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

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

ASSR & RSFSR Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. Subordinate to any SSR (see below) and based on the minority nationality whose home is on the territory. The Mordovian ASSR, for example, is subordinate to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) and so named because it is the home of the Mordovian national minority
CPSU Communist Party of the Soviet Union
EC Executive Committee
KGB Committee for State Security
Komsomol Communist Youth League
MVD Ministry of Internal Affairs
OVDV Department of Internal Affairs
OVIR Department of the MVD for Visas and Registration
SPH Special Psychiatric Hospital
SPR Soviet Socialist Republic, of which there are 15 in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), the largest being the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic)
UVD Administration of Internal Affairs
UVR Administration of the MWD for Visas and Registration

PREFACE

A Chronicle of Current Events was initially produced in 1970 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 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 42, is like previous ones, a translation of a Chronicle originally produced in the spring of 1982. The editors openly acknowledge, in their work, 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.

Amnesty International, August 1982
The Struggle for Human Rights in the Soviet Union Continues

A Chronicle of Current Events

On 2 March Juri Kukk (for his trial see Chronicle 61), who was still on hunger-strike, arrived at a camp in Murmansk from Tallin. He was at once sent off to a hospital in Vologda (distension of the stomach was diagnosed), where he died not later than 28 March.

On 30 March his wife and five friends buried him in Vologda (the authorities would not permit the body to be taken to Tartu). Kukk's body was extremely emaciated and blackened. His wife and friends are of the opinion that he died as a result of his long hunger-strike and incorrect treatment during this time.

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, art. 19
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On 2 March Juri Kukk (for his trial see Chronicle 61), who was still on hunger-strike, arrived at a camp in Murmansk from Tallin. He died not later than 28 March. His wife and five friends buried him in Vologda. He died as a result of his long hunger-strike and incorrect treatment during this time.

On 30 March his wife and five friends buried him in Vologda. The authorities would not permit the body to be taken to Tartu. Kukk's body was extremely emaciated and blackened. His wife and friends are of the opinion that he died as a result of his long hunger-strike and incorrect treatment during this time.

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, art. 19

We have learned with deep sorrow of the martyr's death of Estonian chemist Juri Kukk, who gave his life trying to exercise his right to leave the USSR.

In honour of the memory of the deceased, we, the undersigned, declare a one-day hunger-strike for 12 April 1981.

Today, 1 May 1981, Juri Kukk would have been 41 years old. Juri Kukk's death is something which his numerous friends and students cannot accept without a feeling of protest.

A healthy man, a scientist with an international reputation, is persecuted by the authorities because he openly expressed his views, is removed from his job at the university, is locked up in prison, and he dies a few months later. What is the price of a human being, as opposed to a statistical unit?

Juri Kukk is dead. Could a slanderer, deceitful by
nature, have staged a protest hunger-strike? A slanderer would have left someone else without food. Jüri Kukk was a healthy man, a fact borne out by the documents which accompanied his transfer to Murtsov Prison. Did Jüri Kukk die as a result of his hunger-strike? Or was he murdered? If Jüri Kukk had really been well, he would not have refused. A hunger-strike constitutes such a rejection. The prisoner is an inaccessible force. Going on hunger-strike means denying oneself in the name of the idea of Life. Only a few are capable of this.

During the trial Jüri Kukk weighed 47 kilograms. He was 172 cm tall, Mart Niklus not much more. Nevertheless, these two emaciated men were guarded by two dozen KGB officials, who barred the entrance to the courtroom to all but those whom the authorities had decided in advance would be present at the trial. The sentence - two years of ordinary-regime camp for Jüri Kukk and ten years' special-regime camp and five years' exile for Mart Niklus - proved a death sentence for Kukk.

