A CHRONICLE OF CURRENT EVENTS

Nr 47

Journal of the Human Rights Movement in the USSR

Amnesty International Publications

A Chronicle of Current Events Nr 47

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is a worldwide movement which is independent of any government, political faction, ideology, economic interest or religious creed. It plays a specific role within the overall spectrum of human rights work. The activities of the organization focus strictly on prisoners:

—It seeks the *release* of men and women detained anywhere for their beliefs, colour, sex, ethnic origin, language or religion, provided they have neither used nor advocated violence. These are termed '*prisoners of conscience*'.

—It advocates *fair and early trials* for *all political prisoners* and works on behalf of such persons detained without charge or without trial.

—It opposes the *death penalty* and *torture* or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment of *all prisoners* without reservation.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL acts on the basis of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international instruments. Through practical work for prisoners within its mandate, Amnesty International participates in the wider promotion and protection of human rights in the civil, political, economic, social and cultural spheres.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL has 2,000 adoption groups and national sections in 35 countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, the Middle East, North America and Latin America and individual members in a further 74 countries. Each adoption group works for at least two prisoners of conscience in countries other than its own. These countries are balanced geographically and politically to ensure impartiality. Information about prisoners and human rights violations emanates from Amnesty International's Research Department in London.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL has consultative status with the United Nations (ECOSOC), UNESCO and the Council of Europe, has cooperative relations with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States and has observer status with the Organization of African Unity (Bureau for the Placement and Education of African Refugees).

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is financed by subscriptions and donations of its worldwide membership. To safeguard the independence of the organization, all contributions are strictly controlled by guidelines laid down by AI's International Council and income and expenditure are made public in an annual financial report.

A Chronicle of Current Events
Number 47

A Chronicle of Current Events

Number 47

Amnesty International Publications
10 Southampton Street London WC2E 7HF
1978

Subscription rates—see inside back cover
Russian original © Khronika Press 1978, New York
English translation copyright © Amnesty International, 1978
All rights reserved
Published 1978 by Amnesty International Publications
Designed and produced by *Index on Censorship*, London and New York
Printed in Great Britain by Billing & Sons Ltd, London
ISBN 0 900058 77 3
AI index PUB 96/00/78
Copyright of photographs: requests for permission to reproduce any of the photographs in this book should be directed to Amnesty International Publications, 10 Southampton Street, London WC2E 7HF, England, which will pass such requests on to copyright-holders.

Contents

	page
List of illustrations	v
Preface	vii
Abbreviations	viii
Chronicle No. 47 (30 November 1977)	
The Trial of Serebrov	1
The Trial of Rozhdestvov	5
The Helsinki Groups under Investigation	10
The Case of Ginzburg	10
The Case of Orlov	16
The Persecution of the Working Commission	19
The Case of Shcharansky	22
The Case of Matusevich and Marinovich	30
Arrests, Searches, Interrogations	31
The Arrest of Snegiryov	31
The Arrest of Valentina Pailodze	33
Case Number 186	34
Events in Lithuania	42
The Trial of Lapienis, Matulionis and Pranskunaite	42
The Arrest of Petkus	45
Searches and Interrogations	46
Disturbances in Vilnius	50
The Lithuanian Helsinki Group	53
Persecution of Believers	56
Catholics	56
Adventists	58
Baptists	58
Pentecostalists	64
Persecution of Crimean Tatars	65
Petitions	73
The Right to Leave	77
Pentecostalists	84
Have Left	95
The Jewish Movement	100
In the Prisons and Camps	105
Vladimir Prison	105
The Mordovian Camps	106
The Perm Camps	113
In Other Camps and Prisons	118
Letters and Statements of Political Prisoners	126

In Defence of Political Prisoners 135
Releases 139
After Release 140
In Exile 143
In the Psychiatric Hospitals 145
Kazan Special Psychiatric Hospital 145
Chernyakhovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital 146
Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital 147
Leningrad Special Psychiatric Hospital 147
In Ordinary Hospitals 147
Extrajudicial Persecution 149
Miscellaneous News 150
Letters and Statements 155
Discussion of the Draft Constitution (Conclusion) 171
Official Documents 173
Samizdat News 176
Trials of Recent Years 181
Addenda and Corrigenda 182

Endnotes 183
Bibliographical Note 183
R S F S R Criminal Code, articles 70 and 190-1 184
Index of Names 186

List of Illustrations

I
1 Irina Ginzburg (Zholkovskaya) and Irina Orlova (Valitova) with friends.
2 Ginzburg family with Svetlana Pavlenkova and Grigorenkos.
3 Yury Golfand, Moscow mathematician, friend of Orlov.
II
4 Sakharov-Yankelevich family, Slepaks, Naum Meiman, Irina Ginzburg.
5 Boris Vail, puppeteer, twice a political prisoner.
6 Mikhail Makarenko, art expert, and Vyacheslav Rodionov.
III
7 Felix Serebrov, Moscow worker, with Starchik family.
8 Serebrov's wife and family with the Grigorenkos.
9 Marina Voikhanskaya, psychiatrist, with her son Misha.
IV
10 Alexander Podrabinek, Irina Kaplun, Vyacheslav Bakhmin, campaigners against psychiatric abuse.
11 Mykola (Nikolai) and Raisa Rudenko of Kiev, with Z. and P. Grigorenko.
12 Yaroslav Gasyuk (Hasyuk), Ukrainian nationalist.
V
13 Nadezhda Surovtseva, Ukrainian writer and historian, born 1896.
14 Mikhail Osadchy, Ukrainian writer serving 10 years for a novel.
15 Gely Snegiryov, Kiev writer arrested in 1977.
16 Valery Marchenko, Kiev writer serving an 8-year sentence.
VI
17 Group of Moscow refuseniks including Anatoly Shcharansky, Elena Sirotenko, Zakhar Tesker and Leonid Tsypin.
18 Dina Beilina and Iosif Beilin, Moscow Jewish activists.
19 Ida Nudel, Moscow refusenik and friend of political prisoners.
VII
20 Birute Pašiliene and Aleksis Pašilis, Lithuanian dissenters.
21 Vladimir Lazaris, Moscow lawyer and refusenik.
22 Viktoras Petkus, arrested member of Lithuanian Helsinki Group.
VIII
23 Romas Giedra, Lithuanian imprisoned 1962-67, now seeking emigration.
24 Eitan Finkelshtein, member of Lithuanian Helsinki Group, refusenik.
25 Mart Niklus, Estonian zoologist, ex-political prisoner.
26 Alfonsas Svarinskas, Lithuanian priest, ex-political prisoner.

IX

27 Crowd outside trial in Kirgizia of Baptists Ivan Shlekht and Yakov Yantsen.

28 Baptist leaflet showing new prisoners Shlekht, Yantsen and Yakov Volf.

X

29 Rev. Peter Peters (arrested 1977), Nina Zakharova, Mikhail Khorev, Baptists.

30 Nikolai Baturin, a leader of the dissenting Baptists in Rostov region.

31 Nikolai Kravchenko, young Baptist beaten up for declining to take military oath.

XI

32 Anna Chuprina and Pentecostalist families in Nakhodka, persecuted for seeking emigration.

33 Vasily Patrushev and family, Pentecostalists in the same situation.

XII

34 Irina Matyash, Pentecostalist from Krasnodar region, N. Caucasus, in same situation.

35 N. G. Bobarykin, member of the same congregation as Matyash.

36 Members of the same congregation: Fyodor Sidenko, Bishop Nikolai Goretoi, Goretoi's wife.

Preface

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 should 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* 47, is, like previous ones, a translation of a copy of the original typewritten text. The editorial insertions are the endnotes (numbered) and the words in square brackets. The table of contents, abbreviations, extracts from the R S F S R criminal code, illustrations, names index, bibliographical note and material on the outside and inside of the cover have been added to help the general reader. None of this material appeared in the original text.

The endnotes have been kept to a minimum, partly because the Russian text already refers to earlier issues, and partly because the names index gathers together all references to a particular person. Ukrainian names are usually given in transliteration from the Russian, not in Ukrainian forms.

Since Amnesty International has no control over the writing of *A Chronicle of Current Events*, we cannot guarantee the veracity of all its contents. Nor do we take responsibility for any opinions or judgements which may appear or be implied in its contents. Yet Amnesty

International continues to regard *A Chronicle of Current Events* as an authentic and reliable source of information on matters of direct concern to our own work for the worldwide observance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Amnesty International
May 1978

Abbreviations

ASSR	Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. Subordinate to an 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 and so named because it is the home of the Mordovian national minority.
KGB	Committee for State Security.
Komsomol	Communist Youth League.
MVD	Ministry of Internal Affairs.
OVD	Department of Internal Affairs.
OVIR	Department (of the MVD) for Visas and Registration.
SSR	Soviet Socialist Republic, of which there are 15 in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR).
UVD	Administration for Internal Affairs.

The Struggle for Human Rights in the Soviet Union Continues

A Chronicle of Current Events

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19

Number 47 **30 November 1977**

Contents

The trial of Serebrov. The trial of Rozhdestvov. The Helsinki Groups under investigation. Arrests, searches, interrogations. Events in Lithuania. Persecution of believers. Persecution of Crimean Tatars. The right to leave. The Jewish movement. In the prisons and camps. After release. In exile. In the psychiatric hospitals. Extrajudicial persecution. Miscellaneous news. Letters and statements. Discussion of the Draft Constitution. Official documents. Samizdat news. Trials of recent years. Addenda and corrigenda.

TENTH YEAR OF PUBLICATION

The Trial of Serebrov

On 12 October the People's Court of the Krasnopresnensky district of Moscow examined the case of Serebrov, charged under article 196, part 3, of the R S F S R Criminal Code ('using a knowingly forged document'). Redkina presided over the court session, procurator Kukushkina spoke for the prosecution, barrister E. A. Reznikova defended Serebrov.

Felix Arkadevich Serebrov (b. 1930) is a member of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes (*Chronicle* 44). Since the early 1970s his signature has appeared under various *samizdat* documents: protests, letters in defence of political prisoners, and so on. In 1976 Serebrov sent a number of statements to Soviet organs of health and justice demanding a change in the regime in Sychyovka special psychiatric hospital. In the middle of 1976 the K G B tried without result to recruit Felix Serebrov and his wife Vera Pavlovna Serebrova as informants (to shadow the family of P. G. Grigorenko).

On 22 April 1977 F. Serebrov was summoned to Krasnopresnensky district U V D in Moscow where senior investigator Malyuta charged him with having presented a work-book with forged entries to the personnel section when he had joined his last place of work (details below). Serebrov had to give a written undertaking not to leave Moscow.

On 27 May a search was carried out at Serebrov's flat to 'confiscate documents about his former places of work'. Documents of the Working Commission, a set of directives of the Ministry of Health, poetry written by Serebrov, poetry of Victor Nekipelov, correspondence with Nekipelov, a prescription for a cough medicine (libeksin) written out by Nekipelov, and a blank prescription were confiscated.

On 3 June a search was conducted at the home of Nekipelov (*Chronicle* 46); later, as a consequence, materials relating to Nekipelov were taken from the case of Serebrov and made into a separate case.

On 13 June F. Serebrov wrote:

> Victor Nekipelov, father of two young children, a talented poet, translator and publicist, is threatened with the danger of repeated imprisonment.
>
> The noose of punitive authority is dragging Nekipelov into the mincing-machine of repression.
>
> The devilish mechanism set in motion by Stalin has been regulated, oiled and continues to pulverize human fates. The fate of the family of Victor Nekipelov.

On the same day he wrote in connection with his own charge:

It is more convenient for the authorities to disguise the persecution

of dissenters as the punishment of criminal activity: M. Landa, I. Begun, M. Shtern, the artists Volkov and Rybakov . . .
Criminal cases are snowballing . . .
And we are waiting for arrests.

On 22 August Serebrov was summoned to an interrogation. He refused to answer questions, having stated that the real reason for official persecution of him was his social activity. Then he was arrested on the authorization of the deputy procurator of Krasnopresnensky district, Kirakozov, and sent to Butyrka prison. On his arrest Serebrov declared a hunger-strike.

On 24 August four policemen carried out a search at Serebrov's flat without presenting the relevant documents. Serebrov's aunt Elena Ivanovna Golubkova (75 years, invalid of group I), who was present, immediately protested against the illegal search.

On 26 August inspector of criminal investigation of police station 11 Laniyenko confiscated Serebrov's army card at his flat. He would not allow those present to record this in the protocol.

On 28 August the Working Commission (V. Bakhmin, I. Kaplun, A. Podrabinek) sent a telegram to the International Congress of Psychiatrists in Honolulu, calling on it to speak out in defence of Serebrov. A letter of similar content was signed by 40 people.

On 29 August Serebrov and his barrister Reznikova familiarized themselves with the materials of the completed pre-trial investigation. Reznikova addressed petitions that the case be closed for lack of a corpus delicti and that he be released from detention.

On 30 August Serebrov stopped his hunger strike at the insistence of his friends.

The trial took place on 12 October.

Barrister Reznikova requested that she be given time to familiarize herself with the contents of a sealed envelope which had appeared in the case file after the completion of the pre-trial investigation. The envelope turned out to contain documents of the Working Commission and letters in defence of political prisoners confiscated during the search at the home of Serebrov.

At the beginning of the session Serebrov stated his objection to the procurator 'insofar as the investigation was conducted in a biased manner and the actions of the procurator were not objective'. The Court ruled against his petition. After this Serebrov refused to answer the questions of the procurator and in order to obtain an answer the judge had to repeat them as though they were his own questions.

In the indictment Serebrov was charged with presenting a work-book with three forged entries to the personnel section at the 'Dawn' factory when he started work there in April 1974.

The first of these entries says that in 1953 Serebrov had already worked for seven years, and in addition it was indicated in the work-book that this entry had been made on the basis of Serebrov's own words. The second entry says that Serebrov was dismissed on 10 April 1957 on the basis of the report of a medical commission. Proceeding from the fact that on 9 April 1957 Serebrov was arrested for 'exceeding the limits of necessary self-defence', the investigation, relying on the results of an expert analysis, considered that the words in this entry 'by decision of a medical commission' were forged. Finally, the third entry says that in 1963 Serebrov worked as a metal-worker of category 6. Expert analysis established that in this entry the figure '5' had earlier been in the place of the figure '6'.

The indictment says nothing about who forged the entries enumerated, and when, or what was originally in the place of the first two entries.

The procurator called for the maximum punishment for Serebrov under article 196 part 3 — one year of imprisonment; moreover, he demanded that he serve his punishment in a strict-regime camp. The reason he gave for this was that Serebrov had a negative work testimonial ('carried out his work, no-one has criticized his work, is unsociable, does not participate in public life, does not take part in communist voluntary labour').

The barrister called for the acquittal of Serebrov. She stated that the forgery of the entries had not been proven. (In particular, according to the labour legislation effective in 1957, dismissal in connection with an arrest could be carried out not earlier than two months after the arrest; also, Serebrov really had undergone a medical commission.) In addition to this, Reznikova stated that even if the three entries indicated were forged, they did not give Serebrov any rights (an entry made on the basis of assertions by the owner of a book is not a basis for increasing his official length of service or his pay; an entry about his category is not a basis either for increasing his pay or for establishing his category in the future); therefore there was no corpus delicti under article 196. Lastly, the barrister maintained that the statute of limitations had become effective in the given instance on 30 March 1977, i.e. before the case had been brought (22 April), insofar as on 30 April 1974 the head of the personnel section of the 'Dawn' factory, V. D. Ivanov, had already decided, on his own admission (Ivanov spoke as a witness at the trial), to employ Serebrov, which, in the opinion of the barrister, could not have occurred without his being acquainted with the work-book. (The official date of the start of Serebrov's employment at this job was 23 April.)

In his final speech Serebrov said that he did not consider 'this speech as final, insofar as speech always has been, is and shall be'. He said that recently the K G B, with the aim of compromising and frightening dissidents, had been trying to deal with them by bringing criminal charges. As examples Serebrov named the cases of M. Landa, P. Ruban,

his own case and 'the case being prepared against Nekipelov'. Serebrov said that he had been subjected to threats and interrogations by the K G B even while in Butyrka prison, where K G B investigator Kapayev had interrogated him (case of Yu. Orlov), without concealing the participation of the K G B in his case and expressing regrets that this time Serebrov was getting off lightly. Serebrov described how in 1976 his work-book had been in the possession of the K G B investigator who tried to recruit him. Serebrov concluded his final address with the words: 'Whatever decision the court takes, I regard the fact that a criminal case has been brought against me as a violation of the Constitution and a flouting of my rights and liberties.'

Serebrov's final address was interrupted repeatedly by the judge, who forbade Serebrov to mention other criminal cases and to say 'we' and 'dissidents'.

The trial was open but the front benches were occupied by K G B employees.

In the verdict Serebrov received the punishment called for by the procurator.

After the trial Serebrov was transferred to Krasnopresnensky transit prison.

On 18 October Serebrov handed to the prison administration, for dispatch to the court, a statement requesting that he be allowed to read the protocol of the court proceedings; his statement did not reach the court.

On 20 October Serebrov was handed a copy of the verdict.

On 24 October Serebrov was dispatched to a labour-camp although his sentence had not yet legally taken effect. On 25 October the deputy governor of the prison told V. P. Serebrova that her husband had been sent to Mordovia, as, on the instructions of the U S S R Procuracy and the government, pressure had to be taken off Moscow's prisons before the festivities for the 60th anniversary of October [1917].

On 27 October, on his arrival in camp (Mordovia camp 11 in the village of Yavas), Serebrov tried to hand to the camp administration his appeal against sentence, but they would not take it, giving as the reason for refusal the fact that Serebrov did not have an envelope.

On 23 November the appeal was heard in the Moscow city court. Barrister Reznikova petitioned (a) for the hearing to be postponed in view of the violation of Serebrov's right to a defence, (b) for the period in which Serebrov could hand in his appeal to be renewed, and (c) for the dispatch of Serebrov back to Moscow so that he could utilise her assistance and hand in the appeal. The Court ignored her petitions. The hearing took place. The Court also ignored the arguments of Reznikova which sought to prove the lack of any grounds for the sentence. The sentence was left unchanged and took legal effect.

The Trial of Rozhdestvov

On 23 November the Kaluga Regional Court ruled that Vladimir Rozhdestvov, charged under article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code, was not responsible, and sent him for compulsory treatment to a psychiatric hospital of special type.

Vladimir Pavlovich Rozhdestvov (b. 1937) graduated from the Tomsk building institute.

On 6 November 1970, when he was travelling to Moscow to circulate leaflets he had written calling for the democratization of the Soviet system, he was removed from the train at Kalinin and forcibly hospitalized in a psychiatric hospital, where he was diagnosed as a schizophrenic. Rozhdestvov was treated with insulin therapy. He left the hospital in May 1971.

In October 1971, when the K G B found out about the group of seven people organized by Rozhdestvov which was propagating dissenting views, they hospitalized him once again. He was treated with neuroleptic drugs and sulphazin. He was released in March 1972. Since then Rozhdestvov, as recorded in the history of his illness, 'has been on a special K G B list as a socially dangerous sick person'.

On the night of 9-10 September Rozhdestvov was forcibly placed in Kaluga regional psychiatric hospital No. 1. There he was subjected to treatment with neuroleptic drugs.

On 7 October Alexander Podrabinek wrote to the chief psychoneurologist of the U S S R Ministry of Health, Churkin:

> We ask you to investigate this case and make every effort to release Rozhdestvov.
>
> We consider it necessary to inform you that if Rozhdestvov is not released by 12 October we shall be compelled to appeal to the special committee for investigating complaints about the use of psychiatry for political ends, set up recently by the World Psychiatric Association.

On 11 October Rozhdestvov was transferred to the Kaluga investigation prison.

On 4 November procurator Amarov of the regional procuracy told Rozhdestvov's mother that a criminal case under article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code had been brought against her son and that compulsory treatment in a special psychiatric hospital awaited him.

The trial took place on 23 November. Deputy president of the Kaluga regional court Kuznetsov presided, procurator Dmitriyev was the prosecutor, barrister N. Ya. Nimirinskaya spoke for the defence, and doctor L. P. Tronina of the Kaluga regional psychiatric hospital was the psychiatric expert.

The trial was open, and everyone who wanted was allowed into the hall. N. P. Gaidukova and Voronin had been summoned to the trial as witnesses. Gaidukova did not appear: she presented a sickness certificate. The court determined to hear the case in her absence after reading out the evidence given by her at the pre-trial investigation. The court also determined to hear the case in the absence of the accused, 'in connection with his sick condition'.

The mother of the accused, Olga Efimovna Rozhdestvova, petitioned for the admission of Alexander Podrabinek as legal representative for her son. Barrister Nimirinskaya — in 1974 she defended V. Khaustov (*Chronicle* 32) and V. Nekipelov (*Chronicle* 32), and in 1976, V. Igrunov (*Chronicle* 40) — upheld her petition. Procurator Dmitriyev objected. The Court ruled against the petition of Rozhdestvova.

The 'Resolution on sending the case to court to resolve the question of the application of compulsory measures of a medical character to V. P. Rozhdestvov' said:

Since 1970 Rozhdestvov has systematically spread deliberately false fabrications slandering the Soviet political and social system. This is confirmed by the evidence of witnesses . . .

Witnesses Krivorotov, Gutovsky, Reingardt, Nekrasov, Nadyshev and Naumenko have testified that in the period 1970-1977 Rozhdestvov listened to anti-Soviet broadcasts of Western radio-stations, commented on their content in an anti-Soviet vein, voiced complaints against the alleged incorrectness of policies conducted in the U S S R, and tried to exercise a negative influence on them politically. He was interested in people who expressed political dissatisfaction with living conditions in our country, and praised life in capitalist countries . . .

In February-March 1977 he handed over a manuscript to Gaidukova which contained slanderous fabrications against the material conditions of the Soviet people, its economic and political rights, and also against the internal policies of the U S S R. He suggested to Gaidukova that she listen to broadcasts of foreign radio-stations . . .

On 6-7 September 1977 he tried to foist anti-Soviet fabrications on Voronin. He tried to convince him of the necessity of struggling for the reconstruction of Soviet society on the model of the West, of circulating these fabrications amongst the population, and of joining an anti-Soviet organization allegedly in existence in the U S S R. He suggested that he listen to broadcasts of anti-Soviet radio-stations and copy out the text of an ideologically harmful poem composed by him . . .

According to the conclusion of a forensic psychiatric examination, he expresses delusional ideas of reformism and of struggle with the socio-political system existing in the Soviet Union . . .

Because of his psychic condition Rozhdestvov needs compulsory treatment in a psychiatric hospital of special type . . .

From the interrogation of witness Voronin:

Judge: Where and under what circumstances did you become acquainted with Rozhdestvov?

Voronin: We lived together for two days in a hotel.

Judge: Tell us everything you know about the case.

Voronin: On 6 September I arrived in Maloyaroslavets for military training. I stayed in a hotel, in a room for two, room No. 4. On the evening of 7 September, when I was writing synopses, a conversation struck up between us — Rozhdestvov and myself. Rozhdestvov asked me why I was not working in my speciality (by profession I am a builder). I replied that I was forced to leave my job because of a conflict with the director. Then he said that not only small bosses are bad, but the bosses at the top as well. In the evening he listened to the Deutsche Welle radio-station and said that Italian communists were not allowed into the U S S R and that it was time to put an end to that. I asked: 'Aren't you afraid of trying to convert me?' He replied: 'First I size a person up, then I draw conclusions'. After this the conversation turned to labour-camps. In the evening I went to see a film on a patriotic military theme. Rozhdestvov did not go to see the film and said that he did not watch such films because everything in them was lies. I did not sleep all night and thought: how should I act? In the morning I went to the K G B and told them everything. They ordered me to write a statement. They instructed me how to conduct the conversation and on what topics. In the evening I introduced a conversation about struggle. Rozhdestvov told me about an underground organizaton and suggested that I participate in it. I asked how I could help. He said that it was necessary to try to convert good people, to conduct propaganda amongst pupils of senior classes. He said that it was possible to circulate 1000 leaflets in three months, then to take a break for about three months. He said that branches of the organization exist in 130 towns, a journal comes out — some *Chronicle*. He suggested I form a circle in Kaluga and move there with that aim. He suggested I have a talk about all this with my brother. He showed me his poem, suggested I copy it out for clandestine circulation amongst the masses. The following morning we parted after exchanging addresses. He did not mention his surname in order to preserve security.

Judge: What further conversation was there?

Voronin: I asked what the aim of the organization was. He said that it was necessary to change the system by peaceful means, to disband the army, to divide up the land into approximately 50 hectares per person, to introduce private property for factories and so on, like in the West.

Judge: What is the aim of the organization?
Voronin: To change the system.
Judge: Over how long?
Voronin: In a maximum of ten years.
Judge: What did he urge you to do personally?
Voronin: He urged me to join the struggle.
Judge: In what way?
Voronin: To campaign, to circulate leaflets, to move to a town where I could be closer to the masses.
Judge: What exactly did he say about the leaflets: what should they contain, who will prepare them, how will you receive them?
Voronin: He said that he would provide the leaflets, and that if a journal exists, leaflets are a trifle. He described how they scatter leaflets in Moscow.
Judge: Does the underground organization already exist?
Voronin: I don't know. Rozhdestvov said it was necessary to form a circle.
Judge: Is the journal he was talking about the *Chronicle of Current Events*?
Voronin: Yes.
Judge: By whom is it published, by what organization, where?
Voronin: I don't know.
Judge: What radio-stations did Rozhdestvov listen to? When?
Voronin: The first evening he listened to Deutsche Welle.
Judge: What was the content of the broadcast?
Voronin: About Italian communists who were not allowed into the Soviet Union.
Judge: What stations did Rozhdestvov suggest you listen to? What are they called?
Voronin: Voice of America, Radio Liberty, BBC. I said that everything these radio-stations broadcast was slander. Rozhdestvov said they speak the truth, as strong nations would not slander weak ones.
Judge: Did not doubts arise in you as to the psychic health of Rozhdestvov?
Voronin: No. He produced many quotations, including from Lenin, and gave the impression of being an intelligent person.
People's assessor: Was he drinking?
Voronin: No, he didn't even drink beer.
People's assessor: So in your opinion he is not a sick man but an enemy of the people?
Voronin: Yes.
Prosecutor: What is the content of the poem?
Voronin: The poem called for struggle and in general its content was prohibited.
Prosecutor: Does he slander in it or not?

Voronin: Yes, he slanders.
Prosecutor: What other slanderous things did he say?
Voronin: That worker's pay is low, there is no meat or milk in the shops, that there are no rights like in the West, that some exhibition in Moscow was torn down, that the system of elections is undemocratic.
Prosecutor: In other words, he denigrated and slandered the Soviet way of life?
Voronin: Yes.
Counsel for the defence: What days were you in the hotel?
Voronin: The 7th and 8th. On the 9th I left after work. There was no work on the 10th.
Defence: What slander did Rozhdestvov communicate to you on 7 September, what facts?
Voronin: About the party and the government, that there are the same bad people at the top as down below. He spoke of an underground organization.
Defence: I am asking you not about an organization but about what you regard as slanderous.
Voronin: For example, about the money system — he said that wages are low.
Defence: Did you talk about the money system that day — on 7 September?
Voronin: Yes.
Defence: You wrote the statement to the K G B the following day?
Voronin: Yes.
Defence: Why is it dated 9 September?
Voronin: I wrote it on the 8th but finished it on the 9th.
Defence: Who started the conversations on the second day of your acquaintance?
Voronin: Rozhdestvov was writing down the poem. I asked him about the poem.
Defence: What facts of a slanderous nature were contained in the poem?
Voronin: He wrote that the people drink because they have nothing to do, and he called for struggle.
Defence: You copied out the poem. Did you know that it was not allowed?
Voronin: No, I didn't.

The psychiatric examination had diagnosed Rozhdestvov as a 'paranoid schizophrenic with delusions of reformism'. The psychiatric expert L. P. Tronina stated at the trial that Rozhdestvov 'considered it possible to change the Soviet political system by peaceful means'.

The judge rejected the petition of the defence counsel to arrange

another psychiatric examination and to call the other witnesses. The judge several times rudely interrupted the barrister's speech. He forbade those present to take notes.

On 25 November the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes published a 'Report on the Trial of Rozhdestvov'.

The same day a member of the commission, Alexander Podrabinek, addressed an open letter to the World Psychiatric Association. The letter concludes thus:

> And before it is too late, before the appeal hearing begins, I call on the World Psychiatric Association to intervene in this case. May the resolutions adopted in Honolulu not remain on paper. May Soviet psychiatrists feel the firmness of their foreign colleagues in upholding the humane principles of medicine.

The Helsinki Groups Under Investigation

The Case of Ginzburg

At the end of February or the beginning of March I. L. Ivanov, a worker from Tarusa who helped A. Ginzburg to rebuild his house, and his wife were summoned to an interrogation in Kaluga. Ivanov testified that he had a case of Ginzburg's with some papers in it at his home, and handed over the case to the investigators.

In August investigator Saushkin interrogated several times a former criminal prisoner, Arkady Gradoboyev — an acquaintance of Ginzburg's who worked with him at the Tarusa House of Rest. Gradoboyev testified that Ginzburg gave him *The Gulag Archipelago* to read.

At the end of August investigator Saushkin twice interrogated the 70-year-old Moscow writer N. D. Otten (*Chronicle* 36), who has a house in Tarusa, and his wife, translator E. M. Golysheva — old acquaintances of Ginzburg who spoke out in his defence in 1968. Otten confirmed that he had kept a case belonging to Ginzburg at his house and that he had given this case to I. L. Ivanov for safekeeping. To the question to whom did the issue of *Kontinent* belong which she had given Gradoboyev to read, Golysheva said that the journal had been given to her as a present by N. Vilyams (*Chronicle* 44), now living in the USA.

In the summer a Tarusa woman, M. R. Vogelzang, and Moscow theatre producer Yu. Shcherbakov, who has a dacha in Tarusa, were interrogated in the Ginzburg case.

* * *

Former political prisoners continue to be interrogated in the Ginzburg case.

In August Vladimir Potashov (*Chronicle* 33) was summoned from Omsk to an interrogation in Kaluga. When asked whether he received money from the [Solzhenitsyn] Prisoner's Aid Fund, Potashov replied that he had once received 175 roubles. — 'What for?' — 'I considered it was due to me as a political prisoner.' Potashov was asked questions about the situation of political prisoners in strict-regime camps.

In the middle of August Leonid Borodin (*Chronicles* 1, 34) was summoned to an interrogation in Kaluga. Borodin refused to testify. Nevertheless, the investigator began to read him questions about the behaviour of Ginzburg in camp. Then he read the evidence of a certain anonymous witness, who described the details of a camp hunger-strike in 1969, with the aid of which political prisoners (including Borodin) had sought to obtain permission for the registration of the marriage between A. Ginzburg and I. Zholkovskaya. The evidence describes how materials about the hunger-strike were sent out of the camp; conversations between those who took part in the hunger-strike are related, in particular between Borodin and Victor Kalninš.

On 29 August in Kaluga investigator Odintsov interrogated V. I. Gandzyuk (*Chronicle* 39), who is now in exile in Tomsk region (*Chronicles* 44, 46). Gandzyuk confirmed that he had received a transfer of 100 roubles from Ginzburg and a parcel from his wife I. Zholkovskaya. When asked 'Do you regard yourself as a political prisoner?', Gandzyuk replied, 'Of course; I'm not a criminal.'

At the end of August or beginning of September Sergei Malchevsky (*Chronicles* 9, 17, 23), who is now in exile in the Komi Autonomous Republic (*Chronicle* 37), was summoned to an interrogation in Kaluga. He testified that he had received all in all about 1000 roubles from the Fund. Malchevsky was also interrogated about the life of Ginzburg in camp.

* * *

In the middle of October Vyacheslav Platonov (*Chronicles* 1, 23) was summoned to an interrogation in Kaluga.

Investigator Saushkin told Platonov that it was Ginzburg who had 'killed' Yury Galanskov (*Chronicle* 28). At first he allegedly incited Galanskov to activities which led him to the dock, and then, when he was in the same camp, forced him to take part in a protest hunger-strike which was the reason for his death.

Platonov replied that as he had been in the same camp as Ginzburg and Galanskov he had seen the warmth with which Ginzburg had taken care of his sick friend. He remembered well how Ginzburg had tried to dissuade Galanskov from taking part in hunger-strikes. In particular, in the spring of 1969 Ginzburg himself had cut short a hunger-

strike because of the serious state of health of Galanskov who was supporting his hunger-strike. Platonov said that he considered the camp administration to be guilty of Galanskov's death, as well as he himself and his other camp comrades who had not succeeded in obtaining medical help for Galanskov in time, in the way they had obtained it for others.

The investigator did not enter this reply by Platonov in the protocol.

Moreover, Saushkin told how in the summer a former political prisoner from Mordovian camps, artist Yury Ivanov (*Chronicles* 10, 29), had been summoned to Kaluga for an interrogation in the Ginzburg case. According to Saushkin, before entering the building of the Kaluga K G B, Ivanov had stuck a poster on it saying 'Freedom for Alexander Ginzburg'; the same day he was arrested and was now under investigation in Kaluga prison. He was charged under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code; the investigation was being conducted by the same officers as those on the Ginzburg case. Ivanov himself had allegedly explained his action by the fact that he was tired of living in freedom and worrying about his crust of bread.

* * *

At the beginning of November investigator Saushkin interrogated Yaroslav Gasyuk (*Chronicle* 25). Gasyuk was asked about the behaviour of Ginzburg in camp. Gasyuk told of Ginzburg's numerous virtues. When he was shown materials of the Helsinki Group about food norms in camps, he said: 'In general you don't die of starvation in camps . . . there are parcels . . .'

On 11 November investigator Gaideltsov again interrogated L. Borodin, and on 14 November he interrogated V. Uzlov (*Chronicle* 46). They were once more presented with the questions that had already been put to them, and for the second time refused to answer them. Both were charged under article 182 of the R S F S R Criminal Code ('Evasion or refusal of a witness to give evidence . . .').

In the middle of November Sergei Khakhayev (*Chronicle* 35) was summoned from Luga (Leningrad region) to an interrogation in Kaluga. Khakhayev testified that in the camps his path had not crossed with Ginzburg's and he had not received money from the Fund. The investigator claimed that Ginzburg had transferred 2,500 roubles to Yu. Fyodorov (*Chronicles* 42, 44-46) and V. Novoseltsev (*Chronicle* 45) through Khakhayev, in order to set up an illegal organization of former political prisoners. Khakhayev did not confirm this; for this reason, no doubt, it was not recorded in the protocol of the interrogation.

On 23 and 24 November in Kaluga Gaideltsov interrogated Sergei Ponomaryov (*Chronicles* 13, 15, 32), one of the co-defendants of V. Pavlenkov (*Chronicle* 42). After Ponomaryov had spoken of Ginzburg

with respect, Gaideltsov declared that the *White Book* (the collection of documents on the case of Sinyavsky and Daniel) had in fact been compiled by Yu. Galanskov, whilst Ginzburg had only been the instigator in this affair. Gaideltsov said that when Ginzburg was in the Mordovian camps he had bribed the whole administration and 'lived better than we do in freedom — he always had both tea and coffee'. Gaideltsov alleged that when he had been in charge of the Fund Ginzburg had hardly helped some people, while he had laid on feasts for others and given them all sorts of imported clothing.

On 26 November Irina Zholkovskaya, the wife of A. Ginzburg, sent the following statement to investigator M. V. Oselkov, who is leading the group on the 'Ginzburg case'.

> On 23-24 November of this year an employee in your investigative group which is conducting the case of my husband A. I. Ginzburg, investigator Gaideltsov, interrogated the witness S. M. Ponomaryov (Gorky). Investigator Gaideltsov began the interrogation by reading to the witness, before everything else, a long lecture about Ginzburg, which was full of ridiculous inventions and slander. Thus he informed the witness Ponomaryov authoritatively that the book about the Sinyavsky–Daniel trial was not the work of Ginzburg (as recorded in the verdict in the case of Ginzburg, Galanskov and others in 1968). According to Gaideltsov, the book was the work of the now deceased Yury Galanskov (he died in 1972 in a concentration camp in Mordovia). It was Ginzburg, according to Gaideltsov's information, who forced Galanskov to work for him and then got him imprisoned, cunningly contriving for himself a shorter term of imprisonment than for the sick Galanskov, for whom investigator Gaideltsov has greater sympathy. And generally speaking, according to Gaideltsov, 'Galanskov's death' is 'on Ginzburg's conscience'.
>
> This is not the first time the K G B has started this monstrous and cynical rumour. At the beginning it was spread by the provocateur Evgeny Murashov, whose source was the K G B; now it is being openly pronounced by a K G B interrogator himself.
>
> I state with full responsibility that I regard these actions of investigator Gaideltsov as illegal and amoral, and his statement as insolently slanderous.
>
> After this, investigator Gaideltsov informed the witness Ponomaryov that while he was in camp in Mordovia Ginzburg 'bribed the whole administration', that after his return from prison he bought his friends — former political prisoners — houses from the money of the Fund.
>
> I consider these statements by investigator Gaideltsov to be shortsighted and irresponsible lies. Investigator Gaideltsov is using methods of blackmail and slander with the aim of vilifying a man

who has not yet been convicted, and of putting pressure on a witness so as to obtain from him the evidence needed by the investigation. I express my lack of confidence in investigator Gaideltsov and request that he be removed from the conduct of the investigation. I have every reason to fear that the investigation in my husband's case is not being conducted objectively. I have therefore been forced to turn to an American barrister, E. B. Williams, who represents the interests of my husband in the West, and to send him a copy of this statement of mine so that he and other Western lawyers can see how the investigation in the Ginzburg case is being conducted. I know that E. B. Williams has received a great deal of evidence about the character, life and activities of my husband from people living both here and in the West (including from D. I. Kaminskaya, Galanskov's, and subsequently Ginzburg's, barrister). In connection with the last statements of investigator Gaideltsov I am requesting barrister Williams to use the evidence of witnesses which he already has, as well as new evidence, and to present it to any instance of his choosing.

On 28 November Vitaly Pomozov (a former student of the history faculty of Gorky university; served three years under article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code; now lives near Tarusa) was interrogated in Kaluga. He was asked what Ginzburg had given him to read. Pomozov refused to give evidence as the substance of the charge was not explained to him.

According to rumours, L. Ladyzhensky (*Chronicles* 34, 43) has also been interrogated in the Ginzburg case.

Mikhail Sado (see 'Releases' in section 'In the Prisons and Camps') is at present in Kaluga.

* * *

The wife of Korovin (*Chronicles* 34, 39) and the wife of M. Makarenko (*Chronicle* 46) have been interrogated in the Ginzburg case. The wife of Korovin said that she received help from a 'Zionist fund', but she knew nothing about a Russian public fund.

* * *

From 17 to 22 October in Gorky investigator Gaideltsov interrogated T. L. Batayeva, N. N. Lepekhin, V. I. Zhiltsov (one of the co-defendants of V. Pavlenkov, *Chronicle* 13) and the wife of V. Pavlenkov, Svetlana Pavlenkova (*Chronicle* 42), in the Ginzburg case. All those summoned used to send money to political prisoners some time ago. At the interrogations they were asked mainly about this. Batayeva, Lepekhin and Zhiltsov testified that they sent their personal money to the camps. Svelana Pavlenkova stated that she knew A. Ginzburg well and could not give evidence about friends; she therefore refused to give evidence.

Gaideltsov summoned S. Pavlenkova to another interrogation on 10 November, this time in Kaluga. He repeated to her three of the questions he had put in Gorky; she again refused to give evidence. After this Gaideltsov charged her under article 182 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. On 19 November S. Pavlenkova and her defence counsel E. A. Reznikova studied the case file. Reznikova wrote a petition about closing the case, as the acts with which Pavlenkova was charged had been committed before the Decree on an Amnesty had come into force, and as at the interrogation on 10 November nothing new had taken place.

* * *

On 22 November the newspaper *Gorky Truth* inserted an article about the Pavlenkov family and their friends. Svetlana and Vladlen Pavlenkov are represented in it as slanderers and anti-social elements, living off the hand-outs of the West.

The Ponomaryov family is accused in the article of helping war criminals and members of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, who are serving a 'just' punishment. The brother of Pavlenkov, M. Pankratov, and a co-defendant of Pavlenkov, V. Zhiltsov, are mentioned in the article.

* * *

On the interrogations of K. Lyubarsky, G. Salova and V. Turchin, see the section 'The Right to Leave' in this issue.

* * *

On 1 November I. Zholkovskaya, the wife of A. Ginzburg, was summoned to an interrogation at Lefortovo prison. Senior investigator Yu. F. Suchkov who interrogated her was emphatically polite. In reply to his first question, I. Zholkovskaya recorded in the protocol that she regarded her husband as a remarkable man and was proud of him; she refused to answer the rest of the questions. Suchkov informed I. Zholkovskaya that the investigation was drawing to a close and suggested that she look for a barrister. To the words of Zholkovskaya that the American barrister E. B. Williams (*Chronicle* 44) would be defending her husband, Suchkov replied that this was an international problem and would be settled separately. Then for 40 minutes Suchkov looked into the complaints of Zholkovskaya about the reception of parcels in Kaluga prison, but essentially did not reply to a single question.

Zholkovskaya began to look for a barrister. During the course of November eight barristers from Moscow and four from Leningrad refused to undertake the defence of A. Ginzburg.

* * *

On 4 October more than 50 people from Moscow, Leningrad and other towns carried out a one-day hunger strike in support of Ginzburg and Orlov.

* * *

On 21 November — A. I. Ginzburg's birthday — dozens of congratulatory telegrams from friends and acquaintances of Alexander Ilich arrived at Kaluga prison addressed to him. A group of American senators* also congratulated Ginzburg; they sent their telegram to Minister of Internal Affairs Shchelokov with a request that it be passed on to the addressee.

* * *

See also 'Samizdat News' in this issue.

The Case of Orlov

In the case of Yu. Orlov, besides Irina Valitova, the present and third wife of Yu. Orlov (*Chronicle* 46), his first and second wives have also been interrogated. They were asked whether Yu. Orlov helped his children, where he found the money to help them and what attracted them to him. Both of them spoke favourably about Orlov.

An investigator from the Moscow K G B, senior lieutenant V. N. Kapayev, interrogated Dmitry Orlov (25 years), Yu. Orlov's son. Dmitry refused to answer questions about his father. He stated: '. . . My father has a highly developed sense of moral and social responsibility. I regard the investigation of such a man as my father to be amoral.'

Investigators Kapayev and Eropa interrogated Yu. Orlov's other son, Alexander Orlov (23). They asked him whether his father helped him, how this help was expressed, whether his father had not given him money certificates. Alexander replied that his father gave him ordinary Soviet money and bought him things. To the question whether his father had not given him documents of the Helsinki Group to read, Alexander replied that his father gave him artistic literature.

The writer Vladimir Kornilov (*Chronicle* 46) was asked at an interrogation by an investigator of the Moscow K G B, senior lieutenant V. V. Katalikov, to give a character reference for Yu. Orlov. Kornilov replied that he knew Orlov as a noble, honourable man, a real Russian intellectual. To the question whether Orlov had not given him *Kontinent* to read, Kornilov replied that as he had been printed in the journal himself, there was no point in Orlov doing this. To the question

[* In fact congressmen — R. Bauman, J. Jeffords, S. Solarz, F. Spence, N. Steers, M. Edwards.]

whether Orlov had not composed the text of the statement on the subject of explosions in the Moscow metro (*Chronicle* 46), signed amongst others by Orlov and Kornilov, Kornilov replied that he did not know.

Investigator Katalikov interrogated a head of laboratory in the Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics [I T E P] of the U S S R Academy of Sciences, doctor of physical and mathematical sciences E. K. Tarasov, who worked in I T E P together with Orlov up till 1956. Tarasov characterized Orlov as a talented scientist and a wonderful person.

'What can you say about the political activities of Orlov?'

'I know nothing about Orlov's political activities.'

'What, don't you listen to the radio?'

'No, I don't.'

'Orlov testified to us that you took books from him. Did he give you *Kontinent*, the novel by H. Hesse *The Glass Bead Game*, articles by Burzhuademov?'[1]

'No, he didn't.'

'What money did Orlov live on?'

'He gave lessons.'

'You can't live on that.'

A close friend of Yu. Orlov, a long-term 'refusenik', doctor of physical and mathematical sciences Yu. A. Golfand, said at an interrogation that Yu. Orlov was a great, talented scientist and a remarkable person.

'I am ashamed that people like Orlov are behind bars.'

'What can you say about Orlov's activities in the so-called Helsinki Group?'

'I approve of and support them.'

'What money did Orlov live on?'

'He gave lessons to schoolchildren.'

'Didn't you see dollars or money certificates at his home?'

'No, never.'

Investigators Katalikov and Kapayev interrogated an acquaintance of Yu. Orlov, Igor Virko, who works in the Znanie publishing-house. To the question what he knew about the anti-Soviet activities of Yu. Orlov, Virko had nothing to say in reply. He was asked whether he had seen foreigners at Orlov's house, and whom he had met there. Virko remembered Gastev and Turchin. On this occasion too the interrogators were interested in what money Orlov lived on. Virko said that he had seen a girl pupil leaving Orlov's house.

An old acquaintance of Orlov, the poet Mikhail Kaplan, was interrogated at a police station. They asked him to give a character reference for Orlov, and once more asked what money he lived on. Kaplan spoke about Orlov in superlative tones and again indicated lessons to schoolchildren as the source of his income.

In Kiev, a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, O. Ya. Meshko, was interrogated in the Orlov case.

In Chita, Malva Landa (*Chronicle* 46) was summoned to an interrogation in the Orlov case.

On 2 August investigator of the Odessa K G B Shumilo interrogated Leonid Sery (*Chronicle* 42) in Odessa — in the case, as Shumilo said, 'of Turchin and Orlov'. To the question whether he knew Turchin and Orlov, Sery replied that he had heard of Orlov on the radio. Shumilo recorded this answer in the protocol as follows: Sery knows Orlov but refuses to say when he became acquainted with him. After this Sery stopped talking to the investigator and wrote a statement about his refusal to give evidence.

On 29 August investigator Katalikov summoned T. Velikanova to an interrogation. She refused to give evidence.

The same day investigator Kapayev interrogated L. Ternovsky.

On 30 August investigator Katalikov interrogated A. Lavut. Lavut stated that the criminal persecution of Yu. Orlov was aiding the violation of human rights in the Soviet Union, and refused to give evidence. Nevertheless, Katalikov put several questions on the subject of a number of documents (in defence of M. Dzhemilev, S. Kovalyov, P. Starchik, Yu. Gastev), signed, amongst others, by Lavut and Orlov. Lavut repeated his refusal to give evidence and remarked that some of the questions posed, in accordance with the practice that had grown up, looked like questions not to a witness but to a potential defendant.

On 6 October investigator Kapayev interrogated Yu. Gastev. Kapayev refused to confirm that Orlov was charged under article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code.* Gastev was asked about his relation to the Moscow Helsinki Group. The question provoked by his answer — 'If that's your attitude to the activities of the Group, why didn't you join it yourself?' — was not included in the protocol. On the subject of a number of documents signed, amongst others, by Gastev and Orlov, he was asked when, where and under what circumstances he had come to sign the given document. To the first of these questions Gastev each time advised them to look at the date of publication, to the second he replied — 'In Moscow,' to the third — he refused to answer (Kapayev wrote 'I don't remember' in the protocol). Colleagues of Kapayev, investigators Katalikov and Yu. S. Yakovlev, gave Gastev 'advice': 'It wouldn't be a good idea to tell anyone about the contents of the interrogation or the very fact you have been summoned'; 'To avoid any unpleasantness, keep a bit further away from Sakharov and his entourage'; 'If you don't like it here so much, why don't you look for a freer country to live in?'

[* On 6 February 1978 Orlov's wife was told that he was now charged under article 70.]

On 21 October a member of the Moscow Helsinki Group, A. Korchak, was interrogated in the Orlov case. The interrogation lasted seven hours. The questions concerned not only Yu. Orlov, but also A. Ginzburg and A. Shcharansky. Korchak confirmed that it was his signature under documents of the Group, but refused to answer the other questions. The investigator threatened Korchak with arrest: 'Don't think you'll land up in a political camp. It'll be a criminal one. And they'll bash your head in there.'

On 21 and 22 November V. Albrekht was interrogated in the Orlov case.

* * *

It was suggested to an acquaintance of Yu. Orlov, junior scientific research officer of the Institute of Solid State Physics of the U S S R Academy of Sciences, A. F. Barabanov, by the head of his laboratory that he dissociate himself in writing from the political views of Orlov. In the course of this Barabanov was warned that they wanted to make him a senior scientific research officer. Barabanov, having said that his relations with Orlov were his own private affair, declined to write anything.

The director of I T E P of the U S S R Academy of Sciences, in the presence of the secretary of the party bureau and an 'unknown person', asked corresponding-member of the U S S R Academy of Sciences L. B. Okun whether he was intending to speak out in defence of Orlov. Okun replied that he had no such intention.

The Persecution of the Working Commission

On 10 October seven searches were carried out by officials of the directorate for Moscow and the Moscow region of the K G B attached to the U S S R Council of Ministers in case No. 474 (the case of Yu. Orlov): at the homes of members of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, Vyacheslav Bakhmin, Irina Kaplun and Alexander Podrabinek (at his temporary flat in Moscow), at the home (in Elektrostal) of the brother of A. Podrabinek, Kirill Podrabinek, and at his work (a railway crossing, where he works as a guard), and at the homes of Lydia Ivanova, the wife of the father of A. Podrabinek (in Elektrostal), and Tatyana Yakubovskaya, a friend of A. Podrabinek (in Malakhovka).

The searches at Bakhmin's and Kaplun's were carried out on a warrant of K G B captain Yakovlev, the other searches on a warrant of K G B senior lieutenant Kapayev. In the search warrants for Bakhmin and Kaplun it said that the search was being carried out 'with the aim of confiscating documents belonging to A. Podrabinek'.

At Bakhmin's a card-index of the Working Commission, a verbatim

record of the 17th Party Congress, and poems by Gumilyov were confiscated.

At Kaplun's, documents of the Working Commission and the Helsinki Group, cuttings from Soviet newspapers, R. Conquest's book *The Great Terror* and a copy of the Soviet edition of Mandelshtam were confiscated.

At the home of A. Podrabinek, a typewritten copy of his book *Punitive Medicine*, documents of the Working Commission and of Amnesty International, *The Gulag Archipelago* and a typewriter were confiscated. The search finished at 22.55 hours, after which A. Podrabinek was taken off to the Moscow K G B (Mal. Lyubanka) for interrogation. Captain Yakovlev conducted the interrogation. Before the start Podrabinek refused to answer any questions, giving as the reason for his refusal the fact that he considered a night interrogation inadmissible in this instance. The interrogation finished at 0.30 hours.

At Ivanova's, the almanac *20th Century*, materials of the *samizdat* scientific journal *Researcher*, a photograph of Solzhenitsyn (in the search protocol it said 'a photograph of a man with a moustache and beard behind a microphone') and notebooks were confiscated.

At Yakubovskaya's, notebooks belonging to A. Podrabinek, four small-calibre cartridges and one rifle cartridge were confiscated. On 18 October Yakubovskaya was summoned to an interrogation at the Moscow K G B. She testified that the five cartridges confiscated at the search at her house belonged to A. Podrabinek: he had brought them to her several years ago, having kept them since the time he engaged in shooting as a sport during his schooldays.

At the home of K. Podrabinek (A. Podrabinek is registered here), *Cancer Ward* and materials of the journal *Researcher* were confiscated. The search protocol listed three items in all.

At the place of work of K. Podrabinek, his article on the new Constitution, the second issue of the bulletin *Concerning the Draft Constitution of the U S S R* (*Chronicle* 46), a harpoon gun for underwater fishing and 127 small-calibre cartridges were confiscated.

On 14 October another search was carried out at the flat of A. Podrabinek. The search proceeded thus: after presenting a search warrant, Lieutenant Zotov went up to a wardrobe, opened it, put his hand into a jacket hanging there and pulled it out clutching two small-calibre cartridges in his fist; at this the search ended. Zotov would not allow K. Podrabinek to make any remarks on the protocol and recorded in it: 'Statements and remarks on the subject of the search from persons taking part in the search and present during it were not forthcoming.'

On 23 October K. Podrabinek issued a statement:

In the last year I have become friends with certain Moscow dissidents, have signed various appeals and statements. The possibility of a criminal case being brought against me on the charge of illegally possessing a weapon and ammunition could cast aspersions on the whole democratic movement and, in particular, on my brother, even though it is perfectly clear that the basis of the case is a political charge.

For a number of reasons I cannot at the present time comment on what has happened, confirm or deny that the things confiscated at the search on 10 October belong to me. I therefore ask my friends and well-wishers to refrain also from commenting on these questions. I shall do this myself when I consider it necessary.

On the night of 27-28 October, according to the timetable K. Podrabinek should have been on duty at the railway crossing, but because he was ill another man was on duty there. During the night two well-dressed young people knocked at the sentry-box. For the time of year and the hour this was without precedent (it is 30 minutes' walk from the crossing to the nearest inhabited point). The people who came in asked the guard for a glass. When he turned around to carry out their request, they hit him a blow on the head with some heavy object. He fell unconscious. He came round only seven hours later. If the blow had been inflicted a few centimetres from the place where it fell, it probably would have been fatal. The strangers at the crossing did not take anything.

In a statement on 5 November K. Podrabinek writes:

There is no precise proof that the two attackers were my 'friends' from the K G B, but there are grounds for thinking this.

However, in any event my colleagues are frightened of going on duty at the crossing. And I would not be surprised if at the next search at my place of work a machine-gun was discovered.

K. Podrabinek was dismissed from this job.

I. Kaplun, P. Podrabinek and A. Podrabinek, T. Osipova, M. Petrenko (Podyapolskaya), P. Grigorenko and Z. Grigorenko, N. Meiman, V. Slepak, priest G. Yakunin, V. Kapitanchuk, R. Dzhemilev, A. Lavut and T. Velikanova issued this appeal:

In Defence of Kirill Podrabinek

In the last few years in the U S S R purely criminal methods of reprisal against dissenters have been applied more and more often: blackmail, provocations, beatings, murders.

The specific character of these crimes is such that in each individual instance it is very difficult to obtain direct evidence, as the organs of law and order do not show any interest in investigating

them, whilst individuals are deprived of the possibility of conducting an investigation.

The last instance of this type to become known is the attempted murder of Kirill Podrabinek . . .

