - the phalanx of the third finger of his left hand was cut off by guillotine-scissors used for cutting metal.

8 June. Elchin returned to the camp after 14 days in quarantine.

12 June. Zhgenti was put in the cooler for 15 days for ‘rudeness to an official of the administration’. (The evening before he had felt ill but had not managed to see the doctor. In the morning the doctor was not there either so Zhgenti waited for him instead of going to work. Lieutenant-Colonel Fidorov summoned him to the duty building and there a conflict arose between them. Soon afterwards the doctor appeared in the zone and authorized the sending of Zhgenti to the cooler.)

13 June. Lubman was put in the cooler for 15 days for ‘refusing to work’ and in connection with the fact that he had allegedly stated to Major Galeidze that he ‘would fight against the Soviet system’.

14 June. Berdnitschuk was transported to Camp 35.

15 June. ALTUNYAN, BALAKHONOV, DOSKOLI, MARINOVICH, NEKIPOLOV, OGORODNIKOV, RUDENKO and A. SHEVCHECHKO handed statements to Commandant Khorkov of Institution VS-389 (the Perm camp complex) demanding a general meeting of prisoners of Camp 36 on the question of the medical service (in connection with the reasons which led to Zhgenti being punished). Ivan Vraga was released on completion of his sentence.

16 June. Commandant Zhuravkov of Camp 36 said to ALTUNYAN, MARINOVICH and NEKIPOLOV that the statements they handed in the previous day would not be dispatched as they were of a collective character and came under 33 of the camp rules. He accused NEKIPOLOV of organizing this action.

17 June. NEKIPOLOV was told that his letter to his wife of 1 June had been confiscated as ‘suspicious in content’. In connection with this he was told that according to a new interpretation of the rules by the Procuracy he could not now re-write his confiscated letter. Later he was shown a letter from Khorkov dated 28 April:

According to the explanation received from the Procuracy of Perm Region No. 9-116 dated 13.4.82 in answer to our inquiry... the procedure for dispatching the letters and correspondence of prisoners is regulated by item 34 of the Rules on Internal Order. All letters handed in for dispatch, including confiscated ones, should in future be counted as part of the quota stipulated by article 64 of the RSFSR Corrective Labour Code.

21 June. After 14 days in quarantine MKRTCHYAN returned to the camp. In connection with the Day of the Medical Worker, ALTUNYAN, BALAKHONOV, BOGIN, DOSKOLI, ELCHIN, ZASIMOV, LUBMAN, MARINOVICH, NEKIPOLOV, NILSLO, OGORODNIKOV, RUDENKO and O. SHEVCHECHKO sent complaints to different Procuracies about the medical service in Camp 36: the regular absence of the head of the medical unit Pchelnikov at the appointed reception hours and the impossibility of sick prisoners being received by him in the morning before work, the lack of the most essential medicines in the medical unit and at the chemist’s at work, the lack of a dentist, the poor laundry service and unsatisfactory sanitary conditions, the general policy of the administration to refuse to hospitalise or send dissidents for examination.

22 June. MKRTCHYAN was summoned for a talk with KGB officers from Armenia. RUE was transported to Camp 37. NULSH arrived from Camp 37.

Camp 37
At the beginning of the year ARKADY TSURKOV was transferred to Chistopol Prison.

On 2 April the brother of MARZPET ARUTYUNYAN, SHAGEN ARUTYUNYAN, sent complaints to the USSR Procurator-General and the USSR Minister of Internal Affairs:

On 16 March we were allowed a visit on the condition that we spoke only in Russian, our native language was prohibited; if a
single word was spoken in our native language the visit would be stopped. Is this in accordance with the norms of socialist legality and the Corrective Labour Code? Since my brother, his wife and children do not yet know Russian, we were unwilling to agree to such a visit. However, we were forced to agree just to convince ourselves that Marzpet was alive, especially as we had travelled thousands of kilometres and spent a vast sum of money (just the fare there and back cost us about 400 roubles; for the record, the salary of my brother’s wife, Mkrtchyan Anush consists of 150 roubles [per month]). So in effect there was no visit.

...For several months my brother has not received any letters from us, but before our visit he was handed five of our letters sent over a period of four months. How can you explain this? What is this — a moral and psychological attack on his psyche, intended to keep my seriously ill brother in a state of anxiety, or a refined method of dealing with political prisoners?

...I consider it particularly important to draw your attention to the following. In December 1981 the wife of Marzpet Arutyunyan, Anush Mkrtchyan, appealed to you to transfer my brother to another camp in the Mordovian ASSR. She received an answer not from you but from Corrective Labour Institution VS-389/37, in which it was reported that the state of health of the prisoner M.A. Arutyunyan had been checked and found to be satisfactory, and there were no grounds for his transfer to another corrective-labour colony. The same reply also came from the medical administration of the USSR MVD dated 22.12.81, No.4640.

But during our visit we had difficulty in recognizing Marzpet Arutyunyan: my brother had become terrifyingly thin and could hardly stand. We are therefore compelled to appeal to you again to intervene as a matter of urgency and not to entrust this to your subordinates, as the slightest delay could cost my brother his life. The Perm region with its harsh climate is fatal to his health. We beg you to accede to our request and save my brother’s life.

In statements to Brezhnev and to the Public Health Administration of the USSR MVD Anush Mkrtchyan asks for her husband to be transferred to one of the central prison hospitals in Moscow, Leningrad or Kazan.

At the end of April Yu. Orlov came out of the punishment block (Chronicle 63).

In Other Prisons and Camps

Since 13 December 1981 Lokshin (for his trial see this issue) has been serving his sentence at the following address: 428016, Chuvashskaya ASSR, Cheboksarsky r-n, pos. Lopsary, uchr. Yul. 34/14/1. On 8 January 1982 he asked the head of his detail to allow him not to go outside to clear snow as he had toothache and his cheek was swollen. In reply he was given 10 days in the cooler. In the cooler he declared a hunger-strike. Every two days he was force-fed. On 18 January he was given another six days in the cooler for having prohibited objects (notes, sheets of paper — whatever was in his pockets when he was sent to the cooler) in his possession during his first stay in the cooler.

Eskorov (for his trial see this issue) is serving his sentence at the following address: 735310, Tadzhikskaya ASSR, Darvazsky r-n, pos. Indushek, uchr. YaS-3/5. The camp is overrun with lice; their bites cause sores to form on the body.

At the end of March Boris Chernobylsky (for his trial see Chronicle 63) arrived at camp: Magadanskaya obl., g. Susuman, uchr. Yu. Orlov came out of the punishment block (Chronicle 63).
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Chronicle 63) was transferred to a camp with the address: Dzhambulskaya obl., g. Zhanatas, uchr. Zh-158/3-8. In April compulsory morning exercises and drill were introduced in the camp. Skvirsky and a few others refused to take part in these activities. They are being threatened.

Bogdan Chuiko (Chronicles 56, 57, 61) is serving his sentence in a special-regime camp at the following address: Permskaya obl., Solikamsky r-n, pos. Sim, uchr. AM-244/1-2. For the first two months Chuiko taught in a school for prisoners; a KGB official banned this. In March Chuiko completed a third of his sentence and applied for a transfer from cell type premises to barracks (article 51 of the RSFSR Corrective Labour Code); he was refused. Chuiko has high blood pressure (200-120); he is being given injections. (See also 'Addenda and Corrigenda'.)

Not later than April Yaroslav Lesiv (for his trial see Chronicle 63) was transferred to a camp with the following address: 349348, Voroshilovgradskaya obl., g. Sukhodolsk-1, uchr. UL-314/36-2-29. He has thrombosis, a stomach ulcer, advanced myopia (-15).

The address of Nikolai Gorbal's new camp (Chronicle 57): 329013, Nikolayevskaya obl., Kazanovsky r-n, st. Novodanilovka, uchr. IN-316/93-1.

Since October 1981 Stanislav Zubko (for his trial see Chronicle 63) has suffered from rheumatic arthritis, swollen fingers, dizziness, pains in his heart. After numerous complaints to Moscow and Kiev Zubko was issued with warm underwear. In the spring of 1982 he was transferred to lighter work - winding ribbons onto spools.

Baptist Sergei Volkov (arrested in June 1980, under article 162 part 2 of the RSFSR Criminal Code - 'Engaging in a prohibited trade' - sentenced to three years' ordinary-regime) was transferred from camp to a hospital for tubercular patients not later than February. Because of a disease of the joints Alexander Magnidovich (Chronicle 62) cannot bend his fingers; therefore he cannot fulfill the norm (he is supposed to weave nets) and for this he is put in the cooler (from January to March he was in the cooler three times). There are 1500 people in the camp. 30 of whom are permanently in the 'brigade of dystrophics'. In February Magnidovich was in hospital (bronchitis or pneumonia).

In February Alexander Lavut (Chronicle 63) came out of the punishment block. A few days later, at the request of a camp inmate he exchanged quilted jackets with him, after which he was searched and 'prohibited objects' (razor blades) were found in the jacket. Yet again (Chronicle 62) Lavut was deprived of a long visit. On 17 February a Medical Work Fitness Commission decided that Lavut was suffering from coronary cardio-sclerosis and chronic thrombo-phlebitis of the surface veins of the right shin. On 26 April he was sent to hospital.

On 26 November 1981 Camp CommandantAgafonov of 'institution UKh-16/8' informed the parents of Seraphim Evsyukov (Chronicle 63): 'We cannot allow a long visit. Evsyukov infringes camp discipline.' On 22 March 1982 the deputy Commandant of the Omsk Administration of Corrective Labour Institutions, B.P. Shulitin wrote to them: 'S.S. Evsyukov...did not commit infringements of discipline while he was in institution UKh 16/8...As regards permitting visits...no restrictions or impediments are being imposed on him.' Books sent to Evsyukov through 'Book-post' were returned to the shop by the camp. In the same reply from Shulitin: 'Prisoners in Corrective Labour Institutions can obtain literature by "book-post" if it is charged to their personal accounts.' His parents forwarded the magazine Ogonyok to their son. A camp official receives this magazine but does not pass it on to Evsyukov. Letters from Evsyukov do not reach their destination. On 12 May Evsyukov was placed in hospital. On 3 June Evsyukov's parents addressed a routine complaint to the Party Central Committee. At the end of April Aleksai Mysanuk (Chronicle 62) was deprived of a parcel.

