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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 51, is, like previous ones, a translation of a copy of the original typewritten text (which reached the West only in June 1979). The editorial insertions are the endnotes (numbered) and the words in square brackets. The table of contents, abbreviations, illustrations, index of names, 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 texts.

The endnotes have been kept to a minimum, partly because the Russian text already refers to earlier issues, and partly because the index of names gathers together all references to a particular person. Ukrainian names are usually given in 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 judge-
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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
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ELEVENTH YEAR OF PUBLICATION
The Trial of Nazaryan

On 1 December the Supreme Court of the Armenian SSR sentenced Robert Nazaryan (born 1948) under article 65 of the Armenian Criminal Code (=article 70 of the Russian Code) to 5 years in strict-regime camps and 2 years' exile (the Procurator had asked for 6 + 2).

The final stage of the trial lasted from 27 November to 1 December. The trial had begun on 15 November. On this first day none of the accused's friends was admitted to the courtroom. Yu. D. Mkrtchyan, Nazaryan's defence counsel, therefore refused to enter the court, and the session did not take place. On the following day all who wished to attend were admitted. However, to the audience's surprise Nazaryan then requested that the trial be postponed for a week, as he had had no time to study the case materials. The judge ruled that a week would probably not be long enough, and ordered the trial to be postponed for 10 days. 'Outsiders' were once again excluded from the final stage of the trial.

Criminal proceedings against Robert Nazaryan, a member of the Armenian Helsinki Group, were instituted on 20 December 1977. Two days later he was arrested (Chronicle 48). On 29 December 1977 Nazaryan was issued with an 'Order on proceedings against him as an accused' (for a week he had been a 'suspect').

On 22 January 1978 Nazaryan sent a statement to Brezhnev:

The violation of my rights and those of my family, which we have been powerless to resist, was the reason for my involvement in the human rights movement in the USSR... I ask you to intervene so that the case against me be closed, and my family and myself be allowed to leave the USSR.

On 27 January Nazaryan sent a statement to Mikaelyan, the Chairman of the KGB attached to the Armenian Council of Ministers.

With the permission of the investigator... I read a letter written by my wife Susanna Nazaryan on 29 December... From the letter of my young wife it is clear that she is in the grip of profound contradictory emotions and uncertainty, and is liable to do something rash like, for example, having an abortion, dissolving our marriage or committing suicide.

He asks Mikaelyan to grant him a meeting with his wife, and also requests an interview with Mikaelyan to discuss the affairs of the Armenian Helsinki Group.

On 1 February Nazaryan was received by Mikaelyan. With respect to Nazaryan's emigration Mikaelyan said: 'You'll sit in camp for a time, then you can emigrate in the standard way with a visa.' In reply to Nazaryan's question 'Why was I not arrested in the summer when I was engaged in these activities?', Mikaelyan said 'Because you were
not afraid then, whereas now you are married'. The meeting lasted half an hour.

On 22 February Nazaryan had a meeting with his wife and mother. On 3 April Nazaryan sent Demirchyan, Chairman of the Constitution Commission of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, a statement containing draft texts for two articles of the Constitution (article 69 on Armenia's right of secession from the USSR and article 5 on referenda). He also requested the release of Zagaryan, Airikyan, Markosyan and Shakhverdyan.

On 4 April Nazaryan appealed to the Extraordinary Session (concerning the Constitution) of the Armenian Supreme Soviet:

On 1 April 1977 the Armenian Group to Assist and Monitor the Implementation of the Helsinki Conference Final Act was organized in Erevan. This three-member Armenian group, which was founded on humanitarian principles and acted openly, set itself the task of seeking an amnesty for four Armenian prisoners and also of securing satisfaction for the legal demands of those Armenian citizens whose human rights and basic freedoms have to one or another extent been violated...

In April, May and June 1977 our Armenian Helsinki Group conducted its humanitarian activities openly ...

It is a fact that in April, May and June 1977 the activities of our Armenian Helsinki Group were not harassed, were not stopped, and, finally, were not condemned by the KGB. Is this not evidence that our group was genuinely engaged in humanitarian activities within the constitutional and legislative framework of the USSR?... He requests the Supreme Soviet either to acquit him or to grant him and his family permission to leave the USSR.

In the former Armenian Constitution the Armenian language was declared the official language of the Armenian Republic. This statement did not appear in the draft of the new Constitution. On 11 April Nazaryan made a second appeal to Demirchyan and suggested that the old statement concerning language remain in force (cf. Chronicle 49 [pp. 85-87]; see also 'Addenda and Corrigenda' in this issue).

On 17 August Nazaryan was issued with the final list of charges (in legal terminology, a 'Resolution concerning alterations and additions to the charges'). In August the pre-trial investigation was completed. In September Nazaryan studied the case materials. The investigation was conducted by Lieutenant-Colonel A. Karumyan, Senior Investigator for cases of special importance of the Armenian KGB.

An extract from the indictment follows:

Nazaryan, being of an anti-Soviet, nationalist disposition and living in Erevan, from 1976 until his arrest in connection with the present charges, with the aim of undermining and weakening Soviet authority, was engaged in anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, systematically disseminated, prepared and stored for dissemination, anti-Soviet literature in the form of anonymous books, articles and poetry, the said literature containing fabrications defaming the Soviet political and social system and the policies of the CPSU and the Soviet state, and, having established contact with certain foreign correspondents, gave them slanderous material and information, which was used in the West for purposes hostile to the Soviet Union. In order to mask his anti-Soviet activities and lend significance to the hostile material he had prepared and disseminated, Nazaryan independently declared himself a member of the so-called 'Armenian Group to Assist the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR'.

His criminal activities took the following concrete form: As early as 1969 and 1970, while a student at the Erevan State University, Nazaryan took an active part in the so-called Armenian Culture Club, and was engaged in politically harmful nationalist activities, for which he received a caution. Having failed to come to the appropriate conclusions, from 1976 on he established links by correspondence with the following prisoners sentenced for nationalist anti-Soviet activities: Paruir Airikyan, Razmik Zagaryan, Razmik Markosyan, Bagram Shakhverdyan and others; he spoke out in their defence in an attempt to gain wider support for their nationalist anti-Soviet activity and to justify it, using all sorts of methods: duplicating and disseminating their photographs and his nationalist, slanderous texts entitled 'To American Citizens of Good Will', 'My Firm Belief' and 'Donations to Aid Armenian Political Prisoners', in which the above-mentioned prisoners are called 'political prisoners', alleging they received for their national and political beliefs.

In 1976 and 1977 in Erevan Nazaryan at various times gave these texts to E. G. Aveyan, V. V. Ananyan, S. V. Oyeyn, E. B. Arutyunyan and S. R. Shakhbazyan for them to read.

In 1976 Nazaryan organized the collection of donations through various people and gave material aid to the above-mentioned prisoners — Paruir Airikyan and others — and also to their families. In 1976 Nazaryan was cautioned by the KGB of the Armenian SSR concerning the inadmissibility of such actions, which were damaging to the interests of the USSR state security. However, this did not deter him from continuing his hostile activities.

In 1976 and 1977, with the aim of undermining and weakening Soviet authority, Nazaryan systematically disseminated 40 works of anti-Soviet literature which he had obtained in 1976 in Moscow from

At the end of 1976 at his home in Erevan, Nazaryan gave E. B. Arutyunyan the article ‘Peace, Progress and Human Rights’, the author of which is indicated as Andrei Sakharov. In spring 1977 Arutyunyan returned this article to Nazaryan via K. V. Mkrtchyan, and on 22 December 1977 it was confiscated in a search of Nazaryan’s flat.

The article contains the slanderous allegation that the U.S.S.R is supposedly a ‘totalitarian empire’ and that it is striving ‘to subordinate to its influence large areas of the world’; it calls for the creation of a ‘flexible, pluralistic and tolerant society’ in the U.S.S.R.


Choosing as one form of anti-Soviet activity to write and disseminate slanderous articles and poems, Nazaryan systematically during 1976 and 1977 prepared and disseminated material containing fabrications defaming the Soviet political and social system with the aim of undermining and weakening Soviet authority. At the beginning of 1977, in order to duplicate this material, Nazaryan hired a ‘Ukraine’ typewriter with Armenian typeface from No. 12 ‘Tsiasan’ Communal Consumer Service Establishment, and ‘Moscow’ typewriters with Russian typeface from witnesses R. A. Papayan and E. B. Arutyunyan. With the same aim he also made tape-recordings of certain works and distributed them by playing them on tape-recorders.

Thus, throughout 1976, Nazaryan prepared and disseminated among his friends material containing nationalist, anti-Soviet fabrications, entitled ‘Song of the Captive Soldier’, ‘Stand Up Again, Sons of Armenia’, ‘Armenia’, ‘Experiences’, ‘We Armenians’, ‘The Anguish of Vaspurakan’, ‘The Song of Armenia’s Sons’, ‘Karabakh’s Lament’ and others; he wrote a dedicatory inscription of similar content to the book ‘The New Testament’ and gave it to his nephew Arturik Ekimyan, a minor. This material depicts the Armenian people as ‘having no rights’ and ‘having lost its former glory’, and contains an appeal for ‘vengeance’ and ‘unification’ in the struggle for a free, independent and unified Armenia.

In January-March 1977 at his flat in Erevan, Nazaryan wrote an article entitled ‘Open Letter to President Carter’, which he had prepared abroad, and also disseminated in the USSR among accredited correspondents of bourgeois newspapers and radio-stations, supplying them with slanderous information about Soviet reality for publication abroad. This material has been used widely by organs of the bourgeois mass media in a hostile anti-Soviet campaign.

Thus in April 1977, Nazaryan prepared and duplicated on a typewriter a slanderous anti-Soviet article entitled ‘Declaration’ (‘Appeal’) which is distributed among contacts in Erevan and Moscow, including foreign correspondents, as the programmatic document of the so-called ‘Armenian Helsinki Group’. It contains slanderous fabrications alleging that human rights, human dignity and basic freedoms are being grossly violated in the Armenian Republic and calls for efforts to obtain the release of political prisoners and ‘the reunification of Nagorny Karabakh and the Nakhichevan
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ASSR with the Armenian Republic.

In April 1977 Nazaryan prepared and duplicated on a typewriter, and disseminated, an anti-Soviet article entitled 'Why I Burnt It', containing hostile attacks on the current domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet Union, and a protest against the allegedly 'anti-Armenian policy pursued by Moscow' and 'violence against Armenian patriots and dissidents'.

At the beginning of 1977 Nazaryan prepared and disseminated the text 'The Final Speech of the Armenian National Hero Paruir Airikyan (spoken at his trial)', in which hostile attacks are made on the Soviet system and the CPSU, and Paruir Airikyan, a member of the so-called 'National United Party' and himself sentenced for anti-Soviet activities, is presented approbatively as a supporter of the ideas of 'independence'.

In spring 1977 he prepared and distributed material entitled 'Appeal', the author of which is indicated as Alexander Mkrtchyan. It contains slanderous fabrications about the policies of the CPSU and the Soviet government, and alleges that the political, civil, economic and social rights of citizens are suppressed in the Soviet Union.

In March and April 1977 he prepared, duplicated on a typewriter and by photographic means, and distributed so-called 'Protest complaints' of a nationalist and slanderous content, the authors of which are indicated as Eduard Beglaryan, Artin Kaspur Tatos, Ambartsun Illyan, Razmik Markosyan (sentenced for anti-Soviet activity), Shagen Arutyunyan and others, and also the slanderous 'Letters of Paruir Airikyan to Silva Kaputikyan'.

From May to June 1977, in Erevan, Nazaryan prepared, duplicated on a typewriter and by photographic means, and distributed a document entitled 'Report to Participants in the Belgrade Conference', containing a slanderous portrayal of Soviet reality, of the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens, the political and social system of the USSR, and the domestic and foreign policies of the CPSU and the Soviet government, which are allegedly pursuing a 'great-power' policy; it also contains the deliberately false allegation that there exists in the Soviet Union a 'dictatorship of the CPSU', which has ruined the country's economy, and a hostile appeal to foreign states to exert political 'pressure' on the Soviet Union.

In the summer of 1977, with the aim of further distributing this literature, Nazaryan attached the 'Declaration', 'Why I Burnt It' and other texts to the above-mentioned 'Report to Participants in the Belgrade Conference', and, together with their photographic negatives, gave these materials on various occasions to Benyamin Ovukinyan, Saribek Gedakyan and others to give to his dissident acquaintances in Moscow, and to send abroad via the latter. The above-mentioned 'Declaration' was also sent abroad in autumn 1977 by Nazaryan via Françoise Aupetit, a French citizen who met Nazaryan while staying in Erevan. Nazaryan also gave her slanderous information concerning the USSR...

In 1976 and 1977 Nazaryan stored at his home in Erevan anti-Soviet literature intended for distribution with the aim of undermining and weakening Soviet authority.

Thus, in 1977 Nazaryan prepared and stored for distribution the following texts: 'To the Representatives of the Countries Attending the Belgrade Conference, to Armenian Compatriots' and 'A Statement on Joining the association Amnesty International', which contain deliberate fabrications slandering the Soviet political and social system.

In spring and autumn 1977, in Moscow and Erevan, Nazaryan obtained and stored for distribution anti-Soviet literature, in particular the anonymous books The Legal Fight Against State Atheism and Laws of the USSR, typed copies of Nos. 42/1976 and 46/1977 of A Chronicle of Current Events, The USSR Constitution: Bulletin No. 3: The Voice of Those Who Disagree, Criticize and Argue, 'This is not my Constitution', 'In the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee', 'Some Remarks concerning the 1977 draft Constitution of the USSR', 'To the Procuracy of the USSR — on the arrest of A. Shcharansky', 'Appeal to the World Public', 'Questionnaire Answers', 'To the Editor-in-Chief of Izvestia', Open Appeal to the Leaders of the Soviet Union', 'Dear Silva Kaputikyan' and 'Forgiveness', in which hostile attacks are made on the policies of the CPSU and the Soviet government, and scurrilous remarks appear about Soviet reality.

When questioned as an accused, Nazaryan largely corroborated the facts cited in this indictment relating to his preparation, obtaining, possession and dissemination of literature and materials. However, he denied being guilty of crimes, stating that he had not committed any acts designed to undermine or weaken Soviet authority, and that in the USSR the questions raised in the above-mentioned material concerning democracy, human rights, and the national interests of the Armenian nation and other nations, had allegedly been incorrectly resolved or not resolved at all (vol. III, pp. 135, 136-7, 150-4, 156-285, 290-305).

Contrary to the accused's unfounded statements cited above, the whole body of evidence obtained in the course of the investigation and cited above is irrefutable proof that Nazaryan's activities relating to the dissemination, preparation and possession of literature and materials containing anti-Soviet fabrications slandering the Soviet political and social system were directed against the foreign and domestic policies of the CPSU and the Soviet government, and
the stabilization and deepening of détente, and towards the under-
mining and weakening of Soviet power.

The statements of the accused alleging that the literature and
material which he is charged with disseminating, preparing and
storing, contains no fabrications slandering the Soviet political and
social system are objectively belied by their contents and demon-
strate Nazaryan's efforts to conceal the anti-Soviet aims of his acti-
vities.

Conscious of the socially dangerous nature of his actions,
Nazaryan did not stop his anti-Soviet activities, despite the fact that
the authorities repeatedly confiscated anti-Soviet literature and
other slanderous material from him and others to whom he had
given this literature.

This circumstance also demonstrates that the accused was aware
of the socially dangerous nature of his actions and that they were
premediated with the aim of undermining and weakening Soviet
authority.

During the investigation, members of the Armenian Helsinki Group
attempted to help Nazaryan in certain ways. Ambartum Khlgatyan
was especially diligent in this respect (for further information on him
see in the section 'Letters and Statements' his 'Explanatory Note' to
the Armenian K G).

On 24 August Khlgatyan composed an 'Open Letter to V. A.
Ambartumyan, President of the Armenian Academy of Sciences:
A great hope inspires us in writing you this anxious letter. It is
impossibly difficult for us to predict the response in store for it,
but we are certain of its fate, certain that it is destined to surpass
the limits of a private appeal and attract national attention.

We know you to be a man of great learning, recognized as such
throughout the world, a distinguished, responsible citizen and an
ardent patriot. We appeal to your conscience as a good, compas-
sionate man, in the belief that you cannot be indifferent to the fate
of a young physicist, a colleague and personal acquaintance of yours
who once worked under your supervision.

We call on you to raise your most authoritative voice in defence
of an Armenian defender of the rule of law, the young physicist
Robert Nazaryan. We call on you — by your public defence of
Robert Nazaryan — to throw a heavy weight into the scales of
justice and progress, and against arbitrary repression and the forces
of darkness ...

A gifted mathematician, Robert Nazaryan was fully capable of
becoming a recognized scientist long ago. But, held back by his
troubled conscience and hunger for important accomplishments, he
had no desire to exchange the life of a human-rights fighter and
warrior for progress, a life beating with the ceaseless pulse of pas-
sion and fire, for the deadening life of working for the state ...

No, like the author and signatories of this letter, Robert Nazaryan
has not committed a crime. Evil and evil-doing are totally alien to
his nature ...

In conclusion, allow me to say to you in all sincerity that all the
time I was composing this letter to its distinguished addressee I was
constantly pursued by the thought that most probably some words
will be devoted in the annals of Armenian history to this letter and
also your reaction to it. This is why we address the letter to you
personally, for we know that you are already assured a consider-
able place in the abiding history of our ancient and exceptional
people.

May your counsellors be Wisdom and Good!

The letter was signed by 'friends and fellow campaigners of Robert
Nazaryan' A. Khlgatyan and E. Arutyunyan (Chronicle 48) and also
by his mother, wife and sister.

On 2 September the 'friends and fellow campaigners' of Robert
Nazaryan, members of the Armenian Helsinki Group A. Khlgatyan
and E. Arutyunyan, appealed to the Central Committee of the
Armenian Communist Party:
In the Supreme Court of the republic a trial is being prepared in
connection with the trumped-up charge against Robert Nazaryan of
committing a state crime ... In this critical hour we call on Armenian
communists to intervene without delay to prevent the illegal sup-
pression of an innocent person. We are deeply convinced that Robert
Nazaryan is absolutely innocent. We therefore conclude our appeal
with this plea:
Don't permit judicial tyranny!
Release Robert Nazaryan!

On 26 September A. Khlgatyan wrote the following appeal to A. D.
Sakharov:
Panting, wheezing and grinding to a halt, Stalin's locomotive none-
theless continues to run over its last victims, one of the most warm-
hearted and recent of whom is our friend and fellow campaigner
Robert Nazaryan ... In a telephone conversation with you I asked
you not to ignore Robert's fate and to say a word of support in his
defence. I appeal to you once again with this big request. I assure
you that it is my firm belief that Robert Nazaryan will endure his
prison ordeal honourably and under no circumstances will he bring
upon himself the shame which Zviad Gamsakhurdia and other members of the Georgian group have brought upon their names. In Georgia there are many who are suffering shame for the desertion and faint-heartedness of former defenders of the rule of law who have deserted their cause.

On 5 October A. Khlgatyan sent an appeal to Brezhnev and to K. S. Demirchyan, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party:

I assume that you are acquainted with the 'case' against Robert Nazaryan created by the Armenian K G B. In an excess of vigilance these jingoists accuse him of committing a state crime in the form of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda aimed at undermining and weakening the Soviet system. I swear on oath that this is a lie ...

Moreover, the sentence of Robert Nazaryan, an ardent patriot and passionate upholder of friendship between the peoples of Armenia and Russia, would be a poor gift on the glorious occasion of the 150th anniversary of the eternal union of two fraternal countries ...

The Soviet Union is a mighty power. It needs genuinely great policies. These cannot be substituted for by petty, vacillatory actions. Release Robert Nazaryan! Release all prisoners thrown into prison for pursuing humanitarian ideals!

The Trial of Pailodze

On 6 October Tbilisi City Court, presided over by Gulisashvili, completed its examination of the case of Valentina Pailodze and Nunu Dzhabnidze, charged under article 206-1 of the Georgian Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the Russian Code), article 233, part 2 ('violation of the person and rights of citizens under the guise of performing religious rites'; part 2 stipulates lesser sanctions than part 1) and article 153 ('fraudulence').

Pailodze (born in 1929) was arrested on 6 November 1977 (Chronicle 47).

At the trial Dzhabnidze, who had previously been sentenced for fraudulence, was the main prosecution witness against Pailodze. Furthermore, with the silent approbation of the court, she insulted Pailodze and the witnesses who spoke in her favour in every way possible. The trial was an unusually noisy one, with cries from the Procurator and both defendants and laughter from the 'special' public in the courtroom and the judge. When witnesses testified in support of Pailodze the judge pretended to be asleep.

The charge of fraudulence against Pailodze was fabricated by the investigators in such a crude manner that the court was obliged to reject it.

Under article 206-1 Pailodze was charged with preparing pamphlets of anti-Soviet content, the very same pamphlets which were brought to her at her flat after she was arrested (Chronicle 47). Pailodze denied any connection with these pamphlets.

Under article 233 Pailodze was charged with disseminating religious literature. Pailodze did not deny this charge, but asserted that this had not involved any 'violation of citizens' rights'. The court sentenced Pailodze to 1 year of imprisonment and 2 years' exile (in 1974, under the same two articles, she received 1½ years in camps — see Chronicle 32).

Entry to the courtroom was not obstructed.

During one of the breaks an escort summoned the Muscovite A. Romanova, who was attending the trial, over to Pailodze. ('Who is there from Moscow here?' the escort had asked). Pailodze asked her to tell A. D. Sakharov: 'Trials in Georgia are unjust; people are tried for their faith.'

The Trial of Buzinnikov

On 1 August the Gomel Regional Court, presided over by P. P. Tsirkunov, sentenced E. Buzinnikov under article 186-1 of the Belarusian Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the Russian Code) to 3 years in strict-regime camps. The prosecutor at the trial was Procurator E. G. Masakova; there was no defence counsel.

Evgeny Ivanovich Buzinnikov (born 1938) had received three prior sentences: in 1955 he received 1 year for 'attempts to speculate in bay leaves', in 1956 3 years for attempting to cross the border, and in 1966 12 years for 'the stealing of state ... property, effected through theft' and for an 'attempt to murder police-officers' (police-officers without any search warrants called at his flat to 'search for stolen goods' when Buzinnikov began to protest the police-officers attacked him. In an attempt to defend himself Buzinnikov seized a hunter's hatchet and drove them from the flat, wounding three of them in the process).

Buzinnikov was released from his most recent term of imprisonment in February 1975, as his sentence had been reduced to 9 years. After his release he lived in Svetlogorsk (Gomel Region), where he worked as a metal-worker and fitter in a district construction organization and lived in a hostel. On 5 May 1978 Buzinnikov handed in his resignation, but it was suggested he should continue working for a further two
weeks. On 18 May he was arrested. After his arrest Buzinnikov was held in Gomel Investigation Prison (Institution UZh-15/1S-3). The investigation of his case was conducted by A. N. Makarenko, a senior investigator of the Gomel Regional Procuracy. Buzinnikov refused to take part in the investigation. He did not sign the records of interrogations, and also refused to sign the record stating he had studied the case (although he had in fact looked through it).

Investigator Makarenko stated in his conversations with Buzinnikov that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Final Act were 'not documents' for them, threatened him 'You'll be in prison for the rest of your life!', and called Sakharov a traitor.

Buzinnikov's 'case' is made up of six volumes. The main materials in it are the following: Economic Monologues by M. Rudenko, with a foreword by P. Grigorenko; a letter to Sakharov (it did not reach the addressee); Department 1 of the Physics Institute of the Academy of Sciences, to which the letter had been sent, handed it over to the KGB; five letters to Nekipelov (they had not reached the addressee); and sheets of paper which the investigators called 'rough copies of letters' (in the indictment it was stated that these 'rough copies' were found by an unidentified person at the town rubbish dump and sent to the police). The 'case' also contained replies by the Mogilev and Vladimir Regional Procuracies to requests of the Gomel Procuracy to question M. Kukobaka (essentially, this reply stated that Kukobaka was mentally ill and that questioning him was therefore pointless) and V. Nekipelov (Nekipelov is awaiting permission to leave the USSR; questioning him is therefore pointless). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, confiscated from Buzinnikov, was attached to his case.

In July Mikhail Kukobaka (Chronicle 47) appealed to the Gomel Regional Procuracy, requesting Buzinnikov's release: 'Otherwise it will be necessary to draw the attention of society at large to this case'.

The trial was held in Gomel. On 28 July Buzinnikov was taken from prison to the court. The head of the convoy warned him not to take it into his head to pass the indictment to anyone. The courtroom was empty save for three unidentified people in plain clothes. Before the trial began the barrister came in together with several police-officers and asked Buzinnikov whether he wanted a defence lawyer. Buzinnikov replied that he did not. 'A wise decision,' said the barrister. Buzinnikov then wrote a statement to the effect that he was dispensing with a defence lawyer and would conduct his own defence. The barrister submitted this statement to the court and the judge asked him to leave.

The substance of the charges is clear from the verdict:

The accused E. I. Buzinnikov, resident in Svetlogorsk, from March 1975 to May 1978 listened continually to the broadcasts of the foreign anti-Soviet radio-stations 'Radio Liberty', Voice of America', the BBC and others, and then systematically disseminated orally among acquaintances at work and in his neighbourhood deliberate fabrications slandering the Soviet political and social system; he slandered Soviet reality and socialist democracy, praised the capitalist way of life, claimed that human rights were suppressed in the USSR and that there was no freedom for the individual, and he uttered insulting remarks about the Belorussian people.

He disseminated deliberate falsehoods slandering the Soviet social and political system in written and printed forms. Thus, in December 1976, Buzinnikov wrote and sent a letter to A. D. Sakharov at his address at the branch of the Lebedev Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; in this letter he slandered Soviet reality, alleging that arbitrary repression was practised in the USSR.

He wrote similar slanderous fabrications in an 'Open Letter', in letters addressed to 'Sergei Mikhailovich', 'Volodya' and 'Pyotr Grigorevich', the rough copies of which were discovered in December 1977 and anonymously sent to Svetlogorsk District OVD. In May 1978 he wrote a letter addressed to V. A. Nekipelov (sentenced under article 190-1 of the Russian Criminal Code) which he gave to M. I. Kukobaka in Bobruisk, and in which he defamed Soviet reality. In spring 1978 Buzinnikov disseminated the anti-Soviet document Economic Monologues by Rudenko and the foreword to it by P. Grigorenko, both of which contain malicious, slanderous fabrications about Soviet reality, the Soviet people and the activities of the CPSU and the Soviet government, and attempts to criticize Marxist-Leninist doctrine and the practical activities of the CPSU and the Soviet government, and to discredit the historical experience of the Soviet people in building communism. He took measures to duplicate the above-mentioned hostile documents by typing, photographing and copying them by hand, in order subsequently to disseminate them.

Thus, he personally copied out the text of the 'Foreword' by P. Grigorenko, and part of the text of Economic Monologues by M. Rudenko, into two notebooks. Buzinnikov gave a typed copy of these hostile documents to Yu. A. Chernoshiy to type out in 11 copies; he gave N. A. Chernoshiy P. Grigorenko's 'Foreword' and part of the text of M. Rudenko's Economic Monologues, copied into a notebook, for him to read, and also gave these anti-Soviet documents to V. N. Domoratsky for the same purpose. He tried to have Domoratsky duplicate them by retyping and photographing them.
In his court evidence Buzinnikov explained that he had loved books ever since he was a child and that he had spent a lot of money on them. When one day he came on M. Rudenko's Economic Monologues he naturally wanted to have his own personal copy. By doing so he did not and does not intend to criticize or repudiate Marxism; his sole aim was to understand the theory as deeply as possible, and this entailed making a comprehensive study of it, including, that is, from a critical angle. He was, therefore, interested in M. Rudenko’s book, and all the subsequent actions of which he now stood accused, and which he did not deny, boiled down to the obtaining of this personal copy.

With regard to the letters incriminating him, they contained no slander, and the investigation had produced no proof to the contrary. The testimonies of witnesses Z. S. Mankevich and G. S. Gumenchuk (aunts of the accused), saying that at the time of the events in Novocherkask* described in these letters Buzinnikov was not in Novocherkask, were not true, and were evidently given because they were afraid that Buzinnikov would be brought to trial for taking part in those events. His letter about the Novocherkask events was therefore an eye-witness account and not a second-hand one.

After this the questioning of witnesses began. There were 20 altogether, including Buzinnikov’s relatives, acquaintances and colleagues. In general the witnesses began their testimony by saying that they knew nothing bad about Buzinnikov. At this point Procurator Maslakova would interrupt, and, referring to the records of the pre-trial investigation, would ask leading questions, as with the female witness N. M. Mironovich:

**Procurator** How can you say that you know nothing bad about him?

**Mironovich** Yes, he did listen.

**Procurator** And did he not tell you that there was going to be a revolution in our country?

**Mironovich** Yes, Buzinnikov did say something to the effect that...

**Procurator** There you are, he prophesied a revolution!

**Witneses** Z. S. Mankevich, N. F. Anokhin (her husband), Buzinnikov’s colleagues V. P. Pukhalsky, A. V. Moiseyenko, V. E. Drinovsky, P. E. Kileyev, S. N. Kisel and M. Ya. Kazhdan testified that Buzinnikov listened to foreign radio broadcasts, although they did not know exactly what he listened to (‘something about human rights…’). Not one of them indicated exactly what slander Buzinnikov orally disseminated.

**Witness Z. S. Mankevich** testified that Evgeny Buzinnikov had visited A. D. Sakharov and written him letters.

**Witness A. S. Mankevich** (the accused’s uncle) testified that when he was a boy living in Novocherkask with him, E. Buzinnikov used to collect cartridges in the forest and write slogans; true, exactly what sort of slogans, he did not know...

**Witness G. V. Bratchenya**, a colleague of Buzinnikov, spoke of his habit of listening to foreign radio and recalled that he told him about the pilot Belenko’s flight to Japan before it was published in the Soviet press. Bratchenya remarked that once when an argument arose in the workshop about the events on Damansky Island in 1969 [clashes with Chinese troops], in order to demonstrate how well acquainted he was with these events, Buzinnikov brought an old copy of Pravda containing a description of the armed actions on Damansky. ‘He gloated over it,’ Procurator Maslakova interjected.

Bratchenya also related that one day Buzinnikov read out a line from a foreign newspaper and then translated it to show he could read English. The witness admitted that he could not remember what the article was about.

‘He read out slander,’ the Procurator concluded, although there was no basis for this remark.

Ten witnesses were questioned on the first day of the trial. Judge Tsirkunov also asked them leading questions. He also insistently interrogated Buzinnikov about the circumstances under which he became acquainted with Sakharov, what he wrote to him and what Sakharov replied. Buzinnikov refused to answer these questions and stated that this was not because his friendship with Sakharov was a matter of secrecy, but because it was his personal business and had no bearing on the case.

The trial recommenced on 31 July, when the remaining witnesses were questioned.

**Witness M. P. Sidorenko** testified that Buzinnikov asked him to gather information on violations of human rights.

**Witness Yu. A. Chernoshch, a typist at the Svetlogorsk hospital,** testified that Buzinnikov had asked her to type out M. Rudenko’s book Economic Monologues. After typing several pages, however, she showed her work to the chief doctor at the hospital and on his advice handed the typed pages over to the KGB (Buzinnikov had earlier taken the manuscript back from her).

Buzinnikov’s intention of having M. Rudenko’s book typed out was confirmed by witnesses V. I. Kozlov, N. L. Domoratskaia and S. G. Koval.

**Witness V. N. Demoratskiy** testified that following Buzinnikov’s...
request he had intended to take photographs of M. Rudenko's book *Economic Monologues*, but nothing bad resulted. He also remarked that Buzinnikov had once shown him the text of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

He advised studying gibberish,” Procurator Maslakova declared from her place.

Witness N. A. Chernyayev did not appear in court, apparently because he was serving in the army: the testimony he gave at the pre-trial investigation, probably the longest in the case materials, was read out in court. In it he related that Buzinnikov, with whom he shared a room, praised life abroad and asserted that human rights were being violated in the U.S.S.R. He also testified that Buzinnikov gave him a notebook to read in which part of M. Rudenko's book *Economic Monologues*, and also P. Grigorenko's foreword, had been copied out. On the same day, 7 April, after realizing the 'politically dangerous character' of the foreword, he had made an oral statement to the K.G.B. According to Buzinnikov, Chernyayev stole the notebook from him. Buzinnikov supposes that Chernyayev was sent to live with him specially on a K.G.B assignment.

After the questioning of witnesses Procurator Maslakova spoke. The essence of her prosecution speech was that the Soviet Union was the most democratic state in the world, yet here some people had been found who claimed that human rights were being violated, who collected slander and attempted to supply it to people who would use it to damage our state. The Procurator asserted that the foreign press printed nothing but slander about the U.S.S.R. Neither during the court investigation nor the Procurator's speech was proof given of one single example of 'slander' in Buzinnikov's letters or spoken remarks. The main charge was the allegation that Buzinnikov had said and written that in the U.S.S.R. human rights were violated. This was declared to be 'a slander on Soviet reality'.

After a short break the verdict was read out: 3 years in strict-regime camps.

On 25 August, after reviewing Buzinnikov's appeal, the Supreme Court of the Belorussian S.S.R left the sentence unchanged.

After the questioning of witnesses Procurator Maslakova spoke. The essence of her prosecution speech was that the Soviet Union was the most democratic state in the world, yet here some people had been found who claimed that human rights were being violated, who collected slander and attempted to supply it to people who would use it to damage our state. The Procurator asserted that the foreign press printed nothing but slander about the U.S.S.R.

On 25 August, after reviewing Buzinnikov's appeal, the Supreme Court of the Belorussian S.S.R left the sentence unchanged.

On 1 August, the third day of the trial, Buzinnikov was granted a final word. He took the latest issue of *Izvestia* from his pocket and read out an announcement of the anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Agreement. Buzinnikov said that it was an ironic twist of fate that this was the very day a trial was being held which ran counter to the Helsinki Agreement, and to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on which it was founded. He affirmed that he did not consider himself guilty and regarded the trial of his case as a gross violation of the Helsinki Agreement.

After the questioning of witnesses Procurator Maslakova spoke. The essence of her prosecution speech was that the Soviet Union was the most democratic state in the world, yet here some people had been found who claimed that human rights were being violated, who collected slander and attempted to supply it to people who would use it to damage our state. The Procurator asserted that the foreign press printed nothing but slander about the U.S.S.R.

In conclusion Buzinnikov said that there was and could be no corpus delicti in his actions, and that if he should, therefore, be acquitted.

On 25 August, after reviewing Buzinnikov's appeal, the Supreme Court of the Belorussian S.S.R left the sentence unchanged.

On 1 August, the third day of the trial, Buzinnikov was granted a final word. He took the latest issue of *Izvestia* from his pocket and read out an announcement of the anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Agreement.

On 1 August, the third day of the trial, Buzinnikov was granted a final word. He took the latest issue of *Izvestia* from his pocket and read out an announcement of the anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Agreement.
The Trial of Shatalov

On 10 August the Stavropol Territorial Court, presided over by V. P. Leontiev, sentenced N. P. Shatalov (Chronicle 48) under article 190-1 of the Russian Criminal Code to 18 months in a strict-regime camp. Shatalov was in custody from 10 August 1977 to 16 March 1978 (during this time he also underwent a forensic-psychiatric examination as an in-patient). After the verdict was pronounced he was taken into custody in the courtroom. The verdict stated:

...In March 1976 the accused Shatalov and — under his influence — members of his family, decided to renounce citizenship of the USSR with the aim of emigrating to the USA. From this time on he gave explanations for this decision to emigrate in conversations with I. F. LedOnov, Chairman of the village soviet, and Kovalyov, a local inspector of the Petrovsky District O V D. When they suggested he look for work, he repeatedly made deliberately false comments defaming the political system. Thus, in conversations with LedOnov the accused stated that under the existing system in the Soviet Union he could not find work, that working people in the Soviet Union were oppressed in all sorts of ways, that they had no rights or freedoms, and that the authorities reduced their rights in every way they could.

In conversations with local inspector Kovalyov, the accused repeatedly stated that he did not want to work because he wanted to emigrate; he did not like the laws in force in the Soviet Union, and working people in the USSR were oppressed and had no rights or freedoms.

In November 1976, with the aim of disseminating deliberate fabrications slandering the Soviet social and political system, Shatalov started writing letters containing these fabrications and sent them to various state organs.

Thus, on 28 April 1977 the accused wrote two letters, which he sent by post to the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, one being addressed to members of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR. These letters of the accused contain in written form deliberate fabrications alleging that there is no justice in the Soviet Union, that Shatalov's family was being mocked in subtle ways with the assistance both of modern science and of the techniques of the medieval Inquisition.

On 1 May 1977 the accused wrote and sent by post to the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR a letter containing a fabrication alleging that the Soviet jurisprudence is criminal.

On 22 June 1977 the accused Shatalov wrote and sent by post a letter addressed to L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, in which he wrote deliberate fabrications alleging that arbitrary repression exists in the Soviet Union, that most of the working masses are being robbed, that there is economic destitution and unlimited prospects of imprisonment, that hypocrisy and deceit have been elevated to the level of political policies and that a regime of personal power has been established in the country. On 27 December Shatalov wrote and sent by post a letter addressed to the Procurator-General of the USSR containing fabrications alleging that socialist society is a forge of violence, that those who point out the villains are considered misfits, and that throughout the country tyranny, cynicism and sadism rule. Thus the accused by his premeditated actions committed a criminal act under article 190-1 of the Russian Criminal Code.

When questioned in court Shatalov pleaded not guilty and explained to the court that he had indeed written and sent a number of letters to various state organs, but in these letters he had described the state of affairs in the USSR as it really was.

Witness I. F. LedOnov explained to the court that the accused Shatalov, after renouncing citizenship of the USSR, repeatedly stated in conversations with him that there was no justice in the USSR, that people were deprived of their rights, and that if he and his family were not granted permission to emigrate from the USSR he would initiate a campaign of agitation among those who were dissatisfied with Soviet power.

Witness Kovalyov explained to the court that when Shatalov's family renounced citizenship of the USSR the accused and his wife and daughter refused to look for work. In conversations with him the accused repeatedly asserted that he did not intend to work as he had already done all the work due from him, that the power situation in the country would soon be changing, that this would be brought about by people such as the accused, Solzhenitsyn, Sakharov and others, that if he were not allowed to emigrate he would start a campaign of agitation among the people and seek out people who were dissatisfied with Soviet power. Moreover, Shatalov repeatedly declared that citizens' rights were suppressed in the Soviet Union.

Procurator B. I. Dremov took part in the trial. There was no defence lawyer.

Two workers who formerly worked with Shatalov stated in their...
testimonies at the trial that Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn wanted another revolution in the USSR, but that they, the working people, would not allow such a thing to happen. Shatalov's wife and daughter Tatyana were also witnesses; after giving their testimonies they were removed from the courtroom.

Shatalov's challenge regarding the composition of the court was rejected.

As justification for not imposing a maximum sentence the court referred in the verdict to the fact that Shatalov (born in 1929) was for a long time engaged in socially useful work and 'the crime he committed did not belong to the category of serious crimes'.

On 23 August, in Sovetsk, a session of the Kaliningrad Regional Court presided over by I. I. Kapturov started examining the case of V. Ivanovich Konovalikhin (Chronicle 49), charged under article 190-1 of the Russian Criminal Code. The state prosecutor was Deputy Regional Procurator V. P. Sizov, there was a civic prosecutor, P. N. Stankov, and the defence counsel was barrister A. G. Panfilov.

Konovalikhin was presented with the charges and taken into custody. On 20 July Konovalikhin was presented with the final charge sheet and released after he had signed an undertaking not to leave the town. On the same day he and his defence counsel studied the case — the pre-trial investigation was over.

On 28 March criminal proceedings were instituted against Vadim Nazimov (see Chronicle 49), charged under article 190-1 of the Russian Criminal Code. The judge used similar methods to obtain 'confirmation' of the charges from most of the witnesses. Marakina, an accountant at a television workshop, and Bogachev, a former radio mechanic there, related at the trial that the testimonies they had given at the pre-trial investigation concerning Konovalikhin's spoken remarks were obtained from them by Investigator Kudashkin reading them extracts from Konovalikhin's statements.

On 25 May Konovalikhin was presented with the charges and taken into custody. While in custody Konovalikhin gave some testimony and pleaded guilty. Later, in a private letter, Konovalikhin explained: "This thing is, my mother is very ill and it looks as though I won't see her again. I have therefore taken this step — see you in court!"

On 23 August the trial began. Entry to the courtroom was open to all. As soon as the session began Konovalikhin gave the presiding judge the following statement:

Since I, Vadim Ivanovich Konovalikhin, did not and do not consider myself guilty under article 190-1, I declare before the court that I renounce my signatures on the investigation documents which contain deliberately false charges against me ... I also renounce the statements I wrote myself about repentance, as I wrote the signatures and repentance in exchange for release from custody."

The judge began to read this statement out quietly and then, thrown into confusion, cast a questioning look at the Procurator.

After the reading of the indictment Konovalikhin explained that he did not consider himself guilty, as all the remarks he had made in statements and oral discussions corresponded to reality.

The judge then read the conclusion of the official forensic-psychiatric examination, and, with the words 'It's bad that they're interfering', he also read the letter of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes (Chronicle 49).

When Konovalikhin's statement was read out concerning his resignation from Soviet trades unions and his wish to join the (American) A F L-C I O or the Free Trades Union (Chronicles 48 and 49) (this is one of the statements with which Konovalikhin was charged), People's Assessor A. V. Kotov asked: "But aren't you aware that Meany belongs to a gangster organization?"

The first witness to testify was the accused's father, I. A. Konovalikhin. He said, in particular, that his son had fallen under the influence of the 'unclean', a group of nine individuals formed in Sovetsk by Romen Kosterin (see Chronicle 49 and 'Arrests, Searches, Interrogations' in the present issue) with the aim of defending human rights.

Witness N. N. Nazimov, Party Organizer of the P M K (?), where Konovalikhin had worked during the summer of 1977, said that he had not personally heard Konovalikhin make any slanderous remarks, but had heard from other employees that Konovalikhin had expressed dissatisfaction with Soviet power. When the judge read out a number of phrases from Konovalikhin's 'criminal' statements and asked Nazimov to comment on them, Nazimov confirmed them. Konovalikhin attempted to object to the judge's leading questions, but the judge warned him that he would have him forcibly taken out of the courtroom.

The judge used similar methods to obtain 'confirmation' of the charges from most of the witnesses. Marakina, an accountant at a television workshop, and Bogachev, a former radio mechanic there, related at the trial that the testimonies they had given at the pre-trial investigation concerning Konovalikhin's spoken remarks were obtained from them by Investigator Kudashkin reading them extracts from Konovalikhin's statements.

Bogachev said that while working with Konovalikhin he noticed that the administration used to nag him constantly. After his dismissal (in February he had been dismissed from the workshop for 'absenteeism', when Konovalikhin tried to get a court to reinstate him..."
in his job, the head of the television workshop, Galushko, had rung the KGB and asked them to exert pressure on the court. 'I agree on certain points with Konovalikhin's criticism of the Soviet system,' Bogachev declared.

Galushko related that when money was being collected for the Peace Fund, Konovalikhin had said he would prefer to donate to the Aid Fund for Political Prisoners. Galushko said that when stating his socialist obligations Konovalikhin undertook to fight for human rights and wage rises, and against bureaucrats. Galushko also said that Konovalikhin frequently made slanderous remarks about the CPSU, Soviet trades unions and the voting system.

Konovalikhin appealed to the court for a further four witnesses to be called. His petition was granted.

Two of them, L. V. Zimin, a dispatcher at the television workshop, and Minin, a radio mechanic, said that they had not heard Konovalikhin make any anti-Soviet remarks. Minin also said that Konovalikhin was dismissed from the workshop for criticising the administration and the trades unions.

Minin's assertion was supported by radio mechanic Safonov: 'Both Konovalikhin and I missed work, but only Konovalikhin was dismissed.' Safonov said that Konovalikhin had been dismissed for making critical remarks and for wanting to emigrate from the USSR, while Galushko was the one who had provoked the discussions of political subjects.

Ibbaullin, the head of the aerials department, stated to the court that there was no freedom of the press in the USSR and that CPSU officials were appointed as the chairman of city soviet executive committees. In his opinion there were no grounds for bringing Konovalikhin to trial.

When the questioning of witnesses was completed, at Konovalikhin's request the judge read out article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (on the right to emigration and free movement within one's own territory).

The court investigation lasted three days. On 30 August the summing-up speeches commenced. Procurator Sizov demanded that Konovalikhin be given three years in camps, while barrister Panfilov demanded that he be acquitted, as in his remarks and statements he had expressed his beliefs, so they could not be considered 'deliberate fabrications.' The verdict was pronounced on the same day.

The following is an extract from the verdict:

Under the influence of the foreign anti-Soviet broadcasts to which he had been listening, Konovalikhin systematically, in 1977-1978, prepared by writing and typing on a 'Moscow' typewriter especially obtained for the purpose, and disseminated, deliberate fabrications slandering the Soviet social and political system. These he sent to party and Soviet administrative organs and to trades-union organizations of the USSR, and also to international bodies and official and private persons in foreign states.

Thus on 2 October 1977, at his flat, he wrote a statement containing deliberate fabrications defaming the Soviet state and the policies of the Communist Party; he sent this to the 7th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and sent a copy to the United Nations Organization.

On 7 January 1978 he wrote similar statements containing similar slanderous fabrications which he addressed to Soviet trades unions and sent to the local committee of the trades-union organization of the Sovetsk production unit No. 4 of the 'Ekran' combine, and on 21 February 1978 he wrote and sent a statement to the local committee of the Kaliningrad regional radio and television repair combine; he intended to send a copy of it to the All-Union Central Trade Union Council and the so-called 'Group to Assist the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements on Human Rights Questions'. He wrote and sent letters and statements of anti-Soviet content slandering the Soviet social and political system to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Procurator-General of the USSR, the Procurators of the Kaliningrad Region and Sovetsk, Amnesty International in London, the West German Chancellor and other official and private persons in foreign states.

In addition, Konovalikhin systematically and with bad intent disseminated deliberate fabrications slandering the Soviet social and political system. He did this in conversation with workers of PMK-24 and the Sovetsk production combine 'Ekran', where he worked from 1977 to 1978.

In court Konovalikhin pleaded not guilty to preparing and disseminating in written, spoken and printed form deliberate fabrications slandering the Soviet social and political system, and explained that from 1977 to 1978 in answer to the state organs' refusal to grant him permission to emigrate, he sent letters and statements to Soviet political and social organizations and also to official and private persons and organizations in foreign states.

In these letters and statements he expounded in sharp form his views on the Soviet social and political system, but he did not consider this to be slander.

He made similar remarks in conversations with employees of PMK-24 and the No. 4 production unit for radio equipment repair.

Witnesses Nazimov, Popov, Pomadin, Marakina, Slikov, Bogachev, Fakhruddinov, Zotova, Galushko and Plekhova explained in
The court applied article 43 of the Russian Criminal Code:

...and sentenced Konovalikhin to 4 years' exile. The time he spent in custody (from 28 March to 29 March and from 25 May to 20 July) and under psychiatric examination was calculated according to the usual 'one to three' ratio. The court kept in force the former measure of restraint — his signed undertaking not to leave the town. Konovalikhin's typewriter was confiscated as an 'instrument of crime'.

The court has taken into account the nature and degree of social danger of the crime, the fact that it is a first offence, details about his character, and also the possibility of reform and re-education without isolation from society...
V. Bedarev recounted at the trial that on the night of 14 to 15 March he did indeed give someone a lift, but this person was not Raksha, whom he knew very well, but a stranger. This person asked him to wait near the house on Soyuznaya Street. Soon after he heard cries for help, and when he ran up he saw some people in plain clothes twisting his passenger's arms. He helped him struggle free and they started to run away. Bedarev said that he pleaded guilty only to the fact that he did not stop his car at the demand of a man in a policeman's uniform, but he had not been certain that he really was a policeman. There was no intent, in his actions, to run him over, and, furthermore, the policeman had stood to one side of the car, which had only just started off.

P. Raksha said practically nothing at first. When the judge asked whether he pleaded guilty and where he was on 14 March, he replied that whatever he said would have no influence on the court's decision. 'Who interrogated you?' the judge asked. Raksha answered that when he was seized in the street he was taken to Ponomaryov and then questioned by Investigator Nepomnyashchy and again by Ponomaryov. He was threatened with either 15 years or the death penalty, and all the time led from one cell to the next. He also said that in an 'identification' parade he was placed between two men who were very much unlike him in appearance (one of them was 65 years old). When he was identified as the criminal, Raksha declared to the Investigator that this was a lie and the latter again threatened him with the firing squad.

Raksha did not answer the court's question concerning his relatives or any other people. But when he saw his mother-in-law in the courtroom he apparently stopped worrying that he would endanger his relatives by mentioning them and their addresses in his testimony, and said that on the night of 14 to 15 March he had not been in Tashkent at all. On 13 March he and his wife and three children flew to Kiev to take part in his sister-in-law's funeral, which was to take place in the village of Bezuglyaki, Skvinsky District, Kiev Region. Raksha's defence counsel submitted to the court numerous written items of evidence of people living in the same village as Raksha's relatives; these testimonies confirmed that he stayed there from 13 to 20 March; they had been authenticated by the village council.

However, the investigation had submitted information from Tashkent Airport stating that neither P. Raksha nor his wife flew from Tashkent on the flight they indicated. The defence counsel, pointing to the dubious nature of this information, which bore no issue num-

The arguments of the accused Raksha stating that on 14 March 1978 he could not have committed the crime in question because
The Trial of Bolonkin

On 5 October the Supreme Court of the Uzbek S S R examined the appeal of Bedarev and Raksha. Bedarev's sentence was left unchanged. Raksha's sentence was quashed and the case referred back for re-examination. Raksha remained in custody.

The trial of Raksha and Bedarev is the subject of 'Open Letter No. 3', dated September 1978, of the All-Union Church of True and Free Seventh-Day Adventists (Nos. 1 and 2 are about the arrests and searches in March and April 1978). In the letter (the factual parts of which are used above) there is special stress on the fact that the organizers of the frame-up regarded the case of Raksha and Bedarev as having great propagandistic importance: by portraying the two men as terrorists who had attempted to murder a police-officer, they could — ahead of Shelkov's trial — stir up public opinion against the Adventists. Procurator Ponomaryov, as the 'Letter' relates, said: 'We won't be trying Shelkov for his religious beliefs; no, it'll be for common crimes.'

The Trial of Bolonkin

On 20 April, 26 days before the completion of his exile, A. A. Bolonkin was arrested (in 1976 he completed four years in camps under article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code).

On 6 May he was taken in handcuffs by plane from Bagdarin to Ulan-Ude and placed in cell No. 74 of Investigations Prison No. 2/1 (Chronicle 49). During the two weeks that Bolonkin was in Ulan-Ude he was not once interrogated, but on 15 May Reshetnikov, a prisoner under investigation, beat him up, indicating to him that he was acting on instructions. On 21 May Bolonkin was taken to Bagdarin.

On 30 May he was taken back to Ulan-Ude and placed in the cell he occupied before. Oleichik, a prisoner in the same cell, told Bolonkin that he was being held in an investigations prison used for special assignments.