We fear for the life of Kirill Podrabinek. We fear the repetition of such actions in regard to other persons displeasing to the authorities.

. . . We call for . . . demands to be made for a full and open investigation, remembering that the defencelessness of the victims and the impunity of the criminals untie the latter's hands for new crimes.*

The Case of Shcharansky

From August to November interrogations in the Anatoly Shcharansky case took place in 20 towns in the Soviet Union. About 100 people were interrogated, mostly refuseniks; the majority did not know Shcharansky.

Interrogations in Moscow

Leonid Shabashov was interrogated on 1 and 8 August. To the first interrogation he was brought by force, and his bag was searched with the object of seeing whether he was 'carrying a weapon'. His answers were recorded in distorted form. He was told that his exit visa depended on his conduct at the investigation. Shabashov wrote a complaint to the Procuracy. The reply to it said that the facts set forth in the complaint had not been corroborated.

On 19 August Arkady Mai was interrogated. Investigator Skalov conducted the interrogation. Mai was asked, principally, about the seminar of Jewish culture and history which he directs. Then he was presented with a few pages of a typewritten text, allegedly a list of refuseniks compiled by A. Shcharansky. To Mai's question: 'What does this list have to do with espionage?', the investigator replied that the list, of course, was not espionage, but secret information could have been communicated together with it. A. Mai indicated in the protocol that he had never discussed his place of work with anyone, and had written about it only in O V I R.

The same day Alexander Gvinter was interrogated. Having received the answer from Gvinter that he did not know Shcharansky, the investigator questioned him about himself and about the collective letters signed by him.

At the beginning of September Vladimir Lazaris was interrogated. Investigator Naloichenko said to Lazaris that now he was a witness, but

[* On 29 December K. Podrabinek was arrested and on 14 March 1978 sentenced to 2½ years.]

a charge against him was only a matter of time. (In November Lazaris left the U S S R.)

On 28 and 29 September Zakhar Tesker was summoned to interrogations. Basically, the questions put were about himself.

On 28 October T A S S correspondent Victor Vladimirov communicated a T A S S statement to the West:

> Anti-Soviets at work
>
> In the last few days Zionist organizations in the West have been going all out to blow up an anti-Soviet campaign around the case of the traitor Anatoly Shcharansky. In Washington, Paris, the Hague, Hamburg and Oslo special demonstrations are being organized where he is portrayed as 'an innocent victim of tyranny', a simple 'Jewish fighter for civil rights'. 'Witnesses' confirm this at various disreputble get-togethers. Like scenery on theatrical tours, they are transferred at someone's expense from Europe to America and vice versa.
>
> What does Anatoly Shcharansky — this supposedly innocent fighter for civil rights — stand for in reality? As has already been reported, Shcharansky has been charged with rendering assistance to a foreign state in conducting hostile activities against the Soviet Union. The facts testify that Shcharansky systematically engaged in collecting and fabricating slanderous information about Soviet reality and communicating it to the West to be utilised widely for anti-Soviet ends. At the commission of his masters he supplied the West with facts about Soviet enterprises and institutions which conduct trade with capitalist countries; together with his accomplices, he assisted by every means circles interested in breaking off the trade of these countries with the Soviet Union.
>
> The guilt of Shcharansky and his comrades-in-arms is attested, in particular, by the already widely known (including in the U S State Department and the U N) statement of Sanya Lipavsky (*Chronicle* 44 —*Chronicle*), a Soviet citizen, whom American intelligence attempted to draw into criminal subversive activity against the U S S R. An agent of special services, Robert Toth, the former correspondent of the *Los Angeles Times* in Moscow (*Chronicle* 46 — *Chronicle*), did not consider it necessary to conceal the work of Shcharansky in the interests of U S intelligence; after he had been expelled from the Soviet Union he stated that Shcharansky had served him as a source of information.
>
> The moral aspect of the 'Jewish fighter for civil rights' does not look any better. Just the following detail gives some idea about him. In the last three years alone Anatoly Shcharansky has gone through three wives. The second of them — Natalya Shtiglits, who is now doing the rounds of all sorts of demonstrations under the guise of the inconsolable wife of Shcharansky — should know that her

spouse was at first intending to leave for Israel at the summons of his 'fiancée' Ershkovich, whom he, as he explained in the department of visas and registration, loved ardently and passionately. But after Shtiglits herself had departed for Israel he did not grieve for long about parting with her. In the role of his new wife Shcharansky replaced Natalya Shtiglits with a certain Lida Voronina.

Such are the facts, and they cannot be refuted by any slanderous rabble-rousing. And yet another thing — the organizers of the rabble-rousing do not conceal that their aim is to exercise pressure on the organs of Soviet justice. Your attempts are in vain, gentlemen. The traitor to his country will be punished according to the full severity of Soviet law, in complete accordance with its letter and spirit.

On 15 November Elena Sirotenko and her father were interrogated. Investigator Skalov said to E. Sirotenko that Shcharansky had not acted alone, but within the framework of a far-flung organization: 'We won't try them yet.' He said that Jews wanted to determine the policies of the USSR, but they should not think that they would succeed in this. According to him, refuseniks were collecting anti-Soviet information which Israel then bought up for money and parcels. 'Shcharansky was working for anti-Soviet and Zionist organizations, for the CIA and American capital.' In addition to this, he announced that military experts had, allegedly, proven that R. Toth was a spy. E. Sirotenko was presented with several collective letters of Jews with her signature under them.

The same day Victor Brailovsky was interrogated again (*Chronicle* 45). The interrogation, which was conducted by investigator Koval, lasted 12 hours. Brailovsky was presented with a large collection of documents put together by refuseniks. Brailovsky refused to answer questions. They tried to persuade him to change his position, referring to the *samizdat* essay by V. Albrekht 'How to conduct yourself at interrogations'.[2]

On 16 November investigator Litvinovsky interrogated Vladimir Albrekht. He was asked, specifically: 'Did you render any help whatever to other refuseniks on matters connected with leaving for Israel?' The interrogation lasted 10 hours. On 21 November Albrekht was once again interrogated in the Shcharansky case.

On 16 November the mother of A. Shcharansky, I. P. Milgrom, was also summoned to an interrogation. Investigator Gorbunov conducted the interrogation. Milgrom stated that she refused to be a witness at the investigation as she was not convinced that after it she would be admitted to the trial. She expressed bewilderment in regard to the TASS statement of 28 October (see above). Investigator Gorbunov advised her not to pay any attention to it. He said that it was some form of provocation. Gorbunov asked Ida Petrovna to relate in detail the story of her son's life. She agreed and talked about Anatoly for

several hours. When the protocol was read out it became clear that in recording it Gorbunov had distorted her tale. For example, in place of 'Anatoly lived in the flat of L. Voronina' he had written 'Anatoly lived with L. Voronina at her flat'.

On 17 November the father and brother of Shcharansky were summoned to investigator Chechetkin. B. M. Shcharansky did not go to the interrogation and handed in a written statement about his refusal to take part in the investigation as he did not consider it objective.

Leonid Shcharansky appeared at the interrogation. To a request to relate the story of his brother's life, Leonid replied that he would not do this because his mother had already related everything the day before. Then a long conversation took place as to whether Leonid considered the investigation to be objective. He said that he shared the opinion of his father. The investigator proposed to record this and said that L. Shcharansky would have to answer for slander. After this, he showed for a second a piece of the protocol where it was written in the hand of Anatoly Shcharansky that he had no complaints to make, but it was not clear whether this referred to the investigation, or to an investigator, or to the conduct of the given interrogation (Leonid did not manage to read it through). Chechetkin tried to convince Leonid that now he must recognize the investigation as objective and unprejudiced. Leonid insisted that his opinion on this subject be recorded in the protocol.

On 18 November Larisa Vilenskaya was summoned to an interrogation. Major Yu. F. Kudryavtsev conducted the interrogation. He asked about signatures under collective letters. Kudryavtsev threatened Vilenskaya, saying that she would be answerable for refusing to give evidence, even though she answered his questions.

* * *

On 23 and 25 November Lev Gendin, who was serving 10 days of administrative arrest (he was arrested near the synagogue), was interrogated in the special reception room No. 6 of the UVD of the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee. Lieutenant-Colonel Chechetkin conducted the interrogations. Despite the fact that Gendin was ill at the time and had a high temperature, the interrogations lasted eight hours each. Chechetkin asked, in particular, what was the role of Shcharansky in organizing demonstrations by refuseniks. A photograph was produced of a demonstration at the statue to Yu. Dolgoruky, with Gendin and Shcharansky on it.

The evidence of Leonid Tsypin was read to Gendin about how in October 1974 A. Lunts organized and financed trips by Shcharansky, Gendin and Tesker to towns of the Soviet Union in order to collect information on refuseniks for sending to the office of [Senator] Jackson before the vote on his 'amendment'. (Amongst refuseniks over the

last few years the opinion has prevailed that Tsypin is a provocateur. On 17 May 1977 the newspaper *Evening Moscow* published an 'unmasking' statement by Tsypin about Jewish activists.)

The interrogation was constantly interrupted by insulting remarks directed at Gendin, Shcharansky and other refuseniks. Chechetkin repeatedly threatened Gendin with long terms of imprisonment for various criminal offences.

After the second interrogation Gendin wrote a complaint against the actions of the investigator to Procurator-General of the USSR Rudenko.

* * *

On 24 November Major Kasumov interrogated Iosif Ass. When Ass was given the protocol of the interrogation to sign, it turned out that his answers had been 'edited' in the protocol. Ass refused to sign such a protocol. Kasumov, having refused to record the answers of Ass word for word, began writing that the witness would not answer questions, and threatening him with criminal responsibility under article 182 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. On 27 November Ass sent a complaint to the USSR Procuracy. Having described the circumstances of the interrogation, he asked for the complaint to be joined to the Shcharansky case.

* * *

On 25 November famous Jewish activists and close friends of Shcharansky were summoned to the KGB: Maria and Vladimir Slepak, Dina and Iosif Beilin, Julia and Alexander Lerner, Ida Nudel and Naum Meiman.

Ou 25 November only the Beilins and Ida Nudel appeared at the interrogation. They were interrogated by investigators Skalov and Sherudilo. V. Slepak appeared at an interrogation on 28 November. He was interrogated by Koval. The witnesses were not allowed to record their evidence themselves; the investigators refused to enter additions and corrections in the protocol; the evidence was noted down in the protocol in a distorted form; statements made by witnesses during interrogations were not admitted to the case. Investigator Skalov said that Shcharansky had *committed* a crime and called him a criminal.

All those interrogated gave Shcharansky glowing character references, setting this out in their evidence and statements.

The Lerners, Maria Slepak and Naum Meiman did not appear at interrogations, stating that they considered the case fabricated and the investigation biased.

* * *

In the middle of November Lev Talyanker was taken from work to an interrogation. Talyanker informed them that he was not acquainted with Shcharansky. The investigators were interested in an article by Talyanker on the emigration policies of the Soviet authorities.

* * *

At the end of November Evgeny Liberman, Mark Novikov and Mikhail Chlenov were interrogated. They were shown letters of Jewish activists signed by them. All three refused to give evidence, referring to the fact that if writing these letters were considered a criminal act, then witnesses moved into the category of suspects.

At the same period G. Vigdarov (*Chronicle* 46) was interrogated for the second time. The same questions were put to him as in July. Vigdarov said, as before, that he did not know Shcharansky.

* * *

Leningrad. At the end of August and beginning of September investigator Stepanov from Moscow and investigator Medvedev from Leningrad interrogated many refuseniks. Questions concerned Moscow and Leningrad refuseniks, signatures under collective letters of Jews, a mythical organization ('Sherut Aliya') and some 'refusal groups'. Vladimir Knokh refused to answer the questions, having said that the Shcharansky case was directed against all refuseniks, which meant against him personally as well. Grigory Goman would not answer the questions because he had not been informed with what Shcharansky was charged. Lazar Kazakevich was summoned to an interrogation by a deception — he was told that he was needed for clarification of matters connected with his exit visa. The majority of refuseniks from Leningrad were not acquainted with Shcharansky.

* * *

Kiev. From 6 to 8 September investigator Koval interrogated Vladimir Kislik. The first interrogation lasted 12 hours. Kislik was asked about Shcharansky and collective letters of Jews, but most of all about himself.

Other witnesses interrogated in Kiev (Bedrin, Lebed, Pargamanik and Gertsberg) were asked about Kislik. None of them knew Shcharansky. (On Kislik see also the section 'The Jewish Movement'.)

* * *

Minsk. On 5, 6 and 8 August L. P. Ovsishcher was interrogated. The investigator was Major Skalov. After the interrogation Ovsishcher stated:

> The investigator did not produce a single piece of material or question which confirmed the truth of the charges brought against

Shcharansky. He also has no information about the presence in the information communicated of any secrets, nor can he have. Clearly the desire of the investigator was to find out everything possible about our struggle to leave.

In Minsk another four Jewish activists were interrogated: Goldin, Khess, Ratner and Zubarev. None of them was acquainted with Shcharansky.

One of the questions was who came to the funeral of Colonel Davidovich (*Chronicle* 40). In reply to the bewilderment over this question Skalov said that a meeting with foreigners could have taken place in the train and, during this, secret information could have been handed over.

* * *

Vilnius. Interrogations took place at the beginning of September. A member of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, Eitan Finkelshtein, summoned as a witness, refused to take part in the case as he thought that it was being conducted by methods that were incompatible with legislation. Many other refuseniks were summoned including nursing mothers, pregnant women and people on the sick-list. They all informed the investigation that they were not acquainted with Shcharansky.

* * *

Riga. Interrogations were conducted at the beginning of September by investigator Kochetkov. Valery Kaminsky, brought to the interrogation on a warrant, was told that a 'second Shcharansky' would be made out of him. Yakov Gordin was also brought to interrogation on a warrant. Arkady Tsinober refused to participate in the investigation. Questions were asked about how a list of refuseniks in Riga landed up in Moscow. At one of the interrogations investigator Kochetkov stated that the investigation was being conducted not in the interests of justice, but in the interests of the state.

* * *

Odessa. At the end of August, Liliya and Lev Roitburd and D. Skulsky were interrogated in the Shcharansky case. The questions concerned the trial of Roitburd (*Chronicle* 37). In the middle of November L. Tymchuk and Valentina Barladyanu were interrogated.

* * *

Kharkov. In May Vladimir Pevsner was interrogated (he has now left for Israel). He was asked about himself and about how his complaints reached the West. In August, Faktor, Pshonik and Lander were summoned. None of them is acquainted with Shcharansky. Investigator

Naloichenko asked how letters of Kharkov refuseniks had reached Moscow and the West, and about acquaintances in Moscow.

* * *

Lvov. On 1, 5 and 6 October a local investigator interrogated five people on the instructions of the Moscow K G B. The investigator told them that Shcharansky was the head of the Moscow organization 'Aliya', and during the period of his activity more than 90 slanderous documents had been composed which Shcharansky sent to the West through foreigners; 'Aliya' had deputed Shcharansky to join the Helsinki Group as its representative. In addition, Shcharansky collected and handed over information later used by Western secret services to harm the Soviet state, and established contact with foreign journalists, to whom he gave tendentious materials. The result of his activity was the Jackson Amendment.

* * *

Rostov-on-Don. At the beginning of November 19-year-old L. Brusilovsky was interrogated. He was asked whether Lazar Lyubarsky (now in Israel) gave any assignments to Shcharansky. Because of the interrogations the emigration of Brusilovsky, who had already obtained permission, was held up.

* * *

Dushanbe. In May and August Amnon Zavurov and his father (*Chronicle* 44) were interrogated, also several other refuseniks — about 10 in all. They all stated that they had never seen Shcharansky. Despite the fact that the majority of them have many relatives in Israel, they were asked how the West knew about them.

* * *

Kishinev. Having shown witnesses a photograph of Shcharansky, an investigator stated that he was a criminal of international class.

* * *

Besides this, interrogations took place in Saratov, Tula, Vinnitsa, Krasnodar, Frunze, Chernovtsy, Bendery, Beltsy, Kaliningrad and Kaunas.

* * *

In the last few months collective letters in defence of Shcharansky have been written by Jews in Minsk, Vilnius and Leningrad. Seventeen Minsk refuseniks, in a letter addressed to Brezhnev, demand that Shcharansky be released and given the right to leave for Israel. Eleven Vilnius Jews write about the fact that the threat hanging over Shcharan-

sky is a blow at all Jewish activists, refuseniks, all those wishing to emigrate, all Jews in the USSR. Seventeen Leningraders summoned as witnesses in the Shcharansky case also write that the case is directed against all active refuseniks.

* * *

On 30 September the coordinator of the Shcharansky case, Volodin (*Chronicle* 45), received Shcharansky's mother I. P. Milgrom. In reply to her petitions about granting her son the opportunity to use the services of a barrister during the investigation and about a meeting with her son, Volodin said that she was allowed to hire a Soviet barrister with security clearance, but he would only be allowed to act after the end of the pre-trial investigation and during the judicial proceedings. He also said that Shcharansky would not be allowed to use the services of foreign barristers. Volodin informed her that meetings with Shcharansky were not being granted to relatives, as, afterwards, distorted information would be broadcast over the radio. Volodin tried to compromise Shcharansky's friends in the eyes of his mother.

On 31 October, after numerous inquiries about the possibility of a barrister taking part in the pre-trial investigation, I. P. Milgrom received an answer from the USSR Procuracy signed by Senior Counsellor of Justice S. A. Zakharov: 'Insofar as there are no circumstances preventing the accused from exercising his right to defence, there are no grounds for satisfying your petition.'

In November the parents of A. Shcharansky were told that they should look for a barrister.

The Case of Matusevich and Marinovich

On 2 August Vasily Ovsiyenko (*Chronicles* 44, 45) was interrogated in Zhitomir in the case of Matusevich and Marinovich.* Ovsiyenko denied that he knew Matusevich. He was shown the evidence of his niece Lyudmila Ryabukha, in which she said that in the spring a man called 'Mykola' had visited her uncle. On 3 August Ovsiyenko wrote a letter to Lyudmila advising her to say at interrogations only what went into the protocol, and only with those conducting the protocol.

On 26 August officials of the Zhitomir KGB, Chaikovsky, Shishuk and Kotvitsky, 'chatted' with Ovsiyenko. They threatened Ovsiyenko with criminal prosecution for 'deliberately false evidence', 'impelling a witness . . . to give false evidence . . .' and 'disclosing facts of the pre-trial investigation . . .' In addition, they asserted that in letters which Ovsiyenko had written between 3 and 17 August, he had circulated 'deliberately false fabrications'.

[* Both were sentenced to 7 years of imprisonment and 5 of exile on 29 March 1978.]

Arrests, Searches, Interrogations

The Arrest of Snegiryov

On 22 September the writer and cinematographer Gely Ivanovich Snegiryov (b. 1927) was arrested in Kiev.

In 1974 Snegiryov was expelled from the party, the Union of Writers and the Union of Cinematographers.

In 1974-1976 the heart complaint of Snegiryov became acute, haemorrhages occurred in the retinas of both eyes, and his vision was reduced to a hundredth of the norm. A medical commission classified him as an invalid of group 2.

A Parisian hospital administration invited Snegiryov for treatment, but the USSR Ministry of Health announced that it 'did not have agreements with capitalist countries' on exchange of patients for treatment. On 4 July 1977 Snegiryov addressed OVIR in Kiev with a request to allow him to leave privately for treatment.

After the publication of the Draft Constitution Snegiryov sent a letter to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet in which he expressed his total disagreement with the draft and rejected Soviet citizenship. Snegiryov sent off his passport.

Uninterrupted shadowing of Snegiryov began. Letters from 'indignant patriots' containing abuse and threats appeared in his letter box. He was suddenly summoned to a medical commission to decide the question of his pension payments, even though he had gone through this procedure not long before.

In June Snegiryov handed to foreign correspondents a letter to the President of the USA:

> I am convinced that the decisive hour has come in which either the social-political monster called the Socialist Superpower will gain the upper hand over Human Reason once and for all, or Human Reason will conquer . . .
>
> Our Superpower appears to me to resemble a wagon rushing down a slope . . .
>
> It would seem, Mr President, that the peoples of the world are burdened by freedom. The peoples of the world are ready to arrange a quiet funeral for Freedom and to set off singing into slavery.
>
> May God give you the strength to stop the wagon.

In August he published an 'Appeal to the Leader (a pamphlet with an

optimistic finale)'. In the pamphlet a programme for the radical reconstruction of our society is advanced. The pamphlet concludes thus:

> The black carriage is thundering along. The reins are trailing. Make an incredible effort, reach out for the reins, grasp them firmly — and you will remain in the times 'blessed by Leonid'. Otherwise — dead or alive — you will be flung out on to the road, somersault into a putrid pit, and curses will rush after you.

On 6 September the newspaper *Literary Ukraine* printed a large feuilleton, 'Alphonse'. In this feuilleton, without mincing words, the paper flings mud at Snegiryov. On 9 October Snegiryov sent a letter to the editorial board of the newspaper (copies of the letter were also sent by him to journals in which he had been printed, and to certain literary colleagues):

Dear editorial board,

I am touched by your attention to my modest person. In truth, I did not doubt that *Literary Ukraine* would not forget my 50th birthday in October of this year and celebrate my jubilee fittingly.

I am grateful for the colourful publicity placed in the pages of *Literary Ukraine* for my socio-political activity and my work about Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists in the World Congress of Free Ukrainans. It is especially pleasant that my fame will spread not only through the length and breadth of the Ukraine, but will splash abroad as well, where not a few readers of your respected organ reside.

I am grateful as well to the ideological departments of the K G B and Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party for prompting you to arrange this publicity on time. Right on time, as I was informed at this very period that 'Cartridges for the Execution (Mama, My Mama . . .)' had come out in Ukrainian foreign publishing-houses to meet the glorious 60th anniversary of Great October. (This story was also published in the journal *Kontinent*, Nos. 11, 12 — *Chronicle*).

I am only annoyed that in the panegyric published there was not even a single sentence to illuminate my rejection of Soviet citizenship because of my disagreement with the new Constitution. In a statement to the Presidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet I wrote, specifically: 'Your whole Constitution is a lie from start to finish.'

I hope that in subsequent publications for my jubilee you will manage to correct this mistake and to tell the readers about yet another disgraceful action 'of the righteous Christian'.

Sincerely,
Gely Snegiryov

P.S. I almost forgot.

In subsequent publications for my 50th birthday please announce that the person celebrating the anniversary was head of the section of socio-political journalism and fiction in your respected organ in 1956-57. And then, having received the blessing of suitable educators and rising ever higher above himself, he landed up on the so-called 'Central Committee nomenklatura' [list of people suitable for high appointments]: with the corresponding character references and recommendations from *Literary Ukraine* and the Union of Writers he sat in the chair of the chief editor of the Ukrainian studio of newsreel and documentary films and worked at this responsible job for 7 (seven) whole years.

G.S.

Snegiryov handed in an application for an exit visa from the U S S R.

On 22 September he was arrested.

On 12 October members of the Moscow and Ukrainian Helsinki Groups published an 'Appeal to the governments and democratic public opinion of participant countries of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe' with a request that they speak out for the release of Gely Snegiryov and members of the Helsinki Groups arrested earlier. Another 15 people added their signatures to the appeal.

The Arrest of Valentina Pailodze

On 7 April, the day of the arrest of Z. Gamsakhurdia and M. Kostava (*Chronicle* 45), a search was carried out at the home of a member of the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in Georgia, religious worker Valentina Pailodze (*Chronicle* 32). Six copies of the *samizdat* journal *Georgian Herald* (*Chronicle* 45) were found at her home.

On 6 November Valentina Pailodze and her friend Taso Berikashvili were made to get out of a bus. V. Pailodze was accused of having stolen 500 roubles from some woman. They were taken off to police station 26 and searched. Religious literature was 'found' on Pailodze. Pailodze and Berikashvili were placed in a dark cellar. They declared a hunger strike. On 8 November Pailodze was taken away somewhere. Then Berikashvili was released. To a question about the reason for her arrest Berikashvili was told: 'You're guilty yourself! Why are you friends with such a woman? Go, and don't tell anyone about what has happened and don't have anything more to do with the family of Pailodze.'

On 6 November, when Pailodze and Berikashvili were already under arrest, a man calling himself Grigory Tsintsadze (Berikashvili does not know a man of that name) dropped in to see Berikashvili at home. A friend of Berikashvili was in the room. The visitor said that he would

come back in 20 minutes and left. After he had gone the friend of Berikashvili discovered a batch of leaflets with a Russian text on the table. Scared by this, she took the leaflets to the house of Pailodze to show them to her. When she was in Pailodze's flat police arrived to make a search. They did not find anything in the room, but, on searching the guest, found the leaflets. They drew up a statement in which it was written that Pailodze and Berikashvili had given the leaflets to her. By threatening her with arrest, they forced this woman to sign the statement. When the members of Pailodze's family started to protest, those carrying out the search replied that they were carrying out the personal order of Shevardnadze to arrest Pailodze on any pretext.

Case No. 186

Chronicle 46 reported that **Bengt-Gunnar Sareld** and **Nils-Erik Engström,** Swedes returning from the Soviet Union in their car, were detained at the frontier. A number of errors were made in this account. The incident took place on 5 June. The Swedes were in fact arrested, not detained. During the search not only letters of Pentecostalists requesting that an invitation to emigrate be sent were discovered in their possession, but also documents about the emigration of Pentecostalists and Baptists, and in particular the book *Leave it, O My people* (*Chronicles* 44, 45).

The arrested Swedes were held under investigation in Minsk. They soon began to give extensive evidence about the believers they had met while they were travelling around the Soviet Union. As a result of this evidence numerous searches and interrogations started to occur.

* * *

Moscow. On 8 August in case No. 186 searches were carried out at the homes of Pentecostalist **Anatoly Vlasov** (*Chronicle* 46) and Baptists **Alexander Semchenko, Natalya Varfolomeyeva** and **Victor Strelnikov** (Ramenskoye, Moscow region). Sixty Bibles were confiscated from Semchenko. At the house of Strelnikov a sound-recording studio, in which religious songs were recorded, was discovered and the equipment confiscated. While they were in Moscow, Engström and Sareld had been at Strelnikov's house, inspected the equipment of the studio and got to know the people who worked there; they told the investigation about this.

Altogether ten members of the Moscow congregation of Evangelical Christians and Baptists [E C B] — who worked in the studio — were interrogated in this case. Semchenko, Strelnikov and Varfolomeyeva were interrogated in Moscow and then summoned to an interrogation in Minsk.

After a five-day interrogation in Minsk Alexander Semchenko was interrogated again in Moscow on 21 September. Two investigators from Minsk — Lieutenant-Colonel I. D. Savenkov and Captain G. T. Dorogin conducted the interrogation. As became clear, on 15 September Sareld had additionally testified that he and Semchenko had together been to a Beryozka shop and bought an apparatus so that Semchenko could show Biblical films sent to him by the 'Slavic Mission'. The investigators threatened Semchenko with a term of imprisonment.

Pentecostalists **Pyotr Razumovsky** from the village of Khotkovo (Moscow region) and **Valentina Fedotova** from Maloyaroslavets (Kaluga region) were also summoned to interrogations in Minsk. In addition, Pentecostalist **Nikolai Romanyuk** was interrogated in Moscow. The Swedes had testified that they had seen all three of them at A. Vlasov's flat in Moscow.

In August, on the evidence of the Swedes, following A. Vlasov's interrogations, his wife **Valentina Vlasova** was also interrogated.

In Moscow Orthodox believers **Vadim and Zarina Shcheglov** were also summoned in this case.

* * *

Kiev. On 25 August Pentecostalists **Ya. S. Gavrilev** and **A. S. Prudnikova** and Baptists **T. A. Dubinin** and **V. P. Shuportyak** were searched in the case of the Swedes. Documents of the Council of Churches and materials of the Council of Relatives of E C B Prisoners were taken from the Baptists.

In addition, a search was carried out at the home of Pentecostalist **Adam Ozerchuk.** Religious literature was confiscated from him.

In all, six searches in this case took place in Kiev.

From 26 to 29 August senior investigator Captain Basalyga, who had come from Moscow, interrogated eight believers. It is known that the Pentecostalists refused to confirm that they were acquainted with Sareld and Engström.

* * *

Starotitarovskaya (Krasnodar territory). On 31 August a search was carried out at the home of **Goretoi** and **Bibikov** in the case of Engström and Sareld. Religious literature and books by Shelkov were confiscated. On 1 September Goretoi and Bibikov were interrogated.

* * *

Leningrad. In September a presbyter of the Leningrad E C B congregation, **Makhovitsky,** was searched in case No. 186. 120 Bibles were confiscated from him.

* * *

Tallin. In September a search was carried out here at the home of Methodist **Janus Kärner.**

Confrontations

On 18 October **Anatoly Vlasov** was summoned to an interrogation in Minsk. Investigator Dorogin tried to persuade Vlasov to confirm that he had met the Swedes and conveyed to the West through them the book *Leave it, O My People.*

After Vlasov had refused to give evidence, confrontations with Engström and Sareld were arranged for him.

* * *

On 18 October in the afternoon an identification parade was held. Of the three people sitting next to each other, Engström pointed to Vlasov and said that on 2 June 1977 he had received two parcels of documents from him.

On 19 October a confrontation between Vlasov and Bengt Sareld was held. The investigators were Slidinsky and Dorogin. There was no translator as Sareld speaks Russian well.

On seeing Vlasov, Sareld burst into tears: 'After all, he has children just like me!' The investigators calmed him down and asked whether he knew Vlasov. Sareld replied that he knew him and that they were brothers in Christ. Vlasov replied, to a similar question, that he did not know, and did not want to know, such brothers who betrayed their brothers, for they were Judases.

Sareld felt faint and was given water. When he had recovered, he turned to the investigators: 'But you told me that you would not summon anyone, that nothing would happen to anyone.'

Vlasov to Sareld: 'You were deceived, you don't know all the K G B devices.' The investigators forbade Vlasov to speak. Sareld asked the investigator to confirm that nothing would happen to Vlasov. The investigator confirmed this.

After this Sareld testified that he had been given a task by the 'Slavic Mission' to find out whether Vlasov was connected with the 'Sakharov group'; he was at Vlasov's house and took documents about emigration from him. He did not know the contents of the documents he had taken, he had become familiar with them only at the investigation and now expressed regret that these documents had turned out to be anti-Soviet and slanderous and that Vlasov had given him such documents.

Vlasov retorted: 'But isn't it the truth that our brothers served 20 years, that it is the fault of the N K V D that I am fatherless and myself served five years under Khrushchev?' The investigator interrupted Vlasov, saying that this was not a press conference and that he must keep quiet, since he had refused to give evidence.

Then Sareld testified about who from Sweden had visited Vlasov and when, and told how in 1975 they had brought Vlasov a duplicating apparatus. He also told how on one of his previous visits to Moscow he had suggested to Vlasov that he compile reviews of the Soviet press for 'Slavic Mission' and, as he knew, Vlasov had handled this job well.

On parting from Vlasov Sareld said about himself that he was like an evangelist who wanted to build a tower but overestimated his strength.

The same day after lunch a confrontation was arranged for Vlasov with Engström. The interpreter was Parkhomenko. Engström confirmed that he and Sareld had taken from Vlasov two parcels of documents, which had turned out to be slanderous and harmful to citizens of the U S S R and the state.

During the confrontation other K G B officers came in and asked about the interview Vlasov had given at Ginzburg's flat on 2 February 1977. Vlasov said that he had given the interview in the interests of justice.

* * *

The following day, 20 October, Vlasov was interrogated in the presence of an Assistant Procurator of Belorussia, Shevarov.

To the questions whether he knew the Swedes, whether he knew A. Ginzburg and Yu. Mnyukh, and where the duplicating apparatus was that had been supplied to him from Sweden in 1975, Vlasov refused to reply. To the question whether he knew about the 'Slavic Mission', Vlasov replied: 'What they write in the Soviet press.' Then he was asked what the reason was for his refusal to give evidence. Vlasov replied: 'I can't be a Judas.' On the advice of the Procurator the investigator recorded in the protocol: 'I can't be a Judas in regard to the circle of my acquaintances.'

Vlasov was told that a case against him for refusing to give evidence would be handed to the Moscow Procuracy.

In a conversation not recorded in the protocol Colonel Savenkov told Vlasov that he could be charged under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code for possessing and passing to the Swedes anti-Soviet slanderous materials and, as he had refused to give evidence, he would be given the maximum sentence.

* * *

Sareld and Engström had one meeting with their consul. According to the regulations, consular officials 'can visit regularly' foreigners under investigation. In fact, usually one meeting a month is given. In this instance the consulate was refused any further meetings.

* * *

According to rumours the Swedes were due to be released in mid-November.*

* * *

Erevan. On 9 June, during an attempt to fly to Moscow a member of the Armenian Helsinki Group, deacon **Robert Nazaryan** (*Chronicle* 46), was searched at the airport. Taken away from him were: his passport, a congratulatory letter to President Carter, an appeal about the collection of donations for the needs of families of political prisoners, a Russian translation of the feuilleton about Nazaryan 'False Prophet' (the newspaper *Sovetakan Aiastan* for 5 May 1977) and a number of other documents. Nazaryan was refused a copy of the record of the documents confiscated from him.

* * *

Tbilisi-Erevan. On 11 June, during an attempt to fly to Moscow, **Shagen Arutyunyan** was searched at Tbilisi airport. (A year ago Sh. Arutyunyan repudiated his Soviet citizenship and addressed the West German consulate with a request to grant him political asylum.) Taken away from him were: his passport, a statement to the consulate, an address to the German committee of human rights and other documents. After this Sh. Arutyunyan was arrested and taken to Erevan. There he was kept in the cellar at a police station for another 24 hours. After discovering telephone numbers of foreign correspondents on Sh. Arutyunyan, K G B officers told him that the members of the Armenian Helsinki group would be arrested and they would deal with each of them in their own way; for example, Eduard Arutyunyan was mad, and consequently it was clear how they would act with him; a three-year term of imprisonment for circulating slander awaited Robert Nazaryan. Sh. Arutyunyan was told that foreign correspondents were spies, and the American embassy was a centre for spies. They suggested to him that he drop his plan to emigrate to Germany and take back his 500 roubles from O V I R.

* * *

Moscow. On 13 June **Beniamin Ovakimyan** was detained and searched here. Taken away from him, in particular, was a report from the Armenian Helsinki Group to the Belgrade conference. They would not give him a copy of the record of confiscation.

* * *

Kaluga region. On 16 August **Vitaly Pomozov** (see 'The Case of

[* In fact released in early November. See T A S S and Reuter reports of 10 November 1977.]

Ginzburg' in this issue about him) was summoned as a witness to the Serpukhov district division of the K G B. There head of the division V. A. Shipovsky and captain V. V. Rudavin conducted a conversation with him. It was explained that there was evidence from his Gorky acquaintance Vyacheslav Ulanov against Pomozov, saying that he 'circulated the works of Solzhenitsyn'.

Pomozov refused to reply to specific questions from the investigators.

He was read a warning that he would be criminally charged 'in the event of his continuing anti-state activity, expressed in the circulation of politically harmful literature'.

* * *

Riga. On 23 August, the day of the arrest of **V. Petkus** (see 'Events in Lithuania'), a search was carried out here at the home of former political prisoner **Inc Calitis,** formally in the case of Gajauskas (*Chronicle* 45), which is being conducted by the Lithuanian K G B. At the search, documents of the 'Chief Committee of the National Movement of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania' were confiscated. The same day **Victor Kalninš** (*Chronicles* 41, 46) was detained at the station.

Calitis and Kalninš were summoned several times to interrogations in the case of Petkus, and were interrogated mainly about the committee. Kalninš testified that at the request of Petkus, who had come to Riga, he had done a translation of the documents of the committee from Russian into Latvian (the documents of the committee confiscated during the search at the home of Calitis were in the handwriting of Kalninš).

* * *

Tartu. On 25 August **Mart Niklus** (*Chronicles* 42, 43) was removed from a Tallin-Moscow train and taken off to a search. At the search, which was conducted by K G B investigator Oc, a camera, blank cassettes and several copies of his autobiography were confiscated. After the search Niklus was interrogated about the committee.

Niklus wrote to the Lithuanian K G B demanding that the confiscated things be returned to him. In the reply, signed by investigator Lazarevičius, it said that they were needed in the case of Petkus.

(See also below, at the end of the section.)

* * *

Tbilisi. On 12 September at 8 o'clock in the evening, a foreign citizen who was distributing leaflets was arrested near the Philharmonic building. In leaflets on behalf of the Committee of Young Flemings, the programme of the N T S [People's Labour Alliance, an émigré Russian group] was set forth in the Georgian language. The next day the following report was published in the newspaper *Evening Tbilisi*:

On 12 September this year a tourist from France — **Jean-Jacques Pauly,** b. 1954, was detained when distributing in Tbilisi anti-Soviet leaflets of a subversive character.

An investigation is being held.*

* * *

Voronezh. In May-June history teacher **Valery Semyonovich Gerasimov** was summoned to the K G B six times 'for a chat'. During the chat, he was accused of having a 'bad influence' on young people, listening to foreign radio broadcasts, and reading *The Gulag Archipelago.* It was demanded from Gerasimov that he 'confess' and talk about his 'activity'. Gerasimov said that he did not consider himself guilty of anything.

V. S. Gerasimov (b. 1946) was dismissed from his job at a school in 1970 (he was at that time a 'discharged Komsomol organizer') for 'demoralizing conversations'. Then he worked for a long time as a nightwatchman, etc.

Acquaintances of Gerasimov were also summoned to 'conversations': second-year student at the philological faculty of Voronezh university, Victor Goncharuk; second-year student at the historical faculty of Voronezh university, Georgy Olkhov; and third-year student of the philological faculty of Moscow university, Mikhail Zherebyatev.

On 19 September Gerasimov was summoned for a repeat medical examination to the military registration and enlistment office and was placed in the neurological section of the military hospital for examination. Ten days later he was discharged with a diagnosis of 'paranoid psychopathy' and sent to the regional psychiatric hospital for an in-patient examination.

* * *

Kirovograd region. In August **Kuzma Matviyuk** (*Chronicles* 42, 44) was interrogated in the K G B in the case of the English tourist Andrey Klymchuk, arrested in Lvov.† In the republican newspaper *Radyanska Ukraina* [27 September 1977] it was written that Klymchuk had brought to the Ukraine tapes with coded messages about subversive activities, a large sum of money and addresses. Matviyuk was asked these questions: 'Didn't anyone come to see you from Klymchuk?', 'Would you be glad if your address turned out to be on Klymchuk?'

* * *

Ryazan. On 13 September **Ivan Danilyuk** (*Chronicle* 45) was seized on the street and taken off to the O V D in Sovetsky district. He was shown

[*Pauly was expelled from the U S S R on 16 September 1977.]

[†On 2 August 1977. Expelled from U S S R on 5 January 1978.]

a statement signed by a 'neighbour' and told that he was suspected of buying stolen goods, of drinking bouts and an amoral way of life. Then he was searched; taken from him were: 17 copies of an open letter to the chief editor of the newspaper *Pravda* (in this letter legal expert Danilyuk enumerates 22 violations of the law committed in 1974 in his 'case'), seven copies of a letter to the U N Commission on Human Rights (in it he proposes that those guilty of mass murders of foreign citizens in Stalinist times be brought to an international court), and eight copies of a letter to the U S S R Ministry of Health on the subject of Sergei Purtov (*Chronicle* 26). The verdict in his case and a copy of the indictment was also taken from Danilyuk. Danilyuk would not sign the protocol on the confiscation.

The day before, a secret search had been carried out at his flat in his absence.

* * *

Uman (Cherkassk region). On 28 September 1977 the police carried out a search at the home of **N. V. Surovtseva.** The pretext was a statement allegedly received that N. V. Surovtseva was manufacturing false money. At the search, materials from the archive of N. V. Surovtseva were confiscated, manuscripts of her memoirs.

Nadezhda Vitalevna Surovtseva is a Ukrainian writer, historian and art critic. She is 81 years old. In the period from 1922 to 1956 N. V. Surovtseva was subjected to constant repressions on charges of anti-Soviet activity; she spent more than 30 years in prisons, camps and exile. N. V. Surovtseva is ofen mentioned in *The Gulag Archipelago* by A. Solzhenitsyn, where fragments of her memoirs are used.

In 1972-74 searches were repeatedly carried out at the home of N. V. Surovtseva and her relative living with her, the now deceased E. L. Olitskaya (*Chronicle* 34), in connection with the arrests of L. Plyushch, K. Matviyuk, B. Chernomaz and V. Nekipelov.

* * *

Leningrad. On 6 October K G B officials carried out a search in a room at the residence hostel where **Pyotr Draga,** a student of the philological faculty of Leningrad university, lives. Confiscated were: the *Herald of the Russian Christian Movement,* the book by A. D. Sakharov *My Country and the World,* and a collection of articles on the subject of Solzhenitsyn's letter 'To the Leaders of the Soviet Union'. After the search Draga was taken off to the district soviet executive committee for a 'chat' which lasted several hours. He was threatened with expulsion from the university.

* * *

Moscow. In October secret searches were carried out at the flat of

R. G. Bonner, the mother-in-law of **A. D. Sakharov,** and at the flat in which A. D. Sakharov and his wife E. G. Bonner (*Chronicle* 44) are registered. At the second of these flats those carrying out the search did not even attempt to conceal the traces of their visit.

* * *

Tallin. On 16 November, according to a resolution signed by Major Lazarevičius (Lithuanian K G B), a search was carried out here in case No. 47 (case of Petkus) at the home of **Erik Udam** (*Chronicle* 46). A notebook was taken on the grounds that it contained the address of Petkus.

* * *

Tartu. The same day a search was carried out in the same case at the home of **Mart Niklus.** The evening before, he had been brought a summons to an interrogation at the K G B on the morning of the 16th. When Niklus appeared at the K G B, he was asked to wait. After waiting two hours, Niklus began to protest. During this time a search was being carried out at his flat. Having discovered that Niklus's room was locked, the investigator carrying out the search returned to the K G B and took Niklus to the search. During the search, which lasted about seven hours, Niklus photographed the K G B officials, but they removed the film and exposed it. At the search three typewriters and several articles were confiscated.

Events in Lithuania

The Trial of Lapienis, Matulionis and Pranskunaite

Vladas Lapienis (in preceding issues of the *Chronicle* — Lapienis[2a]) and Jonas Matulionis were arrested in Vilnius on 20 October 1976. (In *Chronicle* 44 there was an error here.) The same day a search was carried out in Panevežys (*Chronicle* 44) at the home of Ona Pranskunaite (in *Chronicle* 45, 46 — Pranckunaite). In January 1977 she was arrested (*Chronicle* 45).

Lapienis (b. 1906), Matulionis (b. 1921) and Pranskunaite (b. 1936) were held in the K G B investigation prison in Vilnius. The investigation was at first in case No. 345, begun in June 1975 (the case of the *Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church* [L C C]). Before the trial it was made into a separate case.

Ona Pranskunaite continued to refuse to give evidence in prison, in particular to name the people who had worked on the 'Era' found in her flat together with duplicated prayer books (*Chronicle* 44) and those who gave her the *Chronicle L C C* to re-print. The investigators threatened her with a psychiatric hospital for not giving evidence.

Lapienis was allowed to write letters to his wife from prison. In them he informed her about his health (which had got considerably worse) and about the fact that, despite his indisposition, he was strong in spirit, and he communicated his meditations on religion.

The case was heard in the Lithuanian Supreme Court on 20, 22 and 25 July. Lapienis was charged under article 68 of the Lithuanian Criminal Code (=article 70 of the R S F S R Code), Matulionis and Pranskunaite under article 199 part 1 (=article 190-1).

The date of the beginning of the trial was kept secret (the wife of Lapienis, Elena Lapieniene, who was appearing as witness, received a summons only the day before the trial), but the public was allowed into the court-room, only they were not allowed to sit in the front rows, as a result of which much of it could not be heard.

V. Lapienis was charged with writing anti-Soviet articles and statements and inserting them in the *Chronicle L C C*, and also with circulating the *Chronicle L C C*. He was also charged with circulating *The Gulag Archipelago* in Lithuanian translation. According to the evidence of witness Ruzgiene from Utena (she confirmed this at the trial) Lapienis had given her a typewriter and asked her to re-type the book. Another episode in the indictment was keeping 'a slanderous article about a statesman'. (This was how the trial materials referred to an article circulated in Lithuanian *samizdat*, 'Mikhail Suslov — Hangman the Second', which describes the punitive activities of Suslov in his post as Chairman of the Bureau of the Communist Party Central Committee for Lithuania in comparison with the activities of Mikhail Muravyov, nicknamed 'the hangman' for his suppression of the 1863 uprising).

J. Matulionis was charged with editing texts for the *Chronicle L C C;* according to the charge, he was drawn into this work by Lapienis, who gave him the texts.

O. Pranskunaite was charged with re-typing several numbers of the *Chronicle L C C* on a typewriter and circulating them in Panevežys and other towns. (The 'Era' was mentioned in the charge, but not the duplication of prayer books.)

During one of the breaks everyone was cleared from the court room and when they were allowed in again it turned out that Lapienis had already made his final address. Nevertheless, the text of his final address (10 pages) was circulated in Lithuanian *samizdat* and published in full in *Chronicle* L C C 29. Lapienis said:

> I am charged with 'preparing articles and statements which contain slanderous fabrications defaming the Soviet system'. . . . I have never written any articles . . . Indeed, after the illegal actions of certain

employees of state security, after the search of 20 November 1973 and interrogations, I wrote statements . . . In these statements I pointed out that the K G B had taken away from me a typewriter, manuscripts and religious books which have nothing in common with a criminal case, while the greater part of them were not recorded either in the search protocol or in the list appended . . . Then at interrogations they tried to obtain evidence from me by threats, lies, cunning and other illegal actions.

Lapienis said that in chatting with him on many occasions about these statements (and having returned to him a part of what was confiscated — according to the materials of his case he found out that the remainder had been burned), officials of the K G B and the Procuracy never found anything slanderous about them. '. . . How could these statements, which have been lying for three years or more in the archives, have suddenly become slanderous in 1977?'

Lapienis said that he could not bear responsibility for the fact that his statements exposing these actions had been published in the *Chronicle L C C*, as they were not secret. During this Lapienis denied the charge that the *Chronicle L C C* was 'illegal'. He said that this publication exercised the legal right of believers to self-defence from persecution, from malicious attacks by anti-religious propaganda (he gave vivid examples of this), and from the tyranny of bureaucrats.

Lapienis also spoke about the prejudiced nature of the investigation, which stuck the label 'anti-Soviet' on any manifestation of dissent and did not engage in a factual investigation of what was truth and what lies, and where the slander lay in these or those texts. He said:

> To defend the Church and believers is not politics but the sacred duty of every Catholic . . . , to be sentenced for fulfilling my obligations is for me not a disgrace but an honour . . .

Lapienis concluded his speech with the words:

> I would very much hope that the mistakes committed during the period of the cult of Stalin would not be repeated at the present time. This would only deepen the general crisis of socialism, which would ultimately end in catastrophe.
>
> Prisons and camps overflowing with prisoners do not greatly enhance our country. It would do a great deal of good to society if the authorities concerned themselves not with revenge but with truth.

The court sentenced Lapienis to 3 years of imprisonment in a strict-regime camp and to 2 years of exile, Matulionis — to 2 years' suspended deprivation of freedom, and Pranskunaite — to 2 years' of imprisonment in an ordinary-regime camp.

* * *

In the newspaper *Tiesa* [21 August 1977] an article was printed about the trial in which the title *Chronicle L C C* was replaced by 'anti-Soviet publication'. The article said:

> The Soviet court is humane . . . Taking into consideration that Matulionis understood his errors and promised not to engage in subversive activity, the court decided to convict him only conditionally. . . . Taking into consideration that Pranskunaite is semi-literate (she has primary education — *Chronicle*) and was drawn into criminal activity, and also the fact that she regretted the thoughtlessness of her actions at the trial, the court gave Pranskunaite a relatively light sentence . . . In this connection it is not superfluous to remember that Radio Vatican and other centres of Western propaganda have been intensifying their activities this year . . .

In October V. Lapienis was transported to Mordovian camp 3. O. Pranskunaite was sent to a camp in the village of Kozlovka (Chuvashia).

The Arrest of Petkus

On 23 August a member of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group Viktoras Petkus (*Chronicles* 40, 43) was arrested in Vilnius. He was detained at the bus station together with Algirdas Masiulionis. Both were taken to the flat of Petkus for a search. The search was carried out in case No. 38 (the case of B. Gajauskas — *Chronicle* 45), and was conducted by investigator Major Pilelis, an employee of the operations squad Major Trakimas and Lieutenant Birvilis. During the search the following items were confiscated: two typewriters (Russian and Lithuanian), four issues of the *samizdat* journal *Devas ir Tevine* (*God and Country* — *Chronicles* 43, 46), documents of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group Nos. 3-12 (see below), 'Resolution of the Chief Committee of the National Movement of Estonia, Latvia and Ltihuania' (three copies in Lithuanian and one copy each in Russian, Latvian and Estonian), a statement of M. Niklus to the Lithuanian Helsinki Group (in Russian and Estonian), a handwritten text in Latvian signed: 'Kalninš', a statement of priest Šeškevičius to the archbishop (besides the typewriters, everything was confiscated from the briecase of Petkus, which he had with him at the bus station). Both Petkus and Masiulionis were subjected to a body search. Petkus made a protest against the detention and search of Masiulionis as they were not provided for by the search warrant. After the search both were taken to the K G B, where Masiulionis was released after interrogation.

V. Petkus was charged under article 68 of the Lithuanian Criminal Code (=article 70 of the R S F S R Code). In the post-war years he served a 14-year term of imprisonment — under article 58 of the old Criminal Code and for escaping from a camp.

In the 'Resolution' confiscated from Petkus, it talks about questions of organization — the election of three chairmen of the Committee (their names are not indicated), the transfer of its functions, in the event of it being impossible for the committee to carry on its work, to foreign organizations of Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians, the election of honorary members (conditional on their agreement: P. Grigorenko, Yu. Orlov, A. Sakharov and a number of foreign figures), and the publication of a bulletin *Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania.*

* * *

At the end of August a member of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, Ona Lukauskaite-Poškiene, sent a statement of protest against the arrest of V. Petkus to the Lithuanian Procurator. In her statement she also protests against the arrest of B. Gajauskas. The statement was supported by 81 people.

* * *

On 14 November former political prisoners — the Estonians M. Niklus, E. Tarto and E. Udam and the Latvians V. Kalniņš, I. Calitis, G. Rode, Ju. Ziemelis and U. Ofkans, addressed the organization Amnesty International with a request to give their support in the struggle for the release of 'the Lithuanian fighter for civil and national rights, member of the Lithuanian group to observe the implementation of the decisions of the Helsinki conference, and one of the chairmen of the Chief Committee of the National Movement of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, V. Petkus.

(See also 'Searches and Interrogations' in this section and the section 'Arrests, searches, interrogations').

Searches and Interrogations

On 16 and 17 August an inhabitant of Šiauliai, **Jonas Petkevičius,** was interrogated in Vilnius in the case of Gajauskas. Lieutenant-Colonel Kažis, who conducted the interrogation in a very rude form, threatened to arrest Petkevičius for communicating 'slanderous anti-Soviet materials' to the *Chronicle L C C.* **Jadviga Petkevičiene** was summoned to Vilnius for 23 August. She was interrogated for two days by the same Kažis, who again shouted, going as far as unprintable abuse. After this Petkevičiene categorically refused to talk to Kažis and on the third day he was replaced by Major Pilelis. Petkevičiene was accused, amongst other things, of 'links with Moscow'. At interrogations the Petkevičius couple were 'advised' to leave the U S S R.

After the search carried out at his flat on 7 February 1977 (*Chronicle* 44), J. Petkevičius addressed the authorities many times, in particular

the Procurator of Lithuania, with the demand to return to him what had been confiscated. Eventually all his things (camera, the book *The Story of Christ* and others) were returned to Petkevičius, except for the composition 'Vitis' (a horseman, the Lithuanian coat of arms) and sets of the journal *Trimatas* for 1938-39.

* * *

On 23 August, at the same time as the arrest of Petkus, searches were begun at the homes of **A. Terleckas** (*Chronicles* 38, 40, 43) and J. Sasnauskas (*Chronicle* 44), both searches by decree of investigator Pilelis.

The search at the home of Terleckas lasted more than 24 hours (with a break for the night). The following items were confiscated: a typewriter, six issues of the *Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church,* two issues of *Aušra,* three issues of *Laisves Šauklis,* photocopies of the Russian texts 'Open letter to the editor of *Literary Gazette* Chakovsky' and 'Documents on the case of Marchenko', a brochure *The Case of Kovalyov* (Khronika publishing house, New York), typewritten copies of a large number of articles on socio-political themes, the Paris telephone number of Sinyavsky, and copies of statements sent by Terleckas to Podgorny and Andropov (*Chronicles* 40, 45). A part of what was confiscated was dug up on a plot near the house (Terleckas lives on the outskirts of Vilnius). After the search Terleckas was held in prison for three days.

Terleckas refused to give evidence about the documents confiscated from him at the search. K G B officers assured Terleckas that he would not be hindered in finding a job if he gave up his struggle against Soviet power. Terleckas stated that he would repeat what he had already written in a letter to Podgorny (*Chronicle* 43), i.e. that he was not intending to struggle against the Soviet system. Eventually the K G B agreed to this and let Terleckas go.

The wife, daughter and aunt of Terleckas were also summoned to interrogations. They were asked about his acquaintances, his links with Moscow, about an interview given by him to the correspondent of the *Financial Times,* and about material confiscated from him at the search.

* * *

Confiscated from **Ju. Sasnauskas** were Lithuanian *samizdat* (including the journal *Aidai* (*Echo*), No. 2) and several books in Russian: *The Diary of Eduard Kuznetsov, My Country and the World* and *Peace, Progress and Human Rights* (Nobel lecture) by A. Sakharov, 135 postcards with the composition 'Vitis', and a statement by Sasnauskas and three of his comrades about their expulsion from school in 1976 (*Chronicles* 42, 43). On the days following this Sasnauskas was interrogated several times.