On 3 February Valery Abramkin (Chronicle 63) refused to talk to Inspector Kvetny of the operations unit and wrote a statement asking for Kvetny to be removed from work with him as Kvetny treated him in a hostile and prejudiced manner, behaved insultingly and was fabricating some new evil. Deputy Camp Commandant Bregakiev prepared an order that Abramkin be placed in the punishment block, but prior to that Abramkin was summoned by Camp Commandant Gorzhei. Abramkin told Gorzhei that there was no point inventing false reasons for punishing him - he realised in any case why they wanted to put him in the punishment block.
According to Abramkin, Gorzhei was embarrassed and signed an order depriving him of a parcel and 'access to the camp shop' for a month for exchanging a packet of tea for a packet of sugar. In camp it is an accepted practice for prisoners to give up their 20 g. of sugar to the cleaner, who does not receive money for cleaning: as a result they are left without any sugar and the cleaner with a large amount of it; Abramkin had given the cleaner a packet of tea he had bought in the camp shop in exchange for some sugar and for going to the bath-house without permission (Abramkin went back to the bath-house for some mittens he had forgotten). Before signing the order, Abramkin wrote that he did not agree with the order - in actual fact it was illegal to deprive prisoners of sugar to which they were entitled.

From a letter by Abramkin:

Sickness has swept over me. Of the stomach and intestines. Sometimes for a week or two, I can't eat a thing. You grab a piece of bread to eat each day - nothing else will go down. You feel terrifyingly weak. Your legs won't work and so naturally you've got no appetite. You try to drive it away surreptitiously with something you've bought, and your gut seizes up. Especially in winter with the draughts, frosts and other 'comforts' here you permanently have inflamed haemorrhoids and bleeding. To begin with just now and again, then of its own accord. Without rhyme or reason.

Initially I was afraid to go to the doctors (for good reason, I think). In January I could not hold out any longer. I feel like describing my medical adventures. In all my visits I was not examined even once. They would listen, nod and say: every other person here has it. They'd prescribe tablets, injections. When my strength failed completely, they carried out an examination on my stomach but the acidity turned out to be normal. In order to determine whether there was any bleeding (at this point I got angry and said straight out that that wasn't hard to do - the blood was dripping out at that very minute; the doctor - stupid cow - chose to ignore this), they took some faeces: they discovered there was fresh blood (either 1:3 or 3:1). The analysis of the blood for haemoglobin produced the result 13 (which they say is normal). They gave me three days off work (just lying down for a bit I began to feel better). But when I went for an extension, they looked at me as if I were an idiot and discharged me on the spot without even asking whether I felt better or not.

There is something else: the operations men [KGB] pester me especially persistently on crisis (health-wise) days, and it cannot be ruled out that they have found out about this from my visits to the medical unit.

I'll describe my sickness to the end. A sort of rash or allergy has attacked me. I was prescribed a sulphuric ointment which at first made me scratch myself all over, but it didn't do much good.

In a camp in Uglich Kirill Podrabinek (Chronicle 63) made a protest against the administration's cruel treatment of prisoners by declaring a hunger-strike and calling on others to join it. He was put in the cooler and held there for 19 days; all this time he kept up a hunger-strike.


A few days later the exercise book in which he wrote his poems was confiscated from him. As a mark of protest Kirill slashed his wrists, but this time his poems were not returned to him (see Chronicle 62). He was put in the cooler for 15 days, where he kept up a hunger-strike.

As a result of an injury to the nerve in his funny-bone when he slashed himself, the little finger and third finger of his right hand are bent over and cannot unbend, the muscles in his arm are atrophied. He weighs 62 kgs. with a height of 178 cms., he is emaciated, thoroughly weak, takes short sharp breaths when he moves, sweats a lot, his temperature is unstable. Tuberculosis of the upper part of the right lung has been diagnosed at the consolidation stage and rheumatic myocarditis. Treatment is not being administered. The special diet prescribed by the doctor on his arrival in prison has been cancelled by the administration as 'withdrawal of an undeserved privilege'.

From 12 September 1981 to 5 January 1982 Alexander Podrabinek (Chronicle 63) was in the cooler without interruption.

On 2 March the Moscow Helsinki Group released Document No.193 'New Repressive Measures against the Podrabinek Family'. This document describes not only the camp life of the Podrabinek...
brothers, but also the persecution of their father Pinkhos Abramovich Podrabinek. On 9 February the People’s Court of Elektrostal, Moscow Region, presided over by Turkin, deprived him of the right to the accommodation (a room of 13 sq. metres) in which he had been registered since 1957, insofar as he was not residing there (in 1975 P.A. Podrabinek got married and went to live in his wife’s accommodation, using his own room as an office). P.A. Podrabinek took part in the Great Patriotic War, was awarded medals, is a Candidate of Medical Sciences, worked as a doctor for 30 years, is now a pensioner.

At the end of June P.A. Podrabinek in Elektrostal was invited for a ‘chat’ by KGB officer Ryabchikov. Ryabchikov showed Podrabinek a letter to the Ryazan KGB from a certain prisoner, stating that Kirill Podrabinek had advised him to seek help from his father P.A. Podrabinek to publicise the injustices he had suffered at the hands of the camp administration. Ryabchikov stated that the given letter could serve as grounds for determining a new charge against Kirill Podrabinek and cost him another term of imprisonment. In order to save Kirill from this, P. Podrabinek should cease all activity. Besides this, he asked whether P. Podrabinek would pass on the afore—mentioned information to the West.

P. Podrabinek replied that he would not pass on the information as he did not respect criminals; besides, the letter could not serve as grounds for instituting a new criminal case against his son. He was interested in what Ryabchikov meant by ‘ceasing all activity’. Ryabchikov explained that P. Podrabinek should give up his membership of the Soviet section of Amnesty International and, in any case, resign as secretary of the executive group of the section (Chronicle 63); he should stop publishing articles in the Bulletin of Amnesty International (Chronicle 63).

He was insistent in his recommendation that he have a good think about all this. P. Podrabinek promised to ‘have a think’. At the end of their ‘chat’ Ryabchikov demanded that its subject be kept secret. P. Podrabinek refused to give such a promise.

In December 1980 Vladimir Kislik (Chronicle 63) was conditionally released and ‘assigned to compulsory work’. He was sent to Zhdanov (see ‘Under Sentence of Compulsory Work at Official Direction’).

In March 1982 Yury Grimm (Chronicle 63) was conditionally released and ‘assigned to compulsory work’. He was sent to Borovsky Settlement, Tyumen Region.

Statements by Political Prisoners

On 23 August 1981 prisoner of Perm camp 36 Viktor Niitsoo and prisoner of Perm camp 37 Tiit Nadisson sent statements to the Soviet government in which they reported that they were associating themselves with the letter from 45 citizens of the Baltic republics on the subject of the secret protocols attached to the ‘Molotov—Ribbentrop’ pact of 23 August 1939 (in Chronicle 54 48 signatures are mentioned).
Helsinki Agreement subjects people who speak out for the observance of the humanitarian articles of the Act to repression. It is impossible to talk of the fulfilment by that country of the international obligations assumed by them.

An essential condition for fruitful international co-operation and mutual trust between the countries participating in the Madrid Conference is the immediate release of members of the Helsinki groups in the USSR and all prisoners of conscience.


His humane appearance, his difficult lot say to naive fools who are blinded by the 'new peace initiatives' and are prepared over and over again to trust in the exhortations of a totalitarian regime: 'Don't believe them! Remember Yury Orlav!'

Like a true scientist, he proved on himself, by his own example, what was already evident - they themselves do not believe in what they promise. And say the pen which signed the proposals with such a flourish tremble in your hand. For a start - demand a deposit. As a guarantee, demand this one small thing: the release of prisoners who defend human rights, and amongst them, the physicist Yury Fedorovich Orlav.

P. Fedorova, L. Murzhenko: 'To Dr Daniel Jacoby' (27 January 1982)

Fedorov is suffering from the following serious illnesses
1) chronic nephritis (kidney disease)
2) chronic cholecystitis
3) arthritis
4) arthritis of the knee joints, the right hand and the right shoulder joint
5) eczema
6) chronic conjunctivitis
7) bleeding haemorrhoids with prolapsus of the straight intestine
8) chronic gastritis
9) vitamin deficiency

Murzhenko is suffering from the following illnesses
1) stenocardia (angina pectoris)
2) tuberculosis
3) chronic gastritis

4) colitis
5) inguinal and scrotal hernias
6) vitamin deficiency
7) arthritis of the shoulder joint

All these illnesses have been contracted in special-regime camps. Our repeated appeals to all Soviet institutions have been unsuccessful. 1. Yu. Fedorov's mother, hardly recognized my son at our last meeting on 15 September 1981.

I, A. Murzhenko's wife, am separated from my husband and our small daughters are growing up without a father. On 3 December Murzhenko's mother died; she could not wait for her son to the end.

We beg you to help us with our petitions to the government to pardon Fedorov and Murzhenko as all those involved in the aeroplane case were released long ago, before the end of their sentences.

On 2 February P. Fedorova and L. Murzhenko appealed to the participants of the Madrid Conference. They asked them to 'raise the question of the release of Yu. Fedorov and A. Murzhenko'.

On 19 February P. Fedorova and L. Murzhenko sent a request for a pardon to Brezhnev.

E. Bonner, I. Milgrom, I. Nudel, R. Khasina: 'To the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, L.I. Brezhnev' (14 June 1982)

On 15 June it will be 12 years since the day Yury Fedorov and Alexei Murzhenko were arrested. All those convicted in this case have been released, including the five people pardoned by you personally in 1979. We ask you to show humanity and mercy to the prisoners and their families who have suffered so long, and to pardon Fedorov and Murzhenko.

A. Sakharov: 'To the President of France, Citizen Mitterand' (20 January 1982)

I have a big favour to ask of you: to intervene on the fate of prisoners of conscience in the USSR, including Anatoly Shcharansky.

I am deeply grateful to you for your support during my hunger-strike. Your appeal to L. I. Brezhnev was without a doubt one of the main factors which helped to resolve this tragic situation. I am convinced that the positive solution of this problem has a significance far beyond the purely personal.
In this letter I particularly want to draw your attention to the fate of Anatoly Shcharansky. More than 80 years ago your country was shaken by the Dreyfus affair. The Shcharansky affair has many similar features to it. Shcharansky, like Dreyfus at one time, was convicted on a trumped up charge of espionage. His sentence is very harsh - 13 years of imprisonment. The main purpose of this provocation is to frighten Jews in the USSR, especially those who are thinking of emigration. Shcharansky was chosen as a victim since he is not only a member of the Jewish movement for the right to leave, but also an active member of the struggle in defence of all human rights in the USSR. So yet another goal was being pursued - to inflict a blow on the general human rights movement and separate it from the purely Jewish movement.

The participation of France with its ever growing influence and ancient democratic traditions and of you as President of the country in the campaign for Shcharansky's release would be of great, perhaps decisive, significance for his fate and his life.


...And now, when Anatoly Shcharansky's health has been most seriously undermined by the inhuman camp regime and constant spells in the lock-up, urgent measures must be taken to secure his release. Now is not the time for academic composure and diplomatic hush. Everything possible must be done at every level to save the life of this courageous man.