Krivov (Chronicle 55). Marchenko is being held in Vladimir Prison. Marchenko (b. 1938) served his first sentence (1958-60) when he was convicted of participating in a brawl (he was, in fact, trying to separate the brawlers): his second (1960-61) after being convicted under article 64 of the RSFSR Criminal Code (this period is described in his book My Testimony); his third (1980-81) for 'violation of the residence regulations' (Chronicle 3), and his fourth (1981-71) when convicted on charges under article 190-1 of the Code (Chronicle 9). Marchenko was sentenced for the fifth time for 'extremely grave violation of the rules of administrative surveillance' (Chronicle 35): the 'case' and his exile term lasted from 1975 to 1979 and are described in his book From Tarusa to Chuna. In April 1980 the authorities threatened him yet again with arrest, and encouraged him to leave the USSR (Chronicles 56).

On 17 March four searches were carried out in connection with Case No. 41. The search at Marchenko's home (in the town of Karshanovo, Vladimir Region) was conducted by Krivov. An English translation of Marchenko's book From Tarusa to Chuna, an open letter by Marchenko and his wife Larissa Bogoraz (Chronicles 61 and 62) entitled 'Alexander Lavut in Exile' (Chronicle 60). Marchenko's diary entries about Poland, issue No. 97 of A Chronicle of Current Events, a bulletin produced by the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled, and a typewriter were among the confiscated items.

The home of Alexander Daniel (L. Bogoraz's son) and his wife Svetlana Artisovich was searched: Issue No. 7 of the Journal Searches, L. Bogoraz's Unpublished Works, photocopies of the book Exodus and of the scientific journal Sindikals (Nov. 1-3). If the home of P. Nikitina, wife of a KGB official, the University Union of Students' Home, wife of a KGB official, the University Union of Students' Home, was searched and the following items confiscated: N. Mukov's four issues of the newspaper Russian Thought, 12 typewritten copies of Voloshin's and Gumiltsov's poetry, a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter.

Ekaterina Valitanova's home in Moscow was also searched and the following items confiscated: N. Bokov's book Bestseller, four issues of the newspaper Russian Thought, 12 typewritten copies of Voloshin's and Gumiltsov's poetry, a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter, a tape recorder, a portable radio, and a typewriter.

On 25 March a search was carried out in connection with Marchenko's case at the home of Marchenko's former comrade, Valery Zaitsev (Chronicle 4), in Alexandrov, Vladimir Region. A photograph of Marchenko was confiscated.

On 3 April Krivov interrogated Zaitsev: was he acquainted
On 30 March the V. FefUlov

On 22 March E. Bonner and A. Sakharov issued an 'Appeal':

(Bonner and Sakharov asked why FefUlov had left his trade union three months previously; on hearing the reply: 'Because it does not defend my interests', Krivov said: 'Don't hope that it will be Poland here!')

On 22 March R. Bonner and A. Sakharov issued an 'Appeal':

Iolya Marchenko has been arrested again. This news is so terrible that it is difficult to accommodate it in one's mind. The story of Marchenko's life is known to the readers of his magnificent books, Testimony and From Tarusa to Chuna. It is a searing indictment of the blind cruelty of the machine of repression, and at the same time it bears witness to the true greatness of a human spirit, to the pride and honesty of a living, suffering person who resists this machine. The worker and writer Anatoly Marchenko, who has told the truth - we important to us all - about today's Soviet camps, in one of those individuals of whom the country and people who gave him birth may be truly proud. How, when the vindictiveness of its jailers has again turned against him, we are whole-heartedly behind him and his family. We ask all honest people in this country and in the world to do all in their power to defend and help them.

On 22 March V. FefUlov wrote an article entitled: 'When Repression is Meaningless...'

If we do not want our lives to become meaningless and empty, to become more enslaved, we will come to the defence of such remarkable and thinking people as Anatoly Marchenko, Viktor Nekipelov, Tatyana Velikanova, Felix Serebrov, Tatiana Oktiabrysh and many, many others who are today languishing in the depths of the bottomless Gulag, which continues to devour more and more victims.