* * *

In the daytime on 23 August Major Trakimas from the operations squad of the K G B and his colleagues detained **Jonas Volungevičius** at the bus station in Vilnius (where an hour later Petkus was arrested). He was taken forcibly to the K G B and there a body search was arranged without a warrant and an interrogation without a procotol, which lasted five hours (nothing was confiscated). During the interrogation they demanded from him that he stop travelling to Moscow: 'For you it is a prohibited city.' When he was let out of the K G B building, several agents followed him calling out (in Russian): 'If you run we'll pull off your legs! Go home and stay put!' and accompanying these threats with unprintable abuse. Volungevičius turned to a policeman for protection; then one of the agents produced his official identity card and said: 'This is a dangerous criminal. Take him to the police station.' The same agent rudely demanded that Volugevičius talk to the policeman in Russian. On 28 August Volungevičius wrote a statement to the Lithuanian Procurator. In this statement he protests against his illegal detention and search and demands that the K G B officers be brought to trial for threats, insults and slander.

* * *

In October all three members of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group were interrogated.

On 7 October Major Lazarevičius interrogated **Eitan Finkelshtein.** In a statement made by the latter the following day he says:

> Without having explained the specific charge that has been brought against Petkus, the investigator presented me with 19 different materials which he claimed had been confiscated from Petkus during a search and were documents of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group (L H G) . . .
>
> The majority of the questions put to me by the investigator concerned not the case of V. Petkus, but the activity of the L H G, its other members and myself personally. To all of these questions I refused to give an answer.
>
> After the interrogation on the case of V. Petkus the same investigator set about interrogating me on the case of Yury Orlov and Alexander Ginzburg. The questions concerned the activity of the Moscow Helsinki Group and its links with the L H G. I also refused to answer these questions.
>
> Thus both the materials of the investigation presented to me and the character of the interrogation convinced me that the investigation did not have any convincing proof at its disposal that the activity of V. Petkus in the L H G was of a slanderous, anti-Soviet nature. On the contrary, all this convinced me that the case of Petkus was in essence the case of the L H G, closely bound up with the cases of other Helsinki Groups in the U S S R.

> In connection with this I must state that Viktoras Petkus, as well as the other members of the L H G, were acting and are acting exclusively within the framework of Soviet legality, and were aspiring and are aspiring to verify as carefully as possible evidence of violations of the principles of the Final Act, which various citizens report to the Group.
>
> As a member of the L H G I bear equal responsibility with V. Petkus for the activities of the L H G and am prepared to stand trial together with him. However, the innocence of V. Petkus as a member of the L H G is absolutely obvious to me. It is precisely for this reason that I appeal to all the governments of countries which signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Helsinki, and to all organizations and individuals fighting for civil rights throughout the world: Do everything in your power not to allow the judicial suppression of Viktoras Petkus!

* * *

On 10 October **Karolis Garuckas** was interrogated in Vilnius. The interrogation lasted seven hours.

On 18 October investigator Captain Daugalas interrogated Ona Lukauskaite-Poškiene in Šiauliai as a witness in the case of Petkus. The questions concerned the formation of the group, contacts between its members, her acquaintance with Ginzburg and Orlov, with Latvians, with Gajauskas and Volungevičius, and differences of opinion with the people mentioned. Lukauskaite replied that she was not acquainted with any of the people named except for the members of the Group, had no contacts with Moscow, and she had really signed the documents of the Helsinki Lithuanian Group presented to her and confirmed her agreement with their contents. Lukauskaite repeated her request that Petkus be released. She said that there was no logic in the fact that Venclova, already after the formation of the Group, had been allowed to go abroad, where he was carrying out the mission entrusted to him even more fruitfully, whilst V. Petkus had been deprived of liberty for the same activity. The interrogation lasted about six hours.

* * *

In the middle of November searches were carried out at the homes of **Erik Udam** and **Mart Niklus** in the case of Petkus (see 'Arrests, Searches, Interrogations').

* * *

More details have become known of the search at the home of **Birute Pašiliene** near Klaipeda on 22 April 1977 (*Chronicle* 45). The search was conducted by Major R. Bertulis in the case of Gajauskas. *Chronicle* 43 and a manuscript headed 'Draft' were found in the garden

in a bee-hive. Pašiliene explained that she had found this literature and, without reading it, hidden it from her children. Two typewriters, Russian and Lithuanian, were also confiscated. Pašiliene demands that they be returned.

Disturbances in Vilnius

On 7 October, after a football match at the Vilnius stadium 'Žalgiris', a crowd of spectators of a few hundred people, basically young people, moved along the streets calling out both slogans in honour of their team's victory and political slogans: 'Down with the Constitution!', 'Freedom for Lithuania!', 'Russians — clear off!' When the police tried to disperse the procession, skirmishes broke out. Here and there in the procession were Lithuanian (Soviet) flags, held by those who had taken them to welcome their team on the stands. The demonstrators went out on to Lenin Square, where opposite the monument of Lenin is situated the K G B building (a prison is in the cellars, the offices up above). Here the demonstrators continued to call out slogans. According to certain reports the demonstrators broke windows in the K G B building.

On 10 October events of a similar character developed on a large scale. Troops (most of the soldiers were from the Asian republics) and many policemen were assembled beforehand near the stadium, all 25,000 places of which were filled. 'Žalgiris' were playing the Smolensk team 'Iskra'. Anti-Russian shouts started during the match (they could be heard by television viewers until the showing of the match was stopped 'for technical reasons'). Attempts by the police and voluntary patrols to seize those who were calling out were for the most part unsuccessful — those whom they wanted to seize escaped across the benches with the assistance of those sitting around them. The public left the stadium by a 'corridor' formed of soldiers. Nevertheless, a procession was formed once again, but this time 10-15,000 people moved into the centre. Skirmishes with the police broke out continuously, and individual groups overturned police cars.

Near Žalesis bridge (now — Dzerzhinsky bridge) another 500 people joined those coming from the stadium. Slogans became audible: 'Let's go to the K G B!' 'Freedom for political prisoners!', and frequent cries of 'Freedom for Petkus!'

Somewhere, in reply to one of the shouts against the Russians, there resounded: 'Russians are here with you too!', 'For your and our freedom!' The demonstrators broke through a cordon of police and soldiers of K G B troops with arms tightly linked on Gedimin Square and moved out on to Lenin Avenue. And only a second cordon — on Chernyakhovsky Square (not far from the K G B building) — stopped them. Agents darted about in the crowd, indicating whom to take, but often those arrested were wrested back. In different places, sometimes from right under the legs of policemen, home-made flags were hoisted noisily and fluttered brightly above the crowd. The demonstrators were dispersed only late at night.

Both on 7 and 10 October the demonstrators tore down posters about the Constitution, the 60th anniversary of October and so on. Some windows with such posters on them were broken. On 11 October all the posters hanging in Lenin Avenue were removed.

The number of those detained and injured is not known. A few policemen landed up in hospital. According to certain reports, in the middle of November the Procuracy of one of the districts of Vilnius — Sovetsky — heard the cases of 17 people arrested on 7 October.

On 12 October expulsions from institutes of higher education started; some people were expelled only from the Komsomol. An especially large number were expelled from the Engineering-Construction Institute. Repressive measures were also taken in certain enterprises.

An article appeared in the local paper *Evening News* which talked only about the escapades of hooligans at the stadium, and the pronouncement of a footballer was published who was indignant at the tactlessness and hooliganism of the fans. All matches in October were cancelled. The match arranged for 4 November was transferred to 8 November. Tickets for this were not publicly on sale, but were distributed at enterprises under the observance of party committees. There was a huge number of policemen at the stadium on 8 November, some of the police buses having Minsk number-plates.

* * *

In Telšiai on the night of 7 November inscriptions appeared on the streets (mostly on posters for the 60th anniversary of October): 'Russians — get out of Žemaitija' (Žemaitija is a region of Lithuania), etc. In Šalčininkai, on the fourth floor of the building of the town soviet executive committee was written in large letters: 'Long live a Free Lithuania!', 'Down with the Russians!'

* * *

The *Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church* 29 reports continuing repression of priests and believers:

On 27 July, when 25 children had assembled in the church of Vidulke for preparation for first communion, the chairman of the local soviet, a policeman and four teachers entered the church and began to take the childrens' names. A document was drawn up against the incumbent of the church **A. Svarinskas.**

The incumbent of the church in Kirdeikiai, **P. Kražauskas,** called on his parishioners to tidy up the cemetery and decorate the graves. The local authorities accused the priest of attempting to ravage the

graves of Soviet activists and demanded a written explanation from him.

A priest from Kibartai, **S. Tamkevičius,** was unable to obtain permission to leave for a neighbouring district to help the incumbent there — the chairman of the soviet executive committee referred him to the head of police, the latter to a K G B representative, and so on.

In June 1977 commissioner Tumenas of the Council for Religious Affairs visited the small place of Žaljoi and promised the local inhabitants to look favourably on their request to open a local church. After his departure many parishioners were subjected to various administrative punishments, and a mill was built in the church.

* * *

In *Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church* 29 the complaint was published which **V. Jaugelis** (*Chronicles* 34, 36) sent to the U N Committee of Human Rights (copy to the republican and all-union Procurators) on the subject of the incident which occurred on 23 June 1976 when he was detained on a street in the town of Raseiniai, was searched without any documents being shown and had the book *Christianity in the World* taken from him. Jaugelis is trying to have the book returned to him.

* * *

This summer **Father K. Garuckas** received a letter from 'Lithuanians' who reproached him for the fact that E. Finkelshtein is a member of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group and that the Lithuanian Group maintains contact with Moscow dissidents, the majority of whom are of Jewish descent.

* * *

On 18 October late in the evening, when **Algirdas Masiulionis** and **Andrius Tučkus** were walking through one of the squares in Vilnius, some people stopped them, called a police patrol and said that they and two others who had hidden themselves were behaving like hooligans. Masiulionis and Tučkus were taken to the police station and a written explanation of what they were doing in the square was demanded from them. The policeman conducting the inquiry gave Tučkus, who did not want to write and speak in Russian, a strong blow with his shoe in the lower part of his back; continuing to beat him, they dragged him off to a cell. Masiulionis, although he wrote an explanation, but evidently not what was required, was also beaten up. They were held at the police station from 12 o'clock at night until 4 o'clock in the morning.

* * *

Vytautas Bogušes, Algirdas Masiulionis, Julius Sasnauskas and **Andrius Tučkus** wrote a statement on 8 November to Barkauskas, the chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania (copy to the military commissar of Lithuania), on the subject of their being called up for military service. First they report that in the spring of 1976 they were 'expelled from the Vilnius secondary school named after Venuolis for their religious and nationalist convictions' (*Chronicles* 42, 43), and that since then they have heard on several occasions from the K G B and the police that their path to institutes of higher education is closed, that they will be taken into the army and sent to Spitzbergen or to the Chinese border. Two of those who signed the statement tried nevertheless to enter an institute of higher education. Masiulionis did not pass the entrance examinations, but Tučkus, although he attained the pass mark, was all the same not accepted — in accordance with 'information from above' — as the rector of Vilnius State University explained frankly. On graduating from school (evening) they were all given testimonials with the formula: 'unhealthy views', 'not free from religious prejudices', etc. The statement says further (quoted in translation):

> We became Soviet citizens not of our own free will, but only because we were born in Lithuania. The Soviet press maintains that service in the Soviet army is a matter of honour and inspires every youth with a feeling of pride for the trust shown in him. We do not feel anything of the sort because both the K G B and the police have assured us that for us the army will be a punishment for our beliefs. Despite this we do not refuse to serve in the army. We only ask that we be left to serve in Lithuania . . .
>
> The local writer Ju. Baltušis proclaims with pride that today Lithuania is 'free and independent'. Citizens of an independent state, as is clear to everyone, should serve in their own country.

The Lithuanian Helsinki Group

Below is a survey of the documents published by the Group from the moment of its formation in November 1976 (*Chronicle* 43) up till July 1977. All the documents were signed: Father Karolis Garuckas, Eitan Finkelshtein, Ona Lukauskaite, Viktoras Petkus and Tomas Venclova.

Chronicle 43 has already presented the contents of **Document No. 1** (On two Lithuanian Catholic bishops), **Document No. 2** (On the 'Statute on religious associations'), and several other statements of the Group.

Document No. 3 (23.12.76) Account of the fate of **Mart Niklus** (*Chronicles* 42, 43).

Document No. 4 (25.2.77) **Maria Jurgutiene** (with her daughter, who is a minor) is not allowed to leave to join her husband for permanent residence in the U S A (*Chronicles* 36, 44). **Valya Belapetravičiene** (*Chronicle* 45) is not allowed to leave to join her father for permanent residence in West Germany.

Document No. 5 (28.2.77) Report on a search carried out at the home of **Genrikas Jaškunas** on 22 December 1976, after which Jaškunas was arrested (*Chronicle* 44).

Document No. 6 (19.3.77) Tells of the appeal of 49 German families, now living in the Radviliški district of Lithuania. The Germans repudiate their Soviet citizenship and ask to be allowed to leave for their historic homeland — West Germany.

Document No. 7 (26.5.77) The story of **Erik Udam** from Tallin, to whom the K G B proposed in April this year that he organize a group of dissidents under his control, with links with the U S A (*Chronicle* 46).

Document No. 8 (2.6.77) Tells of the fate of Pentecostalist **Victor Vasilev** living in Vilnius, who is constantly subjected to persecution. The Vasilevs ask to be allowed to go abroad.

Document No. 9 (14.6.77) On the situation of political prisoners who have been released. The majority (there are a few exceptions) of those who have served 15-year and 25-year sentences are not allowed to return to Lithuania. Some of those released come to Lithuania of their own accord and refuse to go beyond its boundaries. Sometimes they manage to 'prove more stubborn' than the K G B and the police and to remain in Lithuania But even in these instances it costs nothing for the authorities to take away a passport, de-register a person, and convict him for violating the residence regulations.

Document No. 10 (16.6.77) Report on the arrest of **Balys Gajauskas** (20 April 1977), brief information about his first arrest in 1948 and the trial which sentenced him under article 58 to 25 years of camps. Also reports on the searches at the homes of Birute Pašiliene, Leonardas Stavkis and Ona Grigaliunaite in the Gajauskas case (*Chronicle* 45).

Document No. 11 (26.6.77) Estonian **Enn Tarto** (b. 1938), who has twice been convicted (1956 and 1962) under political articles and has served nine years, reports that up till now the K G B has not left him in peace (has been interrogated several times, particularly 'because of his link with Gorbanevskaya'). This year they have already tried to set fire to his house four times.

Document No. 12 (1.7.77) Tells of the fate of **Algirdas Žipre** (*Chronicles* 32, 34). In October 1973 he was transferred to a camp 'loony bin' (written thus in the text) located in Mordovian camp 3. According to the information of the authors of the document, the conditions there are much worse than in camp. The windows are always tightly closed, no links with the outside world are permitted, there are no walks, prisoners are beaten, and are given strong doses of unmarked medicines. Algirdas Žipre has been beaten twice. On two occasions he was taken to Moscow, to the Serbsky Institute. This year he has been taken off to an unknown destination.

Statement on the Contemporary Situation in Lithuania (8 pages, 7 July 1977). The statement basically concerns the following questions:

—The situation of Lithuanians exiled from the republic in the pre-war and first post-war years. It points out that many Lithuanians are in exile up till now 'without trial and sentence': Stepas Bubulas, Kostas Buknis, Antanas Deksnis, Alfonsas Gaidis, Algirdas Gasiunas, Robertas Indrikas, Antanas Jankauskas, Jonas Karalius, Leonas Lebeda, Kostas Lekšas, Juozas Mikailionis, Aleksas Musteika, Petras Paltarokas, Povilas Pečiulaitis, Vytautas Petrušaitis, Albinas Rašitinis, Vincas Seliokas, Vytautas Slapšinskas, Jonas Šarkanas, Benius Trakimas, Vladas Vaitekunas.

—The state of the Lithuanian language. The number of Russians living in Lithuania has increased five-fold in the last thirty years, there are particularly large numbers of Russians in Vilnius and Klaipeda.

—The situation of Lithuanians in Latvia and Belorussia. In Latvia, where on the eve of the war there were 18 Lithuanian schools, now not a single one remains. The situation is almost the same in Belorussia where Lithuanian schools have long been closed, churches are being closed, and the authorities are hindering Lithuanians from inviting priests from Lithuania to come to them.

—The situation of Poles. According to the facts of the last census in Lithuania there are almost as many Poles living there as Russians. However, it is impossible to find notices in Polish anywhere, the Poles do not have their own theatre, there is no possibility of receiving a higher education in Polish. (There is only one Polish group in the Pedagogical Institute.)

—The situation of other national minorities in Lithuania. There is now not a single Jewish school in the republic, yet before the war there were 122 primary, three incomplete secondary (pre-grammar school) and 14 secondary schools (grammar). According to the census of 1970 there are 16,000 Jews in Vilnius, and 4,000 in Kaunas. There are 24,000 Belorussians in Vilnius, but there is not a single Belorussian school in the town, and not a single Belorussian paper comes out. Tatars and Karaim are in the same situation. In the final-year classes of Lithuanian schools four hours are devoted each week to the Lithuanian language and five to Russian. It is impossible to obtain almost any book put out before 1940 (even *The U S S R Through Our Eyes*, the work by Paleckis, the former chairman of the Presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, now chairman of the U S S R Council of Nationalities, is kept in a secret store-room). Many classical books, historical and economic works, have been stolen from readers.

At searches, pre-war publications are often taken away. In the first post-war years many archives and libraries were destroyed.

—Many historical monuments are going to ruin. For example, the Catholic Church of St. Kazimir (1604) in Vilnius was for ten years a warehouse for wine bottles.

In conclusion the authors of the statement point out that they have dealt with only a small part of the problem, and ask the governments of countries which signed the Helsinki Declaration to turn their attention to the fact that agreements which are not implemented or implemented only on one side have no meaning and are a deception.

Persecution of Believers

186 inhabitants of Kiev sent the Soviet government a petition requesting that the monastery in Kievo-Pecherskaya Lavra be opened again.

The monastery, which opened after the war, was never formally closed — its buildings and premises in the caves were placed under repair.

After the effective closure of the monastery in 1961 the monks were found to be scattered all over the place. Some of them settled in the Pochayev monastery. A group of monks started to live 'in the wilderness', as in ancient times. They settled in the Caucasus, in a place that was difficult to reach. In 1965 they were taken from there by force, with the help of a helicopter. One of the 'hermits', the monk **Father Akhilla,** described this at a press-conference on 11 November at the flat of Grigorenko.*

(See also the interview of Shafarevich in the section 'Samizdat News').

Catholics

All Catholic churches in the territory of Moldavia (there were about 10) have now been closed. Only a small chapel in the cemetery in Kishinev is now working, and there Catholics come from all over the republic. The senior priest of this chapel, **Vladislav Zavalnyuk,** who was sent to Kishinev in 1974 after finishing at the Riga ecclesiastical seminary, is the only Catholic priest in Moldavia.

As the chapel is crowded and it can only be reached with difficulty, elderly and sick people are unable to attend services. On Sundays after the service there is a queue of people for the priest; they want to invite him to give spiritual help to those dying or sick at home.

[*See Reuter report of 11-12 November 1977.]

The local authorities, noticing Zavalnyuk's visits, have begun to put obstacles in his way.

* * *

Two years ago the Catholics of Rashkovo obtained permission for a priest to conduct services twice a month in a consecrated house of worship.

This year, on the Wednesday of Passion Week, the car in which priest Zavalnyuk was returning from Rashkovo was stopped by the police in Rybnitsa. The car was searched on the roadside, driven to the police station and searched again. The car was returned only the following morning, after a third search. In this way the service in Kishinev on the Wednesday of Passion Week could not take place.

On 29 July in Rashkovo the patron saint's day of St. Marta was being celebrated. The police stopped the car Zavalnyuk was in on the road to Rashkovo and demanded a certificate from the medical-epidemic station on the pretext of a quarantine existing. The priest was forced to walk a few kilometres on foot.

On 2 August Catholics gathered in Kishinev for the patron saint's day of 'Portsiupkul', but the service did not take place — the police again detained Zavalnyuk on the road from Rashkovo, demanding a pass from the driver.

Recently in Rashkovo Catholics have on several occasions received 15 days in prison. Thus on 20 October **Valentina Olienik** and **Vladislava Pogrebnaya** were convicted. At the trial V. Oleinik pointed to the policeman who had beaten her.

The Catholics of Rashkovo wanted to expand their prayer house but the secretary of Kamensky district soviet executive committee Khozhukhor threatened them that he would put bulldozers and tractors into action.

* * *

The village soviet of the village of Ivanovka, Rybnitsa district, where Polish Catholics live, forbade Zavalnyuk in writing to enter the village.

At the other end of Moldavia, German Catholics from the village of Andriyashevka, Slobodzei district, received a document from the executive committee saying that the priest from Kishinev could perform a service once a month for the Catholics of this village. Commissioner A. Vikonsky of the Council of Religious Affairs attached to the Moldavia Council of Ministers took this document from the believers of Andriyashevka, but would not give the priest permission to go to the village.

* * *

In order to visit a sick man the priest has to have five documents: from the doctor, from the local authorities, from the district soviet

executive committee, from the city soviet executive committee and from the commissioner. Commissioner Vikonsky jokes: 'In order to succeed in acquiring all the documents before the sick man has died, start soliciting beforehand, while the man is still healthy'.

* * *

On 8 April 1977 the commissioner of the Council for Religious Affairs attached to the Georgian Council of Ministers arrived at the Catholic church in Tbilisi. He went into the sacristy and, without saying a word, picked up from the table and took away a book of records, a list of young people receiving the sacraments, and some religious book.

Adventists

A. R. Miller (b. 1958) was arrested in Dushanbe on 30 December 1976 for refusing to serve in the army. Under article 78 of the Tadzhik Criminal Code (=article 80 of the R S F S R Code) he received two years forced labour. He is serving his punishment in Dzhanatas (Dzhambul region).

An inhabitant of Dnepropetrovsk **P. P. Kovalchuk** was arrested on 12 September 1977 for refusing to take the military oath and to carry a weapon. He was held in custody in Taldy-Kurgan.

* * *

The Head of the all-Union Church of Loyal and Free Seventh Day Adventists, **V. A. Shelkov** (82 years), has served three terms in prisons, camps and exile (altogether — 23 years). Since 1969 he had been in hiding.*

Baptists

(Mainly from the materials of the *Bulletin of the Council of Relatives of E C B Prisoners*, Nos. 44, 45.)

* * *

On 5 June 1977 in the settlement of Kant, Frunze region, the trial took place of Baptists **Ya. G. Yantsen** and **I. G. Shlekht.** They were charged under article 141, part 2 of the Kirgiz Criminal Code (=article 142 of the R S F S R Code).

The accused were not taken into custody before the trial.

From the evidence of witnesses and the accused it became clear that on Sundays believers gathered in some house for a service of

[*Arrested in Tashkent on 14 March 1978.]

worship, and would come with their children. After the service they would have dinner, and then occupy themselves with the children: read to them from the Bible, show them pictures, sing songs and read poetry with them.

On 30 January an administrative commission from the district soviet executive committee came to the house of Shlekht and found about 20 children there and approximately the same number of adults — mostly women. Yantsen was occupying himself with the children.

Expert Galperin stated to the court that he regarded such pursuits as constituting a Sunday school and that, whatever they were called, they were all the same prohibited by law.

The court sentenced the defendants to 3 years of ordinary-regime camps.

Events in Rostov-on-Don

The Rostov congregation of Evangelical Christians and Baptists comprises more than 30 members. The congregation has been applying for registration, having stipulated that its members would not recognise the commissioner from the Council for Religious Affairs and the K G B as occupying the place of Jesus Christ in church. The local authorities refused to register the congregation.

The believers assembled in a house belonging to two elderly women: Terekhova and Khmara. In January 1977 this house was confiscated. The members of the congregation began to assemble in other places. The assemblies were dispersed.

Thus, on 8 February the police and voluntary patrols would not allow Baptists who had gathered there to enter the house of the Zakharov family. In the process many people were beaten.

Then the authorities left the congregation in peace for a while.

The believers built a 'tent', 7 x 9 metres, on the Zakharovs' personal plot and organized prayer meetings in it. The district Soviet executive committee decreed that this tent should be taken down, but the Baptists refused to submit.

On 8 August the police took down the tent. Together with the building materials out of which the tent had been made, they took from the plot seven cubic metres of firewood, welding apparatus, two gas cylinders, electric lamps, a table and benches.

The Baptists continued to assemble on the Zakharovs' plot and soon afterwards built a new tent there.

On 23 August late in the evening the police and workmen again took down the tent on the orders of the district Soviet executive committee and took away the building materials.

On 26 August a prayer meeting was again held in the Zakharovs' yard. Ranks of policemen, K G B officials and voluntary patrols filled the streets around it. When the service started on the plot, they switched

on a deafening loud-speaker. They began to disperse the believers, pushing them and twisting their arms. The minister of the church, P. Peters, was taken away. Then members of the congregation assembled near the police station and began demanding his release. Some were taken into the police station, others were driven into buses and taken to far-off districts of the town. In the course of this, physical force was again applied.

The congregation arranged a 'youth communion' for 27-28 August. On this occasion they gathered in a wood. The believers had scarcely reached the place, when the police appeared, together with voluntary patrols, and busloads of workers especially taken off the production line. Loudspeakers started up, a crush began. The service was cut short. A few people were taken into the police station. After talks there the believers were allowed to go to the Zakharovs' plot.

However, on 2 and 4 October prayer meetings at the Zakharovs' were again broken up.

On 14 September massive searches were carried out at the homes of members of the Rostov congregation.

Rumours were released around the town that the Baptists had sacrificed a child and killed a policeman.

The Soviet executive committee of the city's Pervomaisky district decreed that the house be confiscated from the Zakharov family. Nina Zakharova was deprived of guardianship over her younger sister Lena. (The Zakharovs are the children of a Baptist minister. There are three sisters of 24, 19 and 11, and one brother of 22. Their parents died in 1971. The oldest sister Nina has brought up the children.)

A criminal case has been brought against **P. Peters.** He is 34, and has already served three terms of imprisonment as a dissenting Baptist. In 1969 they tried to persuade him to cooperate with the K G B under threat of imprisonment.

Harvest festival in Gorlovka

The Gorlovka congregation of Baptists arranged a gathering for 9 o'clock on the morning of 28 August in honour of the harvest festival. The secretary of the district soviet executive committee was informed of this in advance. They were intending to celebrate in the house of Baptist F. M. Kinash.

At 8 o'clock in the morning the police and civilians surrounded the house and blocked off all approaches. Road signs prohibiting through traffic were hung in the streets close by, and cars were placed across the streets.

At this time, those who had come earlier to help the hosts were in the Kinashes' yard preparing for the celebration. Some of the guests who had arrived in the meanwhile had registered and were allowed to enter the house. After this no one was allowed to approach the

house; in this way those who had assembled were divided into several groups. The Baptists who found themselves in the Kinashes' yard began to pray.

A group of policemen led by Captain Dobrovolsky entered the yard and demanded that the praying stop and they disperse. Then they began to break up the believers by force. They lifted up those praying on their knees, grabbed the prayer books out of their hands, took away bags and briefcases, at the same time stealing money from them. They twisted the arms of believers, tore their clothing, and threw children on the ground. They removed tape-recorders and cameras. They broke tables, chairs, benches, musical instruments brought by guests, and a radio. Dobrovolsky, using a megaphone, poured abuse on the believers.

Those who had gathered outside tried to enter the district soviet executive committee but the authorities began to push them into cars. Some were taken to different support points of the people's voluntary police, others were bundled out on the street at the opposite end of the town, still others were taken out of town.

They dragged some believers out of public transport, stopping trams and buses in the road.

They continued to beat and rob those brought into the police station. It even happened to children who had landed up in the children's room at the police station. Those who came to the police station to receive the things that had been taken away were immediately sent to the cells.

Captain Dobrovolsky with a police detachment drove a group of believers through the town, announcing through a megaphone that they were Baptists, that they did not work, did not submit to Soviet laws, engaged in anti-Soviet propaganda, etc.

A Procurator summoned to the police station personally swore at and beat those detained.

Originally about 60 people were detained. 15 of them were arrested and on the following day given 10 or 15 days each. After the members of the congregation had sent a telegram to the Supreme Soviet and the Procurator of the region about what had happened, 12 people were released.

* * *

The registered Bezhitsa congregation of Baptists in the town of Bryansk built a brick prayer house by their own efforts. 50,000 roubles donated by believers went on the construction. In August the members of the congregation were completing the decorating work.

On 28 August representatives of authority appeared at the construction site. They produced a resolution about the confiscation of the prayer house and ordered the work to stop. The believers

refused to submit, regarding the resolution as illegal. All of them — 62 people — were locked in the house. They were not allowed out to the toilet, and were not fed. In this way two days passed.

On 30 August Baptists gathered near the house. K G B officials, the police and voluntary police began to disperse them. In the course of this about 150 people were beaten up. Believers were dragged along the ground, their heads were beaten against the asphalt and against walls, they were trampled on, their hair was pulled out, and they were drenched by fire-hoses. Those inside the house were smoked out.

Presbyters P. Kozorezov and V. Serpikov, choir-master Kravchuk, deacon V. Vosnyatin and Vasily Vysotsky suffered particularly serious injuries. Elderly and pregnant women were amongst those beaten up.

About 300 policemen and voluntary police took part in the operation, and fire engines were used. It was directed by the head of the U V D of Bryansk region, by K G B Majors Zernov and Korshunov, Lieutenant-Colonel of the M V D Nozdrachev, secretary of the district party committee Khokhlov, chairman of the city soviet executive committee Evdokimov, and chairman of the district soviet executive committee Fomichenko.

* * *

On 30 October, in the house of Sinyushenkov in Bryansk a prayer meeting of the Bezhitsa E C B congregation, which was celebrating the Harvest, was broken up. Believers were beaten, some were fined, others received 15 days in prison.

* * *

In July 1977 a member of the Council of E C B Churches **D. V. Minyakov** was detained at Rostov airport. He was interrogated and warned according to the decree of 25 December 1972.

* * *

On 14 September a search was carried out at the home of presbyter of the Shakhty E C B congregation (Rostov region), **N. G. Baturin.** The wife and children of Baturin were in the house during the search. The Gospels, a Bible and other religious literature were confiscated.

* * *

On 11 September a member of the Council of E C B Churches, **I. Ya. Antonov,** was taken off the Odessa-Kharkov train. He was searched and taken from him were a Bible, a three-volume Bible course, Church documents and personal notes (the Bible and notes were later returned to him). The morning of the following day Antonov was transported to police station No. 2 in Kirovograd and in the presence of the Procurator warned of his criminal liability for vagrancy and parasitism. (Antonov, as a presbyter, is provided for materially by the Kirovograd E C B congregation and is paid 80 roubles a month.)

Then a plenipotentiary of the Ukrainian K G B, Fesunenko, and an official of the Kirovograd K G B, Kryuchek, invited three other members of the local E C B congregation to have a chat with them. They advised them to register the congregation and not to indicate in doing so that it belonged to the [unofficial] Council of Churches; not to incite Baptists against registration; to alter the work of the Council of Churches and the Council of Relatives of E C B prisoners with regard to information about persecution; and not to communicate this information abroad. They advised Antonov to find himself an official job.

In reply the believers asked then to stop persecuting the E C B and not to interfere in the internal life of the church.

* * *

On 2 May 1977 an article was published in the regional paper *Kirovograd Truth* called 'Apostle of Baptism', accusing Antonov of parasitism, appropriating the money of believers, and circulating false information. Members of the Council of Churches Kryuchkov, Vins, Golev and Minyakov were also mentioned in the article. They were represented as slanderers, parasites and criminals, with several convictions each.

* * *

In the town of Issyk in Alma-Ata region the conflict between the local authorities and the E C B congregation continues (*Chronicles* 44, 46). The members of the congregation make the conditions of registration the release from imprisonment and the rehabilitation of their presbyter Shteffen. Employees of the city soviet, the police and voluntary police are constantly breaking up prayer meetings and fining owners of houses where they take place, and those who conduct the meetings.

In the summer the chairman of the city soviet Shabaldin summoned the 'Council of 20' of the congregation to an administrative commission. They told the believers that they would not allow any more prayer meetings; each member of the council would be fined 50 roubles for a meeting, independently of whether they themselves were present or not. They threatened the Baptists with expulsion for living without passports (*Chronicle* 46).

On 3 July a member of the congregation, **Yakov Petrovich Volf,** was arrested. He was sent to Alma-Ata, where an investigation into his case was started.

* * *

On 6 May in the village of Glukhi in Starovyzhevo district, Volyn region, Baptist believers were celebrating a wedding. During the marriage rites about 30 outsiders arrived: the head of the K G B, representatives of local authority, the police. They took pictures with a movie camera and recorded the service on tape, tried to hinder the performance of the rites, pushed guests aside, and threatened to release tear gas. The chairman of the village soviet called out to the believers: 'Stop it, I have already married them'.

In a wood on the way home **Tsapuk** and **Yatsyuk,** who were returning from the wedding, were arrested. They were given 15 days each.

* * *

Also in Volyn region in the towns of Kovele, Rozhishche and Kivertsy the 'public' have been turning up at weddings of Baptists with a brass band, which has played and made a noise during the performance of the rites. After the weddings several believers have been fined.

* * *

Chronicle 46 reported the beating up in a military unit of **Nikolai Kravchenko** — a Baptist of the Council of Churches who refused to take the military oath. After treatment in several hospitals he was discharged and in the middle of September returned home from the army. His jaws, which were injured during the beating, were not successfully treated.

* * *

Dzhambul. In schools No. 20 and 28 teachers handed out to the children a questionnaire, to which it was compulsory to reply. Below are some of the questions in this questionnaire:

1. Do you believe in God?
2. Do you visit a prayer house?
3. Do you visit meetings for young people and children?
4. Who directs them?
5. Are you baptised?
6. Religion is a great evil for the state. How do you explain this?

Pentecostalists

In Yalta the presbyter of a congregation of Christian Pentecostalists **A. M. Tupikov** has been fined 50 roubles. He has nine children of school and pre-school age to support.

In the autumn several Pentecostalists from Simferopol congregation were fined.

Pentecostalists are now being fined in a new way; no longer are resolutions of administrative commissions about the fine and receipts for payment handed out. The representative of the enterprise where the believer works takes him to the city soviet executive committee. There the administrative commission announces the imposition of a fine. The money is stopped from his wages at his place of work.

Evidently, this new procedure stems from the fact that official documents about fines have been reaching the West.

In Donetsk those fined in the old way have had their passports impounded until they hand over their receipts for payment of the earlier fines.

* * *

On 14 August in the village of Prutki, Bryansk region, a wedding was celebrated in a family of Christian-Pentecostalists. Co-religionist and presbyter V. S. Prudnikov, who was performing the marriage rites, came to the wedding from the town of Zhdanov.

The village of Prutki is situated 17 kms. from the district centre of Komarichi. The guests had to cover this distance on foot as the district authorities made people going to the wedding get out of a bus; then the police made them get out of the vehicles in which they obtained lifts.

During the marriage service officials from the district soviet executive committee and the police entered the house and ordered them to finish the service in 15 minutes. Half an hour later they came back again, arriving during the wedding feast. This time they insisted that they stop reading verses and singing and ordered them to disperse.

Having scattered the believers, the police searched them one by one. They took away Bibles and song books.

Persecution of Crimean Tatars

The mass registration [in the Crimea] of Crimean Tatars, which representatives of authority promised in February 1977 (*Chronicle* 44), has so far proved to have been by no means comprehensive. From February to September the ownership of houses which had been bought was legalized, and about 200 families were registered. Amongst them were both those who had been living for several years in the Crimea without registration, and those who came in 1977. However, about another 600 families are living without registration, several dozen of which have been there 3-4 years. Altogether there are now in the Crimea approximately 2,000 Crimean Tatar families (8-10,000 people), 250-300 of which came under the 'organized worker recruitment' system. In the middle of November 1977 25 families were brought from

Uzbekistan under this system, which was used for the first time since 1974. The K G B took part in the selection of those being resettled (there are several thousand waiting in the queue).

* * *

In September 1977, after almost a year's break, forcible evictions started up again (*Chronicles* 41-44).

* * *

In Saki district — where the chairman of the district soviet executive committee, F. Boiko, who recently acceded to the post, stated: 'There will not be a single Crimean Tatar in my district' — four families were subjected to eviction in September.

* * *

In the village of Runnoye two elderly women, the sisters **Nuriye** and **Kerime Kurtseitova,** were driven out of the house they had bought together with their brother, **Rustem Khalilov,** an invalid of the Second World War. This action started late in the evening of 7 September. It was directly carried out by an inspector of the district O V D passport section, Timchenko, the secretary of the party committee of the state farm 'Ozerny', a legal consultant of the state farm, A. Marchuk (he personally broke down the doors), and a large unit of policemen and voluntary police (almost all of whom were drunk). Kerime, who has a weak heart, fell unconscious when they burst into the house. After this the action was broken off. The following day Kerime, who had not yet recovered, her sister and two other women (Khalilov at this time was at the office of the chairman of the district executive committee submitting a complaint) were pushed into a bus, and their property was piled on to lorries (and much of it was broken and stolen). The sisters were handed over to the local hospital, while their things were thrown down in the state farm hostel.

The sisters Kurtseitova are registered in the neighbouring village of Lesnovka. Since they were living in cramped conditions there with other relatives, in February 1977 they bought a house in the village of Runnoye. They obtained the permission of the state farm administration to buy the house.

Khalilov was promised registration and work by soviet and party organs (he is a member of the Communist Party) if he bought a house.

At the beginning of September the former owner of the house was searched, detained at the police station for 24 hours and summoned to the Procuracy on two other days, after which she signed a statement that the purchaser was 'evading' registration of the contract, and that she had sold the house a second time — to the state farm 'Ozerny'. The same day the forced eviction was started. The Kurtseitovas and Khalilov were unable to obtain the restoration of their rights to the house either from the local authorities, or from the Procurator-General. In November they handed in to the court a suit against the state farm and a complaint against the actions of the police.

* * *

In the village of Molochnoye (also Saki district) on 20 September **Zera Mustafayeva** and her 10-year-old daughter were evicted. They were forced to get into a bus (the little girl was taken from her lessons), their things were loaded in after the doors of the house had been broken down, and they were taken to the station in Simferopol. They demanded of Mustafayeva that she send her things to Samarkand. A letter was sent from Saki to the Samarkand regional soviet executive committee requiring that measures be taken against Zera's husband D. Mustafayev, an official of the executive committee and a deputy to the regional soviet. Z. Mustafayeva, after staying for a few days wherever she could at flats in Saki, returned to her house. After numerous statements by her the district Procurator admitted that the eviction had been illegal and her things were brought to her from Simferopol; but she did not succeed in legalizing the contract of purchase and registering there. In October the former owner of the house, who had left for the Arkhangelsk region, was summoned to Saki. She was forced to write a statement that she agreed to the house being pulled down, and on 27 October this was carried out. Mustafayeva and her daughter stayed living in a temporary building which was standing in the yard. The state farm administration cut the electricity off in this building and liquidated the garden plot, dividing it up between the neighbours. The daughter of Mustafayeva, Zarema, twice wrote to *Pioneer Truth.* In reply to her letters an instructor of the district committee of the Komsomol came to the school; he said: 'Tell your mother to take you back to Samarkand, you've got a good flat there'.

* * *

In the same district in September the family of a participant of the Second World War, **Seitmemet Ametov,** was evicted (village of Mityayevo; they were taken to a forest belt) and also the family of **Amet Ganiyev** (village of Trudovoye).

* * *

Evictions also took place in other regions of the Crimea. On 31 August the family of **Nuri Mustafayeva,** including one child aged three and another aged one and a half, was taken out of the village of Sadovoye in Nizhnegorsk district. They were unloaded at a spot in the open air not far from Dzhankoi. Crimean Tatars living in their

neighbourhood found them and took them home. This family has already been living for a year without registration and without work.

In the village of Semisotka in Lenin district there were three evictions in September of **Sh. Bekirov** (with his wife and two young children), **A. Karayev** (a participant of the Second World War) and **S. Khodzhiametov** (with his wife, three children and old mother). The head of the Lenin district O V D and his deputy Kuznetsov played a direct part in these actions. A criminal returning from camp, who had served 10 years for raping juveniles, was billeted in the house of Khodzhiametov.

* * *

The parents of Mustafa Dzhemilev (see section 'In the Prisons and Camps' in this issue), **Makhfure and Abduldzhemil Mustafayev,** moved to the Crimea in July 1977 after buying a house in the village of Muromskoye, Belogorsk district, not far from Mustafa's sisters Dilyara Seitveliyeva (*Chronicle* 46, 'Miscellaneous reports') and Gulizar Abdullayeva, who had moved there previously with their families. They are all being refused registration. In August the administrative commission of the district soviet executive committee decided to warn the Mustafayevs that they must legalize the purchase of their house within three days and that they were violating the residence regulations. In November they were sent a summons to the Procuracy 'on the matter of the illegal purchase of a house'. A criminal case was brought against Dilyara's husband, **Riza Seitveliyev,** under article 196 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ('violating the residence regulations') after the purchase of their house was ruled illegal by a civil court. In November the police carried out an inquiry; the trial is expected in December.

* * *

A criminal case under article 196 was also brought against **Nuretdin Useinov** (village of Batalnoye, Lenin district; he has been living there without registration since 1974) and against Seidamet Memetov (village of Lesnovka, Saki district). The trial of Memetov was fixed for 9 November, but on 6 November the deputy head of district O V D told Memetov that the trial would not take place. To questions whether the case had been closed and whether he had come under an amnesty, he received no definite answer.

* * *

Some of the Crimean Tatars convicted under article 196 (*Chronicle* 43) and now released under the amnesty have returned to Stary Krym.

* * *

In the middle of November a group of Crimean Tatars (mostly women) arrived at the Belogorsk district soviet executive committee.

The police proposed to them that they should enter the building one by one, only not through the main entrance but at the side. A police van was standing there. The first two women were seized. The rest ran to a car. A skirmish broke out, in the course of which both Crimean Tatars and policemen were hurt. Two people (a man and a woman) received 10 days each.

* * *

A. V. Tikhonovsky, married to a Crimean Tatar, lives on the state farm 'Solnechny' in Simferopol district. Recently his telephone was cut off. The head of the telephone exchange, Urmus, explained the reason for the disconnection to Tikhonovsky: 'You talk in Tatar on the telephone and we can't understand'.

Two year ago, when this family moved to the Crimea from Uzbekistan, Tikhonovsky (at first he arrived on his own) legalized the contract for the purchase of a house, and registration, in one day. Later, when he came to the passport office to register his wife, they began to shout at him: 'You're a party member but you're deceiving the state'.

* * *

Amongst the measures taken against the ever growing stream of Crimean Tatars returning to the Crimea are the following: unregistered Crimean Tatars are not given special transport for conveying the containers of their things which have arrived in the Crimea. The head of the loading point at the station of Simferopol, N. G. Smirinsky, says he received oral instructions about this from the K G B. At the same time, in Uzbekistan Crimean Tatars are being hindered from sending containers. The Crimean 'State Car Inspectorate' is hunting down private cars belonging to unregistered Crimean Tatars (one of the signs is that they do not have Crimean number plates) and under various invented pretexts punishing the owners, even to the point of depriving them of a licence for a period of up to two years. Several owners of cars who helped evicted Tatars to return home have been deprived of their licences.

* * *

Asan Mamut, a group I invalid of the Second World War (after being injured he spent eight years in hospitals; since then he has been in the care of his sister, who now has six children), wrote to the newspaper *Red Star*: on 17 April 1977 their family, having bought a peasant house in the village of Balki, Belogorsk district, returned to the Crimea. The chairman of the village soviet and the local policeman

immediately gave the garden attached to the house to the neighbours. He appealed to the district soviet executive committee, the regional soviet executive committee, the district party committee and the district military enlistment office, but did not succeed in getting registered. His son-in-law (a driver and carpenter) is without work, and Asan himself is not paid a pension. The chairman of the district soviet executive committee, Kravets, to whom Mamut went for a reception, called policemen and drove him out of the office. Asan Mamut ends his letter: 'That's what I defended my country for".

* * *

Teacher **Zera Shabanova** in Belogorsk has not been given a job in either a school or even a kindergarten for a period of three years.

Doctor-pediatrician **Fera Muslyadinova,** registered in the village of Nizhny Oreshnik since the spring of 1977, is unable to find work according to her profession even though there is a serious shortage of pediatricians in the district.

Engineer **Nariman Beshevin,** who has been working in Uzbekistan as head of a construction bureau and is laureate of a State prize, is unable to find work in the Crimea. Engineer-mechanic **Redvan Dhzemilev,** who is willing to take any job, for example as a driver, is in the same situation.

Nadzhis Babayeva has been admitted to study in a sewing training school only after numerous complaints right up to the regional party committee. **Gulnara Mustafayeva,** who finished secondary school this year in Krymsk, Krasnodar territory (her family moved to the Crimea and were registered), has not been admitted to the history faculty of Simferopol University after she was given a grade two for an essay (she received a grade five for history). The university refused point-blank to show her the marked essay. The director of the school where Gulnara was one of the best pupils wrote a letter to the university, but this did not help.

* * *

Adzhimelek Mustafayeva (58 years) and her daughter **Afife Mustafayeva** (33), who live in Simferopol, were convicted (at different times) under article 196 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code to 2 years banishment (*Chronicles* 37, 38, 41). They did not leave their house, the purchase of which had been ruled illegal by the civil court, and continued to try to obtain registration. In March 1977 they were both convicted for not submitting to the sentence of banishment (article 185 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code) and fined 150 roubles each. At the trial they started that they would pay the fine when they were registered and had received work.

On 13 October bailiffs appeared at their house accompanied by a local policeman and six other armed policemen. Having presented two court orders, only according to the first of which property to the value of 300 roubles had previously been distrained, the bailiff and policemen began to appropriate things. At the same time a de facto search was organized — locks were broken, suitcases were shaken out. Both women, as well as the husband of Afife (he is registered and lives in another town and was in Simferopol on an official trip) began to show resistance to this lawlessness. The policemen used force — they twisted their arms, pushed and beat the owners of the house, even the pregnant Afife. Witnesses were summoned only to sign the act of confiscation (inventory); the things were taken away without a copy of the inventory being left behind. (The Mustafayevas obtained this in the court only on 19 October). After their complaint to the Procurator, to which was attached a certificate about their having received 'light bodily injuries', they were summoned to the Procuracy and interrogated as defendants in a case of 'resisting the police'.

Both women set off for Moscow. In the reception room of the USSR Procuracy a woman official told Afife Mustafayeva (when the latter complained that with higher education she still could not find work in Simferopol, even though specialists of her sort were needed by many enterprises): "What's the point of strutting around with your higher education if you can't understand that it's impossible for you to live in the Crimea?' The official wouldn't start discussing the objection of Afife about the Decree of 1967, saying she was more literate juridicially than Afife.

On 31 October Adzhimelek Mustafayeva sent a statement to Brezhnev. In the statement she described their ordeals over four years: trials, fines, summonses, and the imprisonment to which she had been subjected in 1975 (she was held in prison for 25 days before her trial under article 196 — *Chronicle* 38). Pronouncements of police officials were also quoted. The head of the passport office, G. E. Kupchenko: 'You will never be registered here, you were deported from here in 1944'. District police inspector V. I. Efimov: 'I won't allow a single Crimean Tatar to live in my district'. Deputy chief of the city police M. V. Zayats: 'You should be exiled again, like in 1944'. The statement says: 'We have been deprived of absolutely all our civil rights . . . articles 34, 36, 40, 41, 42, 44, 53, 54, 57 and 64 of the new USSR Constitution are being violated . . . We earnestly entreat you to save us from the tyranny and violence of the executive organs, to register us, so that we can work and live normally, like all people'. A copy of the statement by neighbours of the Mustafayevas (Russian and Ukrainian), addressed to the first secertary of the Crimean regional party committee V. S. Makarenko, was appended to the statement. The neighbours express their indignation at the action of 13 October and request that the Mustafayevas be registered.

On 4 November the Mustafayevas talked about their situation at a press-conference held at the flat of P. G. Grigorenko (at the press-conference a statement by the Helsinki group on discrimination against Crimean Tatars was also made public — see below).

After the Mustafayevas had returned to Simferopol an M V D (or K G B) official, Yakovlev, came to their house. He asked them why they had given an interview and who had given them the address of Grigorenko, and wrote down the addresses of their relatives. Yakovlev admitted that at least the confiscation of their property according to the second court order was illegal — the bailiff should have just taken an inventory of it. Adzhimelek Mustafayeva was summoned to the passport office of the city U V D on 30 November 'for a chat'.

* * *

In October 1977 **Enver Ametov** wrote a 'Statement for the Press' in which he described the situation of his family after they arrived in the Crimea in 1976. The head of Belogorsk K G B, Ilinov, told him immediately that his family would be evicted because he, Ametov, 'excites people', maintains relations with Sakharov and Grigorenko, and has described the situation of Crimean Tatars to foreign correspondents. On the subject of his conviction under article 196 to 2 years banishment (*Chronicle* 43, 44) Ametov says:

> I repeatedly addressed the U S S R Procuracy with complaints against my illegal conviction. On the basis of my complaints the regional Procurator established that the house bought by me in the village of Melikhovo was demolished illegally, and that my family was illegally subjected to eviction. A declaration was also made by the Procurator about the punishment of the guilty parties. However no one has undergone this punishment.
>
> I did not carry out the decision of the Belogorsk court about the eviction, considering, firstly, that it is illegal, and secondly I have two young children (my son is three and my daughter five months). Out of moral considerations I cannot leave them.
>
> On 1 September 1977 a protocol against me for violating the residence regulations was drawn up by the same person who participated in the eviction of my family — Kharchenko. On 6 September I was summoned to the administrative commission. On 26 September the same First Lieutenant Kharchenko warned me that a criminal case would be brought under article 185, and that threatens me with exile for a period of from two to five years. Besides criminal persecution, I, a father of two children, am not given work. This summer the collective farm management and the village soviet tried to deprive my family of its last source of subsistence. The chairman of the collective farm, the chairman of the village soviet and the secretary of the party committee stated that the garden adjoining my house would be ploughed up. This garden plot, attached to the house bought by me, turned out, after I moved in, to be 'collective farm land'.

Ametov also touches on the general situation of Crimean Tatars in the Crimea. Citing facts about evictions and other oppression, Ametov reports:

> All complaints of Crimean Tatars against the actions of local organs come back to the same local organs.
>
> The repressions carried out by local authorities against our people take place under the patronage of the K G B. On 27 September an official of the regional K G B administration, Zhitov, and an official of the district K G B came to see Mukhsum Osmanov, an invalid of the first group, blind, who lives in Belogorsk. Zhitov called Mukhsum an extremist and stated: 'If there is trouble from the Crimean Tatars during the 60th anniversary celebrations, then you and Bekir Osmanov will be held responsible and we'll imprison Enver Ametov and Eldar Shabanov as anti-sovietists.' Bekir Osmanov lives in Simferopol district, is a former partisan, and was expelled from the party for wanting to live in his national homeland.
>
> Our Crimean Tatar national movement for returning to our homeland has a peaceful character and is based on the Constitution. We are not demanding the overthrow of the government or the Soviet system, we want one thing: to have equal rights, as proclaimed by the basic law of the Soviet Union, to live and work in our national homeland, to be able to learn in our native tongue, and to enjoy our culture and art.

Petitions

More than 90 Crimean Tatars signed an 'Appeal to the Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet and the U S S R Council of Ministers' on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the October revolution (there was a report on the collection of signatures for it in *Chronicle* 44). In the appeal, as in many other documents of the Crimean Tatar movement of recent years (see for example *Chronicle* 31), the 1944 eviction and the subsequent actions of the authorities against Crimean Tatars are interpreted as a liquidation of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary conquests by the forces of imperialism and chauvinism, which have simply disguised themselves with the mask of a socialist state.

> The power of the soviets could never under any conditions have organized a night robbery with the aim of grabbing territory from its ally, a small socialist nation, and then of turning this territory into an object to be given to and shared amongst peoples who are greater only in numbers.

The appeal describes the fatal state of national culture and the lack of any conditions for the national existence of the Crimean Tatars.

Referring to former mass petitions handed in to the Central Committee, the appeal demands an organized return to the Crimea, the restoration of the Crimea Autonomous Republic, the return of personal and national property, the criminal accountability of the 'organizers, inspirers and executors of the counter-revolutionary action and its consequence — 33 years of injustice, repression and persecution in the Crimea and in the places of exile', and the annulment of legislative acts which discriminate against Crimean Tatars. The appeal calls on the party and state leadership to resolve the Crimean Tatar question 'urgently, in a Leninist way'.

* * *

A document entitled 'Appeal Statement' has been addressed to L. I. Brezhnev.

The basic content of the 'Appeal Statement' is the demand that all legislative acts concerning Crimean Tatars promulgated between 1944 and 1978 be repealed. The decree of 5 September 1967 'On citizens of Tatar nationality living in the Crimea', although it 'rehabilitated' the Crimean Tatars, did not liquidate discrimination. The authors of the statement direct attention to the fact that in this decree preceding decisions are revoked *only* 'as regards the wholesale accusations'; in this way, the decree of 28.4.56, which abolished the regime of special settlement of the Crimean Tatars, but established that this 'does not entail the return of their property confiscated during deportation' and that 'they do not have the right to return to the places from which they were deported' remains in force to this day. The 'Appeal Statement' notes that with regard to other deported peoples restrictions in their choice of place of residence were abolished by special decree, and that Crimean Tatars are now the only *juridically* unequal nation.

* * *

The collection of signatures under the 'Appeal Statement' has been going on since March 1977, mainly in Uzbekistan. Copies of the 'Statement', each one signed by 15-20 people, were sent by post with the return address of one of those who had signed. As they did not receive replies, in August the Crimean Tatars sent their representatives to Moscow: E. Fazylov (Tashkent), K. Useinov (Samarkand) and D. Tokhtarov (Bekabad). On 11 August these representatives released 'Information No. 1' — a report of their work, in which they also explain the meaning of the campaign being conducted:

> . . . the spontaneous departure of Crimean Tatars for the Crimea is not only not diminishing, but is actually becoming more frequent from day to day. Already many Crimean Tatars have begun to understand that the main barrier preventing them from returning to the Crimea and re-establishing the national equality of their people is not 'illegal actions' by local organs of authority, but all the state decisions of the period 1944-1976 in relation to the Crimean Tatar people, with reference to which the representatives of authority in the Crimea have been acting.

The representatives report that they visited the Central Committee and demanded a reply from Brezhnev or from an official whom Brezhnev personally commissioned to reply. The Central Committee employees who received them said that the Crimean Tatar question had been resolved by the decree of 5.9.67 and only a small group of people was artificially stirring up the Tatar people. The representatives replied that they had been sent not to hold a discussion but exclusively for a reply to the 'Appeal Statement'.