On 2 June Oleichik returned to the cell after a long absence and said that he had seen the Head of the Operations Section, who had given him a special task and a bottle of vodka. Oleichik started beating Bolonkin up, because, he said, the Head of the Operations Section had instructed him to do so. Oleichik demanded that Bolonkin plead guilty and give the testimony the investigators were trying to extract from him. He threatened Bolonkin that he would rape him and kill him. Telling him that the Head of the Operations Section had guaranteed him full immunity, as everything had been agreed in higher
circles, Oleichik attacked Bolonkin with a knife.

On 3 June Bolonkin wrote about the above to the Procurator-General of the USSR.

It is known that at least up to 11 June he had, once more, had no interrogation.

On 21 June Yu. A. Shikhanovich (Chronicle 2, 27, 30, 32 and 34) appealed to the Procurator-General of the USSR, requesting his intervention in Bolonkin's case. The reason he gave for making this request was the methods used in the investigation. Shikhanovich's declaration was forwarded to the Procuracy of the Buryat ASSR, from which a reply was sent on 26 July:

... In the actions of Investigator B. F. Aleksandrov in the investigation of the criminal case with respect to Bolonkin, there was no infringement of legality, and the information about persecution of Bolonkin by his cell-mates has not been confirmed.

In a letter of 8 November sent from camp, Bolonkin wrote: 'Tell Yura Shikhanovich that I am very grateful to him for coming to my defence. My situation improved a little after this ...'

In July the pre-trial investigation was completed. On 4 August the Eravninsky District People's Court, presided over by E. B. Zhanchipov, examined in Bagdarin Settlement the case of Bolonkin, charged under article 92, part 2 ('stealing of state property ... property, effected through fraudulence'), article 147, part 2 ('fraudulence', article 156, part 1 ('deceiving clients'), and article 175 ('forgery whilst at work') of the Russian Criminal Code. The prosecutor at the trial was Procurator A. F. Baiborodin (from Ulan-Ude) and the defence lawyer was barrister S. N. Ktoyan (from Bagdarin).

At the trial, as during the pre-trial investigation, Bolonkin categorically denied any guilt. His copies of the legal codes and the notes he had made from the case materials were confiscated. During the trial one charge was changed and one dropped. The court sentenced Bolonkin under article 93, part 2 ('stealing of state property, effected through fraudulence'), article 147, part 2, and article 156, part 1, to 3 years in strict-regime camps and repayment of the 1,340 'stolen' rubles.

On 31 October Bolonkin arrived at his camp. Almost immediately, on 4 November, he had to enter hospital with paraproctitis [*anal inflammation*], where he stayed for three weeks. At the end of November he was transferred to another camp with the address: 670016, Buryat ASSR, Ulan-Ude, pos. Yuzhny, uchr.OV-94/2-B.

Arrests, Searches, Interrogations

Moscow, On 25 August Moscow KGB officials, headed by a senior investigator of the Investigations Department, Captain V. S. Semenyuk, conducted a search of the home of Mark Aronovich Morozov (Chronicle 47). The decision to conduct a search was authorized by a military procurator. In the decision it was stated that the search was being conducted in connection with Case No. 494. Among the confiscated items were a xerox copy of A. Amalrik's book Will the Soviet Union Survive until 1984?, A. Solzhenitsyn's One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, a brochure by Yu. V. Andropov entitled Communist Belief is the Great Strength of the Builders of a New World (probably because of the marginal notes), two tape-recorders and a camera.

On 10 October M. Morozov sent a statement to the Moscow Procurator:

I categorically assure you, citizen Procurator, that whatever the mysterious Case No. 494 being conducted by counter-intelligence, I am not involved in any intrigues by capitalist powers against our country. Therefore I am compelled to interpret any attention paid by counter-intelligence to myself as the continuation of a campaign of insinuation aimed at discrediting the Soviet human rights movement, the beginning of which was marked by the very sad case of A. Sheharinsky.

In connection with the fact that the search conducted by counter-intelligence has undoubtedly tended to dishonour my name as a Soviet dissident in the eyes of decent Soviet citizens, I would like to believe that when the KGB investigators reach the only conclusion possible, namely that I am innocent and was not a party to any
Crime, they will make me a public apology to compensate for the moral harm they have done me... I will be grateful to you if you use the prerogative of your office to return most speedily the confiscated articles, which cannot be material evidence, if only because there is no corpus delicti...

On 1 November Mark Morozov was arrested. The investigation of his case (apparently under article 10 of the Russian Criminal Code) is being conducted by Major N. N. Belyayev and Senior Lieutenant N. A. Olezhko. At several interrogations the questions concerned 'information leaks' (on the day Alexander Podrabinek was arrested someone phoned several people to warn them that he would be arrested that day).

On the same day searches were conducted at the home and workplace of Igor Veniaminovich Zhiv. Igor Zhiv himself was taken to Lefortovo early in the morning; here Investigator Major Chernysh (Chronicle 46) interrogated him in connection with the Morozov case all day (11 hours). The interrogation began with the threat that Zhiv was a witness who could very quickly become an accused. According to Chernysh, Morozov and Zhiv had pasted up on walls and distributed via letter-boxes a photocopied leaflet (Zhiv works in the photographic laboratory of a scientific institute). The leaflet, which carried pictures of Orlov, Ginsburg and Shchuransky, demanded their release (Chernysh showed Zhiv the pamphlet). Zhiv replied that he was hardly likely to be able to help him (Chernysh) in any way. After the search at Zhiv's workplace he was forbidden to go out on work assignments and to leave the building during his lunch-breaks.

Bobruisk (Mogilev Region). On 30 August porter Oleg Borisov told Mikhail Kukobaka (Chronicles 47 and 48) in front of everyone in a changing-room that he had received a packet from Minsk for Kukobaka. On the way home Borisov was stopped by a police-officer and two men in plain clothes, who asked him to give them the packet. If he refused, they told Borisov, he could be sent to a labour-treatment clinic for two years for excessive use of wine. Seizing the parcel and without even opening it, they put Borisov into a waiting vehicle and drove him to the local K G B office. There they 'had a chat' with him about Kukobaka's relations with other workers. During the 'chat' they told Borisov: 'You should know that Kukobaka is a lunatic, and you ought to avoid all contact with him.' (The parcel turned out to contain a book by D. Shub entitled Russian Political Figures, 1850 to 1920.)

On the evening of 31 August three plain-clothes officers called on Sergei Novikov, a worker, at his home. One of them produced K G B identification and said that illegal literature belonging to Kukobaka was being stored in the house, and that it was necessary to confiscate it. He added in passing that they were aware that while the house was being repaired, Novikov had tried to 'circumvent the law' and obtain certain building materials. A number of samizdat articles, interviews by Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn, articles by Kukobaka himself and tape-recordings of Western broadcasts of them, the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, a picture of Grigorevko, photographs and personal correspondence belonging to Kukobaka, and also the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Bulletin of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R, the text of the Helsinki Final Act, and a printed letter ready for posting to P. N. Masherov, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party, were confiscated.

On 1 September two plain-clothes officers openly and persistently followed Kukobaka. On 2 September this had increased to three men and a car.

On 3 September Kukobaka sent a protest to the Head of the Bobruisk K G B office and a letter to Masherov. On 5 September he sent a protest-statement to the Procurator-General of the U.S.S.R. At some time in September Kukobaka sent to Pravda an open letter to Andropov in which he described the conditions in which he had been obliged to live during the past two years, i.e. since he was released.

In a chat with N. F. Kuklitskaya, Deputy Head of the Bobruisk communications office, Kukobaka managed to find out that on the orders of the Mogilev Regional Procurator (see 'The Trial of Buzinov') his correspondence had been confiscated up to 20 August. On 1 October Kukobaka sent the Mogilev Regional Procurator a complaint about the violation of the secrecy and integrity of his correspondence.

On 19 October Kukobaka was arrested. At his workplace it was officially announced that he had engaged in agitation. The investigation is being conducted by an investigator of the Mogilev Regional Procuracy, Pichugov. In conversation with an acquaintance of Kukobaka he said that he had no doubt that Kukobaka was mentally deficient. Kukobaka was sent for psychiatric examination.

In connection with Kukobaka's arrest the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes and the Moscow Helsinki Group made a joint statement about their fears over his fate. The appeal, entitled 'Stop an Imminent Act of Tyranny!', was signed by 15 people.

Leningrad. In the spring of 1976, on the opening day of the 25th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, a group of young people distributed pamphlets. One of the members of this group, Andrei Reznikov, a first-year student of the Applied Mathematics Faculty of
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Leningrad University, was arrested. He was charged under article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code, but the case was closed after one month (probably in accordance with article 6 of the Russian Code of Criminal Procedure), and he was released. The other members of the group were expelled from their institutes, and one was even expelled from school (Chronicle 40). Alexander Skobov was a member of the group (see below on him; in Chronicle 40 he is mistakenly referred to as Strogov).

On 4 April the group 'Leningrad School' confirmed the following 'programmatic statement':

1. A group of young people, motivated by their dissatisfaction with the surrounding reality — that motor of social progress — have decided to embark on coordinated social activity aimed at transforming the existing society.
2. The group starts from the desire to bring about a social system capable of satisfying the widest material and spiritual demands of each member of society, and of guaranteeing each individual the opportunity of full and harmonious development. The group considers communism to be such a social system ...
3. The group takes Marxism as its theoretical basis ...
4. By means of a Marxist analysis of reality the group has reached the conclusion that the existing system in the USSR constitutes state-monopoly capitalism ...
5. The process whereby this system was established in Russia after the 1917 revolution was in keeping with the laws of history and was inevitable.
6. The establishment of this system was at that time progressive ...
7. An analysis of the present state of Soviet society has brought the group to the conclusion that the Soviet system has already fulfilled its historic function and has outlived its day. The consequence and main symptom of this is the crisis which has seized our society, manifested in the loss of faith among the masses in the official 'religion', their increasing apathy as citizens, the intellectual and moral impasse which society has entered, and the growth of moral depravities ...
8. The development of our system has entered the downward phase. For mankind's next step to be on the path to progress it is essential to replace it with a more forward-thinking system — socialism ...
9. The transition from state-monopoly capitalism to socialism is essentially a revolutionary process, for it involves the removal from power of the class of state bureaucrats as a result of a class struggle against it by the working classes, led by the intelligentsia.
10. The intelligentsia is the most progressive class of the late 20th century ...
11. The revolutionary process of the transition to socialism can take place in peaceful ways if the ruling class, after realistically appraising the situation, makes concessions and accordingly democratizes the existing system. Such a squeezing of the bureaucracy from power will be able to occur through normal methodical political struggle within the framework of a legal constitutional system.
12. This kind of revolutionary course is the most to be desired ...
13. An indispensable condition for achieving it is the presence of a strong, organized and, most important, constructive opposition, which will present the government with a peaceful solution to conflict, and which has a concrete programme for improvements.
14. The intelligentsia will then be able to play its vanguard role and lead the masses behind it, will then be able to give birth to a strong, organized opposition when it finally forms itself into its own class, will advance its own programme and form its own political party, a militant, united vanguard party.
15. To achieve all this the intelligentsia must overcome its three weaknesses: ideological, organizational and moral. For this, in turn, the exchange of information and ideas and the discussion of burning policial questions must be organized in intellectually critical circles. It is necessary to undertake education and self-education to unite cultural forces and stimulate public thinking. The group sees its primary task as furthering this aim ...

In spring 1978 the group began to issue a journal entitled Perspective. By autumn two issues had come out and a third was under way. For mid-October the group organized a conference. On 12 October searches were conducted at the homes of the group's leaders — Arkady Tsurkov, a second-year student at the Pedagogical Institute, Andrei Reznikov and his 18-year-old wife Irina Fyodorova. Copies of The Gulag Archipelago, A Chronicle of Current Events, From Under the Rubble and Perspective were confiscated. A search was carried out at the same time at the home of 19-year-old Irina Lopotshina. A typewriter, photographic equipment and materials for the third issue of the journal Perspective were confiscated.

On 14 October Andrei Besov, who had just arrived from Moscow, was detained at a railway-station 'on suspicion of stealing' (Besov was born in 1948; he left the Komsomol in 1966 in connection with the Sinjavsky and Daniel case; during his army service he was given a medical discharge, put on the register of a psychiatric clinic as a schizophrenic; he was interned in psychiatric hospitals on a number of occasions; in 1977 he sent critical remarks on the draft new Constitution to several Soviet newspapers).

During the search in the station's police-office, photographic film of The Gulag Archipelago and copies of Will the Soviet Union...
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Survive Until 1984? were confiscated from Besov. He was then released, but after a few minutes detained once again 'for justling and insulting citizens'. In the police-office a record was drawn up about 'petty hooliganism'. On 16 October a court sent Besov for psychiatric examination. Until 16 November Besov was in Leningrad Psychiatric Hospital No. 6 (here he was administered amatin), and then he was transferred to Moscow's 'transit' Psychiatric Hospital No. 7, and a few days later he was transferred from here also.

Also on 14 October Viktor Pavlenkov (a resident of Gorky and the son of Vladlen Pavlenkov — Chronicles 10, 42 and 47) was detained at a different railway-station and imprisoned for 'petty hooliganism'.

On 16 October Alexander Skobov, a fourth-year student in the History Faculty of Leningrad University, a member of the editorial board of the journal Perspective and organizer of a 'commune', was arrested. (Many young people used to come to Skobov's flat, exchange samizdat and hold discussions; his flat was also frequented by people from other towns; the 'commune' survived for half a year; in September 1978 the police broke it up.) According to the Procurator, proceedings have been instituted against Skobov under article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code.

A. Reznikov, I. Fyodorova, A. Tsurkov, I. Lopotukhina and Lev Kuchai signed an appeal calling for people to take up Skobov's defence. In this appeal they call themselves a 'left opposition group'.

On 25 October a search was carried out at the home of Aleksel Chistyakov, a third-year student of the Languages Faculty of Leningrad University.

On 31 October Arkady Tsurkov was arrested. He is also charged under article 70.

Numerous interrogations (30 to 40 people have already been summoned) are being conducted in connection with Case No. 70. KGB Investigators Blinov, Karmatsky, Leputin and Tsygankov refuse to clarify the central issue of the case, since, according to them, it is an investigation secret. In reply, Reznikov and Fyodorova have refused to give evidence.

Kuibyshev. On 7 November Vladimir Bekko (born 1953), a second-year student at Kuibyshev Polytechnic Institute, was arrested.

Vladislav's father is a factory foreman and his mother a nurse. In 1972 V. Bekko entered the Kuibyshev Constructional Engineering Institute. After one year he was expelled 'for academic failures' and found a job.

In 1975 a group of young people formed around Bekko. They read and discussed samizdat, made tape-recordings of radio broadcasts of works by V. Maksimov, I. Shafarevich and others. They then decided to 'go on to the street'. The first time it was without 'political intentions'.

On 1 April 1976 a noisy group of about 30 to 40 young people chanting humorous slogans processed from Samara Square. Thirty minutes later the police blocked their path. Twelve people were taken to a police station. On the orders of KGB Captain Bekko, records were compiled that three of them had disrupted public order. The following day V. Bekko was given 15 days in prison and two others, V. Ryzhov and V. Funtikov, 10 days each. During their imprisonment KGB officials 'chatted' with them.

The KGB continued to take an interest in the group of young people which had formed around Bekko. The group fell apart by winter.

On 1 April 1977 Bekko and the workers V. Solomko and A. Sarbayev again went to demonstrate. This time they took a placard demanding freedoms (of the press, expression etc). They were seized on the way and detained. Their placard was confiscated and then they were released.

In 1977 Bekko entered a polytechnic institute. In February 1978 he was subjected to a series of interrogations in the Kuibyshev KGB offices, after which he was issued a caution in accordance with the 25 December 1972 Decree. Bekko was charged with 'anti-Soviet remarks, the dissemination of anti-Soviet materials and "Charter 77" and organizational activity in forming an anti-Soviet group'. At the beginning of March A. Sarbayev was issued a similar caution.

On 1 April 1978 Bekko was put under preventive detention and taken to be interviewed by the KGB. On 7 April he was again detained and searched and a tape-recording of a 'Voice of America' broad..
were confiscated. Vladislav’s father said that these two sheets belonged to Marina Ryabova.

On 10 November a search was carried out at Ryabova’s flat. Three spools of tape, six notepads and two notebooks ‘containing notes’, and a typewriter were confiscated. On 12 November Konstantinov and Ryabova were released.

On 15 November further criminal proceedings were instituted against Bekko under article 190-1 of the Russian Criminal Code. He was transferred to Investigations Prison I Z-42/1. The investigation was carried out by V. A. Korotkev, Investigator of the Kuibyshev Regional Procuracy. Bekko refused to give testimony, made a statement about the political motives for his actions, and demanded political prisoner status.

Sovetsk (Kaliningrad Region). On 2 August Roman Kosterin was arrested. Kosterin is a friend of Konovalikhin [see above]. In March a search was conducted at his flat in connection with Konovalikhin’s case (Chronicle 49; here he was mistakenly called Roman). Kosterin was charged under article 190-1 of the Russian Criminal Code. The Procuracy Investigator Kudashkin (Chronicle 49) threatened him with physical reprisals and also that his wife would be arrested and his daughter put into an orphanage.

Kosterin worked as an artist in a municipal park. The First Secretary of the Sovetsk town party committee, Petushkov, disrupted the exhibition he had mounted for the May holidays. For this reason Kosterin sent a complaint to Brezhnev.

Kosterin’s wife works as a history and sociology school-teacher.

Krasnoyarsk. On 13 June officials of the Krasnoyarsk K G B conducted searches at the home of engineer Vladimir Georgievich Sirotinin and senior economist Vera Evgenevna Parfenova. The searches were conducted on the instructions of the Chief of the Investigations Department of the Leningrad K G B, Major Savelev, in connection with Case No. 86 — ‘on illegal involvement in producing printed material’ (Chronicle 49; apparently the defendants in this case are Bakhtin and Peretyatko). Copies of Cancer Ward and The Gulag Archipelago were confiscated, along with a reel of film containing The Great Terror by Robert Conquest. At subsequent interrogations the investigators asserted that Boris Vail (Chronicle 47) had given this film to Sirotinin before emigrating.

On 1 August Sirotinin and Parfenova were issued a warning in accordance with the Decree of 25 December 1972. The Deputy Chief of Krasnoyarsk K G B, B. K. Chernyshev, said to Sirotinin, ‘I wonder what you will do when we smash the Moscow dissidents?’

On 9 August ‘discussions’ began in the city ‘Soyuzpechat’ agency where Parfenova works, in the Krasnoyarsk branch of the All-Union State Polytechnic Institute for the Automation of Accounting Systems and Computer Studies attached to the USSR Central Statistical Office, where Sirotinin works, and at the radio factory where his wife Svetlana works.

After the discussions in the ‘Soyuzpechat’ agency the following placard was hung up:

Alarm!

On 9 August a meeting of the collective took place in the city ‘Soyuzpechat’ agency with the following agenda: ‘Condemnation of the hostile anti-Soviet activities of senior economist Parfenova.’

In the course of the meeting speeches were made by officials of the agency, who angrily condemned her hostile actions against our reality.

Resolution of the Meeting

Expel Parfenova from our collective!

Four months before reaching retirement age V. A. Parfenova resigned her job ‘of her own free will’.

At the radio factory meeting Strelkova, Third Secretary of the October District Party Committee, called on the employees to create an intolerable atmosphere around Sirotinina. (Sirotinina has worked at the factory for 19 years, during 12 of which she has been a member of the local party committee and has been awarded the Order of the Red Banner of Labour).

At many of the lectures given in Krasnoyarsk at this time remarks were made insinuating that Sirotinin and Parfenova were involved in the Moscow metro explosions (Chronicle 44).

During K G B interrogations I. D. Minyat, a sales assistant at a bookshop (at the beginning of August she was promoted), and E. I. Alichenko, a worker, gave evidence about people from whom they had received ‘forbidden’ books.

Tolyatti (Kuibyshev Region). On 12 and 13 September K G B officers conducted a search at the workplace of M. V. Zotov (Chronicle 49; he works as an artist at a dairy combine). Samizdat and Zotov’s own archive were confiscated. In reply to the K G B officers’ request to tell them who gave him the samizdat Zotov wrote an ‘Explanatory Note’ (a copy of which he sent to Krugin). In this ‘Note’ Zotov (b. 1923) recounts that in 1939, after finishing his apprenticeship, he started working as a metal-worker. In 1941, when the war started, his father was no longer alive. Since his mother’s maiden name was
German, she and Mikhail Zotov, together with his brother, were sent to Siberia — at first to a place of exile, then to a camp. With some difficulty M. Zotov managed to be sent to the front. In August 1944 he was wounded for the fifth time and demobilized. In 1949 his mother was released from compulsory labour due to illness, but in 1959 the authorities decided that she had recovered and returned her to the work army. At the same time, whilst working as a milling-machine operator, Zotov was producing three one-year output norms per year. In 1957, owing to ill health, he was no longer able to stand at his machine and began to draw. Since 1963 he has been trying to arrange an exhibition of his pictures. His 'Note' concludes:

nowadays dissidents are the only people who are at least in some way trying to eradicate injustice, to reveal just what it is that makes them dissidents. In any matter it is a hundred times more important to know the Causes than the Effects!

In our country, though, the authorities want to spit on the Causes; they don't want to face up to the evidence produced by the dissidents. In advance and without hesitation they call this evidence slanderous. Under such circumstances the naming of any one of the dissidents who have given me the opportunity of getting to know the voices of Sakharov, Grigorenko and others, to give the names of these people, knowing perfectly well that instead of looking at the Causes (I repeat) and eradicting these Causes, the authorities will simply take action on the unworthy secondary question — the eradication of the Results, under such conditions to name anyone would be sacrilege!

I can say nothing more and only ask one more time: find some answers to the questions — Who profits by prolonging the Causes which provoke dissidence?

On 1 November officials of the Tolyatti City Procuracy, on orders from the Moscow Procuracy, conducted a search of Zotov's home and workplace and of his mother's home. Before the search began it was suggested to Zotov that he surrender 'materials, documents, printed publications and items defaming the Soviet political and social system'.

The bulk of material confiscated consisted of pictures (many of a political nature) and manuscripts by Zotov and photographs of his pictures. After the search Zotov wrote a statement to the Procurator-General of the U S S R:

Dear Mr Procurator, two years ago I sent several statements to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I stressed that only under duress could I be a citizen of this super-Chilean regime, that is, a citizen of the U S S R. So why was I not allowed to leave? ... Would it not be better to use your reason — return what you have confiscated and allow me to go abroad with all this — my manuscripts and pictures? This way I would at least have no motivation to paint new pictures.

Chernovtsy. In February K G B officials detained the Director of the District House of Culture, Sherbul, and the sculptor Lisakovsky, and charged them with being Ukrainian nationalists, duplicating and distributing anti-Soviet and nationalist literature (in particular a tape-recording of an essay by Valentin Moroz entitled 'Amid the Snows'), and with participation in nationalist gatherings. Lisakovsky was also charged with distortion of an article by Lenin on the national question. The K G B officers said that Sherbul and Lisakovsky had arrived from Kiev on an assignment from a certain nationalist organization to create similar groups in Chernovtsy (Sherbul and Lisakovsky both studied in higher educational institutions in Kiev). The K G B officers used threats and blackmail. K G B officer Sochivets tried to set Sherbul and Lisakovsky against one another.

Sherbul was detained for three days. Lisakovsky was released after five hours, but was then twice summoned back to the K G B.

Many acquaintances of Sherbul and Lisakovsky were also summoned by the K G B. A search was carried out at Sherbul's workplace.

Sherbul and Lisakovsky were cautioned under the Decree of 25 December 1972. Both were expelled from the party. Sherbul was dismissed from his job.

Lisakovsky was dismissed from the Regional Council for Art and Public Sculpture. Now, when mention is made in the press of the monument to Czechoslovak soldiers who died in the war, one of the designers of which was Lisakovsky, either the designers are not mentioned at all, or only the co-designers are mentioned. No new works are being assigned to Lisakovsky. Maryanin, a regional newspaper correspondent and author of an article on Lisakovsky's work, and local radio and television contributors who organized a broadcast about him, have all met with unpleasant difficulties at work.

Chernovtsy. On 10 November the Leningrad District Procuracy conducted a search at the home of Iosif Ziels (Chronicles 44, 48, 49), formally in connection with the case of some man named Morgulis, charged with pornographic offences. Naturally no pornography was found. Poetry by Tsvetayeva, Voloshin and Mandelshtam, books by Balgakov, the Gospels, copies of letters from the Austrian poet Paul Celan to friends in Chernovtsy, together with a card-index of
prisoners in psychiatric hospitals (approximately 100 people, a particularly large number of whom are in the Dnepropetrovsk S P H), materials concerning Baptists in Chernovtsy, correspondence with exiles, postal dispatch certificates and official notifications of letter receipt were all confiscated.

Taganrog. In 1976-75 Eduard Kuleshov (b. 1936), a worker at a combine harvester factory, made tape-recordings of Western radio broadcasts of The Gulag Archipelago, and also of a number of speeches by Solzhenitsyn. The tape-recordings were kept by M. Slinkov, a foreman at the same factory, who, without consulting Kuleshov, lent them to a worker at the factory, E. Chernopyatov, who was also a correspondence-course student of Moscow University history faculty. Chernopyatov lent them to an acquaintance, a student of a Taganrog Institute. At about the same time Chernopyatov photographed One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, and gave several copies of it to friends to read.

On 11 November 1977 police arrived at Chernopyatov's flat. They told him that he looked like a bandit wanted by the police. At this point there was a knock at the door. The student appeared. He quickly handed back the tapes and ran away.

Everyone in the flat was then taken to the town police department for interrogation. On the same day M. Slinkov, his wife, and E. Kuleshov were also interrogated.

During his interrogation, which was conducted by a K G B investigator called Gennady Ivanovich, E. Kuleshov admitted that the tapes belonged to him. In reply to the question: why had he made the recordings? Kuleshov said that he had a high opinion of Solzhenitsyn's literary talent and had made the recordings so that he could analyse the work and make an individual appraisal of it. He stated that he did not consider The Gulag Archipelago anti-Soviet.

Slinkov and Chernopyatov were interrogated for a second time in February 1978.

Slinkov was asked about Kuleshov's acquaintances and sphere of interests, whether Kuleshov was thinking of writing a book, whether he intended to campaign against the existing system, and even what Kuleshov's view of Brezhnev was. The Chief of Taganrog K G B, Sorokovoi, threatened Slinkov. He stated that Kuleshov was using Slinkov to obtain information which was then being passed to the West. Slinkov refused to give compromising evidence against Kuleshov. He was cautioned under the Decree of 25 December 1972.

Chernopyatov wrote a detailed character-report on Kuleshov, in which he called him an 'anarchosyndicalist' and an 'anti-Sovietist'. He also named the people who had helped him to photograph One

Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich. (He later defended his graduation essay successfully and finished university.)

On 22 February 1978 E. Kuleshov was interrogated. In reply to a question about his view of Solzhenitsyn Kuleshov again stated that he had a high opinion of him as a writer and a citizen. He said that he considered The Gulag Archipelago a truthful book, and when asked whether he would continue to make similar recordings in future, he replied that he saw nothing wrong in this, but if the law directly forbade it, then he was prepared to comply.

Kuleshov, too, was cautioned under the decree of 25 December 1972.

Odessa. On 25 May officers of the Criminal Investigation Department conducted a search at the home of Vycheslav Igrunov (Chronicles 44, 47). They were looking for a stolen typewriter, gold, and drugs. They found a copy of Doctor Zhivago, articles by Pomerants, a translation of Toynbee's book Change and Custom, and other samizdat items.

Igrunov was summoned to the psychiatric clinic and ordered to appear for check-ups once every ten days. (In November 1977 he was asked to present himself at the clinic once every two months — Chronicle 47).

At the beginning of July a search was conducted at the home of Anna Mikhailenko (Chronicles 42, 44, 49).

In June and July Yulia Savchenko, Alexander Chumakov, Pyotr Butov, and Igrunov's former wife Svetlana Artsimovich were summoned to the K G B for 'talks'. They were questioned largely in connection with the proposed publication of an almanac (part of the material confiscated from Igrunov was intended for this almanac).

Kiev. On 2 June Efim Pargamanik (Chronicles 47, 48; see also 'The Right to Leave' in the present issue) was taken off a flight to Moscow at [Kiev's] Borispil Airport. He was called back by a policeman when already on the airfield. He was taken to a police room, where two plain-clothes officers searched him and his luggage. Several documents, including materials from the appeal hearing in Pyotr Vin's case (Chronicle 49) were confiscated from Pargamanik. After this he was interrogated for two hours.

Kiev. People visiting O. Yu. Meshko, a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki group, are frequently searched and interrogated on leaving. For example, Vasily Sichko, a member of the group, and the wife of
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In the Prisons and Camps

The Explosions Case

Interrogations continue in connection with the case of Stepan Zatikyan, Akop Stepanyan and Zaven Bagdasaryan, who are charged with organizing the explosions in the Moscow metro (Chronicle 44, 48).

According to confirmed reports, Stepanyan and Bagdasaryan were arrested in Moscow at the end of October 1977, and Zatikyan in Erevan on 3 November. The investigation was at first conducted in Erevan, but with investigators from Moscow taking part. Almost all the 'old' members of the National United Party (N U P) were summoned for interrogation.

The investigation was later transferred to Moscow.

In March Shagen Arutyunyan (Chronicle 48) was brought to the Moscow K G B investigation prison (Lefortovo). During interrogation Arutyunyan was questioned about Zatikyan (in 1968 Zatikyan and Arutyunyan stood trial together in one of the first N U P trials; Zatikyan received 4 years for 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda', Sh. Arutyunyan received 3 years, and a third defendant, Alkanez Khachatrian, received 5 years), about Zatikyan's views on terrorism, and about the N U P. Questions were also asked about the Helsinki Group.

At the beginning of June, also at Lefortovo, Parsur Airikyan (see 'In the Prisons and Camps') was interrogated by Captain Semenyuk about Zatikyan. Semenyuk told Airikyan that Zatikyan was charged under article 68 ('diversion') and article 72 ('organized activity') of the Russian Criminal Code. He also told him that one of the accused had already confessed. (On 7 June the Moscow evening edition of Erevan stated that the persons responsible for the metro explosions 'have confessed their involvement in this and other crimes'). To Semenyuk's remark 'See where the N U P has led to', Airikyan made the categorical objection that the N U P recognizes only peaceful forms of struggle. He wrote in the record that he respected Zatikyan and did not believe he could be involved in diversions using violence.

In the Prisons and Camps

Order No. 37

The New Rules concerning internal order, mentioned in Chronicle 48, were brought into effect on 15 March 1978 by Decree No. 37 of the U S S R Ministry of Internal Affairs, issued in December 1977. The Decree carries the stamp of the U S S R Prosecutor-General. Like the former rules, introduced in 1972 by the well-known Decree No. 20...
meat is also allowed. Prisons in punishment cells are allowed to keep a pen. In special-regime camps prisoners are now permitted to receive tea. (At the same time, however, a limit on tea has been imposed in all camps — a maximum of 50 grams per month).

The new rules require the camp administration to inform relatives of any change in a prisoner’s address, or of the regime under which he is being held, within ten days of the change occurring.

Concerning certain other innovations, it is not known whether they are being implemented on local initiative or are also prescribed in Decree No. 37. Amongst them are the following. Since spring 1978, in Vladimir Prison, the issuing to prisoners of gloves, fur-lined boots, scarves, thick towels and stretch socks from parcels sent to them and placed in store, has been forbidden. At Vladimir Prison the clothing of new arrivals now has their surname etched on it by chemical means (formerly labels were worn).

**Vladimir Prison**

On 3 July the literary scholar Gabriel Superfin (on his case see Chronicle 32) completed his 5-year term of imprisonment. Before his dispatch from Vladimir, several documents, photographs and personal notes were confiscated from him. Not everything, however, was included in the confiscation record. Superfin was transported from Vladimir Prison to his place of exile — the settlement of Turgai in Kazakhstan (Turgai Region, Dzhangildinsky District). He is working at a night job. His term of exile is 2 years.

On completing prison sentences received in camps, the following have been returned to camps: in May — V. Bashkhonov (Camp 36), in June or July — A. Khnokh (Camp 19), on 27 June — G. Prikhodko (Camp 36), on 1 August — A. Turk (Camp 19), in August — D. Airapetov (Camp 35), in September (?) — Z. Antonyuk (Camp 35), on 30 October — Z. Popadyuk (Camp 19).

On 5 July V. Konstantinovsky (Chronicle 40) completed the prison term received in his original sentence and was transferred to Camp 37.

**V. Antimov**, who appeared as a witness at the trial of Yuriy Orlov (Chronicle 50), in September was still in Vladimir (in the same cell as Shcharansky — Chronicle 50). Later, halfway through his prison sentence, he was transferred to a camp for common criminals in the Urals (either his sentence under article 70 had ended, or it had been reduced).
On 19 July A. Shebarsky arrived at Vladimir (in Chronicle 50 there is an inaccuracy; see also 'Items Related to the Summer Trials' in the 'Miscellaneous Reports' section). At the beginning of August he received a two-hour visit from relatives. In September he was moved to Chistopol Prison.

On 23 May Yu. Shukhevich was taken to Kiev. Before this he was 'processed' by local K G B officials. Shukhevich has a heart condition and an ulcer.

In the spring Andriy Turik (sentenced to 25 years for involvement in the Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army) was taken to the Ukraine to visit his mother, who is unable to visit him in prison owing to ill health. The meeting took place under the supervision of K G B officers. It was terminated after half an hour, when Turik began to talk about the conditions in which prisoners are kept. For approximately two weeks Turik was subjected to 'prophylactic talks' and, in particular, meetings were arranged with former fellow-prisoners.

In December 1977 the windows of many cells were fitted with thick iron shields — 'muzzles' (screens) — on top of the blinds and the grilles. The cells are fitted with light bulbs of 60 watts maximum, but the punishment cells have blue lamps of between 15 and 25 watts.

In summer 1978 I. Mendelevich received a reply to a complaint of his from Karabikhina, acting chief of the Medical Department of the Vladimir Regional U V D: lighting of this strength conforms to the lighting norms for dwelling-places.

In May Zoryan Popadyuk was due to receive a visit. He was deprived of the visit. As Captain Doinikov told his mother, it could have been used for hostile purposes.

On 10 June Popadyuk was punished with 15 days in a punishment cell for making a statement 'of a slanderous nature' (he tried to obtain on official statement about the banning of the visit). On 25 June the period in the punishment cell was extended by a further 15 days because Popadyuk did not lift his bunk on the order of a warder. For the same reason he received another 15 days on 10 July. After this he refused to use the bunk at all. He slept in a sitting position.

Roman Gaiduk was placed in a punishment cell from 13 to 21 June for refusing to move from one cell to another.

In 1977 an attempt was made by a number of political prisoners in Vladimir Prison to exercise their right to vote. Vitol Ahonskin, Vladimir Balakhonov, Roman Gaiduk, Georgy Davydov and Aleksei Safaronov all took part in the experiment.

Elections to the local soviets had been set for 19 June 1977. On 6 April Balakhonov, who at that time was in a punishment cell, presented the prison administration with a request to be given the chance to take part in the election campaign. On 15 April he was summoned by the prison's Deputy Head in charge of political matters, Kasyanov, who stated that in conformity with the 'Statute on Elections' prisoners are deprived of voting rights.

After Balakhonov and Safaronov had handed in statements containing requests to be included in the electoral register of 'temporary residents of the territory of the given soviet', addressed to the chairman of the local soviet executive committee, they were again summoned by Kasyanov and told that their statements would not be sent, but would be attached to their personal files. To justify this he referred to a resolution of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 1.12.45, classified as 'not for publication in the press', in which it is stated that persons awaiting trial, serving a sentence of punishment, or under investigation are to be entered on the electoral register only if they are not in a place of imprisonment or under guard, or if by court order they are not to be deprived of voting rights.

In May a political affairs inspector from the Corrective Labour Institutions Administration of the U V D of the Vladimir regional Soviet Executive Committee, Captain N. N. Gulyayev, spoke with Balakhonov about his complaint concerning the withholding of his statement. He explained to Balakhonov that the rules concerning internal order make no provision for the organization of polling stations in places of imprisonment, and because of this prisoners are deprived of the right to participate in elections. He confirmed that their statements requesting inclusion in the electoral register would not be sent.

All five participants in the experiment then handed in statements addressed to the city soviet, busing their complaint 'about the incorrectness of the electoral register' an article 22 of the 'Statute on Elections'. These statements were also not sent, although no actual confiscation took place. (The administration can either send a prisoner's statements or confiscate it — there is no provision for any other procedure.)
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Several days later they referred their statements on the incorrectness of the register to a court under article 233 of the Russian Civil Procedural Code. Kasyanov did not allow these statements to be sent either. On 10 June the participants in the experiment submitted statements to the court concerning the institution of criminal proceedings against Kasyanov under article 132 of the Russian Criminal Code ('obstruction of the exercising of electoral rights'). On 1 July (i.e. after the elections had taken place) Davydov received a reply to his statement from the Regional Procuracy: 'Examined and not granted.' On 26 June Davydov submitted for dispatch to the court a statement about the prosecution of Kasyanov under article 171 ('exceeding authority or official powers') for having of his own will prohibited the sending of a number of statements to their addressees, by which he had broken the law. This statement was also simply withheld.

Chistopol Prison
Address: 422950, Tatar A.S.S.R, g. Chistopol, uchr. U E-148/st-4. This prison has evidently replaced Vladimir as a place of detention for political prisoners. It is known that the following have been transferred here from Vladimir: A. Shcharansky, R. Gaiduk (whose prison sentence ends on 16 December 1978, and camp sentence — of 5 years — in February 1979, to be followed by 2 years' exile), and G. Sheludko (15 years under article 64 of the Russian Criminal Code for hijacking an aeroplane en route from Petrozavodsk to Leningrad in July 1977; A. Zagirnyak, who was tried with him, is in Camp 19; he received 8 years). It is possible that all the other political prisoners have also been transferred here.

In November V. Balakhonov and M. Kazachkov were brought here from Camp 36. The court which transferred them to a prison regime met on 26 September, but they were kept for a month after this in punishment cells. V. Petkus (see Chronicle 50 on his trial) was transferred here to serve the prison term of his sentence.

The Chronicle first mentioned Chistopol Prison in connection with the transfer here of S. Grigoryants from an 'ordinary' camp (Chronicle 48).

* * *

The Mordovian Camps

Camp 1 (special regime)
About one year ago the camp authorities were replaced. The Commandant of the special zone (officially — the 6th section of Corrective Labour Colony — 1, with the address Uchr. ZhKh — 385/1-6) is now Nekrasov, and his deputy — Sergushin. The commandant of the entire Camp ZhKa-385/1 is Satayev. The camp doctor is Emelyanova (a witness at the trials of Ginzburg and Orlov — Chronicle 50).

* * *

This year the installation of air-extraction equipment, which prisoners have been trying to obtain since 1972, has begun in the work area of the camp (a workshop where chandelier stems are polished). Until now the workshop has been fitted with ventilators only, which simply blow the dust about. Workers arc seldom issued with breathing masks or boots, as laid down in the regulations; the sand needed for the polishing process, and water to help keep down the dust, are often unavailable. Those who refuse to work for these reasons are punished. In summer the workshop is plagued by a large number of mosquitoes. Sometimes the prisoners are forced to burn paper in order to drive them away with the smoke. (This too is punished by the administration).

In the living quarters it is very damp.

In the camp shop this year, spoiled tins of food were placed on sale. There were several cases of food-poisoning. In the summer there was no sugar in the shop.

Sergei Korekhov, sentenced in 1977 (for a second time — Chronicle 47; the regime indicated there was incorrect), arrived at the camp in summer 1978, although his interrogation in connection with the Ginzburg case in Kaluga ended last winter (he refused to give information — Chronicle 48). Genrikas Jatkunas has arrived at the camp. (For his trial see Chronicle 48; see also 'Addenda and Corrigenda'.)

* * *

In February 1978 Svyatoslav Karavansky received a 'private' visit from his wife N. Strokatova, the second visit in 12 years. The meeting lasted 2 days.

In March 1978 he was deprived of a short meeting which had been allocated for August. From March to June he staged hunger-strikes for approximately ten days each month. In July and August Karavansky was on hunger-strike for, in all, not less than 30 days. He was kept in solitary confinement. From March to November not a single
Bogdan Rebrik was again (Chronicle 48) taken for 'prophylactic conversations' to Ivano-Frankovsk. He spent the months of June and July there.

He was granted two three-hour visits. Relatives were allowed to bring him medicines. During one of the visits Rebrik told them, in the presence of KGB officers, that every measure was being taken to persuade him to confess his guilt, to state this in the press and on television, and also to inform the authorities of the channels through which information leaked out of the camp. He had categorically refused.

On 11 August Rebrik was dispatched under escort. As last year (Chronicle 48), during the journey he was beaten up by warders. During the beating his spectacles were smashed (Rebrik has +9 vision) and his medicines were destroyed.

Immediately upon arrival at the camp Rebrik was placed in hospital, complaining of difficulty in breathing and chest-pains. Rebrik thought that some ribs had been broken.

Aleksei Murzhenko was informed of the visit only a few minutes before it began. The building where the meeting took place was unheated. Murzhenko returned to the camp with a temperature. His daughter was also taken ill.

Both before and after the visit Murzhenko's family were thoroughly searched. During the search after the visit they tried to strip his daughter naked. L. Murzhenko began to protest, whereupon she was advised by the woman supervisor not to bring the child to see her father, as 'she is already a big girl and understands everything'.

On 4 September 1978 L. Murzhenko sent a detailed complaint to Brezhnev and Rudenko. In particular she wrote:

In accordance with the established regulations — as I was informed by the Deputy Chief of the reception room of the Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions, Kazantsev — the dates of visits and their duration should be drawn up every month in lists from which each prisoner can find out in advance about a visit and its duration, and inform his relatives. We, however, only discovered the date of the visit after sending a telegram to the camp authorities...
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hour visit. They were forbidden from talking in Lithuanian. They were not allowed to touch one another.

A Press Statement
On 1 September 1978, after ten days in transit, my husband Alexander Ginzburg arrived at the special-regime camp in the village of Sosnovka in Mordovia.

Immediately after arrival Ginzburg was cynically informed by a local KGB officer, Captain Tyurin, that he was going to blackmail him by alleging that he had given evidence against Shcharansky, in return for which he had received a lighter sentence than the others. And indeed, the day before Ginzburg's arrival in the camp Tyurin had made this filthy, slanderous statement to the prisoners in the special-regime camp, and it was repeated by the Deputy Head of the KGB in Dubrovlag (the Mordovian Camps), Captain Tryasoumov, to prisoners in another political camp — Camp 19 in the village of Lesnoye.

On 22 September my husband's mother and I went to visit him. By law prisoners are allowed a long visit of up to three days. However, in spite of the fact that Ginzburg had not committed any offences or incurred any penalties, we were only granted a 24-hour visit. The camp commandant explained that this was because 'they still did not know Ginzburg very well'. During the visit I learnt that he was only being allowed to receive letters from myself and our five-year-old son, and that he was not allowed to possess a Bible. The cell in which my husband and the other prisoners were being kept was so damp that water was dripping down the walls and the plaster was falling off. Mice run around the cells.
P
Prisoners in the camp are required to work eight hours a day, including Saturdays. They do one of the most arduous and dangerous jobs: they polish glass plates for chandeliers (the norm is 30 per day). They nearly always have to work without breathing-masks (which protect their lungs from glass dust), and the dust hangs in the air in a thick cloud. Their hands are constantly being cut, and they still have to lift weights of up to 100 kilograms.

Recently in all the camps a new decree was read out, stating that a prisoner's personal belongings, including books, are now to amount to no more than 30 kilograms in weight (even when in storage). Because of this the prisoners will be deprived (long-term prisoners already are) of the right to keep their own books and magazines in the camp.

We were searched both before and after the visit, all our tinned food was opened, our loaf of bread was cut open, and our clothing was checked. My husband was unable to give me a single line of writing to give to any of our friends or relatives. But I now repeat his words to the free world:

Nineteen months have passed since the day I was seized near my home by KGB officers, who twisted my arms, threw me into their car and took me to prison. In all these months KGB investigators (particularly Senior Lieutenant Saushkin) have threatened me with charges under the article 'Treason against the Motherland' and with the death penalty. They have spread dirty and false rumours about me, intimidated witnesses, and tried to blackmail me. This still continues today. However, I want everybody to know that my friends and I have done nothing illegal or criminal. All we have said — and I am still convinced of this — is in complete accordance with reality. I ask still to be considered a member of the Helsinki Group and I will endeavour to do all in my power to contribute to its work. I am now deprived of any practical opportunity to help the distributors of the Solzhenitsyn Fund, but I am full of admiration for their difficult and self-sacrificing work, which enjoys the complete sympathy and understanding of the special-regime camp prisoners. I wish to give warm greetings to all my friends, to all I know, and those I do not know, who have supported my family and myself during these months which have been very difficult for us.

Written from memory.
Irina Zhokhovskaya, 23 September 1978

On 12 December 1977 my husband Levko Grigorevich Lukyanenko was arrested for being a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group. During the investigation, which lasted until 17 July 1978, I had no news of his whereabouts or what was happening to him. Immediately after his trial he was taken from Chernigov to Kiev, where I was allowed to visit him on 31 July, in the presence of two KGB officers who did not give us a chance to talk about anything. None of his other relatives was allowed to visit him. It is true that his younger brother Alexander received permission to visit him, but he was not given leave of absence from work. After the Supreme Court appeal hearing on 12 September I was refused permission to visit my husband. On 29 September he barely managed to obtain a visit with his mother, Natalya Alekseevna, who had to make the difficult 200-kilometre journey to Kiev. They were given only 30 minutes.

On 4 October my husband was dispatched from Kiev, and on 20 October he arrived in the Sosnovka Camp (Mordovian ASSR).
On one occasion, apples appeared in the camp shop.

In order to obtain a consultation in the camp medical unit (the head is Lyudmila Fyodorovna Rotkina), a sick prisoner must have the permission of his section head, who writes down applicants' names in a special register. Consultations and prescriptions are often given by nurses. Everything is done to avoid sending seriously ill patients to the hospital, although it is not far away (ZhKh 385/3-3); they are treated in the camp medical unit.

The number of prisoners eligible to receive a special diet is limited. 'Diets' are allotted by the administration. The doctor can only petition the administration to prescribe a special diet.

This year alone several people have died in the camp.

In August or September the prisoner Jogavnis died of a heart attack. He had been dragged along the ground to be put into a 'Black Maria', then driven to hospital.

On the same day the prisoner Borzik also died of a heart attack. N. Rudenko found him on the lavatory floor and carried him on his back to the medical unit.

The prisoner Kolbasin, who suffered from high blood pressure, was successfully taken to the hospital; but once there he died.

The prisoner JarorievRius, who suffered from tuberculosis, had a temperature of 39°-40° for three weeks. He too only just made it to the hospital before he died.

In spite of everything he has endured, Levko Lukyanenko has asked me to tell everyone that he still considers himself a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group and will, as far as he is able, inform the public of violations of human rights.

Nadiya Lukyanenko 24 November 1978

Camp 19

This camp now contains about 160 prisoners (it was intended for 700).

Leonid Yuskovlevich Luhman (born 1936) is in the camp. He was sentenced under article 64 of the R S F S R Criminal Code to 13 years'
deprivation of freedom in a strict-regime camp. (He was arrested in December 1977).

Lubman is a native of Leningrad and an electrical engineer; he worked in the administration of a research institute which was also a major experimental radio works, and was a party member. His parents live in Leningrad.

Lubman was charged with producing and sending abroad a manuscript slandering leading officials of the Leningrad Region and advising hostile radio-stations on how to carry out subversive propaganda; Lubman also allegedly expressed a desire to contact C I A representatives. The above-mentioned manuscript was confiscated when an Italian, Nicolo Coletti (alleged to be an N T S agent), was searched by customs at the Soviet-Finnish border.

The manuscript with which Lubman was charged contained biographical material on G. V. Romanov, First Secretary of the Leningrad Regional Party Committee, including information about his “unsavoury behaviour” (going as far as bribery and extortion). The manuscript did in fact contain advice to radio-stations: they were asked to concern themselves with the accuracy and truthfulness of their reports; to make wider use of criticism from the Soviet press, supplementing this with other information on the same subject; and to provide more frequent information comparing the living and working conditions of people with similar professions and qualifications in the Soviet Union and in the West.

Lubman says he does not know N. Coletti.

From 14 to 21 September a hunger-strike was held in the camp. Lubman, Osipov, Rudenko, Soldatov, Ushakov and Yurkov took part in it. The hunger-strikers were protesting in particular against the bad food, poor medical care and compulsory political classes. The hunger-strike was supported by many prisoners in the neighbouring camp for common criminals.

After the hunger-strike four men were sent to the punishment cells for refusing to work.

There was a slight improvement in the food: they started putting fresh vegetables in the soup (previously only dried vegetables had been used).

On 1 October Lubman, Osipov, Rudenko, Soldatov and Turik went on a silent strike (they refused to communicate with the administration). The reason was that Soldatov had been deprived of a visit from his wife, of parcels and access to the camp shop.

In November Lapienis, Lubman, Popadyuk, Turik, Shakirov and Yurkov were taken to the K G B in Saransk. Earlier, Babur Shakirov had been offered release ‘after serving three-quarters of his sentence’ (his 12-year term ends in 1982). Shakirov accepted the condition for his release: ‘to behave quietly for a year’. He was promised a transfer to Tashkent and release there — before the end of 1978.

Since 6 October, Vladimir Osipov has been in hospital again (Chronicle 49). His temperature is above normal all the time, but he is no longer diagnosed as tubercular.

A commission from Moscow came to the hospital after a complaint by Osipov’s wife V. Mashkova. Afterwards there was a slight improvement in the patients’ food and treatment.

G. Ushakov was removed from the camp after many prisoners stopped trusting him, believing him to be collaborating with the administration.

Camp 3

On 15 November Irina Senik, having served 6 years in camp, was dispatched for a 3-year term of exile.

On 4 July 1978 the men’s political zone (ZhKh-385/3-5) was dissolved. Twenty-three men were transferred to Perm Camp 37; the prisoners Biryukov, Lapienis, Paulaitis and Sartakov were transferred to Mordovian Camp 19.
In February 1978 Paruir Airikyan agreed to the proposal of Lieutenant-Colonel Romanov, KGB Chief of Institution ZIKh-385 (Mordovian Camps), that he begin negotiating for his release. The prior condition was that Airikyan confirm what he had written to a friend in a letter which passed the camp censor; that is, that he did not intend to engage in underground activities after his release. Around the same time (possibly in the same letter), Airikyan had stated that he no longer considered himself the secretary of the National United Party, as he could see no real possibility of fulfilling this office after his release. (Airikyan had announced openly in February 1977 that he was the secretary; see Chronicle 45).

On 2 April Airikyan was taken to Saransk. There he spoke with Romanov and KGB officers Bulut Bazarbayevich Karatayev (see Chronicles 45 and 47; he introduced himself to Airikyan as Boris Borinovich) from Moscow and Genrikh Akopyan from Armenia. As a result of the negotiations Airikyan wrote a letter to Andropov about his decision ‘not to take the path of anti-Soviet activities’ if he was released upon re-examination of his case. (Such a position does not conflict with the aims of the National United Party, as Airikyan later explained). Airikyan’s interlocutors were satisfied and hinted that he would be released within the next few months.