On 30 March the Moscow Helsinki Group adopted Document No. 160: 'The Arrest of Anatoly Marchenko'

A worker by profession, a writer by vocation, Marchenko openly defended people's civic and political rights. He is the author of two documentary works, My Testimony and From Tarusa to Chuna, and of numerous PUBLICISTE articles and letters. Anatoly Marchenko's works have been circulated in samizdat and also published abroad. Anatoly Marchenko's opposition to evil, injustice and coercion have resulted in the systematic persecution of this courageous and uncompromising defender of human rights. Since 1968 his home has been searched no fewer than 15 times, and manuscripts, rough drafts and outlines for future works, private correspondence, notebooks, and notes for his diary have been confiscated.

This is already his sixth arrest. Between the age of 19 and the present day, when Anatoly Marchenko is 45, he has spent 15 years in prison and exile and only nine years at liberty, two of them under administrative surveillance. Anatoly Marchenko has a wife and an eight-year-old son. Deprived of his right to live in Moscow with Marchenko' (yes: what did he know of his anti-Soviet activity? Nothing!); how Marchenko had given his literature of any kind? (no); which of Marchenko's works had he read? (none) - Krivov wanted to know why FefUlov had left his trade union three months previously; on hearing the reply: 'Because it does not defend my interests', Krivov said: 'Don't hope that it will be Poland here!'

On 22 March E. Bonner and A. Sakharov issued an 'Appeal':

On 22 March E. Bonner and A. Sakharov issued an 'Appeal':

On 22 March E. Bonner and A. Sakharov issued an 'Appeal':

In his wife's flat, he has lived for the past two-and-a-half years in the village of Karabanovo, where he was in charge of running gas boiler-houses. At the same time, with his own hands, he was building a house for his family. Despite the fact that his health was undermined during his long years in prison, camps and exile (he has had meningitis, intestinal disease and has partially lost his hearing), he was always working, showing himself to be a worker not only by occupation, but in his inner consciousness...

We know him and his life story. We know this courageous, honest, uncompromising man, who has suffered a great deal. We are convinced that only his struggle to preserve human rights and freedoms, only his moral standard, his sensitive conscience and a heart responsive to the misfortunes of others were the inspiration behind all his actions. We know that, being opposed to any kind of violence, he opposed evil with words and only with words. Anatoly Marchenko is among the best people of our epoch. It is for this reason and for this reason alone that he is persecuted by the authorities.

On 23 March a medical commission ruled that Marchenko's hearing was adequate. On 24 March KGB officials tried to obtain his hearing aid, without which he cannot hear, from his family.

On 9 April L. Bogoraz was summoned to Vladimir for interrogation by Investigator Zotov, who said that he wanted a sample of her handwriting. Bogoraz refused to participate in the investigation of her husband's case, giving the following reason:

'I consider that the case which the KGB has brought against my husband, A. T. Marchenko, is illegal for the following reason: a citizen's views and beliefs, expressed in verbal or written form, cannot constitute grounds for prosecuting him as a criminal. Therefore I refuse to participate in any investigative action in this case.'

On 24 April Bogoraz concluded an agreement with Vladimir lawyer L.D. Frankin that he would 'carry out the requirements of article 201 of the RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure' - i.e. that he would study the case materials once the pre-trial investigation was over.

Between 20 and 30 April E. Velikanova, A. Daniil and S. Artsimovich were summoned for interrogation. Daniel and his wife refused to give evidence until the typewriter confiscated during the search was returned to them. Velikanova was ill and did not go to the interrogation.

Pashinin was interrogated on 6 May (he had already been summoned on 3 April, but did not turn up, having sent a statement refusing to take part in the investigation). He was asked about Marchenko, Landa and FefUlov. Pashinin refused to answer the questions, giving as his reason the fact that the KGB were spreading 'absurd rumours' about him in Strunino.

On 11 May Zotov interrogated Sergei Nekipelov (Chronicle 57). Nekipelov said that in 1977 he was doing his military service in the village of Chuna and that he met Marchenko there. He described Marchenko as 'a very decent, honest and responsive man'. Zotov asked several questions about the charges which had been brought against Nekipelov during
his military service. In particular he asked: 'What have
you to say about the interrogation record, signed by you,
in which you state that you supplied Marchenko with military
information and also information defining the Soviet state?
'I deny having signed that record; after I had signed a
cautions, I was given a piece of paper to sign, which I
did not read because I thought that it was also a caution.
In the event the piece of paper turned out to be the record
to which you are referring'.