By August more than 4,000 people had signed the 'Appeal Statement'.

The representatives of the Crimean Tatars (in the middle of August party member E. Kalafatov joined their number) remained in Moscow and continued to insist on receiving a reply to the 'Appeal Statement', sending telegrams and statements to the Central Committee.

The texts both of the 'Appeal Statement' itself and of the bulletin *Information* (three issues have already come out) are written extremely loyally and contain expressions of devotion to the party and government.

* * *

In September an 'inter-regional meeting of representatives of initiative groups of the Crimean Tatar movement for restoring national equality' took place in Uzbekistan. In the resolution adopted at this conference it is proposed to develop the movement on the basis of the idea of the 'Appeal Statement', which is in complete accord with the U S S R Constitution and the policy of the party. The resolution was signed by 14 people, three of whom are members of the communist party. Amongst those who signed are **Dzheppar Akimov** (*Chronicle* 31) and **Rollan Kadiyev** (*Chronicles* 8, 22) who were previously convicted for taking part in the national movement.

* * *

On 4 November the **Moscow Helsinki Group** published its document No. 24: 'Discrimination against the Crimean Tatars Continues'[3]. The document is signed by members of the group P. Grigorenko, S. Kallistratova, M. Landa, V. Slepak, N. Meiman and T. Osipova, and also by A. Lavut, who took part in compiling it. Associating himself with the authors of the document, A. Sakharov stated:

> The solution of the problems posed in this document is absolutely imperative. The delay in solving them increases human tragedies, lawlessness and tyranny daily and without interruption and covers our country with shame.

In the document the scale and character of the losses inflicted on the Crimean Tatar people as a result of deportation are described.

It is noted that the decree of 1976 'under the guise of fine words about withdrawing wholesale accusations' did not repeal the ban on returning to the Crimea and reinforced the dispersal of the nation. The Helsinki Group stresses that the current laws and practice regarding the Crimean Tatars contradict the prescriptions of the Final Act (principle VII) and other international agreements.

In the document the situation of Crimean Tatars who have returned to the Crimea (about 2,000 families) is described, especially those families who are unable to obtain registration, about 600 families). Facts are cited concerning cruel and illegal actions by representatives of authority. The authors of the document express special anxiety for the fate of one of the long-standing activists of the national movement, Enver Ametov, who is being subjected to constant shadowing and threats on the part of the K G B.

In appendix No. 1 to the document the texts of decrees concerning Crimean Tatars and other deported peoples are given, in particular the secret decree of 3.11.72 on the withdrawal of restrictions on the choice of a place of residence for Germans and other peoples (*Chronicle* 34), in which the Crimean Tatars are not included.

In appendix No. 2 individual statements by Crimean Tatars are given.

* * *

In February 1977 **A. D. Sakharov** received a letter signed by 52 Crimean Tatars from Andizhan. The authors of the letter accuse him of — 'with the help of individual Crimean Tatars who have broken their ties with their people, such people as Reshat and Mustafa Dzhemilev, Aishe Seitmuratova, Seityagya Bilyalov and others' — 'trying to do things that are not approved by the people', and of circulating information received from these persons with the aim of 'harming the state'. Stating further that Crimean Tatars are filled with enthusiasm for work and have achieved great successes in social and economic life, the authors write:

> The time is not so far off when, in a normal atmosphere, we shall go to our sunny Crimea by the roads of international friendship, but there is a time for everything. . . .
>
> Citizen Sakharov . . . don't interfere in our affairs, don't harm our people, we shall find the road to the Crimea without you and your friends.

A few of the people out of the 52 wrote to Sakharov that their signatures were placed under the letter by trick: a retired lawyer Samedinov who came to their homes showed them another letter. (Samedinov was the only Crimean Tatar in 1944-46 who worked for the special commandant's office, which administered the punitive regime imposed on the deported people.)

In June 1977 Sakharov received the following letter signed by 549 Crimean Tatars living in Uzbekistan:

> To Nobel Prize laureate, Academician A. D. Sakharov.
>
> We, the undersigned Crimean Tatars, are very grateful to you for your support for the aspirations, expectations and thoughts of the Crimean Tatar people of returning to their lawful homeland — the Crimea.
>
> We do not support the letter of the 52 Crimean Tatars from Andizhan who signed it in their naivety, thanks to a trick.
>
> We categorically reject this letter as unworthy, as not reflecting the opinion of the Crimean Tatar people.

The Right to Leave

Recently those who have been refused an exit visa have been required to renew all their documents every six months for a review of their case.

Since the middle of July 1977 people applying for an exit visa in Odessa have once again been required to supply a testimonial from their job. There too, the authorities have started to demand the written permission of adult brothers and sisters as well as permission from parents. Permission from relatives is now being checked not in the house management committee, but at their place of work. Children over 14 need a document saying that they were not in the Komsomol and have never been expelled from it.

* * *

In 1975 the psychiatrist **Marina Voikhanskaya** (*Chronicle* 45) emigrated to England. Her son Misha, at that time 10 years old, remained in Leningrad, as her former husband E. Voikhansky would not give his consent to Misha's departure. However he promised to let his son go as soon as Marina had found herself a job abroad. All this time Misha has been living with his grandmother (Marina's mother). Although the condition made by E. Voikhansky has been fulfilled, although he himself once wrote to his former wife that he wanted to give their son to her 'even if only for egotistical considerations', he continues to refuse permission for his departure. In the autumn of this year Misha,

after several unanswered addresses to the authorities requesting them to let him go to his mother, wrote a letter to the Moscow Helsinki group:

> I beseech you to help me go to my mother! She left in April 1975 after my father firmly promised that he would let me go in August 1975, but he deceived us and is deceiving us to this day. I think he is a very bad man. I hate him!
>
> Help me leave! I love my mother very much! What an injustice it is if a son is not allowed to live with his mother!

In November 1977 the Helsinki Group and the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes published a statement on the fate of Misha Voikhansky, addressed to the heads of the governments which participated in the Helsinki Conference (Document No. 25).

The statement explains that the refusal of E. Voikhansky to let his son go is no doubt caused by his fears of losing his job and results from the pressure of the authorities.

> . . . The Soviet authorities are taking their revenge on a courageous woman by holding her small son as a hostage. Marina Voikhanskaya, a psychiatrist, is an active participant in the movement for human rights in the U S S R. While still in the U S S R she protested against the psychiatric persecution of dissenters, and in the West she has devoted all her efforts to helping the victims of psychiatric repression. The material collected by her, together with other testimonies, convinced the Congress of Psychiatrists in Honolulu to adopt an uncompromising resolution condemning the use of psychiatry for political ends. Voikhanskaya is also a foreign representative of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes . . .
>
> Familiar with all the details of Misha's fate, we state with full responsibility that the forcible separation of a child from his mother — a tragedy lasting years — is a violation not only of the Helsinki Agreements but also of all the principles of humanism, the motive being disreputable political considerations.
>
> We call on the representatives of the states which are participating in the Belgrade Conference to intervene on behalf of the child and to assist the reunification of the Voikhansky family. This is not an internal affair of the U S S R, for the violation of the rights of a person, the right of a child to be with his mother, cannot be an internal affair of one country.

* * *

On 12 September the deputy head of Vladimir O V I R, Major Ilyukhin, informed **Victor Nekipelov** (*Chronicle* 46) that he had been refused an exit visa. 'We consider that you have no reason to go to the state of Israel, you have nothing to do there', Ilyukhin explained. On 22 September Nekipelov again sent the President of the U S S R Supreme Soviet a 'Statement on my Refusal' (*Chronicle* 46); together with the 'Statement' he sent back his passport. In an accompanying letter Nekipelov demanded permission to leave.

> . . . In the event of it being impossible to leave for Israel, I request you to let me go to the United States or any other so-called capitalist country . . .

At the same time he sent statements of similar content to the head of O V I R of the U S S R M V D and to the head of the passport section of the Vladimir region U V D. In one of them he writes:

> I emphasise that my rejection of Soviet citizenship stems from the *impossibility* of acting otherwise: not only a psychological, but an almost physical impossibility of co-existing further with a state which has become alien.

On 4 November Nekipelov sent a statement to the Rome session of the Sakharov Hearings:

> . . . I request the 2nd session of the International Sakharov Hearings in Rome to publicise this statement at its meetings, and to regard the refusal to me of permission to leave the U S S R as proof of yet another violation by this country of the obligation it has taken on itself.
>
> I request you to help me and my family to implement our right to leave the U S S R.

* * *

In 1975 a corresponding-member of the U S S R Academy of Sciences, Lenin Prize laureate **Sergei Mikhailovich Polikanov** (b. 1926) received an invitation from the director of the European Centre for Nuclear Research, Professor van Hove [Belgian physicist], to go to Geneva to take part in joint research. In 1962 Polikanov took part in a discovery which changed ideas about the process of splitting atomic particles. The research being carried out in Geneva is directed towards checking these ideas. In a letter addressed to Professor van Hove Polikanov writes:

> Until recently I was one of the people who can be called 'passable'. This means that from time to time I was able to go abroad, including to capitalist countries. In my biography there are, or, more precisely, there were, no aggravating circumstances:

I am not Jewish, but Russian;
I have no relatives abroad;
I was not on territory occupied by the Germans during the war;
I have not landed up in sobering-up stations, etc.

I have been in capitalist countries several time, have even spent a year and a half in Denmark with my family, and therefore, when the question arose of an official trip to Switzerland for me and my family for a year, I was convinced that everything would be fine, i.e. they would let me go. However everything began to look completely different when they informed me that I could work for a lengthy period in Switzerland but had to go there on my own. It would be extremely painful for me to spend long months in Switzerland without my family, and I refused the official trip under the conditions of which it was offered to me.

Deeply convinced of the necessity of taking part in the planned research project, I addressed a letter to secretary of the party Central Committee M. A. Suslov, requesting him to send me and my family on an official trip to Switzerland, but this did not resolve the question.

Of course I now know well the reason why I was not allowed to go to Geneva with my family. K G B officials do not wish my wife to go abroad. Is that not surprising? For she does not work and naturally does not know any state secrets. The only thing which she could be accused of is the fact that she, like other women by the way, does not express delight on the subject of the empty shelves in our shops. Probably some informer wrote a denunciation to the K G B and that was enough. A simple truth, isn't it? And how disgusting!

Polikanov writes further that a year later he appealed to Brezhnev to allow him to cooperate with Western scientists as a private individual.

The past year has shown that my attempts to fight the administrative apparatus have put me on the 'black list'. I realize that I will never be sent to a capitalist country even for a day, let alone for a year. Proof of this is the refusal to discuss with me the matter of a trip to Geneva for two weeks to discuss a joint article, and also to Copenhagen at the invitation of the Niels Bohr Institute.

. . . People can also say to me that there are not a few scientists in our country who are not allowed trips to capitalist countries, even though they have invitations from Western scientists. I must note that I have always been amazed why none of these people protest against the discrimination in regard to them. Is it really fear of repression that silences everything? How sad that is . . .

In the life of every man a moment may come sooner or later when he has to ask himself who he is, a free man or a dumb beast. On how he answers himself, and on whether he acts accordingly, much depends; or rather, the whole of his future fate depends.

Give in, and you are guaranteed a wisp of straw in a stall, but if you stand up for what you believe it will be bad for you and your children, even very bad.

What happened to me forced me to think deeply about the place of man in our society. Is a man really not free to dispose of his own fate? Is my wish to cooperate freely with Western scientists really criminal? Why do some people unknown to me, who are indifferent to my research, and, I think, to science as a whole, decide how I should live? And what then can I dare to decide? In the eyes of these 'masters of life' I am evidently an insignificant insect, who can be crushed if need be. And you can be assured that they will try to do this in the near future.

For I did not consent with dumb submission to chew the wisp of straw offered to me, but dared to protest and even to 'wash my dirty linen in public', and this, as is well known, is a very grave sin.

The deputy director of the Combined Institute of Nuclear Research in Dubna where Polikanov works advised him to write to van Hove that he was ill. When he himself arrived in Geneva, he said this to van Hove. 'Look at the man who is the first to have told me a lie in this office while looking me straight in the eyes', was van Hove's response.

* * *

In June 1976 a teacher at the Belorussian Polytechnical Institute, **Lydia Alexandrovna Drozdova** (Minsk, ul. Landera 52, kv. 329), asked for permission to go abroad. She received no answer from the M V D but was dismissed from the institute. In July 1976, in a statement to the President of the U S S R Supreme Soviet N. V. Podgorny, L. A. Drozdova renounced her Soviet citizenship. Since then she has been trying persistently to obtain permission to leave. In July 1977, after six unanswered statements, Drozdova wrote a letter to the President of the U S S R Supreme Soviet, L. I. Brezhnev. Two weeks later she was invited to visit an instructor of the Minsk regional committee of the Belorussian communist party, Podlessky. Podlessky said that the Central Committee of the Belorussian Party had commissioned him to investigate her letter to Brezhnev. In the course of the conversation Podlessky asked:

'Do you have relatives abroad? We allow exit from the U S S R only on the invitation of relatives. Who will receive you there?'

'I want to leave the U S S R not to go to relatives but because of my disagreement with the system existing in the U S S R. I wrote to Brezhnev about this. Many countries receive political emigrants. I

am not connected with secret work, I have no children who are minors. Are there really any reasons for refusing to let me emigrate?'

'There are no such reasons. When did you first conceive the idea of leaving the U S S R?'

'In childhood, while I was still at school. But it was only after the Helsinki Agreements that I was able to declare this. I was a witness of the Stalinist terror, of persecution and illegal acts against many people.'

During a second conversation between Podlessky and Drozdova a 'stranger' was present. He said to Drozdova:

'You have a sister. Why didn't you inform her that you want to leave the U S S R? You should have done this.'

'I'll inform her when I find it necessary.'

At the end of the conversation Podlessky said that in order to process the documents for an exit visa it was necessary to undergo a medical examination, and suggested to Drozdova that she begin the medical examination with a psychiatrist. Drozdova requested Podlessky to ask for a certificate from the psychiatric clinic.

'No, I can't do this. You have to go there yourself. Are you really afraid that you will be locked up in a mad house?'

'Yes, I think that this is precisely the goal you are pursuing by sending me to psychiatrists. In any event, I cannot risk it.'

'In that case our conversation is over. We will not review your statement.'

On 12 November Drozdova appealed to the Helsinki Group for help.

* * *

On 21 October **Liliya Schastlivaya** (Moscow 16 Parkovaya ul. 55, kor. 2, kv. 73) appealed to the Moscow Helsinki Group for help.

In February 1975 she handed in her documents for an exit visa but in July 1975 received a refusal on the basis of the 'secret nature' of her former work. (Schastlivaya worked as an interpreter in the service bureau of the hotel 'Rossiya'. A. Poladyan, who after the dismissal of Schastlivaya began to work in her place, handed in her documents for an exit visa in January 1977, and in June had already left.)

After Schastlivaya handed in her documents for an exit visa, her son **Sergei Schastlivy** (b. 1955) was expelled from his institute. In September 1976 he too handed in documents for an exit visa, but in December 1976 received a refusal without any reason being given.

* * *

The German family **Lange** living in Kirgizia (722191, Alamedinsky r-n, s. Alamedin, ul. Mayakovskogo 1), has been trying to obtain permission to leave for Germany since 1960. In October they sent a letter 'To the Committee for the Defence of Human Rights in the U S S R', requesting help.

* * *

The following people have requested the Lithuanian Helsinki Group to help them leave the U S S R: **Irena-Anna Staniene** (b. 1938), **Alfredas Peteraitis** (b. 1943) and former political prisoners **Stepas Bubulas** (b. 1917), **Povilas Pečiulaitis** (b. 1923) and **Enn Tarto** (b. 1938).

The mother and sister of Staniene (Klaipeda, ul. Ushakova 3, kv. 1) have already left for West Germany. Staniene herself also has German citizenship. She has already been refused an exit visa several times.

Peteraitis (Klaipeda, ul. Daukanto 33, kv. 2) has been trying since 1974 to obtain an exit visa for West Germany — to join his father.

Bubulas served 15 years (1947-1962) under article 58 of the old Criminal Code).

Pečiulaitis served 20 years (1952-1972) under article 58 of the old Criminal Code and one year (1975-1976) for 'violating the residence regulations' (*Chronicles* 36, 37).

Tarto was in prison from 1956 to 1962.

* * *

In September 1977 former political prisoners **Ivan Ovchinnikov** (b. 1929), **Vyacheslav Repnikov** (b. 1935), **Yuri Grimm** (b. 1935), **Victor Semyonov** (b. 1939), **Romas-Juozanas Giedra** (b. 1944), **Birute Pašiliene** (b. 1928) and her son **Aleksis-Alfonsas Pašilis** (b. 1949) addressed L. I. Brezhnev with a request to allow them to leave the U S S R, and J. Carter with a request to allow them to enter the U S A.

Ovchinnikov (601600, Vladimirskaya obl., Alexandrov, 3, Krasnoroginskaya ul. 3, kv. 2) was imprisoned in a Mordovian camp from 1958 to 1965 under article 64 of the R S F S R Criminal Code, and in the Urals from 1966-1969 for failing to report on the attempt of his friend to escape abroad.

Repnikov (601601 Vladimirskaya obl., Strunino, ul. Osipenko 17) spent 1953-1955 in the Leningrad special psychiatric hospital, and 1959-1969 in Mordovia ('betrayal of the motherland').

Grimm (113054, Moscow, Tatarskaya ul. 9a, kv. 74) was in Mordovia from 1964-1966 (article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code). See the report on him in *Chronicle* 46.

Semyonov (357371, Stravropolsky krai, Predgorny r-n, s. Podkumok, Essentukskaya ul. 48) spent 1959-1969 in Mordovia (attempt to leave the U S S R illegally).

Giedra (235780, Litovskaya S S R, Palanga, ul. Ju. Janonio 3, kv. 1) was in Mordovia in 1962-1967 (attempt to leave the U S S R illegally).

Pašiliene (Litovskaya S S R, Klaipeda, ul. Vasorotoiu 20) was in

prison from 1946-1949 for links with the Lithuanian underground movement.

Pašilis (same address) spent 1970-1974 in Mordovia (anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda).

* * *

Activist of the Crimean Tatar movement **Aishe Seitmuratova** (*Chronicles* 34, 37, 41) gave in her documents for an exit visa in December 1976 'at the summons of a relative from Israel'. At the beginning of 1977 she was refused.

In a statement to Brezhnev of 25 September 1977 A. Seitmuratova, referring to the Convention against Discrimination in Education and the Final Act of the European Conference requests permission for her to leave.

> Furthermore, I do not wish to live in Uzbekistan, where I have been sent for life-long exile . . . If there is no place for me in my native land, the Crimea, then I myself shall choose a foreign country.

On 4 October Seitmuratova appealed to the Belgrade Conference. She writes:

> I am deprived of freedom of movement on the territory of the USSR. In 1976 on 5 September . . . after physical force was applied, I was thrown out of the Crimea. In April 1977 I was threatened in Moscow — then thrown out! In Uzbekistan I am under systematic open and secret surveillance. . . . The persecution to which I am being subjected up to the present day is not a personal matter but a specific example of the persecution of the Crimean Tatar people . . .
>
> Deprived of civil and national rights in the USSR, and of the means of subsistence, I was compelled to apply to OVIR to travel beyond the boundaries of the USSR, in order to complete my education and to do historical research, since I have been deprived of this possibility in my own country. But OVIR and the Uzbek KGB have put a veto on this right of mine too — the right to leave. Threats, intimidation and persecution have intesified since I gave in my visa application to OVIR.
>
> I am not even guaranteed against physical punishment.

Seitmuratova requests the participants of the conference to defend her rights and to help her to leave.

Pentecostalists

Primorsky territory

On 10 September **B. I. Perchatkin** and **V. F. Patrushev** from Nakhodka (Primorsky territory) and **M. I. Pimenov** from Vladivostok addressed

1

2

3

1 *L to r:* Kirill Uspensky (Leningrad writer), Irina Ginzburg (Zholkovskaya) and child, Valentina Mashkova (wife of V. Osipov), Irina Orlova (Valitova), Sergei Shibayev. **2** Group in Tarusa, 1976. *Reclining:* Zinaida Grigorenko, sitting, *l to r:* Svetlana Pavlenkova from Gorky, Pyotr Grigorenko, Irina Ginzburg (Zholkovskaya); *standing, l to r:* Oleg Grigorenko, unknown couple, Alexander Ginzburg. **3** Dr Yury Golfand, Moscow mathematician, refusenik, friend of Orlov. See p 17.

4

5

6

7

8

9

4 *R to l:* Maria Slepak, Naum Meiman, Vladimir Slepak, Andrei Sakharov, Irina Ginzburg, Tatyana Semyonova (wife of E. Yankelevich, daughter of E. Bonner) with her children, and Rut Bonner (mother of E. Bonner). **5** Boris Vail, puppeteer, sentenced at political trials in Leningrad (1958) and Obninsk (1970), emigrated to Denmark in 1977. See pp 95, 97. **6** *Left:* Mikhail Makarenko, art expert and political prisoner (1969–77), with Vyacheslav Rodionov, worker and Russian nationalist dissenter sentenced with Makarenko. Photograph of 1977. See p 176.

7 *R to l:* Pyotr and Saida Starchik; Felix Serebrov, Moscow worker sentenced in 1977, in effect for opposing psychiatric abuse (see p 1); the Starchiks' children. **8** *R to l:* Elena Golubkova, her daughter Vera Serebrova (wife of F. Serebrov), P. Grigorenko, A. Podrabinek, Z. Grigorenko, and *standing*, step-daughter of F. Serebrov. **9** Dr Marina Voikhanskaya, Leningrad psychiatrist who resisted abuses of psychiatry, with her son Misha, who has been barred since 1975 from joining her in emigration. See p 77.

10

11

12

10 Members of the 'Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes', which is attached to the Moscow Helsinki Group: *l to r* Alexander Podrabinek, Irina Kaplun, Vyacheslav Bakhmin. See p 145. **11** *L to r:* Mykola (Nikolai) Rudenko, Kiev writer and leader of Ukrainian Helsinki Group sentenced to 12 years in 1977, his wife Raisa (see p 137), and Zinaida and Pyotr Grigorenko, 1976. **12** Yaroslav Gasyuk (Hasyuk), b. 1925, Ukrainian nationalist who spent 1960–72 in camps, interrogated about Ginzburg in 1977 (see p 12). Drawing made in camp in 1969 by Yury E. Ivanov.

13

14

15

16

13 *On left:* Nadezhda Surovtseva, born 1896, Ukrainian writer, historian and art critic who spent over 30 years in prison and exile, and whose writings were confiscated by police in 1977, walking in Uman with her sister-in-law Ekaterina Olitskaya (died 1974). See p 41. **14** Mikhail Osadchy, born 1936, Ukrainian writer and journalist imprisoned 1965–67 for distributing samizdat, sentenced to 10 years in 1972 for his novel *Cataract*. See p 129. **15** Gely Snegiryov, born 1927, Kiev writer expelled in 1974 from the party and the Writers' Union, arrested in 1977 for his protests against oppression. See p 31. **16** Valery Marchenko, born 1947, Kiev writer arrested in 1972 for samizdat activity and sentenced to 8 years. Active protester in the Perm camps. See pp 113, 133.

17

18

19

17 Moscow Jews: *standing, r to l* Zakhar Tesker (see pp 23, 25), unknown, Anatoly Shcharansky (p 22), Boris Tsitlyonok, Mikhail Babel, Leonid Tsypin (p 25), Valery Krizhak; *sitting, r to l* Elena Sirotenko (p 24), unknown, Alexander Lunts, Vladimir Prestin. Photograph taken c. 1973. **18** Dina Beilina and her husband Iosif Beilin, Moscow Jewish activitists eventually allowed to emigrate to Israel in 1978. See pp 26, 103. **19** Ida Nudel, Moscow economist, refusenik since 1972, active defender of political prisoners. See pp 26, 104.

20

21

22

20 *L to r:* Aleksis Pašilis, b. 1949, Lithuanian imprisoned 1970–74 for 'anti-Soviet propaganda' (see p 84); Zinaida Grigorenko; Birute Pašiliene, b. 1928, mother of Pašilis, imprisoned 1946–49 for nationalism, now a dissenter trying to emigrate with son (see pp 49, 83); Pyotr Grigorenko. **21** Vladimir Lazaris, Moscow lawyer, refusenik, eventually emigrated in late 1977. See p 22. **22** *On right:* Viktoras Petkus, b. 1928, member of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, arrested in 1977. See p 45.

23

24

27

25

26

28

23 Romas Giedra, b. 1944, Lithuanian arrested in 1962 for trying to leave the USSR illegally, sentenced to 10 years, but released in 1967. In 1977 he was trying to emigrate. See p 83. **24** Eitan Finkelshtein, Vilnius physicist, Jewish refusenik, member of Lithuanian Helsinki Group. See pp 48, 53. **25** Mart Niklus, b. 1939, Estonian zoologist, imprisoned 1958–66 for 'anti-Soviet agitation', harassed in 1976–77 for his dissenting activity. See pp 39, 42. **26** Adolfas Svarinskas, Lithuanian priest, imprisoned 1946–56 and 1958–64 for nationalism, harassed in recent years for opposing state interference in church affairs. See p 51.

27 Crowd outside the office building in Kant, Central Asia, in which the Baptists Ivan Shlekht and Yakov Yantsen were being tried in June 1977. They received 3 years each for taking part in an informal Sunday school. See p 58. **28** Facsimile of a Baptist leaflet of 1977 which reads 'New Prisoners Sentenced for Spreading the Gospel' and shows Yakov Volf *top left*, (see p 63), Shlekht and family *beneath*, and Yantsen and family.

29

32

30

31

33

29 *L to r:* Rev. Peter Peters (arrested in 1977) and Nina Zakharova, of Rostov-on-Don, and Mikhail Khorev from Moldavia, all Baptists. In 1977 the authorities repeatedly broke up Baptist prayer meetings held in Zakharova's yard. See p 59. **30** Nikolai Baturin, Baptist minister of Shakhty, Rostov region, and a leader of the dissenting 'Council of ECB Churches' (*initsiativniki*). See p 62. **31** Nikolai Kravchenko, born c. 1958, a Baptist from Sumy (Ukraine) called up into the army in 1976, beaten up because he refused to take the military oath (*Chronicle* 46), then discharged with his jaw still broken. See p 64.

32 Anna Chuprina, *top left,* Pentecostalist in Nakhodka on the Pacific coast, with her own and another family. Persecution of the Pentecostalist community, which seeks to emigrate en masse, increased in 1977. See pp 85, 87. **33** Vasily Patrushev and family, Pentecostalists in the same community. See pp 84, 86.

34

35

36

34 Irina Matyash, member of a Pentecostalist community in Krasnodar region (north Caucasus) which is being harassed for trying to emigrate. See p 90. **35** N. G. Bobarykin, a leader of the same community. See p 89, 90 **36** Leaders of the same community *r to l* Fyodor Sidenko, Bishop Nikolai Goretoi, Goretoi's wife. See pp 88–91.

a letter to the participants of the Belgrade Conference on behalf of the Pentecostalists of Nakhodka and Vladivostok:

> . . . In September last year we addressed a request for emigration to world opinion and to the heads of government of different states. After this the authorities began a massive campaign against us. Several times a week from the platforms of clubs, houses of culture and lecture-halls of institutions and hostels, lectures are read out informing the population that believers are enemies, fanatics, traitors, C I A agents, spies. Notices are printed in local newspapers presenting us as monsters and traitors . . . This officially conducted campaign incites the population to beat up believers.
>
> Thus it was, for example, with the beating-up of a group of believers which occurred on New Year's night. As a result there were many injured, and one of them, **Ivan Durov,** will be a cripple for the rest of his life. His skull was broken and his kidneys were crushed. In hospital he was intimidated with threats that if he did not leave the hospital he would be killed. The court rejected his complaint, the bandits went unpunished.
>
> The atmosphere in the town is tense, our women cannot go out on the street: they are threatened, beaten up. L. I. Vasileva was beaten up on the street. Bandits cried out: 'Baptist, you work for the C I A, take this'. In the middle of the day they punched **Nina Mironenko,** who is pregnant, and dragged her into a swamp, crying out: 'You wanted to go to America? We'll show you America!' The hooligans enjoy the silent approval of the authorities, throw stones and glass into our courtyards, and sprinkle our gardens with broken glass.
>
> On 19 May an attack was carried out by bandits on the house of the widow **Chuprina,** in which our prayer meetings are held. The house was burgled, the children were severely frightened, and the glass in the windows and on the verandah was knocked out by blows of an axe. . . . The police authorities tried to force Chuprina to sign a statement that she had no complaints against the attackers . . .
>
> In the month of July this year thirty people who had invitations to emigrate for their families were called to the chief of the city police administration, where in his presence, First Lieutenant Smolentsev officially stated to us that in August we would leave the U S S R, so we should get ready for departure. People started to get ready for departure: to sell their houses, property, belongings and winter clothing, in order to have the money to pay the tax.
>
> The processing of documents has turned into a continuous chain or delays, refusals and procrastination. Applications are returned because of poor or small handwriting. 22 invitations were returned because of corrections made in the U S embassy. The authorities

blackmail parents whose children are leaving, publish forged statements alleging they are from parents, intercept letters, and send forged letters with misinformation. They demand the consent of non-believing parents, who are divorced, have abandoned their children from birth, or hidden themselves to avoid paying alimony. They use any opportunity to intimidate, in order to hold up an exit visa. They demand that the places of work, the addresses, the earnings and the patronymic of the persons who have sent invitations from the United States be indicated.

Documents that have already been handed in and processed are returned or shelved for many months, and then refusals are sent.

When we refer in complaints to the Declaration of Human Rights, to the Covenants on political and civil rights, to points of the Helsinki Agreements, representatives of authority explain our rights to us like this. These are the words of Colonel Spirin, head of the territory's passport office. 'The Declaration of Rights is printed abroad and is brought into the U S S R illegally for subversive activities'.

The commissioner for the affairs of cults in Primorsky territory, V. I. Chupin, pointing to the documents of the Final Act in Helsinki, said at a meeting in the presence of several hundred people, speaking to believers: 'Nothing here will shine a light for you'. The head of the passport office in Nakhodka, Smolentsev, stated: 'What are you keeping on about that declaration for, I have a pile of instructions that big (he moved his hands half a metre apart). How things are interpreted here, that's what we do' . . .

We appeal to all of you who hold dear lofty moral principles — help us!

As a protest against the violence and lawlessness being practised by the Soviet authorities against believers, the congregation of the town of Nakhodka is declaring a hunger strike from 4 October, the day the conference opens, unless we are allowed to leave before that date.

On 21 September at a press-conference in Moscow **V. Stepanov** and **B. Perchatkin** told foreign correspondents about the situation of Pentecostalists.*

On 30 September Stepanov, Perchatkin, **Patrushev** and **Burlachenko** were summoned to the city soviet executive committee in Nakhodka. They were read a warning that a criminal charge would be brought against them for slander and subversion of state security. The same day Stepanov and Perchatkin were summoned to the head of the city K G B department.

* * *

[*See Reuter report of 21 September 1977.]

On 4 October 46 Pentecostalists in Nakhodka and Vladivostok began a hunger strike.

In Nakhodka extra police forces were summoned from Vladivostok, students at the naval academy were put on military alert, two fire engines were on duty near the city soviet executive committee, and the square in front of it was filled with police. On various pretexts cars and motorcycles were withdrawn or impounded from Pentecostalists, constant surveillance was instituted over all of them, and a military vehicle with a radio-transmitter was stationed near the house of Stepanov, where prayer meetings were being held. All those taking part in the hunger strike were summoned to interrogations. The police visited the flats of believers and checked their passports.

On 6 October Stepanov and Perchatkin were again summoned to the K G B. They were told that if they attempted to leave the town or to meet foreign correspondents they would immediately be arrested. Essentially they were under house arrest.

* * *

After 10 days of the hunger strike documents for exit visas were accepted from all those who had invitations (about 47 families). The only exception was the **Chuprin family.**

* * *

At the end of October the Chuprins' house was wrecked for the third time in recent months. Hooligans besieged the house for 40 minutes, and about 200 cobblestones were thrown into it.

During the November festivities a military unit was summoned to Nakhodka from Vladivostok.

At the end of November 500 Pentecostalists from the Far East received refusals. The reasons given varied: (1) Moscow refused; (2) The head of the passport section of O V I R, Spirin, refused; (3) The territorial commission — a temporary organ, to which it is impossible to appeal since it has already been disbanded — refused. In addition, it was said that only invitations from relatives or from a President were valid. Religious reasons are not regarded as a sufficient explanation for the desire to leave and invitations from co-religionists are not recognised as valid.

After the authorities' announcement of the refusals a K G B car stood near the house of every Pentecostalist in Nakhodka for several days. Now shadowing is being continued at places of work. Telephone conversations and correspondence from abroad are being blocked.

Since they are convinced that the Lord will lead them out of the U S S R this year, many Pentecostalists have sold their houses, cows, etc., and with their young children are taking shelter in cramped

conditions and living in poverty. At railway and Aeroflot ticket offices lists are kept of believers' names, and tickets are not being sold to them.

Krasnodar Territory

Stanitsa Starotitarovskaya. In the summer an official of the territorial K G B administration, Lieutenant-Colonel Starostin, repeatedly visited the homes of Pentecostalists who have applied to leave. He advised them not to go abroad, describing the horrors of life there. Starostin called the mass persecution of the sects in the '60s a mistake. Believers noticed that during these conversations Starostin tried to provoke quarrels between members of the congregation.

* * *

On 23 July an article was published in the newspaper *Soviet Kuban* by R. Zakiyev 'The Life of the Apostle Goretoi'. The article fills almost four newspaper columns. The reason for its appearance was the report on 'Voice of America' about the meeting of Goretoi and other Pentecostalists with Western correspondents in Moscow in July of this year. Goretoi is presented in the article as a man who has refused to work in his profession and 'brazenly builds his prosperity in another field', continually deceiving believers. The author of the article notes that **presbyter Goretoi** had a positive influence on co-religionists as regards the observance of laws and loyalty to the authorities. Zakiyev explains the aspiration of members of the congregation to leave the Soviet Union in this way: Goretoi fell under the influence of anti-social elements acting at the command of Western secret services. He 'intimidates believers concerning non-existent persecution on the part of the authorities and stirs them up to emigrate'. From some members of the congregation he obtained applications for exit visas by a trick, while the others are a small group of renegades.

The trip made by L. Voronina to Starotitarovskaya (*Chronicle* 44) is also mentioned in the article. She was sent, writes Zakiyev, on the instructions and money of Western protectors, and 'she threw hysterical fits and stirred up believers to apply to leave'. Part of her mission was to 'collect tendentious material so that "foreign friends" could disrupt the Belgrade Conference'.

* * *

The elder children of Goretoi and other Pentecostalists from Starotitarovskaya sent a letter of refutation to the newspaper *Soviet Kuban*. They accuse Zakiyev of libel and remind him that almost every family of Pentecostalists has someone who was imprisoned or died for his faith. The believers reproach the author of the article for keeping quiet about certain episodes in the biography of Goretoi:

when he returned from the front, Goretoi taught drawing in a school but was deprived of this job for being a believer; subsequently he was constantly forced to move from one job to another for the same reason; in the '60s Goretoi served six years in camp and exile for seeking to obtain free meetings for the sect.

The **Bobarykin family** writes that such publications sow emnity between believing and non-believing citizens. '. . . It should not be forgotten that kingdoms are not created by violence, emnity and lies, but destroyed, however strong they might be.'

* * *

On 27 July in Starotitarovskaya a gathering of villagers took place to discuss 'the anti-social activity of the group of Pentecostalists'.

The day before, the chairman of the village soviet Kirichenko summoned N. Goretoi, deacon **N. G. Bobarykin** and **F. Sidenko.** In the village soviet they were told that the article in the newspaper *Soviet Kuban* would be discussed at the gathering and believers would be given the opportunity to speak about it. Kirichenko asked for all the members of the congregation to attend the gathering.

On the 27th, Komsomol members and voluntary police were brought to Starotitarovskaya in busloads from other villages and towns, and senior officials came from Krasnodar. Music was playing and loudspeakers called the villagers to the gathering in the cinema 'Yubileiny'.

The party organizer at the Ilich state farm, Kulik, presided at the gathering. The subject of discussion was the desire of the Pentecostalists to emigrate. Orators briefed in advance called the believers traitors and renegades. Goretoi, Bobarykin and Sidenko were subjected to especial attacks. They were accused of acting together with Sakharov, Ginzburg and Orlov — enemies of the socialist system. People in the crowd called out: 'Put them in prison! Hang them! Swine, they should be shot!' None of the Pentecostalists was allowed to speak. This aroused the indignation of the inhabitants of the village.

During the meeting the visitors made a tape recording and a film. The believers also tried to record the events — they had brought two tape-recorders and a camera with them. The head of the K G B for the Temryuk and Anapa districts snatched one of the tape-recorders and broke it to pieces. Policeman Butenko, while taking away a microphone from Pentecostalist **Galushkina,** almost injured her hand with the flex. In response to this the Pentecostalists got up, intending to leave the hall, but the chairman ordered the police to stop them and return them to their places. Goretoi was threatened with immediate arrest if he tried to leave. The police and civilians used force to make everyone sit down in their places. Several people had their arms twisted. In this way, the believers were forced to sit through until the end of the meeting, which lasted another three hours.

The second tape-recorder and the camera were in the possession of **Ilya Goretoi** and **Alexander Bibikov.** They were taken off to the police station and told that it was prohibited for believers to take photographs and make tape recordings, as all this could land up abroad.

The gathering passed a resolution warning the Pentecostalists that criminal charges would be brought against them if they did not stop their anti-Soviet activity.

* * *

Pentecostalist **Irina Yakovlevna Matyash** in a letter to L. I. Brezhnev described how the gathering proceeded and requested that a commission be sent out to investigate the actions of the K G B and district party officials who organized the undertaking. In addition, the letter refutes the article by Zakiyev in *Soviet Kuban.*

The letter was sent back from Moscow to the Temryuk district authorities for 'local investigation'. On 17 August a secretary of the district party committee, Radionova and a secretary of the district executive committee, Kulish, arrived in Starotitarovskaya to have a chat with Matyash on the subject of her complaint.

The objections of Matyash against Zakiyev's article were listened to in silence. About the gathering Radionova repeated several times that they had wanted only to show the believers the face of their leaders. Kulish asked why the members of the congregation had not spoken at the gathering in defence of Goretoi and others. Matyash reminded him that he had been sitting on the presidium to which the believers passed notes requesting that they be allowed to speak.

Radionova tried to persuade Matyash to renounce her desire to emigrate, asking what had forced her to take such a decision. 'For nowadays no one harrasses registered congregations of Pentecostalists'. Matyash explained that she had ten children and she could not bring them up calmly in a religious spirit, as she could do abroad.

* * *

32 members of the congregation addressed an open letter to the U N Committee on Human Rights, the World Council of Churches and the delegates to the Belgrade Conference.

In the letter the situation in which the village gathering took place is decribed in detail. The authors ask 'all humanists and intellectuals of the world' to speak out in defence of Goretoi, Bobarykin and Sidenko, who are threatened with criminal prosecution. The letter ends with the words: 'Help us to leave'.

Some members of the congregation wrote individual letters to the same addresses.

* * *

At the end of July the police threatened Goretoi with a charge of parasitism.

At the end of September or beginning of October the authorities proposed to **N. Goretoi** that he leave the Soviet Union. He agreed on the condition that all the members of his family be let out with him.

* * *

In October a round-the-clock watch of police and voluntary police in buses and cars was instituted near the houses of believers; some Pentecostalists were accompanied round the village by a car.

* * *

Stanitsa Leningradskaya. On 5 September a village gathering took place here. The theme was the 'anti-social activity of **Melnichuk** and **Kravets',** who have applied to emigrate from the U S S R.

Melnichuk and Kravets themselves were not invited to the gathering. Of those who had applied to leave, an invitation was sent only to A. Zhiltsova, who was on duty at work that day. Pentecostalists who had not applied to leave were invited to the gathering. In addition, workers and collective farmers, who did not know where they were being taken, were driven to the gathering from work.

Melnichuk and Kravets were accused of trying to persuade co-religionists to leave the U S S R. Teacher Ponomaryova and engineer Bakanov called them 'traitors to the motherland' in their speeches.

On 8 September the district newspaper *Steppe Sunsets* published an article 'Censure by a Meeting'. It reports that Melnichuk and Kravets were engaged in inflammatory and provocative activities and encouraged people to emigrate.

A group of Pentecostalists from the village of Leningradskaya have composed a refutation of this article. They write that they decided to leave the U S S R when they discovered that it was possible in accordance with the international obligations signed by the Soviet Union.

> . . . and no one tried to persuade anyone; neither Melnichuk, nor Kravets, nor the 'recruiter Goretoi'. This was done freely and with the full consent of each person.

Rovno Region

Rovno. Pentecostalist **Olga Krasun** is being promised that if she rejects emigration, she will be transferred to work nearer to her home, her salary will be raised, and she will be allowed to go on a tourist trip to any Western country, and to enter an institute.

Dubno. Senior presbyter of the [official] All-Union Council of the

E C B, Glukhovsky, proposed to **Nikolai Kunitsa*** that if he rejected emigration, he could direct the official union of Pentecostalists, receive a high salary and make trips to the U S A and Canada on the union's money. Deputy local police chief Knyaz threatened Kunitsa with punishment if he did not reject emigration.

On 29 September an article by M. Ivanchuk, 'Mould', was published in the district newspaper, accusing Kunitsa of being a parasite, living on financial subsidies for children, building a house on unearned income, and beating his mother.

* * *

On 5 October Kunitsa was arrested at the railway station. The next day he was taken to the Rovno regional K G B administration. It turned out that the reason for his arrest was the statement of a man who had lost his purse. Kunitsa declared a complete, 'dry' hunger strike. Eight days later he was released.

Before the November festivities Kunitsa was summoned to the local Procuracy. Senior investigator Kotyuk warned him that he must not leave the town or his house before 9 November: 'If you are seen on the street, you'll get a minimum of 15 days'.

His passport and military card were taken away from Kunitsa; without them he cannot work even of a contract basis.

The Baltic Area

Lithuania. On 21 October Pentecostalists in Lithuania handed in to the republican O V I R a general application to leave the U S S R. Attached to the application was a list of those wishing to emigrate, compiled throughout the republic.

On 27 October seven representatives of the believers tried to obtain an appointment with the deputy minister of the Lithuanian M V D, Major-General Žemgulis. They entered their names on special forms. However, as soon as the officials of the reception room found out who they were and on what business they had come, they tore up the forms. When all the other visitors had been received, they began to drive the Pentecostalists out, saying they were preventing them from working.

Žemgulis allowed one of the seven to stand in the doorway of his office and spoke to him without closing the door. He refused to receive the believers, calling them a gang, threatened to call the police, and, finally, demanded that they produce invitations from abroad. One of those who had come — **Pavlovich** — had an invitation from Australia

[*Took part in Moscow press conference on 21 September mentioned above. See Reuter report of same day.]

(his case has been under consideration for two years already). They received Pavlovich and promised to resolve his case. They led the others out of the reception room by force and locked the door behind them.

Latvia. On 26 October Pentecostalists in Latvia tried to obtain an appointment at the republican O V I R. They were rudely driven out of the reception room. After this they sent a telegram to Brezhnev in which they described the incident in O V I R and asked him to assist their departure from the U S S R.

In Riga, **Grigory Petrenko,** who is trying to obtain permission to leave, has been on a hunger strike since 21 November (see 'Arrests, Searches, Interrogations' in *Chronicle* 46).

Estonia. The presbyter of Pentecostalists living on the territory of Estonia, **Vasily Gorelkin,** was summoned to the district K G B at the end of October. A Major-General, chairman of the K G B in Estonia, had a conversation with him. He threatened Gorelkin with arrest for writing to the International Red Cross requesting it for help in leaving the Soviet Union for any non-communist country.

Police sentries have been stationed around Gorelkin's house in Tapa.

In Narva and Tapa the authorities tried before the start of the Belgrade Conference to collect the passports and army cards of Pentecostalists wishing to leave as if to process the documents for exit visas. However, the Pentecostalists would not give up their passports. Then they were warned that no one should leave the town to go anywhere.

* * *

In Batumi a similar device on the part of the authorities passed off successfully. As a result the Pentecostalists of Batumi cannot leave the town.

* * *

The family of Pentecostalist **Shevchenko** from Chernogorsk (Krasnoyarsk territory) has been trying to obtain an exit visa for 15 years. Earlier Shevchenko and his wife Kalinina were convicted for their faith and deprived of their parental rights over several children (there are 10 children altogether in the family). Shevchenko was transferred to a lower paid job and deprived of the pension which he received as a war invalid.

Now the Shevchenko couple have an invitation from the U S A and are asking for their children to be returned to them and for them to be let out of the Soviet Union.

* * *

Congregations of Pentecostalists trying to obtain exit visas from the USSR through Lydia Voronina (*Chronicle* 44) appealed to **Alexandra Lvovna Tolstoy** to provide them with a loan of money from the 'Tolstoy Fund' to pay for their visas and transport. Tolstoy informed them that all believers without means could use the money of the fund and of certain church congregations.

A group of Pentecostal women thank A. L. Tolstoy in an open letter. They write:

> . . . our families are full of strong young sons and daughters who, working in new places of residence, by God's grace, will compensate your temporary financial loss in not too lengthy a period with the legal percentage, and with heartfelt gratitude for such generous and magnanimous kindness, so that still other may use it.

And further:

> . . . but we do not know how to use these means from your Fund! From where and how do we receive them?

The women ask for it to be explained to them to what embassy or bank in the USSR they can turn for this money. In addition, they ask Alexandra Lvovna to petition the Soviet authorities to simplify the procedure of legalizing exit visas for Pentecostalists. The authors of the letter hope that the 'esteemed age' of A. L. Tolstoy and the 'good memory' of her father will play their role in this.

The letter is signed by 19 mothers with many children.

* * *

To Kurt Waldheim, Jimmy Carter, the U S Senate, all countries participating in the Belgrade meeting, the World Council of Churches, the U N Committee on Human Rights, and comrade Brezhnev (20 September 1977).

The Pentecostalists ask for help in obtaining permission to leave the USSR not for their own sake, but so that all who have signed international documents on human rights can prove to the world that they are striving to carry out these laws and agreements.

In the letter one of the reasons for the emigration of Pentecostalists is particularly emphasized — the activities of those presbyters who are officially registered with the All-Union Council of ECB. The authors write that when they themselves were serving their terms in prisons and camps, these men publicly maintained that there were no Pentecostalists in places of imprisonment.

> . . . These presbyters adopted resolutions to prevent our children from praying, and they entered the ranks of the godless so that we should not give alms one brother to another.

It describes further how the authorities are now using the presbyters in the All-Union Council of ECB to persuade Pentecostalists to reject emigration.

On behalf of more than 10,000 Pentecostalists who have applied for emigration, the letter is signed by: Goretoi — Krasnodar territory, Litvin — Latvia, Shilyuk — Rovno, Kiriyak — Chernovtsy region, Smushko — Vilnius, Kunitsa — Dubno, Gorelkin — Estonia, Pavlovich — Lithuania, Trachuk — Kremenets, Sumborsky — Lvov region, Tkachenko — Dnepropetrovsk.

Have Left

Kaluga region. In August **Valentin Ivanov** (*Chronicle* 46) left the USSR.

Donetsk region. In October **Victor Borovsky** (*Chronicle* 46) left the USSR.

Kiev. In September **the Chudnovsky family** (*Chronicle* 46) departed from the USSR. They were not allowed to take their mathematical manuscripts.

Moscow. At the beginning of September members of the family of A. D. Sakharov, **Efrem Yankelevich** (*Chronicles* 41, 44) and his wife **Tatyana Semyonova** (*Chronicle* 44), left the USSR. After receiving her things in Rome, T. Semyonova discovered that the contents of one of the suitcases had been smeared with indelible paint.

On the same day the wife of A. D. Sakharov, **E. G. Bonner,** left the USSR for treatment. The Soviet authorities gave her an exit visa for two months — until 5 November. As the treatment had not been completed by 5 November, E. G. Bonner and the doctor who had performed the operation on her petitioned the Soviet authorities to extend the visa by two months: however the visa was extended by only two weeks. On 22 November E. G. Bonner returned to the USSR.

At the end of September **Alexander Slepak** left the USSR. He is the eldest son of one of the activists of the Jewish emigration movement, the long-term refusenik and member of the Moscow Helsinki Group, Vladimir Slepak.

On 14 October the chairman of the Soviet group of Amnesty International, **Valentin Turchin,** also **Kronid Lyubarsky** and his wife **Galina Salova,** and **Boris Vail** (*Chronicles* 16, 35), left the USSR.

On 4 October Turchin was summoned to an interrogation in the case of A. Ginzburg. Amongst others, he was asked the question: 'Who gave Ginzburg the idea of getting a job with Sakharov?' (Before his arrest A. Ginzburg was working as the secretary of A. D. Sak-

harov). In response to the bewilderment which this question aroused in Turchin, it was explained to him: 'There is an idea that it was Solzhenitsyn who fixed up his man close to Sakharov in order to broaden the sphere of his influence'. Turchin refused to answer questions. After the interrogation he was sent to O V I R, where he was handed an exit visa valid until 15 October.

On 26 August Lyubarsky was summoned to Kaluga to an interrogation in the case of A. Ginzburg. In the middle of the interrogation investigator Vladimir Sergeyevich Gaideltsov said to Lyubarsky that after the interrogation he should go to O V I R. He added that, as far as he knew, Lyubarsky was applying for an exit visa to the U S A. 'The U S A is too splendid a country,' he remarked. 'Israel is somewhat less splendid. They'll explain the rest to you in O V I R'. The head of Kaluga O V I R, Captain V. E. Arro, having found out that Lyubarsky had an invitation from Israel and that he was willing to register his departure as emigration to Israel, said that this 'changed matters'. On 29 August Lyubarsky brought his Israeli invitation to Kaluga and the same day received permission to leave. It was suggested to him that he buy the visas quickly. On 31 August Lieutenant Belov (*Chronicle* 46) appeared at the home of Lyubarsky and told him that if he did not find a job by 1 September a criminal case would be brought against him for parasitism. Lyubarsky addressed a statement to the Tarusa Procurator Sapronov that he could not at the same time hand his work book into O V I R and find a job. The Procurator refused to give assurances that a criminal case would not be brought, but advised him to register his exit documents as quickly as possible. On 12 September, when the Lyubarskys arrived in Kaluga for the visas, Salova was interrogated in the Ginzburg case before her visa was handed to her, but she refused to answer questions. On 12 September the Lyubarskys received exit visas valid until 12 October. The same day surveillance of Lyubarsky was lifted. From 12 September the police also stopped appearing at the home of Strokatova (*Chronicle* 46). In Chernogolovka (Noginsky district, Moscow region) a district policeman appeared at Lyubarsky's and said that if he needed any help he should phone such-and-such a Moscow number and ask for Victor Nikolayevich — who would help him. Subsequently 'Victor Nikolayevich' helped in extending the visa (for two days) and in speeding up the customs inspection at Sheremetevo airport. At the Moscow customs in Komsomol Square Lyubarsky was inspected out of turn. The packer, who had come to an advance agreement with Lyubarsky about the 'usual' reward, on the day of the inspection carefully avoided contact with him. Packers also did not take the agreed money from the Jew who was inspected on the same day as Lyubarsky: 'Today it's impossible, the place is full of Chekists [K G B officials]'.

On 7 September Vail was summoned to Smolensk O V I R by an urgent telegram delivered by phone, even though he had not yet assembled all the necessary documents. He was told 'Time is pressing!' and his documents were accepted in incomplete form. Hereupon he was told that an answer — whether he had been permitted or not — would be given to him on 15.9, but he must buy the visas before the 22.9.

On arrival in Vienna, Turchin and Lyubarsky discovered that a tape recorder, cameras, a typewriter and other things were missing from their luggage. A representative of Aeroflot in Vienna said to them: 'You can complain to wherever you like. We've seen lots of people like you'.

After the departure of Turchin the writer **Georgy Vladimov** (see *Chronicle* 46 and the section 'Letters and Statements' in this issue) became the leader of the Soviet group of Amnesty International.

On 6 November **Tatyana Khodorovich, Mark Popovsky, D. Kaminskaya** and her husband **K. M. Simis** (*Chronicle* 43) left the U S S R.

T. S. Khodorovich was one of the two members of the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights still in the U S S R and at liberty. In February 1977, after the arrest of A. Ginzburg, T. Khodorovich together with K. Lyubarsky and M. Landa became his successor on the [Solzhenitsyn] Aid Fund for Political Prisoners (*Chronicles* 44, 46). On 14 October T. Khodorovich was summoned to the reception room of the K G B attached to the U S S R Council of Ministers, where Bulat Bazerbayevich Karatayev (*Chronicle* 45) told her that if she did not leave the U S S R immediately a criminal charge would be brought against her. On 18 October T. Khodorovich published this statement:

I Want to Live According to my Conscience

I am not afraid of searches or interrogations. I am not afraid of prisons or camps. I am not afraid of the refined mockery of the human essence which is practised now in my country.

The desire to leave the U S S R arose in me *before* and *independently* of the proposal of the authorities.

I cannot and do not want to observe a Constitution which prescribes an ideology, that is, infringes on the freedom of the Spirit.

Not observing the Law, I enter into a contradiction not only with the state, with the authorities, but also with the society that has accepted this Law. This is inevitable.

Though not sharing the communist ideology of Soviet society, I consider it my duty to declare this fact openly.

The Law forbids this.

I refuse to build an atheistic society, for I am a believer.

The Law obliges me to.

I, the mother of four children, want to educate my grandchildren in Faith, Love and Justice.

The Law orders them to be educated in the spirit of communist ideology.

I, the manager of the [Solzhenitsyn] Russian Public Fund for Assisting Political Prisoners in the U S S R, want openly to help prisoners of conscience and their families.

The Law forbids me to do this.

I want to live according to a Higher Law, the Law of my conscience.

The Law deprives me of this right.

Before my eyes culture is being destroyed.

The Law facilitates this. I am helpless to stop this destruction without breaking the Law.

According to the Law I do not have the right to criticise the essence of Soviet art, i.e. the ideology which permeates it and fills it with lies and hypocrisy.

I am powerless even to defend worthy people from cruel repression, for in my defence not only can I not rely on the Law, but must go against it.