At the end of May Airikyan was taken under special escort to Lefortovo Prison in Moscow, where he spoke with the same Karatayev and with investigators Colonel Kuzmichev and Captain Semenyuk. This meeting was in a different style altogether. This time, as proof of his loyalty, collaboration was expected. Airikyan was told that his letter to Andropov had been passed on to the investigators of the case of Zatikyan and others. A few days later Semenyuk began interrogating Airikyan about this case (see ‘Arrests, Searches, Interrogations’).

At the third or fourth interrogation Airikyan refused to have any further conversations. He wrote a statement addressed to Colonel Povarenkov, Head of the Investigations Prison of the KGB attached to the USSR Council of Ministers, demanding to be sent back to camp immediately. On the same day, 13 June, Airikyan discovered while taking his exercise that Shagen Arutyunyan was in one of the exercise yards (he had started whistling a song of his own composition which was familiar to members of the National United Party, and Arutyunyan had whistled the same tune in reply). They started shouting to each other. They were both immediately taken away from their exercise. Arutyunyan was beaten in the process. That evening they were both put in punishment cells for 10 days for ‘attempting to establish contact’.

(The punishment cell is in the basement. It is damp and cold. The plaster is falling off the walls. The cell is 1.8 metres by 1.9 metres. The window is boarded up from inside. The ceiling slopes down in an arch to the ‘window’. There are two holes above the door: one holds a dim electric bulb; the other is apparently for ventilation. The floor is concrete. In the middle stands a one-legged round stool without a back. It is difficult to sit on. The bunk is let down at 10 pm for eight hours. The food consists of a hot meal one day and nothing but black bread and tea on the next, alternately.)

When he was put in the punishment cell Airikyan was told to take off his warm underclothes — ‘it’s summer’. He refused. They did not force him to remove them. That night Airikyan was awakened by the cold, and asked for a pea-jacket, a thermometer, a doctor, and the medical officer. Captain Egorov came and sympathized with him, but said that there was nothing he could do in the absence of his superiors.

The next day Airikyan had a chill and again asked for a doctor. It was not until late that evening that a nurse arrived and told him that medical assistance was not provided in the punishment cells, but gave him a tablet as an exception. The next day another nurse did not do even that much. On 16 June Airikyan declared a hunger-strike. He wrote some statements. Then he was not allowed to have a pen. (Since the summer of 1976, after he came out of the cooler — Chronicle 46 — Airikyan’s temperature has been above normal, sometimes reaching 39°. He suffers from weakness, swollen lymph glands and local oedema.)

On 17 June Airikyan was taken to see Kuzmichev, who told him that the Investigation Department could not petition for a re-examination of his case, as Airikyan ‘had not reformed, and had not helped the investigators to solve a dangerous crime’; he added, however: ‘Don’t think we’ve finished talking to you’.

On 18 June Airikyan was dispatched to Perm Camp 37.

In May, even before the interrogations in Lefortovo, KGB officer Akopyan, who had returned to Erevan from Saransk, told Airikyan’s relatives that Airikyan was ‘reforming’, but that it was too early to release him, and he would not be released that year.

The Perm Camps

Camp 35

This camp contains about 80 prisoners. The first floor of the barracks has recently been vacated. According to rumours, new prisoners are expected.

In 1978 the isolation of the hospital zone from the barracks zone was made more complete.

After the head of the hospital, Sheliya, returned from Orlov’s trial (Chronicle 50), he was more attentive towards the patients (formerly • • •)
he used to pronounce almost all of them malingerers); medicines not available before appeared in the hospital.

On one occasion tomatoes appeared in the camp shop. Issues 48 and 49 of the Chronicle contained very little news of Camp 35. The following ‘Diary’ for January to March 1978 will fill the gap.

**Diary of Camp 35**

Here, as in Chronicles 38, 39, 42, 47 and 48 (see also Chronicle 41), we publish under the title ‘Diary of Camp 35’ (or 36, or 37) the ‘Chronicle of the Gulag Archipelago’ from the camps, documentation which began in 1974 in Camp 35 (Chronicles 33 and 36).

3 January. Yu. Mikitko came out of the cooler ill, with a temperature of 40°. He was put in hospital and is being treated with penicillin and streptomycin.

I. Kandyba’s letter to V. Pidgorodetsky was confiscated.

6 January. A letter from I. Mendelson in Israel to M. Dymshits was confiscated.

10 January. A letter from L. Yagman in Israel to A. Altman was confiscated. Altman and Dymshits wrote to the highest authorities protesting against the continuing confiscation of letters.

16 January. A letter from V. Stus to E. Sverstyuk was confiscated.

19 January. KGB agent Shchukin asked F. Kurtinowski where he would go after his release. Kurtinowski, as a Polish citizen, asks to be repatriated to Poland (see ‘Releases’).

20 January. Altman, Butchenko, Kiirend, Sverstyuk and Shovkovoi were summoned by the Educational Commission, which includes Deputy Camp Head for political matters Khorkov and also Chernyak, who works in the administration of camp complex VS-389, and who is responsible for professional and technical instruction, and is the wife of a KGB officer in Camp 36. The prisoners were orally ‘worked over’ for failing to fulfill the production norm.

P. Seredyak was taken to hospital in a serious condition; he suffers from a chronic liver and kidney disease.

21 January. Butchenko and Shovkovoi were punished by deprivation of access to the camp shop, for absence from their place of work. On the same day Shovkovoi was punished with deprivation of a visit, for refusing to talk with Shchukin, head of section 2.

24 January. Razmik Markosyan was brought to the camp after a ‘working-over’ in Erevan (Chronicle 47). He did not accept the KGB’s proposals that he renounce his activities and membership of the Armenian National United Party. Before going to Erevan he was in Mordovian Camp 19.

25 January. Pronyuk had an accident at work, injuring the fingers of his left hand.
I. Ogurtsov, a sick man, was taken out to work in the stokehold. (The doctor Chepkasova had at first given him sick-leave, but then withdrew it on the orders of the administration.)

13-14 March. Camp K G B officers questioned I. Gribins about members of a Committee for the Liberation of the Baltic States (they probably had in mind the 'Committee of Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian National Movements': see Chronicles 47, 49 and 50).

15 March. Maloozhinsky had a severe haemorrhage in his eye (he suffers from high blood pressure).

18 March. The Camp Educational Committee threatened Markosyan with solitary confinement for failing to fulfil the production norms.

20 March. Yu. Butchenko was deprived of access to the camp shop for a month.

21 March. E. Pronyuk was detained in a passage on his way back from work. He was taken to Camp 37, where he was held for five days under cell regime. There he was granted a 24-hour visit with his wife and son. After the visit Pronyuk was taken back to Camp 35, to the hospital zone (he suffers from tuberculosis).

On 15 April, after six years and three months' imprisonment, Ukrainian writer Ivan Alekseyevich Svetlichny was dispatched on a 21-day journey. Then he was arrested in June, after 4 years' imprisonment, Razmik Markosyan was sent to serve 2 years' exile. At the end of his camp term his ulcer condition (Chronicles 44-47) took a sharp turn for the worse. He was dispatched on a 21-day journey. Then he was held for two more days in a preliminary detention cell in the district capital (during which time he was refused a doctor and left without a bed); afterwards, in a serious condition, he was taken 120 kilometres in a Black Maria. His address is: 474230, Kazakhskaya S S R, Alataisk Krai, Gorno-Altaiskaya AO, s. Ust-Kan, Pervomaiskaya ul. 33, kv. 8.

In June, after 4 years' imprisonment, Razmik Markosyan was sent to serve 2 years' exile. At the end of his camp term his ulcer condition (Chronicles 44-47) took a sharp turn for the worse. He was dispatched on a 21-day journey. Then he was held for two more days in a preliminary detention cell in the district capital (during which time he was refused a doctor and left without a bed); afterwards, in a serious condition, he was taken 120 kilometres in a Black Maria. His address is: 474230, Kazakhskaya S S R, Tselinogradskaya obl., Kurgalzhinskii raion, pos. Kenbidak.

In July N. Matusevich arrived in the camp (on his trial see Chronicle 49).

On 4 August Yu. Orlov arrived (Chronicle 50). He spent the first two weeks in hospital. He was assigned work as a lathe operator. Orlov is still trying to obtain the return of the manuscript scientific articles he wrote in Lefortovo, which were confiscated by the prison administration when he was sent to camp (see also 'Letters and State-ments'). On 22 September Orlov was transferred to Camp 17.

In October [Maria] Tilga, a Latvian, was brought to the camp (his surname needs confirmation). He is 18 years old and has been sentenced to 2 years' deprivation of freedom under the article 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'. His brother Janis (born 1938) is serving a 6-year sentence in Mordovian Camp 19.

D. Airapetov and Zinovy Antonyuk arrived from Vladimir Prison. Airapetov was immediately put in hospital, where he was found to have tuberculosis. He spent over a month there. After his wife petitioned the M V D medical office and the Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions, Antonyuk was examined by a medical commission, which decided that he should be sent to a special hospital in Leningrad; however, he was still in the camp in late November. Antonyuk's seven-year camp sentence ends in mid-January 1979. He then has three years' exile.

Dmitry Kuzminich Verkholyak is serving his sentence in Camp 35. He is 50 years old, a West Ukrainian, and a former member of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists [O U N]; he served as a doctor's assistant in the Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army [U I A]. Verkholyak was arrested in June 1955 and sentenced to death by the military tribunal of the Carpathian Military District. The Military Collegium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet commuted his death sentence to 25 years' deprivation of freedom.

Verkholyak was charged with participating in certain actions of the U I A, carrying a weapon, and, as a member of the O U N, circulating anti-Soviet literature. Verkholyak, who has petitioned several times for a re-examination of his case, asserts that as a doctor's assistant he did not actively participate in the actions with which he was charged, and that the investigation of his case had been prejudiced from the start.

D. Verkholyak's last application for a review of his case was sent to the Supreme Court in February 1978. In it he points out that the nine others who were tried with him have long since been released (four of them were also sentenced to death at first). Verkholyak adds that he worked for ten years as a doctor's assistant in his place of detention, that he is now a production worker who is fulfilling his norms, and that for decades he has not infringed the regulations or been punished.

In April the U S S R Supreme Court replied to Verkholyak, saying that his sentence was justified and that complaints about the pre-trial investigation should be sent to the Procuracy.

[*Corrected here from 'Tilga'.]
V. Pidgorodetsky has been deprived of his Group 2 invalid status and is being made to work. Vasily Vladimirovich Pidgorodetsky was arrested in 1951 for participating in U I A actions and received a 75-year sentence. In 1956 he was sentenced to 10 more years for leading a camp hunger-strike (Ozerlag, Taishet, Camp 07). On 10 April Yury Butchenko was punished with 15 days in the cooler; on 11 April Raznim Markosyan got 10 days in the cooler.

In July E. Sverstyn came out of the punishment cells (where he had served four months; see Chronicle 49), Soon afterwards he was transferred to Camp 36. On 7 October, Constitution Day, a hunger-strike was held by Airikyan, Butchenko, Lisovoi, Matusevich, Ogurtsov and Plumpa.

On 17 October Airikyan, Butchenko, Vorkholyak, Matusevich, Malochinsky, Ogurtsov and Plumpa sent congratulatory messages to Pope John Paul II.

In October many prisoners sent statements to the Procurator of the Buryat ASSR protesting against the arrest of Bolonkin. The camp administration re-addressed all these statements to the Perm Procurator, who refused to examine them on the grounds of paragraph 33, part 6 of the Internal Order Regulations, forbidding prisoners to write about other prisoners (see 'Order No. 37').

On 10 October Butchenko was given seven days in the cooler.

On 30 October, Political Prisoners' Day, a hunger-strike was held by Airikyan, Airapetov, Butchenko, Lisovoi, Matusevich, Ogurtsov and Tilga.

On 16 October Vera Lisovaya arrived with her six-year-old son to visit her husband. For two days she was told that there was no room in the visiting quarters. It was only after N. Matusevich (who learned of their arrival during a short visit with his own wife) raised a protest in the camp, that Lisovoi was sent to Camp 37, where he was given a 48-hour visit.

Camp 36
In July there were 61 prisoners in the camp.

V. Balakhonov arrived in June from Vladimir, and G. Prikhodko in July.

At the beginning of August, after six years' imprisonment, Igor Kalynets was sent to serve a three-year term of exile in Chita Region, where his wife Irina Stasiv-Kalynets (Chronicle 48) is already serving her exile.

In exile, Irina is working as a house-painter, Igor as a stoker. They receive a minimal salary. They were given a room of 25 square metres by a collective farm.

On 20 April K G B operations officer Chepkasov told Sarkisyan that Gluzman's letters to addresses abroad would not be sent, regardless of their content.

On 3 May Gluzman sent a statement to the camp director asking for an explanation of Chepkasov's words.

On 5 May he held a one-day cautionary hunger-strike protesting at K G B interference in his correspondence. At the same time he sent a statement on this subject to Savinkin, Head of the Central Committee's administrative department.

On 25 April and 8 May Gluzman handed in statements to the administration, addressed to the International Post Office, to the Head of the Central Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions (see 'Letters and Statements of Political Prisoners'), to the Soviet Minister of Health (this letter was published in full in Chronicle 48) and to the President of the U S S R Supreme Soviet.

Although the time limit for sending a statement is three days, on 12 May the head of the special section told Gluzman that she had not even heard of one of these statements. That same day Chepkasov told Gluzman in the presence of Sukauskas and Salmonov that all the statements had 'piled up' in the K G B operatives' office. Gluzman sent a statement to the camp director asking him to explain what had happened to his statements and warning him that, failing this, he would begin an unlimited hunger-strike on 13 May.

On 13 May Gluzman went on hunger-strike.

On 15 May he was sent to Perm. (The doctor Yurshukov gave his authorization for Gluzman to travel on the third day of his hunger-strike, even though he himself had ascertained that Gluzman's pulse and blood pressure were obviously not normal).

On 16 May Gluzman handed in a statement to the regional Procurator demanding an immediate explanation of his transfer to prison regime (he had been shown no documents authorizing the transfer).

Gluzman's letters to addresses abroad would not be sent, regardless of their content.

On 17 May Gluzman was taken to the regional K G B office. There he spoke with Chepkasov and the Head of the Investigation Department, Colonel Rozanov. They told Gluzman that he had been transferred to the prison for one month with the authorization of the regional Procurator. On receiving this explanation, Gluzman decided to give up the 'dry' hunger-strike, but he continued the ordinary one.
On 18 May he was taken again to the KGB office, where Chepkasov told him that his statements to the Minister of Health and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet had been confiscated, but the others had been sent to their addressees. Then Gluzman ceased his hunger-strike. On Rozanov's orders he received a special diet for 10 days. On 25 May Gluzman was shown documents from the camp informing him that his statements to the Ministry of Health and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet had been confiscated as 'distorting Soviet reality', while the rest had been confiscated as being 'ideologically harmful'.

Gluzman was taken to the KGB office two more times. Rozanov showed him a Camp 36 'archive' which had been taken from its various hiding places in 1977 and was written largely in Gluzman's handwriting.

Gluzman wrote an explanation confirming that he had written the documents, but refused to answer any more questions. During the conversation the 'Chronicle of Camp 36' was described as a 'tendentious document'.

On 2 June Rozanov informed Gluzman that materials on him were being passed to the Procuracy for the purpose of instigating criminal proceedings against him under article 190-1 or article 77-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code (actions disorganizing the work of a corrective labour institution; punitive sanctions for this include the death penalty).

On 5 June Gluzman declared a hunger-strike and handed in another statement addressed to Savinkin. At the same time he sent a statement to the regional Procurator, asking him to see that the statements written by him at different times, and replies to them, did not 'disappear', as he would petition the court to examine them.

On 7 June Gluzman had a conversation in the KGB office with Rozanov and the assistant regional Procurator responsible for supervising the KGB, Senior Councillor for Justice Gogulin. Gluzman refused categorically to stop 'producing' and sending out documents containing information about camp life, and stated that this was his moral duty.

On 9 June Gluzman was summoned by Procurator Gogulin, who told him that the Procuracy had decided not to instigate criminal proceedings against him.

On the afternoon of 14 June Gluzman was dispatched back to the camp, where he spent the night in a quarantine cell. On the afternoon of 15 June camp Director Zhuravkov read a resolution to him, stating that he was to be put in the punishment cells for six months. The reasons he gave included failure to fulfil the norm, infringements of camp discipline, and composing and sending out various documents. In fact Gluzman had exceeded the norm (for this he had received supplementary food and money to spend in the camp shop).

On 15 June camp Director Zhuravkov read a resolution to him, stating that he was to be put in the punishment cells for six months. The reasons he gave included failure to fulfil the norm, infringements of camp discipline, and composing and sending out various documents. In fact Gluzman had exceeded the norm (for this he had received supplementary food and money to spend in the camp shop).

On the afternoon of 14 June Gluzman was dispatched back to the camp, where he spent the night in a quarantine cell. On the afternoon of 15 June camp Director Zhuravkov read a resolution to him, stating that he was to be put in the punishment cells for six months. The reasons he gave included failure to fulfil the norm, infringements of camp discipline, and composing and sending out various documents. In fact Gluzman had exceeded the norm (for this he had received supplementary food and money to spend in the camp shop).

On 18 May he was taken again to the KGB office, where Chepkasov told him that his statements to the Minister of Health and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet had been confiscated, but the others had been sent to their addressees. Then Gluzman ceased his hunger-strike. On Rozanov's orders he received a special diet for 10 days. On 25 May Gluzman was shown documents from the camp informing him that his statements to the Ministry of Health and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet had been confiscated as 'distorting Soviet reality', while the rest had been confiscated as being 'ideologically harmful'.

Gluzman was taken to the KGB office two more times. Rozanov showed him a Camp 36 'archive' which had been taken from its various hiding places in 1977 and was written largely in Gluzman's handwriting.

Gluzman wrote an explanation confirming that he had written the documents, but refused to answer any more questions. During the conversation the 'Chronicle of Camp 36' was described as a 'tendentious document'.

On 2 June Rozanov informed Gluzman that materials on him were being passed to the Procuracy for the purpose of instigating criminal proceedings against him under article 190-1 or article 77-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code (actions disorganizing the work of a corrective labour institution; punitive sanctions for this include the death penalty).

On 5 June Gluzman declared a hunger-strike and handed in another statement addressed to Savinkin. At the same time he sent a statement to the regional Procurator, asking him to see that the statements written by him at different times, and replies to them, did not 'disappear', as he would petition the court to examine them.

On 7 June Gluzman had a conversation in the KGB office with Rozanov and the assistant regional Procurator responsible for supervising the KGB, Senior Councillor for Justice Gogulin. Gluzman refused categorically to stop 'producing' and sending out documents containing information about camp life, and stated that this was his moral duty.

On 9 June Gluzman was summoned by Procurator Gogulin, who told him that the Procuracy had decided not to instigate criminal proceedings against him.

On the afternoon of 14 June Gluzman was dispatched back to the camp, where he spent the night in a quarantine cell. On the afternoon of 15 June camp Director Zhuravkov read a resolution to him, stating that he was to be put in the punishment cells for six months. The reasons he gave included failure to fulfil the norm, infringements of camp discipline, and composing and sending out various documents. In fact Gluzman had exceeded the norm (for this he had received supplementary food and money to spend in the camp shop).

On 18 May he was taken again to the KGB office, where Chepkasov told him that his statements to the Minister of Health and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet had been confiscated, but the others had been sent to their addressees. Then Gluzman ceased his hunger-strike. On Rozanov's orders he received a special diet for 10 days. On 25 May Gluzman was shown documents from the camp informing him that his statements to the Ministry of Health and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet had been confiscated as 'distorting Soviet reality', while the rest had been confiscated as being 'ideologically harmful'.

Gluzman was taken to the KGB office two more times. Rozanov showed him a Camp 36 'archive' which had been taken from its various hiding places in 1977 and was written largely in Gluzman's handwriting.

Gluzman wrote an explanation confirming that he had written the documents, but refused to answer any more questions. During the conversation the 'Chronicle of Camp 36' was described as a 'tendentious document'.

On 2 June Rozanov informed Gluzman that materials on him were being passed to the Procuracy for the purpose of instigating criminal proceedings against him under article 190-1 or article 77-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code (actions disorganizing the work of a corrective labour institution; punitive sanctions for this include the death penalty).

On 5 June Gluzman declared a hunger-strike and handed in another statement addressed to Savinkin. At the same time he sent a statement to the regional Procurator, asking him to see that the statements written by him at different times, and replies to them, did not 'disappear', as he would petition the court to examine them.

On 7 June Gluzman had a conversation in the KGB office with Rozanov and the assistant regional Procurator responsible for supervising the KGB, Senior Councillor for Justice Gogulin. Gluzman refused categorically to stop 'producing' and sending out documents containing information about camp life, and stated that this was his moral duty.

On 9 June Gluzman was summoned by Procurator Gogulin, who told him that the Procuracy had decided not to instigate criminal proceedings against him.

On the afternoon of 14 June Gluzman was dispatched back to the camp, where he spent the night in a quarantine cell. On the afternoon of 15 June camp Director Zhuravkov read a resolution to him, stating that he was to be put in the punishment cells for six months. The reasons he gave included failure to fulfil the norm, infringements of camp discipline, and composing and sending out various documents. In fact Gluzman had exceeded the norm (for this he had received supplementary food and money to spend in the camp shop).
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Gluzman was taken to the KGB office two more times. Rozanov showed him a Camp 36 'archive' which had been taken from its various hiding places in 1977 and was written largely in Gluzman's handwriting.

Gluzman wrote an explanation confirming that he had written the documents, but refused to answer any more questions. During the conversation the 'Chronicle of Camp 36' was described as a 'tendentious document'.

On 2 June Rozanov informed Gluzman that materials on him were being passed to the Procuracy for the purpose of instigating criminal proceedings against him under article 190-1 or article 77-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code (actions disorganizing the work of a corrective labour institution; punitive sanctions for this include the death penalty).

On 5 June Gluzman declared a hunger-strike and handed in another statement addressed to Savinkin. At the same time he sent a statement to the regional Procurator, asking him to see that the statements written by him at different times, and replies to them, did not 'disappear', as he would petition the court to examine them.

On 7 June Gluzman had a conversation in the KGB office with Rozanov and the assistant regional Procurator responsible for supervising the KGB, Senior Councillor for Justice Gogulin. Gluzman refused categorically to stop 'producing' and sending out documents containing information about camp life, and stated that this was his moral duty.

On 9 June Gluzman was summoned by Procurator Gogulin, who told him that the Procuracy had decided not to instigate criminal proceedings against him.

On the afternoon of 14 June Gluzman was dispatched back to the camp, where he spent the night in a quarantine cell. On the afternoon of 15 June camp Director Zhuravkov read a resolution to him, stating that he was to be put in the punishment cells for six months. The reasons he gave included failure to fulfil the norm, infringements of camp discipline, and composing and sending out various documents. In fact Gluzman had exceeded the norm (for this he had received supplementary food and money to spend in the camp shop).
Goldyrev, Procurator of Chusovoi: 'The administration has committed

On 3 January 1978 Zukauskas received the following reply from

— both from the factory and from Zukauskas. Zukauskas's statement

job); the administration intended in this way to receive money twice

ends as follows: —

During his 'propylactic talks' (as with Gluzman, who shared a cell

with him) Kazachkov was made to write explanations about the Camp 36 "archive" (see above).

On 31 May the Head of the Investigations Department, P. I. Rozanov, showed Kazachkov, among other things, documents entitled 'Memoranda' (on printed stationery). These contained extracts from his letters and those of his mother to him. In connection with this, Kazachkov petitioned for criminal proceedings to be instituted against the camp censor as the person responsible for copying the extracts and thus infringing his mother's right to privacy of personal correspondence.

On 6 July Kazachkov was taken back to Camp 36. In June he was deprived of his next visit for 'infringing camp discipline'.

In August 1977 Sarunas Zukauskas was charged with deliberately producing defective work. Camp Commandant Zhuravkov issued a resolution that Zukauskas be made to pay 60 roubles 63 kopecks — the cost of defective components sent back to the camp by the factory in Lyva. On 9 November Zukauskas wrote a statement to the Chusovoi Procuracy protesting that the claim against him was illegal, and that there was absolutely no proof against him. He explained at length that in his position as assembler of components he could not have had a hand in the production of defective work. He also pointed out that he was being fined the whole cost of the components, even though the defect had been corrected by performing the simple technical operation which had been omitted (and which was not part of his job); the administration intended in this way to receive money twice — both from the factory and from Zukauskas. Zukauskas's statement ends as follows: —

I understand, of course, that you will have to justify the administration. This will probably not be easy to do without contradicting the law and common sense. For this reason I shall await your answer with great interest. However, I feel it necessary to express my sympathy concerning the difficult and, I hope, unpleasant task ahead of you.

On 3 January 1978 Zukauskas received the following reply from Goldyrev, Procurator of Chusovoi: 'The administration has committed

no infringement of the law.' On 10 February he received the following reply from the Perm Regional Procurator responsible for places of detention, Myakishev: —

The Procuracy has suggested that the Camp Commandant suspend the deduction ... An additional investigation will be carried out ... by the Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions ...

On 2 March the Camp Commandant signed the following resolution: —

As a result of an inferior investigation a mistake has been made ... it was found that ... after a slight correction the panels were sent to the warehouse in good condition ... the money deducted from pay will be transferred to his personal account.

However, even after this, Zhuravkov told the other prisoners that Zukauskas had been convicted of deliberately producing defective work.

On 1 May Zukauskas sent the following statement to the Procurator-General: —

The unjust resolution has been revoked ... Only Procurator Goldyrev is of a different opinion ... Do you trust your subordinate ... to see that the law is observed in the future?

On 22 June he received the following answer to his statement from Myakishev: '... The statement has been examined and the necessary measures taken.'

The Chronicle has been informed of several facts concerning S. Taratukhin's self-exposure (Chronicle 42) and his case.

In February 1976 Taratukhin made a statement in which he refused to collaborate with the KGB. Afterwards he was removed from Camp 36 to Camp 37 and given a 'working-over' (by KGB officers Burilov and Degtyarnikov). After a term in the punishment cells he ended up in hospital. On his return to the camp he attempted suicide (by opening his veins). He was soon put back in the punishment cells (after being beaten unconscious), and a week later, when he renounced his citizenship (in July 1977) he was given five months in the punishment cells. From there he was taken to Perm for a month of 'propylactic' talks.

On 13 March 1978 Taratukhin swallowed a piece of glass, a nail and a wire, in the sight of his guards. On 24 March he was again sent to the punishment cells (for six months) and transferred to Camp 35. On 17 May Taratukhin declared a 21-day 'dry' hunger-strike. The reason he gave was his being deprived of religious literature. After six
days he began to urinate blood and gave up his hunger-strike. On 19 July he was transferred to the punishment cells of Camp 36. On 31 July Taratukhin "adopted the status of a political prisoner" until the end of his sentence.

Taratukhin is 23 years old. His 'case' is as follows: — he sent pro-Chinese leaflets, which he himself produced, to various addresses selected at random from the magazine *Philately*. The leaflets contained an appeal to impose various restrictions on national minorities, for example, to impose a curfew on the Buriats. Taratukhin attempted to set up an organization with fascist aims in the town of Chita, where he lived.

He held up a bank by threatening the cashier with a kitchen knife and took 156 roubles.

He was sentenced to 4 years' camp for theft and to 2 years under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. He was due to be released in mid-October 1978.

In the early summer of 1978 Valery Marchenko was put in the hospital of Camp 35 with acute nephritis (Chronicle 47).

Diary of Camp 36

30 April. E. Pronyuk was transferred to the camp from Camp 35.

8 May. S. Kovalyov was removed with his things. Later it transpired that he had been taken to Camp 37, where he was put in the punishment cells for six months.

13 May. Kadlonis was removed 11 days before he was due to be released, having served 25 years for participating in the Lithuanian national liberation movement. On 24 May he was released from Perm prison.

Dovganich was taken away (to Orlov's trial).

Gluzman declared a hunger-strike (see above — Chronicle).

15 May. On the third day of his hunger-strike Gluzman was taken away with his things.

23 May. N. Grigoryan was brought from Camp 37.

Slobodyan was sent to the hospital for an examination which he had been requesting for a whole month. E. Pronyuk was summoned to the educational committee for failing to fulfil the norm. He was threatened with imprisonment in Vladimir.

29 May. V. Abankin was put in the punishment cells for two months (i.e. until the end of his sentence) for repeatedly infringing camp discipline. Earlier he had been deprived of access to the camp shop for the month of June for refusing to work. He had not gone to work on the day his sick leave ended, as he was still weak, and had asked for an examination.

In the Prisons and Camps

31 May. Pyotr Kost (?), a 'twenty-five', was released. He was forbidden to travel to his family in Magadan, as it is a border region. He went to his brother in Novosibirsk.

Pronyuk was punished for failing to fulfil the norm.

2 June. KGB officer Chepkasov suggested to V. Monastyrsky that he ask for a pardon. Monastyrsky refused.

3 June. V. Balakhonov was brought in from Vladimir Prison.

8 June. Slobodyan returned from hospital. He had still not been examined.

12 June. I. Popadichenko was barred from the camp shop for refusing to take his hat off during a search.

12-13 June. The following prisoners sent statements presenting evidence on Orlov's and Ginzburg's cases: — Balakhonov, Grigoryan, Zukauskas, Zalmanson, Zdorovy, Ismagilov, Mitilk, Popadichenko, Pronyuk, Sukisiyan, Safronov, Sergenko and Slobodyan; Kazachkov wrote later (see 'Letters and Statements of Political Prisoners').

14 June. Captain Rak snatched a statement out of Zalmanson's hands about his hunger-strike, written for the anniversary of his arrest, 15 June. Several political prisoners sent statements to the Procuracy protesting at Rak's tyrannical behaviour.

14-15 June. Sh. Zukauskas went on hunger-strike to mark the anniversary of the invasion of Lithuania. During a conversation Deputy Political Instructor Nelipovich told him — 'Nobody invaded your Lithuania. It's where it belongs.'

15 June. S. Gluzman, who returned on 14 June from his 'working-over' in Perm, was put in the punishment cells for six months.

16 June. An extensive search was made for copies of the statements of 12-13 June. All of Grinkiv's things were removed from the camp (see 'Relenses').

Nelipovich explained to Pronyuk that it was normal for a telegram to be delivered after seven days.

18 June. The Ukrainian community observed a national holiday commemorating the partisans and other victims who had perished. In this connection Balakhonov made a statement on the nationalities question, and A. Safronov expressed his agreement with him.

20 June. Major Fyodorov knocked Balakhonov off a bench on to a concrete floor, when the latter failed to stand up in front of him. Several prisoners wrote a statement about this to the Secretary of the Regional Party Committee, Konoplev. On the 27th they were told that the statements would not be sent, as they had been handed in in closed packets addressed to the regional Procurator.

21 June. Balakhonov was put in the cooler for 10 days for repeatedly infringing camp discipline (in addition to failing to greet Fyodorov, he was absent from his place of work once, and was late to the canteen once). He declared a dry hunger-strike. On the 29th, when he was
still in a state of exhaustion, the administration attempted to dispatch him to Camp 35. He agreed to give up his hunger-strike and was taken to the medical unit.

23 June. Mättik and other political prisoners observed a national holiday, Victory Day.

The following road sign was manufactured in the camp — ‘Access to the Premises of the Institution is Forbidden to Unauthorized Persons’.

26 June. Abankin was punished with five days in the cooler.

27-30 June. Gluzman held a hunger-strike in the punishment cells as a protest against repressions.

4 July. Balakhonov refused to go and see a KGB officer, as the RSFSR Corrective Labour Code does not stipulate KGB presence on camp premises.

6 July. M. Kazachkov returned from Camp 35. From 5 to 8 July he held a hunger-strike protesting at the administration’s refusal to send him to his homeland, and as a protest against national discrimination the prisoners observed a national holiday.

14 August. Sergienko was brought to the camp (for an account of his trial see Chronicle 49).

8 July. Popadichenko was given 15 days in the cooler for fighting (in self-defence) with G. Voloshin, who threatened to cut his throat. Voloshin was put in the medical unit. (Prisoners had previously warned the administration about Voloshin’s dangerous aggressiveness, and had received the following reply — ‘Don’t pay any attention, he’s crazy’ — Chronicle).

10 July. Abankin was punished with 15 days in the cooler.

13 July. Balakhonov wrote a statement requesting that Fyodorov, who had used illegal violence against him, be prosecuted under article 171, part 2 of the RSFSR Criminal Code (‘exceeding one’s authority or official powers’).

23 July. G. Prikhodko was brought in from Vladimir.

23 July-1 August. A ten-day period of solidarity of peoples in the struggle against Russo-Soviet imperialism and colonialism was observed. Fifteen political prisoners participated, including Armenians, Jews, a Lithuanian, Russians, Tatars, Ukrainians, and an Estonian.

During this period they held a day of campaigning for return to their homelands, and as a protest against national discrimination the prisoners refused to communicate with the administration in a language other than their own.

1 August was marked as a day to symbolize the right of peoples to decide their own fate, and to campaign for the implementation of Principle VIII of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference.

31 July. V. Abankin was dispatched for release.

14 August. Serzhenko and Zakuuskins were taken away (to Camp 37, where they were put in the punishment cells — Chronicle).
Fitness Commission had recommended that the administration assign him to work which was not beyond his strength.

25 August. Fyodorov deprived Slobodyan of his next visit for being absent from work. Slobodyan, feeling unwell, had stayed behind to wait for the doctor, who was late. At 9.30 am he was summoned by a commission headed by Fyodorov, in the absence of the doctor, Petros. There, in front of the commission, without even attempting to examine Slobodyan, Dr Petros pronounced him fit for work, but said he should not be punished. After the commission Slobodyan went to work.

26 August. Pronyuk was put on extra work detail for failing to fulfil the norm.

28 August. Slobodyan received a warning for failing to fulfil the norm; Pronyuk was reprimanded.

Grigoryan's letter to his relatives and a letter from Yu. Shikhnovich to Balakhonov were confiscated.

29 August. The administration summoned all those (over ten) who had written statements to various departments protesting at Slobodyan's being deprived of a visit. They were told to take back their statements, as they were complaints on behalf of another prisoner. None of them complied.

30 August. An oral order was issued for both sections to be accommodated in the Section II barracks, ostensibly so that the Section I barracks could be repaired. A large number of prisoners were moved.

Grigoryan, Zdorovy, Kazachkov, Kulak, Marinovich, Pronyuk, Sverstyuk, Slobodyan and several others adamantly refused to be moved. The reasons for their refusal were a marked deterioration in living conditions for punitive purposes (according to rumours spread by the administration, this was a reprisal for complaints about the barracks being cold).

31 August. K G B officers from Latvia and the Ukraine (Ivano-Kyevsk region) arrived in the camp. Those from Ukraine had a talk with Slobodyan, during which a certain Kvitin told him: 'We will give you medical treatment if you help us.'

During a conversation it was again suggested to Kulak that he appeal for a pardon. Kulak refused.

At the prisoners' request a supervisory commission arrived in the camp to hold an on-the-spot hearing to settle the conflicts between the prisoners and the administration — Acting Camp Commandant Fyodorov in particular. The commission consisted of Deputy Head of the Perm Department of Justice Zelenin, an Assistant Procurator of Chusovoi district, Azorin, and a 'deputy' from the town of Chusovoi who refused to give his name. They talked to Balakhonov, Zdorovy and Kazachkov. The commission listened to all complaints, promised to look into them, and left.

4 September. The following prisoners sent identical statements to various departments, protesting at poor conditions and the administration's intention to make them even worse by overcrowding: Balakhonov, Grigoryan, Zalmanson, Zdorovy, Ismagilov, Kazachkov, Marinovich, Mitrik, Prikhodko, Pronyuk, Sverstyuk, Safronov, Slobodyan.

Letters from Popadichenko's relatives were confiscated from him as slandering Soviet reality.

5 September. On the morning after a visit Ogurtsov was sent back to Camp 35.

For failing to fulfil the norm Slobodyan was issued a punishment of 24 hours in the cooler (which he did not serve). For the same reason, Pronyuk was promised the cooler. Popadichenko was severely reprimanded for failing to respond to a summons to the special section.

Everyone who wrote statements about camp conditions had their statements returned to them on the grounds that they contained complaints on behalf of other prisoners. None of them took back their statements.

In accordance with established custom the following prisoners observed Red Terror Day: Balakhonov, Grigoryan, Zalmanson, Zdorovy, Ismagilov, Kazachkov, Marinovich, Mitrik, Prikhodko, Pronyuk, Sverstyuk and Slobodyan. They all wrote statements to the Supreme Soviet demanding the abrogation of the relevant Decree of 1918.

6 September. Safronov was deprived of his next visit for 'being rude' in a conversation with Captain Dolmatov.

Safronov's letter to a woman acquaintance in Leningrad was confiscated, as was Marinovich's letter to M. Kotsyubinskaya in Kiev (a second, identical letter to her, of which he sent a copy to the Procurator, was passed by the censor).

11 September. Kazachkov declared a hunger-strike, demanding to know what had happened to a letter he handed in on 31 August.

Order No. 34 was read out; it stated that the two sections would be moved into one building, allegedly 'for the purpose of improving sanitary conditions in the barracks after the unauthorized occupation by convicts of certain beds'. The order did not contain a word about repairs to the Section I barracks, although this was the explanation given in the oral order of 30 August.

12 September. Safronov was put in the cooler for four days for refusing to work on a broken machine.

Pronyuk was issued a punishment of two days in the cooler (which he did not serve).

Grigoryan and Marinovich received a warning for refusing to dig a hole when the subsoil waters were high and it was pouring with rain.

13 September. The following prisoners declared a one-day hunger-
strike protesting at the punishment of Pronyuk and Kazachkov: Balakh- hov, Grigoryan, Zalmanson, Zdormty, Magilov, Nlarinovich, Nllittik, Prikhodko, Sarkisyan and Sverstyk. Along with Pronyuk and Slobod- yan, they wrote statements on this subject to the Procuracy.

Kazachkov gave up his hunger-strike regarding his letter, as the letter had been sent — 13 days after it was handed in and two days after he went on hunger-strike. He stayed on hunger-strike with the others, protesting at Pronyuk's punishment.

A letter from Mataevich’s sister in Kiev was confiscated from Marinovich.

25 September. Zitov was dispatched to an unknown destination. It is possible that he will be brought back to the camp, as some of his things were left behind.

Taraikovich (1),* Boguk, Borovoi and Aksenov (this is from Camp 35) returned after a trial in Mogilev where they appeared as witnesses in the case of five men who served with them in a German sub-unit and were charged with executing and fighting against the Partisans. Zalmanson was told by Nelipovich, in the presence of Z. Gagurin (?), Deputy Head of camp complex VS-389 responsible for political matters, that copies had been made of his letters from Va. M Usilenko, to be used for educational purposes. Later one of these letters was shown to Gluzerman in the punishment cells, allegedly at Zalmanson’s request.

When four new men arrived in the camp, the possessions of Zalman- son, Ismagilov, Balakhov, Prikhodko and Safronov were moved on Fyodorov’s orders, from one part of Section II to another. In protest, all the above-mentioned prisoners joined those who had remained in the Section I barracks.

26 September. The prisoners were punished as follows for refusing to move: Sverstuk (deprived of his next visit), Safronov (deprived of parcels and access to the camp shop for the month of October), Prikhodko (10 days in the cooler), Zalmanson and Ismagilov (reprimanded). Kazachkov and Balakhov were sentenced by an Assizes Court to three years’ prison each (this is Balakhov’s second such sentence) on several charges: systematic infringements of camp discipline, negative influence on the other prisoners, and so on.

28 September. Before lunch, when all the prisoners were at work, Major Fyodorov broke a window in Section I barracks, where eight men were still living: Grigoryan, Zalmanson, Ismagilov, Kulak, Marinovich, Pronyuk, Safronov and Sverstuk. In protest, all of them (except for Kulak and Ismagilov) as well as Sarkisyan, refused to go to work after lunch, the reason for their refusal being the low temperatures of +12° in workshop No. 1 and +16° in workshop No. 2. The temperature in the Section II barracks was +11° and +14°. All the strikers wrote corresponding statements to Zhuravkov.

These prisoners plus Ismagilov wrote a statement to the regional Procuracy in defence of Prikhodko.

All eight men spent the night in the Section I barracks, even though the temperature outside had dropped to —10°.

That night the guards on inspection duty left the door open, although had been sent --- 13 days after it was handed in and two days after he testing at Pronyuk’s punishment.

29 September. The temperature in workshop No. 1 was +12°, and +11° in workshop No. 2. The prisoners again refused to work for this reason. After lunch the strikers went to work — after officially informing the administration of their hope that Prikhodko would be released from the cooler. The temperature in the Section II barracks was +11° and +12°.

30 September. Pronyuk was sent to the hospital. Electric heaters were installed in the Section II barracks, the workshops and the changing rooms (on 2 October they were also installed in the cooler).

Grigoryan, Zalmanson, Marinovich, Sarkisyan, Safronov and Sverstyk held an ‘Italian strike’ as Prikhodko had not been released; they fulfilled only up to a quarter of the norm. The strike lasted until Prikhodko came out of the cooler on 6 October.

2 October. Large worms were discovered in the soup at lunch. All the strikers, as well as Ismagilov and Mattik, wrote statements about this to various departments.

11 October. Slhubyan came out of the medical unit, having been there since 22 September. Dr Petrov had told him that he would not have an operation. Slhubyan carried on living in the Section I barracks.

12 October. The following were punished for refusing to move out: Zalmanson (deprived of his next visit), Marinovich and Slhubyan (deprived of access to the camp shop), Grigoryan (reprimanded) and Ismagilov (given a warning).

18 October. The following were punished for refusing to move out and for repeatedly infringing camp discipline (for example, not keeping their nigh-tables tidy, arriving on the building site a few minutes late, not doing up their buttons): Slhubyan (deprived of access to the camp shop and of his next visit), Sverstuk and Prikhodko (reprimanded).

20 October. The following were punished for multiple minor infringements of camp discipline: Zalmanson and Marinovich were deprived of their next visit (Zalmanson for the second time); Slhubyan was issued a warning (he was threatened with the punishment cells); Grigoryan, Safronov and Ismagilov were reprimanded; Kulak was issued a warning; Mattik was deprived of access to the camp shop for opposing the administration (he refused to hand over a piece of paper with comments on his sentence written on it).

Merkinas was dispatched to the hospital (one of the last remaining Lithuanian partisans, he was arrested in 1969 and sentenced to 15 years).
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demand that Ismagilov be provided with medical assistance, food and a bed in the cooler.

16 November. Merkusov and Sverstyuk arrived from the hospital and Yuskevich from Camp 37.

The following letters were confiscated: to Grigoryan from Yu. Dzyuba in Kharkov, to Zalmanzon from an unknown person in Moscow, and to Marinovich from I. Matusevich and E. Obertas in Kiev.

17 November. The following were reprimanded: Marinovich for not being at his place of work during working hours, and Pronyuk for systematically failing to fulfil the norm.

***

In October and November the quality of the food deteriorated; the choice of grouts was limited, and out of the kinds of fish prescribed for supper the prisoners were almost always given so-called herring, which disintegrates as soon as it is cleaned. As reported above, large worms were found in the food on several occasions. Fat disappeared from the shop; for two months only about 200 grams of margarine per prisoner were sold.

Camp 37

In July 1978 prisoners were brought in from the zone in Mordovian Camp 3 (ZhKh-385/3-5) which has been abolished. A new zone was set up in Camp 37 (the small zone), where the new arrivals were accommodated. There are only 50 men in all in the camp.

Diary of Camp 37

23 March. E. Pronyuk was brought in from Camp 35. On the 29th, after a long visit, he was taken away, straight from the visiting room.

24 March. A. Berniichuk [Chronicle 33] was put in the cooler after duty-officer Salakhov reported him for not having done up his buttons.

30 March. N. Marmus was put in the cooler for five days on a false accusation of infringing camp discipline and arguing with the administration.

3 April. Several prisoners declared a week-long 'crawling' hunger-strike in protest at Marmus's punishment. Shibakin and Trofinov wrote statements to the USSR Procuracy.

4 April. Marmus wrote a statement to the USSR Procuracy accusing the administration of beating him up and stealing his things. That day Marmus was released from the cooler.

5 April. A. Yuskevich went on hunger-strike.

6 April. V. Dolishny went on hunger-strike.

7 April. Shkolnik and Grigoryan went on hunger-strike.

20 April. Grigoryan was searched while leaving after work, and refused to take his clothes off.
21 April. Kovalyov was put in the cooler for three days.

8 May. Kovalyov was brought in from Camp 36. He was put in the punishment cells for six months.

21 May. Yuskevich and Marmus were deprived of access to the camp shop for their statements of 4 and 5 April.

23 May. Dolishny was thrown in the cooler for quarrelling with the administration.

30 May. Trofimov was deprived of access to the camp shop for his statement of 3 April.

26 June. N. Belov was put in the cooler for seven days. He was then given five more days for refusing to work.

7 July. Twenty-three men arrived in the 'small' zone from Mordovia, and Airikyan arrived from Moscow (see 'The Mordovian Camps').

8 July. One of the new arrivals, Vasiliy Vladimirovich Kallin (imprisoned for being a True Orthodox Believer; see Chronicles 46 and 48), had his beard forcibly shaved off. He declared a six-day hunger-strike.

17 July. A week-long 'crawling' hunger-strike was declared in protest against national discrimination. N. Marmus and S. Somovskis wrote statements of protest. Trofimov wrote a statement to the U V D.

18 July. A. Bernlichuk went on hunger-strike and wrote a statement of protest to the Procuracy.

19 July. A. Yuskevich went on hunger-strike.

21 July. V. Dolishny went on hunger-strike. On the same day M. Raviniš was brought in on 19 July, was put in the cooler for three days for writing a protest statement to the USSR Procuracy. 25 July. Raviniš was again put in the cooler for refusing to reinforce the barbed wire. In protest, he slept on the floor of the cooler.

26 July. S. Kovalyov went on hunger-strike in the punishment cells, protesting at Raviniš's punishment.

1 August. On the anniversary of the Helsinki Conference Airikyan wrote a statement to Brezhnev protesting at reprisals against members of the Helsinki Groups.

5 August. Raviniš held a one-day hunger-strike to mark the anniversary of the invasion of Latvia.

11 August. Konstantinovsky went on hunger-strike. The reason was the death of an old man who shared his cell.

Airikyan declared a three-day hunger-strike protesting at the National United Party being provocatively accused of violent diversions. He repeated his earlier demands for legalization of the N U P, a referendum on Armenian independence, and the release of imprisoned N U P members. N U P sympathizers and members held a one-day hunger-strike in his support (see 'Letters and Statements of Political Prisoners').

14 August. A. Sergienko and S. Zukauskas were brought in from Camp 36 and put in the punishment cells.

16 August. Merab Kostava was brought into the camp (on his trial see Chronicle 50).

17 August. Sergienko was put in the cooler for 10 days after being reported by the duty-officer, who claimed to have heard Sergienko, from the corridor, talking to other prisoners about escape.

21 August. Zukauskas, Sergienko, Raviniš and Kovalyov commemorated the 10th anniversary of the invasion of Czechoslovakia by holding a hunger-strike and refusing to go to work.

14 September. The following declared a one-day hunger-strike and refused to go to work: Belov, Bernlichuk, Dolishny, Kovalyov, Kostava, Marmus, Raviniš, Sergienko, Trofimov, Shkolnik and Yuskevich. They demanded an improvement in the food and elimination of other deficiencies in the camp.

20 September. Bernlichuk, Kovalyov, Kostava, Marmus, Raviniš, Sergienko, Yuskevich and others declared a day of mourning for reprisals against the Helsinki Groups. and held a hunger-strike.

* * *

In April 1977 Kokorin and Trofimov arrived in the camp. They are both from Moscow and were convicted under article 64 (and possibly other articles as well). They were charged with betrayal of the Motherland for profit. Kokorin, a researcher at a closed research institute, allegedly thought up a certain scheme at Trofimov's request. The scheme was sold to 'a foreigner, Steve', for 7,000 roubles. Those who took part in the deal were detained on the spot. An official examination declared the scheme to be workable, and to constitute a military secret.

* * *

Stanislav Kuznetsov is in Camp 37. He was arrested in 1973 for attempting to hijack an aeroplane. He was also charged with seducing minors.

* * *

At the end of September, Airikyan was sent to the hospital in Camp 35.

* * *

Yu. Orlow, who was brought in from Camp 35 on 22 September, was put in the 'small' zone. Several 'infringements' of camp discipline have already been registered. One was writing his surname on a window visible from the 'large' zone; second — 'lying down' after reveille (he was in fact doing yoga exercise); third — writing something during working hours.
In Other Camps

On 15 May (Chronicle 49) Pyotr Vins was sent to Camp OR-318/76 (Rafalovka Station, Rovno Region), where Vasily Barladyanu is held (Chronicles 47 and 48).

On 15 May, the day after he arrived in camp, Vins received his camp uniform. In the clothing section, while Vins was trying to find his size, the warder, ensign Purlet, knocked him down and kicked him.

Vins was sent to work in a quarry at first. Because of his poor health, he continually failed to fulfill the norm and after a week was transferred to another job. (They say that during the war there was a German concentration camp on the same premises, and that the production norm in the quarry was about half what it is now).

On 9 June foreman Romanchuk (former Chairman of a collective farm sentenced for beating up collective-form workers) ordered Vins to work the second shift. Vins refused, citing the Corrective Labour Code. The foreman swore at him and said: 'You anti-Soviet agitators, you're setting up anti-Soviet groups here.' Then Vins wrote a statement to the Camp Commandant asking him to put an end to this tyrannical and provocative behaviour. The next morning the Commandant summoned Vins and told him that for knowing the Corrective Labour Code Vins would work an additional two hours each day. That evening Vins was called out to work and ordered to dig the forbidden strip next to the fence. He refused. Senior Lieutenant Lirnik gave him a brutal beating. Afterwards Vins was put in the cooler for ten days. There he was beaten again.

The next day section-head Dobrodeyev remarked to Barladyanu that if he and Vins complained, 'anything could happen'. Lirnik threatened to beat up Barladyanu. Around this time two criminal prisoners wrote a statement saying that Barladyanu had 'slandered our Leninist system'.

On 13 June Vins declared a hunger-strike, demanding that Lirnik be punished. On 14 June Barladyanu also went on hunger-strike. In addition to Vins's demand, he asked that both of them be transferred to another camp. The same day Barladyanu was put in the cooler.

On 21 June both Vins and Barladyanu were released from the cooler on the instructions of the regional Procurator responsible for places of detention. On their release from the cooler they ceased their hunger-strike.

On 26 June Vins's relatives, having heard what had happened in the camp, sent identical telegrams to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the USSR Procuracy and the Rovno regional UVD. They reported Vins's beatings and urged them to take immediate measures. Then the republican Procurator responsible for places of detention visited the camp. Vins was transferred to another barracks (formerly he and Barladyanu had been in the same barracks) and put on a special diet. The Procurator did not speak either with Vins or with Barladyanu. The version spread in the camp was that nobody had beaten Vins up, and that the story had been invented by Barladyanu, who would be made to answer for it.

At the beginning of September Vins was transferred to another camp (Sumskaya obl., Romensky raion, selo Perekrestovka, uchr. US-319/56). Before the transfer Vins held two more protest hunger-strikes. While he was in the cooler, during his third hunger-strike, he was again beaten up. In the presence of two witnesses the guards threw Vins on the floor and kicked him, injuring his head.

In June Grigory Goldshtein, who had been sent off from Tbilisi on 8 April (Chronicle 49), arrived at Institution UR-42/14 (in the town of Velsk, Arkhangelsk Region). The journey took two and a half months, 40 days of which he spent in a Rostov prison.