It is appropriate to address the participants of the Madrid Conference about this case. If the Helsinki Agreement is worth the paper it is written on, try to ensure that the Soviet leaders fully carry out the undertakings the Soviet government has already signed, that it has already guaranteed on paper - freedom of emigration, freedom of conscience, exchanges, correspondence, in short, every aspect of this problem, which it is now trying to bury in talks about verification measures and military detente. Don't let yourselves be duped yet again by false promises and bribes.

* * *

A. Sakharov: 'Letter to Soviet Scientists' (30 March 1982)

I have learned from foreign radio broadcasts that the Sakharov, Orlow and Shcharansky Defence Committee (USA) has called on Soviet scientists to speak out in defence of the family of biologist Sergel Kovaliev - himself, his daughter-in-law Tatyana Usipova and his son Ivan. I am sure that many of you have also heard this appeal. I ask you to treat it with the utmost seriousness and to undertake whatever actions are dictated to each one of you by his sense of civic responsibility and conscience, in this particular case and in others where your intervention would also be of exceptional importance.

Over the course of many years I have witnessed almost total inactivity on the part of my Soviet colleagues in science in matters concerning the defence of human rights. It is shameful to see foreign scientists (deepest gratitude to them) showing more concern for our affairs than we do ourselves. I am referring here, first and foremost, to those who occupy a fairly high and independent position - to Academicians and Corresponding Members of the USSR Academy of Sciences to be specific. I know that certain of you treat my statements on general matters negatively or sceptically. But this is not a general matter (on which I have always expressed my opinion by way of discussion and have never forced my opinion on anyone); these are actual human lives, including those of your scientific colleagues. Each one of you who has shown a minimal interest will will form his own opinion on these matters, on the full extent of the injustice and cruelty of the repression. You cannot regard these matters as of no concern to you - the historical experience of our country, professional solidarity, simple human sensitivity to the fate of others, in some cases personal relations with those repressed (many amongst you know Orlow, Kovaliev or others personally), make such a position untenable. You do not have to refer to work interests, or the need to keep your personal official position for the sake of the cause. The majority of you are, in reality, in a stable enough position. As for the interests of science, they specifically include the defence of members of the scientific community against injustice as well as a sense of civic responsibility. It is no longer the Stalinist era; these days virtually nothing threatens any of you. But can you completely rule out a return to a new period of mass repressions? If that does occur, your inertia now will be one of the reasons for it.

On the other hand, civic action and independence by just a few of the country's major scientists could have a very deep and
beneficial influence on the whole situation, could help it recover, and could any of you say with his hand on his heart that this is not absolutely essential? It is precisely this, more than anything else, that would facilitate international scientific communication and, on a broader scale, international trust and peace throughout the world. Such is the extent of the individual, personal responsibility of each one of you.

A. Balanchivadze, E. Amashukeli, V. Andzhaparidze: 'To the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, L.I. Brezhnev' (April 1982)

... request you to show humanity towards the Georgian musicologist Merab Kostava, who is now under arrest for the second time (Chronicle 63 - Chronicle).

Merab Kostava is well known to the Georgian public as a talented musicologist and theatre critic. He was engaged in creative activity and for a number of years contributed to our periodical publications. His articles were published in the journals Sabchota Khelovneba, Kritika, and the newspaper Literaturuli Sakartvelo. He threw light on topical problems concerning the development of our musical culture, devoted articles both to skilful masters of the stage as well as to amateur performers and actors; he wrote about general problems of musicology and analysed classical works. In the field of drama he devoted interesting articles to the productions of the Rustaveli theatre troupe.

While in exile in the village of Kvitok, Irkutsk region, M. Kostava engaged in praiseworthy activities: he taught in a local music school, organized concerts in a club, and the local people speak favourably of him.

In December 1981 M. Kostava was sentenced by Taishet Court to five years and one month's imprisonment (before this he had served three years in camp and almost two years in exile).

From a whole range of circumstances it appears that the charge against him (insulting a policeman) is groundless; this is particularly evident from the complaints of witness Galina Vasilevna Popova about the illegal arrest of M. Kostava. We request your intervention and assistance in a review of the case, the restoration of legality and the release of M. Kostava, whose health has been undermined over the last few years.

R. Altunyan: 'To the Procurator of the Ukrainian SSR' (1982)

'A complaint (in the form of surveillance)', sent by the wife of

Genrikh Altunyan (for his trial see Chronicle 62) in connection with her husband's case.

Yu. Naksiov: 'To the International Red Cross' (3 June 1982)

I turned for help (as regards emigration - see 'The Right to Leave' - Chronicle) to Moscow circles which defend human rights and, as far as may be judged from the circumstances of my life, received it. But those who once helped me have turned out to be in an even worse situation: they are in prison. It would be unfair of me to remain silent about them. They are Tatyana Mikhailovna Velikanova, Ivan Kovaliov, Tanya Osipova, Vyacheslav Bakhmin... It is very impertinent on my part to send a letter by Soviet post asking for their release. But I beg you: save them!

Releases

In 1981 Taras Melnychuk (Chronicle 55) was released half-way through his sentence.

In January 1982 Eduard Arutyunyan (for his trial see Chronicle 56) was released at the end of his sentence.

In February Yadviga Stanelite (for her trial see Chronicle 60) was conditionally released before the end of her sentence.

In February Miron San-Zhuravkovsky (for his trial see Chronicle 60) was released at the end of his sentence.

At the end of April Rashat Dzhemilev (for his trial see Chronicle 55) was released at the end of his three-year sentence.

In the middle of April Genovevite Navickaite (for his trial see Chronicle 60) was released at the end of his sentence.

On 13 May Igor Korchmaz (for his trial see Chronicle 55) was released at the end of his sentence. On his return to Leningrad he again received a summons to the Military Registration Office.

At the beginning of June Sergei Gorbachev (for his trial see Chronicle 58) was released at the end of his sentence.
On 24 December 1981 A.D. Sakharov was discharged from hospital (see Chronicle 63: 'The departure of Elizaveta Alekseyeva'). In the hospital documents it was recorded that from 4 to 24 December Sakharov 'was hospitalised due to the effects of a protracted, deliberate fast'. When Sakharov asked for a copy of his medical notes, the reply was given that it had been sent to the head doctor of the health centre in the area where he lived (Sakharov has not once been to this health centre).

On 26 December Sakharov began to suffer from heart pains again and no longer left the house.

On 18 January 1982 G. Kalistratova, M. Petrovko-Podyapolskaya, B. Altshuler, G. Vladimirov and Yu. Shikhanovich sent a letter to the President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician A.P. Aleksandrov:

Respected Anatoly Petrovich,

We, friends of Academician Andrei Dmitrievich Sakharov, consider it necessary to report that on 24 December Sakharov was urgently discharged from hospital and returned to his guarded flat, since when he has been deprived of any medical attention or assistance. The administration of Semashko hospital in the city of Gorky has refused Sakharov's request to hand over to him a copy of his medical notes.

As far as we know, the Academy of Sciences is doing nothing to obtain objective information about Sakharov's situation and is not making any attempt to enter into direct contact with him. For two years the Academy has ignored the 'Sakharov problem' and even when he has been deprived of any medical attention or assistance. The administration of Semashko hospital in the city of Gorky has refused Sakharov's request to hand over to him a copy of his medical notes.

As a man of the older generation, you know well what price the country paid for such lawless practices.

We call on you and in your person the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences to review the Academy's position in the affair of Academician Sakharov.

We regard this as an open letter.

(Copies of this letter were sent to the newspaper Izvestia and to Academicians E.P. Velikhov, Yu.A. Ovchinnikov and G.K. Skryabin.)

On 24 January Sakharov again sent a letter to A.P. Aleksandrov:

After reminding him that he had been deprived of medical assistance from the USSR Academy of Sciences for two years now, Sakharov, in connection with his heart pains which had become more frequent, petitioned him to give him a place in one of the Academy's sanatoria.

A.P. Aleksandrov's assistant communicated his reply to Bonner:

'It is out of the question!'

On 19 January Sakharov answered questions from a UPI correspondent:

1) Does the decision to allow Liza Alekseyeva to leave the USSR reflect any improvement in the attitude of the Soviet authorities to the problem of human rights or was the decision exceptional?

In the official communication on the permission for Liza to leave the authorities considered it necessary to emphasise that this decision - in actual fact, the only legal one - had been taken by way of an exception. We know that it was the result of world-wide international support for our demands and of our firmness; up till the very last day the authorities tried to intimidate and to break us. To do this they forcibly separated my wife and me when we were...
hospitalized; even on the morning of 8 December (the day when the decision was taken) they tried to intimidate us in every way. The decision was exceptional, but the achievement of a positive decision has a general significance as a matter of principle for the human rights struggle as a whole, for the understanding by people in the West of the situation in the USSR, especially because so many people joined in this struggle and not only by virtue of my personal authority.

2) Will you declare a hunger-strike on another occasion? If so, for what reason?

In this question of yours I detect a desire for sensation, for strong feelings perhaps, but this is alien to me. An indefinite hunger-strike is an extreme measure, a second one even more so, and in general I am against such measures, but the taking of a hostage, especially one connected with me, and my public activity, was something I could not endure.

3) What did you think about during your hunger-strike?

My main thought was a conviction that the decision we had taken to go on hunger-strike was right and the only possible one whatever its outcome. This created the right frame of mind which allowed us to live peacefully; it even created a good mood for reading, listening to music, watching television, I did a little work. It gave us strength to withstand the pressure of the authorities on the most difficult last four days, when we knew nothing about each other.

4) If the authorities gave permission, would you and your wife leave the USSR? Where would you go?

I won’t discuss a situation that doesn’t exist. My wish is for an end to illegal actions against myself and all prisoners of conscience, for the general right to leave the country freely and return freely. I wish to see close friends and relatives who have been forced to emigrate, to see the world.

5) Does the introduction of martial law in Poland signify an end to the trade union Solidarity?

A movement of ten million people, conscious of their rights and strength, who are fighting for a better, more just and viable pluralistic society within the framework of the existing system, cannot disappear without trace, however dismal and complex the situation might be now.

6) In your opinion is there any possibility in other socialist countries for an experiment in liberalization? In which of them is success possible?

Liberalization is not an experiment (which would always signify voluntarism) but a process which takes place when it becomes historically inevitable. Prognoses and a specific analysis of different countries are not my speciality.

7) Should President Reagan adopt a tougher position towards the USSR? What specifically should he do?

I do not consider I have the right to give specific advice to a head of state. My general position is explained in the article “What the USA and the USSR Should Do to Preserve Peace”. It basically advocates negotiation from a position of unity and firmness by the West and a readiness to compromise, a gradual transition from mutual nuclear deterrence to a strategic balance of conventional weapons.