But I am a person. The Law of the society in which I live should be sacred for me. I want to respect and observe the Law. But this is impossible here.

I refuse to live in a state, the Constitution of which I reject.

I am 56 years old. I am tired of struggle. I am tired of lies. I feel sorry for my children.

I accept the proposal of the Soviet authorities that I leave the Soviet Union. I request the American people and their President Jimmy Carter to allow me to live in America. I vow to observe the Constitution of the U S A.

After the departure of K. Lyubarsky and T. Khodorovich (M. Landa is in exile, see *Chronicle* 46) the wife of A. Ginzburg, **Irina Zholkovskaya,** and the cousin of T. Khodorovich, **Sergei Khodorovich,** became the managers of the Aid Fund for Political Prisoners. In their statement of 6 November they wrote:

> . . . Today we accept the responsibility of being Managers of the Fund. We shall continue the work of helping prisoners of conscience in the spirit of the well established traditions of humanity and brotherly love.

One of the last reports of the agency 'Mark Popovsky Press' (*Chronicle* 46) was 'When the Muse is the Property of the State . . .' (19 September). It recounts how Mark Popovsky, despite all his efforts, was not able to clarify whether a legal procedure exists in our country which regulates for writers the export of their own manuscripts. As a result the customs at Sheremetevo airport would not allow Popovsky to take out his archive and he was forced to leave without it.

The barrister Kaminskaya (*Chronicle* 46) in her time defended Yu. Galanskov, V. Bukovsky, A. Marchenko, P. Litvinov and I. Gabai.

* * *

In November several Jewish refuseniks of many years left the U S S R: the Muscovites **F. Kandel** (literary pseudonym — F. Kamov) — a humorous writer, a film script writer, one of the authors of the cartoon film 'Wait a Moment!', and an editor of the Jewish samizdat journal *Tarbut*, and **V. Lazaris** — a lawyer and editor of the samizdat journal *Jews in the U S S R;* from Riga — **Ya. Gordin, V. Kaminsky** and **L. Frumkin;** from Leningrad — **Rozen**; and from Kishinev — **S. Abramovich** and **Yu. Shekhtman.**

* * *

On 30 November **P. G. Grigorenko** and his wife **Z. M. Grigorenko** flew to New York. They left for the U S A with an invitation to visit from their son Andrei (*Chronicle* 37). It is an almost unprecedented event for the Soviet authorities to let out a man as a visitor at the invitation of a person who left for permanent residence in Israel and who does not live in Israel.

On 11 November the Grigorenkos issued a statement for the press:

> On 10 November 1977 our family, i.e. myself, my wife and our son Oleg, received visas for six months for a private visit to the U S A. The visas were issued on the basis of an invitation from our son Andrei, who is living in New York. THE PURPOSE OF THE VISIT is to see our son and for me to have a prostate operation . . .
>
> We have been asked, further, whether we are counting on returning to the Soviet Union. This question evidently has a double meaning. So I shall reply to it in the same way. If by this is implied, are we thinking of staying in the U S A, then we all three reply firmly — NO! But if those who asked the question are interested in whether we shall be deprived of our citizenship, then here we can only express our views. We shall not conceal it — this question worries us too and we have discussed it with our friends, including A. D. Sakharov. We have all come to the conclusion that if we have been given visas then it is not to turn them into an instrument of repression. The government has many repressive measures without this. Therefore we are inclined to evaluate the permission given to us as an act of humanism and we hope that after a successful operation we shall successfully return home.

The Jewish Movement

On 21 September **Igor** and **Yanella Gudz** were received by the head of the reception room of the U S S R M V D, Colonel Danilov. They tried to find out why they had been refused an exit visa. Danilov said to them: '. . . The question of leaving for Israel is alien to us. We are on different sides of the barricade. . . . We do not intend to tell you why you have been refused an exit visa or for what period. We have secret laws and instructions by which we are guided'.

The Gudz couple, on the same matter, were at a reception of the deputy director of Moscow O V I R, Lieutenant-Colonel Zolotukhin. He said: 'The reason for refusal will never be known to you . . . Not one Jew who has been in my office has yet been satisfied. That is the distinguishing feature of your nation'.

* * *

Leonid Slepak, the youngest son of Vladimir Slepak, has left his institute, fearing that lessons in military affairs would make him liable for 'secrecy' restrictions. In October he received a summons to the military enlistment office. On 19 October he sent a statement to the Ministry of Defence in which he wrote that being a citizen of Israel (the government of Israel long ago gave the members of the Slepak family Israeli citizenship) he did not consider it possible for him to serve in the Soviet army.

* * *

Moscow. On 2 November 1977 **Valery Sorin** (25 years) was arrested in his own home. He was not shown the resolution on his arrest. Sorin was placed in the cells of police-station 51. On 5 November he was transferred to the M V D investigation prison on Matrosskaya Tishina Street. The inquiry in his case is being conducted by First Lieutenant S. Ya. Knysh, an officer at police station 125. Evidently Sorin is charged with 'leading a parasitical way of life for a lengthy period' (article 209 of the R S F S R Criminal Code).

In August of last year Sorin was dismissed from his job and gave in his documents for an exit visa to Israel. Half a year later he was refused because of his army service. (Boris Mendel who served together with him left for Israel three months after demobilization.)

In March 1977, after receiving two warnings under article 209, Sorin found himself a job. On 10 October he was dismissed for absenteeism during the period of his house arrest from 3 to 7 October (on house arrests of Moscow refuseniks see below).

* * *

On 29 September after several warnings under article 209 of the R S F S R Criminal Code **E. M. Akselrod** was detained by the police. He was held for three days in the cells; then he was released after he had signed an undertaking that he would not leave the city. For a month Akselrod tried without success to find work in his profession (psychiatrist, candidate of medical sciences). In the end he went to work as a postman. Now Akselrod's case has been returned from the Procuracy to the police for further investigation.

* * *

At the end of September **P. Abramovich, V. Lazaris** and **Shakhnovsky** received warnings under article 209 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. Abramovich and Shakhnovsky found work soon afterwards. Lazaris was detained on 31 October; he spent three hours in the police station until they satisfied themselves that his exit visa had already been authorized (see 'Have Left' in the section 'The Right to Leave').

Kiev. Izvestiya of 11 June reports that this summer an article on nuclear physics written by the Kiev refusenik **Vladimir Kislik** (*Chronicle* 45) was confiscated from an American tourist, [Harold] Greenberg, at the customs at Sheremetevo airport (Moscow). Kiev's Institute of Nuclear Physics, where Kislik earlier worked, at one time gave permission for the open publication of this article. To an inquiry by the investigative organs the institute has now replied that the article contains confidential information.

Some time later Kislik intended to go to Moscow. He was detained near the train and taken home to a search. The work by Kislik 'Thoughts on the Emigration of Jews from the U S S R' was confiscated.

A criminal case has been instituted against V. Kislik under two articles — 'Disclosure of a state secret' and 'Circulation of knowingly false fabrications . . .' He is being interrogated regularly in the Kiev City Procuracy.

On 27 September the newspaper *Evening Kiev* mentioned Kislik several times in an article on Zionists under the title 'The Intrigues of Anti-Sovietism'.

* * *

Kharkov. Refuseniks here number more than 20 families. In 1977 they organized a seminar on Jewish culture.

On 1 November one of the active participants of the seminar, **Alexander Paritsky,** was invited to Kharkov O V I R, supposedly for resolution of the question of his exit visa. K G B official G. G. Mandrik was waiting for Paritsky there, and took him off to the Kharkov K G B to hold a 'conversation' with him. Mandrik said

that the seminar of Kharkov refuseniks and their other joint actions gave cause to the enemies of the USSR to throw dirt at the Soviet Union. He named as an example the visits paid by foreigners to Paritsky's flat and the laying of wreaths by a group of refuseniks at the place where Jews shot by the fascists in 1943 were buried.

At the conclusion of the conversation it was suggested to Paritsky that he stop participating in the work of the seminar.

* * *

29 September is the anniversary of the mass executions in Baby Yar. In this connection 44 Jews who are awaiting permission to leave the USSR addressed a letter to the Supreme Soviet. They expressed the hope that this year the authorities would not prevent them from revering the memory of the victims of Baby Yar.

On 26 September five Kiev citizens, Tsitverblit, Kharib, Lebed, Gertsberg and Mizrukhina, arrived at the city soviet with a request to allow them to hold a ceremony of mourning at Baby Yar on the 29th — to read prayers of remembrance and to lay wreaths with inscriptions in the Jewish language. Officials of the executive committee V. Kh. Degtyar and S. Zimenko refused to give them permission. They stated that they could lay wreaths, but the word 'Jew' must not be on the ribbons. The petitioners sent a complaint to the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party and the Kiev city soviet. They wrote that as a sign of protest they were declaring a one-day hunger strike on the 29th.

Six Moscow activists of the Movement for Jewish Emigration (amongst them — **V. Slepak, M. Kremen** and **Elistratov**) were detained at the Kiev station in Moscow on 28 September at 7 p.m. and held at the police station until 3 a.m. on 29 September; so they were prevented from leaving for Kiev. **B. Chernobylsky** was detained at the exit of his house and held at a police station.

On 29 September in Kiev Tsitverblit was summoned to the MVD for a conversation on the subject of his finding a job and held there until 8 o'clock in the evening; Lebed was summoned to the Procuracy; **Presman** to OVIR; and **Pargamanik** was seized on the street, taken to the KGB, and held at an interrogation in the Shcharansky case until evening.

A few days before 29 September Kiev citizen **Elbert** was arrested at the airport, when leaving for Moscow, and given 10 days for 'hooliganism'. When his wife tried to clarify where her husband was, she was told nothing.

This year there was no official service of mourning at Baby Yar on 29 September; only a few organizations laid wreaths at the foot of the monument.

* * *

On 26 September Moscow Jewish refuseniks again (*Chronicle* 43) addressed a letter to the presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. As before, they demand that the review of authorization for an exit visa should take place with the participation of the refusenik and that 'legally substantiated' reasons and the duration of the refusal be reported. This time the letter was addressed to L. I. Brezhnev as chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. There were 53 signatures under the letter.

No reply to this letter was forthcoming.

On 3 October a number of the Jews who had signed the letter were intending to gather in the reception room of the Presidium to hand in a complaint addressed to Brezhnev. None of them succeeded in getting into the reception room. The majority were detained at home or near home. They were ordered to return to their flats and to remain there. Only four of them were seized at the approaches to the reception room. They were taken to a sobering-up station. These were **D. Beilina, S. Inditsky, B. Chernobylsky** and **D. Shchiglik.** Chernobylsky was beaten up in detention.

In the sobering-up station the 65-year-old Inditsky began to feel ill with the onset of a serious attack of hypertonia. They would not call a doctor despite the demands of Inditsky and the protests of the others detained.

Dmitry Shchiglik was tied to an iron bedstead with towels.

A loud conversation was started up near Beilina's door. They said, for example: 'Hitler didn't finish you off — he left us the trouble'. They fell silent only when Beilina broke the feeding hole in the door and threatened to break down the door.

Those detained were not given anything to eat all day.

In the evening the police escorted Beilina, Inditsky and Shchiglik to their homes. Chernobylsky was given 15 days for 'breach of public order'.

Thus began the house arrest of 28 refusenik families. Police shifts guarded these families from 3 to 10 October with a break on Saturday, Sunday and the festival of Simhat-Tora (the evening of the 5th).

On 4 October A. Sakharov, P. Grigorenko and N. Meiman addressed the participants of the Belgrade Conference, calling on them to direct their attention to this lawlessness.

During the same period women from families of Jewish refuseniks wrote a statement addressed to L. I. Brezhnev. They described the grievous situation of their families: the reasons for refusal and the dates of exit were not known, both they and their husbands were effectively deprived of the possibility of working. The women requested Brezhnev to receive them personally and to investigate 'the illegal situation which has been created on the matter of emigration'. The letter was signed by 16 Moscow refuseniks: Khana Elinson, Dina

Beilina, Yanella Gudz, Elena Seidel, Faina Kogan, Ida Nudel, Natalya Khasina, Lydia Likhterova, Larisa Vilenskaya, Natalya Rozenshtein, Elena Dubyanskaya, Irina Gildengorn, Evgeniya Nepomnyashchaya, Gitageniya Redker, Galina Shmeleva-Tsitovskaya and Batsheva Elistratova.

On the morning of 6 October they were intending to go to the reception-room of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and hand in their statement. However, from the evening of 5 October persons in civilian dress and police would not let them out of their flats. On 6, 7 and 10 October they were all kept under house arrest. **Ida Nudel** was not allowed out to shop for three days and neighbours were stopped from bringing food products to her.

Natalya Khasina was at first not allowed to for a walk with her infant in arms, then she was let out, but an escort accompanied her and the pram with the baby in it.

Elena Seidel went to a clinic with her daughter on the morning of the 10th. She was ordered to return home. When she refused, force was applied.

A policeman and civilians accompanied **Galina Tsitovskaya** to a clinic. Children invited to the birthday party of their 11-year-old daughter were not allowed into the Tsitovskys' flat.

The same authors describe these events in a complaint addressed to Brezhnev. They conclude with the words:

> Despite everything that has happened, we do not give up hope of obtaining an appointment with you.

* * *

This case is distinguished from preceding cases of the house arrest of refuseniks by the participation of the police (previously it was only people in civilian clothes). The guard was of considerable size — police and men in civilian clothes crowded in the entrances and on the stairways near the doors of those being detained.

(Soviet legislation does not provide for house arrest as a means of restraint.)

* * *

See also the section 'Letters and Statements'.

In the Prisons and Camps

Vladimir Prison

On 20 August, on completion of 3-year prison terms received in Perm camp 36, **Vitold Abankin** (his 12-year sentence finishes in August 1978) and **Aleksei Safronov** were dispatched back to camps.

During the search before their dispatch, addresses (torn out of notebooks) and photographs of prison comrades were confiscated from them, as well as greetings cards, books with dedications from comrades, and books in foreign languages. The other books were bent and mutilated as their covers were pulled off, and inscriptions of 'Vladimir' were rubbed out so hard that holes were made in the paper. Exercise books with personal notes were also confiscated from Safronov, and from Abankin cuttings from newspapers and journals, four exercise books with extracts copied out from books ('tendentious', according to the record), and five exercise books containing science fiction stories composed by him ('tendentious' or 'anti-Soviet').

Before being transported from prison both of them were in hospital. Safronov has anaemia. Abankin has infected liver and kidneys, and swollen legs. In three years he has spent 205 days in the cooler.

* * *

On 21 September **Georgy Davydov** (*Chronicle* 29) completed his 5-year term in prison and camp. He has been transported to Irkutsk region to serve his 2-year exile.

On 22 October he was freed in the village of Tulun. On 20 November he was placed under surveillance there. The end of his exile is in June 1979. His address: Tulun, 4. Prirechnaya ul. 17a.

* * *

On 26 August **Vladimir Balakhonov** was deprived of the meeting due to him. However, no one comes to meetings with him (his wife divorced him, his daughter is 10 years old, his father, brother and sister do not want to come; and his mother died in 1972).

* * *

In November **Gabriel Superfin** received 15 days in the cooler.

* * *

On 19 June 1976 the Azerbaijani **Zeamalov** (a common criminal) was forbidden a meeting just because he spoke to his relatives who had come to see him in his native language. A year later, in reply to his complaints, a K G B official told in a private conversation that there had been nothing illegal in the actions of the administration.

The Mordovian Camps

Camp 1 (special-regime)

In October-November **Aleksei Ivanovich Tikhy** (*Chronicle* 46) arrived here. The Ukrainian Supreme Court, after hearing an appeal on 15 September in the case of Tikhy and **Rudenko,** ruled that the sentence was valid. Tikhy's sentence, 10 years of special-regime camps and 5 years of exile, is being counted from 4 (and not from 5, as in *Chronicles* 44, 46) February 1977.

* * *

There are now 39 people in the camp; 12 of them are war criminals, and 13 are common criminals re-convicted under political articles while in camp.

* * *

In the last three years six prisoners under 50 years of age have died in the camp:

Volobuyev: aged 23 from tuberculosis;
Pekharev: aged 33 from perforation of a stomach ulcer;
Vasilev: aged 42 from a heart attack;
Safronov: aged 47 from tuberculosis;
Tsvetkov: aged 48 from tuberculosis;
Budayev: after contracting tuberculosis, he hanged himself.

The circumstances of Pekharev's death were as follows. He often complained of pains in his stomach, was sometimes sent to the hospital but would be returned without a thorough examination having been carried out. During work one day he could not stand and crawled out into the yard. The prisoners demanded that he be given help, but the medical attendant Nadyushkin declared that Pekharev was 'squinting' (pretending). Only when Pekharev had turned green did the medical attendant give him an injection, and then it was one which could not have helped him with his illness. Pekharev became worse and worse and in the evening he was at last sent to the hospital on a trolley — in handcuffs. He died on the way or in hospital; it is not known precisely. K G B officials circulated rumours that Pekharev had been given an operation, after which he himself broke open his stitches and ate a plateful of kasha. Over 20 prisoners responded to Pekharev's death with a hunger strike, demanding that the causes of the high mortality rate be eliminated.

In April 1977, after the death of Volobuyev in hospital, the prisoners (execpt for the war criminals) also declared a hunger strike, carrying it out on 17 April, a day of communist voluntary labour. Statements addressed to the camp administration, the Procuracy and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, pointed to the harsh conditions

of their confinement, the poor food and medical service, the arbitrariness of the administration, the confinement of prisoners with tuberculosis in the same cells as other prisoners, and the lack of a medical isolation ward in the camp. In their statements many of them demanded recognition of their status as political prisoners.

* * *

On 1 May nine political prisoners declared a new hunger-strike demanding not only an improvement in conditions of confinement, but also an end to reprisals against those fighting for their rights. This time the administration carried out an 'improvement of conditions': the head of the camp, Kropotov, replaced the crackling loudspeaker used during film showings (two films a year, each one three times), a head of detachment brought five books to the library, and a drinking tank without a lock was placed in the workshop.

In May **E. Kuznetsov** declared a hunger-strike in protest against being deprived of a meeting. His demand was supported by other political prisoners. Kuznetsov received the meeting (*Chronicle* 46).

In June a hunger-strike lasting many days was carried out in connection with the Belgrade Conference; the demands were for a fundamental change in attitude towards political prisoners.

In October **Murzhenko** and **Fyodorov** were sent to the hospital.

* * *

Svyatoslav Karavansky should have received a meeting in August, but his wife N. A. Strokata, who is living in Tarusa under administrative surveillance, was not given permission for a trip to the camp (*Chronicle* 46). At the beginning of September Karavansky declared a hunger-strike. Nina Antonovna herself, as well as Sakharov, Lyubarsky and V. Mashkova, taking into consideration the serious physical condition of Karavansky, appealed to him to end the hunger-strike. On 14 October he ended it. At approximately this time representatives of the authorities promised Strokata that in the middle of November she would be allowed to come to a meeting. The promise was fulfilled.

* * *

On 4 October, the day the Belgrade Conference opened, eight people carried out a hunger-strike.

* * *

In the summer of this year the following statement became available:

> Recently in the Mordovian Special Camp (stantsiya Potma, p/o Sosnovka) a committee has been organised on a social basis com-

posed of three people: priest **Vasily Romanyuk, Eduard Kuznetsov** and long-term political prisoner **Danilo Shumuk.** Among the tasks of the Committee are the promotion a friendly climate between political prisoners, unity between different nationalities, and mutual respect and recognition of the humanitarian rights of individual prisoners of all ideological persuasions who have been convicted for their political beliefs; and also the condemnation of anti-semitism.

Recently the Committee has issued a stern reprimand to political prisoners **Valentin Moroz** and **Ivan Gel** for behaviour unworthy of the status of a political prisoner.

Specificially, Moroz is accused of inciting national enmity (particularly in regard to Russians and Jews), and of not respecting the views of his comrades in misfortune. He does not want to sign any collective letters and statements to either Soviet or foreign bodies, and does not want to take part in collective hunger-strikes. In addition, the anti-semitic position of Moroz casts aspersions on Ukrainian dissidents, who form a majority in the camp, and generally inflicts damage on the democratic movement as a whole, as in the West the name of Moroz enjoys great popularity.

Ivan Gel is accused of behaving like a hooligan and of egoism, which he displays at every step. His compatriots M. Osadchy, D. Shumuk, V. Romanyuk, S. Karavansky, B. Rebrik and others have been beaten up by him. In addition, he is accused of anti-semitism and friendship with criminals. The position of Gel is very convenient for the camp administration.

The Committee gave warnings to prisoners Moroz and Gel about their unworthy behaviour, but they rejected all the reproofs addressed to them. The Committee therefore demands that a general boycott be imposed on prisoners Moroz and Gel and that their names not be mentioned either in Samizdat or in other materials.

The Committee asks that Moroz cease to be called the best representative of the Ukrainian people and the dissident intelligentsia.

All Ukrainian political prisoners with the exception of Gel have censured the actions of Moroz.

The *Chronicle* considered itself obliged to publish this statement but, in any event, does not associate itself with the call for a boycott contained in it.

From about September Gel and Moroz were transferred to a brigade of criminals. Moroz was transferred at his own request to solitary confinement. Conflicts and quarrels then ceased.

T. S. Khodorovich expressed the opinion that the conflict situation was the consequence of the cracking of the moral and physical strength of prisoners in the inhuman conditions of the special-regime camp.

Camps 3 and 19

The following prisoners took part in a 100-day campaign (21 April-29 July) for the status of political prisoners (*Chronicles* 45, 46): **Airikyan, Budulak-Sharygin, Karpenok, Markosyan, Osipov, Ravinsh, Soldatov, Ushakov, Kheifets, Khramtsov, Chornovil, Shakirov** and **Yuskevich.** The course of this campaign and the reprisals in response (the information in *Chronicle* 46 is incomplete and not entirely accurate) is reported in a letter from one of the participants:

> On 21 April we adopted the status of political prisoners: we tore off our stripes and did not go to work. We demanded a political amnesty, and, until it came into force, an improvement in the regime of confinement in concentration camps. Threats started. The high ranks (colonels and lieutenant-colonels) threatened us, on the whole, with new terms of imprisonment — for organizing camp disorders. We replied that production was continuing (at first five people in this zone adopted the status, now there are about 15), each person was acting by himself, i.e. there was no 'group of persons', etc. Then reprisals started. We were deprived of everything possible: the right to buy food products, to parcels, to meetings, then it was the cooler. Ushakov got five days, Osipov — six, Shakirov — seven, Soldatov — ten, and Kheifets — twelve. Before this there was a search in the zone and all papers were taken without any records of the confiscations being made; they announced: no papers allowed except for copies of verdicts.
>
> The typical cooler is a damp room with the plaster peeling off, and when we were put in one it was whitewashed. It has wooden bunks held up by chains. In the day time the bunks are bolted to the wall. There is a tiny table with two or four stump seats, 15-18 centimetres in diameter, which are painful to sit on. We lie on the wooden floor. Once one of the present 'status'-adopters — Budulak — fasted for 18 days, but got himself assigned to a floor with wooden boards over cement. They don't issue a bed — we put slippers wrapped in a handkerchief under our head. They feed us on a reduced norm, i.e. on soup that is completely without fat or thickening, and that's only on alternate days. On the other day it's bread and water. There's no limit on salt. We're forbidden to read. They take us out of our cells only half an hour in the morning — to wash and go to the toilet. For daytime and night-time needs it's the close-stool. There's not enough chloride of lime so the cell stinks. Because of the dampness it's cold in the cell at night, even at the warm time of the year. Colonel Novikov from the administration said: 'What are you complaining about? If it's cold we'll heat you up!' The next day they took away warm underclothes from Ushakov, who was in handcuffs, and gave him underpants and a vest. They said it was

time to change into the summer form of dress. Osipov was undressed. In response Soldatov declared a hunger-strike and removed his vest as well. They made a slight concession — they gave us cotton underwear. It's very cold. The nights here are sometimes cold like in autumn, then it's very hard for a naked hungry prisoner in the cooler. If you're lucky enough to find a newspaper in the toilet and you wrap yourself up in it next to the skin, then it's warmer.

We are responding to the hunger and cold with pre-Belgrade hunger-strikes on our days off work. Kheifets has carried out 10, Soldatov and Ushakov — 12 each. Chornovil has done more than 20 of them, but he was the first to adopt political status. When we arrived at the cooler, he was already in the punishment block. (The cells are across the corridor.) In our hunger-strikes we are protesting against the deterioration of the food — way below the regulation minimum norms — and against being transported with criminals, at which time politicals are terrorized by bandits and murderers. We have protested against national discrimination — forcible deportation from our Motherland, lack of proper conditions for our national life; against the impossibility of doing creative work, against compulsory political lectures, against semi-unpaid labour without holidays; against the ban on bringing families into the camp; against the restrictions on contacts with families (one meeting a year), i.e. the effective destruction of families and the furthering of the moral disintegration of the individual; and against secret legislation, when we are punished for breaking secret and official instructions and orders unknown to the prisoners, which make the published legislation immeasurably more burdensome.

In response the administration has decided to confiscate all statements, including private ones, to the Procurator, on the pretext that we were using inadmissible expressions such as 'political prisoners', 'status' and 'hunger strike'. From 24 April, when they confiscated our statements of condolence to the Armenians on the anniversary of the genocide in Armenia under Turkish rule in the pre-revolutionary years, the word 'genocide' was added. Mention of names of other political prisoners is forbidden.

Despite all these hardships, everyone is cheerful. This does not please the administration: 'The cooler doesn't work on you.' Soldatov replies: 'We are stronger than the cooler.'

The soul of the prison block is Chornovil. Conversations between cells are forbidden, but every day he reads us the latest news. The head of the camp, Pikulin called Chornovil our general. Slavko [Chornovil] looks bad — he is worn out with hunger. Every ten days he keeps count of pre-Belgrade activity; up to 20 May 570 days had been served in the cooler and punishment block during '77 (340 in the cooler and 230 in the punishment block), and 135

pre-Belgrade hunger-strikes had been carried out. 80 statements had been confiscated. On average, four people were serving punishment terms every day.

The last specially notable event was saving the Armenian patriot Markosyan, who received 25 days in the cooler out of the first 30 days after he adopted political status. He has a stomach ulcer and cannot recover from it. Twice he was carried out of his cell more dead than alive and taken to the medical block for an enema. When he was brought there for the fourth time Slavko proposed — and everyone supported him — an indefinite hunger-strike until Markosyan was helped. Before this the doctor had not come for three days. We lay down on hunger-strike until Markosyan was dragged out of solitary. The authorities cynically bargained with us: persuade him to give up his 'status' or his death will be on your conscience. We wrote a protest (accompanied by a mass hunger-strike) at this crime against humanity on the day the new constitution was given. We forced them to give in — Markosyan was transferred to the Medical block. The same day, 24 May, Osipov was sent to the punishment block for six months, Chornovil to the cooler for 15 days. They announced they would confiscate all statements like this one.

We are cheerful, backed up by the sympathy of the zone and your support. The K G B hardly ever show up, but at first they were very angry about the leakage of information.

Kheifets was in the cooler for 12 days (from 21 April to 2 May), then, after a 24-hour break, for 13 days (from 4 May to 16 May), then, after a ten-day break, for 15 days (from 26 May to 9 June).

On 26 May **Ravinsh** received another eight days in the cooler.

On 2 June **Soldatov** was put in the cooler.

On 3 June **Markosyan** and **Ravinsh** were sent to hospital.

While he was in the punishment blocks, **Osipov** fell ill. Tuberculosis was diagnosed but he was not sent to hospital right away — only on 29 July. (Despite the symptoms of tuberculosis already discovered, a letter was sent to Osipov's wife, in reply to her inquiries, which said — over the signature of two doctors of camp 19 — that he was healthy.)

One day political prisoners of camp 19, referring to the incident with Osipov, asked K G B camp official Boroda: 'When will the deliberate destruction of the health of political prisoners end?' Boroda replied: 'You shouldn't have landed up in the punishment block.'

Chornovil was also ill for a long time in the punishment block. On 23 September he was transferred to hospital. Both Chornovil and Osipov were sent back from hospital to the zone for taking part in

the 'Belgrade' hunger-strike on 4 October: Chornovil on 5 October and Osipov on 12 October.

* * *

On 14 August Armenian political prisoners held a hunger-strike demanding the legalization of the National United Party and the implementation of a referendum in Armenia on self-determination under U N supervision. This action was supported by 28 political prisoners in the Mordovian camps (it is known that they included **Irina Stasiv-Kalynets, Semenyuk, Kheifets, Ushakov** and **Chornovil**), as well as **Budulak-Sharygin** and **Ravinsh,** who landed up in the cooler after this.

On 22 August **Irina Stasiv-Kalynets, Nijole Sadunaite** and **Paruir Airikyan** carried out a hunger-strike in protest against the confiscation of letters.

In August and September Airikyan was deprived of access to the camp shop. The September deprivation was cancelled when he responded to it by declaring a strike.

On 12 September **Ravinsh** received two months in the punishment block for not fulfilling the norm, for violating the regime, and for slanderous fabrications.

In September many political prisoners made a written protest against two particularly cruel punishments:

— on 16 September **Nadezhda Usoyeva** was sent to the cooler for 15 days for refusing compulsory work because of religious considerations (she was convicted for 'religion'). At this time she was ill, having not yet recovered from an illness received during her previous time in the cooler.

— on 19 September **Pyotr Sartakov,** who suffers from several heart diseases, received 14 days in the cooler for not fulfilling the norm (since 1973 Sartakov has served 524 days in the cooler and the punishment block, and has repeatedly been deprived of access to the camp shop.)

In September **K. Didenko** received 15 days in the cooler for trying to assemble a radio receiver.

* * *

On 4 October, the day the Belgrade Conference opened, more than 15 people held a protest hunger-strike, amongst them: **Stasiv-Kalynets, Popovich** and **Senik** (women's zone of camp 3), **Budulak-Sharygin, Ravinsh, Saranchuk, Sartakov, Soldatov, Ushakov** and **Kheifets** (camp 19), **Osipov** and **Chornovil** (in hospital), and **Airikyan** (camp 3). Besides the protests of a general character declared by everyone, **Airikyan** advanced the demand to let him go to Belgrade or to let him meet foreign correspondents here in camp.

Airikyan was prescribed 15 days in the cooler, but was placed in the medical block in camp 19.

* * *

In October **Vladas Lapienis** (see 'Events in Lithuania') arrived in camp 3.

* * *

Markosyan was taken from the hospital to Erevan.

In August **Yuskevich, Karpenok** and **Shakirov** were taken off to Saransk. In July and August **Soldatov** was in Tallin (*Chronicle* 46).

* * *

In June doctors wanted to send **Nijole Sadunaite** (*Chronicle* 37) to hospital (she had had a high temperature for a long time), but the administration of camp 3 refused to do this.

In August the camp term of N. Sadunaite (3 years) finished and she was transported into exile (also 3 years) in Krasnoyarsk territory (village of Boguchany). The transit lasted 27 days. In exile she is working as a cleaner in a school.

The Perm Camps

On 4 October, the day the Belgrade Conference opened, political prisoners in camps 35 and 36 held a hunger-strike. It is known that the hunger-strike in camp 36 lasted a week, about 15 people taking part in it.

30 October — Political Prisoners' Day — was marked by a one-day hunger-strike.

As punishment for taking part in the 'Belgrade' hunger-strike **A. Sergiyenko** was deprived of his diet-food and treatment (see below 'In Defence of Political Prisoners').

* * *

At the end of September **Valery Marchenko** and **Ivan Svetlichny** were in hospital (in camp 35).

* * *

In October Marchenko was taken to Kiev. In the K G B they tried to persuade him to express repentance, gave him a meeting with his mother, who, fearing for his health, also tried to persuade him. In a letter to his mother written after the meeting V. Marchenko writes that however painful it was for him to see her in tears, he cannot 'cancel himself out spiritually for the sake of a biological existence near his mother'. He writes further:

As a teacher, you constantly taught us to be principled, you taught us the virtues which go to make up a decent person . . . You had and will have a son who loves his mother like no one else, whom this love and the qualities engendered by this love have helped to endure the most difficult moments, as well as in the struggle to acquire the right to call himself a man. This is your merit. It weighs incomparably more than the persuasive arguments which you brought to the meeting. (Quoted in translation from the Ukrainian.)

* * *

In September **Petras Plumpa** was transferred from camp 36 to 35.

* * *

In the period July-September **S. Kovalyov** sent six letters. The camp censorship let them through, but five of them were not received by the addressees. At the beginning of October Kovalyov stated that he was refraining from correspondence and would renew it only when he received a guarantee that legality was being observed in regard to his correspondence.

* * *

In May Kovalyov complained orally to procurator Orekhov about the confiscation from him of four pages from a notepad, which contained an unfinished (here there was an inaccuracy in *Chronicle* 45) statement to the Procurator-General on the subject of the work of the K G B in camp. The notepad was handed over for verification on 29 November 1976 before a meeting with his barrister. The confiscation was based on point 29 in the 'Instructions on M V D Censorship': 'confidential information'. Two days later Orekhov gave an oral reply: 'Was unable to investigate the matter in essence, as the statement had been destroyed. I regard as admissible the removal for verification by the administration and the confiscation of any notes, including statements to the Procuracy, if they have not yet been finalized and not handed in to be sent.'

Diary of Camp 36

(In order not to break its integrity, episodes from the diary have not been excluded which have already been described in the *Chronicle*. References to issues of the *Chronicle* have been added.)

2 May. Fyodorov threatened **Svetlichny** crudely with reprisals for allegedly poor work (in actual fact Svetlichny had done all the work demanded of him in the laundry, including during his time off; he was working on 2 May, i.e. a day off). On 4 and 5 May the conflict between Fyodorov and Svetlichny repeated itself. On 7 May the head of the unit, Dolmatov, summoned Svetlichny on a report from Fyodorov and threatened him with reprisals for 'poor work'.

5 May. **Sapelyak** was punished (he did not say 'good day' to Fyodorov).

7 May. **Monastyrsky** and **Popadichenko** were punished for refusing to appear at the summons of an officer (Monastyrsky had often been summoned without any reason in expectation of his failure to appear — a reason for punishment).

8 May. More than 20 political prisoners sent statements to the Proceurator-General of the U S S R in which they pointed out specific facts about the catastrophic state of medical help in the camp and the poor living conditions; each of the prisoners at the end of the statement demanded that representatives of the Red Cross be allowed to visit the camp. Statements were sent by **Sarkisyan, Mättik, Plumpa, Kavoliunas, Monastyrsky, Mukhametshin, Zalmanson, Dymshits, Gluzman, Svetlichny, Kalynets, Marchenko, Sapelyak, Grinkiv, Demidov, Basarab, Protsen, Gerchak** and **Sergiyenko** (see *Chronicle* 46, see also 'Letters and Statements of Political Prisoners' in this issue).

10 May. **Gluzman** received a reply from the Perm communications administration which said that his letter to Nina Ivanovna Bukovskaya of 3 January 1977 had been lost at Domodedovo airport.

11 May. Reports drawn up against him for unfulfilled norms were brought against **Marchenko.**

14 May. From this day the camp administration made prisoners do unpaid building work (putting up wooden fences, laying concrete on roads, plastering work, etc.); all this was carried out in the name of 'improvement of the camp territory', although the law specifies building and road works as not being covered by such 'improvement'. Later a Perm procurator, Orekhov, confirmed the 'legality' of the actions of administration in this regard.

16 May. Fyodorov demanded that **Svetlichny** go out to build a fence, and Svetlichny refused. A procurator from the department for supervising places of imprisonment of the regional Procuracy, Orekhov, arrived in the zone, together with Procurator Muradyan from Chusovoi.

A public delegation from the Kiev region arrived in the zone — First Lieutenant of the K G B, Kirichek, Professor S. A. Krizhanovsky from the Institute of Literature of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, an official from the Ukrainian Ministry of Justice, Gurnenko, and a worker from a chemical fertilizer plant in Kiev, Vasilev. They were shown round by Pomaz, Utyro and Chernyak of the K G B. The delegation summoned Ukrainian prisoners for conversations. Kirichek set the tone of the conversations, which was basically a rude one. We quote the record of the conversation with **Kalynets:**

Kalynets: 'Who will I talk to — a delegation from the Ukrainian K G B or a public delegation?' *Kirichek:* 'With a public delegation of course.' *Kalynets:* 'I ask the representatives of the public to tell me what they, the Ukrainian public, have done, are doing and will do, in particular at the meeting in Belgrade, to free political prisoners?' *Kirichek* (starting to shout): 'We don't have political prisoners, you are especially dangerous state criminals!' *Kalynets:* 'It was proposed to me I should chat with representatives of the public and not with the K G B.' *Krizhanovsky:* 'Each country has its laws which can't be broken. You committed a crime . . .' *Kalynets:* 'Do you know the content of my sentence? Are you familiar with my case?' *Krizhanovsky* (limply): 'In general terms . . .' *Kalynets:* 'For your information I was convicted for creativity, there is nothing else there.' *Krizhanovsky:* 'Most likely your poetry was anti-Soviet.' *Kalynets:* 'I don't want to continue a conversation with such a "public".' *Everyone*, both K G B and the others: 'Go away then!' Kalynets went out (for the visit of the delegation to camps 35 and 36 see also *Chronicle* 46).

17 May. **Svetlichny** was brought to work on a machine. **Lisovoi** was ordered to collect his things before being transported from the camp. Lisovoi, who had been brought to the guard-house, was carefully searched (during the shift of officer Rak — the action was directed by K G B official Chepkasov); his notes were confiscated from him, including a 'philosophical dictionary' which he had begun in Ukrainian (Lisovoi is a candidate of philosophical sciences and worked before his arrest in the Institute of Philosophy of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences).

23 May. K G B Major Chernyak had lengthy conversations with **Marchenko** and **Svetlichny**; 'cooperation' was proposed to Svetlichny in an extremely transparent form.

24 May. Svetlichny obtained an admission from doctor Petrov that he was in fact unfit to work (despite this, they continue to take him out to do work that he cannot endure, and to demand that he fulfil the norm). The same day a report was drawn up against him by Captain Rak and the head of the workshop, Svinin, for 'an unconscientious attitude towards work'. On the night of 24 to 25 May Svetlichny had a serious nose bleed.

25 May. **Basarab** and **Grinkiv** were (secretly) digging beds planted with onions, when Fyodorov discovered them at it. Having ordered them to stop digging, he added: 'We shall have to pour salt over this place, then nothing will grow here!'

25, 26 & 27 May. In the zone a total search of prisoners' belongings was carried out by officers and warders under the leadership of Chernyak and Chepkasov from the K G B. Notes, warm clothing and plastic bags were taken. Blank paper (standard sheets) was confiscated from **Kovalyov,** soup cubes from **Basarab;** these are a 'prohibited food product'.

30 May. Nelipovich punished **Grinkiv** for visiting another detachment.

2, 6, 13, 16, 20, 23, 27, 30 May. For supper — rotten fish.

In *May* doctor Titov was transferred to work in Perm (to a children's camp), Petrov remained as the doctor in the camp.

30 May. **Kalynets** handed in a statement to the head of the medical section requesting that he be placed on the so-called diet-food list in connection with his stomach illness. On 1 June doctor Petrov replied to Kalynets orally that he had been refused a diet 'by the accounts department'.

2 June. A search of **Sapelyak** was carried out by Zhuravkov, Rak and several warders who were looking for something specific; a copy of his statement to Brezhnev was confiscated (see 'Letters and Statements of Political Prisoners'). A K G B investigator arrived in the zone, and prisoners **Mukhametshin** and **Ismagilov** were interrogated; according to the investigator, **Korekhov,** who earlier served a term in camp 36, has been arrested again (released in 1976 — *Chronicle* 41).

Monastyrsky and **Sergiyenko** were summoned to so-called educational conversations, and were threatened with reprisals for 'violating the regime of confinement'. On the evening of 2 June **Svetlichny** had a heart attack, but did not receive medical help.

3 June. Reports were drawn up against **Kazachkov, Svetlichny, Lisovoi** and **Popadichenko.**

5 June. Captain Rak confiscated a prayer book from **Plumpa.**

6 June. General search in the living zone, led by K G B officer Chepkasov.

9 June. For supper — rotten fish.

10 June. For refusing to greet Fyodorov by standing up, **Gluzman** and **Svetlichny** were punished by him.

11 June. A warning hunger-strike by Gluzman, demanding that his things be sent from camp 35 (statement to the regional Procuracy).

13 June. **Lisovoi** taken away from camp with all this things (to Kiev — *Chronicle* 46).

15 June. In connection with the beginning of the conference in Belgrade 16 political prisoners sent statements to the Presidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet and held a hunger-strike (*Chronicle* 46).

For refusing to work, **Popadichenko** is put in the cooler.

20 June. Head of the workshop Svinin threatens **Svetlichny** with punishment for not fulfilling the norm. Then Svinin orders a group of political prisoners to go out to work in the open air in a temperature of 8 degrees, having refused to issue them with quilted jackets: 'In winter it's 8 degrees in the barrack too, and it's all right, you live!'

Night of 25 to 26 June. **Fedyuk** transported into exile.

28 June. **Marchenko** informed that the parcel sent to him had been sent back as it contained 'prohibited food products'.

29 June. Fyodorov punished **Svetlichny** for not fulfilling the norm; from this moment Svetlichny declared a hunger-strike in protest against moral terror and legal tyranny, and sent a corresponding statement to Brezhnev.

29 June. Warder Rotenko confiscated pages from a journal, used as toilet paper, from **Sapelyak** in the production zone. Several hours later Major Fyodorov announced to Sapelyak that Rotenko had behaved correctly insofar as a prisoner was prohibited from taking any sort of paper, food products, tea, etc., into the production zone. A report was drawn up on this incident in which officer Dolmatov recorded: 'Sapelyak said that Soviet power had brought him here (i.e. to the camp).' (Dolmatov considered this statement by Sapelyak punishable and anti-Soviet!)

30 June. Popadichenko put in handcuffs in the cooler for refusing to work

In June **Borovoi, Parkhomenko, Tarakhovich** and **Boguk** arrived in the camp after trial; all were convicted for cooperating with the Germans during the war [see *Sovietskaya Belorussia*, 19 May 1977].

In Other Camps and Prisons

On 24 August **Vasily Barladyanu,** sentenced to 3 years on 29 June (*Chronicle* 46), was dispatched from Odessa and on 4 September he arrived in a camp in the village of Politsy, Rovno region. Barladyanu was set to work in the cooler — hewing out crushed stone and loading it up; his norm is from six to eight cubic metres a day.

Details have become known of the hunger-strike declared by Barladyanu on 2 March at his arrest (*Chronicle* 44), which lasted until the end of the trial. Until 27 March he was kept in a common cell. On 12 March, after his usual refusal to take food, he was beaten up right in the cell by six warders. The beating stopped only when he lost consciousness. They brought him round and began to force-feed him. After the beating Barladyanu started to have incessant headaches and pains in his side, which did not pass until the autumn. Later on he started to lose the use of his right arm and leg, and his left arm became almost paralysed. A doctor examined Barladyanu for the first time after the trial. He would not treat him, saying only that the pains and other symptoms were consequences of the hunger-strike.

In August K G B officials came to see Valentina Barladyanu; they insisted that she give up her intention of registering her marriage with Vasily (Vasily and Valentina were divorced, but were later reconciled), since, according to them, they would not allow him any visits anyway.

On 5 September, when he had reached the camp, a (2-hour) visit was in fact granted — the first since his arrest.

At the end of October K G B investigator Filippsky told Valentina Barladyanu that if anything about her husband leaked abroad she would be arrested. Valentina replied that she was not afraid of threats. Filippsky asked her not to undertake anything before 4 November, promising to find out by then what the K G B could do to ease her husband's situation. Soon she was invited to travel to the camp, and on 10 November her marriage to Vasily took place there, after which they were given a three-day visit.

In September and October Barladyanu's health deteriorated. Pains developed in his heart, in his groin and under his knee, but he received no treatment. He wrote complaints to the Procurator of the Ukraine and the U S S R Procurator-General, but the camp administration did not dispatch them. His relatives sent telegrams to the same people and also to the Ukrainian M V D and the head of the camp. On 9 November Barladyanu was examined by a doctor from the U V D medical service. On 24 November he was sent to Lvov. There he was given the diagnosis — first-degree hypertonia with swellings and brain haemorraging.

* * *

Mustafa Dzhemilev, who is in a camp in Primorsky territory, should be released on 22 December 1977 (*Chronicle* 40). In a letter of 20 October he reported:

> . . . I have been deprived of the right to a meeting. At the same time they have announced that I am being transferred to a brigade of loaders, i.e. it is evidently intended to create the necessary 'milieu'. And in general there are suspicious intrigues going on here, visits by the K G B . . . , reminiscent of the whole environment during my last days in the Omsk camp. I have handed in a statement demanding to be put in solitary. (As a precaution against the planting of 'witnesses' of anti-Soviet conversations — *Chronicle*).

On 23 October Mustafa declared a hunger-strike and was soon transferred to the cooler.

On 8 November, having received assurances from the administration that a case was not being prepared against him, Dzhemilev ended his hunger-strike.

He was nevertheless sent to a brigade of loaders. To requests by other prisoners to cancel this assignment in view of the state of his health, the camp doctor replied: 'Who are you interceding for? He wants to take away your land. If he dies, that's where he'll be buried'.

At the end of October and begining of November P. G. Grigorenko and A. D. Sakharov made statements about the possible instigation

of a new criminal case against Dzhemilev. In the middle of November they and Reshat Dzhemilev sent telegrams to Rudenko and Shchelokov calling on them not to allow a new trumped-up trial of M. Dzhemilev. An inquiry about his condition was also sent to the head of the camp. (Nothing was yet known about the end of his hunger-strike.)

In view of his impending release, Mustafa Dzhemilev informed the camp administration that he wanted to settle with his parents in the Crimea (see 'the Persecution of the Crimean Tatars' in this issue). The administration sent an inquiry to the Crimean region and received a reply, dated 28 October, from the Belogorsk soviet executive committee:

> The parents of Mustafa Dzhemilev reside on the territory of Belogorsk district, Crimea region, in flagrant violation of the residence regulations . . . As deported persons, their registration in the Crimea is subject to restrictions. In connection with the above, it is pointless to send M. Dzhemilev to the Crimea as he will be refused registration.
>
> *Chairman of Surveillance Commission*

On 30 November M. Dzhemilev was dispatched to Tashkent by aeroplane (with special escort and in handcuffs).

* * *

Yury Litvin (*Chronicles* 39, 46), who was serving a 3-year term in Corrective Labour Institution 25 (Komi Autonomous Republic), asked in April 1977 to be put forward for 'conditional release with compulsory recruitment for work', but subsequently he was left in camp on the basis of the medical report of doctor Frolova: 'Litvin cannot be sent to a building site as he has a work assignment and is ill.' Two weeks later Frolova refused Litvin diet-food (he has an ulcer) after writing that he was 'absolutely healthy'.

On 3 May Litvin wrote a statement 'to the chairman of the K G B of the Komi A S S R' in which he described the harassment of him by the administration. In particular — because of the 'diagnosis' of Frolova, who announced that he was pretending — he nearly died (perforation of ulcer, which took place in the cooler where he was sent for 'simulation' and where he was kept, nonetheless, for the whole of the 10 days assigned to him), but was saved in the republican hospital. In his statement Litvin expressed the conviction that all this was being done as part of 'a special plan on the part of the highest authorities in regard to dissenters' and that the K G B was among those involved. A K G B representative who arrived at the camp tried to convince him that the K G B did not interfere in the activities of corrective-labour institutions.

On 16 May, three days after this conversation, head of institution 25, Lieutenant-Colonel Dobrynin, swearing obscenely, told Litvin off for his complaint, and in reply to his objections sent him to the cooler.

On 22 May Litvin sent a complaint to Andropov, urging him not only to restore justice in regard to him, Litvin, but also to wage a struggle against the inhuman procedures in the camps, as these created fertile soil for the growth of anti-state activity.

After writing a letter to the Komi regional party committee, in which Litvin described the circumstances of the death of a 29-year-old prisoner who died from a heart attack without any medical assistance at all, on 12 July Litvin was called out to the Council of the Colony Collective and again sent to the cooler for 15 days 'for slander'. For the whole of this period Litvin kept up a hunger-strike, demanding that the procurator be called.

On 1 August Litvin wrote an open letter to Brezhnev; in it he set forth the history of his persecution in camp, and linked it with the existing inhuman practice of 're-education' in the labour-camp system. In this letter he also states: '. . . I have committed no crime against the workers of the Soviet Union . . . or against the working people of any country . . . In my works, for which I was convicted by the regional court, I wrote the truth and only the truth, and it is not my fault that the truth is persecuted in our country.' — (See also 'Releases'.)

* * *

A worker from Magadan, **Victor Kuzmich Gridasov** (*Chronicles* 44, 46), who had served a half-year term of imprisonment in a camp near Magadan, was not released at the end of his sentence (26 May 1977). In May he was charged under article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. From the moment the new charge was brought Gridasov declared a hunger-strike and kept it up for 75 days.

The case was heard in the Magadan regional court on 3 September. I. Ya. Nazin was presiding, and the prosecutor was deputy procurator of the region M. I. Guryayev. Gridasov was charged with the oral spreading of slanderous fabrications (some of the witnesses were from the camp) and with writing a letter to the newspaper *Baltimore Sun*; in the letter he described the persecution to which he was being subjected for trying to give up his Soviet citizenship and to emigrate (he had handed in an official statement and paid the tax), and certain events which were taking place in Magadan. For example, the self-immolation outside the regional party headquarters in 1976 of a man who had despaired of obtaining a place to live.

His sentence was 2 years of imprisonment.

On 6 September the newspaper *Magadan Truth* printed an article by

B. Ulasovsky, 'The Shadow of Herostratus', about Gridasov and his trial.

The article says about the corpus delicti:

> . . . Through his friends he tried to send slanderous letters to the American newspaper *Baltimore Sun.* But his chums proved to be sufficiently sensible and the letters fell into the hands of another addressee. As a result they figured at the trial . . .
>
> Dozens of witnesses at the pre-trial and judicial investigation confirmed that Gridasov had falsely claimed in conversation with them that there was a lack of genuinely democratic freedoms in our country and had alleged that tyranny was exercised over the workers.

The greater part of the article is composed of information vilifying Gridasov: an 'artistic' description of his meeting with Americans (journalists and a consul) in Moscow, his 'criminal past' (hooliganism and violating the residence regulations), his quarrelsome disposition at work, and his amoral family behaviour. These accusations use real facts from the biography of Gridasov, but distort or ignore the true circumstances, which essentially alter their meaning.

* * *

Julia Voznesenskaya, on her way from Vorkuta to a camp (*Chronicle* 46), was by chance an eye-witness of certain events which she described in a letter:

On 21 August a prisoner-transport of girls arrived at Novosibirsk Prison from an educational labour colony, on their way to an 'adult' camp (a Corrective Labour Colony), because they had reached the age of 18.

On the morning of 22 August the girls were taken to the baths. That evening they were taken to the baths again. This time (it appears from the behaviour of the wardress that it was a customary 'joke') they were deliberately showered first with boiling water, then with cold water, which it was impossible to avoid in the crowded shower-room. After the showers, the girls were driven naked along the corridor, where a laughing crowd of men — warders and prisoners who worked for the administration — had gathered. All this took place under the eyes of a young doctor and the warder on duty.

The main battle took place at night. Already during the day the senior warder had threatened the girls with punishment because they were singing in their cell.

> At midnight the door opened and two duty warders appeared — with a fireman's hose in their hands. 'We'll give you a farewell bath,' they declared. Other warders were standing in the corridor . . .
>
> Two of them came into the cell and began to spray a powerful jet of cold water over the girls, chasing them around the cell. Many of them were undressed, then one warder sprayed and beat them with the hose, while the other threw them out into the corridor one by one. In the corridor the prison guards on duty were drawn up in two rows. The girls were made to run between the ranks of about 24 men, who beat them with their fists, with the hosepipe and with their keys. Then they were driven through underground corridors into 'box' cells. These corridors are damp, filthy, with pools of water in them and almost without light. The girls ran down them half-naked, in their bare feet, the healthy along with the sick. They were led up from the cellar into a corridor, towards the 'box' cells. The guards had gone round by another corridor and were ranged once more in two ranks, waiting for them. They were made to run the gauntlet a second time. All of them were locked in a 'box' cell for four persons — 21 girls altogether. Then the guards discussed among themselves the need to make somebody clear up the cell. They let out five girls and took them back to the cell: 'If you don't get it cleared up in 5 minutes, watch out!' The table had been overturned, the bunks had been pushed over and there was water up to their ankles in the cell.
>
> In the 'box' cell, the girls were afraid to speak even in whispers. They began to find it hard to breathe. From the corridor they heard insults and threats. The guards threatened to put them in handcuffs, in straitjackets, to give them a thrashing. 10 minutes later they were all starting to suffocate. The first to lose consciousness was **Sveta Medvedeva.** The girls began to knock on the door, asking to be let out, asking that Sveta be taken out. 'When she snuffs it, then we'll open up.' But they did neverthless open the door after 15 minutes. The wardress on duty ordered the girls to put Sveta on the floor and go back into the 'box' again.
>
> Sveta regained consciousness in the medical section. The medical orderlies looked over her case-history, saw that she was in bad health and began to enquire why she was travelling without medical care. In Sveta's presence a telephone call informed the medical orderlies that **Natasha Kachulina** had begun to have an epileptic fit. The doctor told the orderlies, 'They're just getting what they deserve. They're pretending anyway.'
>
> Another girl, who had also suffered from epilepsy since childhood, began to have a fit; she too was refused medical assistance. Both of them had their illness already noted in their case histories, which they had with them.
>
> **Tanya Tapenya** had an attack of breathlessness. She fell on the floor, crouched down and began to tear at her throat with her fingers, then lost consciousness. The girls again began to beat on the door. The door was opened, permission was given to let out all

three of them, and they were thrown on the cold cement floor. Because of the cold the girls regained consciousness. They were immediately told to go into another 'box'. They did not have the strength to do so. They were shouted at and threatened. They crawled along the floor on all fours into the 'box' they were assigned to. There was one male warder in the corridor and two wardresses. They mocked the girls and laughed at them for not being able to get up and for crawling on all fours, calling them dogs and bitches, and insulting them in foul language. Tanya Tapenya kept repeating 'I've never, never been so insulted.'

The three girls were locked in a big cell, but it had a wet cement floor, with pools of water on it. However they did not get up off the floor.