Vadim Smogitel (Chronicle 48) is serving his sentence in an ordinary-regime camp at the following address: Khersonskaya obL, Golopristansky raion, S. Staraya Zburevka, p/ya Yu-Z-17/7, otr. 9-31. He is working in his profession, directing prisoners' amateur musical activities.

Ona Pranskunaite (Chronicles 47 and 48) has been transferred from a camp in Chuvashia 'to a chemical project'. She is working in Ulyanovsk, in a leather goods factory, in a job which is considered harmful (working with acetone). She is living in a hostel with three women criminals as neighbours. Ona Pranskunaite's sentence ends in January 1979.

Rima Muslyadinov (Chronicle 49) is serving his sentence in Institution YuE-312/57-G (Donetskaya obl., g. Shakhtersk, p. Sitnikovo).

Since the middle of May Kirill Podrabsk (on his trial see Chronicle 49) has been serving his sentence in Tobolsk (Institution YaTs-34/16-D). On 12 June he was given 15 days in the cooler. Then he was apparently punished with two more consecutive 15-day sentences.
in the cooler. The reasons given were Podrabinek's refusal to work (the only refusal work beyond his strength, as he suffers from myocardia) and 'expression of anti-Soviet views' (Kirill had described his case to those who were interested). Kirill declared a hunger-strike in the cooler.

On 25 July the Tobolsk People's Court ruled that Kirill Podrabinek should be transferred to prison for the same reasons as those for which he had been put in the cooler. After the trial Kirill was still held in the cooler.

During all the time K. Podrabinek spent in the camp, he was not allowed a single visit. The administration claimed that this was because he was always in the cooler. On 26 August Kirill's father P. A. Podrabinek came to see him. He told the Camp Commandant, Major Khvostov, that he was not sure his son was alive, as he had only received one letter from him, in June, and asked permission to see his son, if only for a few minutes. Khvostov granted P. A. Podrabinek a five-minute visit with his son. Kirill was brought over from the cooler. He looked emaciated. It transpired that he had already been on hunger-strike for 50 days.

In September and October P. A. Podrabinek attempted to find out where his son was. On 15 September Khvostov replied to his telegram saying: 'We do not know as yet, but will inform you when we find out.' On 11 October the Information Centre of the Tyumen U V D replied to his telegram of enquiry by saying that Podrabinek was registered as being in the original camp. P. A. Podrabinek complained about the camp administration to the USSR M V D Central Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions [A C L I]. He received the following reply from Shepko, the head of the Tyumen U V D's A C L I:

Your son is at present serving his sentence in Institution YaTs-34/16 in Tobolsk. The official who gave you an inaccurate reply has been given a severe warning. I must explain that in corrective labour institutions prisoners are re-educated by work, taking the prisoner's state of health into consideration, and according to doctors' recommendations.

It has been established that there has been no violation of the law on the part of the administration of the institution regarding the conditions in which your son is held.

At the end of November K. Podrabinek arrived at a prison in Elets, Lipetsk Region (Institution YuU-323/ST2).

G. Goldshtein, after spending time in the Rostov and Rysan Transit Prisons, told his relatives that the cells in these prisons contained filth, lice and bedbugs, and were overcrowded.

I. Nudel (Chronicle 30), before being dispatched to her place of exile, was in Verkhnaya Priya transit Prison in Moscow. During a visit she recounted that there were lice and bedbugs in the cells, and for this reason many of her fellow-prisoners had been completely shaved. The cells were overcrowded: I. Nudel slept on the floor.

V. Shepok (Chronicle 50) has recounted that in Sverdlovsk Transit Prison 103 men were held in a cell built for 48. The Butyrka Transit Prison (in Moscow), where Shepok was held until his trial and before he was dispatched, was even more overcrowded: 25 prisoners were held in a cell meant for 10. The prisoners had to take turns in sleeping; they also slept under the bunks. In the cell there were bedbugs, lice and huge quantities of fleas; the cells was stuffy and filled with stale stinking air; many prisoners fainted and their cell-mates had to pour water over them. The guards were armed with rubber truncheons and beat prisoners without warning. In the Irkutsk Transit Prison the floor was covered with a film of water, there were no mattresses and the bunk boards were covered with bedbugs.

* * *

At the beginning of June I. Goldshtein (G. Goldshtein's brother) managed to obtain a meeting with an official of the Party Central Committee's administrative organs department, Vitaly Evgenieviich Sidorov, who supervises the M V D. I. Goldshtein reported what his brother had told him about the transit prisons. Sidorov promised to check out the situation and put things right. In July, after he had visited I. Nudel, I. Goldshtein again tried to obtain a meeting with Sidorov. Sidorov refused to see him and sent him to the M V D. In the M V D offices the department head, Colonel Kurageyazan, agreed to see Goldshtein. When Goldshtein reported the unsanitary conditions in the transit prisons, he told him: 'It's quite possible. It does happen. Write a complaint. We'll punish them.'

Letters and Statements of Political Prisoners

Chronicles 48 and 50 have already reported on statements of political prisoners asking to be questioned in connection with possible charges against Ginsburg and Orlov accusing them of depicting conditions in the camps and prisons slanderously. One of these statements was published in Chronicle 50, that by A. Zdorovy telling how the prisoner Anisimov had been coached on how to give evidence at Orlov's trial. Here now is a survey of seven such statements, which were sent by prisoners in Perm Camp 36 on 12 June 1978 to the Kaluga Regional Court and the RSFSR Supreme Court.
Zakauskas describes the poor medical care in the camps, giving several specific examples. He also mentions Major Chernyakov's attempt in 1976 to recruit him as an informer, in exchange for which the medical unit would provide him with the medicines he needed.

Saftronov writes about the political prisoners' food situation:
The authors of the book Corrective Labour Psychology, written for official use only, express the opinion that the food given to prisoners must be limited and of inferior quality. He reports that prisoners are not given the amount of meat prescribed. He also points out, regarding non-food items of primary necessity, that:
Prisoners may obtain them only to the detriment of their stomachs, since they are included in the meagre five-rouble maximum the prisoners are allowed to spend [in the camp shop]. (This statement was confiscated as 'containing slanderous fabrications').

Balakhonov cites examples of violations of the law in places of detention, and reports that the prisoner Zipre was beaten up by orderlies in a psychiatric block, that the prisoner Tikhonov was murdered in Vladimir Prison, and that food is insufficient, and that it is impossible to obtain basic medical assistance.

Pronyuk writes about the political prisoners' working conditions, violations of safety regulations, increased production norms, and punishments for failing to fulfil the norm.

Shobodyan writes that 'living conditions in the camp lead to inhuman and deliberate destruction of human beings':
On 10 March this year, I, a sick man, was put in the cooler for 48 hours for not being able to fulfill the production norm, due to poor health, and for demanding medical assistance because of ulcers and glands ... I am deprived of access to the camp shop because I, a sick man, was unable to fulfill the production norm. In winter it is 8°-9° in the barracks, instead of 18°. In winter the temperature in the workshop dropped to zero (the water froze). In this temperature one must work eight hours at the panel assembly. Moreover we are not issued warm clothing (felt boots and quilted jackets) and those who manage to obtain some are put in the cooler by the administration. He also writes about the raising of production norms 'without any improvements in production equipment', about the lowering of job rates, and about punishments for failure to fulfill the norm.

Grigoryan, giving an example of camp conditions, tells how in January 1978 he and N. Marmus were put in the cooler. At night the temperature was 14°-15°, however Grigoryan and Marmus's warm underclothes and jackets were taken from them. Sometimes the guards would 'accidentally' leave the door of the cooler open ... As a result Marmus and I were ill for over a month.'

Mittik writes about the food and living conditions, about the intolerably long delays by the censors (sometimes taking several months), and about the disappearance of statements addressed to various departments.

** Letter to A. D. Sakharov (summer 1978)**
This long letter (27 pages) was written by a political prisoner in Mordovian Camp 1. Instead of signing, the author writes:
I will not write my name, so as to avoid reprisals. If you need to mention my name, however, you may do so.

On 30 October, Political Prisoners' Day, A. D. Sakharov distributed the letter for publication, along with his own introduction. He says that he knows the author, whom he respects and trusts fully. Regarding the content of the letter Sakharov writes the following:
This is, first of all, a remarkably concrete and striking picture of camp life: the insanitary conditions, the cold, the hunger, the crowding and filth, the callousness, tyranny and cruelty of the administration, the dangerous and exhausting labour, the repression and provocations, the frequent illnesses and unsatisfactory medical care. The letter also discusses other aspects of camp life — relations with the authorities, specific features of the position of political prisoners and of their relations with the criminal prisoners. Most important of the general questions discussed in the letter is the true role of labour in the camp — its compulsory and punitive, in fact slave-like, nature.

We are hostages of the Free World. Our fate is a sad prototype of the fate which awaits all those who love freedom in the West, whenever it may be that Soviet jurisdiction reaches them. Any form of condoning a tyranny which cruelly punishes all dissent is immoral and dangerous ...
The authors express their approval of the policies of Carter's government.
Danilo Lavrentievich Shumuk, aged 64, has now been a political prisoner for 24 years. He has been in Polish prisons, he has escaped from a German concentration camp, he has been in an interminable succession of Soviet dungeons and forced labour camps, whose iron claws have held him for 29 years. Behind him are a death sentence, torture, torment, hunger, and participation in all forms of opposition to his gaolers, the high point being his active participation in the Norilsk Camp revolt of 1953.

He still has three years of concentration camp and five years in exile left out of the 15-year term to which he was sentenced in 1972 for recounting, in his book Beyond the Eastern Horizon, how, after dedicating his youth to the underground struggle for Soviet power in the ranks of the West Ukrainian Communist Party, for which he served five years in Polish prisons, when he met real Socialism face to face, he was horrified, mustered the strength to see the error of his ways, joined the struggle for the national liberation of the Ukraine, and finally experienced all the cruelty of the Soviet system, which finds its fullest and most open manifestation in the practices of concentration camps.

By Soviet standards the remainder of Shumuk's sentence is a mere trifle; however, burdened as he is with many diseases, he is not likely to live until 1987 and thus get the chance to insist on his right to emigrate to his relatives in Canada and live out the rest of his days there without fear of another arrest.

We, Soviet political prisoners, not only receive practically no medical assistance from the so-called doctors assigned to the concentration camps, but are also deprived of the right to receive necessary medicines from outside the camps, even though for years the camp pharmacy has had nothing but aspirin.

Shumuk is wasting away under our very eyes. Our efforts to compel our gaolers to provide Shumuk with qualified medical assistance have come up against cynical malice: Shumuk's high principles and inflexible will, his whole life, are detestable and terrify ing to them, as a living indictment and witness and a call for retribution.

We appeal to you with gratitude for your concern for our fellow-prisoner and urge you to do everything you can so that he may be released as soon as possible.

The authors of this document consider that the Ukrainian national Renaissance of the '60s and '70s, after the 'lost years' of the '30s and '40s, has left its mark on the history of the Ukrainian people. In their opinion, when the non-Russian peoples were subjected to increasing pressure in the '70s, the number of people in the Ukraine who openly expressed their dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs increased. The authors consider that a situation arose in which Ukrainian patriots were obliged to assume moral responsibility for the fate of the nation. They declare:

We are democrats. For us, the U.N.'s Universal Declaration of Human Rights and its covenants and other documents on the independence and sovereignty of nations and peoples represent the highest principles of community and international social life.

We dissociate ourselves from the policies and practices of the Soviet communist party in the nationality question, and from its interpretation of the idea of democracy...

The authors stress their rejection of all forms of dictatorship, tyranny and disregard for the rights of any nations and peoples.

The next section of the document is entitled 'The Historical Fate of the Ukraine'. Here the authors briefly give their point of view on the consequences of the joining of the Ukraine to Russia. Regarding the Soviet period they write:

Collectivization, the artificial famine of 1933, the war with fascist Germany, and the post-war repressions, particularly in the western regions, cost the Ukrainian people approximately 17 million lives.

The third section of the document is entitled 'Possible Forms of Opposition'. In order to have the nation from spiritual and cultural destruction certain 'Norms of Behaviour for Ukrainians' must be set. These are mainly concerned with passive resistance to Russification; using the native language everywhere; refusing to send one's children to kindergartens, schools and other educational establishments where teaching is in Russian; demanding educational establishments where teaching is in the native language; boycotting shows, films and concerts in Russian; refusing to work in establishments or organizations where the Ukrainian language is disregarded; refusing to serve in the Army outside the borders of the Ukraine and under non-Ukraine speaking commanders; and not going to find work outside the Ukraine. In addition, the 'Norms of Behaviour' urge Ukrainians not
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I appeal to the I.R.C. (I already know what the reply of the Executive Committee of the Union of the Soviet Societies of the Red
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new Motherland, which he has forced us to love and defend. My grandfather lived under Austria, so Austria was my Motherland. My father lived under Poland, so Poland was my Motherland. I happen to live under the U.S.S.R., so the U.S.S.R. became my Motherland. My grandfather fought for Austria in 1914, my father for Poland in 1939, while I have 'betrayed' the U.S.S.R. I also want to leave it.

Dmitry Kvetsko asks to be deprived of his Soviet citizenship and allowed to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. after he has served his term of imprisonment.

D. Kvetsko: 'To the Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. of the Kingdom of the Netherlands' (10 December 1977). A request for political asylum and citizenship.

I have never considered the Soviet Union my Motherland. My Motherland is the Ukraine, which has been enslaved by the Bolsheviks ... I have always admired the beautiful free country of Holland and been interested in her nature, her traditions, her ability to conduct herself with dignity in the international scene and to remain faithful to the principles of ethics and democracy. For these reasons my choice is not a casual one, and I shall be truly happy to receive a satisfactory reply.

A. A. Altman: 'To the Administrative Organs Department of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.' (30 December 1977)

Altman protests against the camp trial of G. I. Butman on 27 December 1977, at which Butman was sentenced to be transferred to prison regime for the rest of his sentence. Altman demonstrates that the charges that Butman had several times infringed camp discipline were fabricated. For example, Butman's case file contains about 30 reports on him, which had not been shown to him while they were being accumulated. The main episode in the charges — terrorizing the prisoner Pashchenko, 'who had taken the path of reform' — was also a fabrication. In fact, as Altman reports, they had once had a trivial, everyday dispute, for which they had both been punished, and the Deputy Camp Director had even threatened Pashchenko, as the one more to blame, with further investigation. At the trial however, he was transformed into the victim of Butman's persecution. Altman gives the real reason for the campaign against Butman: his wearing of a yellow star in protest against the anti-Semitic outbursts encouraged by the administration, e.g. the provocation by Udartsev of a quarrel with Zalmanson (see Chronicles 45, 46).

E. Sverstyuk: 'To the International Red Cross' (8 May 1977)

I appeal to the I.R.C. (I already know what the reply of the Executive Committee of the Union of the Soviet Societies of the Red

to get drunk, smoke or swear; not to use objects of luxury; not to accumulate money and valuables, but to spend them on charity; to stand up for their rights and those of other people, and for the sovereignty of the Ukraine; and to expose and publicize all violations of legality, regardless of who committed them.

The authors consider that these forms of opposition to the 'policies and practices of bureaucratism' cannot be regarded by the authorities as crimes, although they may well entail extrajudicial persecution. Ukrainian patriots are also given specific rules of behaviour in case they are summoned to 'working-over sessions', talks or interrogations, or imprisoned for political reasons. These rules do not go beyond the norms of ordinary human behaviour (in similar situations) or ethics.

Tikhon and Romanyuk conclude that:

It is not necessary to break the law. It is enough to make use of the laws proclaimed by the Soviet Constitution, and thus to achieve, in the interests of the Ukrainian people, the renaissance, flourishing and freedom of the Ukraine.

D. Kvetsko: 'To the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet' (10 December 1977)

Kvetsko (in 1967 he was given 15 years' imprisonment plus 5 years' exile for being a member of the Ukrainian National Front — Chronicle 17) writes that the reason for his imprisonment was several articles on the situation in Podgore, which he had published in the Ukrainian samizdat collection Freedom and Fatherland. Kvetsko explains that he was compelled to write these articles by the 'devastation, poverty and hopeless penury of the inhabitants' of his native Podgore, which he observed in the '50s and '60s; the country's main wealth, its forests, was burned and hacked down by the authorities, because detachments of the Ukrainian Insurrectionist Army were hiding in them; the peasants, deprived of their land, left the villages in a hurry to find work in Siberia, the Far East and Central Asia; many of them were forcibly deported to these areas, while 'foreigners settled in the towns'. Kvetsko reports that his articles also described 'the annihilation of Ukrainian culture, the extermination of the intelligentsia and the decline of national spirit and national consciousness among what was left of the creative intelligentsia'.

Kvetsko writes that his publicistic activities could not relate to the article in the Criminal Code about 'betrayal of the Motherland', but only to the article 'Anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'; he has repeatedly applied to the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, requesting that his case be re-examined.

I know the value of the so-called 'Motherland' I 'betrayed'. I know from history that every invader has brought to us Ukrainians on their warriors' bayonets not only a new colonial yoke, but also a...
At the beginning of February 1977 S. Kovalyov was awaiting a visit from his family, since he was about to undergo an urgent operation on a suspected cancerous tumour. When the visit was rudely cut short, he declared a hunger-strike, demanding that the visit be allowed to continue and that his operation take place in a Leningrad hospital. He was placed in solitary confinement and for a whole month a sick man was held under the watch of ensigns. He was even refused the necessary daily allowance in food. As a result V. Pidgorodetsky, who had a hernia operation on 3 January 1977, still on hunger-strike, was sent to the Cooler Cell of the hospital with the following reply: 'The law has not been violated with regard to Kovalyov.'

On 3 January 1977, in the central hospital (i.e. in a cell used for medical purposes), without air or exercise, without treatment or care, political prisoner Rashch [Chronicle 33] died, having suffered from heart disease. The hospital is a few steps away from the camp, but he was put there only a couple of days before he died.

On 14 March 1977, in the central camp hospital, A. Pleishe, a middle-aged man with a hernia operation, after enduring a 70 km journey over the pot-holes from Kuchino to Vsevyatokaya in the iron box of a Black Maria, Two tuberculosis patients, D. Demidov and A. Sergienko, who shared Pleishe's cell and witnessed his helpless agony, refused to remain any longer in this horrible medical cell. Although a woman medic, Maia, confirmed that they had tuberculosis in an active form, on 22 March 1977 they were taken out of the hospital to Camp 36 and locked in the Cooler Cell for 15 days. My statement to the U V D Region of the U S S R, saying that their punishment was unjustified.

On 3 January 1977 V. Pidgorodetsky had a hernia operation. In April he was discharged from hospital with a festering open wound. For some reason the head of the hospital, Sheliya, chased a sick man, in need of an operation, out of his office. As a result V. Pidgorodetsky's heart disease was aggravated. There are sinister rumours about the hospital of Institution 389 and its head. As is shown simply by the facts given here, medical care in camp conditions where the doctor plays the least significant role, and brings suspicion on himself if he dares to stay within the bounds of his duty as a doctor. All these reasons compel me to appeal to the IRC to fulfil its duty (within its competence) and to investigate how real is the right of political prisoners in the U S S R to medical care.

E. Svertzov's statement is one of many written by political prisoners of Camp 36 in May 1977 about camp medical treatment (see Chronicles 46, 47).

M. Kiirend: 'To the Executive Committee of the Soviet Societies of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent' (31 December 1977)

Kiirend gives a table, which he composed, based on the official food menu. It indicates the average quantity of food which a prisoner receives daily. The author takes into account the fact that the prisoner actually receives even less than this, as part of the food is inedible. Kiirend concludes from his calculations:

- The energy deficiency is 416 calories, or 15%.
- The protein deficiency is 27.2%.
- The fat deficiency is 64%.
- The vitamin deficiency is 53%.

- Vitamin A (100%), Keratin (78%), Vitamin B1 (8%), B2 (47%), PP (48%), C (63%).

E. Pronyuk: 'To the Director-General of the International Labour Office' (9 January 1978)

A whole series of I L O conventions ... which have been ratified by the U S S R, have not come into force in this country. Just as in the first decades of the U S S R's existence, Soviet citizens today are being subjected to compulsory labour. Millions of them do not have the freedom to choose their work and are subject to discrimination when being hired (residence registration, nationality, party membership, and other personal data). As a rule, discrimination is applied against dissidents, political opponents and believers.

Pronyuk continues by elaborating his charges and giving concrete details.

On the collective farms the situation is still that people are literally driven out to work. Compulsory labour is applied in the most barbaric form with regard to political prisoners. For failing to go to work, prisoners are punished with the Cooler and transferred to a prison regime.

Pronyuk cites the names of scientists and writers well known in the Ukraine, who have been deprived of the opportunity to work in their professions.
Political prisoners have absolutely no freedom in choosing their work. They are all forced to do physical labour. The enforcement of labour on those who are incapable of doing it causes frequent traumas.

Here Pronyuk cites the example of fellow-prisoners. The writer Sverstyuk, the artist Kiirend, and the engineer and pilot Dymshits work at the lathe; the Arabic literature specialist Ogurtsov works as a stoker, the lawyer Butman as a loader, the history teacher Kvetsko as a lavatory cleaner, and Pronyuk himself (a philosopher) works as a sewing-machine operator. In 1977 Ogurtsov, Sverstyuk, Kiirend, Butchenko and Shovkovoi suffered injuries at work.

Official revenge means that political prisoners’ families are subject to discrimination. The minimum they are deprived of is the chance to do creative work. The situation of former political prisoners in the USSR is grim and hopeless. They are permanently deprived of the opportunity to do creative work. They will never be allowed to publish their books, to exhibit their paintings, to teach students or children.

Pronyuk supports this statement with examples: members of the families of Moroz and Svetlichny have been dismissed from their teaching posts in secondary schools; members of Pronyuk’s family have been deprived of their work in scientific research; and former political prisoners — psychologist M. Goryn, lawyers Kandyba and Lukyanenko, teacher Pavlenkov, art historian N. Ivanov, and philologist Svetlichnaya — do physical labour.

Wages, working hours, rates of pay, etc, depend wholly on the one employer in the USSR — the state.

Tyrrany in this area, according to Pronyuk, is particularly marked in the camps.

50% of the prisoners’ wages is deducted for state use. The wages are so low that after the various deductions almost nothing remains. In agreement with secret instructions, the total earnings of a prisoner (or of any convicted person) must not exceed 75% of the corresponding earnings of a free employee. Political prisoners often go out into the world from the camp without any money, sometimes even those who have spent 25 years in prison. The productivity norms in the camp are rising sharply. Thus since 1 December 1977 the norm for lathe operators has risen 45% and for stokers — 100%.

In conclusion, Pronyuk requests that his statement be brought to the attention of ILO members and informs them that he is prepared to give ILO officers ‘further clarification and data if the ILO can provide such an opportunity’. (Several other prisoners from the Perm Camps also sent letters to the ILO.)

I. Grabans: ‘Statement to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet’ (20 March 1978)

Grabans describes the situation concerning his correspondence. His letters take 50–60 days to reach his relatives. The camp administration explains this by saying that the censorship must first have his letters translated from Latvian to Russian. Grabans protests ‘at the discrimination against non-Russian political prisoners … because of their refusal to renounce their mother tongue’.

M. Ravind: ‘To the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet’ (11 August 1978)

Ravind states that as a sympathizer-member of the Armenian National Unity Party he knows its position as one of ‘complete rejection of violent methods of political struggle’. Therefore the present charge against the NUP of organizing last year’s explosions in Moscow looks like a sinister resort to political provocation on the part of the authorities, the goal of which is to get rid of national minority opposition in the USSR.

Stepan Yakimovich Mamchur (1916–1977)
A fellow prisoner of S. Ya. Mamchur (Perm Camp 35) writes:

For a long, long time we will hear the quiet voice of Pan Mamchur, and his image will appear before us to help us at difficult moments. His conscience will shine in the darkness, a conscience which has never known the temptations of compromise, the temptations of the easy way, the temptations of rest.
The author recalls the tactfulness and refinement of Stepan Yakimovich:

We have never had enough men like Pan Mamchur ... never had enough of his wise and reliable strength, which, in spite of all odds, would nourish the roots, uphold tradition and unswervingly preserve the nation's atmosphere for the young and the living ... Stepan Mamchur was a rural intellectual, one of those activists who have spread ideas throughout villages and farms, who have shone with a quiet light of goodness and love, who have attracted young people and excited noble emotions in them ...

Part of the text of Mamchur's obituary, together with the name of its author, have been lost. It is known that S. Ya. Mamchur was sentenced for his participation in the Ukrainian Insurrectionist Army to 25 years' deprivation of freedom.

On 1 September in the town of Kolomiya (in Ivano-Frankovsk Region). He was granted a pardon at his parents' request.

On 16 March Ivan Gromyak was released from Camp 35 upon completion of his 25-year sentence. Gromyak is a peasant from Lvov Region. He was accused of being a member of the OUN, and distributing OUN literature.

On 17 March Julis Dubuzkus was released from Camp 35, having served a 25-year sentence for his participation in the Lithuanian partisan movement.

On 13 May Jonas Kudzlonis was taken from Camp 36 to Perm prison. On 24 May he was released on completion of his sentence. He was sentenced to 25 years' deprivation of freedom for his participation in the Lithuanian partisan movement (as a district partisan leader).

In May V. K. Bogdanov was released from Camp 36. He had served 10 years under article 64 of the Russian Criminal Code (Chronicles 44, 45).

On 28 May Anatoly Malkin completed his 3-year sentence (Chronicle 37). He completed it while working on chemical construction (Chronicle 42).

On 15 June Izrail Zalmanson was released on completion of his 8-year sentence for his involvement in the 'Aeroplane Case' (Chronicle 17). Before his release he was transferred from Vladimir Prison to Lefortovo, then to Riga Prison, where he was granted a two-hour meeting with his relatives. Soon afterwards he left the USSR.

In June Taivo Praks was removed from camp just before his release upon completion of his sentence. He is from Estonia, and his mother is Finnish. As a boy during the war the Germans took him to Finland. After the war he returned as a displaced person. He ended up in Leningrad. The security organs began to take an interest in him. Then he went to Estonia and went 'into the forest' [i.e. joined the underground]. In 1953 Praks was arrested and received 25 years under article 58 of the old Criminal Code.

In June Yury Khrantsov (Chronicle 45) was released from Mordovian Camp 19 on completion of his sentence. He was sent to an invalid home in Mordovia, from which he managed to extract himself with difficulty. Present he lives in Tarusa.
On 19 November Vasily Shatalov finished serving his 2-year sentence (Chronicle 48; for his father's trial see the present issue).

In the summer Pyotr Saranchuk was released from Camp 19 on completion of his sentence. First he had been on special regime, then he was transferred to strict regime.

Lithuanian Antanas Kazakevičius (Chronicle 33) was released from Camp 36 after completing his 25-year sentence. On 19 August Yury Dzyuba, on completion of his 5-year sentence (there is a mistake in Chronicle 46), was released from Camp 36 (he was sentenced for 'preparation of letters of an anti-Soviet nature'). Dzyuba settled with his parents in Kharkov. At the end of September, after Dzyuba had been to Moscow and tried to meet the American consul, he was placed under surveillance.

Valery Shushunin and Georgy Gimpu were released from Camp 37 on completing their sentences for 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda' (on Gimpu see Chronicles 39, 40, 43).
A. E. Letnev, replied:

In the Tula Regional Procuracy, in which he wrote that the administrative surveillance imposed on him was illegal and asked to have it revoked. From there his complaint was sent to the Tulun Procuracy.

In August the Vladimir Regional Court, having examined Davydov's appeal, confirmed the decision of the people's court:

As is evident from the materials, the conflict between Davydov and the Director of OD-1/ST-2 arose in connection with correspondence with prisoners in OD-1 and concerns the nature of their contents. Complaints about violations of prison procedures are resolved administratively, and courts have no competence to resolve them.

At the end of May Davydov was summoned to the police station, where he was told that the previous night at nine o'clock he had not been at home. The police handed the report about this to the court. In court, however, it became clear upon interrogation of the policemen Efremenko and Budarov, who had recorded Davydov's absence, that the house they had described as his did not resemble his house, that they drove to that house 'for dinner', i.e. long before the time referred to by them in the record, and that they had not checked whether Davydov was in the yard; moreover, in the details of their evidence they contradicted one another. Therefore Judge Krapivin ruled: 'Refuse G. V. Davydov the application of measures of administrative punishment' (sic — Chronicle).

In August a penalty was imposed on Davydov at work for 'reading non-relevant literature, for conversing, for leaving the work-place, and also for not fulfilling his assignments for the last week'. (He works as a technician at an agricultural chemical station.) When he requested that he be shown the norms, they found them with difficulty. It transpired that, according to the official list no 'non-fulfilment' had occurred; however the penalty ('a stern warning') was not revoked.

At the end of October Davydov sent a complaint to the Irkutsk Regional Procuracy, in which he wrote that the administrative surveillance imposed on him was illegal and asked to have it revoked. From there his complaint was sent to the Tulun Procuracy.

On 17 November an Assistant Procurator of the Tulun District, A. E. Letnev, replied:

... it has been established that, in accordance with article 81 of the Russian Corrective Labour Code, a person sentenced to exile is under surveillance by the authorities responsible for carrying out this form of punishment. Consequently, surveillance has been legitimately imposed and there are no grounds to revoke it.

On 16 November a man who called himself an Inspector of the Irkutsk Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions, Yu. S. Semyonov, talked with Davydov and, separately, his wife V. I. Iskova at the police station.

Semyonov told Davydov that the aim of the conversation was to avoid a mistake in deciding whether or not to continue the administrative surveillance. Normally, as there has been no infringement of the surveillance rules, no summonses to the police station and no evidence of drunkenness, the issue would be clear. 'Indeed,' Semyonov remarked, it is obvious from the case file that the administration itself committed certain infringements (See above — Chronicle). But in your case we have come across an unusual situation: your thoughts have remained the same, and because the thoughts are the same, the repetition of a similar crime is not excluded. And you still do not consider yourself guilty. Therefore we are forced to regard you as a potential recidivist. As far as formalities are concerned, we have extremely negative reports about you from your places of imprisonment and we cannot ignore them. Moreover, you have been penalized at work (See above — Chronicle). On the whole, there are enough formal grounds for an extension of surveillance.

On 20 November Davydov was informed of the decision to extend his surveillance for a year, although, according to the Statute on Administrative Surveillance, a surveillance can be extended for only half a year at a time and in eight months Davydov will complete his term of exile.

The grounds for the extension were:

From his place of work G. V. Davydov has been given negative references; his attitude towards his duties is slovenly, for which the administration has cautioned him. He categorically refuses to participate in social activities. He does not react to measures of a re-educational nature carried out by police officials and the administration.

To the surveillance restrictions was added a ban on visiting the airport, the train station, the bus station and the restaurant.

Mikhail Khlebets is serving his term of exile (Chronicle 49) in the town of Ermak in the Pavlodar Region (6, Lermontov St.).

In November B. Shakhverdyan (Chronicle 49) was transferred to the town of Turkestan in the Chimbek Region.
On 3 October S. Shabatura (Chronicle 48) wrote to the Procurator-General of the USSR and to the Procurator of the Armenian SSR that she demands an amnesty for all political prisoners and the release of R. Nazaryan; she stated her solidarity with the Armenian National United Party and announced that on 7 October she would hold a hunger-strike in protest against violation of human rights and political repression in the USSR.

In the summer V. Chornovil's (Chronicle 49) wife Atena Pashko (Chronicle 37) came to see him. They registered their marriage, which they had previously tried to do in vain (Chronicle 36) while Chornovil was in the camp. In June, just before Pashko's departure for Yalta, an officer of the Lvov KGB, Captain Shumeiko, spoke with her. He tried to dissuade her from going and from making the marriage, and he threatened that he would inform the Institute where her daughter studied. After Pashko's return to Lvov Shumeiko again met her and repeated his threats.

Sergei Malchevsky, a Leningrad driver, has completed his term of exile. He was sentenced according to articles 70 and 72 of the Russian Criminal Code to seven years in camps and three in exile for his participation in a youth group with pro-fascist tendencies (Chronicles 9, 17, 18, 36, 37). His fellow defendants were N. Braun, A. Berger and Vodopyanov. Not managing to settle anywhere, Malchevsky returned to live at his place of exile (in the town of Troitsko-Pechorsk, Komi ASSR).*

In November Nikolai Braun completed his term of exile.

Andrei Kravets (Chronicles 39, 42, 47) has been released from exile. He was arrested in 1973 and sentenced for 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda' to 3 years in camps and 2 in exile. His fellow defendants were Slobodyan, Sapelyak, Senkov, Vinnichuk, and the brothers Marmus; all come from the village of Rossokhach in the Ternopol Region.

Stepan Sapelyak is serving his term of exile (Chronicle 48) in the Khabarovsk Territory (in the village of Bogorodskoye in Ulchsky District). At first he was put in a hostel, in a room unfit for habitation. When he fell ill, the doctor did not even make a medical report (his blood pressure was 160/110). Sapelyak wrote a letter to Brezhnev, in which he requested that he be returned to the camp, because he had nowhere to live and they would not take him to hospital. On 30 October he declared a hunger-strike to support his demands for dwelling and for medical aid. On 31 October he was summoned by the KGB and told to look for a flat. All he could find was a former bath-house without a stove.

Releases

In July Grigory Prokopovich was released from exile. In 1967 he was arrested in connection with the Ukrainian National Front organization. He was sentenced for 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda' to 6 years in a strict-regime camp and 5 years in exile (Chronicle 17).

With permission from the police V. Gandzyuk (Chronicles 44, 45) went to Tomsk to buy medicine (he has tuberculosis). When he returned the director of the Chainsky consumer services enterprise, A. P. Fomichev, dismissed him for 'truculence'. Gandzyuk had difficulty in finding a new job — as a watchman in a non-departmental security group. In the autumn he completed his term of exile.

In the Psychiatric Hospitals

This section has been compiled largely from the Information Bulletin of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, Nos. 9 (9 June 1978), 10 (10 August 1978), 12 (9 October 1978), 13 (20 November 1978) and 14 (5 January 1979).1°

In Special Psychiatric Hospitals

Dnepropetrovsk S PH

In May, in accordance with a court ruling in Donetsk, Vladimir Klebanov (Chronicles 48, 49) was transferred here. Neither Klebanov nor his relatives were notified about the trial.

The condition of Iosif Tereya's health (Chronicle 48) has worsened significantly, probably as a result of the medicines prescribed for him. Currently Tereya has difficulty in reading and answering letters.

Viktor Fedyanin, arrested in 1976 on charges of 'distributing deliberately false fabrications defaming the Soviet political and social system', was sent after his trial to the Dnepropetrovsk S PH. Here he was given an intensive course of neuroleptic drugs (the doctor in charge of him was Valentina Alexandrovna Zagubizhenko. On 20 July 1978 Fedyanin was transferred to the Kishinev Psychiatric Hospital.
Kazan S P H

At the beginning of June the regular periodic commission (the Chairman was Shustakovitch from the Serbsky Institute, the doctor in charge was Olga Ivanovna Volkova), did not recommend Boris Evdokimov (Chronicle 48) for discharge. A short time before, Evdokimov had received a parcel from Austria. Unsuccessful attempts were made to persuade him to refuse it. In connection with this and also with other similar instances (See for example in Information Bulletin No. 12 the letter by Yu. Belov 'To Soviet Psychiatrists'), V. Bakhmin, a member of the Working Commission, sent a statement to the Kazan Procuracy: '... the administration of the Kazan S P H, in violation of existing instructions, restricts the receipt by prisoners of the hospital of parcels containing food ... I hope that the hospital administration will not in future violate laws the execution of which should be checked out by the Procuracy.

This statement was sent to the Procurator of the Soviet District of Kazan, V. P. Gafurov, 'for a substantive answer'; at the beginning of October V. Bakhmin was notified of this in a letter. On 19 November Bakhmin informed Gafurov that the 10-rouble postal-order he had sent Evdokimov had been returned to him by the Kazan S P H administration, stamped 'return to sender'.

On 16 November the next regular commission recommended Evdokimov for discharge from the S P H [and his transfer to an ordinary mental hospital]. Because he has been ruled mentally incompetent his son Rostislav is assuming guardianship over him.
At the end of May Vyacheslav Dzibalov (Chronicle 49) was recommended for discharge by a medical commission. The court, which sat on 11 August, declined the application and decided to extend Dzibalov's stay in the psychiatric hospital. Dzibalov's brother and wife made a formal appeal to the Supreme Court of the RSFSR. The Supreme Court turned Dzibalov's case over to the Leningrad Regional Court for a second review. On 14 November the Leningrad Court decided to order a new examination for Dzibalov by psychiatrists from the Serbsky Institute. Dzibalov has received no medication for over a year now.

In October 1978 Valov issued a statement to the press entitled 'Some Words from a Disabled Person', in which he described the workers' low standard of living, especially that of the disabled, in the 'District Psychiatric Hospital No. 4 (at Borodenki Settlement, Moscow Region).

On 4 September 1978, while again attempting to obtain a reply to his statement, Komarov was forcibly hospitalized. He was not subjected to 'treatment'. On 15 September he was released. On 20 September Komarov was summoned to the regional clinic and examined; he was pronounced sane and it was recommended that he be removed as a case of psychiatric abuse.

In 1976 Alexander Evgenievich Komarov, in view of his 'passivity in social life', was refused the recommendation from social organizations which is necessary for those starting post-graduate studies. Komarov attempted to protest against the decision and sent complaints to various departments. A year later the issue of the missing recommendation was raised for a second time in the university. Komarov was refused once again, this time on account of his work reference (while working in a research institute, he had refused to do work unrelated to his qualifications: building work, cleaning up the surrounding area, etc).

Komarov appealed to the Regional Procuracy for an explanation. There he was shown a document which disclosed that he was on a psychiatric register. (Komarov had never been to a psychiatrist or undergone psychiatric examination.)

The Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes sent a letter to the chief doctor of the city psycho-neurological clinic, in which it pointed out the inadmissibility of putting someone on the psychiatric register without first examining him.

In 1976 Yury Valov (b. 1938) was moved to the Ruza District Psychiatric Hospital No. 4 (at Borodenki Settlement, Moscow Region).

In August 1978 a letter by Valov was published in the Bulletin of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled in the U.S.S.R. (Pos. Poimo-Tiny, Krasnoyarsk territory), to which he was transferred from the Serbsky S.P.H. Shipilov's doctor, Anatoly Demyanovich Odzshkin, confiscated a copy of the New Testament from him. Shipilov was told that after his release he would be sent to an invalid home (he has no relatives and is 56).

On 27 October 1978 Valov was forcibly hospitalized. The Working Commission sent a letter to the chief psychiatrist of the Moscow Region and to Yuta Khunovna Syrova, the hospital's chief doctor, in which it quoted the expert diagnosis and demanded the immediate release of Yu. Valov.

On 15 November F. Serebrov, a member of the Working Commission, spoke with the doctor in charge of Valov, Mark Vladimirovich Kuryandsky. In Kuryandsky's words Valov was in a general ward for diagnosis of his condition; and he was not undergoing treatment. Serebrov was refused a meeting with Valov.

At the end of November Valov was transferred to the Central Moscow Regional Psychiatric Hospital and placed in Section 1 (Department Head — Vera Petrovna Shablevich). He was prescribed a course of trisedil [*] and cyclodol.

In 1976 Alexander Evgenievich Komarov, in view of his 'passivity in social life', was refused the recommendation from social organizations which is necessary for those starting post-graduate studies. Komarov attempted to protest against the decision and sent complaints to various departments. A year later the issue of the missing recommendation was raised for a second time in the university. Komarov was refused once again, this time on account of his work reference (while working in a research institute, he had refused to do work unrelated to his qualifications: building work, cleaning up the surrounding area, etc).

Komarov appealed to the Regional Procuracy for an explanation. There he was shown a document which disclosed that he was on a psychiatric register. (Komarov had never been to a psychiatrist or undergone psychiatric examination.)

The Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes sent a letter to the chief doctor of the city psycho-neurological clinic, in which it pointed out the inadmissibility of putting someone on the psychiatric register without first examining him.

On 4 September 1978, while again attempting to obtain a reply to his statement, Komarov was forcibly hospitalized. He was not subjected to 'treatment'. On 15 September he was released. On 20 September Komarov was summoned to the regional clinic and examined; he was pronounced sane and it was recommended that he be removed.
from the psychiatric register.
Komarov was not shown his case history. However, his parents were informed of the diagnosis — ‘psychopathy with litigious tendencies’.

Releases
On 16 July a court ruled that Genrikas Klimagauskas (in Chronicle 44 his surname was mis-spelt) be transferred from Chernyakhovsk S P H to an ordinary hospital. On 1 September he was released.

In July Zinovy Krasivsky (Chronicles 27, 39, 41, 42; for his biography see Information Bulletin No. 12) was released from the Lvov Regional Psychiatric Hospital in accordance with a ruling by the Vladimir Regional Court. He will now live at the home of Miroslav Meles, a fellow defendant (Chronicle 17), who has been appointed his guardian: 293511, Lvovskaya obl., g. Morshin, ul. Mira 11, kv. 3.

On 12 September Evgeny Nikolayev (Chronicles 48, 49) was released from a [Moscow] psychiatric hospital. He was ordered to visit a psychiatric clinic monthly under threat of forcible hospitalization if he refused.

On 12 June Gavrill Yankov (Chronicle 49) was transferred from the Serbsky Institute to the Butyrka Prison. On 22 June he was transferred to a ‘transit’ psychiatric hospital. On 11 October Yankov was released. In his letter of discharge it is stated that he was released on 14 June ‘on the orders of the Moscow police station No. 70 owing to the dropping of his case and his dispatch to a psychiatric hospital for treatment as an ordinary patient’.

In 1971, after an unsuccessful attempt to swim to Turkey, Anatoly Alexandrovich Butko (b. 1928), a doctor, was ruled not responsible and placed in a psychiatric hospital. He was then kept in the hospital for nine months. In 1974 Butko was charged under article 190 of the Russian Criminal Code for writing poetry on civic themes, which he signed with a pseudonym and placed in letter-boxes. In July 1975 he was placed in Chernyakhovsk S P H after being diagnosed as a ‘schizophrenic’. In February 1977 he was transferred to the Kharkov Regional Psychiatric Hospital. On 6 April 1978 he was released.

In August Mikhail Shatravka was released from an ordinary psychiatric hospital. After crossing the Finnish border Mikhail and his brother Alexander were seized by the Finnish authorities and handed over to the U S S R. A court ruled them not responsible. They were sent to Dneprpetrovsk S P H, then transferred to Chernyakhovsk S P H. In March Mikhail Shatravka was transferred from there to the Geiko Psychiatric Hospital (in the town of Igren, Dneprpetrovsk Region). In August Alexander Shatravka was transferred to the same hospital; he was at first treated with Trisedil and afterwards with Phrenolon and Tizertsil.

Information on Lydia Valendo’s release from psychiatric hospital is contained in the section ‘The Right to Leave’.

In the middle of March Malva Landa returned to Moscow (Chronicles 48, 49). Her living quarters (in Krasnogorsk, near Moscow) turned out to be occupied. She settled in Petushki in Vladimir Region.

Andrei Tverdokhlebov (Chronicles 48, 49) also settled there, after all the relevant authorities refused him permission to register in Moscow. (The statute on residence registration, even in its classified clauses, does not forbid this; its prohibition relates only to those returning from ‘places of imprisonment’ — Chronicle 34.) A graduate of the Moscow Physics-Technology Institute, Tverdokhlebov has begun work at a factory in Petushki as a trainee lathe operator. Tverdokhlebov is the Secretary of the Soviet Group of Amnesty International (Chronicle 36).

On 5 September official surveillance of Vasily Ovsienko was again extended (Chronicle 47). He no longer has to report once a week (at first this was monthly, now it is twice monthly). He has applied to emigrate.

On 1 August the period of surveillance of Nina Strokatova (Chronicle 49), a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, was extended.

In May 1978 Yuri Litvin, who was released in November 1977 (Chronicle 47) and has been living since his release in the village of Barakhty, Vasylkov District, Kiev Region (his mother lives there), went to Kiev to visit O. Ya. Meshko, a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group. On his way home he was taken to the police station in Vasylkov and searched. After this he was placed under surveillance for six months.
In November the period of surveillance was extended because Litvin again visited Meshko when he went to Kiev to fetch his work book after getting oral permission from the police.

In September Anatoly Marchenko (Chronicles 35, 36) finished his term of exile.

In the middle of October Marchenko arrived in Moscow. On the second day after his arrival, in accordance with the rules, any stay of more than three days has to be recorded or registered, an officer from the district police, the same one who gave false evidence against Marchenko in court, arrived at the flat of L. Bogoraz, Marchenko's wife. Bogoraz refused to talk to him.

On 9 November Bogoraz received a letter from the 96th police station, sent on 3 November. In this letter the station chief wrote that 'having examined on 25 October material concerning the infringement by citizen L. I. Bogoraz-Brukhman of Resolution No. 385 of the USSR Council of Ministers', he had directed that a fine of 10 roubles be imposed on her. In the same letter it was written that 'the offender must pay the fine within three days', and that the 'deadline for payment is 30 October'. Marchenko has settled in the village of Karabanovo in Vladimir Region.

In March and April officials of the Ivano-Frankivsk KGB had three conversations with Vasily Shovkovoi (see 'In the Prisons and Camps'), who had just been released, in connection with an interview which he gave while in camp (Chronicle 47). This interview was printed in the English-language press and broadcast by Radio Liberty. The KGB officers tried to make Shovkovoi renounce the interview and contradict it. 'We shall remind you of this interview in ten days' time,' one of them said.

On 19 July the head of the Pustomyty KGB Division, Captain Polischuk (Chronicle 49), again visited Kandyba at his place of work (a communal consumer service establishment). The subject of his talk with Kandyba was the same: correspondence with political prisoners and membership of the Helsinki Group.

On 3 August the Pustomyty District newspaper Leninsky Prapor published an article entitled 'Through Dark Glasses'. The article states (translated from Ukrainian):

If I do not receive a positive reply I shall be forced to appeal to the Soviet government for payment to start negotiations with other states, so that one of them will accept me and give me work: I have no chance of finding this in my own homeland.

In May Kampov received a refusal 'in connection with the lack of vacancies'. In June he appealed to Brezhnev:

I do not have the strength to endure discrimination and humiliation in my own country.

Therefore I ask you: allow me to make a personal appeal to the embassies of the USA and Canada in Moscow to be accepted by one of these countries. If they agree to accept me, let me go. He received no reply.

On 14 November, during the night, two police-officers, Captain Durunda and Lieutenant Syurtin, ordered Kampov to allow them into his home (Kampov is not under surveillance). When he refused they broke down the door and burst into his home. That night 55 roubles disappeared from Kampov's bedside table.

The following day Kampov sent a request for protection to Brezhnev by telegram. Ten days later the head of the Trans-Carpathian UVV informed Kampov that the facts stated in his telegram were unfounded.

On 11 July an article entitled 'Give the Evil-doer a Pedestal' — about Ivan Diky (Chronicle 48) — appeared in the Lvov newspaper Leninska Molos. In the article P. Grigorenko, L. Luyunyaenko and I. Kandyba were called 'ideological tutors of a recidivist thief'.

On 19 July, the head of the Pustomyty KGB Division, Captain Polischuk (Chronicle 49), again visited Kandyba at his place of work (a communal consumer service establishment). The subject of his talk with Kandyba was the same: correspondence with political prisoners and membership of the Helsinki Group.

On 3 August the Pustomyty District newspaper Leninsky Prapor published an article entitled 'Through Dark Glasses'. The article states (translated from Ukrainian):

Kandyba has not ceased his filthy activities. He writes letters to various organizations and authorities... At the same time he tries to fill his complaints with a nationalist stuffing. In this connection he has important consultations with such traitors to the Soviet people as Sakharov, Bukovsky, Orlov, Rudenko, Tikh and others... Even now Kandyba cannot sit quietly. He is trying to find the slightest fault in our everyday life and to send this information abroad at any price. As reward for this he is — clearly as a reward — sent parcels from abroad containing all sorts of trash. Kandyba is trying to spread his rotten nationalist ideas among those to whom
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he flogs these 'rags'...
On 15 August the Head of the Pustomyty Criminal Investigation Department, Senior Lieutenant Magurat (Chronicle 49), suggested to Kandyba that he find somewhere to live outside the Lvov Region once his period of surveillance came to an end on 23 September. However it transpired that he was not allowed to live in Kiev or in any regional centre.
On 25 August Captain Polishchuk told Kandyba that he had enough material in his safe to initiate criminal proceedings against him, and again asked Kandyba to leave the Helsinki Group.
On 22 September Kandyba's period of surveillance was extended a further six months, since he 'had not taken the path of correction and had no desire whatever to be corrected'.

Persecution of Crimean Tatars
In the Crimea
In the spring of 1978 there were about 700 Crimean Tatar families in the Crimea, living without registration in houses they had bought (Chronicle 49). Almost all of them had been through the civil courts, which had declared the arrangement of house sales and purchases to be null and void; after this, only a demand for reinstatement by the former owner of the house was needed for a 'legal' eviction to take place. Since October 1978 this procedure has become unnecessary, owing to an (unpublished) Decree of the USSR Council of Ministers (see below) 'legalizing' administrative evictions from houses in the Crimea and even deportation ('expulsion') of unregistered families from the Crimea without trial, by decision of district soviet executive committees.

Court proceedings under article 196 of the Ukrainian S S R Criminal Code ('Violation of the residence regulations') have continued: in June-July Alim Selimov was sentenced in Sovetsky District to 11 years' imprisonment, while Server Asanov was sentenced to 2 years; in Simferopol, Memet Seidov was given a conditional sentence of 11 years, with compulsory assignment to labour. (Crimean Tatars are made to serve their 'compulsory assignment to labour' outside the Crimea).

Evictions
12 June. In the 'Sunshine' state farm (Simferopol District) the Khalilov family, with two children (aged three and one), were evicted. The driver of one of the lorries refused to participate in the eviction and drove away.

16 June. In the village of Lugovoi (Simferopol District) the family of Memet Selimov have been thrown out of the house they bought. The family consists of his 89-year-old mother, his wife and child. The family has begun to live in a tent.

22 June. In the village of Chernovo (Saki District) the family of Asan Kosse has been evicted. The evening before, the Crimean Tatar residents of the village were warned not to go away anywhere, as a commission examining the question of their registration would be going round the houses. The head of the district police and representatives of the district Party Committee and the district Soviet Executive Committee took part in the eviction. While trying to lock the doors, Asan Kosse was dealt such a blow that he lost consciousness. His wife and his daughter (ill from birth) were beaten and dragged into a bus, their arms twisted. When Asan regained consciousness, he was pushed into the bus, a shirt stuffed into his mouth. For some hours they were kept under guard in the bus, while their belongings were taken to the storehouse of the state farm. Complaints to Brezhnev, Rudenko and other state leaders by Asan Kosse, a veteran of the Second World War and the Japanese war, were of no help.

23 June. In the village of Sadovoye (Nizhnegorsky District) a raid took place on the Mustafayev family. Vera Mustafayeva (born 1943) is pregnant and has four children. Her husband Nuri Mustafayev, sentenced in December 1977 to 2 years' banishment, is outside the borders of the Crimea. The police threw a child of 7 months out on to the street together with the family's possessions. Vera Mustafayeva was beaten up. The operation was conducted by Nikolaichuk, Deputy Head of the district O V D. In spite of the fact that the evidence of her beating was registered during a medical examination, Vera Mustafayeva did not manage to obtain a court hearing of her complaint against the actions of the police.