8) The dissident movement in the USSR is in disarray. Is there a way to reorganize it?

The strength of the struggle for human rights does not lie in its organization or the number of its participants. It is a moral strength, a strength of unconditional rightness. This movement cannot disappear without trace. A word already spoken lives on, and new people with their unique destinies and souls continually make new contributions.

On 24 January Sakharov wrote:

Two years in Gorky

Two years have passed since I was exiled to Gorky. This exile and the prescribed regime of isolation are totally illegal. To some extent the final straw might have been my statements against the invasion of Afghanistan. But probably the main reason [for my exile] was the fact that illegal repressive measures were taken against me openly as part of a general plan to suppress dissidents in the USSR. Over the last few years many have been arrested and convicted (some repeatedly and particularly cruelly), amongst them my friends and others who have done a great deal for the non-violent defence of human rights. Their fate is often extremely tragic. They are: Velikanova, Orlov, Shcharansky, Marchenko, Yakunin, A. Podrabinek, R. Rudenke, G. Matushevich, I. Kovalyov, Osipova, Ternovsky, Volkov, Kandzha, Stus, Bolonkin, Landa, Lavut, Bahain and many others. There is no doubt that these repressive measures, including my deportation, conflict with
the right to freedom of belief and exchange of information, precluding an open society, and thereby with international trust, security and stability, the Helsinki Agreement and other international obligations of the USSR. It is also crucial that during the same period other alarming phenomena have occurred: in particular, the nature of propaganda in the Soviet press has changed, having become more hostile and one-sided, and the number of those given permission to emigrate has sharply declined, against a background of a worsening economic situation in the country with shortages of food and other goods. All of this is contrary to the underlying interests of our country, which is vitally in need of pluralistic reforms to get out of an economic and social impasse, and not of new repressive measures and intensified expansion. But at the moment our state shows no inclination to institute reforms and is directly or indirectly impeding these necessary processes within its sphere of influence. I have followed the events in Poland during these years with intense interest. I am sure that the position of the majority of the Solidarity leaders, supported by millions of workers, peasants and intelligentsia and many members of the PZPR [Polish Workers Party], is in accordance with the Polish interests and does not constitute a threat to the foundations of its system and even less so to neighbouring states, and that only pressure from outside led to difficulties in the end and to the present tragedy. I am, however, convinced that the future lies with a pluralistic path of development, with an open society as the only flexible and viable one which will not threaten international security. The future course of events in Poland will, I hope, bear this out.

In the summer of 1980 I addressed a letter to L.I. Brezhnev in which I set forth my thoughts on ways of solving the Afghan tragedy (Chronicle 57 - Chronicle). I attach great significance to this document. In 1981 I produced the articles 'The Responsibility of Scientists' and 'What the USA and the USSR Should Do to Preserve Peace'.

During the final months of the past year international support helped in solving a difficult problem which was of vital importance to me: an end to my daughter-in-law being held hostage and her re-unification with my son. My wife and I were forced to take an extreme measure - an indefinite hunger-strike; we are deeply convinced that this step was the only right one and that the positive solution has not only a personal but also a wider, general significance, especially for the vital principle of freedom to choose one's country of residence.

Over the whole course of these years the only link between myself and the outside world, my support during my difficult and paradoxical life in Gorky, has been my wife. It is important for me that everyone who speaks out in my defence should understand the complexity and difficulty of her situation.

I am filled with a feeling of gratitude towards my friends in the USSR and throughout the world, and with deep anxiety for those subjected to repression and for those threatened with repressive measures. I live in the hope that good will eventually triumph.

On 21 February Sakharov sent a telegram to the American astronomer Gerels:

Dear Dr Gerels,

I learned with great excitement that the small planet No.19 discovered by you had, at your suggestion, been named after me. This is really a great honour for me. I regard it as a sign of generous support not only for me personally, but for all who speak out for human rights and openness.

I am deeply grateful to you. I wish you and your family all the very best.

* *

On 10 January Sakharov and N. Nelina appealed to 'The Madrid Conference' in defence of Yury Orlov (see 'In the Prisons and Camps').

On 20 January Sakharov wrote 'To the President of France, Citizen Mitterand' in defence of Anatoly Shecharansky (see 'In the Prisons and Camps').

On 19 February Sakharov wrote 'In defence of Georgy Vladinov'.

On 19 February Sakharov wrote 'In defence of Sofia Kalistratova'.

On 30 March Sakharov wrote a 'Letter to Soviet Scientists' regarding political prisoners who were scientific workers (see 'In the Prisons and Camps').

On 3 April Sakharov wrote 'In defence of Ivan Kovalév' (see 'The Trial of Ivan Kovalév').
On 5 March Mark Kovner (Chronicle 56) was summoned to the Gorky KGB. He was asked why he signed letters in defence of Sakharov and whether he had passed them on to foreign correspondents. Kovner refused to answer.

At the end of January Boris Altshuler was deprived of his teaching work at the Moscow Polygraphic Institute. On 1 March he was dismissed. The same day two KGB officials arrived at his mother-in-law's and conducted an hour-long conversation with her. The essence of the conversation was: 'The help which Altshuler is giving Academician Sakharov is criminal, anti-State activity. The KGB has enough evidence to bring him to trial. Altshuler must either cease his activity or emigrate. Otherwise he will be arrested in the near future and won't see his children for another seven to ten years.'

On 17 March KGB officers had a similar conversation with Altshuler's wife. On 19 May Soviet KGB officials told her: 'The proposal to emigrate made earlier was a trick. We will not authorize your departure abroad. Moreover, your husband must cut off all help to the Academician (his name was not mentioned - Chronicle) and cut off all contact with his wife. Otherwise we will do with him what we warned you about during our previous conversation.'

On 31 May Sakharov wrote a letter:
In Defence of Boris Altshuler
At the present time a threat of arrest is hanging over Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, B.L. Altshuler. The KGB is threatening him in the form of an ultimatum. He has been dismissed from his job. At first the KGB demanded that he emigrate, but when he expressed readiness to take this step, a difficult one for him, in order to save his family, a KGB official stated that there could be no question of this; he must cease all participation in public matters, sign nothing and, most importantly, break off all communication with me through my wife. He is allegedly the link connecting me with scientists in the USSR Academy of Sciences (which is, of course, a total absurdity). If he does not carry out these demands, he won't see his children again for a long time. The real reason for these very serious threats is the fact that my colleague, physicist and theoretician Boris Altshuler, has indeed been connected with me for a long time. In the 1960s I was the official opponent when he defended his dissertation. In the years that followed I often met him at scientific seminars. After my deportation Boris was amongst those who kept up relations with my wife: he does what he can to help her in everyday matters, sometimes accompanying her to the station and carrying heavy bags. Boris Altshuler regularly selects scientific literature for me and reports on scientific conferences and seminars which have taken place in Moscow. It is difficult to over-estimate the significance of this for my scientific work. Altshuler wrote a splendid article in the anniversary collection dedicated to me on my 60th birthday. But could this really be the reason for such persecution?

I draw the attention of society and especially the scientific community, to the threatening situation which has been created and hope for support in the event of possible future complications.

On 2 June Altshuler was given a warning at the police station that he could be prosecuted for 'parasitism' (under article 209 of the RSFSR Criminal Code). On 5 June he sent a statement to the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, L.I. Brezhnev, in which he writes that the demand to break off all contact with Sakharov 'is unacceptable to me', and asks him 'to protect me and my family from the threats and "tricks" of the Committee for State Security [KGB].''

In Exile

On 28 June Galina Silivonchik arrived in Vorkuta to serve her five year exile term. There she was told that there were no places in the hostel; it was suggested she spend the night at the station.

In April the RSFSR Supreme Court, having examined an appeal in the case of Vsevolod Kuvakin (for his trial see Chronicle 63), left the sentence unchanged. On 6 May Kuvakin left Lefortovo Prison for exile. He is serving his exile at the following address: 743819, Uzbekskaya SSR, Karakalpakska ASSR.
Leninabadsky r-n, p/o Kyzylzhar, sovkhoz im. Dzerzhinskogo.

After 15 years' imprisonment, since February Igor Ogurtsov has been serving a five-year term of exile at the following address: 169160, Komi ASSR, Ust-Vymsky r-n, pos. Mikun. Head of the NOVO Captain Chiglayev sent Ogurtsov to work in the boiler-house. Ogurtsov is living in the same house as Salnikov from Tula, who was convicted under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code for [writing] samizdat articles, collaborated on the camp newspaper and was released conditionally and 'assigned to compulsory work'.

After 10 years of special-regime, since January Ivan Gel has been serving his five-year term of exile at the following address: 169439, Komi ASSR, Troitsko-Pechersky r-n, pos. Mylva.

After 10 years in camp (first special-regime, then strict-regime) Daniil Shumuk (b. 1914) is serving a five-year term of exile at the following address: 418360, Kazakhskaya SSR, Uralskaya obl., p/o Karatobe. Shumuk has spent 37 years in confinement: in a Polish prison (six years before the war), in a German concentration camp, three times in a Soviet camp (1945-1956 for OUN [Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists] activities, 1957-1967, 1972-1982).

Viktor Brailovsky (for his trial see Chronicle 62) is serving his exile term at the following address: Kazakhskaya SSR, Mangyshlakskaya obl., pos. Beineu.

In February Zinovy Krasivsky (Chronicle 60) was interrogated in connection with the case of Goryn [Horyn] (for his arrest see Chronicle 63). In June Krasivsky arrived in Lvov to take part in the trial of Goryn as a witness.

**Releases**

At the end of December 1981 Mikhail Osadchy (Chronicle 52) completed his three-year exile term. He is living in the village of Pustomyty, Lvov Region.

In January 1982 Vadim Konovalikhin was released from exile. He is living in the town of Sovetsk, Kaliningrad Region, where he lived before his arrest.

In April Ida Nodel (see 'After Release') completed her term of exile.

On 11 May Semën Gluzman and on 18 June Mustafa Dzhemilev completed their terms of exile.

In September 1981 Father Vasili Romanyuk was released (see Chronicle 52; in Chronicle 28 his sentence was given incorrectly; see 'After Release').

**IN THE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS**

In Special Hospitals

Ala-Ata SPH [Special Psychiatric Hospital] (g. Talgar, pos. Aktas)

On 20 February Aleksei Nikitin (Chronicle 61) arrived here from Dnepropetrovsk SPH.

Kazan SPH

Anna Mikhailenko (Chronicle 60) has been transferred here from Kharkov Regional Psychiatric Hospital.

Orlov SPH

Nikolai Samkharadze (for his arrest see Chronicle 61) is here. In a 'Statement for the press' of 30 May his son Tamaz Samkharadze calls on 'all people of good will to raise their voice' in his defence.