In the small 'box', the next to lose consciousness was Ira Rusak, a perfectly healthy girl. She was followed by **Ira Evseyeva.** The girls knocked on the door for 25 minutes. Then the door was opened and they were ordered 'Out, all of you'. They were taken to the 'box' where the other three were. There they sat till morning, sitting or standing on the wet cement floor. There were two benches, but everyone could not sit on them. Ira Medvedeva was also brought there from the medical section. Zhenya Vlasova began to have cramps in her legs. At 5 o'clock in the morning they could hold out no longer and began to knock (some of them were in their underwear, one only had her underpants on — and all of them were wet through). The wardress said: 'If you keep knocking, you'll sit there all day!' They were taken out only in time for breakfast. In their cell they fell asleep on wet mattreses.

The next day Voznesenskaya demanded that the prison administration should start an investigation. The prison authorities interviewed those who had suffered and promised to punish those responsible. 'I don't believe their promises,' writes Voznesenskaya. 'The authorities showed very little surprise at this story.' (Some of the girls had suffered similar torments in the same prison in December 1975 and in November 1976.)

A Camp Revolt

From 28 January to 8 April 1977 the Omsk regional court held a closed hearing on the riots which took place on 21-23 August 1976 in Corrective Labour Colony 8 (Omsk region).

17 people faced charges according to article 77, paragraph 1 ('actions disorganizing the work of corrective-labour institutions') and article 79 of the R S F S R Criminal Code ('mass rioting'). They were sentenced to between 6 and 10 years in strict-regime camps (two got special-regime), in addition to the sentences they were already serving (most

of them were serving 2 to 6 years for hooliganism and robbery).

According to the verdict the revolt had begun in the camp prison. The prisoners there had broken down the doors to the cells and the prison and began to call for support from those in the camp zone itself. During the ensuing riots, some small buildings were destroyed and some activists among the prisoners were beaten up. Troops were summoned, but they met resistance (stones, sticks and barricades round the barracks) and could not immediately restore order. One of the statements to the appeal court said:

> The revolt came about on impulse. The prisoners had their reasons, for which the camp administration was to blame; in particular camp officials had blackmailed and beaten up prisoners more than once. They also tried to recruit informers by any means . . . They tried to humiliate those prisoners who refused their offers before the others and spread vile rumours about them, thus creating hostility among the prisoners themselves.

One of those sentenced at the trial recounted:

> On 21 August 1976, at 10 o'clock at night, rumours started going round the camp zone that prisoners were being beaten up in the punishment cells and a fire-engine was sent there. Many prisoners assembled and all of them set off for the cells, as they knew that the fire-engine was summoned only to subdue prisoners. There had been many cases of prisoners being beaten by the camp administration . . .
>
> One such case was when Corporal Beloborodov, who was in charge of the cells and the camp prison, insulted the prisoner **Ulyashov,** calling him a 'pederast'. Ulyashov replied to this in foul language. He was taken out of his cell, put in hand-cuffs and hung up on a fence; then they began to beat him, concentrating their blows on his liver and kidneys. Those who beat him were Beloborodov, and Vdabenko, head of the military guard, also a corporal. After the beating, Ulyashov was put in a solitary cell. Medical assistance was summoned. Captain Klara Andreyevna Putalova, head of the medical section, came. In answer to Ulyashov's complaints, she told him he was pretending to be ill. The prisoners who were in the punishment cells began to shout and protest. Ulyashov was transferred from solitary to cell 7. A little later there was another attempt to enter his cell. He would not allow anyone in, as he knew they were going to beat him again. Those in charge summoned the fire-engine. They soaked Ulyashov with a jet of water and then entered the cell. The prisoners protested loudly and declared a hunger-strike, so that the procurator would be summoned. Ulyashov was put in cell 6, with the prisoner Koltsov, who had been involved

in the revolt. He saw what kind of state Ulyashov was in when he was thrown into the cell. He had been beaten with a fireman's hose, boots and a wooden stick. The next day Ulyashov was taken away from camp 8, but we don't know where. We sent a complaint to the procurator's office, asking for those in charge to be dismissed, to which he agreed, but nothing happened; the officials in charge keep on working as they have always done, and have begun to behave even worse to the prisoners . . . The security section is working well too. A prisoner who refused to work for this section was beaten up a number of of times . . . The prisoner **Shubin** was summoned in December 1975 and offered work as an informer. He refused, so he was stripped naked and sent back to his section on the other side of the camp in 40 degrees of frost . . .

After the revolt, the following officials were among those removed from their posts: deputy political officer Major Kartavtsev, Lieutenant-Colonel Polyakov, deputy head for regime, Captain Putalova, head of the medical section, and the senior security official, First Lieutenant Kirillov. This means they were considered in some sense responsible for provoking the spontaneous revolt . . . Troops were brought into camp 8. Security official Lieutenant Kershtein was standing by the watchtower. He indicated with his fingers who was to be seized. That prisoner was then made to run between two ranks of soldiers. They had cudgels in their hands and with these they 'sent' the prisoner on his way to the prison wagon. We were taken straight to the town of Tavsa [Tavricheskoe?] and from there to Omsk prison. There we spent almost a year. The trial was in closed court. Relatives were not allowed in. They were allowed into the courtroom only for the verdict. The judge did not allow the prisoners to say anything in their defence. The witnesses and those who were injured were questioned by him only after he read out the evidence they had given at the pre-trial investigation. Then they had to give evidence agreeing with what he had read. Many did not 'remember' what they had said at the pre-trial investigation, and he would then assist them.

Letters and Statements of Political Prisoners

Mordovian Camp 1 (special-regime)

Open Letter to L. I. Brezhnev, concerning the draft USSR Constitution, from *N. Evgrafov, E. Kuznetsov, A. Murzhenko, M. Osadchy, B. Rebrik, P. Saranchuk, Yu. Fyodorov* and *D. Shumuk*

After a number of sharp 'queries' revealing the difficult conditions prisoners endure, the authors write:

> We could go on asking these questions, but we are quite convinced that whatever you write in the new Constitution, none of it will be put into practice, any more than the old one was. All that is just camouflage, to deceive the public.
>
> From the historical experience of the past and the tendencies of the present, we have already concluded in advance that any articles of the new Constitution which proclaim limited rights for Soviet people will remain on paper . . .

Appeal to Soviet Public Opinion from *N. Evgrafov, S. Karavansky, E. Kuznetsov, A. Murzhenko, M. Osadchy, V. Romanyuk, B. Rebrik, P. Saranchuk* and *D. Shumuk*

The political prisoners write that recently the Soviet press has begun a campaign to discredit people languishing in Soviet concentration camps, trying in every way to blacken their activities and moral character:

> . . . Inhuman conditions have been created in Soviet concentration camps. Many of the most upright people, those most devoted to the cause of democracy and freedom, are spending their best years in overcrowded cells; the overwhelming majority of them suffer from some illness, including neuro-psychological illnesses. There's nothing surprising in the fact that conflicts sometime arise among us, as they are skilfully fomented by the camp administration.

The text of the appeal is basically concerned with analysing the libellous article in the Lvov paper *Leninist Youth* of 9 July 1977, the author of which is allegedly the former prisoner Yablonsky.

> We are deprived of the possibility of replying to slanderers who are state officials . . . of unmasking them publicly in the Soviet press. So we appeal to you from our thrice-locked cells to show your contempt from the slanderers and traitors Petrov-Agatov, Zakharchenko and Yablonsky, and others if they should offer their services in the future.

Open Letter from *Yu. Fyodorov*

In his letter Fyodorov exposes the above-mentioned article by Yablonsky which libelled the community of Ukrainian political prisoners, and attacks its 'author'.

Yablonsky, a 'typical criminal', although he was imprisoned on a political charge, was known in the camp as an informer and a despicable character. When a man is clearly a degenerate and cannot put three words together, he could not have been the author of the cleverly-written article:

> . . . As more 'Yablonskys' will be publishing articles in future, I appeal to honest people to show their contempt for informers and criminal pawns. The K G B sends them into our camps to make use of them in provocative acts and fights; it uses their presence in our midst to give authenticity to articles about us signed by them . . .

Do not believe any article published in newspapers about us or our living conditions. . . they are public flagellations of us prisoners. We live in inhuman conditions, in a tense atmosphere of provocations, repressions and baiting, which has especially increased because of the international campaign for human rights. Our life is difficult, but it resembles life in Soviet society as a whole. We have our differences and disagreements, but it is not for the Yablonskys of this world to judge us . . .

Fyodorov writes that, having known Ukrainian political prisoners for many years, as they were always a majority in the camp, he could only speak of them as unselfish, highly cultured and intelligent people, inspired by the ideas of their great nation, for which they live and work; they lead their lives nobly.

'The truth, the facts about the Ukrainian patriots have guided my pen.'

V. Romanyuk: Appeal to Jews and all People of Goodwill (11 September 1977)

The appeal speaks about the fate of the group of Jews who in 1970 'made an attempt illegally to leave a country which had become a prison to them' (Kuznetsov, Dymshits, Fyodorov, Murzhenko, I. and V. Zalmanson, Penson and others). Since then Soviet emigration policy has become somewhat more liberal; many thousands of people have already been able to leave the U S S R, but those who so bravely stood up against illegality and cruelty are still wasting in camps and prisons.

I appeal to all people of goodwill, above all to all true children of Israel, to do all they can to have Eduard Kuznetsov and his comrades released . . . the fight for their release from captivity cannot be carried on out of utilitarian considerations. For many of us, those of another faith, their fate has become symbolic . . .

V. Romanyuk: Appeal to Catholic Priests and Believers in Western Europe

The author expresses his disquiet, on behalf of believers in the Soviet Union, at the large number of supporters communist ideas have gained in Western Europe.

If European communists were really concerned about democracy and justice, they would not close their eyes to what has happened and is still going on in the Soviet Union.

Father V. Romanyuk calls on Christians not to 'sit with their arms folded'. He describes the violation of believers' rights in the U S S R, particularly the liquidation of the Ukrainian Church: over 2000 Uniate priests were shot or perished in concentration camps. The 'legal' Orthodox Church is also in a miserable position.

We . . . address our appeal to all ordinary Catholic priests and believers of the Catholic countries of Europe, first of all in Italy and France, where communist successes have been greatest, so that you may realize the great danger of communist tyranny that threatens Europe.

V. Romanyuk: To the Presidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet (8 February 1977)

In his open letter Romanyuk condemns the Decree of 8 February 1977, according to which 'conditional release with compulsory labour' can now be applied also to especially dangerous recidivists, including political prisoners. As the latter are in the charge of the K G B, people will be sent off to compulsory labour and put under the supervision of the K G B.

The Soviet government has thought up this Decree, whose aim is to make innocent condemned people admit to some guilt, and thus cover up the latest crime against human personality . . The Decree . . . gives the punitive organs the opportunity to apply any repressive acts of violence and terror against anyone, in specific new conditions. It is precisely because of this that I must reject the Decree, as I don't wish to participate in any deception of world public opinion.

M. Osadchy: To Brezhnev, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet

Osadchy writes that, according to the Decree of 8 February 1977, he is under threat of being sent forcibly to the town of Sumy for compulsory labour under open K G B supervision — 900 kilometres from his family, his wife and two children. Sentenced for publishing his story *Cataract* in the West, Osadchy does not agree that this constitutes 'anti-Soviet activity', the charge on which he was condemned. 'Even the great executioner Stalin did not sentence people directly for artistic creation.'

Osadchy regards his possible removal to Sumy — where he could be beaten up (like his mother) or killed by criminals (like his brother Vladimir Osadchy on 5 April 1975, when there was no investigation) — as a clear threat and a reference to his brother's fate.

Citizen Chairman, your Decree of 8 February 1977 is intended not to humanize the punitive system of our country, but to switch it over to more subtle methods of terror . . . Save me from its murderous enactment. I need to be exculpated, and only exculpated, not to be given a criminal sentence with open supervision and forced labour.

N. Evgrafov: (beginning lost)

In assessing the situation in Soviet society, which has turned into a 'police school system', the author expresses his joy that 'a sense of civic duty, of national consciousness and dignity is beginning to awake . . .'

I appeal to you, to all true communists and socialists, to all representatives of the workers, and I beg you to speak out against Asiatic Soviet pseudo-communism . . . and the totalitarianism which hides behind Marxism. I hope that Soviet dissidents will find support and solidarity among the progressive activists of communist and socialist parties.

I. Stasiv-Kalynets, M. Osadchy, O. Popovich, I. Senik, B. Rebrik, D. Shumuk, N. Evgrafov and V. Dolishny: To the Holy See, the World Council of Churches, the National Council of Christian Churches in the U S A, to the governments and parliaments of countries which were signatories of the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement

Ukrainian political prisoners wish to bring the 'crying violation of elementary human rights in our country' to the attention of Christians throughout the world and all people of goodwill. They take as an example the fate of Father Vasily Romanyuk, who got 10 years 'for being an especially dangerous recidivist'. They write that, according to influential clergymen, Father Romanyuk is above the average as a preacher and is distinguished for his active part in church affairs.

It is not without cause that his name is now used to intimidate priests in the Ukraine . . . but at the same time he has become a real martyr for the word of God, for the faith . . . We hope that all people of goodwill will make the greatest effort to put an end to this savage punishment of a true son of the Church.

The authors ask that foreign journalists should obtain permission to visit their camp and that efforts should be made to ensure that political prisoners receive letters from abroad. They express their support for President Carter's policy in defence of human rights; they ask him to insist that in return for every visit made by Soviet journalists to American prisons, the Soviet authorities should allow American journalists to visit Soviet prisons and camps.

Perm Camp 36

S. Kovalyov: U S S R Procurator-General Rudenko (18 November 1976)

It has come to my knowledge that on 16 November 1976 K G B official Major Afanasov used inexcusably foul language in speaking to political prisoner S. E. Sapelyak in the camp reading-room, even addressing him with the familiar 'you' and calling him insulting names. A camp official and the librarian were witnesses of this unworthy scene, but I have not the slightest reason to doubt S. E. Sapelyak's word.

As a protest against this insult and to demand an explanation of the discreditable incident, Sapelyak went on hunger-strike. He has already been on hunger-strike for three days, but no explanations have so far been forthcoming. In addition, Major Afanasov threatened Sapleyak, saying the camp administration would put him in the camp prison for 15 days — and it was certainly strange how punishments for breaking the regulations rained down on Sapelyak all at once, as if from a horn of plenty. Does the camp administration really intend obediently to put this threat into practice? Unfortunately, the laws I have access to say nothing about regulations governing K G B activity — or about how such activity is to be monitored. They contain no information about K G B authority in camps for political prisoners; and K G B officials won't answer such questions. However, in such K G B activity denigration of human dignity must presumably also be considered unlawful. I ask you to enquire into this incident, to restore law and order, and to protect Sapelyak from insults and reprisals.

S. Kovalyov: To Camp Commandant Zhuravkov (21 November 1976)

Kovalyov calls for immediate action to end S. E. Sapelyak's hunger-strike.

I consider that a satisfactory resolution of the conflict, very natural in the circumstances, would be achieved if some competent person would assure Sapelyak that the insult to his self-respect will not be repeated. Of course this would resolve the conflict only if Sapelyak is not subjected to harassment or reprisals from the K G B.

I. Svetlichny: To the U S S R Procurator-General (3 May 1977)

Svetlichny writes that at the end of the previous year he — an invalid with serious injuries to both arms, high blood-pressure and angiospasms — was made to work as a compressor-worker in camp 35. He was punished many times for his inability to manage this work; only after two letters to Brezhnev was he given work suited to his strength. After his transfer to camp 36, he was again forced to do the impossible — he was assigned to work in the bath-house laundry and was refused the medical treatment he had been prescribed in camp 35, because there was no medicine.

He is always being reprimanded and threatened with new punishments for not fulfilling his workload (cutting logs, hauling heavy loads and so on). This 'arbitrary tyranny and moral terror, sanctioned by doctors' without a medical check-up or examination of his medical history, took place on the first day after his arrival in camp 36.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that the state of medical aid here is catastrophic. There is a lack of the most elementary medicines. There are no nurses and prescribed injections are given to the sick not more than once a day and not every day. Because of the state of the medical section, many sick people who need treatment don't even apply for medical assistance. The fact that the

water is unfit to drink, the fish is rotten, and so on — matters on which medicine has no effect — is another whole subject. Considering that this situation is intolerable, while appeals to the local and central medical authorities achieve nothing, I ask that representatives of the International Red Cross be allowed into Institution VS 389/36 . . . to examine the evidence on the spot impartially and objectively.

I. Svetlichny: To Titov, Head of the Medical Section (18 May 1977)

He states that his medical card mentions no limitations on his work-fitness, in spite of his severe physical disabilities. He asks that such limitations be entered on his medical card and that his statement be attached to it.

I. Svetlichny: To Camp Commandant Zhuravkov (2 June 1977)

He states that he, an invalid, has been repeatedly reported for non-fulfilment of the work norm; he has also been obviously and tendentiously picked on — for 'tea-drinking in the open air', which has never before been regarded as a breach of the regime regulations. 'As there can be no question, in my state of health, of my fulfilling the work norm appropriate to a healthy man, this means I shall be subjected to all the varieties of punishment.' Svetlichny asks to be given work appropriate to his capabilities:

> If arbitrary violence and moral terror continue to be used against me, I shall be forced to go on hunger-strike in defence of my rights on the next occasion when repressive action is taken against me.

S. Sapelyak: To Camp Commandant Zhuravkov (18 April 1977)

After systematically listing his transfers from one job to another during a period of six months, Sapelyak notes that these transfers were not formulated in corresponding orders, which is clearly contrary to article 13 of the Basic Principles of Corrective Labour Law and article 25 of the Labour Law Code. He also reports the insulting and unlawful behaviour of Major Fyodorov to him, in trying to force him to do heavy work by means of threats — work he had been forbidden to do by a medical commission because of his hypertonia.

S. Sapelyak: To Procurator-General Rudenko (7 June 1977)

> On 28 May 1977 I sent a statement to L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the C P S U Central Committee, in which I outlined the concrete facts about the so-called 'educational' measures taken with regard to myself in Corrective Labour Colony 389/36. Obviously the statement was not sent to the addressee, in an attempt to hide from the Central Committee the actions taken to 're-educate dissidents'. Only on 6 June 1977, after a written reminder from me, was the statement sent to Colonel Mikov, head of a U V D department . . .

> I ask you to make it clear to the administration of Corrective Labour Instititution 389/36 that there is a difference between General Secretary Brezhnev of the C P S U Central Committee and Colonel G. I. Mikov, a head of department at the U V D.

S. Sapelyak: To Andropov, Chairman of the K G B (8 June 1977)

In his statement Sapelyak writes that, since the time of his arrest in 1973 (when he was 22 years old), his parents — collective farm-workers with little education — have been subjected to various repressive measures, although the conclusions of the investigation commission made it clear that they had nothing to do with his 'case'. Their letters are being held back, his mother is summoned by the K G B and threatened, and suggestions are made to them that they should renounce their son. In May 1977 his mother was again summoned by the K G B:

> . . . they threatened to send her to prison and demanded that she should stop corresponding with people abroad who had expressed their sympathy for our family. Terrorised and intimidated, my mother lives in constant fear, not only on my behalf but now also on her own behalf . . . I find it hard to imagine that this is being done with your knowledge. I ask you to tell your colleagues in Ternopol that such actions are impermissible, and to protect my parents from repressive measures.

V. Marchenko: To Titov, Head of the Medical Section (14 May 1977)

Marchenko reports that the state of his health has recently taken a sharp turn for the worse (he has chronic glomerular nephritis [kidney disorder], cystitis, headaches and high blood-pressure) and that he is receiving no medical treatment. He asks to be immediately put into hospital and also asks that enquiries be made concerning treatment in the institute where he was being treated before his arrest. (V. Marchenko was sent to a hospital in September — *Chronicle.*)

V. Marchenko: To Zhuravkov, Camp Commandant (14 May 1977)

Marchenko writes that on 4 May engineer Bulatov made out a complaint about his non-fulfilment of the norm his shift had been assigned, although he was seriously ill with kidney disease. Marchenko asks that those in charge of production should be reminded that the administration of a Corrective Labour Institution is bound to provide work for prisoners in accordance with their capabilities (article 37 of the R S F S R Corrective Labour Code) and also in accordance with the articles on 'abuse of power' and 'deliberate torment' in the Criminal Code and article 1 of the Corrective Labour Code.

P. Plumpa: To Camp Commandant Zhuravkov (8 June 1977)

On the evening of 5 June Plumpa's hand-made Catholic prayer-book in the Lithuanian language was confiscated. Captain Rak, who took

away the prayer-book, declared that a charge would be brought against Plumpa for allegedly insulting him. This was not the first false report against Plumpa which used Russian terms he could not understand. Plumpa also writes about other forms of national discrimination: lengthy detention of his letters, de facto deprivation of short-term visits (at these, Russian is compulsory, but his wife and children don't speak it).

Therefore, taking into account the fact that I was brought forcibly to Russia from my native Lithuania and that the USSR Constitution guarantees equal rights to all nations, and I want to avoid in future any false accusations based on language, I have decided that, from 6 June 1977, I shall speak to representatives of the camp administration only in my native Lithuanian.

V. Kavoliunas: To Titov, Head of the Medical Section (18 April 1977)

After two weeks in hospital because of his recent illness, V. Kavoliunas was summoned to the medical section on 31 March, 'but Major Fyodorov did not allow him to see the doctor and ordered him to go to the camp zone at once, assigning him to especially heavy work in the saw-mill'. Kavoliunas describes the symptoms of his sharply worsening health as a result of this work and asks Titov to take steps to give him medical treatment. (Kavoliunas did not receive any medical attention or treatment, or any special food-diet — *Chronicle.*)

V. Kavoliunas: To Rudenko, Procurator-General of the USSR (8 May 1977)

24 years ago I was taken from Lithuania to Russia and put in a concentration camp for political prisoners, although until then I had never been in Russia and had not done Russia any harm. During 24 years in concentration camps I lost my health, began to feel severe pains in the region of my heart and stomach, but I cannot obtain medical treatment, as the treatment of prisoners depends not on the camp doctor, but on Major Fyodorov, the deputy commandant responsible for discipline.

. . . I ask the Procurator-General of the USSR to allow a representative of the International Red Cross to visit our camp, in order to determine the situation here and secure the necessary treatment for sick prisoners.

D. Basarab: To the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet (14 June 1977)

As I have no hope of the Belgrade Conference moving the USSR to fulfil the obligations it undertook, which are traditionally violated in this country, I still consider it my moral duty to protest against the constant cynical infringement of basic rights and individual freedoms in the Soviet Union.

* * *

From an interview with political prisoner Ivan Shovkovoi (Perm camp 35)

'Do you consider yourself a political activist?'

'No . . . I'm an ordinary man, a worker, I never thought about politics as a profession. I'm only a political prisoner because the government classed me as such when they shut me up in a camp.'

'Have you renounced your Soviet citizenship?'

'Yes, I want to emigrate . . . because I don't know how I can be of use to Ukraine here in the USSR, after I leave the camp. Then I want to have a family and bring up my own children, to read normal Ukrainian books not "literature in the Ukrainian language".'

'What has been your worst experience in the camp?'

'I saw how living men disintegrated, how the human soul was defaced. People who had fought for the Faith, for the Homeland, for Justice . . . are tormented to the point of exhaustion, lose all self-confidence and begin to serve the enemy . . . knowing they are committing treachery, not believing in any ideals of communism. Not all, not very many, but some become traitors.'

'What is the brightest, the best experience you have had here?'

'The fact that, in spite of undergoing the whole horror and torment of the Stalinist camps, the tortures, the starvation, the treachery of friends and much else, there were people who had worn the padded jackets of zeks for 25 years and more, who had preserved their faith in God and their loyalty to the homeland, and these people are the majority.'

In Defence of Political Prisoners

T. Velikanova, A. Lavut, P. Grigorenko, N. Meiman, Yu. Zaks, M. Landa, A. Podrabinek, P. Podrabinek, I. Valitova-Orlova, T. Osipova, I. Zholkovskaya-Ginzburg, L. Ginzburg, T. Khromova, V. Bakhmin and I. Kaplun:

30 October — Political Prisoners' Day

Today this day was marked for the fourth time. The problem of political prisoners in the USSR is essentially a problem of human rights. People who have committed no offence, either political or criminal, in the commonly accepted sense of these words, are subjected to criminal punishment. They are condemned for their words, their thoughts, their faith, or for their unwillingness to live in this country . . . Soviet political prisoners are watching with hope and anxiety to see if the defence of human rights will become the ruling principle of international relations.

Pointing out that 'the health of prisoners is being ruinously destroyed' in the prisons and camps, the authors of the statement appeal to Amnesty International and the International Red Cross

to consider the problem of preserving the health of Soviet political prisoners, to try to carry out inspections of the camps and to try to send medicines to the prisoners, to obtain the right for them to consult doctors and the most elementary rights of all — sufficient food of good quality.

The statement also says that an important part of aid to political prisoners would be the ending of the isolation they are subjected to by the authorities, who try to keep their conditions of detention secret.

(For other statements on 30 October, see the 'Letters and Statements' section.)

Valentina Barladyanu: To the Ukrainian Helsinki Monitoring Group (20 July 1977)

Vasily Barladyanu's wife writes that her husband's trial was in fact held in closed court and its outcome was determined in advance. She also reports that:

> . . . as a result of a 4-month hunger-strike, Barladyanu's life is in danger: he has begun to lose the use of one leg. In spite of this, he was first examined by a doctor only after the trial was over.

Valentina Barladyanu asks the Helsinki Group to assist in her husband's defence by publicizing the evidence in his case, and also to appeal for help to the International Red Cross.

P. Grigorenko: To the International Congress of Psychiatrists (26 August 1977)

> Come to the aid of your colleague, the doctor and psychiatrist Semyon Gluzman.
>
> He is imprisoned in a camp just because he dared to openly oppose the false diagnosis which condemned me, a sane man, to five years' imprisonment in a psychiatric prison.
>
> Demand the immediate release of Semyon Gluzman, who upheld the high calling of a doctor at the risk of his own life.

O. Meshko, Z. Vivchar: Complaint to the Head of the Medical Administration of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Strusov (10 October 1977)

The mother and wife of Alexander Sergienko write:

> For participating in a protest hunger-strike on 8 October, he was deprived of the medical diet he had been prescribed by the medical section for the month of October.

They also complain about other actions of the doctor in camp 36, Petrov. On 30 May 1977 he took Sergienko off the list of tuberculosis cases, on his own authority, and in March he allowed him to be sent from a sickbed to serve 15 days in a punishment cell. They also complain about the incorrect treatment given to Sergienko in the hospital of camp 35, which made his condition worse.

O. Meshko and Z. Vivchar ask that Sergienko be sent to a specialized hospital, as this is required by his present condition and the diagnosis he was given before his arrest: chronic disseminated tuberculosis of both lungs.

P. G. Grigorenko: Mykola Rudenko is being tortured! An Open Letter to the Participants of the Belgrade Conference (18 October 1977)

P. G. Grigorenko writes that for Rudenko, who suffers from an illness of the spine (the result of a wound he received at the front), the prison regime is the cause of constant physical pain, to which are added 'moral tortures': attempts to make him repent and announcements that the Group he led has been broken up.

> Offers are made to him of freedom from physical pain and release from imprisonment at the price of falsehood and treachery. He has described this in the natural language of a poet — in a poem which, after a long and difficult two-month journey, has finally reached the person it was addressed to: myself.
>
> . . . Obviously these cunning tortures are intended to make M. Rudenko bear witness to his 'repentance', to state that the cruel and unjust sentence passed on O. Tikhy and himself, based on a fabricated charge, was just and humane.

Grigorenko appeals:

> Demand an immediate end to the physical and moral tortures being used on a war invalid! Demand the release from imprisonment of the unjustly sentenced Ukrainian poet Mykola* Rudenko and his fellow-defendant Oleksa* Tikhy!

Grigorenko attaches the poem by Rudenko to his open letter, in his own hasty translation:

> That's all you have to do: repent,
> And you'll get the right to live. . . .
> Just those ten tormented words,
> Which you've mumbled out in the dark,
> And you exist no more — there's just the dark
> Just the hidden prison inside.

Raisa Rudenko: An Open Letter to the Governments of States Participating in the Belgrade Conference (1 November 1977)

M. Rudenko's wife asks that the problems 'of human fates and rights' should not be forgotten 'behind the great questions' of peace and security. She describes the train of persecutions against the members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, concluding with the confirmation of the sentence passed on Rudenko and Tikhy by the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian S S R on 15 September 1977.

Even since the sentence was confirmed he is still being kept in

---

[*The Russian forms are, respectively, Nikolai and Aleksei.]

Donetsk prison, where they continue to torment him spiritually. During his short visit from his wife (about 1 hour), which took place through a double-paned window, with the aid of a telephone, he was not allowed to talk about anything except his health.

At the same time, other people who are not related to him have had access to him for unlimited conversation face to face, across a table. And no one interrupted their conversations. All this was because these people were offering a peculiar bargain: if Mykola Rudenko would announce the abolition of the Group in the press and condemn its activities, then he would be pardoned and released! They also threatened that if he didn't do this, his wife would face the same fate!

My husband does not receive many letters, although they are not returned to me. Neither have I received any letters from him, although by law correspondence has been allowed since the Supreme Court trial.

A few days ago I came to know that the administration of Donetsk prison had not sent me a letter addressed to me and had returned it to Mykola Rudenko merely because he had written to his wife — *in Ukrainian.* A striking example for a discussion on human rights! Mykola Rudenko, a war-invalid who suffers from many serious illnesses, 'is threatened with death every day that he remains in prison'.

Gentlemen!

Demand the immediate release of Mykola Rudenko, Aleksei Tikhy and other members of the Group!

I. Kovalyov: Open Letter (October 1977)

S. Kovalyov's son gives some details of his father's detention in a camp: how he was punished for protesting against an order forbidding the wearing of warm boots (*Chronicle* 44); the absence of necessary medicines; the confiscation of a letter (in draft form — *Chronicle*) to the Procurator-General; the 'disappearance' of letters that had been passed by the censors. He writes about two visits (that took place on 7 June and 7 October):

My first, 'short' visit was limited to two hours because of the 'bad behaviour' . . . *of L. Boitsova, my father's wife,* during a 'long' visit. My second visit was also limited to two hours, for unknown reasons. I shared this visit with L. Boitsova.

After the usual 'instructions' from a security official, we were personally instructed by the camp commandant Zhuravkov. His instructions to us included: a prohibition on 'conveying dirt from abroad', 'talking about Sakharov', 'giving messages from other people' . . . permission 'to talk for the whole of two hours, if necessary, about the health of our grandmother'.

We were not told the legal basis for the limitations placed on the subject-matter of the conversation, despite all our requests; we merely received assurances that this was a personal order from Zhuravkov.

Similar conditions are made before visits to any prisoner. As we found out, my father had been forbidden to talk about his correspondence at all, but at this he refused to participate in the visit, and so the prohibition was lifted.

The visit was broken off after 1 hour 50 minutes, without any clear reason being given. The day of the visit — 7 October — was the fourth day of a protest hunger-strike to mark the beginning of the Belgrade Conference.

I. Kovalyov declares:

I consider that, if I had kept quiet about this, I would have been cooperating with the punitive organs . . . in trying to keep their criminal activities secret.

I. Kovalyov: To the Procurator-General (28 November 1977)

Reporting his father's renunciation of the right to correspondence (see above 'Perm Camps'), I. Kovalyov quotes his own words: 'For correspondence to be resumed, it will be quite enough for me to receive a guarantee from you that legality will be observed.' On his side, I. Kovalyov asks that

the five 'lost' letters should be taken out of the place where they 'disappeared' and sent to the people to whom they were addressed; I ask that the senders of letters addressed to my father, which were confiscated by the camp administration, should be informed of their whereabouts.

Releases

On 5 November **Nikolai Bondar's** 7-year term of imprisonment came to an end (*Chronicles* 23, 33, 44). Before the end of his sentence he was transferred from Vladimir prison to the Ukraine.

Vladimir Afanasev (*Chronicles* 33, 36, 44) has been released from Vladimir prison before his sentence was up. His term was due to end in 1980, not in 1984, as stated in *Chronicle* 44.

Antanas Burbulis has been released early from Mordovian camp 19. He was serving 15 years for 'treason to the motherland'. His sentence was due to end in 1979 or 1980. Burbulis is an invalid (he has only one leg).

In the same camp **Mikhail Zhurakovsky** (Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army and Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists) was released on 16 November at the end of a 25-year sentence.

One of the leaders of VSKhON [the All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Liberation of the People], **Mikhail Sado** (*Chronicles* 1, 19, 33), has been released early from Perm camp 36, after a pardon. His 13-year sentence was due to end in 1980.

Alexander Litvinenko (who got 5 years for 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda') has been released early from the Perm camps.

On 14 November **Yury Litvin** (*Chronicles* 37, 39 and this issue) was released from an ordinary regime camp in the Komi A S S R at the end of a 3-year sentence.

After Release

Tarusa. On 3 August Judge Karpezhnikov again (*Chronicle* 46) fined **Nina Strokata** 20 roubles, for not allowing the policeman Yu. Belov — who was carrying out administrative surveillance on her — into the house. In July or August Karpezhnikov received a party reprimand for giving 'soft sentences'. On 19 August, when Karpezhnikov was on holiday, the routine police report on 'disobedience' was examined by a judge from the neighbouring (Ferzikovo) district, who refused to impose a fine on Strokata.

At the beginning of November Strokata was 'warned' according to the Decree of 25 December 1972, as a result of a search carried out at her home in connection with the Ginzburg case (*Chronicle* 44).

Uzhgorod. Pavel Kampov (*Chronicle* 45) has still not found work. He applied both to the university, where he worked before his arrest, and to the regional department of education, and to many other places (the shoe factory, the industrial clothing factory, the gas appliances factory, the fire-station, the regional book store, the Voluntary Society assisting the Army, Navy and Air Force) and was refused employment everywhere. Voloshko, director of teaching enterprise number 1, told Kampov, 'The K G B has forbidden anyone to employ you.'

Alexandria (Kirovograd region). On 2 August the surveillance order on **Matviyuk** (*Chronicle* 42) was cancelled.

Lvov. On 23 September, two days after his return from a visit to Moscow, **Ivan Alexeyevich Kandyba** (*Chronicle* 45) was summoned to the Lvov regional procurator's office. Here the deputy regional procurator, Rudenko (brother of the Procurator-General of the U S S R), and General Poluden, head of the regional K G B administration, after expressing various opinions on his behaviour, suggested that he should express his repentance in the press and on television. In return, he was promised permission to live in Lvov and work in his own specialized field (Kandyba is a lawyer). Kandyba refused: a surveillance order on him was immediately renewed — to last for 8 months. The reasons given for this order were: (1) he had consistently refused to work; (2) he had not lived in the place where he was registered; (3) he had been travelling round the districts and towns

of the U S S R. The surveillance restrictions were stricter than before (he had to be at home by 8 o'clock in the evening.) Kandyba was taken straight from the procurator's office to the village of Pustomyty, where he is registered.

Kandyba appealed against the new surveillance order, pointing out that the first charge was false — since June 1977 he had constantly been searching for work in Lvov, and the second and third charges were without foundation, as the fact that he had 'travelled around' did not constitute 'an anti-social way of life', as stated in the 'Surveillance Order'. Obviously, Kandyba declared, the authorities did not consider him a free citizen.

In Pustomyty, Kandyba found work and lodgings only with difficulty (his former room had already been taken). He works as a stoker in a school for 75 roubles a month and rents a room for 25 roubles.

Zhitomir region. On 5 September **Vasily Ovsienko** (*Chronicle* 44), living in the village of Lenino, had his surveillance order prolonged. The following reasons were given for prolonging it: (1) he was maintaining links with 'anti-Soviet elements in places of imprisonment'; (2) he was connected with Matusevich and Marinovich; (3) he had influenced his niece Lyudmila Ryabukha to give 'knowingly false testimony' in the case of Matusevich and Marinovich (see 'The Matusevich-Marinovich Case' in the section 'Helsinki Groups under Investigation').

On 23 September V. Ovsienko wrote a statement to the procurator of the Ukrainian S S R. In it he objects in detail to the reply he received from the procurator of Zhitomir region in answer to his letter to the procurator of the Ukrainian S S R on 8 April (*Chronicle* 45); he describes the conditions of surveillance and the threats under which he now lives, and protests with detailed arguments against the prolongation of the surveillance.

Kiev. In June 1977 **Nikolai Gorbal** (*Chronicles* 33, 44) ended a two-year term of exile (after 5 years in camps). After his marriage he was given a residence permit in Kiev with his wife. While the permit was being made out, the police chief of Pechersky district in Kiev spoke to Gorbal very rudely. Gorbal protested: 'Why are you behaving to me like this? I have not robbed or killed anyone. I served my sentence for writing a poem.' The police chief replied: 'Robbing and killing — that's nothing. Look, we've got a whole list of those cases hanging over there. But you're the only offender against the state that we have in Pechersky district.'

On 4 December Gorbal was summoned to the police station to have his finger-prints taken.

Kiev. After obtaining a residence permit (under administrative surveillance) in Kiev, **Nadezha Svetlichnaya** (*Chronicle* 46) tried to find

work in her own special field ('Ukrainian philology, teaching Ukrainian language and literature'), or at least some job connected with her speciality. She was refused work everywhere. In particular, she was refused a job — 'because of her conviction' — as corrector of translations from Russian into Ukrainian at RATAU (the Ukrainian telegraph agency), where she had applied in answer to a newspaper advertisement. A representative of the district soviet executive committee told Svetlichnaya that she could not work in her specialized field, as she could 'creep into the ideological pocket of the state', but that perhaps she would be allowed to work as a teacher in an infants' school, where the children 'are still little and don't understand ideology'. At certain workplaces (for example, regarding the job of embroideress in a souvenir factory) she was refused work because she had higher education.

After being questioned in connection with the cases of Rudenko, Marinovich, Matusevich and Snegiryov, in November N. Svetlichnaya began to be summoned by the KGB for 'talks' about matters in her own 'dossier' (when she refused to come, they threatened to use force). She was shown her own 'maliciously libellous' letters to the Central Committee, to the Ukrainian Helsinki Group and to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet about her renunciation of Soviet citizenship, and her translation of Memorandum number 2 from the Ukrainian Helsinki Group ('authorship and direct participation'). At these 'talks' Svetlichnaya was charged with disseminating these documents, organizing 'meetings' at the grave of the artist Alla Gorskaya [in Ukrainian: Horska], setting up Christmas carol groups and exhibitions of embroidery, and urging young people to anti-Soviet activity (particularly Marinovich and Matusevich). Another accusation made was that she was bringing up her son incorrectly (he is now 7 years old): she carried on undesirable conversations in front of him, brought him with her to interrogations, took him with her on visits to her brother Ivan Svetlichny in a camp, and travelled to the trial of Rudenko and Tikhy with him. All this, according to the KGB officials, could lead to N. Svetlichnaya's son being taken from her and educated by the state.

The talks with Svetlichnaya were conducted by Lipovitsky, investigator from the republic KGB, and security official Grinchuk. At the end of November they told her that she would soon be informed of the end result of these talks, and that perhaps she would be facing a charge under article 62, paragraph 2, of the Ukrainian SSR Criminal Code (= article 70 of the RSFSR Code).

In November Svetlichnaya was also tried twice for 'infringing the surveillance regulations': as the living conditions were not sufficiently good at the place where she was registered, she had gone to live at the home of her brother's wife. The judge fined her on both occasions.

Three (or more) invitations, sent to N. Svetlichnaya from abroad, have not been delivered to her.

Chernigov. In a letter to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of 24 August, **Lev Lukyanenko,** a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, describes the conditions he had to live in after his release from a camp (*Chronicles* 39, 43): administrative surveillance, which in his case could continue throughout his life, according to Soviet law; perusal of his letters, bugged telephone conversations, the impossibility of working in his own field (Lukyanenko is a lawyer), the constant threat of being arrested again. The letter ends as follows (translation from Ukrainian):

> The prospect of working all my life as an electrician and of gazing at my own homeland only from within the borders of one town, Chernigov, and of being imprisoned once more in addition, is not satisfactory to me and I ask you to allow me to emigrate from the Soviet Union and reside permanently outside its borders.

Gorky. On 2 October **Vladlen Pavlenkov** had his administrative surveillance lifted (*Chronicle* 42). On 3 October, because his place of work was transferred from one organization to another, he was sacked from his job as a boiler-maker. 'I don't need any dissidents at the power-station, they might start poisoning the water-supply,' said the engineer in charge.

In Exile

Chronicle 46 has already reported that **Bogdan Chuiko,** who has been sent from camp 36 into exile in the village of Bakchar in Tomsk region, is not receiving a pension, although he is an invalid of the second group; neither can he obtain a transfer closer to his family, or release from exile.

From a statement by the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, 'On the Fate of Bogdan Chuiko', issued in May 1977, the circumstances have become known in more detail. His disabilities are as follows: he has no toes on his feet and the fingers of his hands are crippled, he has hypertonia, arteriosclerosis, a weak heart; he has had a heart attack, he has eye pains, headaches, breathlessness, and impairment of limb mobility — all this makes him quite unfit for work. He is not being given a pension, as he has no documents proving his labour record or showing how he received invalid status. All his medical documents (like the papers concerning his 'case') were confiscated from him in camp 36. The camp administration should have sent to a court the documents releasing Chuiko from exile and categorizing him as a

man who cannot support himself. In addition to its failure to do this, it made his position even worse by giving him the following character reference:

> . . . He considers himself innocent. Always complaining. Hostile to the existing system . . . Has a bad influence on younger prisoners. A stubborn nationalist. He has not admitted his crime and has not embarked on the path of reform.

As a result Chuiko has been put under administrative surveillance, and he assumes that it is this character reference which has caused the particularly cruel attitude towards him.

The Supreme Court of the Ukrainian S S R and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian S S R have refused to commute his term of exile. The local authorities refuse to provide him with aid regarding food and clothing, as 'Soviet laws do not allow exile for invalids of the second group who are incapable of working'. Neither can his family send him any money (his wife is a pensioner, his daughter a schoolgirl, his son is in the army). In answer to requests from Chuiko's wife that he be moved closer to his family, the Ministry of Internal Affairs replies that there is no area for exiles in Tambov region (Chuiko's family lives in the town of Michurinsk).

The Ukrainian Helsinki Group asks, in its statement, for the release of Bogdan Chuiko from exile, an illegal punishment which is a threat to his health.

* * *

At the beginning of 1973, in the village of Rosokhach, Ternopol region, a group of Ukrainian nationalists was arrested: **Andrei Kravets** (*Chronicle* 39), **Nikolai Slobodyan, Pyotr Vinnichuk** (*Chronicle* 39) and **Stepan Sapelyak** (*Chronicles* 33, 42).

After serving 4 years in camps, Vinnichuk has started on two years of exile. His address is: Tomsk region, Verkhneketsky district, p/o Bely Yar, settlement of Poludenovka. Kravets, who came out of a camp the year before (*Chronicle* 42), is serving two years of exile in the same place. Slobodyan is in exile at the following address: Tomsk region, Krivosheino district, village of Nikolskoye. His term of exile is due to end at the beginning of 1979.

Sapelyak is still in a camp (Perm camp 36). He will leave the camp for a 3-year term of exile at the beginning of 1978.

* * *

Kolyma. When **Vasily Stus** (*Chronicles* 45, 46) moved from one room to another in a hostel, he was summoned by the police to the district police station (130 kilometres away!), where the police chief Major Pereverzev began to yell at him: 'Violating the exile regulations, are you? Want to go back to a camp? We won't let your wife come here!'

Stus is under administrative surveillance.

The poems which were confiscated from him in the camp (*Chronicles* 42, 44) have not been returned to him. The Kiev publishing house, to which he sent a manuscript of his 10 years ago, has not replied to his letter asking that it be returned. The majority of letters sent by him and to him disappear. Stus sent a telegraph to Andropov, saying that his officials were stealing his letters.

As a result of an accident which took place in a mine, Stus landed in hospital on 20 August, where he was bedridden for 2 months. He was visited there by a K G B official who declared that his allegation in the telegram to Andropov was a libel and that Stus would answer for it. During Stus's stay in hospital a secret search was carried out in his room.

From a letter by Stus to another exile:

> . . . I was better off in Mordovia. Here I howl like a wolf in my loneliness. But we aren't giving in . . . Unlike all of you, I have a great disability: I'm a Ukrainian, so I feel a zoological hatred directed against me . . .

In the Psychiatric Hospitals

This section has been compiled from material in the *Information Bulletin* of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, numbers 2 (10 September), 3 (19 October) and 4 (5 November).

Kazan Special Psychiatric Hospital

The women's sections have been transferred from here to Alma-Ata special psychiatric hospital.

* * *

In May **Nikolai Grigorevich Plakhotnyuk** (*Chronicle* 46) was recommended by a medical commission for release from the special psychiatric hospital. His case is to be decided by the Kiev regional court.

* * *

Since July 1974 **Nikolai Ivanovich Baranov** (*Chronicles* 18, 27, 39) has been here. On 8 August 1976, during a visit from his mother, he asked her to ask A. D. Sakharov for help. After that he was given injections of arsenic preparations for three months. In the last month, letters from him have ceased to arrive. His mother's address is: 196180, Leningrad, per. Ilicha 9, flat 19.

* * *

In August 1976 **Boris Dmitrievich Evdokimov** (*Chronicles* 26, 27, 37, 39, 42) was transferred here from Dnepropetrovsk special psychiatric hospital. Recently he has been complaining of bad health. He has chronic ischemia, asthma, diabetes and hypertonia. At present he is in the 'work' section.

On 28 October 1977, B. D. Evdokimov's son Rostislav Evdokimov (192028, Leningrad, Saltykov-Shchedrin Street 5, flat 24) appealed to the committee set up by the World Psychiatric Association to investigate complaints about the abuse of psychiatry for political ends:

I am convinced that his psychological state does not necessitate his beging forcibly detained in a psychiatric hospital, and that prolonged isolation in the conditions of a prison hospital will be dangerous for his physical health.

Numerous complaints and statements from his relatives to official Soviet institutions have not eased his lot.

I ask the Committee to do all it can to release my father.

Chernyakhovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital

Mikhail Nikolayevich Zhikharev (*Chronicle* 46) was arrested in Sochi on 12 September 1974. The investigation was carried out in connection with article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. On 7 October 1974 an outpatient diagnosis, which took place at Krasnodar Prison (the doctor was Baklanov), declared him not responsible, stating he had 'a mental illness in the form of psychopathic paranoia with over-valued ideas and quarrelsome inclinations'. On 28 October the people's court of Sochi's central district (chairman — M. A. Shelikhova, prosecutor — V. G. Chaiko, defence counsel — N. A. Sorokina) sent Zhikharev for compulsory treatment in a special psychiatric hospital.

Zhikharev arrived in Chernyakhovsk on 11 April 1975. He was given neuroleptic drugs, which led to a sharp decline in his health.

Zhikharev's wife has complained repeatedly about the forcible medical treatment of her husband, but has never received any reply.

In July 1977 a medical commission recommended Zhikharev's transfer to an ordinary hospital. On 17 September he was transferred to Krasnodar territory's central psychiatric hospital (Krasin Street 1). There he was given injections of aminazine and sulphazine. The head of the department threatened Zhikharev, saying that if he did not 'stop agitating' she would send him back to the special psychiatric hospital.

On 25 September Zhikharev's mother, Elena Illarionovna Khumago (Sochi, Gargarin Street 27, flat 35), sent this declaration to the [W P A's] Committee to Investigate Psychiatric Abuse for Political Ends:

. . . I declare that my son is sane, has never suffered from any mental illness and needs no medical treatment . . .

I ask the Committee to investigate my son's case and do all it can to obtain his release from the psychiatric hospital.

Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital

Iosif Terelya (*Chronicle* 46) has been transferred here. On 17 October S. Kallistratova, N. Meiman, P. Grigorenko and A. Sakharov issued a statement on his behalf (see the section 'Letters and Statements').

Vasily Spinenko (*Chronicle* 33) is here.

Vladimir Trifonov (*Chronicles* 26, 34, 39) has been transferred here from Leningrad special psychiatric hospital.

Leningrad Special Psychiatric Hospital

Lev Ubozkho (*Chronicle* 17) has been sent here after his escape from an ordinary psychiatric hospital (*Chronicles* 37, 39).

In Ordinary Hospitals

Yu. Belov's twin sister (*Chronicle* 46) has written a statement, asking that he be registered for residence with her and undertaking to create normal living conditions for him.

A medical commission at Krasnoyarsk psychiatric hospital has recommended Yu. Belov for release. The Vladimir regional court has ordered that compulsory treatment of Belov should cease.

* * *

In July **Vladimir Veretennikov** (in *Chronicle* 46 he was wrongly called Vedernikov) was released from Leningrad psychiatric hospital number 5.

On 26 October he was summoned to the psychiatric clinic in Leningrad's October district. There he was told that he would have to spend the holiday period [anniversary of 1917 Revolution] in a psychiatric hospital for his own good. He was then taken forcibly to the Kashchenko psychiatric hospital (near Gatchina). Veretennikov was put in a ward where there were over 30 people. They are not allowed out for walks 'because of a lack of medical personnel'.

* * *

In July **Vladimir Avramenko** (*Chronicle* 44) and **Sergei Musatov** (*Chronicle* 44) were released from psychiatric hospital number 5 near Moscow (at Stolbovaya Station).

* * *

On 6 October **Mikhail Kukobaka,** who was working as a loader in one of the factories of Bobruisk, was forcibly committed to Mogilev psychiatric hospital.

By way of protest at the psychiatric diagnosis fabricated against him in the past, M. Kukobaka refused to place himself on the list of patients at the psychiatric clinic or to respond when summoned by a psychiatrist.

Kukobaka is the author of notes exposing the Sychyovka special psychiatric hospital, which have been circulated in samizdat; of the article 'Defence of Human Rights and Détente are Indivisible' (*Chronicle* 45); and also of an open letter to Petrovsky, the USSR Minister of Health.

In April 1977 he sent a statement to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet asking for permission to renounce his Soviet citizenshop and emigrate.

The pretext for his hospitalization was Kukobaka's refusal to take down a small icon he had hung above his bed in the factory hostel, together with portraits of A. D. Sakharov and P. G. Grigorenko and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Kukobaka is in section 3 of the Mogilev regional psychiatric hospital, in strict isolation, with no walks outside his section. The doctor in charge of his treatment, head of department Nadezhda Matveyevna Drabkina, told him: To hang up icons and portraits of people like Academician Sakharov and General Grigorenko is going against the usually accepted norms of behaviour in our society and is therefore a mental abnormality.' Drabkina also considered Kukobaka's desire to obtain a picture of US President Carter to be a mental anomaly.

Kukobaka was forced to take neuroleptic drugs.

On 15 October **Alexander Podrabinek** appealed to the head doctor of the hospital:

> . . . The Working Commission considers the forcible hospitalization of Kukobaka to be a case of psychiatric abuse for repressive political ends and we inform you that if Kukobaka is not released in the near future, the Commission will be forced to appeal to the special committee set up by the executive committee of the World Psychiatric Association . . .

On 20 October **V. Nekipelov** and A. Podrabinek issued a joint letter, *In Defence of Mikhail Kukobaka*:

> . . . Kukobaka was a danger to the authorities because of his influence on other workers, to whom he gave an object lesson in how to fight for their rights. Living in a hostel, mixing with the factory collective, Kukobaka was an undesirable dissenting element, a sort of centre for the crystallization of independent public opinion. That was something the regime could neither accept nor forgive . . .
>
> The situation is all the worse because Kukobaka is alone, he has no relatives, and this being so, under Soviet law he has no one to defend his rights . . .
>
> We appeal to public opinion abroad, to the World Psychiatric Association, to those who participated in the recent congress in Hawaii — come to his aid!
>
> Freedom for Mikhail Kukobaka!

On 5 November Alexander Podrabinek appealed to the [WPA's] Committee to Investigate Complaints about Psychiatric Abuse for Political Ends to investigate the case of Kukobaka's forcible incarceration in a psychiatric hospital.

Extrajudicial Persecution

Leningrad. In May 1977 **Sergei Levin,** a senior laboratory worker at the Leningrad University Research Institute of Mathematics, had to face a special review of his qualifications (*Chronicle* 45).

In April the union official in his laboratory, junior scientific worker **Andrei Grigorevich Filippov,** refused to sign a character report on Levin prepared by the laboratory authorities, as he considered the report was not objective. (Later the Commission on Labour Disputes at Leningrad State University admitted that the accusations made against Levin by the laboratory authorities were unfounded and the dimissal notice issued to him was cancelled.) V. M. Chebanov, the head of the laboratory, told Filippov that his refusal would lead to unpleasant consequences for him.

In June Filippov himself was due to have his research position reviewed. In the character report he was given it was stated that he had committed a number of actions showing his political immaturity. Nevertheless, as a result of Filippov's account of his scientific work, the laboratory recommended that he should be confirmed in his post.

The review of Filippov's position was postponed from June to September. He was asked to repeat his work-report. His academic supervisor refused to participate in a second discussion of his work. This time the laboratory did not recommend his re-employment.

On 28 September Filippov wrote a statement to the Academic Council of the Faculty of Mathematics and Mechanics at Leningrad University. After describing what had happened, he concluded:

> . . . It should be pointed out that all the time I was working I made no demands on the administration or my academic superiors; on the contrary, I was regularly awarded prizes (every year) for successful work on tasks I had been allotted. In addition, the laboratory's report deliberately keeps silent about the fact that I prepared two articles for publication, which were approved by my academic

supervisor and my colleagues at the laboratory.

So the adverse character of the selection commission's conclusions, which you put forward, is due not to my lack of scientific productivity, but to the 'political immaturity' attributed to me.

On 29 September the Academic Council decided, by 23 votes to 7, not to give Filippov a new contract. Volkov, the deputy dean of the faculty, made a speech at the meeting, saying that he must not be 're-employed', in order to protect the students from an unwholesome ideological influence.

Miscellaneous News

Nizhny Tagil. In May this year **Sergei Korekhov** (*Chronicle* 41) was arrested here. He is 21 years old. In 1973 he was sentenced to 3 years in strict-regime camps for producing leaflets, the charges coming under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. He served his term in Perm camp 36.

This time, too, Korekhov was charged with producing leaflets. He typed them on a stolen typewriter and pasted them up around town. The leaflets contained protests against the arrest of A. I. Ginzburg and the position of political prisoners in the Soviet Union, and appeals of a generally democratic nature.