During the following month there were no evictions, possibly in connection with the self-immolation of Musa Mamut (see below).

27 July. In the town of Stary Krym (Kirovsky District) an attempt to evict the family of Enver Muratov was foiled by the refusal of local vigilantes to participate in this action.

3 August. Stary Krym. Eviction of 65-year-old Aishie Baimak and her son. The eviction was carried out by a bailiff on the basis of a court decision declaring the purchase and sale of the house illegal; state-
ments had been obtained from the former owner of the house, re-
nouncing her sale of the house. Four policemen and 15 vigilantes took part. (This time the vigilantes were brought in from distant villages and were told they were to evict religious sectarians. Those who tried to get out of it were threatened with expulsion from the Komsomol or dismissal from employment.) A. Baimak’s son was beaten up and taken away; she herself was locked up and only released after her possessions had been taken away. The former owner was resettled in the house.

8 August. Village of Dobrolyubovka (Kirovsky District). Gulnaz Kharakhadiyeva, a widow with three daughters, was subjected to eviction when only her youngest daughter, a girl of 15, was at home. The eviction was conducted by the Chairwoman of the village Soviet, A. Rinkevich (a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR), a local policeman and a judge. The girl tried to run away, but was caught and put into the truck; then their possessions were dragged out of the house and driven away, together with the girl. When Kharakhadiyeva returned home, A. Rinkevich refused to tell her where her daughter and her property were. A man from a neighbouring village, who helped her to search for them in his car, had his driving licence taken away. They had intended to resettle the former owner in the house, but when she saw the unanimous indignation of the neighbours (Russians), she refused to go back. Kharakhadiyeva remained in her house.

September. Representatives of the police, sometimes of the ‘public’, drew up a list of all unregistered Crimean Tatars. Among the few exceptions was the family of Musa Mamut. Household furniture and domestic animals were also listed. The accompanying questionnaire included the questions: Where have you come from? From whom did you buy the house and at what price? The address of the former owner? A pretext sometimes given for this undertaking was that it was a preparation for the All-Union Census.

2 October. Village of Abrikosovka (Kirovsky District). The family of Osman Gardzheli was evicted. The operation was conducted by Pokhilko, Chairman of the village Soviet, and local policeman Voloshin. The evicted family returned to their house (see also below 26 October).

4 October. Village of Zhuravki (Kirovsky District). Five policemen, led by a captain, and about ten vigilantes evicted 23-year-old Abduraim Pashala and his 70-year-old grandmother from the house they had bought on 22 September. They were taken to the bus-station.
7 Balsys Gajauskas, Lithuanian dissenter imprisoned 1948-73, with his fiancée
Irena Dumbryste, 1977. In 1978 they married in camp. 8 Zinovy Antonyuk
before his arrest in 1972 and 10-year sentence for Ukrainian samizdat
activity. He now has TB. 9 Zoryan Popadyuk, Ukrainian student given
13 years in 1973. 10 Nikolai Budulak-Sharygin (in the West 'N. Scharegin'),
with his adopted daughter and granddaughter in Kalinin, after serving
10 years. 11 Svyatoslav Karavansky, Ukrainian dissenter, photographed
in captivity where he has been almost continuously since 1944.

12 and 14 Stepan Sapelyak, Ukrainian dissenter transferred from camp
for 3 years' exile in east Siberia, could find only this unheated hut to live
in. 13 Ivan Svetcivchyn, a leading Ukrainian national democrat, also began
his 5-year exile term in 1978, in a hut like Sapelyak’s, but near the
Mongolian border. He suffers from chronic bad health after his camp
experiences.
16. Gabriel Superfin, a Chronicle editor, transferred from Vladimir Prison to spend 2 years’ exile in a Central Asian village. 16 Irina Stekiw and her husband Igor Kalyutts, Ukrainian dissenters now exiled on the Manchurian border, 4,900 miles from home. 17 Stefania Shabatura, Ukrainian nationalist, exiled in SW Siberia, 2,000 miles from her Lvov home, is visited by Nikolai Gorbal. 18 Irina Senik, Ukrainian dissenter now exiled to Central Asia for last part of 3-year term.

19. L to r: Vladimir Klebanov, Valentin Poplavsky, unidentified colleague, telling a Moscow press conference (26 January 1978) about their free trades union. Klebanov was put in a prison mental hospital. Poplavsky in a camp. 20 Viktor Anisimov, prisoner who turned state’s evidence against Yury Orlov (Chronicle 50). 21 Valeria Novodvorskaya, librarian psychiatrically interned for role in another free union. 22 Alexander Lyapin, interned in 1977 for involvement with Orlov, reinterned following a protest suicide attempt. 23 Mikhail Lutsik, Ukrainian nationalist (see ‘Biographies’).
The special psychiatric hospital in Talgar, 15 miles from Alma-Ata, Central Asia. The sign reads: 'Forbidden Zone. No Entry.' Between the second barbed-wire fence and the wooden fence armed guards patrol with dogs.

Sergei Purtov, Leningrad leftist held in this SPH. Arrested in 1971.

Revolt Pimenov, dissenter since Stalin's time, stayed in the Urals after his last sentence. Subject to harassment in 1976.

Oskar Rabin, a leading Moscow non-conformist painter deprived of citizenship while abroad.

Sergei Ruzer, Moscow Jew ref'd 'security grounds,' with his wife.

Group of Ukrainians for emigrating Nadezhda Svetlichnaya, L to r: Oksana Lisovaya, Mikhailina Kotyubinskaya, Svetlichnaya, D, Mikhail Goryn (Horyn), Atana Pashko (V. Chornovil), Chornovil (Chornovil's sister).
Crimean Tatar demonstration in the Crimea following the self-immolation of Musa Mamut in protest at increasing official persecution of Tatars, 30 June 1978. His widow walks in front. The large banner reads: 'To our own Dad and Husband, who gave his life for the Crimean Homeland.' The small one attached to a wreath: 'To Musa Mamut from his Neighbours.'

Eviction by police (flat-topped hats) of the Crimean Tatar Nadzhiye Bekirova and her family from their home in the Crimea, 14 April 1978 (Chronicle 49). The evictions continued in summer 1978. See 'Persecution of Crimean Tatars.'

Two founders of an unofficial group to fight for the rights of the disabled, Maris and Jonen Tilgals, Latvian brothers sentenced in August 1978 for founding a socialist democratic group.

Yury Kiselev I and Valery Fefelov, physicist and artist, respectively, joined Moscow dissident and emigrant Andrei Sinyavsky on a hunger strike in protest against pressure on dissenters at party congresses. Their wife, Vera Sinyavskaya, joined them in the fast. She died in September 1978. Their daughter, Vera Sinyavskaya, was born in prison in 1979.
The founder members of the Catholic Committee to Defend Believers' Rights, set up in Lithuania in November 1978: Fathers Vincas Velvidis (38), Jonas Kauneckas (39), Juozas Zdebskis (40), Alfonsas Svarinskas (41), and Sigitas Tamkevičius (42). The committee issued protests against persecution of the Church and liaised closely with the analogous Christian Committee in Moscow. 43 Ivan Vagner (Johann Wagner), centre back row, a German worker in Moldavia imprisoned for 'parasitism', with his family. He first applied to emigrate in 1956.

44-6 Sabotage of a Baptist wedding in Merefa, Ukraine. Pavel Snitsarenko and Galina Litvinenko were due to marry on 14 May 1978. On 12-13 May police asked them to cancel the reception, then interrogated them for six hours, then imprisoned four friends for 15 days, then destroyed the marquee for the reception (44-45). On 14 May they dug up the road outside the bride's house (46) to have a pretext to close it, then arrested the guests and drove them away.
in the village of Sovetsky. The former owner of the house was forced to renounce her agreement to sell the house, which had been made before witnesses, but without the presence of a notary (notaries are forbidden to draw up contracts selling houses to Tatars). The family did not leave the Crimea.

9 October. Village of Lechebnoye (Belogorsk District). The family of Usein Gafarov — his wife, three children aged from one to eight, and his aged parents (his mother is 84, his father 88) — were deported to Krasnodar Territory. R. Settarov, A. Umerov and Kh. Seitkhalilov, who protested against this action, were imprisoned for 15, 10 and 10 days respectively.

11 October. Three evictions in Belogorsk District.

In the village of Novozhilovka Eskender Subairov was beaten up and led away in handcuffs, after which his parents were evicted from their house. The house was bulldozed.

In the village of Kurkovo the families of S. Osmanov and I. Khumsarov were evicted. The operation was personally conducted by Major Chernyakov, head of the district OVD (Chronicle 49).

The family of Seitbilyal Osmanov, including the children, were deported to Novosaleksejevka (Kherson Region). (A few days later, when pupils in class 7 of the local school asked during a Russian lesson why their classmate Tair had been evicted, teacher R. A. Rudakova replied 'The Crimea is overpopulated, there isn't enough food'.)

The house belonging to the second family was bulldozed. Ismael Khumsarov, who had bought the house, was at the time in Uzbekistan, fetching his bride. His father was forced into a police car by kicks and blows. The police sent with him to Belogorsk some other people, who had protested against the eviction and the destruction of the house, as well as Ewver Ametov (Chronicle 47), a neighbour of the Khumsaros, who had been put under 'preventive' detention — before the action started he had been picked up in the yard of his house. In Belogorsk three other people, who had come to enquire about the fate of those held, were also detained. Some of those detained were fined, others were held under arrest: S. Osmanov for 15 days, E. Ametov, N. Daganba, E. Dzhepparov and A. Umerov for 10 days each. Those arrested were taken to a special detention centre in Simferopol, where Lieutenant Katkov said, on receiving them, 'There's a Decree of the Council of Ministers on the eviction of the Crimean Tatars. The year 1944 will be repeated — that's no secret to anyone.'

The Khumsarov family set up a tent in their yard (see also below: 19 November).
12 October. Belogorsk. About 200 Crimean Tatars came to the district Soviet Executive Committee to protest to the district authorities. The building was ringed by police and vigilantes drawn from the town and many villages of the district. Also present were Chernysykov, head of the district O V D, and district K G B Chief Ilinov. The police dispersed the Crimean Tatars. The Deputy Head of the district O V D, Pisklov (Chronicle 49, where his name was spelt Peskov) also stated that on 15 October a total eviction of Crimean Tatars from the Crimea would begin.

Second half of October. In many Crimean villages meetings to discuss the evictions took place. Party organizer Sidarov at the Gorny collective farm (village of Bogatoye, Belogorsk District) called on collective farmers at the meetings not to defend the Crimean Tatars, but to help the police. Sidarov turned up at school while a class of pupils were writing an essay about the war and told the teacher to make sure the essays mentioned 'the treason of the Crimean Tatars'.

18 October. Fyodorov, Presiding Judge of the Belogorsk People's Court, summoned all citizens who had told their houses to Crimean Tatars. He demanded that they should give back the money they had received for the houses and return to live in them. 'Otherwise you will be deported together with the Tatars, and in addition you'll each get 2 years' compulsory labour,' stated Fyodorov.

20 October. Village of Novopetrovka (Kirovsky District). Adzhier Abyshikimova, who was living in the house of her registered son, was evicted and sent to the port of Krym. (Her husband was an underground fighter during the war years, her youngest son is now serving in the army.)

26 October. Village of Abrikosovka (Kirovsky District). Second eviction of the Gavdzhi family (see 2 October). This time a detachment of 50 policemen, headed by Captain Nikhayev, Head of the district O V D, was moved into the village. Petty convicts serving 15-day sentences were brought in to move the furniture. Gavdzhi's daughter Nefize, a pupil of class 7, was deceived by headmistress T. P. Konовалova and sent home. The Gavdzhi family were taken in lorries and a bus, with a convoy of police cars, to the station of Novooleksyevka (Kherson Region), from which they were to be sent on to Central Asia. The 'operation' was then interrupted. In a short space of time over 200 people gathered in Novooleksyevka. They wrote slogans on the vehicles which had brought the evicted people and their property: 'We demand equal rights!', 'Shame on the Soviet police!' and 'Stop the violence!' Ukrainians and Russians, as well as Crimean Tatars, took part in this spontaneous demonstration. The demonstrators, in spite of the additional forces of police brought in, did not allow the furniture to be transferred to rail wagons. In the morning a police colonel arrived and persuaded the people to disperse, promising that the Gavdzhi family would be allowed back home. When Osman Gavdzhi returned to his house, the village soviet 'told him that if he did not leave the Crimea voluntarily within 7 days, then the year 1944 would be repeated for his family and himself. Osman Gavdzhi is 43 years old, his wife Sanie is 39. Two of his eldest sons are now serving in the Army.

9 November. A delegation of Crimean Tatars came to the regional committee of the party to hand in a declaration of protest, signed by 750 people from various parts of the Crimea, to the committee's First Secretary. The latter refused to receive them, but an employee of the committee told them they would be received by the Deputy Chairman of the regional Soviet Executive Committee, Baranovsky. On 15 November, when three delegates went to the Executive Committee, Baranovsky demanded that they come in to see him one by one, and talk only about themselves personally. The delegates refused. In the meantime a police unit appeared in the building and the police chief began to drive the delegates out. He said the police had been summoned because 'The Crimean Tatars are about to organize a demonstration.'

In November unregistered Crimean Tatars were summoned to village soviets and district soviet executive committees, and, on the basis of a new Decree (No. 700) of the U S S R Council of Ministers (15 August) on observance of the residence regulations in the Crimean region, they were warned to 'leave the Crimea within 7 days'. None of the 'violators of the regulations' summoned was shown the text of the decree, but it was explained to them that it gave the district Soviet Executive Committee the right to carry out a decision on eviction and deportation from the Crimea with the aid of the police.

19 November. Village of Kurskoye. Crimean Tatar young people assembled for a Sunday voluntary work-stint, to rebuild the Khumsarovs' house, which had been bulldozed on 11 October. They had gathered money in advance to pay for building materials which they brought with them. The chairman of the village soviet would not let the young people do any work and the bricks in the Khumsarovs' yard were taken away.
In May and June 896 signatures were collected in the Crimea on an appeal addressed to Kurt Waldheim, Secretary-General of the U.N. The appeal states that the unwillingness of the Soviet leaders to respond to the peaceful and lawful demands of the Crimean Tatars makes it necessary for them to seek support for their national and individual rights from the U.N. They list the articles of the International Convention outlawing all forms of racial discrimination, and of the International Covenants on Human Rights, which have been violated by the Soviet government. In conclusion, the Crimean Tatars ask that a commission be set up to investigate the situation in the Crimea. The supplements to the appeal contain detailed evidence of discrimination, illegality and cruelty practised by the authorities.

On 2 September the Moscow Helsinki Group published a document, ‘Continued Discrimination against Crimean Tatars’ (Document No. 60), supporting the appeal.

At the end of November over 2,000 Crimean Tatars signed a ‘Protest Declaration’, addressed to the central Soviet party and state organs, and also the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

Many of the above-mentioned facts are taken from this declaration.

The Self-immolation of Musa Mamut

On 23 June Musa Mamut, a 46-year-old Crimean Tatar, committed suicide by self-immolation. In April 1975 he, his wife Zekie Abdul-layeva and their three children settled in the Crimea after acquiring a small house in the village of Besh-Terek (now Donskoye, in Simferopol District). They were refused residence registration and confirmation of the sale and purchase by a notary. In May 1976, under article 196 of the Ukrainian S.S.R Criminal Code, Musa Mamut was sentenced to 2 years of camps and his wife was given a 2-year suspended sentence (Chronicle 41). On 18 June 1977 M. Mamut was released early for good work and exemplary behaviour, and returned home. Once again he was pursued by summons, warnings, and threats of another trial and eviction.

In March 1978 we were received by Chairman Tsekhla of the district Soviet Executive Committee and asked him to grant our family registration and employment, as we were in a difficult material situation. Our children had been starving. The Chairman replied briefly: ‘Not only will we not register you, but on the contrary — as soon as it gets warm, we’ll evict you’... My husband Musa declared that he had prepared a canister of petrol in order to immolate himself. Thus he would simply not leave his homeland, the Crimea, or his own house.

(From a declaration to the Procurator-General by Z. Abdul-layeva, written in August 1978.)

and his wife, after interrogating them for 3 hours, that a criminal case would be made out against them under article 196. Mamut told Ponemaryov that they would not take him alive.

Three days later local policeman Supsykin drove up to Mamut’s house and demanded that he should immediately accompany him to the village soviet, where investigator Ponemaryov was waiting for him. Going out to the far end of the yard, Musa poured petrol over himself and, running back towards the policeman, set himself on fire.

Supsykin left at once.

This took place before the very eyes of Ridvan Charukhov (Chronicles 31, 32, 34, 37), who was living in the same village and had come over to Mamut’s when he saw the policeman driving up to the house. Charukhov ran up to Musa to put out the flames, but could not do this with his bare hands. He ran into the house for a blanket, but meanwhile two workers from a passing car had managed to extinguish the flames round Musa. They immediately took Musa to the hospital in Simferopol, but the burns were too extensive.

On 28 June Musa Mamut died.

The funeral took place on 30 June. On that day the roads into Donskoye were blockaded, buses and other vehicles were forbidden to stop in the village, and many Crimean Tatars were warned the day before that if they participated in the funeral, they would lay themselves open to a charge of disturbing the peace and so on. In spite of all these measures, about 1,000 people assembled for the funeral. The funeral procession was accompanied by banners: ‘To our dear daddy and husband, who gave his life for his Homeland, the Crimea’, ‘To dear Musa Mamut, a victim of injustice towards the Crimean Tatar nation’, ‘To Musa from his indignant Russian brothers. Rest in peace, justice will triumph’.

The elderly Amet-Aga from a neighbouring village, who performs the functions of a mullah (there are no ‘official’ mullahs in the Crimea), led the prayers. A few people made speeches over the grave. At the suggestion of one of the speakers, those present swore to do all they could to ensure that Musa’s sacrifice on behalf of his people would not be in vain.

... 

The funeral took place under the watchful eyes of the police and K.G.B, whose activities on the spot were supervised by Colonel Pavlenko, Deputy Head of the Crimea K.G.B.

Besides the obstacles placed in the way of access to the cemetery, the authorities tried to prevent dissemination of information about the self-immolation and the funeral. As soon as Mamut was brought to the hospital, he was declared in quarantine and only his wife was allowed access to him. On 30 June telephone links with Donskoye...
were broken off, while public telephones in Simferopol could not be used for conversations with Moscow. Searches for written information were undertaken. For example, on 1 July Elbuzr Seiltarangov, a resident of Simferopol, was taken off a suburban bus. The 'employees of the Criminal Investigation Department' searched him, suspecting him to be 'a criminal liable to investigation' and carefully examining all the papers he had on him. Finding nothing, they let him go.

* * *

On 4 July A. D. Sakharov sent a letter to L. I. Brezhnev and N. A. Shchelokov:

... Apart from the immediate circumstances, the self-immolation of Musa Mamut is really due to the national tragedy of the Crimean Tatar people, who in 1944 were the victims of a monstrous crime by Stalin and his assistants, and who from 1967 to 1978 — since the expulsion of the Crimean Tatars by a Decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet — have again become victims of continued discrimination and injustice...

I appeal to you, as I am convinced of the urgent necessity of most decisive and widespread intervention by the highest state authorities in the land. The tragic death of Musa Mamut, whose name will live for ever in the memories of his fellow-countrymen and all decent people, must serve to restore justice, to restore the scorned rights of his people.

I ask you also to make sure that an adequate pension is paid to his wife and children and that the specific circumstances of his death are investigated.

* * *

At the end of July a KGB Colonel from Kiev had a talk with Dzhemil Velilayev, who had made a speech at the funeral. His questions included the following: Why was the Moslem burial ritual disregarded, in that women were present at the cemetery and people had brought flowers and wreaths? What was the oath taken by the crowd over the grave? How had it come about that Western radio had immediately reported Mamut's self-immolation and the funeral? The colonel told Velilayev: 'Don't hope that this self-immolation will help the Crimean Tatars. On the contrary, the solution of your whole problem will only take longer.'

* * *

In July the regional procurator's office carried out an investigation. Mamut's neighbours were asked if they had not seen any peculiarities in his behaviour. Questions of this kind were also asked in Yangi-Yul (Uzbekistan), where Mamut's family had lived before returning to the Crimea.

The authorities made big efforts to spread a story among the local population, according to which the Crimean Tatars themselves had persuaded Musa to set himself on fire, promising him they would be able to put out the flames. This accusation was directed primarily at Ridvan Charukhov.

In July Investigator Karatygin from the regional Procurator's Office interrogated Zekia Abdullayeva. He tried to portray the situation in which Mamut's family found themselves as being the result of a misunderstanding. When Abdullayeva told him that the police had refused them registration because of the small size of the living-space in the house they had bought ('the sanitary norms are not being complied with'), he was 'amazed': 'The sanitary norms don't apply to private house-owners.'

Seeing that the investigation was not going to touch on the real causes of Musa Mamut's death, Z. Abdullayeva wrote a declaration to the Procurator-General (quoted above) on 15 August. The declaration ends with the words:

... The people directly responsible for the death of my husband Musa Mamut, born 1931, father of three children, and all decent people, must serve to restore justice, to restore the scorned rights of his people. I ask you to investigate immediately and bring to justice those responsible for my husband's self-immolation, in accordance with the existing articles of the RSFSR and Ukrainian SSR Criminal Codes.

* * *

Reshat Dzhemilev appealed to the King of Saudi Arabia, Khaled ibn Abdul-Aziz as-Saud, to help his people: 'The Islamic world must listen to the voice of the guardian of the holy Qaaba; this is a mighty force.'

R. Dzhemilev speaks in his letter of the Crimean Tatars' situation, their lack of rights, and the cruel persecution which led to the death of Musa Mamut.

This was not suicide, which is forbidden by the Koran. I declare it a murder, committed by the Soviet authorities.

... I do not think that the living torch of Musa Mamut's body will awaken the consciences of the Bolshevik leaders. But I do hope for help and solidarity with my people's struggle from all decent people in the world, most of all from our fellow-believers, the Moslems.

I also ask you to declare Musa Mamut a martyr fallen in the battle for the faith, for goodness and justice.

* * *
On 22 August a document signed by 685 Crimean Tatars was sent from Uzbekistan to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, protesting against the violence of the Crimean authorities which led to the tragic death of Musa Mamut, and asking for the repeal of all anti-Constitutional state legislation and decisions concerning the Crimean Tatars.

The Suicide of Izzet Memedullayev
On 19 November, in the village of Yarkoye Pole, Kirovsky District, Izzet Memedullayev (born 1937) hanged himself. He had come to the Crimea in September 1977 with his wife and 3 daughters (they are now 10, 6 and 4 years old). He was refused registration in the house he had bought. The village soviet more than once summoned the former owner of the house and demanded that before winter came he should return the money to Memedullayev and settle into the house again. Memedullayev himself was often summoned by the Administrative Commission, which threatened to make a criminal case against him under article 198 of the Ukrainian SSR Criminal Code.

It is known that not long before Memedullayev's death a KGB official from Feodosiya, Rodionov, had obtained from him a written note promising to work with the KGB. However, a few days later Memedullayev demanded the note back: he declared he had handed it over while he was in a depressed state because of his situation. Rodionov replied that he did not have the note with him, but promised to destroy it. Immediately after this meeting, the local authorities increased the pressure on Memedullayev. He began to be summoned every day. Izzet Memedullayev left a letter: 'I have never been a scoundrel. I want to die with a clear conscience.' Izzet Memedullayev's funeral took place on 22 November. In spite of strong counter-measures by the local authorities (all roads into the village of Zhuravki, where the cemetery was, were barred), the funeral was attended by about 300 people, including Russians. The funeral was conducted under strict surveillance by numerous KGB officials and policemen.

In Krasnodar Territory
About 30,000 Crimean Tatars live here. They are mostly those who came to the Crimea from Central Asia and were either deported from there or could not find accommodation there (many such families arrived in 1978).

At first the Crimean Tatars were not hindered from settling in Krasnodar Territory and were even welcomed (as honest workers). However, now the authorities greet new settlers in almost the same way as in the Crimea — they won't legalize sales of houses to them or register their residence. Various rumours are disseminated among the Russian population, slandering the Crimean Tatars (for example, one 'report' blamed Crimean Tatars for the murder of a watchman during the burglary of a shop in a settlement on the edge of Novorossiisk — until the real criminals were caught).

On the night of 18 May (the anniversary of the deportation of the Crimean Tatars in 1944) a black flag was hoisted in the settlement of Nizhne-Bakansky. At 4 am the flag was taken down. An investigation began, conducted by local KGB Chief Major Zagummeny and KGB officials from Novorossiisk. Crimean Tatars were summoned for interrogation to the village soviet. On 24 May soldiers were brought into the settlement and patrolled the streets. All the Crimean Tatars had their names listed. Operational groups of 6 to 8 men inspected the houses and yards of the Crimean Tatars. Even schoolboys were summoned for interrogation. During this action a rumour was spread among the population that the Crimean Tatars were going to be deported to Siberia.

In Nizhne-Bakansky, out of 8,000 inhabitants 6,000 are Crimean Tatars.

In Uzbekistan
Reshat Shamilev, who lived with his family of four in the town of Bekabad (Tashkent Region), sold his house in July 1978 so that he could leave for the Crimea. The head of the passport office refused to de-register him, citing an instruction not to de-register Crimean Tatars 'heading for the Crimea'. After complaining to the Uzbek SSR Minister of Internal Affairs, Shamilev received a reply which stated in part:

As regards the question of de-registration from your place of residence and resettlement in the Crimea, we must explain that, according to a decision of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers (28 August 1974) 'On the rules of registration and de-registration', registration for residence in towns and urban settlements is permitted only if living accommodation is available. On the basis of this decision, on de-registering in your town you must show confirmation from a district Soviet Executive Committee that you have a place to live in your proposed area of new registration. Refusal to de-register Crimean Tatars wishing to leave for the Crimea has been a practice in Uzbekistan since the spring of 1978. The "legal" bases of this refusal became known to M. Dzhemilev, and in this connection he wrote the following declaration on 25 October:

To the Chairman of the U.S.S.R Supreme Court
persecution of Crimean Tatars

On 22 October M. Dzhemilev and R. Dzhemilev were detained near the house of friends by 'employees of the Criminal Investigation Department', who explained that a flat in the house had recently been burgled and that their department was now checking the documents of all visitors to the house. As it turned out that they had no documents with them, they were sent to the police station, where they were held for five hours. After this the police chief told them 'there has been a misunderstanding'.

The national movement of Crimean Tatars, which in Uzbekistan has become organized around the demand that all decrees and resolutions concerning the Crimean Tatars be repealed as discriminatory (see the Appeal Statement addressed to L. I. Brezhnev — Chronicle 47), is continuing to send representatives to Moscow. Nos. 4 to 6 of an Information Bulletin (report of work done), signed by representatives of Crimean Tatar nationalities policy of the Soviet government, I was shown a letter dated 10 October 1978, from Kh. Kayumov, head of the passport office of the U V D of the Tashkent city Soviet Executive Committee, which mentioned among other things an unpublished 'Instruction No. 221 from the UzSSR Minister of Internal Affairs (26 April 1978) regarding citizens of Tatar nationality formerly resident in the Crimea'.

According to this 'Instruction' from the Minister, as Kh. Kayumov says in the letter, 'citizens of Tatar nationality formerly resident in the Crimea are forbidden to settle in the Crimea without supporting documents showing that they can be found living accommodation and employment in the Crimea'. This 'Instruction' applies exclusively to citizens of Crimean Tatar nationality ...

Undoubtedly this 'Instruction' contradicts articles 34 and 36 of the U S S R Constitution as well as international legal documents signed by the Soviet state, including the U N Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Helsinki Agreements. Therefore I ask you to take steps to investigate the circumstances in which this 'Instruction' was issued and to bring those responsible to justice ...
Events in Lithuania

This section is largely based on material from the Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church, issue 35 (16 November 1978) and AuAra, issue 12 (August 1978).

... 

According to AuAra, in June 1978 a League for the Freedom of Lithuania was founded. A declaration on the League's foundation states that the USSR does not intend to fulfil the Helsinki Agreement as regards the sections on the right of peoples to self-determination, but the Lithuanian people will try to gain freedom at any price. The declaration outlines the League's two aims: to promote the growth of religious, national and political consciousness among the people and to raise the question of Lithuania's freedom at the international level.

The highest organ of the League has been formed — its People's Council. Abroad it is planned to form an Overseas Council, which would be called on, in particular, to replace the National Council in the case of its liquidation.

The National Council has appealed to the heads of state of Europe and America, and also to the Chinese People's Republic, to raise the question of Lithuania's freedom at the UN General Assembly. The National Council has also appealed to Lithuanians abroad to set up the Overseas Council.

... 

On 14 September, members of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group O. Lukauskaite-Pakiene and Fr. K. Gareckas sent an appeal to the Presidium of the Lithuanian S.S.R Supreme Soviet in defence of V. Petkus (Chronicle 50). The appeal was supported by 78 other people (including 3 Estonians). The appeal disagrees with the official description of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group and the Committee of the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian National Movements as anti-Soviet organizations. It is noted that 'the facts reflected in the Group's documents were not disproved in court'. The appeal examines the infringement of the Criminal Procedural Code in court: the charge of homosexuality was based on the evidence of one witness; witnesses who were favourably inclined towards V. Petkus were not called into court. The signatories of the appeal ask the Presidium to re-examine the case of V. Petkus and repeal the sentence, which is 'a crude political reprisal against a dissenter'.

...
At the beginning of November 1977 E. Jonaitis, together with two friends, tore down the flag on the Vilnius Electrographical Institute. He was put in a psychiatric hospital.

Arrests, Searches, Interrogations

On 26 May 1978 Romas Giedras and his wife Lida Giedriene were detained in Vilnius. They were taken to Vilnius by plane. During a personal search of R. Giedras the following were confiscated: 'Open letter to Lithuanian and Russian Patriotic', Valentin Turchin's book The Inertia of Fear and the Messenger of the Russian Student Christian Movement. L. Giedriene was released after interrogation, but Romas was held in an MVD investigations prison for three days. R. Giedras is a former political prisoner who is at present trying unsuccessfully to emigrate to the USA, where his father lives.

On 31 May Zinaida Dapšienė, a programme engineer at the Institute of Metal-Cutting Lathes, was arrested in Vilnius on suspicion of reproducing and disseminating some kind of proclamation.

On 5 October Maryte Vitkunaitė, a resident of Kaunas, was interrogated in Vilnius. Investigator Urbonas, who interrogated her in March (Chronicle 48), again enquired about Vitkunaitė's acquaintance with the former seminarian Biaukas (Chronicles 48, 49), Angeles Saliauskaite and Monika Didžiokaite (in Chronicle 48 they are both mentioned only by their Christian names). Vitkunaitė was shown her notebooks containing the addresses of these people, which had been confiscated from her during a search. In addition, Vitkunaitė was shown the testimony of M. Didžiokaite, confirming their acquaintance and describing their meetings in detail. She declared, however, that the names listed were unknown to her.

Persecution of Believers

Raseiniai. The town newspapers in Raseiniai and Jurbarkas have published articles accusing Father A. Lazdauskas of deceiving the believers: although he is a Catholic priest, he is married.

An answer was given to these publications by Fathers P. Radiunas, M. Buožius and V. Pošela in their sermons. They explained to their parishioners that A. Lazdauskas is a priest of the Uniate Church and has the right to marry, according to the statutes of that Church.

Telšiai. On 14 July chairman Razimavičius of the district Soviet Executive Committee told Father J. Kauneckas (Chronicle 49; there his name is given in a different transliteration) that if he did not stop explaining to his parishioners the rights of believers, he would demand that the church committee dismiss Kauneckas from his post; if he did not achieve this, he would abolish the Catholic parish of Telšiai.

On 17 July Father N. Paginskiškis was summoned to the district Soviet Executive Committee and accused of conducting an assembly which had not been in accordance with the laws on religious cults.

Kybartai. 1 November is All Souls Day in Lithuania. A religious procession on its way to the town cemetery was interrupted: on reaching the cemetery the believers discovered that a secular ceremony, which should have taken place later, had been brought forward to this time. Loudspeakers had been set up in the cemetery to relay songs.

Father S. Tamkevičius, who was participating in the procession, was fined 50 roubles for organizing activities disturbing the traffic (in fact the procession was moving along the pavement). About 740 believers from the town of Kybartai signed a protest addressed to the First Secretary of the Lithuanian Party Central Committee.

Slabadai. For more than a year the local believers have not been able to obtain permission to register their congregation.

The number of trips bishops may make round their dioceses is limited to two a year. The authorities explain this by reference to the 'disturbances' which take place during the bishops' visits.

The Bishop of Vilnius, C. Krivaitis, has in effect been deprived of the right to preach and has no opportunity to hear the confessions of believers. He takes services only in the churches of Vilnius, and then only on great feast days.

On 13 November it was announced that a Catholic Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights had been founded in Lithuania. An appeal by the Committee states that its aim is 'to obtain equal rights in practice for believers and atheists'. To this end the Committee intends to 'draw the attention of the Soviet government to cases of discrimination against the Church and individual believers; to inform the Church hierarchy and, in cases of necessity, other sections of society about the position of believers in Lithuania and other republics in the USSR; to achieve the compliance of Soviet laws and their application, in the sphere of religion, with international agreements on human
The members of the Committee ask the Pope to bless their work and aims.

The Committee has addressed a declaration to the Council for Religious Affairs attached to the USSR Council of Ministers, concerning the position of two bishops, Sladkevičius and Steponavičius (Chronicle 43), who `have been expelled from their dioceses ... for almost 20 years ... and sent to remote districts of Lithuania'; the Committee asks that they be given the opportunity to fulfill their duties.

A declaration addressed to the USSR Minister of Internal Affairs concerns the refusal to allow Father Masilionis to visit the USA (Chronicle 46). The seventh refusal finally gave a reason: the officials of the Radviliskis OVD told Masilionis that his brothers, who had invited him to the USA, had organized 'gangs' and 'murdered Soviet citizens'. The Committee's declaration points out that such charges have never been laid against Masilionis's brothers. The Committee asks that Masilionis be allowed to go on the visit and that wholly innocent people should not be called murderers.

On 16 November the Committee appealed to the Commissioner for Lithuania of the Council for Religious Affairs attached to the USSR Council of Ministers, concerning the fines levied on Fathers Zubrus, Svarinskas and Tamkevičius for participating in processions to the cemetery on 1 November, All Souls Day.

If atheists have the right to secular commemoration of their dead, then why are believers deprived of the same right? ... The district Soviet Executive Committee demand written permission for religious processions, but they themselves never issue such permits in Lithuania ... We are convinced that not only should the above-mentioned administrative penalties be repealed, but that the anti-constitutional `Statute on Religious Associations', which is contrary to international agreements, should be abolished ...

This declaration refers extensively to the declaration of 5 November from the 740 believers of the parish of Kybartai (see above).

On 22 November a joint appeal from the Catholic Committee and the Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights was published (see 'Letters and Statements').
Persecution of Believers

Orthodox Christians

On 2 July the Deputy Head of the Smolensk K.G.B. 'chatted' for an hour and a half with T. N. Shchipkova (Chronicle 49) about the journal Community (Chronicle 49 and 'Samizdat News' in this issue). Shchipkova refused to answer his questions. At the end of the 'chat' she was given a warning under the Decree of 25 December 1972. Shchipkova did not sign the warning.

After a search in April (Chronicle 49), the lecturers in the Faculty of Foreign Languages were forced to describe their attitudes to Shchipkova in writing.

Soon afterwards Shchipkova was dismissed from the Pedagogical Institute 'for lack of sufficient qualifications' (Shchipkova has worked at the Institute for 17 years, knows 5 languages and has 40 diplomas).

In September there was a meeting of the Academic Council of the Leningrad Department of the Academy of Sciences' Foreign Languages Institute, at which Shchipkova had once defended her Candidate's dissertation. The speakers said that Shchipkova was a believer and therefore ... The Academic Council agreed to request the Higher Degrees Commission to deprive Shchipkova of her academic degree.

A charge of 'parasitism' has been laid against Alexander Ogorodnikov, leader of a Christian seminar (Chronicles 41, 43, 46).

In the middle of November Ogorodnikov, who was living in Redkino (Kalinin Region), received a summons from the police to appear on 22 November with a document demonstrating that he was employed.

On Friday 17 November, when he was preparing to go and find work, he was detained at the station and held at a police station for 16 hours.

On Monday 20 November, when he was again about to obtain work, he was arrested in the morning at the station and taken to an investigations prison in Kalinin.134

On 2 November Alexander Kuzkin was visited at work by a psychiatrist and two men in civilian clothes. One of them asked Kuzkin about the authorship of the texts 'What will happen in our country in 1980' and 'The mysteries of the number 666'. Kuzkin said that he was not the author, but agreed with what they said; he was then delivered to the Central Moscow Regional Psychiatric Hospital, which is 50 kilometers from Moscow.

As Kuzkin refused to dress in hospital clothes, he was tied to his bed and given an injection; in the morning he was given another. Then he was taken for an examination, while under the influence of the drug, so that he could hardly answer any questions.

On the day Kuzkin was hospitalized, K.G.B. officials confiscated some papers from his home and made his mother write a declaration dictated by them, saying that her son was engaged in harmful activities and that she asked for him to be protected against the bad influence of Father Dmitry Duiko and a number of Kuzkin's acquaintances, whose names were also dictated to her.

The K.G.B. summoned friends of Kuzkin's for chats.

Kuzkin spent about 2 weeks in this hospital and was then transferred to the psychiatric hospital near his place of residence, in Abramtsino, Moscow region (the head of his department is Oleg Ivanovich Kleshchevnikov, the head doctor is Rudolf Dmitrievich Smirnov). He is there being subjected to intensive 'treatment'.

Alexander Kuzkin (born 1949) many years ago applied to a neurologist because of a temporary worsening of his memory, but he reckoned he was not on the clinic's register of patients. Kuzkin has participated in A. Ogorodnikov's seminar and has not hidden his religious convictions.

In recent years the situation of the monks at the Holy Assumption Pochayev Lavra (in the town of Pochayev, Ternopol Region) has grown significantly worse.

In 1960 there were 149 monks and novices at the Lavra; now there remain 50 in all. Out of these, 20 are unfit for work, either because of illness or because of old age.

The majority of brothers have in recent years been forced out of the Lavra. The authorities' basic weapon in evicting the monks has been registration for residence. The same means is used to prevent new monks being tonsured. Every day two or three men apply to become monks. However, during the whole of 1976 only three managed to register at the Lavra.

All those who apply are carefully 'screened' by officials of the Ternopol K.G.B. Department. In the words of Vladimir Lestvin, in July 1977 when he applied for registration at the Lavra, a K.G.B. official who did not give his name talked to him and tried to persuade him to cooperate with the security organs.

The Lavra has had a number of buildings, the bishop's residence and the garden taken away. It is planned to open a museum of atheist propaganda in the residence, a psychiatric hospital is to be set up in the other buildings, and an excursion bureau is to be established in the monastery grounds. The police hinder pilgrims from reaching the Lavra in all kinds of ways.
The 'Swedish case' (Chronicle 47), largely based on material from the Chronicle Bulletin of the Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives. The 'Swedish case' is continuing, although the Swedes themselves have been released (and expelled from the country). On 22 May searches were carried out in Moscow in connection with this case at the homes of Pentecostalist Anatoly Vlasov and Baptists

**Pentecostalists**

Chernogorsk (Krasnoyarsk Territory). In the spring Yakov Kulai and Alexander Sheffer were arrested for refusing to be conscripted into the army. On 19 June Procurator Nerkachev informed them that criminal proceedings against them under article 80 of the RSFSR Criminal Code had been dropped, but that the military enlistment office would send them another call-up notice.

On 3 March Roman Roda (Chronicle 48), Presbyter of the congregation, was called for military reserve training — he also refused to go. The newspaper Soviet Khakassiya published an article about him. At his place of work (Roda works as a joiner in a factory) a meeting was held. He was given the following character reference for the court: 'Has mastered all the machine tools, allows waste, doesn't turn up for Saturday work-days in honour of Lenin, distorts the facts of Soviet reality, praises bourgeois life.' On 21 June the court fined Roda 100 roubles.

Vinnitsa. The sacking of Nikolai Polyakov (Chronicle 48) was ruled to be unlawful by a court, which reinstated him at work and ordered him to be paid for his 3 months of enforced idleness.

Settlement of Mikhailovka (Neklinovsky District, Rostov Region). On 18 May Yury Safronov, leader of the local congregation, was warned by the Procuracy that if he did not register the congregation he would be held criminally responsible. In the 1960s Safronov served a 3-year sentence.

Moscow. In May Anatoly Vlasov (Chronicle 46, 47, 49) was visited at home by KGBe official Yu. S. Polyukh, who had come for 'a chat'. The 'chat' concerned the 'Swedish case' (Chronicle 47) and Vlasov's acquaintance with dissidents. Polyukh said that all dissidents were renegades and would get just what they deserved. Polyukh reproached him for taking part in a press conference held at Ginzburg's flat (Chronicle 48).

**Baptists**

(Largely based on material from the Bulletin of the Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives)

The 'Swedish case' (Chronicle 47) is continuing, although the Swedes themselves have been released (and expelled from the country). On 22 May searches were carried out in Moscow in connection with this case at the homes of Pentecostalist Anatoly Vlasov and Baptists

Persecution of Believers

Alexander Semchenko (Chronicle 47), Nikolai Epishin and Alexander Batylin, also in the town of Ramenskoye (Moscow Region) — at the home of Baptist Viktor Strelnikov (Chronicle 47). At Vlasov's home nothing was confiscated (not even religious literature); at Semchenko's a typewriter, blank paper, about 30 religious books and personal notes were confiscated; at Epishin's — a typewriter, about 40 religious books, 2 tape-recorders and 10 cassettes; at Batylin's — religious literature, 5 tape-recorders, 232 cassettes, 60 tapes, 4 microphones and 2 cameras; while at Strelnikov's, religious literature and personal notes were confiscated.

On the same day, Investigator Lundina of the Babushkino district in Moscow interrogated all five men 'as witnesses'. According to her the case had reached Moscow from Minsk. During the interrogations she referred constantly to the article 'Under a False Mask' (Izvestia 5 April).

Later, Semchenko, Batylin and Strelnikov began to be summoned for interrogation by Investigator Artemova of the Proletarsky District Procuracy in Moscow. They are charged under article 142 ('Violation of the laws separating the Church from the State') and article 162 ('Engaging in a forbidden trade') of the RSFSR Criminal Code. The leaders of the official Baptist congregation in Moscow, of which Semchenko, Batylin and Strelnikov are members, have reprimanded them for behaviour 'discrediting the members of the congregation'.

* * *

The Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives receives many complaints from Baptists about the forcible dispersal of their prayer-meetings, weddings and so on. Such dispersals are accompanied by 15-day arrests, violence, breaking into private homes, illegal searches, and confiscation of literature, other articles and money, as well as imposition of fines beyond their ability to pay. Such information has come in particular from Kharovsk Region, where on 14 May in the town of Merefa the wedding of P. I. Saltursenko and G. A. Litvinenko was broken up. In the settlement of Nauchny (Crimea Region — ?) the authorities broke up a crowd of believers who had gathered to say farewell to L. N. Bondyr, A. A. Bondyr and A. A. Andreichenko, who were leaving to serve in the Army. The believers of the churches in Bezhtsky and Bryansk complain that the authorities do not merely break up their prayer-meetings, but even break into homes when they just visit each other; among them are families who have been fined over 300 roubles in a month. In Rostov-on-Don the leaders of a district Soviet Executive Committee and police officials started preparing ahead of time to put obstacles in the way of the wedding of P. V. Gokun and L. R. Goncharuk, also of G. I. Bublik and L. P. Zakharova (the first wedding nevertheless took place). A telegram to the Council...
of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives from believers in the settlement of Hinkske (Moscow Region) states that on 28 May police and vigilantes broke up a prayer-meeting; this was going on Alexei Ponomaryov (16 years old) was beaten into unconsciousness by unknown men in civilian clothes. In the village of Ivanovka (Bryansk Region) police and vigilantes broke up the wedding of V. Vysotsky and L. Denina; 10 of the guests were sentenced to 15 days' imprisonment.

In a letter addressed to Korygin, pensioners N. F. Zdanovich and M. F. Zdanovich complain about the action of the local authorities in driving away guests who were visiting them for Easter; the Zdanoviches were fined 50 roubles each. M. A. Pshenitsyn (Chronicle 46) from the town of Zhlebnoredorozhny (Moscow Region) appealed to Brezhnev in an open letter; he describes the break-up of a prayer-meeting at his flat on 4 April. Baptists from the town of Sumy state that on 19 August police and KGB officials broke up the wedding celebrations of Sirenko and Koplik, 6 people got 15-day sentences and V. F. Kucherenko was beaten up and taken to the Preliminary Detention Cells; on 23 August he was transferred to the town prison and criminal proceedings were begun against him.

In Donetsk on 22 April 1977 the secretary of the district Soviet Executive Committee and the police broke into R. S. Goncharova's house, where the children of believers were at the time; they carried out an unlawful search, confiscating spiritual literature, a Bible and 150 roubles. The district Procuracy brought a criminal case against the owner of the house. After her fellow believers interceded for her, the regional Procuracy closed the case (for lack of evidence) but refused a request to return the spiritual literature and money. (The religious literature confiscated from Goncharova, which was produced illegally, is not liable to be returned. No money was confiscated from Goncharova or stolen from her — according to V. I. Tatischuk, Deputy Head of the Investigation Department). On 6 July 1978 Goncharova was detained at the flat of a fellow-believer in the town of Makeyevka, whom she was visiting, and the local authorities are again preparing a criminal case against her.

50 Baptists from the town of Kivertsy (Volynskaya Region) have applied in a letter to Brezhnev, demanding an end to forcible dispersal of their prayer-meetings; on 23 July believers in Kivertsy were stopped and thrown into cars while they were still on the way to a prayer-meeting.

On 11 June guests had gathered at the home of an 84-year-old Baptist woman, Popovich (in the village of Marshinsky, Novoselitsa District, Chernovtsy Region): they sang songs and psalms and read the Bible. By a decision of the district Soviet Executive Committee's ad-

ministrative commission, two women were fined: L. S. Chernyshenskaya was fined 25 roubles and A. V. Ruskamu — 50 roubles. As a result of an appeal to the district court, which took into account A. Ruskamu's material difficulties, the fine was lowered to 30 roubles, but after a protest by the Procurator this court decision was revoked.

28 members of the congregation in Magnitogorsk have sent a declaration to the USSR Minister of Defence, the Procurator-General of the USSR, the (unofficial) Council of Baptist Churches and the Council of Prisoners' Relatives, also to the commanders of various military units, informing them that tribunals have begun criminal proceedings against young Baptist servicemen in the Soviet Army — I. V. Rotar, V. M. Zhikhov and A. M. Pugachev — for refusing to take the military oath. The believers ask for the early release of the sentenced Christian servicemen, and in general for an end to the practice of sentencing people for refusing to take the oath on religious grounds. A similar letter was sent to the USSR Minister of Defence by A. M. Pugachev's parents and sister.

The military tribunal of Kharkov Garrison has sentenced Baptist A. A. Kalyashin to 3 years' imprisonment in an ordinary-regime camp for refusing to take the oath on religious grounds, under article 243 of the Ukrainian SSR Criminal Code ('Avoidance of military service'). Kalyashin is serving his term in Sumy Region.

Dedovsk (Moscow Region). The Baptist congregation in Dedovsk has no building in which to hold its religious services. The money collected to acquire a suitable house was confiscated during a search of V. Ya. Smirnov's home (Chronicle 49). Because of the resulting situation, the congregation applied to the Dedovsk Soviet Executive Committee for permission to hold services in a school in the settlement of Nakhabino and also asked for the return of the money (9,641 roubles) which had been collected for the repair of the building. The executive committee had refused the congregation. Permission to hold a service in Nakhabino was granted for two days only.

After triumphal Easter services which the congregation held at the flat of Mr. and Mrs. Ryzhuk in Nakhabino on 1-2 May, they began to be threatened with criminal proceedings (M. O. Kondrashkin, Procurator of Krasnogorsk District, vowed to arrest Ryzhuk if the latter did not stop holding services in his flat). The Ryzhuks were fined 100 roubles.

On 21 May the authorities set up a cordon of police, vigilantes and men in civilian clothes to prevent a religious service being held. So the Baptists sang and prayed while standing in the street outside...
daughter, that the patient was in an individual room. However, she had come to Rostov to find out what had happened to their missing daughter, although the patient was perfectly healthy, as she had been examined; Ovchinnikova was then taken to a ward. The doctor in charge of her treatment turned out to be Tatyana Alexandrovna Pernaki, who admitted to Ovchinnikova that she could not release her; three of their fellow-believers from African countries were witnesses to this. On 24 May P. V. Ramachik, Prebyster of the congregation, received a warning from the police that if he had not found work within a month, he would be sentenced for parasitism. On 26 May about 20 police officials carried out a search at the Ryzhuk's flat (since 1960 Ryzhuk has been arrested 3 times, and has served 10 years altogether because of his religious beliefs).

In a letter to the Council of Prisoners' Relatives, Prebyster P. V. Ramachik explains the pressure the authorities exert on the Dedovsk congregation by the fact that many young people, formally members of the [officially recognized] All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists, had been confusing their faith at his services in Nakshino, and that the leaders of the All-Union Council had 'reported this to the relevant people'. According to Ramachik, four people responsible for All-Union Council youth groups had been searched and three of them might be arrested.

* * *

The Council of Baptist Churches has appealed to Brezhnev, the Chairman of the Moscow Regional Soviet Executive Committee and the Council of Prisoners' Relatives in a declaration concerning the persecution of P. V. Ramachik. He had been given temporary registration for a year in his own family's flat, after returning from imprisonment (it had been his fourth term of imprisonment), but even before the year had run out, he was informed by the police passport section that he was to be evicted from the flat. The authors of the letter conclude that Ramachik is being threatened at one and the same time with a charge of parasitism and with eviction from his flat, in order to deprive the Dedovsk congregation of its prebyster.

* * *

Rostov-on-Don. Details have become known about the forcible incarceration of Baptist L. M. Ovchinnikova in a clinic for epidemiological and venereal diseases, after the Easter events in Rostov-on-Don (Chronicle 49). Ovchinnikova had travelled to Rostov-on-Don and had been detained by the police, together with others; she spent the night in prison and the next day, 8 May, she and seven other believers were taken to the venereal disease clinic, where they were forcibly examined; Ovchinnikova was then taken to a ward. The doctor in charge of her treatment turned out to be Tatyana Alexandrovna Pernaki, who admitted to Ovchinnikova that she could not release her, although the patient was perfectly healthy, as she had been brought in by the police. T. Pernaki told Ovchinnikova's parents, who had come to Rostov to find out what had happened to their missing daughter, that the patient was in an individual room. However, Ovchinnikova was in fact held together with 13 sick people until 19 May, when T. Pernaki discharged her, writing in the records that she had 'allergic dermatitis'.

* * *

On 3 July the Baptist Yu. G. Skornyakov was arrested in Rostov-on-Don. Skornyakov received a 15-day sentence in Rostov and was imprisoned in dreadful conditions; he was then transferred to a prison in Dzhambul, where a trial of Baptists is in preparation. His state of health is bad: Skornyakov has a stomach ulcer.