Syzran SPH

A. Milyukhin (b. 1940), charged under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, is here.

Smolensk SPH

Dnepropetrovsk citizen Valery Tyurichev (b. 1947) is here.

In 1978 Tyurichev was expelled from the CPSU for losing his party card.

In April 1980 he was detained in Moscow; during the search a manuscript on the economics of socialism was confiscated. In June 1980 Tyurichev took his work to the USA and Canada Institute;
after reading the manuscript, the director's secretary suggested that Tyurichev write a dissertation. Tyurichev wrote 700 pages and sent them to the Institute of Marxism-Leninism; from there he received a critical review.

Tyurichev handed in to Dnepropetrovsk OVIR a statement of his intention to leave the USSR and renounce his Soviet citizenship; his documents were not accepted. Then he sent his passport, his wife's passport and statements renouncing his Soviet citizenship to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; the passports were forwarded to Dnepropetrovsk OVIR, from where they were returned to Tyurichev with a statement that they could not leave the USSR as he did not have an invitation from Israel.

In June 1980 Tyurichev was summoned to the Military Registration and Enlistment office to undergo further training. He asked to be sent before a medical commission. The next day he was put in a psychiatric hospital, where he was held until the end of the Olympic Games. The diagnosis: 'Mentally healthy'. After leaving the psychiatric hospital Tyurichev was dismissed from his job and his wife was also sacked. Appeals to the local authorities did not help. Tyurichev and his family went to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; from there they were sent to the local authorities.

In November 1980 Tyurichev and his family went out on to Red Square with a placard: 'We want to leave the USSR - why the KGB?', and on the other side: 'Helsinki - Belgrade - Madrid! They were detained and sent to Dnepropetrovsk. A day later policemen and medical orderlies appeared at Tyurichev's; they were not allowed in.

The next day an inspector at OVIR told the Tyurichevs to prepare their emigration documents. The Tyurichevs filled in the questionnaires and paid the tax.

On 15 March 1981 a postcard arrived from OVIR to appear on 16 March at ten o'clock to draw up the documents. On 16 March, as he left his house, Tyurichev was arrested. Officers from Dnepropetrovsk KGB conducted a search at his flat and confiscated 16 exercise books of his work.

During the preliminary investigation Tyurichev was subjected to a psychiatric examination; the diagnosis: 'schizoid psychopathy'.

On 2 February 1980 Sergei Belov (Chronicle 54) from the town of Privolzhsk, Ivanovsk Region, was again placed in a psychiatric hospital. The address is: Filo Zinovo, Teikovsky r-n. There his head was immediately shaved and he was given an injection, after which he slept for 24 hours.

The head doctor of the hospital is V.N. Privalov, the doctor administering treatment V.D. Shirokov.

On 10 May one of the patients hit Mikhail Zotov (for his trial
Chief Zaugolnikov of police station 72 in the city of Moscow has refused to register Ida Nudel in her own co-operative flat. Zaugolnikov said to Nudel: 'You must understand that I'm not the one who decides the question of your residence permit'.

Since his release from exile Father Vasily Romanyuk has been living under surveillance in the town of Kosov, Ivano-Frankovsk Region. As he has not been allowed to officiate in a place of worship, Romanyuk has found a job as a watchman. In the spring of 1982, after he had received an invitation from Canada, Romanyuk began trying to emigrate (Chronicle 54). Soon after this his son Taras was sent by the Military Registration and Enlistment office before a new medical commission (the previous commission had found him 'unsuitable for military service in peace time').

In the autumn of 1980 Iosif Terelya (Chronicle 56) was released from Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital. He has written an essay 'Three years in Dnepropetrovsk Special Prison YaE-308' (13 pages) about his three-year stay in a Special Psychiatric Hospital. The essay ends with an account of the conversation held with Terelya before he was discharged by the head of the hospital, Colonel Babenko, the head of section 3 where Terelya was a patient, N.M. Buckovich, and a Dnepropetrovsk KGB official, Lieutenant-Colonel Kaputiny (7 pages); the conversation was preceded by a 'stimulant' (an injection into the vein of 10 cm3 of caffeine with barbamil). On 18 June 1982 the 'curator' of the Ukrainian Catholic Church (Chronicle 63), Transcarpathian KGB official Lieutenant-Colonel M.M. Dzyamko and head of the local Irshavsky KGB Major I.A. Vichal came to visit Terelya, who is living in the village of Dolgoye, Irshavsky District, Transcarpathian Region. They suggested to Elena Terelya, Iosif's wife, that she write a statement refusing to accept parcels sent from abroad. Elena replied that she could not live on the salary of a village doctor; she accepted help from friends as her due and did not wish to talk about this subject. Dzyamko began to threaten her: 'As we know your husband isn't afraid of prison, we'll mail him somewhere and wipe him off the face of the earth. They'll kick up a bit of a fuss in the West and then they'll forget about it, but
you, dear Elena Timofeyevna, will be left without a husband. He should stay at home and not go off anywhere. If he wants to go somewhere, he should inform us. We have to protect him, otherwise, if he gets beaten up by some hooligans, in the West they'll think it was the work of the KGB.' Dzyamko demanded that Terelya not go anywhere before 1 July or he would be arrested immediately.

A few days later Vichai again called to see Terelya. He apologised for the conversation of 18 June, saying that the boss had been slightly tipsy. 'Live quietly, work, only don't go openly to the local Roman Catholic Church as people are watching you and your wife is a doctor.' Vichai again warned Terelya not to go anywhere before 1 July.

On 23 June by resolution of the Procuracy of the town of Mukachevo a search was carried out at Terelya's house. The reason: losif's brother Boris, killed on 10 June in an exchange of fire with police and KGB officials, might have left a weapon at their house. However, those carrying out the search sorted through Terelya's letters, photographs and papers.

THE DEATH OF VARLAM SHALAMOV

On 17 January 1982 the author of Kolyma Tales, Varlam Tikhonovich Shalamov, died in Home No.32 for chronic mental patients, to which he had been forcibly transferred from an ordinary Home three days before his death.

In the spring of 1978 Shalamov was placed in Home No.9 for invalids and old people in the Tushinsky district of Moscow. Not long before this he had been in the neuropathological section of a hospital and his neighbours demanded that they be spared him on the grounds that he made a terrible mess. In the home Shalamov was placed in a six-metre ward for two people. He was then 71.

By the spring of 1980 Shalamov had gone blind and his speech had been seriously affected. At this time A.A. Morozov started visiting him. He writes:

From a non-medical viewpoint, Varlam Tikhonovich looked thus: he recognized me right away (we hadn't met for about 12 years), remembered the circumstances of our meeting in the house of N.Ya. Mandelshtam, replied to all my questions, although it was excruciating trying to make out what he said and one had to ask the question several times. He did not want to talk about how he felt: he felt fine here, the food here was good, what he needed was to be visited. But in the course of this he mentioned (several times) the 'camp shop' to which he had to hurry before it closed. Then this would pass, but to the end he exhibited a dislike of sheets, wore a check towel wound round his neck and displayed other symptoms of camp displacement. All in all, it seemed to me as if he felt that he were in the best prison here, which he did not want to leave for anything. And so it was: it was impossible to take V.T. out for a walk or even to the bathroom. He perceived any change whatsoever as for the worse.

Treatment required hospitalization. After repeated appeals to different doctors (these doctors really were different - I won't forget how one, invited from the appropriate neuropathological clinic, where he held the post of head of department, turned back from the gates of the Invalids' Home, saying that to visit Shalamov would ruin his reputation). Finally a doctor agreed to help arrange a hospital place for V.T., if only he would agree to it himself. There could be no other way, but almost a year passed before V.T. said to me one day that he agreed... 'But only with you' - he added. It was then that the threat of another 'hospital' arose, which I'll tell you about, but first let me pass on to the story of the poems.

He began dictating them to me in October 1980; in the first poem he described the environment of the Invalids' Home and said that 'my brain works like before, instantaneously'. He dictated about 30 poems (dictated? I don't know the word, of course), but said the main one would be 'The Unknown Soldier'. The last one, however, was the one in which 'we are not self-immolators and not Avvakums' and 'is the Earth greatly troubled, I do not know myself'. V.T. said himself on the next occasion that this would be his last poem ever, and asked me to compile a selection from the ones there already were under the title 'The Unknown Soldier' and to take it to Znamya, then to Yunost. Neither publication accepted Shalamov's testament. Some of his earlier poems had been published in Yunost; the head of the poetry section stated that these ones, of course, showed
real letter arrive from an admirer with words about 'a great Russian writer' and so on. In the letter, by the way, these lines by V.T. were quoted:

There must be such people,
Who have your constant trust,
There must be such Buddhas,
Not just characters in books.

All those who visited V.T. after me he received well, thanked them, and even earlier than this began asking first me and then others: 'When will you come again?', counting the days himself.

Rumours that he never received anyone and therefore no one came to see him are untrue.

During the last few days of July 1981 Khinkis discovered accidentally from a conversation between the nurses that a decision had been taken to transfer Shalamov to a special home for chronic mental patients. The head doctor of the invalids' Home B.L. Katayev confirmed that the decision had been taken on the basis, firstly, of a diagnosis of 'senile imbecility' made at a consultation with Shalamov not long before this, and, secondly, of a conclusion by the sanitary-epidemic station about the unsanitary state of his ward. Katayev said that Shalamov was 'socially dangerous' and a threat to the staff as he was capable, for example, of overturning a bedside table or throwing a mug at a nurse. Khinkis reminded Katayev about the bad reputation of homes for chronic mental patients. Katayev exclaimed: 'What do you mean? It's really not that terrible! 'When is the transfer proposed?' 'Tomorrow or the day after'. 'You mean if I hadn't come today, no one would have known about the transfer?' 'Of course not, we were intending to phone the Union of Writers'. Khinkis asked him to postpone the transfer. Katayev wanted to know for how long, ('Just for two or three weeks' — said Khinkis) but did not give a definite reply.

Khinkis went immediately to the director of the home, Yu.A. Seleznev, who started getting excited as soon as he heard Shalamov's name. Who might you be?' he asked. Khinkis explained. 'You mean you think he's really a poet?' Khinkis said there was proof of this. Then Seleznev revealed that he did not need any proof and was even well informed about the most recent facts connected with Shalamov. He stated that a 'fuss has been kicked up' around Shalamov, 'he's being published', 'he's been given a prize'. 'Foreigners with tape recorders keep on appearing' and
Evtyushenko has phoned already. What do you want? he asked at last. Khinkis urged him to adopt a humane and informal attitude to Shalamov's fate. 'I would be glad to approach it informally,' Seleznev said. 'Personally it's all the same to me whether Shalamov stays or is transferred but the comrades from state security have already taken an interest in this.' Khinkis asked who had conducted the consultation and whether it was impossible to try and review the diagnosis. It turned out that Shalamov had been declared senile by consultants from psycho-neurological clinic No.17, who served the invalids' Home, which does not have its own psychiatrists on the staff. The conversation ended with Seleznev's vaguely expressed agreement to try and obtain a re-examination of Shalamov.