This summer former prisoners in the Perm camps — **Davidenko** (*Chronicles* 33, 41,), **Pestov** (*Chronicles* 33, 41, 45) and **Uzlov** (*Chronicles* 33, 45) — were interrogated in the Urals in connection with Korekhov's case. In connection with the same case, the former political prisoner **S. Ponomaryov** (*Chronicles* 13, 15, 32), his wife **E. Ponomaryova** and **S. Pavlenkova** (*Chronicle* 42) were interrogated in August in Gorky.

In September the trial took place in Nizhny Tagil. The sentence was 6 years in strict-regime camps.

* * *

Dushanbe. Four months after the appeal in the case of **Amner Zavurov** (*Chronicle* 44) his father was informed that the sentence would remain in force.

There has been no answer to the defence counsel's supervisory appeal for more than five months.

* * *

Latvia. The artist **Jurgis Skulme** (born 1928) has been sentenced according to article 183-1 of the Latvian S S R Criminal Code (=article 190-1 of the R S F S R Code) to 2½ years' deprivation of liberty. The sentence is a suspended one but subjects him to forced labour. His 'knowingly false fabrications' consisted of his personal letters to people abroad, in which he 'libelled the policies of the party and the leadership of the Artists' Union'). Skulme was sent to work on a building site.

* * *

Moscow. At the end of October **Tatyana Semyonovna Osipova** (123056, Moscow. Second Brest Street 43, flat 90) and **Victor Alexandrovich Nekipelov** (Kameshkovo, Vladimir region) joined the Moscow Helsinki Group.

* * *

Kiev. On 2 October **Pyotr Vins,** a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, was detained in the street and taken to K G B headquarters in Kiev. There Major Izergin told him that if he did not put an end to his activities, a criminal charge would be made against him. After one and a half hours of discussion Izergin handed P. Vins a summons for 10 October and said that on that day he would have to give an answer: did he intend to participate in anti-Soviet activity in future? Izergin threatened that if he did not turn up he would be brought by force and they would have a talk in the presence of the procurator, after his mother had been summoned. On the appointed day P. Vins did not go to K G B headquarters.

* * *

Kiev. On 2 October **Oksana Yakovlevna Meshko** was visited by the American lawyer **Burton Hall.** He told Oksana Yakovlevna that at the request of Maiya Grudko, a cousin of her son Alexander Sergienko and resident in the U S A, he had taken on her son's defence. During Hall's talk with O. Meshko a policeman came into the house, explaining that he was checking up on observance of the residence regulations. After inspecting Hall's documents, he said that foreigners were not allowed to be there and demanded that Hall should leave at once, which he did. Two days before, Hall had been detained for 12 hours at the customs in Kiev. A draft of his statement in defence of Sergienko was confiscated, together with a letter by Leonid Plyushch and a statement by the well-known American lawyer Ramsey Clark (*Chronicle* 46) in defence of Rudenko and Tikhy.

* * *

Kiev. During the 'constitution session' of the U S S R Supreme Soviet a night watch was set up in institutes of the Ukrainian S S R Academy of Sciences.

On the night of 6-7 October about 3000 'public spirited people' were on guard in the streets of the town. They had been warned that there were reports that people would be pasting up leaflets and writing posters.

* * *

Odessa. On 29 June the Odessa regional court issued a special order concerning the secondary school teacher **A. V. Golumbievskaya** (*Chronicle* 46), at the same time that it passed sentence in the case of Barladyanu.

Golumbievskaya appealed against the special order, pointing out that it had established no facts about her 'illegal activities' or 'incorrect behaviour', which — according to the regional court order — had assisted 'the criminal activities of Barladyanu'. Neither was there any proof of talks 'of the above-mentioned nature', which had allegedly taken place between Barladyanu and Golumbievskaya, as none of the people close to them who could have heard such talks had given such evidence in court or had even been allowed into the courtroom.

On 25 August the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian S S R repealed the decision of the regional court to send the special order to secondary school 130 and to the District Education Department 'for their reactions', and decided to remit the case for further investigation with a view to instituting criminal proceedings against A. V. Golumbievskaya.

On 30 August the K G B 'warned' Golumbievskaya according to the Decree of 25 December 1972. Golumbievskaya refused to sign, stating that she did not consider her activities illegal and that she had a right to her own views and beliefs and a right to express them. She also stated that she would continue to sign declarations on behalf of people who needed such support.

* * *

Odessa. In August employees at the workshops where **Leonid Sery** (*Chronicle* 42) works were summoned for 'talks' and asked to sign statements that Sery had spread 'slanderous fabrications defaming the Soviet state . . .' In Sery's reference, which the workshop administration gave to the K G B, it was stated: 'He ignores in every way the political measures carried out in our country, expressing his dissatisfaction with the existing socialist system and order, and demanding to emigrate to the U S A , France or Canada.

On 9 August the medical histories of Sery's children were confiscated from a children's polyclinic, and L. Sery's own medical history was confiscated from the district polyclinic.

On 12 September Valentina Seraya (*Chronicles* 42, 45) was taken off a bus going into Kiev.

On 3 November K G B Major Shiganovsky 'warned' Sery according to the Decree of 25 December 1972. He also called Golumbievskaya, Danielyan, Igrunov and Tymchuk 'anti-Soviet characters'.

Sery refused to sign a record of the warning.

* * *

Odessa. On 18 October two men in civilian clothes came up to **Vyacheslav Igrunov** (*Chronicle* 40) in the train from Kiev to Odessa and asked him to show them his documents. What reason did they give? Somebody resembling him had stolen a suitcase. At Igrunov's request one of the men showed an identity card attesting that he was V. P. Khveshchenko, a police captain. The other refused, stating that Khveshchenko's card was enough. However, it was this anonymous 'other man' who took charge of ensuing events (Khveshchenko later said of him that he worked for 'another organization').

Igrunov's belongings were searched (without any witnesses). After discovering a typewritten letter, the searchers took Igrunov off the train at the Fastov station. There (now in the presence of witnesses) his belongings were searched once more. They were going to proceed to a personal search, but later agreed on a 'compromise': there was no personal search and some confiscated papers were returned to Igrunov; he, for his part, did not demand a record of the search. Igrunov wrote an 'explanatory note', in which he stated that, as a result of a search carried out without a warrant, certain papers had been confiscated from him (the address of P. Vins and a letter from N. Gorbanevskaya). After this Igrunov was released.

On 28 October an ambulance drove up to Igrunov's house, with a policeman and a nurse from a psychiatric clinic inside. The nurse showed an order to hospitalize Igrunov 'because of his worsening state of health'. Igrunov's relatives protested sharply, but the ambulance drove away only after Igrunov's mother had signed an undertaking that on 31 October they would come to the clinic together.

On 31 October Doctor Timoshkina at the clinic told Igrunov's mother that he must be taken to hospital, regardless of his state of health, because he had been 'released too early from the hospital' (from compulsory treatment — *Chronicle*). When his mother would not agree, Timoshkina said that Igrunov would be hospitalized forcibly, without her consent.

Igrunov's mother wrote to the head doctor at the clinic, saying that she was herself a doctor and psycho-neurologist and thus could judge her son's state of health; that there was no medical foundation for his hospitalization at present; and that therefore his forcible hospitalization would be contrary to legal and medical norms. She declared that the time had come to re-examine the question of her son's alleged 'illness'.

The head doctor, after inviting Igrunov and his mother to meet him, apologized for what had happened and promised that it would not be repeated and that the clinic would try to get Igrunov taken off the register of psychiatric patients. Meanwhile the head doctor asked Igrunov to come to the clinic twice a month. Igrunov agreed, as he had done when released from the psychiatric hospital.

* * *

Orekhovo-Zuyevo (Moscow region). On 14 October the local K G B official, V. I. Chechenev, standing at the entrance of a factory, tried to hand a K G B summons to engineer **Vladimir Tyulkov** (*Chronicle* 46). The latter categorically refused to accept the summons, basing his refusal on its illegality. On 21 October V. Tyulkov was summoned to the town procurator's office, where in the presence of deputy procurator Zadorozhny, the same Chechenev read out to him an official warning according to the Decree of 25 December 1972.

Tyulkov refused to sign a record of the warning and declared the proceedings unlawful.

* * *

In the middle of July the Kharkov newspaper *Red Banner* published an article by N. Solovyov, 'Life of Refusal'. The article mentions **Vladimir Albrekht,** the acting secretary of the Soviet group of Amnesty International. In particular, it was stated of him that he was a schizophrenic.

At the beginning of August Albrekht sent a letter of protest to the paper's editor:

> . . . I am not on the list of patients at the district psychiatric clinic, I have never suffered from any mental disorder in the past, but even if this had not been so, any spreading of rumours in the press about a man's mental illness should not be regarded as normal . . .

He asked the editors to inform him for what reason this had been done. No reply followed.

At the beginning of September Albrekht appealed to the Kharkov regional procurator's office, asking that the editors be told it was their duty to answer letters.

* * *

Lev Konin from Leningrad (*Chronicles* 45, 46) has received a summons from a psychiatric clinic where he is on the list of patients.

* * *

In August 1977 **Avtandil Papiashvili,** a psychiatrist from Georgia, did not return from abroad.[4]

* * *

On 25 July Judge V. A. Korchanin of the Frunze district people's court in Vladimir refused to hear a claim by **Evgeny Pashnin** (*Chronicle* 43), who is serving a term of exile in Vorkuta, against the administration of Vladimir prison for damaging his books while examining them. His reason for refusing was that the matter was 'not under the jurisdiction of the judicial organs' (compare this with the claims made by Suslensky and Lyubarsky in *Chronicle* 46).

* * *

In September-October 1977 officials of Comecon, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Communications and the Ministry of Foreign Trade read a secret letter from the Central Committee, which spoke of the necessity of uncovering secret dissidents and Zionists.

* * *

Academician Sakharov and **Natalya Shtiglits,** wife of A. Shcharansky, have been awarded the 1977 prize of the International Committee for Combating Slander [the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith?].

Letters and Statements

M. A. Morozov: 'To the Leaders of the Italian Communist Party' (5 August 1977)

The author asks for help on behalf of Yu. Orlov, A. Ginzburg and A. Shcharansky. In particular he suggests that the Italian C P should send an Italian lawyer as an observer to their trial.

V. Turchin: 'To the Leaders of the Italian Comunist Party' (3 October 1977)

In support of M. A. Morozov's letter (see above), the author points out that — besides the three men mentioned by Morozov — Marinovich, Matusevich, Gamsakhurdia, Kostava, Petkus and Serebrov are also awaiting trial. He expresses the hope that the principle of the importance of human rights, proclaimed by Eurocommunists, will mark the beginning of a new political policy, leading to a form of true socialist democracy being worked out.

B. L. Altshuler: 'Eurocommunism and Human Rights. A Statement to the Press' (18 October 1977)[5]

The author is a Muscovite and a Candidate of Physics and Mathematics. The basic theme of his statement is that détente has provided wide opportunities for the defence of human rights, but these opportunities are not being exploited by the Eurocommunist parties: the passive attitude of these parties is a dangerous symptom of the fact

that their ideological dogmas and party interests are still more important to them than humanity and justice.

L. Regelson: 'Appeal to those taking part in the Belgrade Conference' (16 September 1977)

The author raises the question of the right to a free choice of one's work. He considers that forced labour in places of imprisonment and compulsory labour for free citizens in the state economic sector are violations of the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement, and he suggests that this question be examined at the Belgrade Conference.

75 signatures: 'To the Heads of the States Participating in the Belgrade Conference' (27 September 1977)

Concerns the persecution of Jews, the Hebrew language, Jewish culture and Judaism in the USSR, the limitation of the right to emigrate, and the position of refuseniks.

The signatories state that on 16 October they intend to begin a three-day protest hunger-strike against the continuing limitations on the human rights of the Jewish national minority in the USSR.

52 other people signed the letter separately, as a sign of support, but will not be participating in the hunger-strike for medical reasons.

127 signatures: 'To the Participants in the Belgrade Conference'

The letter reports that 'Jewish repatriation is subject to completely arbitrary administrative action' and formulates demands 'calling for the establishment of legality in this field'. The authors of the letter consider:

> . . . permission for repatriation should be given on the application of the person desiring it, without his obtaining an invitation from relatives . . .
>
> On receiving a refusal on the grounds of state security, the applicant should have the right to see the conclusions arrived at by experts and to express his own objections . . .
>
> The maximum terms of delay for various security risks and the conditions permitting emigration in cases not linked with state security should be stated openly . . .
>
> On being refused a visa, the applicant should receive a written refusal stating the concrete reasons for refusal, based on the law, and the period of delay or the conditions for possible emigration.

The authors of the letter ask the participants in the Conference to support their demands:

> that the material claims of relatives on the emigrant should be made through the emigration authorities themselves and without delay, so that material disagreements can be decided in court on the basis of the testimony of both sides . . .
>
> that a decision to refuse should be liable to appeal in court; . . .
>
> that the following order of events should be adhered to:

> (a) the applicant should be called up for military service only if he is to perform it in conditions unconnected with security; at the end of his period of service he should be given the opportunity of repatriation without delay;
>
> (b) the applicant, having applied to renounce his Soviet citizenship, should not be called up for military service . . .
>
> . . . it should be established that after an applicant and members of his family have applied to emigrate, they should not be transferred to work in worse conditions than those prevailing before their application.

The letter reminds the participants in the Conference that the repatriation of Jews from the Soviet Union is accompanied by repressive measures: those sentenced in the 'aeroplane cases' — Dymshits, Kuznetsov, V. and I. Zalmanson, Fyodorov, Khnokh, Murzhenko, Mendelevich, Penson, Butman and Korenblit — are in prisons and strict- or special-regime camps; Glezer, Zavurov, Levinson (sentenced for speculation — *Chronicle*), Shkolnik, Malkin and Silnitsky are serving terms of punishment after specially organized criminal trials; Nashpits, Tsitlyonok and Begun have been sent into exile.

The authors devote their attention especially to the case of Anatoly Shcharansky. They write:

> . . . Such legal activities as sending appeals and letters from Jews to the Soviet authorities and to the West on various aspects of emigration; meetings with foreign social and political activists who are interested in the problem of Jewish repatriation; discussing our problems with foreign journalists; and any information about arbitrary violence and illegality which has reached the West — all this has turned into the subject-matter for a trial with charges of 'betrayal of the motherland'.

A. Lerner: 'Open Letter to L. I. Brezhnev'

The letter begins with the words:

> Respected Leonid Ilich! I wrote to you in 1975 about the necessity of liberalizing emigration policy and about the fact that, in my opinion, this is not only in the interests of the emigrants but also in the interests of the Soviet government. And although I am a mere dabbler in politics, my appraisal of coming events turned out to be correct, and the ensuing hard line and arbitrary repression in matters of emigration have had a serious effect.

Later Lerner writes that infringement of the more humane emigration policy promised by the Soviet Union has had its effect on international détente, on the prestige of the USSR, the relations of the CPSU with many Western communist parties and on the prestige of Soviet propaganda. '. . . Such a policy is not only condemned for its cruelty, but also causes amazement by its absurdity and short-sightedness.'

Lerner expresses doubt as to the sense and far-sightedness of the authorities' attitude to many individual refuseniks. He concentrates particularly on the case of Anatoly Shcharansky. He writes:

> All the cruelties and injustices committed by wicked and stupid agents will not be linked with their names. They will not be remembered. However, all this will be a black mark on the red flag and will mean dark pages in your biography.

Lerner assumes that the letter may be answered by repressive measures; after the way *Izvestia* and *Evening Moscow* had written about him, he had reason to expect 'any illegality, any arbitrary violence towards myself and my family'.

> . . . But I cannot be intimidated any more. I am 64 years old and I have had an interesting and productive life . . . I have succeeded in leaving my mark in science, in educating my students, who include a number of leading theoreticians on management; I have published over 150 books and articles, which have been translated into many languages . . . I have many friends here and also millions of well-wishers in other countries. No one, not even the almighty K G B can take all this away from me. So now I am not afraid of any outcome to my Exodus . . .[6]

A. D. Sakharov: 'To the Parliaments of all Countries which Signed the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement. An Appeal' (27 September 1977)

> Two years ago the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference was signed. Its historic significance lay in the declaration that there was an indivisible connection between international security and an open society: that is, freedom for people to move across state borders, freedom to exchange information, freedom of belief.
>
> Is the West ready to defend these high principles which are of vital importance? Or is it prepared gradually to accept, in secret and step by step, the interpretation of the Helsinki principles and of détente as a whole which the leaders of the U S S R and Eastern Europe are trying to impose?
>
> . . . I will mention here those persecuted for their religious activities; those Pentecostals and Baptists and the many Germans and Jews and people of other nationalities who are being denied emigration visas; those who have suffered repression for their humane and legal activities — such as Kovalyov, Gluzman, Vins, Romanyuk, Soldatov, Ogurtsov, Semyonova, Sergienko, Kiirend, Osipov, Superfin, Gajauskas, Chornovil, Ruban and hundreds of others; I remind you of those suffering for their attempts to leave the country. It is an extremely worrying fact that repressive measures are being used against people for collecting and publishing material about the violation of the humanitarian articles of the Helsinki Agreement, for organizing groups to monitor the fulfilment of the Helsinki Agreement, and for belonging to such groups.
>
> The amazingly cruel sentences passed on Rudenko and Tikhy, who were deprived of a public trial and the right to defend themselves, the arrests of Orlov, Ginzburg, Shcharansky, Marinovich, Matusevich, Gamsakhurdia, Kostava, Serebrov and Petkus, the exile of M. Landa — these are not merely routine violations of the right to freedom of conscience, but a challenge from the Soviet authorities, a testing of Western firmness in defending the principles proclaimed at Helsinki.
>
> . . . I appeal in particular to the U S A Congress. The President of the U S A, relying on the great power and influence of his country, on the clearly expressed will and freedom-loving traditions of his people, has declared the defence of human rights throughout th world to be the moral basis of U S policy. These principles must now be actively upheld.
>
> We are now experiencing a moment in history when decisive support for the principles of freedom of conscience, the open society and human rights is absolutely necessary. The alternative is capitulation to totalitarianism, the loss of all the treasures of freedom, and political, economic and social degradation.
>
> Today the West, its political and ideological leaders, its honest and free people, are still capable of preventing this.

On 27 September A. D. Sakharov handed this Appeal to Western journalists, among them the correspondent of the *New York Times*. On 30 September and 3 October he visited the embassies of the U S A, Great Britain, France. West Germany, Italy, Holland, Austria and Norway, and gave his Appeal to the responsible officials of these embassies, to send to their parliaments.

* * *

On 4 October, the day the Belgrade Conference opened, the *New York Times* printed a shortened and distorted text of the Appeal, as an article by Sakharov, under a heading thought up by the editors. On the same day the article was included in the Russian broadcasts of 'Voice of America'.

On 15 October A. D. Sakharov wrote a letter to the editor of the *New York Times* (copies were sent to the editor of the *Herald Tribune*, which had reprinted the article, and to 'Voice of America'), in which he pointed out necessary corrections and asked that his letter be published.[7] In particular, Sakharov asked for the original heading to be restored (it was an appeal to parliaments, not an article written for a paper) and for the restoration of the passage about people persecuted and repressed. He writes:

> . . . The paper omitted all surnames, except for those of five members

of the Helsinki Group, and has distorted the whole meaning of that paragraph in an impermissible way. The struggle and sufferings of Kovalyov and the other people I mentioned deserve more respect. In Moscow we are convinced that mentioning particular individuals in the press and on the radio is very important and has a real practical effect. Any Western editor has access to information about the people I mentioned and other dissidents (for example, this is available from the Khronika Press publishing house, New York), if he wishes to comment on my text; that would be very easy.

The letter ends as follows:

I consider the correction of these distortions to be a matter of principle. I and other dissidents have had similar experiences with the press much too often. Here we are carrying on a difficult fight for publicity, involving heavy casualties. We cannot allow our voices, which have reached the West with such difficulty, to be distorted; this deprives us, at least partly, of the fruits of our struggle.

E. Bonner, P. Grigorenko, N. Meiman: 'To the Belgrade Conference to Monitor the Fulfilment of the Helsinki Agreement' (November 1977)

Members of the Moscow Helsinki Group write:

We are following the course of the Belgrade Conference with close attention. The discussion which has begun at the Conference about the humanitarian articles of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference is extremely important.

. . . We particularly emphasise that article 7 in the preamble of the Final Act contains a direct reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on rights. For this reason the Belgrade Conference has not only the right, but the duty, to consider violation of human rights over the whole range covered by these documents, independently of whether or not some principles are repeated in other parts of the Final Act.

. . . We consider it very important that the discussion of human rights at the Belgrade Conference should not be limited to general formulas and should not concentrate only on violations of human rights that have come to the attention of the Western delegations more or less by chance, as, while sometimes these are very important, sometimes they are of secondary significance. A principled analysis must be made of the situation as a whole, using all the information available to the delegations, particularly the 23 documents drawn up by the Group to Assist the Fulfilment of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR. Provision must be made for wide-ranging measures to rectify both general deficiencies and *all* substanial concrete violations.

The authors go on to list the problems of human rights which, in their opinion, should be examined at Belgrade.

The following expressed their full agreement with the letter: A. Sakharov, T. Velikanova, A. Lavut, V. Borisov, the members of the Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights in the USSR (Father G. Yakunin, V. Khaibulin and V. Kapitanchuk) and representatives of the Free Adventists (R. Galetsky and V. Shelkov).

E. Arutyunyan, R. Nazaryan, S. Osyan: 'To the Representatives of Nations at the Belgrade Conference. To our Armenian compatriots' (10 July 1977)

The members of the Armenian Helsinki Group (*Chronicle* 46) describe the persecution they are subjected to. A number of cases of illegal detention are reported, together with personal searches, pressure on members of their families, harassment in educational institutions and at work (also affecting their relations), threats and libel in the press (the article 'The False Prophet' about deacon Robert Nazaryan, published in the paper *Sovetakan Aiastan* on 5 May 1977).

We appeal to the Armenian people in the USSR and abroad, to Armenian political, economic, social, humanitarian and cultural organizations and to the Armenian Church; we call on them to come to the defence of the Armenian Helsinki Group. We appeal in particular to the four Armenian parties and anarcho-socialist organizations which exist in the West and have promised to help Armenian patriots in all countries: be the first to condemn the Soviet authorities and to give us help and moral support.

We don't want any confrontation between the Armenian people and the Soviet government, but we declare our intention to continue the fight for civil and political rights.

R. Rudenko: 'Open Letter to the Governments of States Participating in the 1977 Belgrade Conference' (1 November 1977)

Nikolai Rudenko's wife asks them to demand the release of her husband, of A. Tikhy and other arrested members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group.

L. Kopelev: 'Letter to Professor I. I. Stebun' (26 November 1977)

The author asks Professor Stebun, who appeared as a witness at at the trial of Rudenko and Tikhy (*Chronicle* 46), to answer the following questions:

(1) Did you really describe Rudenko and Tikhy as 'anti-Soviet', as enemies of the state and society?

(2) What facts and concrete circumstances were the basis for your becoming a witness for the prosecution in a criminal trial directed against the poet Rudenko and the educationalist and journalist Tikhy?

(3) Do you consider that they were deservedly sentenced to long terms of imprisonment? (You are no doubt aware that for Rudenko this could mean death.)

(4) Do you remember how Rudenko behaved at the time of the campaign against the 'cosmopolitans', which seemingly also involved you?

(5) How long have you known M. Rudenko and O. Tikhy and what was your attitude to them earlier?

(6) Do you remember what you prepared and wrote about Maxim Rylsky in the years 1937-38 and how it differed from what you wrote about him later? Have you not thought that your statements about Rudenko and Tikhy may also have to be revised?

(7) How do you, as an ageing literary figure, imagine your future, your posthumous reputation? Perhaps you have never even considered this question?

G. Vladimov: 'To the Board of the U S S R Union of Writers' (10 September 1977)[5]

You did not allow me to go to the book fair in Frankfurt-am-Main, to which I was invited by the Norwegian publishing house Gyldendal . . . It is difficult . . . to explain to Mr Gordon Holmbakk, the chief editor, who naively invited me, how my union, a voluntary creative union of like-minded people, could confiscate the invitation and refuse to answer my enquiries, how it can refuse to allow an author to meet his publishers and his readers or to see his book.

. . . When my story *Loyal Ruslan* appeared in the West and began to be distributed, you realized how little you had achieved by your long struggle against *Three Minutes of Silence* . . . You decided you had been mistaken in the whole campaign and in giving me the status of an 'undesirable', which I had always been to you, and you called on me to 'return to Soviet literature' . . . I could have asked Mr Holmbakk to rewrite his letter of invitation, so that no reference would be made to *Ruslan* . . . but for me that would mean rejecting my own book; I shall not humiliate myself. Like you, I cannot change my nature, and because that is my nature, this will be my last letter to you.

Have you considered what you are asking me to 'return' to? . . . To where a book has to wait seven years for publication, after it was printed in the chief journal of the country? . . . Where any half-literate editor can demand any excisions, even after giving his approval? . . . And where an independent court . . . will take the side of the state publishing-house in 90 cases out of 100?

. . . Ten years ago, in a letter to the Fourth Congress, I spoke of the arrival of the era of Samizdat; and now that is coming to an end, another more long-lasting era is on its way — that of Tamizdat [published in the West].

. . . You invite me to 'make myself clear', to choose — but I'm afraid the choice is not between publication 'here' or 'over there', but between my readers and you . . .

. . . This is the point of no return: when the fate of writers whose books are bought and read is decided by writers whose books are neither bought nor read.

. . . While remaining on this earth, I don't want to share your company. Not for myself alone, but for the sake of all those you expelled, 'destined' for extermination and oblivion, I exclude you from my life, even if you have not authorized it; but I think you won't object.

. . . Go on carrying your grey burden, go on doing what you are fit for and called to do: oppress, persecute and 'refuse to permit'. But — without my assistance.

Union ticket 1471 is hereby returned.

V. Voinovich: 'To the Members of the "Brigantine" Club' (2 November 1977)

A few years ago Vladimir Voinovich received notice from the members of the literary 'Brigantine' club that he had been chosen as an honorary member of the club (founded at school 7 in Artemovsk, Voroshilovgrad region). After this Voinovich regularly received greetings on 1 May from the members of the 'Brigantine' club. On 1 November he received the following letter, signed by the headmaster of school 7 and twelve pupils who are members of the club:

To Citizen V. N. Voinovich.

It has come to our notice, from foreign radio broadcasts and from the year-book of the Union of Writers, that you have been expelled from the Union of Writers for anti-Soviet activity.

We are indignant at your 'creative work' and we feel that, after this, you are unworthy to be a member of the 'Brigantine' literary club, of which fact we hereby inform you.

In an answering letter to the pupils Voinovich wrote, in particular:

. . . About four years ago (you've realized it a bit late) I was indeed expelled for activities which it would be more correct to describe as literary and social, that is, for trying to write according to my abilities and live according to my conscience.

. . . My books have not become worse because of my expulsion from the so-called Union of Writers.

. . . My books are not now published in the U S S R, but the fault for this is not mine.

Quoting Lenin's words about many Russian writers being forced to publish abroad, Voinovich ends his letter thus:

I hope that someday Lenin's dream will come to pass and that among the many books which are as yet unavailable to you, you'll

have access to mine. And then some of you will be ashamed of signing the letter composed by your headmaster.

S. Kallistratova, N. Meiman, P. Grigorenko and A. Sakharov: 'To the Psychiatrists of the World, the World Psychiatric Association, Amnesty International, and all Honest People. In Defence of Alexander Podrabinek and Iosif Terelya' (17 October 1977)

. . . Recently the memoirs of Iosif Terelya were published in the West.[9] With touching simplicity and credibility, he describes the horrors of the Sychyovka special psychiatric hospital. The authorities reacted swiftly — Terelya was again imprisoned in a special psychiatric hospital (*Chronicles* 45, 46 and this issue). We call on you to come to his aid.

The threat of repression is now hanging over Alexander Podrabinek (*Chronicle* 45 and this issue — *Chronicle*) . . . This threat must and can be averted.

A. Podrabinek, I. Kaplun, V. Bakhmin, V. Shcheglov, G. Yakunin, N. Meiman, V. Kapitanchuk, P. Grigorenko and V. Slepak: 'Statement' (19 October 1977)

In defence of V. Havel, J. Lederer, F. Pavliček and O. Ornest, whose trial began in Prague on 17 October.

The undersigned consider very timely the foundation of the International 'Helsinki Agreements Implementation Group'[10] and they announce publicly their adherence to it.

. . . We are convinced that the activities of the Social Groups to Assist the Fulfilment of the Helsinki Agreements are both legal and useful and in that conviction we are continuing our work.

Members of the Moscow Helsinki Group: P. Grigorenko, S. Kallistratova, N. Meiman, V. Slepak

Members of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes: V. Bakhmin, I. Kaplun, A. Podrabinek

Members of the Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights in the USSR: Fr. G. Yakunin, V. Kapitanchuk, N. Goretoi, N. Kunitsa, V. Shcheglov

Members of the Armenian Helsinki Group (*Chronicle* 46), E. Arutyunyan, R. Nazaryan, Sh. Arutyunyan and A. Khlgatyan, have declared that they are joining the international 'Helsinki Agreements Implementation Group'.

Malva Landa (Vershino-Shakhtoma, 4 October 1977)

Political Prisoners' Day in the USSR is approaching, the day of prisoners of conscience in the USSR. This year political prisoners in prisons, in the small zones of camps of various regimes, will be marking this day for the fourth time . . .

On this day I, in the 'large zone' outside, although in distant exile, formally sentenced for arson but in fact for ideological nonconformism, declare my solidarity with political prisoners and prisoners of conscience in the USSR.

So on that day I shall be fasting, like them.

Freedom for prisoners of conscience in the USSR!

Open up the camps and prisons for independent international inspection, for Amnesty International and for the independent press!

46 signatures: 'Appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR concerning an Amnesty for Political Prisoners' (30 October 1977)

. . . 7 November will be the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution . . . There is no doubt that an amnesty will be announced for that reason. We appeal to the Supreme Soviet not to exclude political prisoners from that amnesty.

We would remind you that in Spain, which has experienced the cruellest of civil wars, all the political prisoners have been amnestied. We remind you that the coming year, 1978, has been officially declared Political Prisoners Year by the United Nations.

46 signatures: 'Statement to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR' (30 October 1977)

The authors, referring to their Appeal for an amnesty for political prisoners (see above), write:

. . . At the same time we consider it necessary to call attention to the absolutely unbearable situation of all categories of political prisoners in the USSR, which is incompatible with human dignity, humanity and accepted international standards.

. . . We call on you, in connection with the adoption of the new Constitution and the 60th anniversary of October, to take the necessary measures on these matters so important to the well-being of Soviet citizens and to the prestige of our state.

A. Sakharov: 'To Academician B. N. Ponomaryov and Academician A. P. Alexandrov' (15 November 1977)

I and many of my friends are convinced that an amnesty for all political prisoners in the USSR, liberalization of the regime and shortening of prison sentences for all prisoners, abolition of forced labour, abolition of the death penalty, measures to ensure full human rights in this country, which in the past has lived through monstrous terror and national suffering, would have a great significance both internally and internationally. What is the official point of view on this, the view of the CPSU Central Committee? What is your personal point of view? The extremely limited nature of the last amnesty disillusioned many in the USSR and abroad. Prisoners of conscience, among them Kovalyov, Dzhemilev, Romanyuk, Vins, Orlov, Ginzburg, Shcharansky, Gluzman, Gamsakhurdia,

Kostava, Rudenko, Tikhy, Petkus, Ogurtsov, Sergienko, Gajauskas, Shumuk, Chornovil, and hundreds of others I have not named merely for lack of space, should be released.

I appeal to you, as members of the Central Committee of the C P S U. I hope that my letter will become known to the C P S U Central Committee, its Politbureau and also to L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the C P S U Central Committee.

V. Bakhmin, I. Kaplun, A. Podrabinek and F. Serebrov: 'To the Psychiatrists Participating in the Honolulu Congress' (August 1977)

. . . We hope you will not remain indifferent to the fact that in the U S S R psychiatry is not used only to treat the mentally sick, but also as a means of suppressing civil freedoms.

. . . In this connection, we call your attention to the fact that the establishment of international norms for the treatment of mentally ill persons could to some extent prevent the well known abuses of psychiatry.

The absence of internationally agreed criteria concerning the danger to society of the mentally ill leads to a situation where thoughts and words are sometimes defined as an illness dangerous to society.

We call on you, the participants of the International Congress of Psychiatrists, to condemn in the name of humanity and charity the abuse of psychiatry for political ends.

This appeal from the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes was supported by 39 people.

V. Bakhmin, I. Kaplun and A. Podrabinek: 'Appeal to the World Psychiatric Association, two months after Honolulu' (4 November 1977)

Two months have gone by since the days when a resolution was passed at the Psychiatric Congress in Honolulu, condemning the Soviet Union for abusing psychiatry for political ends. However the Commission cannot, unfortunately, perceive any visible change in the use of medicine as a punishment. . . . We call on the Psychiatric Association not to stop short at passing resolutions but to make every effort to have them put into effect.

I. Dyadkin: 'To P. A. Ivanov, editor of *Kalinin Truth*' (17 November 1977)

On 15 November the newspaper *Kalinin Truth* printed an article entitled 'Under the cover of the slogan "Defence of Human Rights" '. The article was signed 'V. Bolshakov'. In connection with this article I. G. Dyadkin, a resident of Kalinin (*Chronicle* 45), asks a number of questions. For example:

How can I, a reader, obtain the journal *Aussenpolitik*, the newspaper *New York Times*, the book *The Year 2000* and the work by Solzhenitsyn *The Gulag Archipelago*, which are quoted by V. Bolshakov, so that I may read their full text and thus be sure that the ideas of the authors have been honestly reported?

He suggests that the editors should ask A. D. Sakharov, who is attacked in the article, to give his views on the pages of *Kalinin Truth*, so that we may be certain of the proposition that Sakharov is an enemy of socialism, while Bolshakov is its friend. Without this I cannot vouch for Bolshakov's integrity: he is carrying on a dialogue with an opponent whom he has first gagged.

S. V. Belyakov, deputy editor of *Kalinin Truth*, replied to Dyadkin on 18 November:

Citizen Dyadkin!

In your letter you asked quite a lot of questions, which are difficult to answer all at once. We invite you to come to the publishing house, so that we can have a talk on the subjects you mention.

The talk took place. During the conversation Belyakov told Dyadkin that he could not meet Bolshakov, as the latter did not work there: the material had been sent from the Novosti Press Agency.

V. Borisov, A. Marchenko, A. Podrabinek and A. Sakharov: 'To Mr Meany, President of the A F L-C I O'

The authors of this letter (together with N. Ya. Mandelshtam and Val. Ivanov) were sent invitations to the A F L-C I O congress in Los Angeles, to be present as guests. V. Borisov received 7 copies of the invitation through the post. A. Sakharov received the envelope his invitation had been in, which contained a cutting of an insulting nature from some journal. The others received nothing. At O V I R Borisov was told that invitations to individuals from foreign organizations could not be considered.

The authors of this letter, after expressing their thanks for the invitation, write:

We would gladly visit Los Angeles, if the Soviet authorities would grant us tourist visas and would guarantee that we would be allowed to return to the U S S R.

A. Marchenko: 'To those taking part in the A F L-C I O Congress'

. . . I could not visit you for reasons that were neither my fault nor yours. I would, however, like my short speech to be heard at your congress in spite of this.

Later the letter describes labour conditions and the daily life of workers in the Siberian settlement of Chuna, where Anatoly Marchenko is serving his term of exile (*Chronicle* 35); it also describes the 'principle of the hierarchical allocation of benefits'. The letter ends as follows:

Such conditions for the working population of our huge country

are possible only because we are completely deprived of rights in our own homeland. In the USSR the management, the trade unions, the authorities in power and the punitive organs are all links in the same chain, which has our nation securely shackled. All organizations, including the Church, are under the control of a small group of rulers, and are subordinated to them. May our 60 years of experience serve as a warning to other nations!

I can understand those Americans who are dissatisfied with the political, social and even economic conditions in their country. I sympathize with their wish for a better life. However, when I read ecstatic journalistic accounts of my country by your fellow countrymen, I long to address them in the words of a modern song of ours: 'If you really envy us, come and sit beside us here' . . .

I invite Mike Davidov, Gus Hall and anyone else who wants to come, to be my guests in Chuna, together with their families. If they agree, I'll make out official invitations for them. I also invite any delegate at your congress who is willing to visit me, and I ask you to send me his name so that I can make out an official invitation.

Gunars Rode: 'To L. I. Brezhnev, the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, from Soviet dissident Gunars Oskarovich Rode, born 1934, resident at the following address: 226029, Latvian SSR, Riga 29, Gramzdas Street 9, flat 1' (31 July 1977)

The former political prisoner (1967-1977), released on 19 May 1977 (*Chronicles* 18, 45), writes:

I ask you to relieve me of citizenship of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as it was forcibly and groundlessly imposed on me.

I was not born in the USSR, as in 1934 Latvia was an independent state, and my parents were Latvian citizens. So I was not a citizen of the USSR by birth.

The fact that Latvia was occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940 could not be a reason for an automatic change of citizenship. It was not without reason that in 1950, when I received my first passport at the age of 16, I was told to write an application asking for Soviet citizenship. When I attempted to refuse to write such an application, I was threatened with arrest at Riga police station 7 and told my parents' family would be punished. Faced with such threats, I had to give in and write the application. Thus I formally became a citizen of the USSR . . .

. . . After being sentenced, I applied over ten times to the Soviet authorities and the Government, asking to be relieved of my Soviet citizenship. I did not make any other demands or requests — either for remission of my sentence for unproven lawbreaking, or for permission to leave the USSR. I merely did not wish — and still do not wish — to have anything in common with those who support the policy of the CPSU and obey it, or with those who direct the internal and foreign policies of the USSR, which have nothing in common with the internationally accepted concepts of human rights. I do not want to have anything to do with traitors to the Latvian people, who are even now transforming the full-blooded Latvian nation into a dying national minority in its own land, destroying its historical and cultural values, distorting the recent history of Latvia and the Latvian people.

. . . In January 1975, I sent a statement to the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet from Corrective Labour Colony 17/A in the Dubrovnoe Corrective Labour Institution, Mordovian ASSR, in which I renounced the responsibilities of Soviet citizenship on my own initiative and openly declared that in future I would no longer consider myself a Soviet citizen . . . After repeated requests, I received an answer only from the Vladimir Corrective Labour Department, noting my statement.

. . . I ask you to annul my application for Soviet citizenship, which I wrote under intimidation at the beginning of October 1950 in police station 7, Riga, and also the second statement I wrote there in similar circumstances 11 years later; I ask to be considered a stateless person living on the territory of the USSR, and to be given the opportunity of making out my personal documents as for a stateless person.

V. G. Baranov and G. E. Baranova: 'To the Chairman of the USSR Constitution Commission'

Vadim Baranov (a worker with 25 years' seniority) and his wife, who have been trying since January 1977 to obtain permission to emigrate from the USSR (*Chronicles* 45, 46), write:

We consider it our duty to inform you that, because of our convictions, we cannot accept the new Constitution . . .

We no longer consider ourselves citizens of the USSR. We do not believe that a happy future is being constructed . . .

We do not believe in the ruling party . . . Of course, we could congratulate you on the great achievements of the 60th anniversary, such as: the shortage of food-products or their complete disappearance, the replacement of foodstuffs by vodka . . . the complete breakdown of agriculture, the absolute decline in morality among the population, the existence of psychiatric hospitals, camps and prisons for political prisoners . . .

On the basis of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights . . we applied to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, expressing our wish to leave the USSR.

. . . We have had no answer to this day.

V. Abramkin: 'To the Procurator of the R S F S R: A Statement' (9 November 1977)

Having received no answer from the procurator's office to his two previous statements (to the procurators of Moscow and Tuapse, *Chronicles* 43, 44), V. Abramkin insists that the violations of legality which he reported should be examined, as they were committed not only by the K G B but also by the procurator's office, which has now not answered him for several months. He proves that the actions of the K G B which he complained about were violations of his constitutional rights (articles 118, 125 and 127 of the old Constitution).

In conclusion, Abramkin discusses the double-faced nature of the officially proclaimed principle that rights and duties are one; he comes to the following conclusion:

> Having exhausted almost all the possibilities of defending my rights which are afforded to me by the Constitution and the laws, I declare, as a citizen of the U S S R, that if I do not receive a reply from you giving fundamental answers to my questions within the period of time laid down by law, that is, if it is officially established that a state body, whose duties include observance of the law, is basically sanctioning violations and limitations of my civil rights, I shall be forced to absolve myself of responsibility for fulfilling the duties enjoined on my by the Constitution, as a citizen of the U S S R.

Abramkin's statement was sent, 'for checking out', from the R S F S R procurator's office to the Moscow procurator's office and that of Krasnodar territory.

On 28 November an assistant procurator of Moscow, S. N. Chistyakov, replied to Abramkin: 'Violation of the law by officials of the Administration for Moscow and Moscow region of the K G B attached to the U S S R Council Of Ministers has not been proved.'

A. Bolonkin: 'To the Supreme Court of the Buryat A S S R' (14 August 1977)

Statement

I have written twice — on 7/4/1977 (3/p 163) and on 19/1/1977 (3/p 181) — to the chairman of the Buryat A S S R Council of Ministers, asking him to give me work in accordance with my qualifications as a Doctor of Technology and living quarters fit for a human being, with reference to article 122 of the R S F S R Constitution.

I have received no reply.

I demand that the chairman of the Buryat A S S R Council of Ministers be charged according to article 150 of the R S F S R Criminal Code, for abuse of his public position and for ignoring the Constitution of the R S F S R.

I attach a photograph of the hut in which I live (a worker's palace in the land of developed 'socialism'), and which I share with two other families.

On 23 August a reply was sent from the Supreme Court of the Buryat A S S R:

> In answer to your statement of 14 August 1977, we must explain to you that the Supreme Court is not competent to deal with the questions you raised in your letter.
>
> *A. A. Sidorin*
> Chairman of the Supreme Court of the Buryat A S S R

Discussion of the Draft Constitution (Conclusion)

The third and fourth issues of the bulletin *Concerning the Draft Constitution of the U S S R* (for issues 1 and 2 see *Chronicle* 46), include the letter by **Mark Popovsky** mentioned in *Chronicle* 46, another letter by **Leonard Ternovsky**, letters from **Orion Kvachevsky, Larisa Bogoraz, Yury Grimm, Yury Sergeyev, Evgeny Shapoval, Mikhail Zotov, Boris Altshuler** and **Georgy Vins**, also letters from the Council of Baptist Churches (extracts), from 17 Baptists in the town of Timashevsk (Krasnodar territory) and a survey of letters from believers.

In criticising the draft Constitution, many authors draw on their experience of the way the 1936 Constitution was carried out (mass repressions, suppression of dissent and other manifestations of the 'personality cult' and 'voluntarism'). They consider that the draft constitution does not contain real guarantees against a repetition of this experience. In the opinion of many writers (L. Ternovsky, V. Sokirko, L. Bogoraz, O. Kvachevsky and Yu. Sergeyev), the draft differs from the 1936 Constitution in strengthening the state dictatorship at the expense of human rights. This tendency is borne out by the circumstances in which the new Constitution is to be adopted: 'increased political repression, an anti-democratic means of replacing the head of state, accompanied by an unprecedented and exaggerated personality cult, and the absolute impossibility of criticising the proposed new constitution' (The Initiative Group to Unite Victims of Stalinist Repression).

In many of the letters the critical comments and suggestions mentioned in *Chronicle* 46 are repeated.

The authors suggest that the concept of freedom of conscience be broadened and more precisely defined to include not only questions of faith or disbelief but also political views.

They insist that the Constitution should affirm the obligation to observe the rights of men listed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Covenants on Human Rights.

The letters point out the absurdity and danger of article 62 of the draft Constitution, which obliges every citizen to strengthen the authority of the state, and of the vaguely formulated concept of 'treason to the motherland', which could become a pretext for arbitrary action by the punitive organs.

One of the letters suggests that the Constitution should grant every official the right not to carry out clearly anti-Constitutional orders.

* * *

The fifth (and most recent) issue of the bulletin includes letters from **E. Orlovsky, A. Malkhazyan, V. Yankov, V. Nekipelov** and **N. Strokata,** a letter from the Kiev Evangelical Christian-Baptist congregation, a letter from **Victor Sokirko** to the compilers of the bulletin and a reply from the editors, also a satirical 'Summary of the USSR Constitution' written by **Alexander, Kirill and Pinkhos Podrabinek.**

Orlovsky suggests many concrete amendments to the draft Constitution, though he writes, 'I realize they have no chance of being accepted'.

Yankov points out the contradictions between many articles of the draft Constitution and the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference.

Malkhazyan, Nekipelov and Strokata consider the draft Constitution hopelessly bad and feel attempts to improve it are useless.

Sokirko expresses his dissatisfaction with the compilers of the bulletin for including his letter in bulletin 2 in a shortened and changed form. In their reply the editors of the bulletin write:

> . . . In the majority of cases the usual editorial work of literary type was carried out, which happens in the press generally, whether it is censored or uncensored. The difference, alas, lies in the fact that in our circumstances the editor cannot meet the author.
>
> . . . The only change made out of non-literary considerations (and your main complaint!) was indeed your suggestion that the supreme power of the CPSU (or rather the leadership of the CPSU) should be legalized in this country by means of country-wide elections to the Central Committee of the CPSU and the post of General-Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Yes, we did exclude this suggestion, for the simple reason that it contradicted and rendered less valuable your other criticisms and all your other suggestions . . .

Three statements, signed by **272 priests** (almost all the priests of three Lithuanian dioceses) suggest that article 52 should be changed to guarantee freedom 'both of religious and of anti-religious propaganda'. The authors also consider it necessary to guarantee 'the right of parents to bring up their children in accordance with their own conscience and convictions'.

* * *

Soviet newspapers, in writing about the discussion of the draft Constitution, do not as a rule give a sociological or statistical analysis of the letters they have received.

Some curious, though very meagre facts on this matter are provided in issue 9 (435) of the paper *Pravdist*, dated 15 October (the organ of the party and trade union committees of the *Pravda* newspaper publishers). **N. Petrov,** the deputy head of the publishing-house's Constitutional Group, states in his article 'The Treasure of Room 573' that he had read about 3000 letters, about one tenth of those that reached *Pravda.*

> I am still under the influence of the warm patriotism expressed in them. But I will say openly that something in these letters also worried me. Why were the authors of the overwhelming majority of letters people of advanced years? The traditional explanation is that pensioners have more time, but it seems a trifle too simple in such a case. Why was it that for almost a month after the beginning of the discussion we received no letters from collective farmers or workers on state farms? . . . Why were there so few letters from young people, and of these few, why were such a high proportion about records and jeans? In my opinion, there were too many letters dealing with measures to preserve public order. Are we not placing too much hope, figuratively speaking, on the 'policeman' and too little on ourselves?

Official Documents

On 7 August 1975 the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet issued a Decree 'On the introduction of amendments to article 209 of the RSFSR Criminal Code' (*Gazette of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet*, 1975, number 33, page 698). At the same time the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution 'On the procedures for applying article 209 of the RSFSR Criminal Code' (*Chronicle* 37), the second paragraph of which lays down an interval ot two months between a first warning and the bringing of criminal charges. On 30 May 1977 the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet halved this period:

Not for publication.

Resolution of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet

On the introduction of amendments to the Resolution of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet 'On the procedures for applying article 209 of the RSFSR Criminal Code', dated 7 August 1975.

The Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves that: Amend-

ments are to be made in paragraph 2 of the Decision of the Presidium of the R S F S R Supreme Soviet of 7 August 1975, 'On the procedures for applying article 209 of the R S F S R Criminal Code', in that the following text will now be substituted:

'2. Persons leading a parasitic way of life (in the absence in their actions of evidence of vagrancy or begging) are summoned by the organs of internal affairs and officially warned that a parasitic existence cannot be tolerated. These persons are informed that, within a month, they must choose a place of work at their own discretion, and obtain employment, and that necessary assistance in obtaining work can be provided by the executive committee of the local Soviet of Workers' Deputies.

If, one month after such an official warning, a person continues to lead a parasitic way of life, the organs of internal affairs will decide the question of bringing criminal charges against him in accordance with article 209 of the R S F S R Criminal Code.'

M. Yasnov, Chairman of the Presidium of the R S F S R Supreme Soviet

Kh. Neshkov, Secretary of the Presidium of the R S F S R Supreme Soviet

* * *

Order

From the Main Administration for the Preservation of State Secrets in the Press, subordinate to the U S S R Council of Ministers

No. 31 dsp 13 August 1976

The books of **Alexander Pavlovich Berdnik** (Oles Berdnyk) are to be removed from both ordinary and special libraries and from the book-sellers' network of the U S S R.

* * *

Order

Concerning the centralized system of libraries in the Yalta area

No. 45 24 June 1977

In spite of many warnings issued to the employees of the Centralized System of Libraries concerning the necessity of a timely purge from the book-stocks and catalogues of ideologically harmful literature, concerning responsibility for careless work with the lists from the Literary Publishing Department [of the Ministry of Culture?] the book *The Gospel according to Robespierre* by **A. Gladilin** has been discovered in branch library 3 of the Yalta Centralized System of Libraries.

In this connection I order that:

Vanda Viktorovna Stepykina, librarian of branch library 3, should

be severely reprimanded for her irresponsible attitude to her work on purging the stocks of ideologically harmful literature.

S. I. Zamlinskaya, Director of the Centralized System of Libraries

* * *

Order

No. 20 25 April 1977

For disseminating literature of a decadent nature reproduced on a duplicator among pupils of class 9, literature which had a negative influence on the character-development of the adolescents, comrade **V. A. Senderov** is to be reprimanded and given a strict warning.

Evidence: admission of the fact by comrade V. A. Senderov and voluntary surrender of duplicated texts of **Gumilyov** [1886-1921].

A. N. Rodionov, Headmaster of school 2, Moscow

* * *

Extract from a decision of the trade union committee, 6 May 1977

. . . 2. The school administration is asked to annul Order No. 20, as it contains a number of imprecise formulations, to reprimand comrade **V. A. Senderov** for allowing educational errors which had a negative influence on the character-development of adolescents, and to give him a strict warning.

* * *

Order

No. 25 10 May 1977

Comrade **V. A. Senderov** is engaged in disseminating literature reproduced on a duplicator. Comrade V. A. Senderov gave reproductions of Gumilyov's anthology *The Tent* to L. P. Golovanova, the secretary of the party organization. The Acmeists, like the Symbolists, the Decadents and other representatives of decaying feudal-bourgeois ideology, were proponents of decadence, pessimism and other-wordliness.

The reactionary nature of the Acmeists, their hatred for the people, their extreme individualism, their flight from life into the field of 'pure art', was even more sharply expressed after the revolution. Anna Akhmatova, the well-known participant in this movement, propagated pessimism and gloom in her aristocratic salon poetry. N. Gumilyov, the leader of the Acmeists, inspired and took part in a counter-revolutionary plot in Petrograd, which aimed at overthrowing the Soviet government, and for this he paid the harsh penalty.

The Resolution of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of 14 August 1946 severely criticized the

work of Akhmatova and Gumilyov and condemned it as 'harmful to the education of our youth and not to be tolerated in Soviet literature'.

. . . Comrade V. A. Senderov does not appear at meetings of the pedagogical soviet, does not come to political seminars, and discloses trade union committee matters to pupils of class 9.

Taking the above into account, I decree that:

1. V. A. Senderov shall be severely reprimanded.

2. Representations will be made to the District Education Department to relieve comrade V. A. Senderov of his position as a teacher and to deprive him of the right to go on teaching children and young people.

Reasons: Request of the trade union committee, 6 May 1977.

A. N. Rodionov, Headmaster of school 2, Moscow

(The decision of the Central Committee of 14 August 1946 does not even mention Gumilyov.)

Samizdat News

N. Meiman: 'The Monument at Baby Yar' (15 September 1977, 4 pages)

Concerns the efforts of the authorities to hide the fact that those exterminated at Baby Yar [in 1941] were primarily Jews.

T. Khodorovich, V. Nekipelov: 'To Jimmy Carter: Don't Retreat before the Rhinoceros! Politics and Morality' (8 August 1977, 8 pages)

An appeal to President Carter 'as a Christian and a humanist'. They warmly support his actions in defence of human rights and his statement that 'Without respect for human rights there can be no progress, détente or peace on earth'.

Ivan Belov: 'What is Socialism? (An Open Letter to Santiago Carrillo and other Eurocommunists)' (1977, 20 pages)

The author considers that there can be no 'good' socialism. He tries to prove that 'socialism, the basis of which is public ownership of the means of production, has in an epoch of division of labour, all the characteristics of feudal methods of production.' At the end of his letter the author writes:

> Socialism, as a public form of ownership based on specialized machine production, will inevitably be destroyed by its own logical development. It will be replaced by the capitalist means of production.

M. Makarenko: 'We do not Forgive!' (5 September 1977, 4 pages)

The author, just released after 8 years of imprisonment (*Chronicle* 46), writes about the Remembrance Day for Victims of the Red Terror (on 5 September 1918 the Council of People's Commissars issued the decree 'On the Red Terror', which founded the concentration camps). In 1977 political prisoners are marking this day for the sixth time. The author describes how the day is marked in the camps. The article ends thus:

> On 5 September all of us, the spiritual sons and daughters of those murdered, say 'To hell with you, executioners!' And then perhaps our children, if they repeat these words, will not themselves become executioners.

K. Podrabinek: 'The Unfortunates' (1977, 26 pages)

The author, who served in the army from 1974 to 1976, reports on the system of 'fathering' that has become solidly rooted in the Soviet barracks. The 'father', soldiers in their second year of service, treat the 'sons' [new recruits] as their slaves, subjecting them to beatings, insults, theft and exploitation.

V. Albrekht: '140 Questions about the Tverdokhlebov Case' (1977, 25 pages)

The author describes how he was interrogated in 1975 in connection with the case of Andrei Tverdokhlebov (*Chronicles* 36-40).

I. Shafarevich: 'Television Interview with the B B C on 26 September 1977' (9 pages)

I. Shafarevich answered seven questions which were put to him.

'Are there restrictions on freedom of conscience in the U S S R?'

Quoting the law which regulates the position of religion in the U S S R, the author answered in the affirmative.

'What does anti-religious propaganda consist of?'

'Have you personally experienced the kind of difficulties believers face?'