* * *

Krasnodon (Voroshilovgrad Region). On 22 May a woman calling herself Krasnova, an employee of a psychiatric hospital, turned up at the flat of G. Yu. Rytikova, a member of the Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives, and suggested that the latter should visit the clinic for an examination. Taking into consideration the many threats she had received from KGB officials and the Voroshilovgrad Regional Commissioner of the Council for Religious Affairs, Rytikova refused. She took her three youngest children and left the house. The five eldest children and their 80-year-old grandmother remained at home. On 30 May an ambulance arrived at the Rytikov's with people looking for the owner of the flat. They shouted at the children 'Where have you hidden her?' Rytikova sent telegrams to Brezhnev, Kosygin, Rudenko and the USSR Minister of Health, asking for a guarantee that she would be able to live freely at home. She received no reply.

Galina Yurevna Rytikova is 41 years old and the mother of nine children. Her husband, a Baptist clergyman, served a 5-year sentence on a 'religious' charge a few years ago. He cannot live at home because of constant threats and persecution by the authorities. Galina Yurevna's house has become a 'post-box' for the Council of Prisoners' Relatives: replies to all the Council's appeals, and information from congregations on persecution, come to her address.

* * *

Mukachevo (Trans-Carpathian Region). 152 Baptists have appealed in a letter to the Christians of the whole world, the UN Committee for the Defence of Human Rights and the Council of Prisoners' Relatives: on 26 August young people had gathered in a forest clearing for a religious service; about 200 policemen and KGB officials broke up the service, beat up the believers, and confiscated religious literature and personal property. The believers were pushed into buses and driven away; five people were arrested, the rest were fined. The letter-writers point out that the authorities have acted in a similar
who could contradict the prosecution's version (these witnesses included all drivers, taking their numbers and fining them. Those who managed to reach the place held a service for about two hours in relative peace, but then the clearing in the forest was surrounded and tractors blocked all approaches to the place where the service was to be held. In declarations addressed to the higher authorities the believers demand the return of property confiscated from them during the pogrom and of the money paid in fines by drivers of cars; they ask that the claim against the Gamms, father and son, be annulled. The declaration was signed by 572 people.

Young Baptists in the Omsk, Kokchetav and Tselinograd Regions decided to hold a united open-air service on Sunday, 4 June, in a forest in Isilkul district. The day before, the traffic police had already blocked all approaches to the place where the service was to be held and were stopping and turning back cars, checking the documents of all drivers, taking their numbers and fining them. Those who managed to reach the place held a service for about two hours in relative peace, but then the clearing in the forest was surrounded and tractors were brought up, which began to tear up the ground, trying to run people over and drowning the prayers with their powerful engines. In the end police and vigilantes began to provoke a fight. Despite the fact that the believers did not physically resist, they filled the Black Marias with those arrested and drove them to a police station, where they were detained until the evening. The rest were dispersed with insults and violence: rough wrestling methods were used — they were dragged along by the hair, beaten with sticks, threatened with fire-arms. The food, dishes and other things which had been prepared for supper were confiscated and taken away. The tractors broke down shrubs and saplings while chasing through the wood after the Baptists. Many of the vigilantes were drunk. Finally, Police Chief Garpinyuk.
The court in Maikop has sentenced Yury Kupriyanov effects, a Bible and exercise books containing sermons and religious verses were confiscated. Another member of the congregation, L. Gusakova, was subjected to the same kind of 'inspection'. The Baptists were interested in who did what in the congregation, and much else besides.

In D. Krylov's article "With whom are we Dealing?" (Adygeiskaya Pravda, 6 September) it is stated that Jehovah's Witnesses "are an organization which aims to corrupt people's souls, to entice them away from the active construction of communism in our country", and that their way of life 'harms the society in which they live'.

Adventists

In August-September 1978 a series of searches and arrests took place in Stavropol Territory. The operation was conducted by Procurator G. V. Ponomaryov from Tashkent, who carried out the search of V. A. Shelkov's home in March (Chronicle 49). The searches were intended to discover the printing-press of the Adventist publishing house 'True Witness'.

On 13 August, in the village of Essentuki, V. K. Kovalenko, A. S. Kovalenko, V. R. Zaporozehts and P. G. Tomailo were subjected to searches; in Mineralnye Vody, E. A. Kolesnichenko and M. M. Yakovenko were searched.

On 22 August KGB officials in Pyatigorsk District caught a car containing printing materials. Anatoly Ryskal (born 1939), a resident of Pyatigorsk, and 19-year-old Yakov Dolgoter were arrested when the car was seized (Chronicle 48) reported Dolgoter's arrest in January; 30 days after his arrest he was sent to a psychiatric hospital, from which he was soon released; during the investigation he was beaten up.

On 23-24 August in Pyatigorsk, N. V. Irinin and A. M. Ryskal were searched; in Mineralnye Vody V. P. Prilipsky was searched. On 3 September searches took place in the town of Georgievsk, at the homes of M. M. Zinets and E. Ya. Barkova. On 11 September a search was carried out at the home of G. I. Spalin in the village of Lysogorskaya.

As a result of the search, 200 roubles and two gold crowns for teeth disappeared from Zaporozhets's home, 4,000 roubles from Yakovenko's home, an electric drill with bores, an electric grinder with a selection of emery discs, and an electric bell from Irinin's home, and a watch from Barkova's home.

Jehovah's Witnesses

The court in Maikop has sentenced Yuri Kupriyanov (born 1958) to 3 years' imprisonment under article 80 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, for refusing to serve in the Army. At the trial Kupriyanov said: 'I cannot serve because of my religious convictions.'
At Yakovenko's house the search continued for two days; during the search the mistress of the house and her daughter were locked up in a big stove in the yard; no copies of the search record were left behind — Yakovenko does not know what exactly was confiscated. Maria Yakovenko's child was questioned during the search in the absence of its mother.

During the search at Prilipsky's house, his 8-year-old son was also questioned without his parents being present.

The searchers stove in walls and poked about in them, took up floorboards and removed roof-tiles, searched the lavatories and cesspools, ripped open furniture panelling, removed picture frames and searched in clocks and inside passport-covers.

At Barkova's house they found religious literature buried in the ground. At Ryskal's home they confiscated two religious pamphlets.

During the search at A. M. Ryskal's home, the officials detained his daughter and two other Adventist women, E. F. Korkishko and V. I. Shevchenko. They were subjected to body-searches, then taken to Mineralnye Vody and imprisoned for 30 days (this was probably formulated as 'establishing their identity'). The cell was full of fleas, lice and dirt; the women were not once taken to wash themselves during the month. They were constantly interrogated, threatened and insulted.

In September Valentina Romanovna Zaporozhets (52 years old) was arrested. The following were also arrested: Rikhard Spalin (born 1937), brother of Arnold Spalin, who was arrested in March (Chronicle 49), Ekaterina Ryskal (born 1938), sister of Anatoly Ryskal, and Nikolai Irinin (born 1947).

On 25 September the Moscow Helsinki Group published a report on 'The Persecution of the Church of True and Free Adventists' (Document 64):

... we express our great concern and sympathy for the hunted and persecuted True and Free Adventists. We have a great respect for the self-sacrificing and successful activity of their publishing house 'True Witness', which has developed over many years in seemingly quite impossible circumstances...

Riga. On 15 August Z. S. Kirsnauskaite was taken to hospital with a sharp attack of her chronic nephritis. On 31 August she was discharged with a temperature of 38.2° and a statement that she was healthy and her complaints had been a symptom of psychopathy. Kirsnauskaite complained to Moscow. On 1 December she was summoned to the Latvian SSR Ministry of Health and told that she had mental abnormalities, otherwise she would not have started complaining to Moscow; a car was called, which took her to a psychiatric hospital.

The Adventist Valentina Mikhailovna Velichko, a resident of Glevakha village, Vasilkov District, Kiev Region, described in an open letter how her 16-year-old son Kostya Ladchenko was recruited by the KGB. The mother learnt of it by chance.

According to Kostya, the person in charge was KGB Colonel Vadim Stepanovich Furman from Kiev: his 'chief' paid him well and took him to restaurants; for betraying church activists the KGB pays an informer up to 500 roubles.

It also turned out that the husband of V. M. Velichko's sister, Anton Iosifovich Bunevich, was working for the KGB. Bunevich said the KGB officials had persuaded him to work for them by means of promises and threats.

On 12 September 1977 Major Ilyukhin, Deputy Head of the Vladimir O V I R, informed Viktor Nekipelov, a member of the Moscow Helsinki Group, that he had been refused an exit visa: 'We consider that you have no reason to visit the state of Israel — there's nothing for you to do there!' (Chronicle 47).

On 5 December 1977, at the Vladimir U V D, Colonel Shaidrov told Nekipelov: 'You must prove that the person who sent you the invitation is really your twin brother. Besides, your father is categorically against your leaving.'

In March 1978 Major Ilyukhin told Nekipelov: 'Your son is serving in the Army — you'll have to wait.' In May Sergei Nekipelov was demobilized.
On 31 July, at the O V I R of the U S S R M V D, Colonel Davydov told Nekipelov: 'You have been refused a visa on security grounds. It's in the interests of the state!' The same day Nekipelov sent a declaration of protest to K. I. Zotov, Head of the O V I R of the U S S R M V D.

On 15 August Nekipelov wrote a declaration entitled 'On Security Grounds':

... your 'security grounds' have nothing to do with access to state secrets, which you know I have never had. And all your earlier subterfuges about my twin brother or my son being in the army were just irresponsible gabbling by lips accustomed to lying. The real 'security grounds' are my dissenting views: my 'Declaration on a Visa Refusal', my apostasy — conscious and irreversible, my rejection of today's state, its spider-like partocracy [rule by party], prisons and special political hospitals, of its godlessness, violence and lies.

Your 'security grounds' consist of my defending to the best of my ability the rule of law, of my creative work and the publication of my poetry, of my sketches and journalistic articles in the foreign press.

These are indeed 'security grounds', for by having grown up in your 'large zone',* I know too much about its security regime and you are afraid I will take my knowledge abroad with me!

Only in this way can I explain to myself your refusal of today. I don't know how long I will still be allowed to sit at my writing table. But even in those places you are now trying to force me into, on the same 'security grounds', — behind the barbed wire of a Mordovian camp, in a psychiatric hospital, in the punishment block of Vladimir Prison — I shall still do the same thing every day, every hour, every stolen minute: I shall be telling people the truth about your diabolical regime.

* In the U S S R the 'small zones' are the camps, while Soviet territory outside the camps is often called 'the large zone' by people who consider it to contain little more freedom than the camps.

On 18 November 1977, at a press conference, Polikanov gave Western correspondents a letter to van Hove, Director of C E R N, in which he stated that he could not come to CERN and explained the circumstances (Chronicle 47).

At the end of December 1977 Polikanov was invited to visit Logunov, Vice-President of the U S S R Academy of Sciences, and Academician Markov, Secretary of the Nuclear Physics Department. The academicians admitted the existence of shortcomings in the situation but condemned the position taken by Orlov and Sakharov, saying that a scientific approach was necessary in overcoming shortcomings.

'And when you signed the letter against Sakharov, were you also taking a scientific approach?' asked Polikanov.

Almost at the same time, on the orders of the Party Committee, Academician Pontecorvo came to talk to Polikanov round. He also criticized the dissidents.

In January 1978 Kuznetsov, Secretary of the town Party Com-
From the beginning of 1978 administrative persecution of Polikanov began. His lectures at seminars were cancelled, post-graduate students were forced to reject him as a scientific adviser, and he was forbidden to travel to Moscow (from Dubna) without written permission from the administration. The persecution was directed by the Head of the Laboratory, V. P. Dzhelepov, who specially wrote a letter to the Higher Degrees Commission asking that Polikanov be expelled from the Academy Council. This request was granted. Polikanov suddenly learnt that he was no longer secretary of the Institute's general seminar. Finally, N. N. Bogolyubov issued an order on the necessity of concentrating forces on the physics of higher energy and, in accordance with this, the section headed by Polikanov was to be disbanded.

Polikanov became a Senior Research Fellow. A notice quoting the Law Code on Labour appeared on the Laboratory wall, stating that every employee in our land should be at work every day from start to finish. Now the Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences began to receive warnings for being absent. One of these was for spending a few days outside the trial of Yu. Orlov. Not one of the warnings was signed by N. N. Bogolyubov. They were signed by deputy directors from brotherly countries — the Hungarian KIK and the Pole Sawinski.

In the spring of 1978 Polikanov learnt that he had received a prize from the American Physics Society and sent a declaration to O V I R asking permission to go and receive the prize.

From the spring of 1978 Polikanov became actively involved in activities to defend the rule of law in the USSR. He spoke out in defence of Yu. Orlov, A. Ginzburg and A. Shcharansky. He often journeyed to Kaluga to find out what was happening to A. Ginzburg, and stayed there during the whole trial. He spoke out in support of the boycott organized by Western scientists after the trial of Yu. Orlov. He appealed to psychiatrists throughout the world to fight for the release of A. Podrabinek.

On 15 July Polikanov announced that he was joining the Moscow Helsinki Group.

In the fall of 1978 Polikanov wrote a letter to Brezhnev, stating that it was impossible to do scientific work in this country and expressing his desire to emigrate to any capitalist country. On 21 August A. G. Zotov, Deputy Head of Moscow O V I R, summoned Polikanov and suggested he name a particular country to which he wished to emigrate. Polikanov named the USA. On 7 September Polikanov was called by S. A. Fadeyev, Head of Moscow O V I R, who told him that the answer to his request for emigration was positive.

On 15 September, a meeting of the Academic Council of the Laboratory took place, which demanded that Polikanov be deprived of his degrees of Candidate and Doctor of Sciences for his unpatriotic activity, in accordance with article 104 of the Regulations of the USSR Higher Degrees Commission, and that he should also be deprived of his Lenin Prize and title of Corresponding Member.

Two hours later, after the Academic Council meeting, an order from the directors followed: "For actions incompatible with the title of Soviet scientist and with his work in the U I N R, Polikanov is to be dismissed from the Institute.'

The next day, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet deprived Polikanov of all his government honours.

On 10 October 1978 S. M. Polikanov and his family left the USSR.

In July 1976, after a win in an international tournament in Amsterdam (place 1-11 [7]), chess Grand Master Viktor Korchnoi declared that he did not want to return to the USSR. Korchnoi explained his decision by referring to the political stance of the USSR Chess Federation, which prevented him from leading a normal creative life as a player.

In August 1977 his wife Bella Korchnaya and his 18-year-old son applied to the Leningrad O V I R asking for permission to visit relatives in Israel. Before this, for over two months, O V I R had refused to accept their application, demanding a note from her husband renouncing all material claims on his wife and giving his consent to her emigration from the USSR. In November 1977 B. Korchnaya received a refusal, on the grounds that the relatives were too distant.

In April 1978 B. Korchnaya sent a letter to L. I. Brezhnev asking for permission to leave the USSR. On 3 September B. Korchnaya received a telephone call from O V I R, informing her that her request had been refused again: 'We can’t boost his morale' (i.e. that of defector V. Korchnoi — Chronicle).

On 19 October B. Korchnaya gave a press conference for journalists at which she read out a declaration setting forth the above-mentioned facts.

On 13 November B. Korchnaya applied to the newly elected President of F I D E [Fédération Internationale des Echecs], Grand Master Olafson, asking for help in emigrating from the USSR.

On 14 November B. Korchnaya appealed to Shchelokov and Brezhnev in letters asking for permission to leave the USSR.

From December 1977 to May 1978, four invitations were sent to the
Kievan Grigory Tokayuk (Chronicle 48) — but he did not receive a single one. At the Ministry of Communications Tokayuk was told that no invitations had come addressed to him. Tokayuk wrote complaints to Brezhnev and Andropov.

In July he met French journalists in Moscow and asked them to help him emigrate.

In August Tokayuk was summoned to the Kiev KGB Department. There he was scolded for his active support of P. Vins (Chronicle 49), his contacts with members of the Moscow Helsinki Group, with T. Velikanova and A. Poudraven, and his ‘links’ with foreigners; he was warned that if he became a recidivist, stricter measures would be taken: ‘You know, don’t you, that we’re all-powerful.’

Tokayuk’s father was a Polish citizen; all his relatives on his father’s side live in Poland, the USA or Argentina; his uncle on his mother’s side is a German Jew; he has a grandmother and aunt on his mother’s side living in Israel.

Vary Makisnin, a resident of Riga, has been trying to get permission to emigrate since 1974. In October 1978 he was told by the Riga OVIR: according to existing legislation emigration can be permitted only to those who have invitations from relatives abroad; in addition, on presenting such invitations it is also necessary to show the envelope in which this invitation has arrived. When Makisnin quoted the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, he was told ‘The International Covenant operates between states, but internally they use different rules from those laid down in the Covenant.’ When he asked for a written reply he was told that written replies might be used to compromise the state.

Anatoly Leonidovich Glukhov (born 1946) and his mother have been trying to obtain permission to emigrate for 14 years already.

On 31 August 1978 A. Glukhov was forcibly interred in the Chelyabinsk Psychiatric Hospital, apparently for writing a letter to a Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Kovalyov. One of the doctors told Glukhov that if he continued trying to emigrate, he would ‘earn himself some schizophrenia’.

In 1972 and 1974 Glukhov had twice been in a psychiatric hospital (34 days altogether) because of his wish to emigrate.

On 9 October Glukhov was discharged from the hospital with a diagnosis of ‘reduced energy potential’. He was ordered to visit the local psychiatrist every month.

Sergei Belov, a resident of Privolzhsk in Ivanovo Region, has been sending telegrams for a long time to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, asking for permission to emigrate. He gives as his reasons for wanting to emigrate: his beggarly existence (he has a university education as a lawyer, but is working as a motor-scooter driver, transporting food-products) and the violation of human rights in the USSR.

Pentecostalists and Baptists

Seventeen-year-old I. Vashchenko from the town of Chernogorsk (Krasnoyarsk Territory) has sent a declaration to the U.N. Committee of Human Rights. The Vashchenko family has been trying to get permission to emigrate since 1961. In April 1978 they received an invitation from the USA. In Chernogorsk their applications were not accepted and the Vashchenkos travelled to Krasnoyarsk. At the Krasnoyarsk OVIR they were told that their invitation was of no
use. The Vashchenkos travelled to Moscow. There they tried to enter the U S Embassy. During this attempt I. Vashchenko was beaten up; he was taken away, interrogated and sent back to Chernogorsk accompanied by K G B officials. Only there did I. Vashchenko learn that his parents and three sisters had managed to break through to the embassy (where they still are).

The Pentecostalists of Chernogorsk have appealed to President J. Carter, asking him to help them emigrate.

Pentecostalists in the town of Nakodka (Primorsky Territory) have now been trying to emigrate for 13 years.

They made their first attempt to do so in 1965, when V. P. Patrushev (Chronicle 47), the preacher in their congregation, sent a list of those wanting to emigrate to the U N. Patrushev is a Second World War veteran who has already served 3 years in camps (his fellow-defendant Sidenko got 4 years). Attempts to obtain permission to emigrate were renewed in 1974, when members of the congregation compiled a series of documents about the unlawful actions of the authorities and sent them to the West.

The activities of the Nakodka Pentecostalists led to more cruel repression, also to a desire by the authorities to break off all contacts between the members of the congregation and people beyond the Krasnoyarsk boundaries. With this end in view, Pentecostalists are hindered in every way from travelling to the European part of the U S S R from Nakodka. Photographs and 'reports' on members of the congregation like Boris Perchatkin (Chronicle 46-48) and Vladimir Stepanov (Presbyter of the Nakodka Pentecostalists) have been sent to all railway-stations and airports in the territory. They are often detained on the way to Moscow and sent back. Letters are also intercepted. Since 1977 a special group of K G B officials has been operating in Nakodka to combat the Pentecostalists: Major Rudmutsky (the leader), Senior Lieutenant Malyukovich (who recruits informers among the believers), Captain Volkov and Senior Lieutenant Lukashin.

About 40 members of the congregation already have invitations from the U S A. All of them have been turned down, on the grounds that the invitations are not from relatives.

Patrushev is in a particularly difficult situation: in the camp he contracted glaucoma, as a result of which he now has vision (about 10%) in only one eye. He has more than once received invitations from abroad for treatment (the last time was in 1978, from Italy), but he has always been refused permission to go.

Sixteen families of Baptists from the town of Chernovtsy submitted a declaration in August, asking to be allowed out to any non-Socialist country. They have received no reply.

Germans

In August 1977 Tilman, a resident of Frunze, applied to emigrate. In February 1978 he received a refusal on the grounds that 'you have more relatives here than in the Federal Republic of Germany' (Tilman has two brothers in West Germany, from whom he had received the invitation). In September 1978 Tilman again applied for permission to emigrate.

Yakov Vagner, a resident of Kuragino in Krasnoyarsk Territory, has been trying to get permission to emigrate since 1976. The 'higher authorities' (the Krasnoyarsk U V D, the U S S R M V D and the Central Committee of the C P S U) direct him to the Kuragino U V D, while M. I. Svidilenko, its head, says: 'I don't decide your fate. I only accept your applications. The territorial authorities decide.'

In August Alexander Miller (Chronicle 49) received a routine refusal. He then sent his passport and a declaration renouncing his Soviet citizenship to the Presidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet.

Pyotr Isiofovich Eld (born 1937) has been applying for permission to emigrate since 1972. He has submitted his documents five times already.

38 Germans living in Lithuania have put their signatures to an appeal addressed to 'Members of the American Trades Unions'. The appeal lists the political, economic and cultural restrictions and repressions to which Soviet Germans are subjected. The signatories ask for help in emigrating from the U S S R.

To: Comrade Brezhnev, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet; President Scheel of West Germany; Chancellor Schmidt of West Germany.

On the eve of a visit to West Germany by L. I. Brezhnev, Chairman of the Presidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet, a court in Moldavia sentenced Ivan Vagner, a worker of 32 years' experience, who is trying to get permission to emigrate to West Germany, to one year's imprisonment for so-called parasitism. I appeal to you, and through you to the governments of the U S S R and West Germany, to intervene in Vagner's case and restore justice ...

Andrei Sakharov, Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, 4 May 1978.

On 6 May A. D. Sukharov delivered this letter in person to the West
Sakharov was informed by the USSR Procurator’s Office that the case of Vagner had been brought up for re-examination. On 2 August A. D. Sakharov was informed by the Moldavian SSR Procurator’s Office that:

In the case of Ivan Ivanovich Vagner a review protest has been issued by the Moldavian SSR Procurator’s Office and accepted in part by the Presidium of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Court.

The case has been returned for further examination, to establish I. I. Vagner’s state of health and the source of the sums of money he possesses.

I. I. Vagner has been released from detention.

Jews

On 15 November B. Shamulin, Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs of the USSR, received in turn a large group of Moscow women refuseniks (Chronicles 47-50) and some of their husbands.

During the conversation he told Gyuzel Khait that in December her family would receive exit visas.

Shumilin refused to show the women the reports from their places of work, on the basis of which O V I R had refused them visas — ‘on security grounds’. He said it would be the same in future.

Shumilin stated that there was no maximum term for obtaining permission to leave and that no such term would be fixed. He gave them to understand that there were people who would never be given permission to emigrate. At the same time he said that refuseniks who had been waiting for over five years were special cases and should be given particular consideration.

Shumilin promised to end the illegal practice of some O V I R s of demanding that school-children provide references from their schools. At the time of Shumilin’s conversation with the refusenik women, there were American senators in Moscow. On 21 November (when the senators had gone) Shamulin did not receive three refusenik women whom he had earlier promised to see.

* * *

In June 1978 Sergei Ruzer from Moscow (Chronicle 45) was refused permission to emigrate. At an interview after this refusal Colonel S. A. Fadeyev, Head of the Moscow O V I R, looked very embarrassed and said ‘I do understand that you have every reason to complain’, but did not deign to disclose the reason for the refusal.

It was only in November, during a talk with Shamulin, that Ruzer managed to discover that the reason for the refusal had been a ‘security ban’ from his last place of work — the Centre for Scientific Organization of Labour in the Chemical Industry.

* * *

In January 1978 the Employment Bureau in Tbilisi sent Isai Goldshtein (Chronicle 48) to ‘TONIET’ [Tbilisi Section of the Electrical Technology Institute ?], but the Director of this Institute, Lekishvili, refused to accept him as an employee because of the secrecy of research at the Institute.

On 18 January officials of the Lenin District OVD in Tbilisi issued a statement that I. Goldshtein was avoiding work.

All attempts by I. Goldshtein to obtain work in his specialized field have been unsuccessful.

In April he appealed for help to M. Gudushauri, Head of the Lenin District OVD. In June the latter replied that Goldshtein should apply to the Employment Bureau. I. Goldshtein followed this advice, but Senior Inspector Sokolov told him that there was no employment opening for him.

In a declaration to M. Gudushauri, dated 11 September, Isai Goldshtein writes:

I bring to your notice the fact that I am continuing to try and find work, without ceasing to be involved in socially useful activity without pay. If my work savings run out, I shall apply to the USSR Ministry of Finance, asking that it give me unemployment benefit.

* * *

On 21 December 1977 a meeting of representatives from the ‘Rossiya’ collective farm in Talovsky District, Voronezh Region, refused to allow (four families of Matveyevs (in Tinkka village the Matveyevs are not necessarily relatives) and the Piskarev family to leave the collective farm (Chronicle 49; the date of the meeting there is given wrongly).

(During the years 1974-6 12 families left Tinkka. Another 14 families have applied to leave. The above-mentioned five families are actively continuing their campaign to leave, while the others have ‘fallen silent’. Since 1976 no one has been allowed to leave.)

In the spring and summer of 1978 they tried to obtain justice in Moscow. At the RSFSR Procurator’s Office they were told that they should have been released from the collective farm, but were refused any kind of help. In the waiting-room of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet they were told: ‘If you were pensioners, we would let you go, but as it is — who would be left to do the work?’ The Deputy Head of O V I R at the USSR MVD explained to them that ‘Letting you go wouldn’t be in our interests’.

In September the heads of the five families agreed to travel to Moscow again.

On 18 September the chairman of the village soviet handed them an invitation to come to the district Sovet Executive Committee on 20
September; on 19 September they were given summonses to the district Military Enlistment Office; however, all five — Yakov Isayevich Matveyev, Yakov Mikhailovich Matveyev, Samuil Morafeyevich Matveyev, Moisei Einovich Matveyev and Ein Mikhailovich Piskarev — travelled to Moscow nevertheless and spoke of their situation regarding emigration at a press conference.

On 3 April the Moscow refusenik Grigory Rozenshtein (Chronicle 50) was given an official warning at police station 27 to end his "parasitic way of life". In reply Rozenshtein wrote a declaration stating that this sanction was against the law and was one of the elements of the anti-Jewish and anti-religious campaign which had been promoted in the Soviet Union.

The Rozenshteins' home is traditionally the place where Jewish refuseniks in Moscow hold Jewish religious festivals. It was also here that the symposium on Jewish culture was held (Chronicle 43).

At the beginning of 1978 Rozenshtein was taken to the central KGB office and warned: if his religious activities continued, a criminal case would be initiated against him.

Karl Varmbrand, a resident of Tashkent, is 68 years old. He was born, brought up and educated in Germany. In 1939, to save himself from the Nazis, he fled from Germany and ended up in the Soviet Union. There he was sentenced for illegally crossing the frontier. In 1941 he was arrested as a political émigré but permitted to live only in Uzbekistan. In 1943, under pressure from the police, Varmbrand became a Soviet citizen.

In 1974 Varmbrand wanted to emigrate to East Germany — he was not allowed to and his letter of complaint to Honecker about this refusal remained unanswered. In 1975 Varmbrand discovered that his sister and brother were in Israel, and a year later that his twin sisters were in West Germany. His relatives sent him an invitation.

On 10 February 1977 Varmbrand and his wife handed in applications for emigration to Israel to the Tashkent O V I R. On 14 June 1977 they received a refusal, without a reason being given. They appealed against the refusal in a letter to the All-Union O V I R and in a letter to Brezhnev. Later they were informed by the Tashkent O V I R that Moscow had confirmed the refusal. No reasons for the refusal were given.

A year later, in February 1978, Varmbrand sent in a fresh application for a review of the original decision. The next day he was told that the refusal remained in force. On 6 March Karl Varmbrand wrote a complaint to General Khasanbayev, Minister of Internal Affairs for the Uzbek S S R. He emphasized that he and his relatives were all advanced in years and that further lobbying would be difficult for them. Although neither Varmbrand nor his wife had ever been involved in secret work, Khasanbayev said that Varmbrand had been refused emigration on security grounds.

The violinist Valery Shevchenko-Lerner (Novosibirsk, ul. Gorkogo 104, kv. 11) was refused permission to emigrate in September — 'because it is inexpedient'. He managed to discover that his 'emigration file' contained a letter from the Khabarovsk KGB stating that, as his brother was doing political work in the Army, his emigration was undesirable (as it might injure his brother's reputation).

In June-July Iosif Krass, Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences and Junior Research Officer at the Modelling Laboratory of Productive and Biological Processes of the Department of Theoretical Cybernetics at the Institute of Mathematics, Siberian Section of the U S S R Academy of Sciences, and Galina Kolesova, Junior Research Officer at the same Laboratory, applied for emigration to Israel. When Kolesova was handing in her application, she was asked to produce written consent from her child's father to his son's emigration. She explained that the father of her child had already emigrated from the U S S R and was living abroad. In spite of this, the Novosibirsk O V I R insisted, so the child's father sent a telegram in which he 'gave his consent' and asked that Kolesova be allowed to leave as soon as possible.

In August the 'Leningrad Kirov Factory' production unit transferred a sum of money to the Institute of Mathematics, Siberian Section of the U S S R Academy of Sciences, to be paid as a prize to Krass, Kolesova and engineer Larisa Kononenko for fulfilling their contracted work.

I. A. Poteiatyev, Candidate of Technical Sciences and head of the Laboratory, confirmed the proposed prize, but V. T. Dementev, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences and head of the Siberian Section, and V. L. Makarov, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences and Deputy Director of the Institute, refused to countersign.

On 20 September Makarov informed Krass that the District Party Committee had banned them from receiving the prize, because of their intention to leave the Motherland.

On 22 September S. L. Sobolev, Director of the Institute, signed the proposed award and sent it to the personnel section of the Institute for inclusion in instructions.

On 26 September, at a reception to mark the opening of an inter-
national conference on 'Differential Equations and Mathematical Calculation', Demeniev said in the presence of witnesses to a Senior Research Officer of the Laboratory, Yu. I. Gilderman, Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences: 'Yids should be throttled! Yids will never get any damned prize from me!'

On 27 September A. V. Sychev, Secretary of the Institute's Party Bureau, confiscated the award from the personnel section, declaring that Sobolev had changed his mind.

On 28 September the Party Bureau took this decision — to recommend to the local trades union committee that the prize be given to Kononenko but not to Krass and Kolesova because of their low level of morality, as expressed in their wish to leave the Motherland.

On 2 October the union committee decided — unanimously, except for one abstention, to support the parallel proposal by Demeniev and the recommendation of the Party Bureau. Kononenko was paid the portion of the prize allotted to her.

At the beginning of October Major-General Slanetsky of the Novosibirsk U V D invited Kolesova to meet him and told her that he was refusing her permission to emigrate because she had more close relatives in the USSR than in Israel.

In the middle of October Krass and Kolesova brought an action against the Institute of Mathematics in the Soviet District People's Court in Novosibirsk. Judge N. G. Mozina accepted the case for investigation.

On 23 November Krass asked the court to defer examination of the case he had accepted. On 22 November Krass gave Kolesova permission to emigrate. She was given three weeks to do so.

On 20 November the lawyer engaged by Krass refused to carry on with the case he had accepted. On 22 November the Novosibirsk O V I R gave Krass permission to emigrate. On 23 November Krass asked the court to defer examination of the case, as he could not find a lawyer.

Meanwhile the union committee had established a new reason for the non-payment of the prize money: the work had not been finished. At the end of November Kolesova left the U S S R. Krass is due to leave in December.

Have Left

In May and June the 'Kazakh' Germans Ivan and Nelli Teiber, Valentin Klink and Khetmut Martens (Chronicle 49) left the U S S R.

The Leningrad residents Vadim Nechayev and Marina Nedrobova (Chronicle 49), Krill Kontinsky (Chronicle 49), Andrei Filippov (Chronicle 47) and Lev Konin (Chronicles 45-7) have emigrated from the U S S R.

In September Olga Iofe (Chronicles 11, 15, 18, 20, 21) and her mother N. Ya. Shatunovskaya left the U S S R.

The following Jewish refuseniks have been allowed out of the U S S R: Moscovites A. Nizhnikov (Chronicle 50), Yu. Gudz (Chronicles 47, 48), L. Schadilivaya (Chronicle 47), I. Ass (Chronicle 43), B. Kats (Chronicle 50), Corresponding Member of the U S S R Academy of Sciences V. G. Levich, M. Peeker from Leningrad (Chronicle 49) and E. Pargarnnik from Kiev (Chronicles 47, 48).

The following ex-political prisoners have left the U S S R: G. Rode (Chronicles 45, 47), V. Kolchin (Chronicle 50), Yu. Mashkov (Chronicle 50), N. Svetlichnaya (Chronicles 43-5, 47, 48), she left on an invitation from the U S A), V. Uzlov (Chronicles 46-8), the 'aero-plane man' I. Zalmanson (see 'Releases' in the section 'In the Prisons and Camps'), N. Budolak-Sharygin (see the same section and 'Biographies') and M. Makarenko (Chronicles 46, 48).

At the beginning of August A. Zinoviev (Chronicles 45-5, 48) was allowed out of the U S S R. Not long before he was given permission to emigrate, he had once again been refused. Zinoviev was not allowed out 'to Israel for permanent residence' but to West Germany, on a visitor's invitation. So he left while still a citizen of the U S S R. But in Gazetteer of the U S S R Supreme Soviet, No. 37, 13 September, it was already announced that the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet had deprived Zinoviev of Soviet citizenship 'for activities which dis-honour the title of citizen of the U S S R'. On this occasion the Decree depriving him of citizenship was not itself published, nor was the date of its issue given in the Gazetteer.

In November Aish Seimuratova (Chronicles 47, 49), a Crimean Tatar activist, left the U S S R.
At the end of June she had appealed to the Central Committee of the CPSU in a new declaration. On 26 June she was received by Filatov, Head of the Central Committee reception office. He said that she could talk about emigration to K. I. Zotov, Head of the OVIR of the USSR MVD. The next day (not a reception day) K. I. Zotov received her and suggested she should write a declaration asking for a review of the refusal to allow her to emigrate. During the conversation Seitmuratova said that the invitation from relatives in Israel, which she had submitted to the Samarkand OVIR, was an enforced formality, but that she could submit an invitation from her real relatives (cousins) living in the USA. Zotov replied that there was no need for this.

In July, when A. Seitmuratova was living with her brother in the Crimea (she is one of the few who come to the Crimea 'legally', as part of organized labour recruitment), she was sought out there and told that she had permission to emigrate and could draw up the documents in Samarkand.

At the end of October she received her emigration documents (to Israel) and decided to fly to Moscow on 3 November. However at the airport, before boarding, certain persons told her she would not be flying: 'Your presence in Moscow over the next few days (i.e. during the public holidays) is undesirable.'

On 20 November Seitmuratova flew to Vienna. During the customs inspection at Sheremetovo Airport, typed copies of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and of the Convention Against Discrimination in Education, as well as a group photograph of Crimean Tatar delegates (about 40 people) on Red Square in the summer of 1967, were not allowed through. (In 1967 a few people from that delegation, including Seitmuratova, were received by Andropov, Mikoian, Shchelokov and Roudenko).

Round about 20 January 1978 M. Makarenko escaped the surveillance of the MVD and KGB for the third time (Chronicle 48).

On 28 January his son-in-law E. Murashov (Chronicle 46) was seized on the street and taken to the Leningrad KGB. There a man who refused to give his name demanded that he ensure that by 13.00 on 31 January Makarenko would be at the KGB or at least that he would phone to say he was on his way. If he agreed, the 'man' promised that Makarenko would get a residence permit in Leningrad, the surveillance order would be repealed, he would receive a visa to leave the USSR and a series of other 'benefits'; if not, he would be captured in five days at the most, and would get a new 'term' — either under Article 190-1, on the basis of testimony from his former cell-mates, with whom he had shared a cell for a month in October-November 1977.

On 24 July G. V. Romanov, First Secretary of the Leningrad Regional Committee of the CPSU, received from Makarenko a list of his legal claims against the KGB, the MVD and various courts concerning the theft of his money and property to the sum of 11,298 roubles, 9 kopecks (some of these claims were listed in Chronicle 48).

On 7 August Colonel Bokov, Head of Leningrad OVIR, told Murashov that the surveillance of Makarenko had been repealed and that they should leave by 31 August.

On 3 September Makarenko left the USSR.

On leaving, Makarenko put into samizdat a volume entitled Some letters, telegrams and reviews of the exhibition of works by Pavel Nikolayevich Filonov (1883-1941), which took place in Akademgorodok from 18 August to 27 September 1967 (Makarenko was then Director of the art gallery of the Siberian Section of the USSR Academy of Sciences); the volume contains 45 of his complaints and declarations — out of the 200 which he wrote in the 14 months after his release (entitled Report from the Socialist Middle Ages) — and a short account of his life during those 14 months entitled Information in Case of Need. (This account is dated 30 August 1978; it contains many interesting details left out of Chronicle 48 and this issue.)

Makarenko has described his life from his birth to his arrest (1969) in the book Story of My Life: On Answer to Provocateurs (supplement to my appeal to the RSFSR Supreme Court), written in the Lefortovo KGB Investigations Prison and smuggled out. This book was published in samizdat in 1970-71; in 1974 it was published abroad.  

In August the Kiev literary critic Igor Pomerantsev (Chronicle 48) emigrated from the USSR.

In August 1976 he was detained on the beach in Odessa. He was
announced that they had formed the Initiative Group to Defend the
I. Pomerantsev, translated by V. Fefelov (Yurev-Polsky, an employee of the Nuclear Research Institute), the doctor L. Sheindlin, linguist A. Lesovol, patents specialist V. Karmuzin, music-teacher M. Nezhabitsovskaya, orchestra leader A. Smarichevskaya, the woman student L. Oleinik, V. Matyukhin (member of the Kiev Chamber Orchestra), and R. Pomerantseva, mother of I. Pomerantsev.

During his interrogation, Matyukhin stated that Pomerantsev had disseminated libellous anti-Soviet fabrications, for example by stating that in the USSR a creative personality could not realize his potential.

In November 1977 Major Melgunov gave Pomerantsev a warning 'according to the Decree'. The text of the warning mentioned dissemination of libellous fabrications 'defaming ...', storing and disseminating harmful literature, regularly listening to hostile radio broadcasts and having contact with foreigners. Pomerantsev refused to sign the warning.

In November 1977 Pomerantsev's friends G. Tokayuk (Chronicle 48 and this issue) and M. Belorusets (Chronicle 48) also received warnings 'according to the Decree'.

At the same time KGB Major Izorgin advised Pomerantsev to emigrate.

Defence of the Rights of the Disabled

On 20 May Yury Kislev (Moscow), Valery Fefelov (Yurev-Polsky, Vladimir Region) and Faizula Khusainov (Chistopol, Tatar ASSR), disabled people (Group I) with paralysed legs or without both legs, announced that they had formed the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled in the USSR. The group sees their fundamental task as assisting in setting up an All-Union Society of the Disabled, since only the disabled themselves can assert their rights; they cannot entrust this matter to any indifferent guardians such as the Ministry of Social Security.

The Initiative Group have put out three numbers of their Bulletin (edited by V. Fefelov).

Bulletin No. 1 (20 May) reports on an unsuccessful attempt in 1973 to set up a society of the physically handicapped. It was 'impressed pretty categorically' by Social Security officials on one of the participants in this attempt, A. Vinogradova, that their action was 'anti-state'. A letter about G. Guskov is published (see below) and F. Khusainov's appeal to Brezhnev. To a question from V. Fefelov an editorial consultant of the journal Man and Law replied: 'At the present time disabled workers have no housing privileges'.

Bulletin No. 2 (22 June) contains the announcement of the formation of the Initiative Group (Document No. 1) and an appeal in defence of G. Guskov dated 20 June (62 signatures). The report 'Existence on the Brink, or the Lifestyle of the Disabled and their Relations with the State Apparatus' cites material published in the Soviet press describing the situation in homes for the disabled. Glushchenko, the Chief of Social Security in Yurev-Polsky, states that compensation (of 120 roubles per annum) for increases in expenditure on petrol, spare parts and service for motor transport for the disabled (due to a doubling of prices) is given only to disabled war and army veterans.

Bulletin No. 3 (26 August) includes the Initiative Group's appeal to the governments of the Helsinki Agreement signatory countries (Document No. 2) and F. Khusainov's open letter to the disabled of the West. Also included are information about the state of prosthetics and orthopaedics in the USSR, a sociological survey of the problems of finding work for the disabled, and Yu. Valov's letter to the Bulletin's editors (see 'In the Psychiatric Hospitals'). A questionnaire for disabled people is attached and a paper from the Initiative Group, 'On the Position of the Disabled in the USSR' (Document No. 3).

The paper investigates the legal and material position of the various categories of disabled people (for example, a Group 1 disabled person, who has never worked, receives benefits of 17 roubles 50 kopecks per month), their living conditions, medical facilities, problems with prostheses, means of transportation and mobility, work and education, and also gives another reminder of the right of the physically handicapped to have their own public organization.

The reaction of the authorities to the idea of forming an All-Union Society of the Disabled is apparent from the views of two officials...
Gennady Guskov (b. 1941) has been a Group 1 disabled person from birth. He is almost completely paralysed, and has a congenital defect—deformed and atrophied hands. In order to write, he has to guide, with his teeth, a brush with a pencil attached. Guskov completed a correspondence course at a technical college and was the author of several inventions (reported in Engineering for Youth and Komsomol Pioniery). While living in a residential centre in Voronezh, he was the initiator in setting up an electrical engineering workshop there on a cooperative basis. From 1972, the workshop operated under his technical supervision, producing accumulator testers. It made steadily increasing profits and guaranteed disabled people well-paid work. Suggestions were made to expand production, train disabled people and encourage house-bound disabled people from other regions to work there; in connection with this the workshop was due to be transferred to the authority of local industry and the organs of Social Security would have lost control (in Social Security homes 50% of the salary of disabled workers is deducted. Their labour is considered not to be 'work', which would have legal consequences, but instead 'occupational therapy').

Officials of the residential centre and of the Social Security organs launched a campaign of slander and persecution against Guskov. On 21 August 1977 the RSFSR Deputy Minister of Social Security, D. P. Komarova, authorized the forcible expulsion of Guskov from the Voronezh Residential Centre to another home for the disabled. He was immediately removed from his bed, in his night-clothes and without his belongings, and driven by ambulance several hundred kilometres to the Saratov Region. (After the expulsion of Guskov from the Voronezh Residential Centre, the workshop was shut down for six months. When it reopened, output was considerably reduced.)

At the present time G. Guskov is in an old people's home in the village of Verkhnyaya Krasavka in the Atkarsky District of the Saratov Region, and is trying, without success, to secure his return to Voronezh. He is allowed neither to visit Moscow for treatment nor to use a telephone. The Director has been told not to allow him out for walks. On 7 June 1978 Gennady Guskov was beaten up in the Director's office.

* * *

Valery Fefelov (b. 1949) suffered damage to his spinal cord and complete paralysis of both legs in a serious industrial accident in 1966. He lives alone, confined to a wheelchair, and has difficulty looking after himself.

On 11 October 1977 the State Motor-Vehicle Inspectorate (SMVI) in Yurev-Polsky banned him from driving his 'Zaporozhets' invalid car for five years. The car had been his only means of transport outside the home. False reasons were given for this penalty; when Fefelov tried to contest them a Chief of SMVI, A. N. Chernov, informed him orally of the real reason—Fefelov's contact with unreliable, dissident groups.

On 30 October 1978 an illegal search was carried out in Valery Fefelov's flat, without a Procurator's sanction. Officers of Yurev-Polsky District OVD, Senior Lieutenant Karaulov and Lieutenant Egorushkov, carried out the search. They informed Fefelov that they were looking for 'unauthorized people', and, taking advantage of his helplessness, came into his room, searched his personal possessions and looked through his correspondence, photographs and typewritten texts. Fefelov filed a complaint to the town Procurator, pointing out the illegality of the police action and also that 'a Group 1 disabled person without both legs has been subjected to force, humiliation and insult.'

* * *

Extra-judicial Persecution

From 1957 to 1963 Revolt Pimenov (b. 1931) served six years for 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda' (Chronicle 15). In 1964 he defended his thesis for a master's degree in mathematics, and in 1969 his doctoral thesis. Before the latter could be ratified, in the summer of 1970, Pimenov was arrested (Chronicle 15). In April 1974 he finished serving his sentence of exile in Syktyvkar and remained there to live (Chronicles 16, 32).

On 6 October 1978 the Academic Council of the Biological Institute of the Komi Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences investigated the question of 'whether to re-select R. I. Pimenov, ahead of schedule, for the office of Senior Research Officer'.

In her opening address, the Institute's Director, I. V. Zaboyeva, said:

On 3 August 1978 Senior Research Officer of the Laboratory of Mathematics and Computer Science R. I. Pimenov tried to copy, on the 'Vega' copier, a handwritten book of poems by Galich—poems which slander our Soviet way of life. The attempt was made in working hours, through laboratory assistant M. A. Demina. It was discovered by Acting Chief of Laboratories A. M. Pupkov.
Our thanks to him. He wrote down this incident in a report and on 8 August this report was handed by me to the Presidium. On 21 August V. P. Podoplelov and other members of the Presidium had a talk with Revolt Ivanovich and recommended that the Academic Council review Pimenov's position ahead of schedule. This position is due for review in October 1979.

On his return from holiday, Acting Chief of Laboratories V. S. Nikiforov made a report to the Director confirming the fact of R. I. Pimenov's breach of discipline in using a machine for his own purposes and placed in doubt the possibility of retaining Revolt Ivanovich in the office of Senior Research Officer.

The action of Research Officer R. I. Pimenov is a gross violation of the basic principles of our society and flouts the norms of communist morality. In agreement with all the instructions of the Higher Degrees Commission, a Senior Research Officer is, above all, a patriot of his Motherland and an educator of young people. R. I. Pimenov's attention was drawn seriously to this point when he was chosen for the office of Senior Research Officer in 1974.

Pimenov then gave a short account of his work. In conclusion he said: With respect to what has happened, I must say that I admit my guilt in disobeying instructions about the use of the 'Vega' copier and am ready to hear your judgment on this matter.

Replying to questions, Pimenov said: This was the first time I tried to get poems copied. I wanted one copy, for my personal use, and simply because I find some of these poems moving.

A. M. Pupkov, coming forward, said: As regards the political platform of this action, I can't say. But one thing is clear to me, that such an action is punishable according to article 190-1, and the abuse of his position — by article 171, i.e. these aspects of Revolt Ivanovich's action verge on violating the law.

There could also be negligence on my part towards the action of Revolt Ivanovich, but this is already taken care of by article 172. And if I had shielded Revolt Ivanovich — this would be a typical example of complicity. Today the Academic Council must put Revolt Ivanovich on the right path.

The majority of speakers expressed opposition to Pimenov's continuation as a Senior Research Officer. Two speeches, however, stand apart. V. S. Nikiforov said:

There is no doubt that R. I. Pimenov is unsuitable for his office, especially if one considers the not unimportant demand that a Senior Research Officer be an educator of young people. His ideological convictions have nothing in common with our world view. Even before this incident I had no doubt on that score.
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The majority of speakers expressed opposition to Pimenov's continuation as a Senior Research Officer. Two speeches, however, stand apart. V. S. Nikiforov said:

There is no doubt that R. I. Pimenov is unsuitable for his office, especially if one considers the not unimportant demand that a Senior Research Officer be an educator of young people. His ideological convictions have nothing in common with our world view. Even before this incident I had no doubt on that score.

All the same, we did elect Revolt Ivanovich to the office of Senior Research Officer, believing that this would allow us to make demands on R. I. Pimenov, the fulfilment of which would make his election to our advantage, and hoping that the possible harm caused by such a step would be slight and easily neutralized through our efforts, etc.

From my point of view Revolt Ivanovich's record and his past actions fully confirm that our expectations were completely justified. R. I. Pimenov's usefulness to the Laboratory in the period under review is unquestionable, and the harm he has caused has been minimal … I do not see a basis for changing my initial point of view, that the wrong he has done can be compensated through his usefulness. I think that if we discharge R. I. Pimenov from the office of Senior Research Officer we will only slightly lessen the extent of the harm, which has not been so great, but at the same time, we will deprive ourselves of the possibility of making further demands of him. We will lessen the benefits which he has brought to the laboratory, and to a great extent will add to the harm he has caused by bringing harm to the laboratory ourselves.

In view of this, believing the present discussion to be vitally necessary, I call upon you to consider all the aspects of the decision which we will be making by secret ballot, and to take into account the aspects and problems which I have formulated. I hardly need to say that, whichever one of us was being voted on, nothing can guide us other than our own consciences. But it would be desirable that our consciences were guided by practical considerations as well as spontaneous feelings.

(On 26 October the Academic Council did not elect Nikiforov to the post of Chief of Laboratories.) The Institute's Komsomol Secretary, E. G. Barkova, said:

I have worked in the same Laboratory as Revolt Ivanovich for almost three years. What he did was, of course, very bad and I once heard, out of the corner of my ear, that he had been in prison somewhere, for something; but in the Laboratory I saw nothing unusual. I am the Institute's Komsomol Secretary, which puts me under a lot of obligations. It's been said here that he is engaged in anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, but I want to say that nothing like that went on in the Laboratory in my presence, and I'm annoyed — I mean all in all he's a good man.

After this speech Zaboyeva commented:

It seems we were hasty and mistaken in choosing you as Komsomol Secretary. You're too feeble a Secretary for us.

On 18 October a new Secretary was chosen.

In the secret ballot on re-electing Pimenov to the office of Senior Research Officer one person voted in favour, 12 voted against and one paper was declared spoiled.
On 19 October Pimenov and Nikiforov were called to a meeting of the Presidium of the Komi Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Speaking at the meeting, the Rector of Syktyvkar University, V. A. Vityazeva, said:

Revolt Ivanovich, you remember that when the question of whether to employ you in our branch was being decided, none of us was burning with the desire to take you. But all the same, and in spite of your past, we decided to trust you. Have you now reverted to your former ways?

Pimenov replied:

I have indeed committed an offence and am not trying to justify myself. But why is it necessary to make such a broad generalization — that I’ve ‘reverted to my former ways’ — in the light of one incident? When this episode was analysed everyone noted that it was the sole thing of which I am guilty.

Vityazeva’s question:

But why were you in need of this Galich, a man expelled from the Soviet Union for anti-Soviet activity?

Pimenov replied:

V. P. Podoplelov said: ‘Galich looks at the world through prison bars’; prison bars are a part of my life too. And I like some of Galich’s poetry, or rather I’m moved by it, because of that very harmony with a slice of my life. The poems which we are talking about have not anti-Soviet content. Galich was never charged with anti-Soviet activity during the time that he lived in the USSR. He sang these verses openly in Moscow. I heard them myself. This collection is dated 1974, so it does not include any of his work in emigration. Therefore there are no grounds for talking about anti-Soviet activity.

I’m not trying to justify my action, but I feel that my punishment was exceptionally severe.

To this, Presidium Chairman V. P. Podoplelov said:

Indeed I agree with Pimenov that his punishment is exceptionally harsh. But it would seem so only to someone who doesn’t know Pimenov. I know him ten times better than Vityazeva and I know that anyone who was in possession of all the facts about Pimenov would see that his punishment was exceptionally light.