During the next few days Khinkis succeeded in making contact with the head of clinic No.17 and with surprising ease arranged with her over the telephone a repeat consultation. On 14 August Khinkis met two consultants at the gates of the Home and took them to the head doctor. Then a senior nurse and several other staff appeared. It appeared that they knew in advance at the Home about the impending consultation although Khinkis had not informed anyone of the day or time. They all went upstairs together to see Shalamov. He was sitting on a chair, absorbed in drinking tea. Khinkis greeted him and Shalamov replied. The consultants did not offer greetings. After a silence one of them, evidently the senior one, said: 'Pathological gluttony'. Silence. Then they asked Shalamov what year it was. Shalamov said: 'Leave me alone'. Silence. They asked why there were no sheets on the bunk. Khinkis replied to this, mentioning Shalamov's camp past. Silence. 'Well, O.K.', said the senior one at last, 'we'll describe him as seen' (which meant: the patient is not open to contact and the conclusion will be made on the basis of visual observation). 'So what do you think?' Khinkis asked the consultants when they were outside in the corridor. 'Oh well', replied the senior one, 'he's senile of course. You could ask a hundred psychiatrists to come along and not one would alter the diagnosis.' The entire conversation lasted a few minutes.

Nevertheless, an attempt was made to alter the diagnosis by appealing to the head psychiatrist of the Litfond, Dashevsky. He promised to examine Shalamov but soon afterwards withdrew his promise, having let it be understood that this case was outside medical competence. The doctor who examined Shalamov privately did not consider that his transfer to a mental hospital was clinically justified, but would agree to state his opinion only to an official and fully authorised medical commission. During the first ten days of September the Union of Writers gave an assurance that the Union was assuming control of the situation and Shalamov would not be transferred anywhere without the Union's knowledge.

Shalamov was transferred on 14 January 1982. But as early as October, on asking for his address at a Moscow City Information Bureau, one of his readers received a form with the address of the Home for chronic mental patients No.32. And after Shalamov's death it was discovered from the stamp in his passport that he had been discharged from Invalid Home No.9 as early as the end of July.

The transfer itself was discovered as follows. Shalamov had long been asking Khinkis to call on his behalf the editor I.S. Isayev, whose help he was counting on to prepare a book of poems for his 75th birthday. Khinkis actually phoned on 14 January. Isayev spoke drily, would not promise to help and only towards the end of the conversation announced the news: 'He's already been transferred. Some woman phoned me.' This woman was an official of the Central State Archive of Literature and Art [TsAL], I.I. Sirininskaya, to whom Shalamov, she claimed, had bequeathed his literary archive.

On the morning of 17 January Khinkis arrived at the Home for Chronic Mental Patients No.32. The doctor on duty said that Shalamov was 'in a very bad way'. The doctor did not know who Shalamov was. In a ward for eight people Shalamov lay wheezing; the doctor supposed it was pneumonia. The nurse said: 'He was brought in like this. He couldn't even stand'. He had not been looked after at all during these few days. Shalamov recognized Khinkis and was pleased to see her but could no longer speak. He remained conscious almost to the very end. Death came at about six in the evening.

The last entry in Shalamov's medical file: 'Extremely delirious, cannot make sense of questions put to him. Tried to bite the doctor.' On 19 January the question of Shalamov's funeral was discussed in the building of the Writers' Union Secretariat. Union representatives tried to persuade friends of the deceased 'to bury him properly', i.e. to lay out the body before cremation in the Central House of Writers and conduct a civic funeral. They also agreed to a church funeral, but in that case without a
requiem in the Central House of Writers and 'without speeches'. The poet V. Kostrov disappeared for half an hour and returned having finally settled the matter with the secretary of the Union administration, Yu. Verchenko. The Union would provide buses and a place at the cemetery. As they left, Kostrov expressed satisfaction that 'a great Russian poet will be buried in a worthy fashion', and added that neither he nor other representatives of the Union of Writers could be present at the church 'for understandable reasons'.

On 21 January the funeral service for Varlam Tikhonovich Shalamov took place in the church of Nikolai Kuznetsy and then the burial at Kuntsevo cemetery. About 150 people attended. A. Morozov and F. Suchkov read Shalamov's poems aloud.

MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS

On 27 January in Tallinn former political prisoner Artem Yuskevich (for his trial see Chronicle 38), released in December 1979 (Chronicle 55), died from a stroke.

On 21 May senior investigator S.A. Bykov of Kaluga KGB 'had a chat' in Tarusa with Valentina Mashkova. Bykov accused Mashkova of writing an article published in the journal Russian Renaissance, an article entitled 'Who will judge?' from the collection 'What is the Soviet Union waiting for?', an article prepared for the foreign journal Veche (the manuscript of this article was confiscated from her during a search), and an open letter in connection with the 'confession' of Dm. Dudko (Chronicle 57).

Bykov said that the content of the articles did not interest them: any publication abroad was criminal. Bykov reminded her of the article in Izvestia about Amnesty International which Mashkova's name had been mentioned (27 August 1980 – Chronicle 60). She said she did not know the people named in Izvestia. Bykov replied: 'It would be the last straw if you knew them and got money from them'. Bykov warned Mashkova 'according to the Decree'. He said that signing the record signified only that one had read it and not an acknowledgement of the facts.

In March Moscow KGB official Victor Vladimirovich Krasilnikov communicated to Vladimir Tolts (Chronicles 56, 60, 62) via Sergei Pestov (Chronicle 63) that he should leave 'for one of the Western countries' in the near future otherwise he would be arrested; a case had already been instituted against him.

In the summer of 1981, having discovered the existence of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled in the USSR, a few Ukrainian invalids decided to set up a similar group in the Ukraine. In January 1982 Elena Sannikova (Chronicle 62) and a member of the Initiative Group, Olga Zaitseva, went to the Ukraine to help the invalids set up such a group. Nine people joined the group.

A month later one of the members of the group sent a letter refusing to work with it. A while later another three invalids announced their departure from the group.

On 26 March Malikov, head of the Kolchugino District section of the Vladimir KGB, summoned Zaitseva. He said that the KGB
regarded Sannikova's and Zaitseva's trip to the Ukraine as agitation - 'with the purpose of slandering the Soviet state system' - and that in the 'explanations' written by Ukrainian invalids it is said that Sannikova and Zaitseva had held 'anti-Soviet' conversations with them and tried to persuade them to join an 'anti-Soviet group'.

Malikov gave Zaitseva a warning 'according to the Decree' under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

Building materials taken away were not included in the inventory); the rest, designated in the inventory as 'domestic things, unsuitable for use' had been thrown in the shed, the lock of which had been broken in for the purpose.

Bogoraz was not allowed to study the documents authorizing the demolition of the house.

Bogoraz was working in Moscow as an [extra-departmental] security guard. She discovered that a KGB official had come to see her superiors and asked them to transfer her to a unit where there would be thefts. Soon afterwards she was transferred from the Plekhanov Institute to a building-site as a watchman. The foreman of the building site told the brigade-leader of the extra-departmental security guard that everything would get stolen with a woman guard on a building site.

In February Bogoraz was dismissed.

On 26 April a student of the Preparatory Department of Moscow Polygraphic Institute, Petr Maslov, talked at a political information session about a demonstration by neo-fascists on 20 April in Pushkin Square. His classmates A. Pronin and A. Trusevich confirmed his story.

During the interval a teacher of the history of the CPSU telephoned the KGB for assistance.

The KGB official who arrived, Grachev, said in conversation with Maslov that it was not the business of young people to fight fascists, competent bodies existed for this purpose. He threatened Maslov with expulsion from the Institute. Grachev wanted to know whether Maslov had been at the demonstration in commemoration of J. Lennon. Maslov replied that he had been abroad at the time in the army, from which he had been discharged after a serious injury.

Grachev also threatened Pronin and Trusevich with expulsion. Then Grachev proposed that they collaborate, which they sharply refused to do.

Pronin's uncle, who works in a scientific-research institute in Protvino, has had an official trip to West Germany [which was already authorized] cancelled.
On 4 January in Leningrad an exhibition of feminist artists opened at the flat of Galina Bocharova. That day the police came to the flat.

The Council on the History of World Culture attached to the USSR Academy of Sciences had arranged a conference for April on the theme 'Myth and Culture'. When the deputy chairman of the Council, V.A. Karpushin (a former KGB official), crossed several Jewish names off the list of speakers, referring to them as a 'bunch of yids', about ten speakers refused to take part in the conference. Karpushin postponed the conference until the autumn.

LETTERS AND STATEMENTS

Documents of the Moscow Helsinki Group

Document No 191 (3 February 1982): 'Five Years Since the Arrest of Yury Orlov' (see 'In the Prisons and Camps').
Document No 192 (2 March 1982): 'Persecution of Citizens Wishing to Leave the USSR Continues' (see 'The Right to Leave').
Document No 193 (2 March 1982): 'New Repressive Measures Against the Podrabinek Family' (see 'In the Prisons and Camps').
Document No 194 (2 April 1982): 'Conviction of Member of the Moscow Helsinki Group Ivan Kovalev' (see 'The Trial of Ivan Kovalev').

SAMIZDAT NEWS


Bulletin No 14 of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled in the USSR (20 June 1982)

The Bulletin contains documents No.26 'The Disabled and the Trade Unions' (criticism of social security for the disabled) and No.27, 'Limitation of Movement' (about the worsening material position of the disabled due to the rise in petrol prices) of the Initiative Group; appeals by the Initiative Group dated 28 March (to help invalids who were injured during the war in Afghanistan) and 30 April (to help the disabled); letters to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and to the Politbureau of the USSR Central Committee from Initiative Group members F. Khusainova and V. Feferlov; letters from the Initiative Group about the fate of Group 1 invalid and Kiev refusenik Leonid Bronfeld (see 'The Right to Leave') and about the hunger-strike of invalid-refuseniks V. Prokopchuk, A. Makolov and G. Makolova (see 'The Right to Leave'); a letter to the Initiative Group from Group 1 invalid I. Utavlinov from the town of Ilek, Orenburg Region (all his correspondence is being withheld from him); a letter from the Initiative Group to the First Secretary of Orenburg District party committee concerning the situation of Utavlinov; a letter from Feferlov to the authorities of Chistopol and Kazan on the situation of Khusainov's family; a letter to Brezhnev from E. Khayeve-Baranova on the forced confinement of her brother N. Baranov in a psychiatric hospital; the autobiography of Anatoly Pozdnyakov.