'Why is the government afraid to allow Christians freely to confess their faith?'

'Why does the Church have so much support?'

In answering these questions Shafarevich said:

> I feel that in our country religion does not play quite the same role that it does in the West. Some people are weary of the materialist atmosphere of life, and they seek spiritual values in religion. Others are trying to come closer to Russian national traditions, which have so long been suppressed, through the Orthodox Church. A third group sees the foundations of Russian culture in Orthodoxy. Religion fulfils many functions in the spiritual life of a country, besides the basic one — linking men with God. Religion is now a very great spiritual force.

. . . Russia came into being as an Orthodox land and has remained so for almost 1000 years. It is impossible to imagine that it could remain spirtually healthy if it lost its ties with Orthodoxy.

'Tell us about concrete cases of people being persecuted for their faith'. Shafarevich described how a group of Orthodox believers has compiled a list of martyrs of the Orthodox Church — it includes 8000 priests. He remarked that only a few of these were known in the West.

'We've seen churches, both Orthodox and Baptist, filled to overflowing with people, solemn services uninterrupted by anyone. How can this be reconciled with what you've been telling us?'

. . . The greater the number of believers and the fewer the number of churches, the more people there will be in each church . . .

Church services are not as a rule disturbed . . . This is in accord with the whole spirit of the legislation on religion and with the entire policy of the authorities: these try to turn religion into 'cult performance', to limit its activity to the walls of a church. The churchgoer will usually not meet with any kind of persecution if his faith is not expressed in any way outside the church, if he attends atheist lectures and gives his children an atheist education, if he does not protest when a priest is dismissed for attracting great numbers of people to his services, if he does not protest when the church he usually attends is closed, and if he does not try to have a new church opened instead of the old one, and so on. That kind of believer is in agreement with the spirit and letter of the legislation on religion.

V. Gusarov: 'There are no Simple Answers, but the Questions must be Asked' (on *Twentieth Century*, a social, political and literary almanac, number 1) (5 September 1977, 6 pages)

In welcoming the appearance of a new samizdat almanac, published by Roy Medvedev, the author objects to the polemical attacks on A. Solzhenitsyn, on the collection *From Under the Rubble*, on V. Maximov and the journal *Kontinent*. Gusarov writes that the authors and publications listed cannot just be dismissed. Their point of view, although certainly not incontestable, deserves serious discussion.

Aušra (*Dawn*), number 7 (47), August 1977

This issue includes:

'The Hill of Crosses', a report on the famous hill near Šiauliai, which has been 'adorned by crosses for a number of centuries'. The hill, to which crosses are brought even from Siberia, is seen by the author as a symbol of faith and hope, a pledge of national revival.

'Our Cultural Heritage', an article on the Lithuanian Literary Museum, which is situated in Kaunas, in the house of the poet Maironis (1962-1932), 'the bard of national revival'. The article is written in the form of a guide to the museum, and answers such

questions as 'What is missing from room so-and-so?' The statue of Christ is no longer there, nor the panel painted by Daugirdas in the colours of the Lithuanian flag, nor the portrait of Vytautas the Great, nor the picture 'The Last Supper'; and the well-known portrait of Maironis has disappeared.

The article on 'The Position of Lithuanians in Belorussia' (begun in numbers 5 and 6) is continued.

Aušra publishes another review of the article by the writer Baltušis in *Tiesa* (2 February 1977). The author accuses Baltušis of lying, describes the real events of 1940, and depicts the situation in Lithuania today.

A complaint to the Procurator-General of the U S S R from **Algirdas Žipre** is included: he has been trying to obtain his release since 1973, as he considers that in 1958 he received a 15-year sentence, not a 25-year sentence. Because of his complaints he has been put in the psychiatric block in Mordovia (*Chronicles* 32, 34). A letter to the Twenty-Fifth Congress from the villagers of Pielis, Grodno region, in the Belorussian S S R, states that their Lithuanian collective farm has been merged with a backward Belorussian one, to get rid of their 'Lithuanian island' and make them forget their native language. Reports are published of searches at the homes of **J. Petkevičius** and **B. Pašiliene** (*Chronicle* 45 and this issue).

The 'News' section reports on the Lithuanian Helsinki Group.

'The Case of Alexander Ginzburg and Yury Orlov' (information bulletin 2)

This includes written evidence by friends of Ginzburg (the Leningrad literary critic Kirill Uspensky, Valery Ronkin and Svetlana Pavlenkova), which they have sent to the American lawyer E. B. Williams, and also Williams's statement in defence of Ginzburg, made on 3 July to the Commission of the U S Congress on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

'The Fight for Freedom of Conscience in the U S S R by the All-Union Church of True and Free Seventh Day Adventists' (20 pages)

A short history of the All-Union Church of True and Free Seventh Day Adventists. A list of Adventists who are imprisoned at the present time. On the persecution of Adventists. On the new Constitution.

'Relapse into Hatred of Mankind' (41 pages)[11]

The author is obviously an Adventist. The pamphlet is a reply to a series of articles by A. A. Sulatskov, 'Relapse into Non-resistance' (in *Banner of Labour*, the Dzhambul regional newspaper, 7-22 October 1977). An analysis of the problems of military call-up for Adventists and other 'non-resisters'. The pamphlet is written in a strongly polemical manner.

'Fraternal Leaflet' (1977, number 4)

The *Fraternal Leaflet*, produced by the Council of E C B Churches, publishes a selection of material on K G B attempts to recruit informers among the 'initsiativnik' Baptists.

'An Anthology of Sundays' (Moscow 1977, 185 pages)

The anthology, dedicated to the memory of **Vera Matveyeva** who died in August 1976, begins with four of her songs. In his article-monologue 'Fate and Song', **Pyotr Starchik** ponders how a song becomes 'a reality of life'. **V. Abramkin**'s 'Notes on the Other Side of the Page' and 'The Little House on Wooden Foundations (a Historical Cycle)' are dedicated to Vera Matveyeva's songs.

The poetry section of the anthology includes poems and songs by authors who participated in the 'Sundays' (**A. Mirzayan, V. Vildshtein** and others) and **Ilya Gabai** and **S. Genkin.** V. Abramkin writes an article 'Thus it was told . . . (preliminary notes)' on the creative work of Daniil Kharms. Prose is represented by **M. Liyatov**'s story 'The Girl on the Bridge' and chapters from 'Conquistadors', a novel by **S. Bagrov** about Siberia at the end of the 1920s. Part of 'Memories and Thoughts of the Past' by **M. Novinsky** (1889-1969) is also published.

Also included is a translation of **Oskar Sternbach**'s lecture on 'The search for happiness and the epidemic of depression', which analyses the depression prevalent among young people; the author links its widespread and vehement nature with 'the removal of limitations in the search for happiness'. An article by A.B. dissects and criticizes the statements made in Sternbach's article.

The 'Information' Section at the end of the anthology tells the story of the foundation and development of the Amateur Song Club in Moscow and its 'Sundays' (*Chronicle* 41).

Daniil Kharms: *A Selection* (239 pages plus 11 illustrations)

The selection is the fullest collection of works by the 'mature' D. Kharms. In an introduction the compilers write:

> We have tried to restore the author's own texts and to include works representing the basic themes of Kharms's creative work. This book does not include the so-called 'children's' works (those written for children) by the author.

Only a small part of the material included in this anthology has been published in the U S S R before.

Trials of Recent Years

In August 1973 the Donetsk regional court sentenced **Boris Borisovich Monastyrsky** (born 1935) to 3 years' imprisonment, according to article 187-1 of the Ukrainian S S R Criminal Code (=article 190-1 of the R S F S R Code).

He served his punishment in Corrective Labour Colony 87 of the Donetsk Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions. Even before his sentence ended a new 'camp' case was begun against him — this time according to article 62 of the Ukrainian S S R (Criminal Code (= article 70 of the R S F S R Code).

On 6 May 1976 the Donetsk regional court heard his case in closed session. The presiding judge was E. N. Zinchenko, the prosection was conducted by procurator Yu. Ya. Noskov, the defence counsel chosen by the court was the lawyer F. I. Aleksevnin.

The verdict reads:

> . . . when serving his punishment Monastyrsky . . . did not choose to reform, but pursuing anti-Soviet aims, began to carry on subversive activity against Soviet society and Soviet power. During the years 1974-75 the accused systematically wrote letters to various state authorities and social organisations, discrediting the Soviet state and social system in the eyes of citizens; he slandered the C P S U and Soviet reality and composed verses of anti-Soviet content.

The evidence against Monastyrsky also included a letter to his mother and four letters to Akhto Levi, 'of a libellous nature'. (Akhto Levi is the author of *Notes of Grey Wolf*.)

> While serving his punishment, Monastyrsky spread his hostile fabrications among the prisoners by word of mouth, with the aim of systematically subverting Soviet power, slandering Soviet reality, the Soviet state system, the U S S R Constitution and Soviet law.

As stated in the verdict, the accused said in court that he had not been aiming to subvert or weaken Soviet power by the actions he was charged with.

> However, the explanation given by Monastyrsky as to his aims is contradicted by the following evidence: the testimony given by the accused Monastyrsky himself at the pre-trial investigation and the court hearing, from which it is clear that in 1974-75 he did indeed write verses and letters of an anti-Soviet character . . . The verses and letters listed above are anti-Soviet in content, gravely libelling the socialist system, the policies of the C P S U, the Soviet people and Soviet law, and thus proving anti-Soviet intent in Monastyrsky's actions.

The court sentenced Monastyrsky to 6 years and 4 months in a strict-regime camp, after taking into account the period he still had to

serve according to his first sentence. His term of imprisonment is due to end on 8 April 1982. Monastyrsky is now in Perm camp 36.

Addenda and Corrigenda

Vladimir Dvoryansky, a witness in the Mustafa Dzhemilev case (*Chronicle* 40), was sentenced in September 1976 to one additional year of imprisonment according to article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, not according to article 181 ('Giving knowingly false evidence'), as stated in *Chronicle* 43. In the indictment he was charged according to both articles, but only one article featured in the verdict.

Endnotes to Chronicle 47

1. See the collection of essays by K. Burzhuademov (pseudonym), *Ocherki rastushchei ideologii* (*Anti-galbreit*), 'Ekho', Munich, 1974 (earlier summarized in *Chronicle* 20).
2. See full text in *Volnoe slovo*, Frankfurt, No. 27, 1977, pp. 3-75.

2a. The *Chronicle* editors evidently considered that their previous transliteration into Cyrillic script (Lapienis) indicated in Latin script the spelling Lapijenis. Their new transliteration (Lapenis) sounds in Russian pronunciation the same as the correct, original Latin form, Lapienis, does in Lithuanian pronunciation.

3. See full text in *Sbornik dokumentov Obshchestvennoi gruppy sodeistviya . . .*, Khronika Press, New York, vol. 4, 1978, pp. 12-26.
4. For reports of a press conference he gave in London see the British and world press of 1 September 1977.
5. Text published in *The Baltimore Sun* in October 1977.
6. The Russian text contains a play on words which cannot be rendered in English. Russian has the same word for both 'outcome' and 'Exodus'.
7. After some delay publication took place.
8. Full text published in *Index on Censorship*, London, 1978, No. 2.
9. *Notes from a Mad-House*, Smoloskyp Publishers, P.O. Box 561, Ellicott City, Maryland 21043, USA, 1977 (21 pp.).
10. Address: HAIG, Tribunestraat 16, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium. President: Willy Kuijpers. On 22 March 1978 HAIG issued a press release announcing the adherence of the Moscow Groups and the Armenian Helsinki Group, and a dossier of relevant documents, including the one summarized here and the succeeding item.
11. The full text of this document, and of most of the other religious documents summarized in the *Chronicle*, is available from the Centre for the Study of Religion and Communism, Keston College, Heathfield Road, Keston, Kent, UK.

Bibliographical Note

The original Russian text of *Chronicle* 47, of which this book is a translation, appeared as a booklet without annotations, *Khronika tekushchikh sobytii*, Khronika Press, New York, 1978.

Earlier issues of the *Chronicle* are available in English from two main sources. Numbers 16-39 and 46 have been published by Amnesty International Publications with annotations and names indexes, all

issues except number 16 still being in print (see inside back cover). Numbers 1-11 appeared in full, with annotations and 76 photographs, in Peter Reddaway's *Uncensored Russia: the Human Rights Movement in the Soviet Union,* London and New York, 1972.

Numbers 40 to 45 of *A Chronicle of Current Events* will be published in English by Amnesty International Publications in 1978. Future issues will be published as they become available.

Other books and periodicals in which readers can find more details about many of the people mentioned in the *Chronicle* are listed in the annotated bibliographies in the Amnesty International editions of numbers 22-23 and 27.

Many texts referred to briefly in the *Chronicle* have appeared in full in *A Chronicle of Human Rights in the U S S R,* Khronika Press, 505 Eighth Avenue, New York, NY 10018, quarterly (separate Russian and English editions), and (documents of Helsinki groups) in the four volumes of *Sbornik dokumentov Obshchestvennoi gruppy sodeistviya . . .* (same publisher). In French the best source of such texts is *Cahiers du Samizdat,* 105 drève du Duc, 1170 Brussels, Belgium, monthly; in German: *Menschenrechte-Schicksale-Dokumente,* Gesellschaft für Menschenrechte, Kaiserstr. 40, 6000 Frankfurt/M, Germany, bi-monthly; in Italian: *Russia Cristiana,* Via Martinengo 16, 20139 Milan, Italy, bi-monthly; and in Dutch: *Rusland Bulletin,* Fijnje van Salverdastraat 4, Amsterdam-W, Netherlands, bi-monthly.

For many religious texts, see *Religion in Communist Lands,* Keston College, Heathfield Road, Keston, Kent, England, quarterly. For Jewish texts see *Jews in the Soviet Union,* 31 Percy Street, London, W1, England, weekly.

For Lithuanian texts see translated issues of *The Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church* (published as booklets), 351 Highland Boulevard, Brooklyn, New York 11207, U S A.

R S F S R Criminal Code

Each republic within the Soviet Union has its own criminal code. The *Chronicle* frequently refers to specific articles of these codes. The articles mentioned most often are found in the criminal code of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic — R S F S R for short. These articles read:

Article 70 Anti-Soviet Agitation and Propaganda. Agitation or propaganda carried on for the purpose of subverting or weakening Soviet authority or of committing particular especially dangerous crimes against the state, or the spreading for the same purpose of slanderous fabrications which defame the Soviet political and social system, or the

circulation or preparation or keeping, for the same purpose, of literature of such content, shall be punished by deprivation of freedom for a term of 6 months to 7 years, with or without additional exile for a term of 2 to 5 years, or by exile for a term of 2 to 5 years.

The same actions committed by a person previously convicted of especially dangerous crimes against the state, or committed in wartime, shall be punished by deprivation of freedom for a term of 3 to 10 years, with or without additional exile for a term of 2 to 5 years.

Article 190-1 Dissemination of Fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet political and social system. The systematic dissemination by word of mouth of deliberate fabrications which defame the Soviet political and social system, or the manufacture or dissemination in written, printed or other forms of works of the same content, shall be punished by deprivation of freedom for a term not exceeding 3 years, or by corrective labour for a term not exceeding one year, or by a fine not exceeding 100 roubles.

Index of Names

The numbers in brackets refer to the illustrations

Abankin, Vitold 105
Abdullayeva, Gulizar 68
Abramkin, V. 170, 180
Abramovich, P. 101
Abramovich, S. 99
Afanasev, Vladimir 139
Afanasov, KGB Major 130-31
Airikyan, Paruir A. 109, 112-13
Akhilla, Fr. 56
Akhmatova, Anna 175
Akimov, Dzheppar A. 75
Akselrod, E. M. 101
Albrekht, Vladimir 19, 24, 154, 177
Alekseynin, F. I. 181
Alexandrov, Acad A. P. 165
Altshuler, Boris L. 155, 171
Amarov, procurator 5
Ametov, Enver 72-73, 76
Ametov, Seitmemet 67
Andropov, Yury V. 47, 121, 133, 145
Antonov, I. Ya. 62-63
Arro, Capt. V. E. 96
Arutyunyan, Eduard 38, 161, 164
Arutyunyan, Shagen 38, 164
Ass, Iosif 26
Avramenko, Vladimir 147

Babayeva, Nadzhis 70
Bagrov, S. 180
Bakanov, engineer 91
Bakhmin, Vyacheslav 2, 19, 135, 164, 166, (10)
Baklanov, prison doctor 146
Balakhonov, Vladimir F. 105
Baltusis, writer 53, 179
Barabanov, A. F. 19
Baranov, Nikolai I. 145
Baranov, Vadim G. 169
Baranova, G. E. 169
Barkauskas, Supreme Soviet official 53
Barladyanu, Valentina 28, 118-19, 136
Barladyanu, Vasily 118-19, 136, 152
Basalyga, Capt. 35
Basarab, Dmitry P. 115-17, 134
Batayeva, T. L. 14
Baturin, N. G. 62, (30)
Bauman, Congressman R. 16n
Bedrin, witness 27
Begun, Iosif 2, 157
Beilin, Iosif 26, (18)
Beilina, Dina 26, 103-104, (18)
Bekirov, Sh. 68
Belapetraviciene, Valya 54
Beloborodov, Corporal 125
Belov, Ivan 176
Belov, Yury, police lieut. 96, 140
Belov, Yury S. 147
Belyakov, S. V. 167
Berdnik, Alexander P. (Oles Berdnyk) 174
Berikashvili, Taso 33-34
Bertulis, Major R. 49
Beshevin, Nariman 70
Bibikov, Alexander 35, 90
Bilyalov, Seityagya 76
Birvilis, Lieut. 45
Bobarykin family 89
Bobarykin, Deacon N. G. 89, 90, (35)
Bogoraz, Larisa I. 171
Boguk, P. V. 118
Boguses, Vytautas 53
Boiko, F. 66
Boitsova, Lyudmila Y. 138
Bolonkin, Alexander A. 170
Bolshakov, V. 166-67
Bondar, Nikolai V. 139
Bonner, Elena G. 42, 95, 160
Bonner, R. G. 42, (4)
Borisov, Vladimir E. 161, 167
Boroda, camp official 111
Borodin, Leonid I. 11-12
Borovoi, prisoner 118
Borovsky, Victor 95
Brailovsky, Victor 24
Brezhnev, Leonid I. 29, 32, 71, 74, 75, 80, 81, 83, 84, 90, 93, 94, 103, 117-18, 121, 126, 129, 131, 132-33, 157, 166, 168
Brusilovsky, L. 29
Bubulas, Stepas 55, 83
Budayev, prisoner 106
Budulak-Sharygin, Nikolai A. 109,112
Buknis, Kostas 55
Bukovskaya, Nina I. 115
Bukovsky, Vladimir K. 99
Bulatov, prisoner 133
Burbulis, Antanas 139
Burlachenko, Pentecostal 86
Burzhuademov, K. 17
Butenko, policeman 89
Butman, Gilel I. 157

Calitis, Inc 39, 46
Carrillo, Santiago 176
Carter, Pres. J. 31, 38, 83, 94, 98, 130, 148, 176
Chaiko, V. G. 146
Chaikovsky, KGB official 30
Chakovsky, A. B. 47
Chebanov, V. M. 149
Chechenev, V. I. 154
Chechetkin, Lieut.-Col. 25-26
Chepkasov, KGB official 116-17
Chernobylsky, B. 102-103
Chernomaz, Bogdan 41
Chernyak, KGB Major 115-16
Chistyakov, S. N. 170
Chlenov, Mikhail 27
Chornovil, Vyacheslav M. 109-112, 158, 166
Chudnovsky family 95
Chuiko, Bogdan M. 143-44
Chupin, V. I. 86
Chuprin family 87, (32)
Chuprina, Anna 85, (32)
Churkin, psychoneurologist 5
Clark, Ramsey 151
Conquest, Robert 20

Daniel, Yuly M. 13
Danielyan, Elena 153
Danilov, MVD Col. 100
Danilyuk, Ivan 40-41
Daugalas, Capt. 49
Daugirdas, painter 179
Davidenko, Georgy M. 150
Davidov, Mike 168
Davidovich, Col. E. 28
Davydov, Georgy V. 105
Degtyar, V. Kh. 102
Deksnis, Antanas 55
Demidov, Dmitry I. 115
Didenko, Konstantin 112
Dmitriyev, procurator 5-8

Dobrovolsky, police Capt. 61
Dobrynin, Lieut-Col. 121
Dolishny, Vasily M. 130
Dolmatov, camp official 118
Dorogin, Capt. G. T. 35, 36
Drabkina, Dr. Nadezhda M. 148
Draga, Pyotr 41
Drozdova, Lydia A. 81-82
Dubinin, T. A. 35
Dubyanskaya, Elena 104
Durov, Ivan 85

Dvoryansky, Vladimir 182
Dyadkin, I. G. 166-67
Dymshits, Mark Y. 115, 128, 157
Dzhemilev, Mustafa 18, 68, 76, 119-20, 165, 182
Dzhemilev, Redvan 70
Dzhemilev, Reshat 21, 76, 119

Edwards, Congressman M. 16n
Efimov, V. I. 71
Elbert, Kiev Jew 102
Elinson, Khana 103
Elistratov, V. 102
Elistratova, Batsheva 104
Engström, Nils-Erik 34-37
Eropa, KGB investigator 16
Ershkovich, 24
Evdokimov, party official 62
Evdokimov, Boris D. 146
Evdokimov, Rostislav B. 146
Evgrafov, Nikolai A. 126-27, 129-30
Evseyeva, Ira 124

Faktor, Kharkov witness 28
Fazylov, E. 74
Fedotova, Valentina 35
Fedyuk, Vasily 117
Fesunenko, KGB official 63
Filippov, Andrei G. 149-50
Filippsky, KGB investigator 119
Finkelshtein, Eitan 28, 48, 52, 53, (24)
Fomichenko, party official 62
Frolova, camp doctor 120
Frumkin, L. 99
Fyodorov, Major, deputy commandant 114-18, 132, 134
Fyodorov, Yury I. 12
Fyodorov, Yury P. 107, 126-28, 157
Gabai, Ilya Ya. 99, 180
Gaideltsov, Vladimir S. 12-15, 96
Gaidis, Alfonsas 55
Gaidukova, N. P. 6
Gajauskas, Balys 39, 45-46, 49, 54, 158, 166
Galanskov, Yury T. 11, 13-14, 99
Galetsky, R. 161
Galperin, court expert 59
Galushkina, Pentecostal 89
Gamsakhurdia, Zviad K. 33, 155, 159, 165
Gandzyuk, Vladimir I. 11
Ganiyev, Amet 67
Garuckas, Fr. Karolis 49, 52, 53
Gasiunas, Algirdas 55
Gastev, Yury A. 17-18
Gasyuk, Yaroslav 12, (12)
Gavrilev, Ya. S. 35
Gel, Ivan A. (Hel) 108
Gendin, Lev 25-26
Genkin, Sergei 180
Gerasimov, Valery S. 40
Gerchak, Grigory A. 115
Gertsberg, Kiev Jew 27, 102
Giedra, Romas-Juozanas 83, (23)
Gildengorn, Irina 104
Ginzburg, Alexander I. 10-16, 19, 37, 38, 48-49, 89, 95, 97-98, 140, 150, 155, 159, 165, 179, (2)
Ginzburg, Irina—see Zholkovskaya
Ginzburg, Lyudmila I. 135
Gladilin, A. 174
Glezer, Ilya I. 157
Glukhovsky, presbyter 92
Gluzman, Dr Semyon F. 115, 117, 136, 158, 165
Goldin, Minsk witness 28
Golev, Baptist 63
Golfand, Yury A. 17, (3)
Golovanova, L. P. 175
Golubkova, Elena I. 2, (8)
Golumbievskaya, Anna V. 152-53
Golysheva, E. M. 10
Goman, Grigory 27
Goncharuk, Victor 40
Gorbal, Nikolai (Mykola) A. 141
Gorbanevskaya, Natalya E. 54, 153
Gorbunov, investigator 24-25
Gordin, Yakov 28, 99
Gorelkin, Vasily 93, 95
Goretoi, Ilya 90
Goretoi, N. P. 35, 88-91, 95, 164, (36)
Gorskaya, Alla A. (Horska) 142
Gradoboyev, Arkady 10
Greenberg, Harold 101
Gridasov, Victor K. 121-22
Grigaliunaite, Ona 54
Grigorenko, Andrei P. 99
Grigorenko, Oleg 99, (2)
Grigorenko, Pyotr G. 1, 21, 46, 56, 72, 75, 99, 103, 119, 135-36, 147, 148, 160, 164 (2, 8, 11, 20)
Grigorenko, Zinaida M. 21, 99, (2, 8, 11, 20)
Grimm, Yury 83, 171
Grinchuk, security officer 142
Grinkiv, Dmitry D. 115-17
Grudko, Maiya 151
Gudz, Igor 100
Gudz, Yanella 100, 104
Gumilyov, Nikolai 20, 175-76
Gurnenko, official 115
Guryuyev, M. I. 121
Gusarov, V. 178
Gutovsky, witness 6
Gvinter, Alexander 22

Hall, Burton 151
Hall, Gus 168
Hasyuk—see Gasyuk
Havel, V. 164
Hel—see Gel
Hesse, Herman 17
Hitler, Adolf 103
Holmbakk, Gordon 162
van Hove, Prof. 79, 81

Igrunov, Vyacheslav V. 6, 153-154
Ilinov, KGB official 72
Ilyukhin, OVIR official 79
Inditsky, S. 103
Indrikas, Robertas 55
Ismagilov, prisoner 117
Ivanchuk, M. 92
Ivanov, I. L., worker 10
Ivanov, P. A., editor 166
Ivanov, Valentin 95, 167
Ivanov, V. D., factory head 3
Ivanov, Yury E. 12
Ivanova, Lydia 19-20
Izergin, KGB Major 151

Jackson, Sen. Henry 25, 29
Jankauskas, Antanas 55

Juskunas, Genrikas 54
Jaugelis, Virgilijus 52
Jeffords, Congressman J. 16n
Jurgutiene, Maria 54

Kachulina, Natasha 123
Kadiyev, Rollan 75
Kalafatov, E. 75
Kalinina, Pentecostal 93
Kallistratova, Sofia V. 75, 147, 164
Kalnins, Victor 11, 39, 45-46
Kalynets, Igor M. 115-17
Kuminskaya, Dina I. 14, 97, 99
Kaminsky, Valery 28, 99
Kampov, Pavel F. 140
Kandel, Felix (Kamov) 99
Kandyba, Ivan A. 140-41
Kapayev, V. N. 4, 16-19
Kapitanchuk, V. 21, 161, 164
Kaplan, Mikhail 17
Kaplun, Irina 2, 19-21, 135, 164, 166, (10)
Karalius, Jonas 55
Karatayev, Bulat B. 97
Karavansky, Svyatoslav I. 107-108, 127
Karayev, A. 68
Kärner, Janus 36
Karpenok, M. 109, 113
Karpezhnikov, N. P. 140
Kartavtsev, camp Major 126
Kasumov, Major 26
Katalikov, V. V. 16-18
Kavoliunas, Vytas 115, 134
Kazachkov, Mikhail P. 117
Kazakevich, Lazar 27
Kazis, Lieut.-Col. 46
Kershtein, Lieut, 126
Khaibulin, V. 161
Khakhayev, Sergei 12
Khalilov, Rustem 66-67
Kharchenko, First Lieut. 72
Kharib, Kiev Jew 102
Kharms, Daniil 180
Khasina, Natalya 104
Khaustov, Victor A. 6
Khelfets, Mikhail R. 109, 111-12
Khess, Minsk witness 28
Khlgatyan, A. 164
Khmara, Baptist 59
Khnokh, Arie-Leib G. 157
Khodorovich, Sergei 98
Khodorovich, Tatyana S. 97-98, 108, 176
Khodzhiametov, S. 68
Khokhlov, party official 62
Khramtsov, Yury A. 109
Khronova, T. 135
Khrushchev, Nikita S. 36
Khumago, Elena I. 146
Khveshchenko, Capt. V. P. 153
Kiirend, Mati A. 158
Kinash, F. M. 60-61
Kirakozov, deputy procurator 2
Kirichek, KGB First Lieut. 115-16
Kirichenko, village soviet chairman 89
Kirillov, First Lieut. 126
Kiriyak, Pentecostal 95
Kistik, Vladimir 27, 101
Klymchuk, Andrey 40
Knokh, Vladimir 27
Knyaz, police chief 92
Knysh, First Lieut. S. Ya. 100
Kochetkov, investigator 28
Kogan, Faina 104
Koltsov, prisoner 125
Konin, Lev 154
Kopelev, Lev Z. 161
Korchak, A. 19
Korchanin, V. A. 155
Korekhov, Sergei 117, 150
Korenblit, M. S. 157
Kornilov, Vladimir N. 16-17
Korovin, Mrs. Fyodor Ya. (Zoya) 14
Korshunov, KGB Major 62
Kostava, Merab 33, 155, 159, 166
Kotvitsky, KGB official 30
Kotyuk, KGB investigator 92
Koval, investigator 24, 26, 27
Kovalchuk, P. P. 58
Kovalyov, Ivan S. 138-39
Kovalyov, Sergei A. 18, 47, 114, 117, 130-31, 138, 158, 160, 165
Kozorezov, P., presbyter 62
Krasun, Olga 91
Kravchenko, Nikolai 64, (31)
Kravchuk, choir-master 62
Kravets, local official 70
Kravets, Pentecostal 91
Kravets, Andrei N. 144
Krazauskas, P. 51
Kremen, M. 102
Krivorotov, witness 6
Krizhanovsky, Prof. S. A. 115-16
Kropotov, camp head 107
Kryuchek, KGB official 63
Kryuchkov, Baptist 63
Kudryavtsev, Major Yu. F. 25
Kukobaka, Mikhail I. 148-49
Kukushkina, procurator 1
Kulik, party official 89
Kulish, party official 90
Kunitsa, Nikolai 92, 95, 164
Kupchenko, G. E. 71
Kurtseitova, Nuriye and Kerime 66
Kuznetsov, judge 5, 7-8
Kuznetsov, official 68
Kuznetsov, Eduard S. 47, 107, 108, 126-28, 157
Kvachevsky, Orion 171

Ladyzhensky, Lev A. 14
Landa, Malva N. 2-3, 18, 75, 97-98, 135, 159, 164
Lander, Kharkhov witness 28
Lange family 82
Lapieniene, Elena 43
Lapienis, Vladas 42-45, 113
Lavut, Alexander P. 18, 21, 75, 135, 161
Lazarevicius, Major 39, 42, 48
Lazaris, Vladimir 22, 99, 101, (21)
Lebed, Kiev Jew 27, 102
Lebeda, Leonas 55
Lederer, J. 164
Leksas, Kostas 55
Lenin, V. I. 8, 163
Lepekhin, N. N. 14
Lerner, Alexander 26, 157-58
Lerner, Julia 26
Levi, Akhto 181
Levin, Sergei I. 149
Levinson, Sender 157
Liberman, Evgeny 27
Likhterova, Lydia 104
Lipavsky, Sanya 23
Lipovitsky, KGB investigator 142
Lisovoi, Vasily S. 116-17
Litvin, Pentecostal 95
Litvin, Yury T. 120-21, 140
Litvinenko, Alexander 140
Litvinov, Pavel M. 99
Litvinovsky, investigator 24
Liyatov, M. 180
Lukauskaite-Poskiene, Ona 46, 49, 53
Lukyanenko, Lev G. 143
Lunts, Alexander 25, (17)
Lyubarsky, Kronid A. 15, 95-98, 107, 155
Lyubarsky, Lazar 29

Mai, Arkady 22
Maironis (Jonas Maciulis) 178-79
Makarenko, Mikhail 176, (6)
Makarenko, Mrs. Mikhail Y. 14
Makarenko, V. S. 71
Makhovitsky, presbyter 35
Malchevsky, Sergei 11
Malkhazyan, Alexander 172
Malkin, A. 157
Malyuta, investigator 1
Mamut, Asan 69-70
Mandelshtam, Nadezhda Ya. 167
Mandelshtam, Osip E. 20
Mandrik, G. G. 101
Marchenko, Anatoly T. 47, 99, 167
Marchenko, Valery V. 113, 115-16, 118, 133, (16)
Marchuk, A. 66
Marinovich, Miroslav F. 30, 141-42, 155, 159
Markosyan, Razmik G. 109, 111, 113
Mashkova, Valentina 107, (1)
Masiulionis, Algirdas 45, 52-53
Mättik, Kalju Y. 115
Matulionis, Jonas 42-45
Matusevich, Nikolai I. 30, 141-42, 155, 159
Matveyeva, Vera 180
Matviyuk, Kuzma I. 40, 41, 140
Matyash, Irina Y. 90, (34)
Maximov, Vladimir E. 178
Meany, George 167
Medvedev, investigator 27
Medvedev, Roy A. 178
Medvedeva, Sveta 123-24
Meiman, Naum 21, 26, 75, 103, 135, 147, 160, 164, 176, (4)
Melnichuk, Pentecostal 91
Memetov, Seidamet 68
Mendel, Boris 100
Mendelevich, Iosif M. 157
Meshko, Oksana Ya. 18, 136, 151
Mikailionis, Juozas 55
Mikov, MVD Col. G. I. 132-33
Milgrom, Ida P. 24, 30
Miller, A. R. 58
Minyakov, D. V. 62-63
Mironenko, Nina 85
Mirzayan, A. 180
Mizrukhina, Kiev Jew 102
Mnyukh, Yury 37
Monastyrsky, Boris B. 115, 117, 181-82
Moroz, Valentyn Y. 108
Morozov, M. A. 155
Mukhametshin, Gantobari M. 115, 117
Muradyan, procurator 115
Murashov, Evgeny 13
Muravyov, Mikhail 43
Murzhenko, Alexei G. 107, 126-28, 157
Musatov, Sergei 147
Muslyadinova, Fera 70
Mustafayev, D. 67
Mustafayev, Makhfure and Abduldzhemil 68
Mustafayeva, Adzhimelek and Afife 70-72
Mustafayeva, Gulnara 70
Mustafayeva, Nuri 67
Mustafayeva, Zera and Zarema 67
Musteika, Aleksis 55

Nadyshev, witness 6
Nadyushkin, medical attendant 106
Naloichenko, investigator 22, 29
Nashpits, Mark K. 157
Naumenko, witness 6
Nazaryan, Deacon Robert 38, 161, 164
Nazin, I. Ya. 121
Nekipelov, Victor A. 1, 6, 41, 79, 148, 151, 172, 176
Nekrasov, witness 6
Nelipovich, camp official 117
Nepomnyashchaya, Evgeniya 104
Neshkov, Kh. 174
Niklus, Mart 39, 42, 45-46, 49, 53, (25)
Nimirinskaya, N. Ya. 5-6, 9-10
Noskov, Yu. Ya. 181
Novikov, Col. 109
Novikov, Mark 27
Novinsky, M. 180
Novoseltsev, Valentin 12
Nozdrachev, MVD Lieut-Col. 62
Nudel, Ida 26, 104, (19)

Oc, KGB investigator 39
Odintsov, investigator 11
Ofkans, U. 46
Ogurtsov, I. V. 158, 166
Okulova, Julia, *see* J. N. Voznesenskaya
Okun, L. B. 19
Oleinik, Valentina 57
Olitskaya, Ekaterina L. 41, (13)
Olkhov, Georgy 40
Orekhov, procurator 114, 115
Orlov, Alexander Yu. 16
Orlov, Dmitry Yu. 16
Orlov, Prof. Yury F. 4, 16-19, 46, 48-49, 89, 155, 159, 165, 179
Orlova, Irina—*see* Valitova
Orlovsky, Ernst 172
Ornest, O. 164
Osadchy, Mikhail G. 108, 126-27, 129-30, (14)
Osadchy, Vladimir 129
Oselkov, M. V. 13
Osipov, Vladimir N. 109-112, 158
Osipova, Tatyana S. 21, 75, 135, 151
Osmanov, Bekir 73
Osmanov, Mukhsum 73
Osyan, Samvel 161
Otten, N. D. 10
Ovakimyan, Beniamin 38
Ovchinnikov, Ivan V. 83
Ovsishcher, L. P. 27
Ovsiyenko, Vasily 30-31, 141
Ozerchuk, Adam 35

Pallodze, Valentina S. 33-34
Paleckis, Supreme Soviet President 55
Paltarokas, Petras 55
Pankratov, M. K. 15
Papiashvili, Avtandil 154
Pargamanik, Efim 27, 102
Paritsky, Alexander 101-102
Parkhomenko, translator 37
Parkhomenko, I. M. 118
Pashnin, Evgeny I. 155
Pasiliene, Birute 49-50, 54, 83, 179, (20)
Pasilis, Aleksis-Alfonsas 83-84, (20)
Patrushev, V. F. 84-86, (33)
Pauly, Jean-Jacques 40, 40n
Pavlenkov, Vladlen K. 12, 14, 143
Pavlenkova, Svetlana 14-15, 150, 179, (2)
Pavlicek, F. 164
Pavlovich, Pentecostal 92-93, 95
Peciulaitis, Povilas 55, 83
Pekharev, prisoner 106
Penson, Boris S. 157
Perchatkin, B. I. 85-87
Pereverzev, police chief 144

Pestov, Viktor G. 150
Peteraitis, Alfredas 83
Peters, Pastor P. 60, (29)
Petkeviciene, Jadviga 46
Petkevicius, Jonas 46-47, 179
Petkus, Viktoras 39, 42 45-49, 50, 53, 155, 159, 166, (22)
Petrenko, Grigory I. 93
Petrenko, Maria (Mrs. G. Podyapolsky) 21
Petrov, camp doctor 116-17, 136
Petrov, N. 173
Petrov-Agatov, Alexander A. 127
Petrovsky, Dr. Boris V. 148
Petrusaitis, Vytautas 55
Pevsner, Vladimir 28
Pikulin, camp commandant 110
Pilelis, Major 45-47
Pimenov, M. I. 84
Plakhotnyuk, Nikolai G. 145
Platonov, Vyacheslav 11-12
Plumpa, Petras 114-15, 117, 133-34
Plyushch, Leonid I. 41, 151
Podgorny, N. V. 47, 81
Podlessky, party official 81-82
Podrabinek, Alexander P. 2, 5-6, 10, 19-21, 135, 148-49, 164, 166-67, 172, (8, 10)
Podrabinek, Kirill P. 19-22, 22n, 172, 177
Podrabinek, Pinkhos A. 21, 135, 172
Pogrebnaya, Vladislava 57
Poladyan, A. 82
Polikanov, Sergei M. 79-81
Poluden, KGB General 140
Polyakov, camp Lieut.-Col. 126
Pomaz, KGB official 115
Pomozov, Vitaly 14, 38-39
Ponomaryov, Acad. B. N. 165
Ponomaryov, Sergei M. 12-13, 150
Ponomaryova, Mrs. E. 150
Ponomaryova, teacher 91
Popadichenko, I. 115, 117-18
Popovich, Oksana Z. 112, 130
Popovsky, Mark A. 97-98, 171
Potashov, Vladimir 11
Pranskunaite, Ona 42-45
Presman, Jewish activist 102
Protsen, pol. prisoner 115
Prudnikov, V. S. 65
Prudnikova, A. S. 35
Pshonik, Kharkov witness 28
Purtov, Sergei 41
Putalova, Capt. Klara A. 125-26
Radionova, party secretary 90
Rak, Capt. 116-17, 133
Rasitinis, Albinas 55
Ratner, Minsk witness 28
Ruvinsh, Maigonis 109, 111-112
Razumovsky, Pyotr 35
Rebrik, Bogdan 108, 126-27, 130
Redker, Gitageniya 104
Redkina, judge 1
Regelson, Lev 156
Reingardt, witness 6
Repnikov, Vyacheslav A. 83
Reznikova, E. A. 1-4, 15
Rode, Gunars O. 46, 168
Rodionov, A. N. 175-76
Roitburd, Lev 28
Roitburd, Liliya 28
Romanyuk, Nikolai 35
Romanyuk, Fr. Vasily O. 108, 127-30, 158, 165
Ronkin, Valery 179
Rotenko, camp warder 118
Rozen, Leningrad Jew 99
Rozenshtein, Natalya 104
Rozhdestvov, Vladimir P. 5-9
Rozhdestvova, Olga E. 6
Ruban, Pyotr V. 3, 158
Rudavin, Capt. V. V. 39
Rudenko, deputy procurator 140
Rudenko, Nikolai (Mykola) D. 106, 137-38, 142, 151, 159, 161-62, 166, (11)
Rudenko, Raisa 137, (11)
Rudenko, R. A. 26, 120, 130, 132, 134, 161
Rusak, Ira 124
Ruzgiene, female witness 43
Ryabukha, Lyudmila 30, 141
Rybakov, Yuly A. 2
Rylsky, Maxim 162
Sado, Mikhail Y. 14, 139
Sadunaite, Nijole 112, 113
Safronov, prisoner who died 106
Safronov, Aleksei V. 105
Sakharov, Acad. Andrei D. 18, 36, 41-42, 46, 47, 72, 75-77, 79, 89, 95-96, 103, 107, 118, 138, 145, 147, 148, 155, 158-59, 161, 164, 165, 167, (4)
Salova, Galya I. 15, 95-96
Samedinov, lawyer 77
Sapelyak, Stepan E. 115, 118, 130-33, 144
Sapronov, procurator 96
Saranchuk, Pyotr 112, 126-27
Sareld, Bengt-Gunnar 34-37
Sarkanas, Jonas 55
Sarkisyan, Emil 115
Sartakov, Pyotr K. 112
Sasnauskas, Julius 47, 53
Saushkin, investigator 10-12
Savenkov, Lieut.-Col. I. D. 35, 37
Schastlivaya, Liliya 82
Schastlivy, Sergei 82
Seidel, Elena 104
Seitmuratova, Aishe 76, 84
Seitvelliyev, Riza 68
Seitvelliyeva, Dilyara 68
Seliokas, Vincas 55
Semchenko, Alexander 34-35
Semenyuk, Roman Z. 112
Semyonov, Victor 83
Semyonova, Tatyana 95, 158, (4)
Senderov, V. A. 175-76
Senik, Irina M. 112, 130
Seraya, Valentina 152
Serebrov, Felix A. 1-4, 155, 159, 166, (7)
Serebrova, Vera P. 1, 4, (8)
Sergeyev, Yury 171
Sergiyenko, Alexander F. 113, 115, 117, 136, 151, 158, 166
Serpikov, V. 62
Sery, Leonid 18, 152-53
Seskevicius, Fr. 45
Shabaldin, local official 63
Shabanov, Eldar 73
Shabanova, Zera 70
Shabashov, Leonid 22
Shafarevich, Igor R. 56, 177-78
Shakhnovsky, refusenik 101
Shakirov, Babur A. 109, 113
Shapoval, Evgeny 171
Shcharansky, Anatoly B. 19, 22-30, 155, 157-58, 159, 165, (17)
Shcharansky, B. M. 25
Shcharansky, Leonid B. 25
Shcheglov, Vadim 35, 164

Shcheglova, Zarina 35
Shchelokov, N. 16, 120
Shcherbakov, Yury 10
Shchiglik, Dmitry 103
Shekhtman, Yu. 99
Shelkhova, M. A. 146
Shelkov, Vladimir A. 35, 58, 161
Sherudilo, investigator 26
Shevardnadze, Eduard 34
Shevarov, procurator 37
Shevchenko, Pentecostal 93
Shiganovsky, KGB Major 153
Shilyuk, Pentecostal 95
Shipovsky, V. A. 39
Shishuk, KGB official 30
Shkolnik, Isaak 157
Shlekht, I. G. 58-59, (27, 28)
Shmeleva-Tsitovskaya, Galina 104
Shovkovoi, Ivan V. 135
Shteffen, presbyter 63
Shtern, Dr Mikhail 2
Shtiglits, Nutalya 23-24, 155
Shubin, prisoner 126
Shumilo, KGB investigator 18
Shumuk, Danilo L. 108, 126-27, 130, 166
Shuportyak, V. P. 35
Sidenko, Fyodor A. 89, 90, (36)
Sidorin, A. A. 171
Silnitsky, Alexander T. 157
Simis, Konstantin M. 97
Sinyavsky, Andrei D. 13, 47
Sinyushenkov, believer 62
Sirotenko, Elena 24, (17)
Skalov, investigator 22, 24, 26, 27-28
Skulme, Jurgis 150-51
Skulsky, D. 28
Slapsinskas, Vytautas 55
Slepak, Alexander V. 95
Slepak, Leonid V. 100
Slepak, Maria 26, (4)
Slepak, Vladimir 21, 26, 75, 95, 100, 102, 164, (4)
Slidinsky, investigator 36
Slobodyan, Nikolai V. 144
Smirinsky, N. G. 69
Smolentsev, police First Lieut. 85-86
Smushko, Pentecostal 95
Snegiryov, Gely I. 31-33, 142, (15)
Sokirko, Viktor 171, 172
Solarz, Congressman S. 16n
Soldatov, Sergei I. 109-112, 113, 158
Solovyov, N. 154
Solzhenitsyn, Alexander I. 11, 20, 39, 41, 97-98, 167, 178
Sorin, Valery 100
Sorokina, N. A. 146
Spence, Congressman F. 16n
Spinenko, Vasily 147
Spirin, OVIR official 87
Stalin, Joseph 1, 44
Staniene, Irena-Anna 83
Starchik, Pyotr P. 18, 180, (7)
Starostin, KGB Lieut.-Col. 88
Stasiv-Kalynets, Irina O. 112, 130
Stavskis, Leonardas 54
Stebun, Prof. I. I. 161
Steers, Congressman N. 16n
Stepanov, investigator 27
Stepanov, V. 86-87
Stepykina, Vanda V. 174
Sternbach, Oskar 180
Strelnikov, Victor 34
Strokatova (Strokata), Nina A. 96, 107, 140, 172
Strusov, ministry head 136
Stus, Vasily S. 144-45
Suchkov, Yury F. 15
Sulatskov, A. A. 179
Sumborsky, Pentecostal 95
Superfin, Gabriel G. 105, 158
Surovtseva, Nadezhda V. 41, (13)
Suslensky, Yakov M. 155
Suslov, Mikhail A. 43, 80
Svarinskas, A. 51, (26)
Svetlichnaya, Nadezhda A. 141-43
Svetlichny, Ivan A. 113-118, 131-32, 142
Svinin, camp workshop head 116-17
Talyanker, Lev 26-27
Tamkevicius, Fr. S. 52
Tapenya, Tanya 123-24
Tarakhovich, M. A. 118
Tarasov, E. K. 17
Tarto, Enn 46, 54, 83
Terekhova, Baptist 59
Terelya, Iosif M. 147, 164
Terleckas, Antanas 47
Ternovsky, Dr. Leonard 18, 171
Tesker, Zakhar 23, 25, (17)
Tikhonovsky, A. V. 69
Tikhy, Aleksei (Oleksa) I. 106, 137-38, 142, 151, 159, 161-62, 166
Timchenko, inspector 66
Timoshkina, Dr. 153
Titov, camp doctor 132, 133-34
Tkachenko, Pentecostal 95
Tokhtarov, D. 74
Tolstoy, Alexandra L. 94
Toth, Robert 23-24
Trachuk, Pentecostal 95
Trakimas, Major 45, 48
Trakimas, Benius 55
Trifonov, Vladimir I. 147
Tronina, Dr. L. P. 5, 9
Tsapuk, Baptist 64
Tsinober, Arkady 28
Tsintsadze, Grigory 33
Tsitlyonok, Boris 157, (17)
Tsitovskaya, G., *see* G. Shmeleva-Tsitovskaya
Tsitverblit, Kiev Jew 102
Tsvetkov, prisoner 106
Tsypin, Leonid 25-26, (17)
Tuckus, Andrius 52-53
Tumenas, commissioner 52
Tupikov, A. M. 64
Turchin, Valentin F. 15, 17-18, 95-97, 155
Tverdokhlebov, A. N. 177
Tymchuk, Leonid 28, 153
Tyulkov, Vladimir S. 154
Ubozhko, Lev G. 147
Udam, Erik 42, 46, 49, 54
Ulanov, Vyacheslav 39
Ulasovsky, B. 122
Ulyashov, prisoner 125-26
Urmus, telephone official 69
Useinov, K. 74
Useinov, Nuretdin 68
Ushakov, German M. 109-110, 112
Usoyeva, Nadezhda 112
Uspensky, Kirill 179, (1)
Utyro, KGB official 115
Uzlov, Vladislav N. 12, 150
Vail, Boris B. 95, 97, (5)
Vaitekunas, Vladas 55
Valitova, Irina (Orlova) 135, (1)
Varfolomeyeva, Natalya 34
Vasilev, prisoner who died 106
Vasilev, worker 115
Vasilev, Victor 54
Vasileva, L. I. 85
Vdabenko, Corporal 124
Vedernikov, Vl., *see* Vl. Veretennikov
Velikanova, Tatyana M. 18, 21, 135, 161
Venclova, Tomas 49, 53

Veretennikov, Vladimir 147
'Victor Nikolayevich' 96
Vigdarov, G. 27
Vikonsky, Commissioner A. 57-58
Vildshtein, V. 180
Vilenskaya, Larisa 25, 104
Vilyams, Nikolai 10
Vinnichuk, Pyotr N. 144
Vins, Georgy P. 63, 158, 165, 171
Vins, Pyotr G. 151, 153
Virko, Igor 17
Vivchar, Z. (Mrs. A. Sergienko) 136
Vladimirov, Victor 23
Vladimov, Georgy N. 97, 162
Vlasov, Anatoly 34-37
Vlasova, Valentina 35
Vlasova, Zhenya 124
Vogelzang, M. R. 10
Voikhanskaya, Dr. Marina I. 77-78, (9)
Voikhansky, Evgeny 77-78
Voikhansky, Misha E. 77-78, (9)
Voinovich, Vladimir N. 163
Volf, Yakov P. 63, (28)
Volkov, Oleg N. 2
Volkov, deputy dean 150
Volobuyev, prisoner 106
Volodin, Col. 30
Voloshko, teaching director 140
Volungevicius, Jonas 48-49
Voronin, witness 6-9
Voronina, Lydia 24-25, 88, 94
Vosnyatin, Deacon V. 62
Voznesenskaya, Julia N. (Okulova) 122, 124
Vysotsky, Vasily 62
Vytautas the Great 179

Waldheim, Kurt 94
Williams, E. B. 14-15, 179

Yablonsky, former prisoner 127-28
Yakovlev, official 72
Yakolev, Yury S., KGB Capt. 18-20
Yakubovskaya, Tatyana 19-20
Yakunin, Fr. Gleb. 21, 161, 164
Yankelevich, Efrem V. 95
Yankov, V. 172
Yantsen, Ya. G. 58-59, (27, 28)
Yasnov, M. 174
Yatsyuk, Baptist 64
Yuskevich, Artem V. 113

Zadorozhny, deputy procurator 154
Zakharchenko, V. 127
Zakharov family 59-60
Zakharov, S. A. 30
Zakharova, Lena 60
Zakharova, Nina 60, (29)
Zakiyev, R. 88, 90
Zaks, Yu. 135
Zalmanson, Izrail I. 128, 157
Zalmanson, Vulf I. 115, 128, 157
Zamlinskaya, S. I. 175
Zavalnyuk, Vladislav 56-57
Zavurov, Amnon 29
Zavurov, Amner 150, 157
Zayats, M. V. 71
Zeamalov, criminal 105
Zemgulis, Major-Gen. 92
Zernov, KGB Major 62
Zherebyatev, Mikhail 40
Zhikharev, Mikhail N. 146
Zhiltsov, Vladimir I. 14-15
Zhiltsova, A. 91
Zhitov, KGB official 73
Zholkovskaya, Irina S. (Ginzburg) 11, 13, 15, 98, 135 (1, 2, 4)
Zhurakovsky, Mikhail P. 139
Zhuravkov, camp commandant 117, 131-33, 138-39
Ziemelis, Juris 46
Zimenko, S. 102
Zinchenko, E. N. 181
Zipre, Algirdas 54-55, 179
Zolotukhin, Lieut.-Col. 100
Zotov, KGB Lieut. 20
Zotov, Mikhail 171
Zubarev, Minsk witness 28

Subscriptions

Subscriptions are for six issues starting with No. 46 and cost £9.90 or US$20. Single issues cost £1.65 or US$3.45. Orders with payment should be sent to the distributors, Routledge Journals:—
ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS, Broadway House, Newtown Road, Henley on Thames, Oxon, RG9 1EN, England.
The Post Office Giro number of Routledge Journals is 385-0056.
US orders can be sent to:— **ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS,** 9 Park Street Boston, Mass 02108, USA.

Back issues

All the back issues, numbers 1-45, are being made available during 1978. Numbers 1-16 will be produced in microfiche only; numbers 17-39 (in printed form) are available now; numbers 40-45 will be brought into print before the end of 1978. Prices are as follows:—

(a) The complete series, 1-45: £47 or US$95
(b) The microfiche of *Chronicles* 1-16: £10 or US$20
(c) The printed *Chronicles*:

Chronicle 17	£1/US$2	*Chronicles* 25 & 26	£2/US$4
Chronicles 17 (supp) & 18	£1/US$2	*Chronicle* 27	£1/US$2
Chronicles 19 & 20	£2/US$4	*Chronicles* 28-31	£3/US$6
Chronicle 21	£1/US$2	*Chronicles* 32 & 33	£3/US$6
Chronicles 22 & 23	£2/US$4	*Chronicles* 34-36	£4.95/US$9.90
Chronicle 24	£1/US$2	*Chronicles* 37-39	£4.95/US$9.90

Orders with payment should be sent to the distributor, Routledge Journals, at the addresses given above.

A Chronicle of Current Events is the journal of the movement for the defence of human rights in the USSR.
In spite of KGB attempts to suppress it, the journal is still regularly produced in typescript samizdat inside the Soviet Union and circulated on the chain letter principle.

Chronicle 47 describes the official criminal 'investigations' of arrested 'Helsinki monitors' and the repressions of other dissenters who have been active in exposing abuses of psychiatry. It also includes detailed information on the persecution of religious believers and continues the running account of events in the country's camps, prisons, psychiatric hospitals and places of exile.

With its scope, detail and accuracy, A Chronicle of Current Events remains the most important source of information on the violation of human rights in the Soviet Union today.

"What makes the Chronicle so impressive is its utter lack of melodrama."
The New York Times

"The Chronicle itself goes on, courageously and mysteriously, against all probability."
The Times, London

For subscription details, see inside back cover
UK £1.65 USA $3.45 ISBN 0 900058 77 3