I can believe that he didn’t intend to circulate Galich’s verses and really did make just one copy. One can believe what he says that foreign editions of his (Pimenov’s) works came out without his knowledge. But what revolting publications they appeared in: a dirty little anti-Soviet paper in Germany, and that one in Paris. They make the most of him there!

This really is the only incident, nothing else happened in the laboratory. But I don’t trust Pimenov!

And bear in mind, Revolt Ivanovich, that if something like this occurs again in the Laboratory, our conversation with you will be different.

On 21 October (Saturday) Podoplelov signed an order from the Komi Branch to transfer R. I. Pimenov as from 19 October to the office of Junior Research Officer, ‘in connection with his non-election’.

The Deputy Head of the Hostel Administration of Moscow University [MGU], V. I. Pechatkin, sent an ‘official note’ to the Faculty of Biology:

Among the articles left in the locker room of MGU’s zone ‘V’ student house by student S. B. Bogdanovsky, the following anti-Soviet materials were discovered: one handwritten copy of a poem beginning with the words ‘The brake squeaked in a raucous tenor’ and ending with the words ‘The seven enter’, and one typed copy of an article ‘A Letter from Russia to Russia’ (ten pages) ... these materials were confiscated from S. B. Bogdanovsky and a statement was drawn up. In an addition to the statement Bogdanovsky denied ownership of the above-mentioned articles.

In connection with this ‘official note’ on 15 May the Bureau of the MGU Komsomol Committee investigated the personal affairs of fifth-year student of the Faculty of Biology Sergei Bogdanovsky.

Bogdanovsky made a statement to the Bureau:

Because of my faith in God I became a member of the Russian Orthodox Church. Since membership of the Komsomol is incompatible with Christianity, I am hereby giving notice of my resignation from the Komsomol. I ask you to listen to my personal affairs in my absence.

The Bureau expelled Bogdanovsky from the Komsomol for ‘political immaturity and behaviour unworthy of the title of Komsomol member’.

On 18 May the Acting Dean of the Biology Faculty, V. M. Logvinenko, signed an order to expel Bogdanovsky from the university — ‘for behaviour unworthy of the title of Soviet student’.

Miscellaneous Reports

Political Prisoner Day

30 October was declared ‘Political Prisoner Day’ by the Moscow Helsinki Group (Document No. 60).
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The statement was signed by A. Sakharov, L. Boitsova (Kovalyova),
N. Buzyeva (Fyodorova), I. Valtova (Orlova), I. Zholkovskaya
(Ginzburg), N. Strokatova (Karavanskaya), A. Lavut, T. Velikanova,
Fr. G. Yakunin, V. Kapitanchuk, V. Bakhmin, L. Ternovsky, G.

On the same day the traditional press conference was held in A.
Sakharov's flat in Moscow (Chronicles 33, 38, 41, 47). The correspond-
dents were given the statement cited above and two further docu-
ments drawn up specially for this day by the Moscow Helsinki Group:
'On Medical Provision for Political Prisoners' (Document No. 67) and
'On the Position of Political Prisoners Regarding Correspondence'
(Document No. 68). Sakharov handed over a letter from Mordovian
Camp No. 1 (see 'Letters and Statements of Political Prisoners'). At the
press conference L. Shevarsky, I. Zholkovskaya and I. Kovalyov
spoke on the conditions of their relatives. A. Khlgatyan gave a state-
ment about K. Nazaryan. Malva Landa gave the correspondents G.
Davydov's statement 'I am against Terror' (see 'Letters and State-
ments').

Items Related to the Summer Trials (Chronicle 50)

At the end of March Alexander Ginzburg's wife, I. Zholkovskaya,
unexpectedly had her phone disconnected (it had not been working for 21
months). At the end of May it was equally suddenly disconnected. At
the same time A. Ginzburg's mother, L. I. Ginzburg, also had her
phone disconnected.

In May, 18-year-old Sergei Shibayev, a close friend of the Ginzburs,
who had lived with the family for many years (Chronicle 45), was
called up for the Army. On 18 May he was due to present himself
with his gear at the Military Registration and Enlistment Office.
On 14 May he was taken to hospital (the 64th Moscow Hospital) with
signs of concussion. Two spinal punctures were administered
and on 19 May, two days after the second puncture, he was un-
expectedly discharged from hospital. Hospital officials, deceiving the
friends who had come to fetch him, took him out through another
exit, where some people calling themselves officials of the Moscow
Crime Department met him and took him under escort to the station,
from where they took him to Kaluga. In the train the boy started to
feel ill but his escorts just laughed at him. At Kaluga Shibayev was
handed call-up papers for 22 May and threatened with 'time' if he
did not appear. In a very sick condition Shibayev returned immediately
to Moscow.

The next day, 20 May, he was taken by ambulance to hospital
and remained there for a month.

In August Shibayev tried to re-enrol at the Moscow Professional
Technical College [P T C] from which he had been transferred to
Kaluga a year previously (formally — at his mother’s request), but
he was turned down on medical grounds: 'Unfit for training to be a
roof-tiler at P T C No. 68 in accordance with articles 23 and 15.'

In October Shibayev was called up. He was sent to the north of
Yakutia, to a building battalion. He was assigned to work with
concrete.

. . . .

The American violinist Daniel Heifetz, who came fourth in the
Tchaikovsky Competition in Moscow, gave his prize money to Irina
Zholkovskaya for the Aid Fund for Political Prisoners.

. . . .

My Thanks

They say that in the Third Reich the following custom existed: the
relatives of prisoners condemned to death were officially presented
with a bill for the expenses incurred by the execution.

I do not know the details of this obsolete and foreign practice, but
I can, from my experience of life in our country, give a much fresher
example of administrative resourcefulness.

Nearly two years ago the KGB arrested my husband. Before the
arrest came a 'search' which resembled nothing so much as a com-
monplace robbery. Everything remotely valuable — the tape-recorder,
the record player, and money — was taken away, and our family was
left with . . . 38 kopecks to live on (! ). For 17 months the 'organs'
held my husband, a very sick man, in Kaluga Prison, working out
the scenario of 'justice': then, muddled and confused, they staged a
four-day mockery of a show for him. But just before they raised the
curtain they ordered A. Ginzburg to pay 1,500 roubles in so-called
costs for all the mockery and torment he had suffered.

But even that was not enough for them.
According to Soviet law, whether one approves of it or not, these costs are taken out of the money earned by prisoners over the whole period of their camp sentence. All the same, disregarding the laws of their own making, the authorities confronted me with the demand, at the end of October, that I immediately bring them these 1,500 roubles, and threatened me, in the event of non-compliance, with confiscation of property.

It seemed that I was faced with an impossible choice.

If I paid the sum demanded I could have saved my husband a part of that meagre pittance paid in camps which is vitally essential in those circumstances. But at the same time, to give up that money meant giving in to illegal, vulgar blackmail. Anyway the choice was theoretical, since I had no money to give or not to give. I earn a negligible salary, and have two small sons on my hands, and A. Ginzburg’s 70-year-old mother lives on a tiny pension. In addition we have an enormous debt (2,500 roubles) for our house in Tarusa (13 sq metres) which my husband, on his release in 1972, was obliged to buy, since the authorities refused to let him live with his family in Moscow.

There seemed to be no way out of the situation and I simply did not know what to do.

The solution came from outside. Dozens of people, both friends and strangers, on learning about our plight, treated it as their own. Not one of them believed the officially inspired slander which held that our family was capable of using the resources of the Public Aid Fund for Political Prisoners for our personal needs. In a few days they had collected the necessary sum, and my husband’s lawyer E. A. Reznikova handed it to the court officials.

Let our persecutors have the money. Let them have power, strength, our very physical existence in their hands. All the same they have suffered defeat, for that wave of mercy which rose to meet their violence cannot be valued in any material way.

And they have suffered defeat on that higher level where the violator always loses to the victim, even if he himself is unaware of it. They have suffered defeat because the spirit of envy, fear and evil torments them. And human trust and goodness surround my family.

Trust and goodness saved our family in days that were terrible for us. And I wish to bow low to them.

I. Zholkovskaya (Ginzburg), 16 November 1978

* * *

When the trial of A. Shcharansky ended, his relatives were given papers addressed to Povarenkov, the head of Lefortovo Prison, which gave Shcharansky’s mother, father and brother permission to visit him. At Lefortovo the following schedule of visits was suggested to

Shcharansky’s mother: she could see her son for three hours the next day, 18 July, and Shcharansky’s father and brother could see him in turn on the following two days, also for three hours each.

On 18 July Ida Petrovna Milgrom arrived at the prearranged time. She was taken into an empty room and asked to wait for a while. More than two and a half hours passed. Eventually she was taken into the prison building. The visit lasted 25 minutes. It took place in the presence of Povarenkov and an unknown man in plain clothes.

Shcharansky wanted Povarenkov to pass his mother a list of books and other articles which he would need before his departure to a transit prison. When the meeting was over Povarenkov did not give the list to Milgrom—he promised to give it to Shcharansky’s father the next day during the latter’s visit to his son.

On 19 July, when Shcharansky’s relatives arrived for the visit, they were told that he had left at 6am for his place of punishment. Relatives’ complaints to the Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions [MACLI], with the request to grant his father and brother their legal right to visit Shcharansky and take him his possessions did not help. MACLI simply informed them that Shcharansky had been taken to Vladimir Prison on 19 July.

In reply to I. P. Milgrom’s complaint to the party Central Committee, the First Deputy Procurator-General of the USSR, A. M. Rekunkov, replied:

Permission was given to Shcharansky’s mother, father and brother to visit him. However, the father and brother did not appear on the appointed day, and the following morning he was transported to his place of punishment in accordance with his sentence.

* * *

As a sign of protest against the sentence of Yury Orlov, Alexander Lyapin (Chronicle 49) made an attempt to immolate himself on Red Square during the night of 24-25 May.

Policemen put out the flames and took Lyapin to a police station. In spite of his serious condition (25% of his skin was burnt) he was interrogated. The interrogators tried to determine who had ‘put Lyapin up to’ setting fire to himself. After the interrogation, which lasted over an hour, Lyapin was taken to the reanimation section of the Sklifosovsky Institute.

The authorities classed the attempt at self-immolation as “malicious hooliganism” and charged Lyapin under article 206 of the Russian Criminal Code. The court ruled him not responsible and sent him for compulsory treatment to an ordinary psychiatric hospital.

At the present time Lyapin is in Section 11 of the Third Lenin-grad Regional Psychiatric Hospital.

* * *
After D. Leontiev had served his 15 days he was arrested during the trial of Orlov — Chronicle 50 — his behaviour was discussed at the House of Culture of the 'Red Textile Worker' factory where he works as a musician.

At the meeting there were cries of 'C I A!', 'He (Orlov) was wearing foreign underpants!'. 'Banner — what a revolving name!', etc.

Leontiev said in reply that they had spent two and a half hours discussing his beliefs, which were not known to them, but had not said what they considered him guilty of. He had served 15 days for insubordination to the police, but for beliefs, as Brezhnev had said more than once, people were not persecuted in our country.

The meeting changed direction. 'That's a fact! Why are we poking our noses into someone else's business? If his beliefs are wrong, the KGB will deal with that.' In conclusion, Leontiev was made to promise that he would join the trades union ('Moreover, you'll get full pay when you're off sick').

* * *

As a sign of protest against Orlov's conviction, many American scientists have denounced their contacts with Soviet scientists. In particular, the Americans attended neither the Soviet-American Symposium on Condensates arranged for 22 May (because of this the symposium was cancelled), nor the Conference on Fields Calibration Theory which began on 23 May. In the auditorium where this conference took place, Academician Sakharov wrote on the board: 'Our gratitude to those who, by their absence today, support justice.' (The board was immediately removed, although it was needed by the speakers.)

Members of the Moscow Helsinki Group, with S. Polikanov and A. Sakharov, in a letter addressed to the President of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, P. Handler, and the Director of the Federation of American Scientists, J. Stone, approved such refusals of contacts inspired not by the absence of a desire to cooperate professionally, but by spontaneous indignation at the farcical trial of Professor Orlov, and by a desire to prevent analogous reprisals against A. Ginzburg and A. Shcharansky.

* * *

From 20 to 30 August the 14th International Genetics Congress took place in Moscow. The delegation from Israel was absent — in protest at the conviction of Shcharansky. An official delegation of U.S. scientists was likewise absent.

In the U.S.A. the Moscow Congress Boycott Committee was set up several months before the congress began: a number of eminent American geneticists joined, including several Nobel Prizewinners.

The Committee expressed concern over the recent trials of members of Helsinki Groups and called for solidarity with the accused (especially the scientists Yu. Orlov and A. Shcharansky) by non-participation in the congress. Hundreds of American scientists sent letters of refusal to participate on political grounds.

A short while before the congress opened, a number of geneticists received an appeal by I. Kovalyov (see 'Letters and Statements').

On the very first day of the congress, during the ceremonial session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, the French scientist J. Lejeune drew attention, in his address, to the question of human rights. After his address, members of the French delegation tried to circulate material on S. Kovalyov among their Soviet colleagues. On the second day, F. J. Ayala (U.S.A) expressed his solidarity with the Israeli and other scientists who had felt unable to take part in the work of the congress. W. Hennig (W. Germany) began his address on the final day of the congress with an expression of solidarity with absent colleagues; he noted the concern of Western scientists with the question of human rights in the U.S.S.R. On the very last day two West European delegates tried to read an English translation of I. Kovalyov's appeal to participants of the congress. Academician A. A. Bayev (who spent many years in Stalin's camps) prevented this. J. Lejeune handed Academician D. K. Belyayev, whom the congress had voted President of the International Genetics Federation, a letter signed by about 50 participants of the congress. In the letter, concern was expressed over the fate of S. Kovalyov and other convicted scientists.

The final sessions were devoted to the scientific legacy of N. I. Vavilov (1978 was the 90th Anniversary of his birth). N. I. Vavilov's portrait hung in the Palace of Congresses during the sessions. However, in the official papers given by both Soviet and foreign scientists, not a word was said about N. I. Vavilov's fate and that of his colleagues, nor about the reasons why the 7th Genetics Congress was not held in Moscow in 1937-1938 (all the Soviet members of the Organizing Committee had been arrested — some were shot, many died in camps). Only Professor V. S. Kirpichnikov (Chronicle 18), at the opening of the symposium on 'Problems of Evolution and Population Genetics' (second day of the congress), expressed the hope that no more scientists would suffer N. I. Vavilov's fate.

The 30th Anniversary of the August session of the All-Union Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences went unremarked.

On 28 August stacks of leaflets were thrown from the top floors of the Moscow University building, where sessions of the congress were being held. They bore the words 'Freedom for Orlov, Ginzburg and Shcharansky!' — in Russian and English. The leaflets had been duplicated from a stencil.

* * *
A Defence Committee for Biologist Prisoners of Conscience, founded in France (Chairman — Claude Caussanel), sent a letter to Aleksandrov, the President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, asking him to assist in securing the release of S. Kovalyov on the basis of article 100 of the Corrective Labour Code (release on the grounds of illness). An analogous letter, sent to Brezhnev and Aleksandrov by the Committee, was signed by more than 600 biologists from 64 laboratories and universities in a number of countries. Around 200 biologists also signed a statement, at the request of the Committee, in which it was said that in view of the systematic persecution of people for their beliefs in the Soviet Union, they were refusing to take part in the 14th International Genetics Congress and also in any other event ‘organized by the authorities of a country which carries out police persecution and systematically violates human rights’.

During the first days of October leaflets appeared in Moscow University buildings with the text: ‘Freedom to the Champions of Human Rights’ and (on the other side) — ‘Shame to the Prostituted Constitution’. Several hundred copies were distributed.

Uman (Cherkassy Region). During the spring political slogans painted in semi-fast colours appeared on the walls of several public buildings (for example the Town Soviet Executive Committee). One of them read: ‘The Little Land* is a Political Farce’.

Moscow. On the evening of 13 September a local policeman came to the flat of Yu. F. Orlov. At the time only Orlov’s son (from his first marriage) Dmitry was present. The policeman asked D. Orlov if he knew the whereabouts of the occupier, I. Valitova; hearing that she was away, he told Orlov that he would have to ‘come along’. At the station a record was drawn up claiming that D. Orlov, when requested to show his documents, had tried to run away. In fact D. Orlov had shown his passport, and his ‘running away’ consisted of his trying, after informing his escorts in advance, to run over to acquaintances to show his documents, and (on the other side) — ‘Shame to the Prostituted Constitution’.

Moscow. On 30 May Yu. A. Gastev was summoned to the City

[Uman: An historical name for the territory of the Ukraine.]

On 13 September a local policeman came to Yu. A. Gastev’s home and took him to police station 58 — for another clarification of the question of his employment (Chronicles 45, 48). At the station Gastev caught sight of the Deputy Head of Crime Prevention, Major Mak-simov, and wanted to talk to him immediately. But the Major told him that he was busy and said to the policeman: ‘Take him to the cells. Charge him with being found drunk in the street’. The next morning Investigator Tarantsov began to interrogate Gastev on the subject of charging him with ‘parasitism’. Gastev informed the Investigator that he was in the process of completing some work under contract, editing scientific literature. The Investigator telephoned the publishers and checked this, but detained Gastev for a further hour. Gastev’s question: ‘Why was a false record made about my detention?’ remained unanswered.

On 26 September Gastev sent the Procurator of the Dzerzhinsky district of Moscow a statement:

From the documents, copies of which were shown by me to Investigator Tarantsov of police station 58 (labour book, pay book and labour contracts Nos. 1/78 and 6/78), it is clear that the warning issued to me on 21 November 1977 has no legal force and that the initiation of proceedings against me under article 209 of the Russian Criminal Code, and even more my detention, are illegal. I ask you to explain to the officials of police station 58 the incorrectness of their actions.

Shortly afterwards Gastev was informed in the police station that the Procurator had not sanctioned the institution of criminal proceedings.

In October a plenary meeting of the Board of the All-Union Society of Psychiatrists and Neurologists (A S P N) resolved to organize a commission to investigate events described by the psychiatrist A. Voloshanovich, in which in his opinion, compulsory hospitalization had taken place without valid grounds. (Alexander Voloshanovich is a consultant to the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes — Chronicle 50.) The A S P N commission was headed by a Vice-Chairman of the Board, Professor V. V. Kovalyov.

On 19 October the commission visited Moscow Regional Hospital No. 20 (in Dolgoprudny) — Voloshanovich’s place of work. At the
commission must, therefore, list for them the names and addresses of people he had examined, the addresses of the hospitals in which they had been held, and his conclusions.

On 25 October the Working Commission, in a statement to the press, welcomed the establishment of the A S P N commission, but expressed the fear that its activity 'might not be free from the influence of other, non-psychiatric organizations, and might turn out to be an attempt to discredit the results of the examinations carried out by Alexander Voloshanovich'.

On 28 October the A S P N commission, in Voloshanovich's presence, investigated the case of a certain 'G', whom Voloshanovich had observed in hospital in 1976 (i.e. before the Working Commission was set up). The commission did not permit Voloshanovich to study G's case history in advance, and all the examples he gave of concrete violations of the Directives on Immediate Hospitalization were ignored. Voloshanovich then wrote a statement to the Board of A S P N, pointing out the commission's lack of conscientiousness and laying down conditions for his future participation in its work. Voloshanovich has received no answer to this statement (published in full in the Working Commission's Information Bulletin No. 13).

* * *

Moscow. On 29 October the flat where A. D. Sakharov lived was empty for 80 minutes. During this time unknown people entered the flat. They emptied a box of papers (and filled it with different papers so that the owners would not realize immediately), and also removed A. D. Sakharov's dressing-gown and his wife's spectacles.

At the end of August a parcel of informational material of the Ukranian Helsinki Group disappeared from the possession of S. Belokon, a resident of Kiev who was then in Moscow (in his words it was 'lost' by him). Soon afterwards S. Belokon, a Master of Historical Science, who had for a long time been trying to secure a Kiev residence permit and specialist work, obtained both the one and the other.

Kiev. In October Zvenislava Vivehar (the wife of political prisoner A. Sergienko), Vera Lisovaya (also the wife of a political prisoner), A. F. Matusевич (the mother of N. Matusевич), Pavel Stokolshy (the husband of N. Svetlichnaya), Elena Lelekh and Valentina Tzeplo were summoned for 'chats' at the K G B.

* * *

Vasil'kov (Kiev Region). A meeting held in the workshop where Tamila Matusевич works, censured her for not dissociating herself from the anti-Soviet activities of her brother. The speakers said that she could not be trusted with the work of an engineer.

* * *

Dolina (Ivano-Frankovsky Region). On 6 October V. Streltsov, P. Sichko and V. Sichko, members of the Ukranian Helsinki Group, were summoned (or taken) to the local K G B department, where they were warned: 'If anything happens in this district on the First Anniversary of the Constitution, you will be arrested'.

* * *

Kiev. Early in the morning of 3 November a man entered the home of O. Meskho (who lives in a detached suburban house on the outskirts of Kiev) and said that he needed to see Oksana Yakovlevna. To Meskho's question 'Are you an investigator?', he answered in the affirmative. Asking him to wait in the hall, she started moving towards her bedroom. The man followed her, seized her by the hand, and getting out a revolver, demanded 'Money!'. Oksana Yakovlevna broke away and jumped, screaming, through the window into the garden. Neighbours came running. One of them saw the man calmly leave the house, get into a taxi which was waiting at the gate, and drive away. A while later a crime detective summoned by Meskho's neighbour arrived. When he heard Meskho's story this official asked why she had thought the man was an investigator. Meskho explained that, as the mother of a political prisoner, she had had dealings with investigators more than once, and that her 'guest' had seemed a man of that type. The official then gave his version: 'The attacker is a friend of your son. I saw the same thing myself a while ago. Acquaintances of mine also have a relative in prison for a political affair. Two men came to their house while I was there and asked for money to help political prisoners. We detained them and found anti-Soviet materials on them'.

* * *

Kiev. On 15 November Lyubov Murzhenko, the wife of Aleksei Murzhenko (See 'In the Prisons and Camps'), was summoned to the Kiev K G B. After a 'chat' lasting an hour and a half, K G B official N. F. Shernet issued her with a warning under the Decree of 25 December 1972 — for 'circulation of false information' (as an example Sheremet mentioned L. Murzhenko's letter to her husband about her arrest during the trial of Vins — Chronicle 49; this letter was confiscated by the camp administration) and her 'antisocial way of life'. L. Murzhenko did not sign the warning.
Moscow Region. In August P. A. Podrabinek (Chronicles 47, 48) went to the post-office to find out why letters addressed to him and his family were not being delivered. The head of the post-office showed him the Statute on Communications:
In the event of necessity, the organs of investigation have the right to confiscate and withhold correspondence.

Podrabinek asked whether the Procurator had sanctioned the seizure of his correspondence. The head said that someone simply comes, shows his 'credentials' and looks at Podrabinek's letters.

Makhop. Acquaintances of V. Pavlov (Chronicles 43, 46) are constantly being summoned to the KGB. The party organizer at his place of work asks those who are seen in conversation with him what he has been talking about. KGB officials came to see Pavlov's wife at work. They asked her whether she shares her husband's views. Pavlov's letters to Moscow (for example to V. Voinovich), and abroad, systematically go astray. To his complaints the post-office replies: 'Your letter was lost in internal processing channels', and the Deputy Procurator of the Adygei Autonomous Region told Pavlov: 'You are not allowed to write abroad'.

Moscow. In March the telephone of Yu. Shikhanovich (Chronicles 2, 27, 30, 34) was disconnected. The chief of the Miussky telephone exchange, I. E. Desyatsky, told him that the telephone had been disconnected for six months on instructions from the chief of the Moscow City Telephone Network [MCTN] under article 74 of the Statute on Communications (Chronicle 27). On 4 October the telephone was reconnected, but on 1 November again disconnected. This time I. E. Desyatsky told Shikhanovich that the telephone had been permanently disconnected, and that it would be useless complaining to MCTN, because the authorization had not come from them and he did not know from whom it had come. He explained that the telephone had been disconnected 'for his inability to use a telephone'.

Leningrad. On 5 April, at a meeting of the department where Ernst Orlovsky (Chronicles 46, 49) works, the question of discipline at work was discussed. The head of department accused Orlov of being twice (4 and 5 April) a few minutes late for work. 'The other day at our meeting Orlovsky criticized several articles of the R S F S R Constitution, but I consider that the Constitution is perfect, except that there is one article missing, one which would send people like you, Orlovsky, to a building without architectural excesses!' The meeting passed a resolution: 'to show the minutes of the meeting to the administration'. Later the words: 'for the purpose of taking necessary punishment measures' were added, and in a memorandum dated 22 April it was stated that the meeting had presented a 'Petition for the imposition of an administrative reprimand'. In addition, on 26 April a 'Report' dated '4 April' was drawn up, in which it was said: E. S. Orlovsky was indeed this morning seven minutes late for work, on 4 April 1978, and eight minutes late on 5 April 1978. (None of the four people who signed the report works in the same office as Orlovsky)

On 28 April an order was issued to give E. Orlovsky a reprimand. The personnel department, when they informed him of the order, did not allow him to write any of it down or to read the papers on the basis of which it was issued. In the end Orlovsky succeeded in doing the latter.

Orlovsky wrote 'The History of a Reprimand' (six pages) about this incident.

On 23 June the Presidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet issued a Decree to deprive Oskar Rabin of Soviet citizenship 'for actions discrediting the title of citizen of the U S S R'.

Oskar Rabin, an artist, is one of the organizers of the movement of independent artists (Chronicles 34-7, 44, 49). In January 1978 Rabin went to West Germany as a guest. Before his departure the authorities tried for a long time to make him go not 'as a guest' but for permanent residence. They instituted criminal proceedings for 'parasitism' (article 209 of the Russian Criminal Code) against his son and threatened Rabin himself with the same charge.

On November 16 the police came to the flat of P. G. Grigorenko (Chronicle 48) and ordered the relatives who were living there (with two small children) to vacate the flat immediately. An extension of 24 hours was obtained with difficulty. On 17 November the flat was sealed. (Z. M. Grigorenko, the wife of P. G. Grigorenko, has not been deprived of Soviet citizenship).

Dirty Tricks

Since the spring of 1978 anonymous texts have been circulated in Moscow entitled 'Memorandum of the Fifty-Seven' (Nos. 1-3) and signed 'the All-Russian Inter-Ideological Union' (V M I O) or even 'the Political Board of V M I O'. These reminiscences consist of threats, abuse, gossip and slander directed at the movement to defend the rule of law and its participants. To illustrate their level here are two quotations:
In the final count, political information has materialized into roubles and kopecks. And financial independence has given the dissident leadership the opportunity to buy homes and cars for the children of dissidents. But why did the money of the Aid Fund for Political Prisoners not go to aid the movement, to help political prisoners and their families? It only goes to help ex-political prisoners, and why did this happen? The money of the Aid Fund for Political Prisoners is expended on: half a house — 13 square metres — in Tarusa at the beginning of 1973. Sakharov received several anonymous telephone calls. Zholkovskaya R. Medvedev writes that Ginzburg, Orlov, Alekseyeva and Tverskaya, connected with the Fund received anonymous letters. Their contents are not described. Only one ex-criminal, Gradoboyev, connected with the Aid Fund for Political Prisoners. This really does resemble provocation.

Sakharov observes: "The Helsinki Group, like other civic groups defending the rule of law, acts legally, basing itself on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and operating within the limits of international covenants and agreements ratified by the U S S R."

The appeal for illegality is a calculated attempt to pervert the very essence of the movement to defend the rule of law. R. Medvedev reproaches Ginzburg with 'strange carelessness', with an almost deliberate provocation of repressive measures against himself and his immediate circle, and with conceit. Medvedev accompanies his reproaches of carelessness with an appeal for strict conspiracy, for 'living underground', etc. On this point the Moscow Helsinki Group's Document No. 65 states:

"Defend the Rule of Law in the U S S R" — includes "The VMIO Memoranda' and R. Medvedev's 'Open Letter' in the context of the general campaign being conducted by the authorities to discredit the movement and its leaders, who are perceived as dangerous and dangerous inventors of conversations, 'models of a new Russian'."

In the final count, political information has materialized into roubles and kopecks. And financial independence has given the dissident leadership the opportunity to buy homes and cars for the children of dissidents. But why did the money of the Aid Fund for Political Prisoners not go to aid the movement, to help political prisoners and their families? It only goes to help ex-political prisoners, and why did this happen? The money of the Aid Fund for Political Prisoners is expended on: half a house — 13 square metres — in Tarusa at the beginning of 1973. Sakharov received several anonymous telephone calls. Zholkovskaya R. Medvedev writes that Ginzburg, Orlov, Alekseyeva and Tverskaya, connected with the Fund received anonymous letters. Their contents are not described. Only one ex-criminal, Gradoboyev, connected with the Aid Fund for Political Prisoners. This really does resemble provocation.

Sakharov observes: "The Helsinki Group, like other civic groups defending the rule of law, acts legally, basing itself on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and operating within the limits of international covenants and agreements ratified by the U S S R."

The appeal for illegality is a calculated attempt to pervert the very essence of the movement to defend the rule of law. R. Medvedev reproaches Ginzburg with 'strange carelessness', with an almost deliberate provocation of repressive measures against himself and his immediate circle, and with conceit. Medvedev accompanies his reproaches of carelessness with an appeal for strict conspiracy, for 'living underground', etc. On this point the Moscow Helsinki Group's Document No. 65 states:

"Defend the Rule of Law in the U S S R" — includes "The VMIO Memoranda' and R. Medvedev's 'Open Letter' in the context of the general campaign being conducted by the authorities to discredit the movement and its leaders, who are perceived as dangerous and dangerous inventors of conversations, 'models of a new Russian'."
movement. The authors write about a multitude of newspaper and magazine articles and false rumours disseminated through official propaganda, including judges (see Chronicle 50 and I. Zholkovskaya's letter in the section 'In the Prisons and Camps').

In October 1978 Vladimir Borisov and three of his friends from Leningrad — Lev Volokhonsky, Nikoloi Nikitin and Albina Yakoreva — staged a 'play' with the aim, as they wrote afterwards, of 'clarifying for ourselves which moral and ethical norms ... to live by in everyday life'. Choosing a few dissenters of differing outlooks, they made phone calls to them and, telling them some story on behalf of other (sometimes invented) characters, wheedled from them a few pairs of underpants and bottles of vodka. Their experiment having demonstrated, according to them, the low moral level of the people tested, Borisov and his comrades described it in the form of a play — 'The Knickererdes (Kostomardals) (Gangsters and Philanthropists')

One of the involuntary personages in the play, Yury Grimm, wrote in reply the article 'After the Première (Instead of a Review)', which ended thus:

To our way of thinking, this whole Borisov lark is very like a denunciation to the Cheka (an earlier name for the KGB). And if these gangsters from the Democratic Movement are unable to find an application for their talents in the necessary channels in future, the threat to the democratic movement from within will become fairly real.

We've had enough Yakirs, Petrov-Agatovs, Gamsakhurdias, V M I O Memoranda and 'Knickeraedes'.

The Free Inter-Trade Association of Working People

After the Free Trades Union (Chronicle 48) was effectively destroyed (Chronicles 48, 49), an attempt was launched to organize a new association along similar lines.

On 28 October, at a press conference held in Mark Morozov's flat (see 'Arrests, Searches, Interrogations'), the formation of a 'Free Inter-Trade Association of Working People' (F I A W P) was announced. V. Borisov, L. Volokhonsky, N. Nikitin, A. Yakoreva, L. Agapova, A. Ivanchenko (Chronicle 43), E. Nikolayev (Chronicles 48, 49), V. Novodvorskaya and V. Skvirsy (Chronicle 43) made up its 'Council of Representatives'.

On 1 November Mark Morozov was arrested.

On 2 November V. Borisov, L. Volokhonsky and N. Nikitin were deported to Leningrad.

On 13 November V. Skvirsy was arrested and charged with the theft of library books.

On 24 November V. Novodvorskaya was compulsorily hospitalized (see 'In the Psychiatric Hospitals'). A. Ivanchenko was warned by the KGB (first through his father, then in person) that he would be arrested if he did not cease his 'activities'.

The authorities are trying to keep Soviet eyes away from the pollution of contact with the six-pointed star (the form of a Mogen David or 'Star of David' — a Judaic holy sign). For example, in S. A. Klepikov's book Russian Watermarks of the XVIII — Early XX Century (Moscow, Nauka, 1978) they blanked out the six-pointed star on the Goncharov family's coat of arms (and the department's employees were told to keep quiet about it); and on the gates of the Zhukovsky Air Force Academy Club a six-pointed star has been removed from the lattice-work.

In several libraries issue 17 of The Gazetteer of the USSR Supreme Soviet for 1976, in which the International Covenants on Human Rights are published, is not being issued. For example, in the State Historical Public Library a reader was told that it had been 'put into the special archive'.

The Lithuanian Glavlit (Main Administration for Barring State Secrets from the Press, attached to the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian SSR) issued an order on 10 May to remove the books of Tomas Venclova from the library and trade network. (These are three books published in 1962, 1965 and 1972. T. Venclova, a member of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, left the USSR in January 1977 — (Chronicles 44, 45).)

On 3 August the Ukrainian Glavlit issued an analogous order about the books of Mykola [Nikolai] Rudenko.

In 1978 Progress Publishers put out a book by Thomas Rezac, Solzhenitsyn's 'Spiral of Treachery' (an authorized translation from Czech). References are made in the book to the 'revelatory' utterances about Solzhenitsyn of K. Simonyan, a school comrade of Solzhenitsyn who died in 1977, and L. Kopelev. Kopelev has published a denial under the title 'Forgery'.
Novosibirsk. Yu. I. Kulakov, an Assistant Professor in the Physics Faculty of Novosibirsk University, is well-known as a connoisseur and 'popularizer' of painting. He is often invited to give art lectures. In the past ten or twelve years he has given lectures in many Soviet towns.

At the beginning of 1978 a certain 'Petya' attended several of Kulakov's art lectures and made his acquaintance. One day he went up to him at the university after a physics lecture and suggested a talk. He introduced himself to Kulakov as a KGB official and introduced him to 'Vasily Ivanovich, a KGB Colonel from Moscow'.

They told Kulakov that a pile of information — letters from people who had listened to Kulakov's art lectures — had built up, showing that the content of the lectures was ideologically harmful, for example, his lectures on Salvador Dali, Marc Chagall and Picasso.

The Colonel invited Kulakov to write an explanation. The next day Kulakov delivered the explanation, but the KGB men did not look at it and began to question Kulakov about his circulation of samizdat and other 'anti-Soviet literature'. They referred to literature shown them by acquaintances of Kulakov who had received or seen it at his home. They showed Kulakov several statements.

Kulakov did not want to embark on detailed explanations, especially about circumstances which affected other people; he was then invited to write yet another explanation — this time about the 'circulation' of literature, even just about himself. At a third meeting Yu. A. Kulakov announced that he would not write an explanation. In reply, Vasily Ivanovitch and Petya began threatening Kulakov with various reprisals — sacking from the university (Kulakov has been teaching there for over 15 years), expelling his daughter from the Stroganov College (in Moscow), and also the instituting of criminal proceedings.

In the autumn of 1978 Petya approached Kulakov several times and reminded him that 'the conversation was not finished'.

In November 1978 Kulakov was summoned to the KGB and informed that in view of his age (he is 55 or 56) and other circumstances, they would close his 'case' but advised him to be sensible, and especially to refrain from doubtful utterances in his lectures on art.

In 1968 Yu. I. Kulakov signed the letter from 46 Novosibirsk academics (Chronicle 1) about the trial of Ginzburg and Galanskov, and was, for this, subjected to an informal investigation.

Moscow. On 13 April, at the Steklov Mathematical Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, a philosophy seminar was held. The seminar was devoted to a 'creative exchange' with the writer I. Shvetsov (author of the scandalously famous novels *Aphis, In the Name of Father and Son and Love and Hate*) and the poet F. Chuyev.
Letters and Statements

115 signatures: 'To the International Committee of the Red Cross; To the League of Red Cross Societies'

For a number of years the International Red Cross has not responded in any way to reports about bad conditions in places of imprisonment, and to the abuse of psychiatry in the U.S.S.R.

We call on you to initiate the setting up of a system of international inspection of places of imprisonment and prison and psychiatric hospitals in all the countries belonging to the League.

We call on you to bring about the immediate release of those who have embodied the principles of your organization in their humanitarian activities.

A. Sakharov: 'To King Carl-Gustav XVI of Sweden' (5 June 1978)

During his official visit to the U.S.S.R the King of Sweden received a letter from Sakharov, asking His Majesty to speak out in defence of his colleague S. Kovalyov (while in Moscow Carl-Gustav took part in a biochemistry symposium). The King said that his position did not allow him to involve himself in politics and passed Sakharov's letter on to his Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mrs Seder, who gave the letter her consideration.

Moscow. On 13 July Shkalikov, Secretary of the Admissions Commission of the Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty of Moscow University, took Valery Senderov (Chronicles 45, 47), a mathematics teacher from School No. 2 (Chronicle 27) to the police station, accusing him of helping school-leavers to write appeals (See 'Samizdat News'). Senderov wrote an 'explanation':

In particular he lost his temper when I advised one of the pupils, who was writing an appeal, how, in my opinion, to do it in a literate and tactful way...

After this he was allowed to leave.

Moscow. On the notice-board of the All-Union Vitamin Research Institute of the Ministry for the Medical Industry hung an invitation to Komsomol members to take part in a quiz:

Our Socialist Commonwealth

I. What has socialism given man in 60 years?
2. Why is there only one party in the U.S.S.R? Is socialism compatible with a multi-party system?
3. Can socialist planning take the place of competition?
4. Can Soviet citizens set up their own public organizations and publish periodicals?
5. Why can art not be divorced from politics? What is Socialist Realism?
6. Does planning in science not hinder its free development? Its unfettered exploration?
7. Why was it necessary to adopt a new Constitution and how does it differ from the old one?
8. Does any kind of limitation on rights and freedoms exist in the U.S.S.R?
9. How is environmental conservation organized in the U.S.S.R?
10. How is price stability on basic consumer goods guaranteed in the U.S.S.R?
11. What is the relationship between the state and trades unions in the U.S.S.R? Are there any laws in the Soviet Union limiting trades union rights?

The winner will receive the preferential right to a holiday in one of the socialist countries in 1979 (allocated through the Komsomol District Committee).

I. Kovalyov: 'To Scientists of the World; To the Participants in the 14th International Genetics Congress' (27 June 1978)

S. Kovalyov was convicted of what the court termed 'anti-Soviet propaganda', which in actual fact meant his actions in defence of human rights and the circulation of the truth regarding these rights.

I hope that you... will express your opinion regarding the imprisonment of your colleague, for whom active non-participation in deceit is a fundamental principle governing all his actions, in the field of science as in all other fields.

I. Kovalyov, A. Orlov: 'To the Nobel Peace Prize and Nobel Chemistry Prize Laureate L. Pauling' (25 September 1978)

The sons of the imprisoned scientists S. Kovalyov and Yu. Orlov describe their fathers' situation in camps to Professor Pauling.

We turn to you in the hope that you will publicly express your opinion on the practice of persecuting people for freedom of thought and conscience, and in particular on the imprisonment of our fathers.

We would be extremely grateful to you for showing any interest in their fate.

Committee, Chairman of the KGB Andropov and Chairman of the
Presidium of the U.S.S.R Supreme Soviet, Brezhnev.

The authors say that while under investigation in Lefortovo Prison,
Yu. Orlov wrote three scientific papers. The prison head, however,
not only refused to send the papers to scientific journals, but would
not even give them to Orlov’s wife.

It can be said that among political prisoners in our country a sad
but noble tradition has developed: not to stop creative work even
in the most unconducive circumstances.

In this connection the authors mention N. I. Kibalchich, N. A.
Morozov, N. G. Chernyshhevsky and D. I. Pissarev (anti-tsarist figures).
They urge Andropov and Brezhnev to ‘press’ the prison head to
‘correct his mistake’.

We sincerely hope that you will help to put right this obviously
improper state of affairs and that on this occasion our native science
will not suffer.

A. Sakharov: ‘To the World Council of Churches; To Pope John
Paul II’ (27 November 1978)

In connection with the forthcoming trial of the head of the All-
Union Adventist Church, V. Shelkov (Chronicle 49), the author writes:
Shelkov has been arrested in reprisal for his purely religious activi-
ties and his long-standing, uncompromising fight for freedom of
conscience and belief.

Sakharov asks for help to prevent tyranny being used against the 83-
year-old Shelkov.

I. Zieja, N. Gorbach (August 1978)

The authors write of the persecution of Ivan Kandyba (Chronicles
47, 49) a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, and of the threat
of arrest hanging over him.

G. Davydov: ‘I am against terror’ (August 1978)

On 5 September 1977, from cell No. 4-32 in Vladimir Prison, I sent,
as usual, the following statement: ‘Today, 5 September, I dedicate
the traditional hunger-strike to the memory of the victims of the
Red Terror’.

But on this occasion I considered it essential to add the following
to the traditional text: ‘Through my 5 September hunger-strike I
emphasize my fundamental disagreement with terror as a way of
dealing with social problems’...

M. Novikov, B. Chernobylsky: ‘Letter to E. S. Orlovsky’ (10 May
1978)

The authors write in answer to Orlovsky’s article ‘On the Question
of the Freedom to Emigrate from the U.S.S.R.’ (Chronicle 49). They
consider that Orlovsky’s attitude to ‘refusals for security reasons’ lends
justification to the tyranny of the authorities.

And that which you scornfully call a ‘hue and cry’ is an obstinate
fight for human rights and is aimed at eliminating violations of these
rights which are at present widespread and regular, and at intro-
ducing precise legal norms based on the Covenant [on Civil and
Political Rights]...

E. Orlovsky: ‘Once again on the Question of the Freedom to Emigrate
from the U.S.S.R. (Open Letter to B. M. Chernobylsky and M. Z.
Novikov)’ (14 August 1978)

Explaining and clarifying what he has said earlier, Orlovsky writes:
I repeat that I consider the right to emigrate one of the most impor-
tant democratic rights. But I do not agree that it is the most impor-
tant right. In my opinion, the right to free exchange of information,
for example, is more important. And more important still —
although this is not written into the Covenant, it is nevertheless
accepted in many civilized countries and hinted at in the Constitu-
tion — the right to information regarding the activities of our
government organs.

Furthermore, the right to emigrate is important, but its impor-
tance does not apply solely to Jews — and among Jews to those
with access to secret documents. And there is no direct connec-
tion between the degree of freedom to emigrate and the number of
emigrants. It is perfectly feasible that in a situation where people
have unlimited or almost unlimited freedom to emigrate, there are
very few emigrants. It could just as easily be the other way round:
an increased number of emigrants in a situation where freedom to
emigrate is lacking and the authorities decide whether to let people
go or not, or force certain people to leave, in accordance with their
own arbitrary decisions. Your attitude to freedom of emigration
tends to reduce the whole problem to freedom of emigration for
Jews, and among them, primarily for those Jews with access to
secret documents. I cannot agree with you in this, just as I cannot
agree with the quota system.

By ‘hue and cry’ I certainly did not mean the ‘determined fight
against violations of the Covenant, which are at present widespread
and regular’. You are right in saying that the reasons for refusal
described in Zvenia by the head of the U.S.S.R. V I R, which are
widely used by the authorities, are by no means in accordance with
the Covenant. The very fact that an invitation from a close rela-
tive is required contravenes the Covenant. But is this what you are
fighting against? No, you agree with the system of invitation. If
there are no real relatives, fake ones are used. Of course, after this
I consider it important and realistic that each delegation of athletes should accept specific responsibility for the fate of one, two or several prisoners of conscience in the USSR... and that they should ask the Soviet authorities for the release of these particular people as an act of humanity and friendship; this would be an essential condition of the participation of each delegation in the Olympics and a fundamental embodiment of the humanitarian principles of the Olympic Charter.

A. Sakharov: 'Interview with a French journalist' (14 September 1978)

1. Mr. Sakharov, do you regard yourself as a believer?

This is, of course, a deeply personal question, a very personal question, and for me difficult one. I have great respect for people with religious faith, but I cannot describe myself as a believer, at least not in any church sense, and for me this is the sort of problem about which I can say no more.

7. Could the Orthodox Church play as great a role? (as the Catholic Church in Poland — Chronicle).

I don't know. We always know less about our own country than we do about others, for in no other country, certainly, is there such a bad flow of information; from what I know, I don't think that Orthodoxy today plays a large part in the life of the country... The official Orthodox Church is very indifferent to everything apart from its internal church affairs, and even in these internal church affairs it adopts a conformist attitude — under compulsion, but perhaps this is the only part of its position visible to us.

On 1 October the Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights in the USSR sent a letter to the future Pope — the successor to the deceased Pope John Paul I. The Committee asked Cardinals Slipyi and Wyszynski and Archbishop [in fact Cardinal] König to make the contents of the letter known to the Conclave of Cardinals before the election, so that they would know 'what sort of help the Christians of Russia expect from the new Pope'.

In the first part of the letter the authors analyse the 'conformist course of the Moscow Patriarchate, which is similar to the Eastern policies of the Vatican'. Metropolitan Nikodim is taken as an example in this analysis (Pope John Paul I's praise of him, and his call to follow his example had, according to the authors of the letter, deeply offended Orthodox believers). In the 60s, when over 10,000 Orthodox churches were shut, Metropolitan Nikodim, Head of the Moscow Patriarchate's Department of Foreign Church Relations, managed to create the impression among Christians in the West that religious life was prospering in the USSR, and thus to neutralize protests. Another aspect of Metropolitan Nikodim's activity was:

Being himself convinced that it was morally permissible for believers...
to combine the name of Christian with secret work for the KGB, and even that this was useful, he helped those who wavered, with the aid of his high authority among his Christian followers, to surmount the barrier of their Christian conscience.

The unchanging policies of the Russian Orthodox Church, according to the members of the Committee, show the inertia of irrational fear from which the Episcopacy of the Russian Church continues to suffer, while the best part of Soviet society has already freed itself from it.

The ten years' existence of the democratic movement in our country shows that:

- only loud public protests against violations of human rights, including those in the sphere of religion, accompanied by widespread international support, bring genuine results.

In the second part of their letter, the members of the Committee make a number of requests and proposals. They welcome a recent new trend: Pope Paul VI, in his last public statement, condemned the trials of human rights activists which took place in the USSR in the summer of 1978, and Pope John Paul I, during the turmoil of his coronation, asked heads of state to respect freedom of religion.

The members of the Committee express the hope that in the contemporary world, where totalitarian regimes encroach on men's souls to a greater extent than on their bodies, the Papacy will not remain indifferent to the struggle for human rights, and especially the right to believe in God. In particular, they call on the future Pope to direct the attention of Catholic scientists to the victory of Academician Snezhnevsky's school in Soviet psychiatry — according to which belief in God is regarded as a symptom of schizophrenia. The other specific proposal is to call on all Catholic sportmen to use the forthcoming Olympic Games in Moscow to monitor the observance of human rights in the USSR, and in particular to speak out in defence of the prisoners of conscience and members of Helsinki groups V. Romanyuk, V. Petkus, G. and P. Vins, V. Shelijkov and V. Osipov.

On 22 November the Christian Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights in the USSR and the Catholic Committee for the Defence of Believers' Rights (See 'Events in Lithuania') published a joint letter to Pope John Paul II, the heads of autocephalous Orthodox Churches, the Primate of the Anglican Church, Archbishop D. Coggan, the World Council of Churches, the United Christian Committees to Defend Believers' Rights and the President of the USA, J. Carter.

The letter says:

The suppression of human rights in any sphere arouses a feeling of deep protest, but it is especially horrifying when man's spiritual freedom is roared. Christ warned his followers to shun — not those who killed the body, but the killers of souls ... Our times are characterized by widespread awareness of freedom and of the dignity of the human personality. But there is also a contrasting tendency: the formation and development of totalitarian states of a type unknown in previous history. The creation of a new type of person with a unified, atheistic consciousness has become a government task, which is pursued to the accompaniment of a campaign against religion, using the forces of the government apparatuses ... The formal proclamation of the principle of 'freedom of conscience' in the state Constitution in no way guarantees its implementation, either in everyday life or in the legal sphere. So, for example, in our state ... the formal recognition of this principle goes hand in hand with open discrimination against believers both through the enforcement of legislative acts and through actions of the authorities which violate even the few rights granted to believers by law.

The discrimination is so intolerable that believers are sometimes forced — in order to be able to live in accordance with the dictates of their religious conscience — to apply for permission to emigrate. Thus 20,000 Pentecostalists, the letter states, have applied to emigrate from the USSR.

The members of the Committee propose that the UN should adopt a Convention on the fight against discrimination in the sphere of religion', and ask their addressees to initiate such a convention. They consider that during the working out of such an international agreement the laws in force in various countries should be examined.

'Profession of religious belief' should be precisely defined. A person's religious conscience cannot accept the fact that the constitutionally proclaimed 'freedom to profess religious belief' is limited in the legal framework to the freedom to have an inner religious conviction and 'freedom to attend religious services'. In addition it is forbidden to engage in missionary work, religious charity work, to teach religion freely to children, for children and young people to participate in religious services, to prepare, circulate or receive religious literature and much more ... The right to profess in full one's thoughts and one's belief in God, by word and deed, should be proclaimed a norm of man's religious life in contemporary society.

In Information Bulletin No. 9 of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, the aims and principles of the Commission are set out as follows:

The Commission has three main aims:

1. To detect and publicize cases of illegal compulsory confinement
of persons in psychiatric hospitals, and to work for their immediate release.
2. To give help to people who have been groundlessly placed in psychiatric hospitals, and also to their families.
3. To work for the general humanization of conditions for patients in psychiatric hospitals.

The Commission does not claim (and never has) that all those whose release from psychiatric hospitals it seeks are free from all psychological abnormalities and in perfect mental health.

K. Matviyuk: 'To the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR' (May 1978)

Former political prisoner K. I. Matviyuk (Chronicle 42), who since his release has not been allowed to work in his profession (Chronicles 44, 48), asks for protection from the KGB for himself and his family. After describing his conversations with KGB officials he asks:

If all these conversations do not indicate an attempt on the part of the state security organs to persuade me to work for them, then why have I been deprived of the right to work in my profession and left to my own devices? Why, in order to work in my profession, am I obliged to pay with my own moral downfall? ... why am I deprived of the opportunity to work as a teacher or a researcher? ... In what way must I rehabilitate myself and what am I guilty of now? ... What are my children guilty of? ... Neither in the Constitution, nor in the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, can I find grounds for the administrative harassment, or the demands and threats of the KGB, to which I am being subjected.

On the other hand, the KGB is still not the supreme governmental institution and I still hope for protection from it. I turn to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR requesting that I, a citizen of the Ukrainian SSR, and my family, be protected from the harassment of the KGB.

In the event of a refusal, please inform me that the KGB's activities meet with your approval.

R. Dzhemilev: 'To the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; To Nobel Peace Prize Laureate A. D. Sakharov; To Radio Liberty' (15 April 1978)

In his letter R. Dzhemilev gives a detailed account of a meeting at his place of work, which branded him a 'slanderer', and at which it was demanded that he be prevented from leaving the USSR (Chronicle 48), the letter's second and third addressees were those to whom the 'denunciatory' letters, discussed at the meeting, were addressed.