Bulletin No 3 of the Moscow Group of Amnesty International

The Bulletin contains: an article on the origin, structure and activities of Amnesty International; 'Minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners' (UN resolution of 30 August 1958); and P. Podrabinek's article 'Prisoners of Conscience or Political Prisoners? Is Special Status Needed?'

SMOT [Free Inter-Trade Association of Working People - FITAWP]

Information Bulletin No.32 (March 1982, 12 pages), No. 33 (May 1982, 9 pages), No.34 (June 1982, 11 pages)

No.32 contains the articles 'Administrative Arrest - a Fight Against Hooliganism or the Demands of the Economy?' by I. Geraschenko and 'KGB Spies in America' (translation of an article from Newsweek).
No. 33 contains letters from Mikhail Zotov (see 'In the Psychiatric Hospitals') and Victor Grinev (see 'Arrests'), and a statement by Valery Senderov on the search of 6 April (see 'The Sixth of April').

No. 34 contains a biography of Mikhail Kukobaka, a statement by the CR 'Council of Reps' of SMOT on the arrests and searches of 17-22 June (see 'The Seventeenth of June'), a statement by Senderov, 'Position' - an appeal to world public opinion by I. Ratashinskaya, I. Gerashchenko and I. Pletneva.

Section A ('Abstracts and Excerpts') contains 33 articles; section B ('Points of view, Reviews') - 10 articles; section C ('The contents of recent issues') contains the table of contents of the journal Searches and Reflections Nos.1-8 (Chronicles 57, 61) and of the almanac Main No. 2.

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

The report in Chronicle 62 that M. Marinovich had been transferred to Chistopol Prison was a mistake.

The Trial of Streltsov (Chronicle 63)

On 20 October 1981, five days before the end of his two-year exile term, Vasily Streltsov was arrested. That day a search was carried out in the town of Vygoda, Ivano-Frankovsk Region at the house of physical education teacher Seminishin (the occupant was not at home, only his father was there) and Streltsov's archive was confiscated.

In April 1982 the Poltava Regional Court sentenced Streltsov under article 72 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code) to seven years of strict-regime camp and four years' exile. Vasily's brother Pavel Streltsov, who lives in Ivano-Frankovsk, was summoned to the court as a witness. There was no defence lawyer at the trial; P. Streltsov made a one and a half hour speech in defence of his brother.

The Trial of Esip and Kovatsiv

From 20 to 28 October 1981 L'vov Regional Court, presided over by P.O. Romanyuk, examined the case of Roman Stepanovich Esip (b. 1951; arrested 18 March 1981) and Vasily Mikhailovich Kovatsiv (b. 1934; arrested 18 March 1981), charged under article 138 part 2 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ('Infringing the laws on the separation of church and state and school and church') and article 209 part 1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ('Infringement of the Personal Rights of Citizens under the Guise of Performing Religious Rites'; part 1 of article 209 is 'stricter' than part 2). The state prosecutor was Procurator V.M. Durov, the public prosecutor was Yu.M. Grigorev, the defence lawyers were M.V. Zhloba and B.V. Satensky.

During the preliminary investigation the investigator went to a school and interrogated the children. Many of them signed the record without knowing what was in it; some of them signed a blank sheet of paper. At the trial they repudiated the records presented to them. The court did not take their repudiation into account. From the judgment (translation from Ukrainian):

Kovatsiv and Esip, each one posing as a priest of a church to which they give different names, 'Greco-Catholic church of Eastern rite' or 'Ukrainian Catholic Church', which was founded by anti-Soviet minded emigres abroad and proclaimed by I. Slipyi, former bishop of a reactionary Greco-Catholic Church which dissolved itself in 1946, during the period 1974-81... deliberately carried out on the territory of L'vov Region organizational activity to revive the above-named church and create in villages of the region groups of so-called 'Ukrainian Catholics'.

Kovatsiv and Esip carried out this organizational activity by means of organizing and conducting in villages of the region illegal services according to Uniate-Catholic rites without having registered these church groups.

Kovatsiv and Esip organized and conducted these services in religious buildings which were no longer active and had been struck off the register and around these buildings, at
The court sentenced each one to five years of ordinary-regime camp, three years' exile and the confiscation of his property.

From the judgment (translation from Ukrainian):

...in his statements of 7 September 1978 to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet and to the participants of the fifth session of the Committee on Human Rights taking place in Geneva, the accused P.V. Sichko slanderously alleged that on the instructions of the KGB his son Vasily Sichko had been subjected to constant persecution and blackwall during two years of study at the university, as a result of which he was illegally expelled from the university. In these statements P.V. Sichko also slanderously alleged that in the USSR healthy people were interned in psychiatric hospitals.

In his statements of 30 April 1979 to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet and to the head of Dolina ROVD, Ivano-Frankovsk Region, P.V. Sichko slanderously alleges that genocide of the Ukrainian people, especially of the intelligentsia, is being carried out in the USSR, and that for reasons of economic gain the state, by means of producing a large quantity of vodka, is reducing the people to spiritual impoverishment, and that russification is being implemented in the Ukrainian SSR.

In these statements P.V. Sichko slanderously alleges that on 28 December 1978 Gely Smigiă died in the torture-chambers of the KGB.

During 1976-77 the accused V.P. Sichko, while living in Kiev and studying in his second year at the Faculty of Journalism at Shevchenko University in Kiev, repeatedly expressed his anti-Soviet nationalistic views to students...In expressing these views the accused slandered Soviet reality, talking about the oppression of the Ukraine within the USSR, the russification of the Ukrainian people, the decline of Ukrainian literature, poetry and culture; he also expressed his view on the need for the Ukraine to secede from the USSR.

The accused V.P. Sichko gave to the above-mentioned students to read his slanderous articles of anti-Soviet content.
by the roadside. 'Why do Soviet people keep quiet?' and poems of similar content written by him in 1976-77.

On 10 June 1979 the accused P.V. Sichko and V.P. Sichko, who had come from Dolina especially...made anti-Soviet, nationalistic, slanderous speeches before those present.

Thus, in his speech the accused V.P. Sichko slanderously alleged that V.M. Ivasyuk had not committed suicide but had died 'in the torture-chambers' of the KGB, like many other Ukrainians, and called for the day of Ivasyuk's funeral, 22 May 1979, to be proclaimed 'a day in memory of Ukrainian victims and Ukrainian blood'; he also recited poems of slanderous content to those present...

The accused P.V. Sichko in his speech at the grave of Ivasyuk associated himself with his son V.P. Sichko's slanderous fabrications and also indulged in slanderous fabrications about Soviet reality himself, stating that all around in villages he saw the painful situation and sorrow of Ukrainians.

At the trial six witnesses were interrogated, who described the speeches of the accused at Ivasyuk's grave.

As a result of the conclusions of in-patient forensic psychiatric examination No.271 of 14 August 1979 and the court hearing of 4 December 1979 it is recorded that the accused V.P. Sichko does not suffer from any psychiatric illnesses...

P.V. Sichko's sentence began on 5 July 1979, that of V.P. Sichko on 14 August 1979.

The Trial of Gandzyuk

In 1952 Vladimir Ilich Gandzyuk (b. 1934) was arrested and sentenced to be shot for belonging to the UPA [Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army]. Execution was commuted to 10 years' imprisonment. In 1962 he was released.

In 1971 Gandzyuk was again arrested. For a 'murder newly come to light' committed at that time - before 1952, Ivano-Frankovsk Regional Court sentenced him under article 56 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ("Betrayal of the Motherland"), article 58 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ("A terrorist act") and article 64 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ("...participation in an Anti-Soviet Organization") to 15 years of strict-regime camp, three years' exile and the confiscation of his property (including a house built after 1962). The ten years he served from 1952-1962 were taken into account. Gandzyuk says that he did actually commit the actions with which he was charged in 1952, but has no connection with the 'murder newly come to light'.


On 18 March 1981 the People's Court of the town of Kalush, Ivano-Frankovsk Region, presided over by A.I. Kitayev, examined the case of Gandzyuk (Chronicles 61, 62). charged under article 206 part 2 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ('Malicious Hooliganism') and article 222 part 3 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ("Illegally Carrying...Side-arms..."). The prosecutor was Kalush Procurator S.P. Gilchenko; the defence lawyer was R.I. Zhuruyeva from Ivano-Frankovsk.

From the judgment:

On 15 January 1981 in the Barvinok cafe in Kalush, the accused, being drunk, out of motives of hooliganism provoked a quarrel with the victim Boiko, in the course of which he used foul language in the presence of a large number of citizens, and also beat Boiko, inflicting on him light physical injuries without damage to his health.

When the accused was detained by a police officer and a body search was carried out, a home-made flick knife was discovered in his coat pocket... The accused...would not admit his guilt and explained that on 15 January...before dinner he met a friend...Lyzen, who bought some vodka and together they went into the Barvinok cafe where they drank this vodka. The victim sat down at their table and suggested they drink some more, but the accused refused. On these grounds a minor quarrel arose with the victim but there was no fight. However, a police officer intervened and detained all three of them. When they were leaving the cafe the police officer showed a knife which he had allegedly pulled out of the pocket of the accused, but he (the accused) never carried knives and considers that someone planted this knife in his pocket as a provocation.

The court sentenced Gandzyuk under article 222 part 3 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code to two years, under article 206 part 2 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code to one year; the total sentence was three years' strict-regime camp.
On 23 March 1981 Zhuruyeva sent an appeal to Ivano-Frankovsk Regional Court:

The court based its conclusions on unauthentic, contradictory evidence:

In his statement of 15 January 1981 Boiko wrote that Gandzyuk hit him several times with a stick (this is the eighth year Gandzyuk has suffered from osteochondrosis which deforms the knee and hip joints of both legs and the spine and he walks with a stick - Chronicle) across the shoulder... then Gandzyuk... dealt him several powerful blows on the chest.

During a forensic examination on 16 January Boiko explained that Gandzyuk had dealt him several blows on the chest with his fist...

At a confrontation...Boiko said that Gandzyuk had hit him across the back with a stick...

At an interrogation on 23 January 1981 Boiko again explained that Gandzyuk had hit him several times across the back with a stick and several times on the chest with his arm.

But at the trial Boiko explained that Gandzyuk had hit him on the arm below the elbow with a stick and hit him on the chest with his elbow.

Witness Skripnik (head of the Criminal Investigation Department of Kalush ROVD who was sitting in the cafe at the next table - Chronicle)... explained that Gandzyuk had supposedly waved his stick at Boiko, 'I can't remember where the blow landed, but I think it was across the shoulders'.

But at the court session Skripnik explained that Gandzyuk had hit Boiko on the chest with a stick.

Lyzen did not confirm any facts of blows inflicted on the victim with a stick or an arm.

All the tables in the cafe were occupied at the time and the investigative organs could not establish persons who might have confirmed the explanations of the victim.

In the scullery of the cafe Gandzyuk stated immediately that the knife was not his and asked for the knife to be sent for examination to determine the presence of his fingerprints. This lawful demand by Gandzyuk was not carried out by the investigative organs.

The investigative organs did not check whether the knife could have been surreptitiously placed on Gandzyuk by the victim Boiko or by Lyzen...

Witness Yatsiv stated at the investigation that she had not been present when the knife was confiscated and had not seen from whom and where the knife was taken (Yatsiv was not summoned to the trial even though Gandzyuk asked for this - Chronicle).

The Regional Court left the sentence unchanged.

The Case of Chuiko

Bogdan Mikhailovich Chuiko was born in Poland in 1919. In 1942-43 his brother was killed by the Gestapo, another two brothers landed up in Auschwitz. Bogdan himself joined the UPA [Ukrainian Insurrectionist Army], and until 1944 fought the Germans. In 1944 Bogdan Chuiko became a citizen of the USSR.

In 1948 he was arrested; an NKVD [an earlier name for the KGB] officer [secret police special board] sentenced him to 10 years in camps for 'Betrayal of the Motherland' (belonging to the UPA in 1942-44). In 1949 Chuiko arrived at his camp. He worked in civilian jobs (as a foreman, a technician, a senior technician of OTK [Technical Control Section], received wages, paid taxes, received official thanks.

On 1 June 1956 Irkutsk Regional Court conditionally released Chuiko before the end of his sentence. When he started work, on the basis of certificates from camp and the decision of the Irkutsk Regional Court, personnel department officials entered in his labour-book that he had worked from 1949 to 1956.

In 1969 a case was instituted against Chuiko for embezzlement. Despite positive work references, a letter from more than 800 workers requesting that Chuiko be allowed out 'on bail' and a speech in his defence by the secretary of the area party committee, Chuiko was given seven years in camp.

Chuko was transferred to Ivano-Frankovsk. There 'in accordance with circumstances newly come to light' a case was again instituted against Chuiko for participating in the UPA and he was sentenced to 15 years in camp and five years' exile (one of the pieces of evidence was that the nickname of the leader of the UPA battle detachment was the same as Chuiko's first name); however, the years he had served in 1948-56 were taken into account.

In 1976 Chuiko was transported from camp to Tomsk Region - into exile (Chronicles 46, 47). In 1977 as an invalid unfit for work he was allowed to move to Michurinsk to join his family.
Attempting a Crime) to six years in a special-regime camp.

On 17 June 1980 Tambov Regional Court heard an appeal, revoked the sentence and sent the case for a fresh investigation. The Procurator of Tambov Region protested against this decision by the Tambov Regional Court. At a further examination in Tambov Regional Court and later in the RSFSR Supreme Court, the sentence was left unchanged.

CONNECTIONS TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

Chronicle 39 p.188. Leonid Efimov should read Aleksei Efimov.
Chronicles 40-42, pp.159-60. Manko should read Manko.
Chronicle 56. Viktor Tselykh should read Tselykh.
pp.283-4. The 29 names on p.283 and the first 2 on p.284 should be transposed to their proper alphabetical position, also the third name on p.284.
ENDNOTES

1 Published weekly in Russian in Paris.
2 Works written in the USSR, published abroad, then smuggled back into the USSR.
3 Solovki: colloquial name for the Solovetzy Island group in the White Sea. Three monasteries there were used as places of detention for political prisoners in the early Soviet period.
Vladimir Mayakovsky (1893-1930): innovative poet and playwright; committed suicide.
Yury Olesha (1889-1960): novelist and dramatist, with (initially) a rather ambivalent attitude towards the communist state.
Alexander Fadeyev (1901-56): novelist; general secretary of the Union of Soviet Writers, 1946-53. Said to have been responsible for the arrest of several writers.
Maxim Gorky (1868-1936): the 'father of Socialist Realism'. Lived abroad for many years, returning to the USSR in 1931. He died in mysterious circumstances.
4 See note 2.
5 See note 2.
6 All-Russian Christian-Socialist Union, formed secretly in 1916. Militantly anti-communist, it advocated a democratic state run largely on socialist principles, with a church assembly (sobor) as the controlling body. Several of its leaders, including Borodin, were arrested and tried in 1917 and 1918 and sentenced to varying terms in camps (see Chronicle 1).
8 Publishing house of the anti-Soviet emigre group NTS (Popular Labour Alliance), based in Frankfurt. A journal of the same name is published regularly in Russian.
9 Iosif Brodsky: non-conformist poet, sentenced to five years in camp for 'parasitism' in 1966; subsequently emigrated. Natalya Gubanenskaya: poet and co-founder of the Chronicle. Forcibly interned in a special psychiatric hospital in 1971, released nine months later; emigrated in 1973 (see Chronicle 38, pp.142-4). Irina Patushinskaya: poet, subjected to harassment because she wishes to leave the USSR (see Chronicles 62, 63 and 'The Right to Leave' in this issue).
20 Iosif Brodsky was ruled not responsible in April 1983 and sent to Alma-Ata Special Psychiatric Hospital for compulsory treatment.
11 Tradition started by Lenin of voluntary, unpaid work on days off, originally especially on Saturdays.
12 See note 2.
13 A Decree of 25 December 1972 providing for citizens to be formally warned in writing that their activities are bordering on crime. See Chronicle 34, pp.92-6 for details.
14 See note 13.
15 See note 13.
16 See note 13.
17 See note 2.
18 In order to formally register a religious congregation, 20 believers must submit their names and personal details to the local authorities.
19 See note 18.
20 A reference to article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.
21 See note 13.
22 See note 2.
23 Possibly A.D. Sakharov, who appealed several times on Bolonkin's behalf (see Chronicles 61 and 62) but did not know him personally.
24 Popular name for 'compulsory work at official direction' (see 'Under Sentence of Compulsory Work at Official Direction' in this issue).
25 0 stands for Oles, a familiar form of Alexander.
26 The Corrective Labour Code allows a maximum sentence of 15 consecutive days in the cooler, although prisoners are often sentenced to another 15 days as soon as the first, or subsequent term is completed.
27 See note 24.
28 Prisoners are usually 'transported' away from the camp before being released.
29 The Aid Fund for Political Prisoners and their Families was founded by Solozhenitsyn in April 1974, using the royalties from The Gulag Archipelago. Its first administrator was Alexander Ginzburg (see Chronicle 44, pp.99-100).
30 See note 24.
31 Ukrainian poet (1814-1861). Passionate advocate of national
and social liberation; imprisoned under Tsar Nicholas I on account of his poems. Greatly revered by Ukrainian political prisoners.

32 Lavut should have been released on 29 April 1983 but was re-arrested prior to this after he refused to sign a statement agreeing to refrain from further political activities. As of October 1983 he was in Khabarovsk Investigation Prison.

33 Kirill Petruniev was released on 29 June 1983. He returned to Elektrostal and was admitted to a hospital for tuberculosis patients.

34 On 12 April 1983, a court in Irshava, Transcarpathian Region, sentenced Terelya to one year in camp for 'parasitism'.

35 Fund administered by the Writers' Union, to provide material assistance for writers.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

The original Russian text of Chronicle 64, of which this book is a translation, appeared as a booklet without annotations, entitled Khronika tekushchikh sobytii, Khronika Press, New York, 1983.

Earlier issues of the Chronicle are available in English as follows. Numbers 16-67 have been published by Amnesty International Publications as booklets (all except No 16 still being in print), and numbers 1-16 on microfiche (see inside back cover for details). Numbers 1-11 appeared, with annotations and 76 photographs, in Peter Reddaway's Uncensored Russia: the Human Rights Movement in the Soviet Union, London and New York, 1972.

Future issues of A Chronicle of Current Events will be published in English by Amnesty International Publications as they become available.

The most comprehensive source of current, up-to-date information on the sort of events reported with some delay by the Chronicle is the fortnightly USSR News Brief: Human Rights edited by Dr Cronid Lubarsky and available from Cahiers du Samizdat, 46 rue du Lac, 1050 Brussels, Belgium. This address provides the English and Russian editions. In addition, a Japanese edition is available from the Soviet Coordination Group of Amnesty International, 2-2-2 Nishi-Maeda, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan; a Dutch edition from Stichting Comite V. Boekovski, Postbus 51049, 1007 EA Amsterdam, Netherlands; and a German edition from GFK, Kaiserstr. 40, 6000 Frankfurt/Main 1, Germany. A French edition is planned. (Dr Lubarsky has featured in many issues of the Chronicle since 1972, where his name is spelled Kronid Lyubarsky. He emigrated in 1977.)

A similar publication, but specializing on the Ukraine, is Herald of Repression in Ukraine, edited by former prisoner of conscience Nadia Svitlychna and available monthly from: P.O. Box 770, Cooper Station, New York, NY 10003, USA.

Many texts referred to briefly in the Chronicle have appeared in full in A Chronicle of Human Rights in the USSR, Khronika Press, 505 Eighth Avenue, New York, NY 10018, quarterly (separate Russian and English editions), and (documents of Helsinki groups) in the volumes listed in endnote 2 of Chronicles 43-5. The Samizdat Bulletin, P.O. Box 6128, San Mateo, California 94403,
A NOTE ON PHOTOGRAPHS

Nearly 900 photos have been published in the English editions of the Chronicle. They comprise photographs of individuals, demonstrations, labour camps, prisons, psychiatric institutions, other buildings, facsimiles of documentary material and groups of people. An alphabetical index to the first 700 photos appeared as a special supplement at the end of the English edition of Chronicle 54.
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The trial of Moscow Helsinki monitor Ivan Kovalyov opens Chronicle 64, which goes on to report the wave of arrests carried out in Moscow in early summer 1982: of the underground circles of Russian Orthodox printers and the "New Socialist" intellectuals arrested on 6 April; and of the campaigners for workers' rights arrested on 17 June. Also described is a series of preventive "chats" between KGB officials and human rights campaigners in Moscow in the first half of that year.

Around 20 pages are devoted to people who want to emigrate from the Soviet Union and those who have been imprisoned for their peaceful attempts to do so — in particular Jews, Germans and Pentecostalists. The Chronicle includes reports from the non-Russian republics as well as detailed accounts of life in political prisons and camps where, in early 1982, five prisoners of conscience had been re-tried on expiry of their first sentences.

I consider the Chronicle's thirteen years of publication a genuine miracle, and I consider it as well an expression of the spirit and moral strength of the human rights movement in the USSR. The authorities' hatred of the Chronicle, manifested in innumerable acts of persecution, only confirms that evaluation.

Dr ANDREI SAKHAROV
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