Dzhemilev writes:

"... to leave one's Motherland is not an expression that can be applied to me. Soviet power already deprived me of my Motherland in 1944, and in 1968 ... I and my family were for a second time forcibly evicted from the Crimea. I now demand that — until our national question is settled — I should be granted the right to choose my own place of banishment.

But I am not settling personal accounts here. I only wish to leave this celebrated paradise of all the peoples, this socialist camp. It will not be the first time that I have been robbed — my family and I are willing to leave this paradise for the capitalist hell, leaving behind all our property — that is, if we are convinced that I still owe something to Soviet power.

In connection with the fact that the main speaker at the meeting, Department Head Manasyan, was unusually well informed about broadcasts by foreign radio stations, and letters signed by Dzhemilev, and the latter's friendly relations with P. G. Grigorenko and A. D. Sakharov, R. Dzhemilev remarks:

it is perfectly obvious that he was furnished with this information, in falsified form, by the same institution which has for many years kept me under constant surveillance and through which I have on several occasions been suppressed for my active participation in the national movement of my people.

In conclusion the author writes that on 28 March he was informed that he had been refused an exit visa because he did not have close enough family connections abroad (the invitation had come from his cousin).

Am I obliged to live and to give the fruits of my labour to a regime which is alien to me and which does not even recognize the existence of my people, for the sole reason that I was born in a land which was conquered by Russia and annexed by her as eternally Russian? ... Why am I forced to be a 'white slave' of the Soviet regime at the end of the twentieth century?

In practice there are many well known cases where permission to go abroad has been granted; various measures have been employed to force many Soviet citizens to leave, even though they had no relatives abroad. Evidently these people were considered to be more dangerous in the USSR than abroad. In my case the opposite decision was taken: it was considered that a person with a lot of information about the Crimean Tatar movement is more dangerous abroad than in the USSR, where he can at any moment be swept into prison or into a psychiatric hospital.

But I demand ... permission to leave the USSR.

If I do not receive this permission, I will be forced to renounce
my Soviet citizenship unilaterally.

In a statement dated 28 November 1977 Ivan Kovalyov informed the Procurator-General that five letters written by his father S. Kovalyov had been lost (Chronicle 47). I. Kovalyov's statement was sent to the Procurator of the town of Chusovoi, V. A. Goldyrev.

On 19 January 1978 Goldyrev wrote to I. Kovalyov that 'the facts referred to in your statement have not been confirmed'.

On 7 March I. Kovalyov asked Goldyrev to explain exactly which of the facts he had described had not been confirmed:

1. The confiscation of a rough draft of S. Kovalyov's statement to the Procurator-General (Chronicle 47);
2. The 'loss' of five of S. Kovalyov's letters (Chronicle 47);
3. The refusal to allow the receipt numbers of these five letters to be mentioned during a visit;
4. The confiscation of two letters from L. Boitsova.

On 11 April Goldyrev informed I. Kovalyov that 'all the letters were legally confiscated; the administration of Institution VS-389/36 did not violate the law'.

On 30 April I. Kovalyov wrote to Goldyrev saying that he wished to know the legal grounds for confiscating a prisoner's draft statement to the Procurator-General, for concealing from S. Kovalyov's family the postal receipt numbers of the 'lost' letters, for confiscating two letters from L. Boitsova, for concealing from L. Boitsova the fact that her letters had been confiscated and why, and for the camp administration's keeping of Boitsova's letters; he also wished to know the whereabouts of the five 'lost' letters.

In June 1978 Mart Niklus wrote to the USSR Procuracy and the Lithuanian Procuracy requesting the return of the things confiscated from him during a search in connection with the Petkus case in November 1977 (Chronicle 47). On 31 July a senior assistant to the Lithuanian Procurator, Ju. Bakucionis (Chronicle 50) replied:

... in accordance with the court verdict of 13 July 1978 in the case of V. A. Petkus, the things confiscated from you are to be sent to the K G B of the Estonian S S R; the materials connected with your activities which were included in the Petkus case will be sent there in the near future.

Therefore the question of the fate of these possessions can only be decided by the Estonian K G B.

V. Kuvakin: 'To the Ninth Session of the U S S R Supreme Soviet' (July 1978)

Letters and Statements

On 20 October 1977 legal labour inspector of the Central Committee of the Trades Unions of Oil and Gas Industry Workers V. Kuvakin was dismissed (Chronicle 48). Considering his dismissal illegal, on 13 December 1977 Kuvakin sent a complaint to the Eighth Session of the U S S R Supreme Soviet. The complaint was passed on to a secretary of the All-Union Central Trade Union Council, I. M. Vladychenko. Not receiving any reply from Vladychenko, Kuvakin complained to the next session of the Supreme Soviet.

On 11 July 1978 he received a post-card from the Secretariat of the Presidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet stating: 'Your letter addressed to the 10 July 1978 Session of the U S S R Supreme Soviet has been sent to the All-Union Central Trade Union Council for the attention of Secretary comrade I. M. Vladychenko'.

I. Ovchinnikov: 'To the Ideological Department of the C P S U Central Committee. An Open Letter' (15 November 1978)

On 9 November this year (1978) I was invited to K G B headquarters in Aleksandrov for a talk with a representative of the Vladimir Regional K G B in connection with my manuscript, confiscated from the typist while she was typing it, on 3 October this year.

The confiscated manuscript is the first part of my autobiographical novel, in which I express my personal view of numerous events in the recent history of our country, discusses matters about which other people usually decide to remain silent, and give an independent analysis of past and present.

I have had rather an unusual life. I was only just four years old when (1933) state security arrested my father, a simple peasant and honest worker. At the age of six I was imprisoned with my mother in a concentration camp in Vladivostok, where I saw vast numbers of prisoners deported from Russian towns and villages to the Kolyma tundra where my father was serving his sentence and where slave labour, hunger, scurvy and death awaited them. When I was seven, my mother too was taken from me; she died, aged 43, from overwork, suffering and deprivation. I had only just started school and begun to learn the rudiments of grammar, when my first schoolteacher was arrested and disappeared without trace (1937). In addition there was the terrible hunger of the war years, homelessness, an orphanage. From the age of not quite 15 onwards — an army barracks, then study in a military institute of higher education, service in the German Democratic Republic, departure to the West, return, prison, camp. The vicissitudes of life led me to reject standards of thought that did not correspond to reality and were false, and to work out my own independent world view. All this is naturally reflected in the manuscript of my book.

During my interview with them, I was told by K G B officials that
my manuscript contained material of an anti-Soviet nature and that my actions came under article 70, part 2 of the Russian Criminal Code... It was also proposed that I repent, acknowledge my guilt and deposit the rest of my work with the KGB.

My autobiographical novel On Russia's Crossroads is the story of my life, in which the history of my country is also partly revealed...

The head of the Vladimir KGB told me that he would inform 'higher authorities' about my manuscript and that my fate would depend on what they decided.

I hope that the Ideological Department of the CPSU Central Committee, taking into consideration what I have written above, will intervene in the activities of the KGB in this matter and help me to get my manuscript back and put a stop to the harassment and threats.

A. Khlagtian: 'To Head of the Investigations Department of the KGB attached to the Council of Ministers of the Armenian SSR. An Explanatory Note' (12 May 1978)

On 22 December 1977, during a search carried out in my home and in my wife's flat, a number of rough drafts and notes for my statements and appeals were confiscated, in particular those relating to letters I had already sent to party and government departments concerning the question of my leaving the USSR to take up permanent residence abroad.

In answering the investigators' questions, I gave a detailed explanation of the contents of these papers and the reasons for their presence in my home. Nevertheless, I consider it necessary to make the following additional statement:

In the period between April 1974 and December 1977 I composed and sent by post or personally delivered several dozen statements and appeals (amounting to hundreds of pages) to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, all comprising one insistent request — permission to leave the USSR...

In February of this year, at the Armenian KGB headquarters, I gave a written undertaking that henceforth in my official correspondence with the Soviet authorities on the question with which I am concerned, I would not digress on to matters having no direct relevance to my theme, and not include criticisms which might be termed slanderous under Soviet law.

You are well aware that I have strictly adhered to this undertaking and henceforth I pledge myself to keep an even tighter reign on my pen.

I would like to assure you that I am not anti-Soviet, nor a slan-derer,—not even an oppositionist (since I have not and will not take part in oppositionist political activity). I have simply been too late to be a defender of the rule of law. My career was cut short at its very beginning.

If it is possible to give a political description of oneself, I would describe myself as a law-abiding citizen with a critical bent, dreaming of a democratic revival in his country. My desire to leave the USSR I consider a forced civic desertion and I justify it by my grave doubt as to the possibility of the establishment in the USSR of a multiparty democratic system in the foreseeable future.

I request and hope that, in assessing my rough notes according to their contents, you will take into consideration the explanations given above.

I also ask you to add the present explanatory note to the evidence which I give to the investigation as a witness in the case of Robert Nazaryan.

V. Franchuk: 'To L. Leroy, author of the article "Who Finds this Convenient?" (Ogonyok Nos. 33-5, 1978)' (25 November 1978)

Leroy's article (Chronicle 50) was devoted to the arrest of some Swedish Pentecostalists and to the Soviet Pentecostalists whose homes were searched in connection with this arrest (Chronicles 46-9). Vladimir Franchuk, a resident of Zhdanov, begins his letter thus:

Comrade Leroy!

I am a poet and a preacher of the evangelical (Pentecostalist) faith.

In answering the investigators' questions, I gave a detailed explanation of the contents of these papers and the reasons for their presence in my home. Nevertheless, I consider it necessary to make the following additional statement:

In February of this year, at the Armenian KGB headquarters, I gave a written undertaking that henceforth in my official correspondence with the Soviet authorities on the question with which I am concerned, I would not digress on to matters having no direct relevance to my theme, and not include criticisms which might be termed slanderous under Soviet law.

You are well aware that I have strictly adhered to this undertaking and henceforth I pledge myself to keep an even tighter reign on my pen.

I would like to assure you that I am not anti-Soviet, nor a slan-derer,—not even an oppositionist (since I have not and will not take part in oppositionist political activity). I have simply been too late to be a defender of the rule of law. My career was cut short at its very beginning.

If it is possible to give a political description of oneself, I would describe myself as a law-abiding citizen with a critical bent, dreaming of a democratic revival in his country. My desire to leave the USSR I consider a forced civic desertion and I justify it by my grave doubt as to the possibility of the establishment in the USSR of a multiparty democratic system in the foreseeable future.

I request and hope that, in assessing my rough notes according to their contents, you will take into consideration the explanations given above.

I also ask you to add the present explanatory note to the evidence which I give to the investigation as a witness in the case of Robert Nazaryan.

V. Franchuk: 'To L. Leroy, author of the article "Who Finds this Convenient?" (Ogonyok Nos. 33-5, 1978)' (25 November 1978)

Leroy's article (Chronicle 50) was devoted to the arrest of some Swedish Pentecostalists and to the Soviet Pentecostalists whose homes were searched in connection with this arrest (Chronicles 46-9). Vladimir Franchuk, a resident of Zhdanov, begins his letter thus:

Comrade Leroy!

I am a poet and a preacher of the evangelical (Pentecostalist) faith.

I read your article 'Who Finds this Convenient?' in the journal Ogonyok. Your open and brazen lies stirred me to the depths of my soul...

A. Zgurovsky: 'To citizen B. M. Shain' (28 July 1978)

A. N. Zgurovsky, Deputy Head of the Saratov Regional Industrial and Technical Communications Administration, writes in his reply to a complaint from B. M. Shain, Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, that his letter to the USA had been returned to him by the international post-office:

...citizens of the USSR may send abroad manuscripts, printed matter, drafts and other scholarly material only through the appropriate institutions competent to deal with these and other matters, and must submit them together with form F103'M'.

Shain's letter contained the manuscript (typescript) of an article on mathematics. In his complaint of 4 September Shain writes that he had received this manuscript from the USA and was sending it back.

47 signatures: 'Appeal' (July 1978)

This summer will remain a black page in Russia's memory — the
summer of political trials in Moscow, Tbilisi, Kaluga, Vilnius, the Ukraine. Disregarding world public opinion, the authorities demonstrated their determination to eradicate freedom of thought and all that goes by the name of the struggle for human rights. The main target of the trials were the Helsinki Groups, which had collected incontrovertible evidence that the humanitarian obligations undertaken by our state were not being fulfilled and that the authorities did not intend to fulfill them.

We call on the world public not to weaken in the struggle which has developed around these trials; and to insist that the trials be subjected to review in conditions of full publicity and on the basis of the international agreements on human rights. This is not only a question of the fate of individuals. It is a question of opposing the spiritual sterilization of the whole of our society.

On the Trial of Yu. Orlov (Chronicle 50)

S. Polikanov (14 May 1978)

On the eve of the trial of Yu. Orlov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences S. Polikanov appealed to scientific and cultural figures in various countries, calling on them to ‘speak out decisively and immediately in defence of Yury Orlov and Alexander Ginzburg’.

N. Fyodorova (17 May 1978)

On the day following Dr Emelyanova’s testimony at the trial of Yu. Orlov, the wife of Yury Fyodorov, the ‘aeroplane man’ imprisoned in Mordovian Camp No. 1, made a statement contradicting Emelyanova’s evidence:

My husband, Yury Pavlovich Fyodorov, has spent eight years in a special-regime camp in Mordovia. He has been constantly ill throughout these eight years. Dr Emelyanova has been the camp doctor for about a year. During this time she has personally sent Fyodorov to hospital five times. At the moment he is in hospital for the sixth time on her orders. The following illnesses are listed on his medical card: chronic nephritis, gastritis, rheumatism of the knee, chronic conjunctivitis. He is 185 cm tall and weighs 57 kg. So Dr Emelyanova gave perjured evidence in court that Fyodorov is perfectly healthy!

Evidently Dr Emelyanova gave similarly ‘truthful’ evidence with regard to other prisoners too.

M. Landa: ‘Addition to the Record’

Member of the Moscow Helsinki Group M. Landa, using the extensive factual material available to her, states that the three camp doctors and two prisoners who appeared at the trial of Yu. Orlov were false witnesses. Landa also exposes the testimony of doctors from the Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital concerning L. Plyushch. She recalls L. Plyushch’s wife’s descriptions of the humiliating visiting conditions and of the horror which Plyushch experienced on seeing his ‘doctor’ Lyubarskaya (at the trial, Lyubarskaya testified that she and Plyushch had a good relationship).

Yu. Belov: ‘To Judge Valentina Lubentsova’ (18 May 1978)

On the day the trial of Yu. Orlov ended, Yuri Belov (Chronicle 48) sent a letter to Judge Lubentsova:

The first problem is: how do I address you? ‘Comrade’? An executioner and a victim cannot be comrades. ‘Citizeness’? Citizens respect the laws of their country, they have an inherent sense of responsibility. You do not carry this burden ... So let me say:

Madam Judge!

Today you took upon yourself personally the blame for a cynical act of tyranny. Today you destroyed the faith of thousands and thousands of Soviet citizens in Soviet law.

Even Adolf Hitler did not attack the principle of free speech in court. G. Dimitrov was an enemy of fascism, but he was not gagged in court, he was not denied defence witnesses. The court set out to prove his guilt and the court PROVED that he was innocent.

Tell your friends in the KGB that they have only succeeded in undermining the faith of the whole of the civilized world in the sincerity of the talk about peace and détente ... The real face of your system was shown up at the trial in Lyublino.

And now I cannot offer you anything but pity. I pray to God for you, that you may repent and recognize your shame.

G. Vladimirov (19 May 1978)

Yury Orlov has doubly fulfilled his heroic mission — as an irrepressible exposé of social lies and as the victim of a trial which only through excessive politeness could be called a legal proceeding. This very comedy of a trial, a sinister comedy, is yet another exposure — it has shown the world that those who lead and govern us have completely freed themselves from the inferiority complex inherent in any government which is conscientious and responsible before its people. Not so long ago they at least felt themselves partly to blame for sufferings whose like had not occurred in the history of any other nation; now they feel this no longer.

We can be in no doubt that Ginzburg and Shcharansky will be tried in the same merciless way and that we can expect new arrests and trials — as well as new, triumphal, humane promises, so beautiful on paper that it won’t even be necessary to carry them
out. The face of these lovers of law is taking on an ever clearer outline in the eyes of the world; they dare to employ the sternest measures in order to silence our awakening consciousness. But do they themselves understand that they have never been further from their goal, and so close to defeat, as they are today, the second morning after their glowing 'victory'?

V. Kuvakin (21 May 1978)

... For four days a trial took place in Moscow; it was unprecedented not only on account of its content, but also because of the way in which it was conducted. There was probably no judicial principle, no judicial guarantee of the right to defend oneself from groundless charges, that was not violated by the kangaroo court which tried Yury Orlov.

J. Macdonald: 'Appeal' (23 May 1978)

The British lawyer J. Macdonald, with the full authority of Yu. Orlov's wife (Chronicle 42), sent an appeal to the Russian Supreme Court. In the appeal it is argued that the verdict in Orlov's case should be revoked, on the grounds that the Moscow City Court did not prove that Orlov acted with direct intent to undermine or weaken Soviet power and that the court continually violated Orlov's right to defend himself: the Judge stopped Orlov from questioning witnesses, interrupted Orlov during his defence speech, allowed those in the courtroom audience to insult him, and did not allow him to read out the documents of the Moscow Helsinki Group with which he was charged. Furthermore, both the pre-trial and the court investigations were unobjective and incomplete: the court rejected all of Orlov's petitions regarding the summoning of additional witnesses, did not call Orlov's co-authors of the Moscow Helsinki Group to give evidence, did not include in the case file the testimony of A. Amadrik, V. Bukovsky, N. Gorbanevskaya and L. Plyushch, sent by Macdonald as early as June 1977, nor the testimony of M. Volkhanskaya and G. Low-Beer.

I. Kovalyov: 'Open letter to A. Kulikov, correspondent of Moscow Pravda' (May 1978)

Ivan Kovalyov ironically demolishes the version of events during and surrounding the trial of Orlov, given in Kulikov's article. For example, he writes:

Who's saying that the doors were locked during an open trial and that a cordon of police let no one through? Aren't you familiar with the Soviet way of life, don't you know yet how one must behave? Take away that cordon and our simple Soviet people will tear that Orlov to pieces, and there will be no need for a trial.

Who says that Orlov's 'documents' are the documents of a whole group and that there are several more groups like it in the country, that they are all monitoring the observance of the Helsinki Agreements? The slanderers have overreached themselves — as we observe, so we will monitor — no groups are necessary. There was no mention of the group during the trial and no word of it in Kulikov's article, so that means there is no group, Orlov himself invented it.

S. Polikanov: 'Some Reflections on Letters from Confused Readers' (14 June 1978)

The author notes that the unity of the workers was manifested even in the textual similarities of the letters published in various newspapers (N. Chernov's letter in Evening Moscow and V. Pavlovsky's letter in Moscow Pravda). After quoting the comments about Orlov made by Academician Tselikov ('This, forgive me, Scientist') and Academician Kolotyrkin ('A so-called scientist ... Once a doctor of sciences, a physicist'), Polikanov writes:

It is difficult now to remember who Kolotyrkin and Tselikov were in the past, but at present one can recommend only one thing to them: From now on, don't make so many rash statements about who was and who has remained a real scientist! Yury Fyodorovich is a well-known physicist, a genuinely learned man. He demonstrated this once again in prison, where he wrote scientific papers in almost total isolation.

S. Polikanov (2 September 1978)

The author exposes as false the testimony of A. V. Lebedev, a Senior Researcher at the Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, who said at Orlov's trial that 'any Soviet physicist can publish freely, travel abroad to conferences and seminars, have free contact with foreign colleagues, whatever his views and beliefs'.

Documents of the Moscow Helsinki Group

Document No. 53 (15 June 1978): 'Supplement to Document No. 50'.
Document No. 55 (26 June 1978): 'To the International Olympic
Committee; To the President of the I O C, Lord M. Killianin’ (see above).

Document No. 56 (15 July 1978): ‘On the verdicts in the cases of A. Ginsburg, A. Shcharansky, V. Petkus’ (Chronicle 50). This document is the first to be signed by a new member of the Moscow Helsinki Group, S. Polikanov.


Document No. 60 (2 September 1978): ‘Discrimination against the Crimean Tatars continues’ (See ‘Persecution of Crimean Tatars’).

Document No. 61 (5 September 1978): ‘On the violation of the rights of prisoners to do creative work’. A ‘List of scholars and creative people who are political prisoners’ (26 people) is attached.

Document No. 62 (9 September 1978): ‘Inhuman conditions of imprisonment. The lives of Kirill Podrabinek and Pyotr Vins are in danger’ (See ‘In the Prisons and Camps’).

Document No. 63 (18 September 1978): ‘Jewish collective-farm workers in the village of Ilinka are forcibly tied to the land and refused permission to emigrate’ (See ‘The Right to Leave’).

Document No. 64 (25 September 1978): ‘Persecution of the True and Free Adventist Church’ (See ‘Persecution of Believers’).

Document No. 65 (15 October 1978): ‘The propaganda campaign to discredit the democratic movement in the U S S R’ (See ‘Dirty Tricks’ in the section ‘Miscellaneous Reports’).


Document No. 68 (30 October 1978): ‘On the position of prisoners with regard to correspondence’ (ibid.).

Samizdat News


The word ‘movement’ in the title of this article is not intended to bring to mind any sort of organization, or association, or, still less, party. It simply means people united by a certain common point of view and method of action...

The socio-political ideology which puts human rights in first place, seems to me in many respects to be the most reasonable, given the limits of the relatively narrow arms which it sets itself.

In counter-balance to the self-assertiveness of most political philosophies, the ideology of human rights is essentially pluralistic in its essence, allowing freedom and the coexistence of various forms of social organization and giving people the maximum freedom of individual choice ... I am also convinced that the universal defence of human rights is an essential foundation for international trust and security ...

Recalling that the Soviet people had lived through a short, stormy period of intoxication with communist maximalism and the bloody nightmare of Stalinist fascism, which has been followed by the present stable phase of party-state totalitarianism, the author writes: With such experience behind us, it is very natural for us to accept an ideology which has as its top priority the defence of specific people and specific laws, using unconditionally non-violent, non-destructive means, an ideology based on laws and international documents signed by governments ...

A most important stage in the development of the human rights movement in the U S S R was the founding of the remarkable samizdat journal A Chronicle of Current Events. In my opinion, this journal more than anything else reflects the spirit of the movement — its impartiality and apoliticalism, its pluralism, its continual effort to be accurate and reliable, its particular interest in specific violations of human rights ...

The human rights movement in the U S S R and Eastern Europe on principle makes civil and political rights its first priority ... The author discusses a number of specific violations of human rights and the standard of living in the U S S R. Later he writes: The most insidious and difficult-to-avert danger threatening the free and progressive development of mankind is the spread of totalitarianism. It is this very danger that the struggle for human rights uncompromisingly opposes ... the threat of the spread of totalitarianism has its epicentre in the U S S R.

At present, the small handful of dissenters with whom I am personally acquainted are going through a difficult period. Many fine, noble people have been arrested. A campaign of slander and provocation is gathering strength, stemming partly from deliberate action by the K G B and partly taking advantage of and reflecting the lack of unity, the ferment and disillusionment among many dissidents and groups closely associated with them. Life is complex. And in such conditions personal insults and ambitions spur people on to do and say quite dubious things. Evidently, the number of active participants in the movement, both in Moscow and in the provinces, has...
noticeably declined. Nevertheless, I still do not consider that there are any grounds for talking about the defeat of the human rights movement. This is a question where arithmetic has very little bearing on the facts. Over the past few years the struggle for human rights in the USSR and Eastern Europe has radically altered the moral and political climate throughout the world. Not only has the world received extremely rich information, it has believed it. And this is a fact that repression and provocations on the part of the KGB no longer have any power to change. This is a historical victory for the human rights movement. Now, as before, the movement's only weapon is publicity, free, accurate and objective information. It is also perfectly obvious that, while conditions have not changed and the aims of the struggle for human rights have not been achieved, new people, through force of circumstances and their own spiritual needs, will pour into the places of those who have departed. Repressions by the authorities cannot prevent this either. On the contrary, the curtailment of repressions would be an important factor in improving the situation from the authorities' point of view.

The article examines the problem of interdependence in the talks on strategic arms limitation and in the struggle for human rights, the question of boycott (in particular, a boycott of the Moscow Olympics) and the question of the exchange of political prisoners.

The author concludes:

The ideology of the defence of human rights is evidently the only one which is compatible with such wide-ranging ideologies as the communist, the social-democratic, the religious, the technocratic, and that of the national 'native-roots'. It can also provide a basis for those people who do not want to involve themselves in theoretical details and dogma, who are tired of the abundance of ideologies which do not bring people simple human happiness.


The author indicates 'more effective ways of action for the human rights movements in our country': Claiming that today's movement for democracy and the rule of law is more a way of thinking, a world view, the civic attitude of individual, dissociated hundreds and thousands of citizens in our country... the author proposes that the democratic movement should become organized and indicates the forms and principles of such an organization. The author enumerates 'three levels of participation in the movement for democracy and the rule of law', differing in the 'degree of avowed readiness to undergo persecution'. He proposes more precise terminology: 'the movement for the rule of law', the more general

'democratic movement', encompassing a 'movement to change the existing political and social system', and 'the opposition movement'.

The author also gives specific advice. For example: staging a demonstration in Red Square or Pushkin Square is much less effective than staging it, for example, near the Manezh.

I. Shafarevich: 'Interview with a Correspondent of the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung' (May 1978, 8 pages)

1. How would you assess the present position of dissidents in the Soviet Union? What trends can you discern among them? Do you think that the growth of the dissident movement is connected with political detente?

The word 'dissident' has a very vague meaning and must be explained... It seems to me that in our country people are above all divided into two types. People of the first type are those who feel that their fate is inextricably linked to that of their country, who feel themselves personally responsible for its future. People of the second type are all the others. I do not mean that people of the first type are the dissidents... 'Dissidents', in the Western sense of the word, are simply those whose circumstances in life have brought them into open conflict with the apparatus of power. It seems to me, however, that the most important thing is not the most obvious one of being in conflict with the authorities, but the REASON behind this conflict: not the outward deed, but its inner motive. For example, if a person joins a 'committee' or 'commission' in order to pressurize the authorities into giving him permission to emigrate... it would be unreasonable to place him in this social category. I do not in any way wish to criticize such actions, only to point out that here we have two fundamentally different phenomena which it would be unreasonable to classify together.

Among the dissidents one can point to two trends, whose most obvious divergence is on the question of their principal aims. The adherents of one trend base their arguments on the premise that all societies develop along approximately the same lines and that the West has overtaken Russia and the Soviet Union on this single path: therefore, the healthy course is development on the Western model... A similar point of view existed before the Revolution and its adherents were called 'Westernizers'. Adherents of the other trend takes as their premise the belief that each nation is individual and that this very individuality should define its path in life. They therefore consider that the direction of our country's development should be organically defined by its past history. For most adherents of this trend, Dostoyevsky's views on Russian history have a fundamental part to play. Dostoyevsky destroyed himself as a 'native-roots man'. It seems to me that this
term aptly describes this trend.

Political detention has not caused the dissident movement to grow ... but it is interesting that it has not diminished it either.

2. How would you define your ideological position?

I share the views of those whom I described above as 'native-roots people'. In particular, I consider that the beginning of our national history ... is inextricably linked with the acceptance of Orthodoxy. It seems to me extremely improbable that any people can reject something which has been the source of its spiritual nourishment for a thousand years — and remain a spiritually-alive organism. Therefore I am convinced that if the life of our country is not yet over, its continuation is only possible along the path of Orthodoxy and the development of Russian national tradition.

4. What alternative social and political system would you like to see?

What we need is a maximum spiritual change accompanied by a minimum outward change ... What is needed is a return to God and to our people, a feeling of national purpose and of responsibility to the history and the future of our country.

6. What do you think will be the government's future attitude towards dissidents?

I am an optimist and I am convinced that one day the only reasonable point of view will prevail: that it is necessary to contest published facts and proclaimed opinions — not with camps and exile.

The phenomenon which Podrabinek is fighting (the treatment of 'dissent' by psychiatric hospitals — Chronicle) is not due soleley to misuse of power or the imperfection of the law. It is the entirely logical outcome of a deeply rooted, consistently materialistic attitude to human nature ...


The second issue has the sub-title 'Political Trials the Criminal Way. The Oprichniki in God's houses'. It is concerned with searches carried out in the homes of Seventh Day Adventists in the spring of 1978 (Chronicle 49).

One cannot look at these photographs without shuddering. A jumble of household articles, kitchen utensils, clothes, children's toys, torn newspapers. This is just what is described by the short, comprehensive word pogrom.

[*Ivan the Terrible's secret police, staffed by 'oprichniki'.]
Deputy Director of the Steklov Institute E. F. Mishchenko, the editor of the Journal Mathematical Notes, S. V. Stechkin, and Professors of Moscow University B. I. Il'in, P. L. Uyanov, A. A. Gonchar, E. M. Nikishin, V. A. Il'in and A. A. Karatsuba.

The authors give the following figures: in 1971 46% of the articles printed in Mathematical Collection were written by Jews; in 1975 the figure was only 12.5%; in 1976 — 8%; in 1977 — 5%; of 346 articles in the first volume of the Mathematical Encyclopedia only 10 are by authors with 'doubtful' names.

G. A. Freiman: 'It Turns Out that I am a Jew' (1978, 75 pages)

An essay on the same theme. The author is a Professor at Kalinin University and a Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences. He describes in forceful terms the methods of failing Jews wishing to enter Moscow State University or defending their dissertations.

Besides the people named above, this policy is pursued by: the Dean of the Mechanical and Mathematics Faculty at Moscow University, Corresponding Member of the U.S.S.R Academy of Sciences A. I. Kostrikin, Professor S. I. Adyan, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences A. N. Andrianov, Corresponding Member of the U.S.S.R Academy of Sciences A. I. Shishov and Corresponding Member of the U.S.S.R Academy of Sciences Yu. L. Ershov.

N. N. Meiman: 'Discrimination Against Jews Over Entering University' (1978, 3 pages)

The author is a Professor and a Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, and a member of the Moscow Helsinki Group.

He mentions the following fact: this year, 21 graduates of a certain Moscow mathematics school applied to the Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics at Moscow University; 14 of them were Russian, seven were Jews. All 14 Russians were accepted, but only one of the Jews (he had obtained first prize at the International Mathematics Olympiad and had won first prize in the All-Union Olympiad for three years in succession). Of the six rejected Jews, one had won first prize four years running in the Moscow Olympiad, another had won this prize twice.

The number of Jews accepted by the Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty this year is substantially lower than the average percentage in Tass times.

Selected Questions from the Oral Examination in Mathematics (Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty, Moscow State University, 1978)

The compiler selected 13 questions given to those especially talented high school leavers whom it was necessary to 'fail'. One of them is a complex variation of the most difficult (according to the jury) question at the 8th International Olympiad; two were posed in the final round of the Moscow Olympiad; one, in very slightly modified form, was posed at the All-Russian Olympiad in 1976 and at the U.S. Olympiad; one is (according to the jury) the most difficult question in the final round of the All-Union Student Olympiad in 1976; one is a more refined version of one of the questions in the final round of the All-Union Student Olympiad in 1977; one was posed at the same Olympiad; one is featured in the book Collected Questions and Theorems of Planimetrics by D. O. Shklyarsky, N. N. Chentsov and I. M. Yaglom (Moscow, 'Science', 1967) as a 'starred' question, and one is underlined in V. Serpinsky's book 250 Problems in Elementary Number Theory (Moscow, 'Education', 1968).

The names of two examiners are mentioned as having given school graduates questions from this list — Instructor in Mathematical Logic A. S. Podkolzin and Instructor in Theoretical Mechanics Ya. V. Tatarinov.

Entrance Examinations, Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty '78 (a collection of documents)

'Apeal' documents (with commentary) by five Jews who were refused entry to the Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty of Moscow University are quoted. Four of them were given questions from the above list at their oral examination (the fifth had already been given a '2' in the written exam).

The name of yet another examiner who posed questions from the above list to high school graduates is mentioned — Pereyaslavsky.

Adam Kuznetsov: 'The Poverty of the Peoples (where they have abolished the bourgeoisie)' (1978)

In a work based on material from the Soviet press, the author analyses the problems of the Soviet 'anti-economy', looks at the reasons for ineffective work in all spheres of the national economy and its management, carefully examines the difficulties encountered by people working in fields outside government control ('shabashniks', peasants working on their private plots, etc).

In the fourth and final section of the book, the author examines the state of independent economic thinking in the country and possible alternatives of further development.

Sergei Cheremukhin: 'Because of a Poodle' (2 pages); 'To the July Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee' (2 pages)

Luis Corvalan was not permitted to change his flat, 'despite... respect for his poodle', since it was equipped 'not only with a rubbish chute and a telephone, but also with a modern listening device'. 
The second article is concerned with 'run-down villages' which are dying. Their areas of uncultivated land are growing, since the authorities do not allow people to work them.

V. Nekipelov: 'The Cemetery of the Vanquished' (October 1978, 4 pages); 'Stalin on the Windscreen' (October 1978, 4 pages)

The second article is concerned with 'run-down villages' which are dying. Their areas of uncultivated land are growing, since the authorities do not allow people to work them.

From the second article:

Today Stalin is appearing on windscreen. This is not so much due to sanction from above, as to a push from below. Paradoxical as it seems, this is also a protest, a protest against today's lack of leadership and disintegration, a sort of longing for order, for a better, meaningful and reasonable life... Each portrait of Stalin above the steering wheel is above all a 'No!' to the portrait of Brezhnev.

M. Kukoboka: 'A Meeting with My Childhood' (1977, 5 pages); 'Stolen Motherland' (25 March 1978, 8 pages)

The first article is based on autobiographical material. In Bobruisk, the author's native town, the cathedral and the Catholic church have been demolished, the Orthodox church burnt and signs in the Belorussian language destroyed. In the second article the author discusses the concept of Motherland.

I. Noi: 'A Memorandum on the Contradictory Evidence Concerning the Appearance of Academician N. P. Dubinin in a Certain Photograph of Lenin' (10 pages)

The article is a professor at the Kursky Institute of Law at Saratov, a Doctor of Legal Science and a member of the Communist Party since 1946. The subject of this article is a photograph of V. I. Lenin in a car in Red Square on 1 May 1919. Next to Lenin are two little boys in peaked caps. The journalist M. Ya. Lenshchinsky is putting about the story that one of these boys is Kolya [N.P.] Dubinin. Academician N. P. Dubinin supports the story.

E. Orlovsy: 'An Unusual Promotion' (3 pages)

The story of the author's demotion from the position of Chief Engineer to that of Engineer (Chronicle 34) and the story of his promotion back again (Chronicle 46 contains an error — the word 'restored' is used).

E. Orlovsy: 'Materials Relating to the Question of 'Soviet Legislation and Freedom of Thought, Conscience and Religion' '(August 1978, 8 pages)
The author's basic thesis is: 'The devil is formed in the foam on the lips of the angel entering the battle for good, for truth, for justice ... I can see in the character of Solzhenitsyn a justification for the revolutionary scoundrels of his book (the Gulag Archipelago — Chronicle). I cannot exonerate him and condemn them. They are one and the same human type. In his article 'Panpersonalism as a Philosophy and Image of Life' P. Ahovin-Egides maintains that social development will inevitably lead to a system in which 'all people are individuals ... in all spheres. A complete, harmonious personality is what panpersonalism, or the communism of the future, built on a genuinely democratic base, means.'

V. Sokirko (Chronicles 46, 47, 49) publishes his correspondence with a sociologist professor of the Catholic University of Paris. In these letters they discuss their understanding of the nature of socialism — in which the West differs from Russia.

Today, reading through these letters, I can see how difficult it is for us to communicate and come to an understanding with people in the West; I can see their unwillingness to accept our guarded approach to such concepts as socialism and equality.

An abridged verbatim record of the discussion 'The Classics and We' (Chronicle 48) is published.

The poems and pros of V. Gershuni, Yu. Dombrovsky, G. Bez- glazny and M. Batalsky (Chronicle 45) are published. Also published is Maximilian Voloshin's article 'Poetry and Revolution: Alexander Blok and Ilya Ehrenburg', written in 1918.

The letters of Yu. Voznesensky and P. A. Podrabinek are printed, in which the humiliation, lawlessness and tyranny reigning in places of imprisonment are described.

There are articles by F. Svetov, G. Vladimov, I. Zhokovskaya-Ginzburg and V. Abramkin, concerning the trial of A. Ginzburg (Chronicle 50).

'The Religious Movement' and...
A Chronicle of Current Events No. 51

'Bibliographical Section'...

'Augra' ('Dawn') No. 12 (52), August 1978

The issue opens with a declaration by the League for the Freedom of Lithuania (see 'Events in Lithuania'). The greater part of it is taken up with the trials of V. Petkus (Chronicle 50) and B. Gajauskas (Chronicle 49).

The section 'Memories of the Gulag Archipelago' contains P. Stavski's memoirs, 'Two Martyrs'. To commemorate the second anniversary of the self-immolation of A. Kalinauskas, an article entitled 'For Lithuania, for Freedom, for God' (his last words before he died) is published. In an 'Open Letter', a Lithuanian schoolboy calls on his peers to become 'soldiers of truth'.

'Tesos Keles' ('The Path of Truth') No. 10, August 1978

In the foreword to the first issue it is said that the aim of the publication is to prepare the ground for the formation of public opinion in Lithuania. The publication's motto is 'Respect the opinion of others even when you disapprove of it'. Issue No. 1 includes the works 'Socialism, Communism and Democracy' in the Present and the Future'. The political and economic systems of leading world states are analysed. The political system of the USSR is defined as a dictatorship, its economic system as state capitalism. It is claimed that world democracy is giving way to totalitarianism.

In issue No. 2 a Lithuanian translation of A. D. Sakharov's book My Country and the World is published.

Issue No. 3 contains M. Baskas's article 'Rubicon', which criticizes (from a Eurocommunist point of view) violations of human rights in the USSR.

Issue No. 4 contains the pamphlet 'Thank You, Party' about the bribery, extortion, striving after personal comfort and careerism of the ruling class.

Biographies

M. P. Lutsik

Mikhail Lutsik (Chronicle 39) was born in 1921 in the village of Volosyanka in the Skole District of Lvov Region. His father Pyotr Lutsik graduated from the Historical-Geographic Faculty of Lvov University, knew 8 languages, and wrote poetry and essays on historical subjects. In 1939 he was twice arrested by the Poles for nationalist (Ukrainian) activities; in the spring of 1941 he was arrested by the NKVD [earlier name for KGB], and sent into exile in Krasnoyarsk Territory, returning in March 1943; four days after his return he died, following a night attack by Captain Zaitsev, an official of the Skole district KGB. Mikhail Lutsik's mother graduated from the Philological Faculty of Lvov University, knew six languages, and wrote poetry; she died in 1935. Mikhail's sister, Maria Lutsik (b. 1931), is now living in the Skole District of Lvov Region.

In the spring of 1939 Mikhail's father and Mikhail along with him, were arrested and detained for a few days by the Polish police for poems of nationalist content.

In September 1919, after the Red Army entered the Western Ukraine, M. Lutsik crossed into Polish territory, which was occupied by the Germans.

At the beginning of November 1940 he was arrested by the Gestapo, but eventually succeeded in escaping from prison.

In the summer of 1943 Lutsik defended his thesis at the Historical-Geographical Faculty of Lvov University.

In August 1943 Lutsik organized a fighting unit of young Ukrainians, which attacked a German concentration camp near the town of Skole in the Lvov Region and freed the prisoners. In August
1944, in a battle with the Germans, Lutsik was seriously wounded — his left hand was mutilated.

On 28 October 1944, the day the Red Army entered the village of Volosyanka, Lutsik was arrested by the NKVD. On charges of belonging to the OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists) he was sentenced to 15 years' deprivation of freedom and 5 years' exile. On 15 June 1956 he was freed by a Commission of the Supreme Soviet. In November 1956 he was legally exculpated.

On 19 November 1957 Lutsik was arrested by the KGB in the town of Striy in Lvov Region. In connection with his nationalist-patriotic poem 'My Native Land,' which had already caused the Poles and the Germans to arrest him, Lutsik was charged with 'anti-Soviet agitation.' Since he was also threatened with charges of organizational activity in the camps, which at that time carried the death penalty, on 21 November 1957 Lutsik began to simulate mental illness. A Lvov forensic psychiatric commission pronounced him sane, but Lutsik continued his pretence and succeeded in getting himself sent to Moscow for a second psychiatric examination. In August 1958 a diagnostic team at the Serbsky Institute reported that Lutsik had been sane at the moment he committed his crime, but had become ill (a 'state of reaction') after his arrest. In April 1961 the Lvov Regional Court sentenced Lutsik to 15 years' deprivation of freedom, the first 5 years to be served in prison, the remaining 10 years in a camp with strict regime (Procurator Starikov had demanded the death penalty).

In March 1970, referring to the Serbsky Institute diagnosis of 1958, Lutsik demanded to be classed as a Category 2 invalid. Psychiatrist Bozhkov of the Mordovian camps, who came to examine him, diagnosed Lutsik as suffering from 'post-reactive development of the personality — psychopathy,' but did not grant him invalid status. In the summer of 1970, by saying that he was left-handed, Lutsik was granted Group 2 invalid status all the same, because of the mutilation of his left hand.

On 18 November 1972 Lutsik was released. He was sent to live in the town of Rybnitsa in the Moldavian SSR.

Making use of the fact that his parents had been Austrian subjects, Lutsik refused after his release to have a Soviet passport and applied for permission to emigrate to Austria.

On 31 July 1973 Lutsik was once again arrested. In September 1973 the Rybnitsa District People's Court sentenced Lutsik for 'systematic vagrancy,' to 2 years in a strict-regime camp (the maximum penalty under part 1 of article 221 of the Moldavian Criminal Code, equivalent to article 209 of the Russian Code). As a result of an appeal, the Moldavian Supreme Court annulled the sentence and sent Lutsik for a forensic psychiatric examination. In March 1974, in the republican psychiatric hospital, Lutsik was diagnosed as suffering from 'paranoidal schizophrenia with a continuous progressive course — paraphrenic stage' and it was recommended that he be sent for compulsory treatment to a psychiatric hospital of special type.

Lutsik immediately began writing to all conceivable institutions, claiming that he had been wrongly diagnosed and asking to be sent for another examination at the Serbsky Institute.

In July 1974 the Rybnitsa Court ruled that Lutsik should be sent for compulsory treatment in a special psychiatric hospital.

In January 1975 Lutsik arrived at the Dnepropetrovsk S P H. Immediately after his arrival he again began demanding to be sent to the Serbsky Institute for another examination. Between June 1975 and July 1977 Lutsik was examined by five visiting commissions and by a conference of doctors from the hospital. Lutsik answered the questions put to him like a 'normal Soviet person': he was not thinking of emigrating at all, he would gladly have a passport, he did not even consider any sort of political activity, let alone nationalist activity, etc. The first commission wanted to recommend Lutsik's release on the grounds that he was in a state of remission, but Lutsik refused, saying that he wanted the diagnosis changed. In August 1977 a diagnostic team from the Serbsky Institute visited the hospital; it decided to send Lutsik to the Serbsky Institute for re-examination.

From February 1975 to July 1977 Lutsik had been forced to take sidnecarb, butambin, milipromin, cyclodol and triflazin; he was given a course of insulin therapy.

Lutsik did not arrive at the Serbsky Institute until May 1978. In July a commission presided over by Kira Lvovna Immerman annulled all Lutsik's previous psychiatric diagnoses.

In August Lutsik was taken (under guard, as before) to Kishinev. On 1 September the Moldavian Procuracy removed the detention order on Lutsik and he was set free.

At the beginning of November Lutsik was informed in the Moldavian Procuracy that the 1973 charges of 'vagrancy' had been quashed.

According to article 48 of the Russian Criminal Code, the time limit for prosecution under article 209 of the Code is one year.

At present Lutsik is trying to obtain a residence permit in the town of Skole.

N. I. Budulak-Sharygin (Scharegin)

Nikolai Ivanovich Budulak-Sharygin was born in the Ukraine in 1926. In 1941 he was deported to Germany to work. The end of the war found him in the American zone. The Americans sent him to the Soviet zone. Here he began work. In 1947 Budulak-Sharygin...
appointed by the investigators) submitted a number of petitions. A
investigator that his first sentence had long since been revoked.

When, after Budulak-Sharygin's insistent protests about falsified
and Ukrainian émigré organizations. The first investigator threatened
charges, the investigator was replaced, he learned from the second
that Budulak-Sharygin's old sentence — shooting — would be carried
was accused of having links with the N T S [Popular Labour Alliance]
hostile activities' during the period when he lived in England: he
'flight abroad' and with 'helping a foreign government to carry out
Russian Criminal Code; later this was changed and he was charged
under article 64 with 'Treason to the Motherland' in the form of
guaranteed protection on the territory of the Soviet Union or East
European countries).

sul be summoned: 'The Queen of England won't declare war for
your sake'. (Budulak-Sharygin had not yet obtained British citi-
ship, although he had submitted the relevant application to the
in the summer of 1977 (Chronicles 45-47).

A few months before his release, Budulak-Sharygin managed to
re-establish contact with his adopted daughter A. Kotelnikova. Officials
of the Kalinin K G B did not let this fact escape their attention. Where-
as previously they had told Kotelnikova that she was in no way re-
lated to Budulak-Sharygin, now they not only acknowledged the
family relationship, but even helped her to come for a visit (in May
1978).

At the beginning of September Budulak-Sharygin was taken from
Mordovia to Kalinin. On 20 September he was driven from an in-
vestigation prison to the district police station, where it was pro-
moved that he accept a Soviet passport and he was told that he was
not a Soviet citizen and that he intended to return to
the city. Budulak-Sharygin refused to accept the passport, declaring
that he was not a Soviet citizen and that he intended to return to
England as soon as possible. The police official did not insist.

A few days later, Budulak-Sharygin set off for Moscow with someone
who was going that way by car; the car was stopped and a G A I [State Motor Vehicle Inspectorate] official told Budulak-
Sharygin that he must return to the city.

At the beginning of October A. Kotelnikova visited the British
Embassy, where the Consul explained that the granting of British
citizenship ten years after the submission of an application was not
possible; he advised Budulak-Sharygin to take the Soviet passport
and to try and arrange his departure through O V I R. The Embassy
also issued a document confirming that Budulak-Sharygin's entry
into England was authorized. On their part, officials of the Kalinin
K G B promised that there would be no obstacles to his departure.
At the end of October Budulak-Sharygin agreed to accept the passport and submitted his documents to the Kalinin O V I R office. On 13 November he received a Soviet passport valid for foreign travel (and was released from surveillance) and on 19 November he flew to London.

Throughout the two months in Kalinin, both the police and the K G B were especially courteous towards Budulak-Sharygin.

Addenda and Corrigenda

The account of the case of Genrikas Jagkunas (Chronicles 44, 48) can now be clarified and filled out.

Investigators from Moscow and Leningrad, as well as from Lithuania, participated in the pre-trial investigation. The trial took place in the police headquarters in the town of Jonava. On the eve of the trial the building was examined with mine detectors. During the trial armed soldiers with dogs stood in the corridors. The witnesses were escorted into the courtroom by two soldiers; when they had been questioned, they were immediately led out again. In the dock, Jagkunas had three guards, one of whom held an automatic pointed at him.

Jagkunas was charged under article 62 of the Lithuanian Criminal Code (=article 64 of the Russian Code) and part 2 of article 68 of the Lithuanian Code (=article 70 of the Russian Code).

Besides a 'Manifesto of the Union of Organizations of Independent Peoples', Jagkunas was charged with authorship of articles and leaflets in which it was proposed to transform the Soviet Union into a federation of independent republics with their own armies; this, according to the author, would guarantee their sovereignty and right to self-determination. Jagkunas was sentenced to 10 years in a special-regime camp and 5 years' exile; his co-defendant Danasas in Chronicle 48 to 5 years in a strict-regime camp and 2 (or 3) years' exile.

Several statements submitted by Lev Lukyanenko (Chronicle 50) during his pre-trial investigation have become available. On 21 December 1977, nine days after his arrest (Chronicle 48), Lukyanenko wrote to the Presidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet renouncing his Soviet citizenship and asking for permission to leave the U S S R. On 21 January 1978 he complained to the Procurator of Chernigov Region about the number of Ukrainians and the number of Russians living in Chernigov and the number of schools where the respective languages are taught; also the average number of pupils in each type of school; how many churches have been closed in Chernigov recently and how many are still functioning (one remains — Chronicle); how many petitions requesting the opening of another church had been submitted and how many people had signed them.

In connection with the Ukrainian Helsinki Group's intention to register itself officially (Lukyanenko's arrest interrupted the pursuit of this aim), on 3 April Lukyanenko asked the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian S S R: 'Is a dialogue between the Group and the authorities in the Ukrainian S S R possible ... or is it sufficient for certain party or government officials to reach a conclusion about the Group's unconstitutionality for the result to be not a discussion about rights, but arrest?'.

Before leaving the Soviet Union, the English psychiatrist Gery LowBeer (Chronicle 49) was searched and addresses and photographs were confiscated.

Evgeny Nikolayev's wife was not taken to the police station on 12 March (Chronicle 48, 49). She was only summoned to the reception booth at the hospital gates, where her documents were checked and she was allowed to go.

Felix Serebrov and his wife were not subjected to recruiting attempts, to be informers (Chronicle 47); his step-daughter was.

The rumours put about in Perm Camp 36 by K G B Captain Chepkasov were false: a plea for clemency had not been submitted by Yu. Dayuba, but by his parents (Chronicle 48).
During the trial of Marinovich and Matusevich (Chronicle 49) Moscow Helsinki Group member T. Osipova and member of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes A. Podrabinek were detained outside the courtroom. They were kept for three hours at the police station, then they were driven from Vasilkov to Kiev Station, where an attempt was made to put them aboard the train to Moscow, but they managed to escape from the platform.

* * *

The Article proclaiming that the 'native' language is the official language of the relevant republic is included not only in the Constitution of the Georgian SSR (Chronicle 49), but also in the Constitutions of the Armenian and Azerbaidzhani Republics. There is no analogous Article in the Constitutions of other Republics.

---

Endnotes

1. Both brochures were published in Russian by Khronika Press, New York. The mother referred to is Nina Bukovskaya, mother of V. Bukovsky.
2. Published in English in Sakharov Speaks, London and New York, 1974, and elsewhere.
5. In June 1979 Morozov was sentenced under article 70 to 5 years' exile.
7. Probably the Ukrainian Vladimir Yurkov (or, in transliteration from Ukrainian, Volodymyr Yurkiv) mentioned in Chronicle 25 as having, by 1972, already served 22 years in captivity. See more details in Michael Browne, Ferment in the Ukraine, London, 1971.
8. Published in full, with Sakharov's introduction, in Kontinent, 1979, No. 19.
9. The mistake was corrected in the English edition.
10. No. 11, wholly devoted to A. Podrabinek's trial, was used in Chronicle 50.
11. Evdokimov was soon transferred to an ordinary Leningrad mental hospital, then, in spring 1979, released in connection with the diagnosis in him of a serious form of cancer.
13. According to the Encyclopedia Lituanica, Boston, Vol. 4, 1975, Bishop Prancikus Ramanauskas (1893-1959) was allowed to return to Lithuania in 1956, but could not exercise his episcopal duties. He died in Telšiai.
14. Ogorodnikov was sentenced to 1 year in camps in early 1979.
15. The Chronicle is correct.
16. Published in full in Volnoye slovo, Possev Verlag, Frankfurt, 1974, No. 12.
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