On 11 May N. Nikipelov wrote a statement:

To the Head of the Investigation Department of the
Vladimir KGB, P. T. Plyshkov.

On 11 May 1981 I was interrogated by Senior Investigator
Zotov in connection with the case of A. T. Marchenko.

In the course of the interrogation I was shown a piece
of paper which bore my signature. As I realized immediatel-
y from its content, this was the record of my interroga-
tion of 31 May 1974, drawn up by an investigator from
the Special Section of the Transbaikal Military District,
in connection with charges which had been brought against
me and were later dropped.

I consider it necessary to state that I did actually
sign this paper, but I had not read it, and I never gave
the evidence contained in this 'interrogation record'.
I deny the information written in this record, since
it does not correspond to the truth. I also consider
it necessary to explain why I signed the document without
having read it.

In May 1974, before I was demobilized from the Army,
I was attached to a military unit stationed in the village
of Chuna, Irkutsk Region. I was arrested and charged
with collecting compromising evidence about offences
committed by commanding officers of Unit 443. I was
detained under guard in the investigation cell of the
garrison guardhouse. In appalling conditions: at night
the temperature did not rise above 7°C, I had a wet plank
bed to sleep on and no warm clothing, there was no glass
in the windows of the concrete-floored cell and a gap
of 15-20 centimetres under the door. During this time
I did not sleep at night, I only dozed in between interrogations, which took
the form of a series of uninterrupted threats. I was
fed miserable portions of soup.

All this reduced me to such a state that I did not
guise the significance of my actions, and when
I was informed that I had to sign a caution and then
my case would be closed, I signed all the papers I was
presented with, without reading them.

Please attach this statement to the record of my
interrogation of 11 May 1981.

On 28 May Investigator Feofilatov interrogated L. Bogoraz
(Plyshkov came in several times during the interrogation).

Bogoraz was asked about 30 questions. She answered only
the question about whether Marchenko wished to emigrate.
She explained that he had submitted his documents to OVIR
in 1974. When asked why she answered this question, Bogoraz
replied that if they released him, she intended to persuade
Marchenko that it would be wise to emigrate. (At this point
Pleshkov intervened: 'Who's going to let him go? When he's
sat it out - he can leave!' He also told Feofilatov: 'But are you asking her for, she's an accomplice, the results
of the handwriting examination show that'). The remaining
questions concerned the papers confiscated during the
search, which, according to the handwriting examination,
had been edited by Bogoraz.

In mid-May an official of the Karabasovo Town Soviet EC
and a policeman forbade Bogoraz to go on building the house
her husband had started, as Marchenko had not registered
the permission of the local authorities (he had permission
to build from a central organisation).

THE TRIAL OF OSIPOVA

On 27 March R. Altshuler, E. Bonner and I. Kovalf sent
the following letter:

To the World Medical Association, the International
Association of Women Doctors, the World Psychiatric
Association, the International Union of Medical Journal-
ists, TO ALL DOCTORS!

On 31 March the trial of Tatyana Osipova will begin in
Moscow. She is a member of the Moscow Helsinki Group
and a member of the human rights movement in the USSR
and for the prevention of nuclear war, which describes the terrible consequences
of nuclear war. It is difficult to expect a state machine
which violates fundamental human rights and permits the
madness of psychiatric repression to behave rationally
in other matters, including the crucial question of war and peace...

Soviet defenders of human rights have never resorted
to violence and have not incited others to violence;
by publicizing the facts about violations of human rights
they have striven to create an atmosphere of trust and
freedom in society, without which peace on earth is
unthinkable.

Therefore we appeal to the doctors who have united
to try and avert nuclear war. Help Tatyana Osipova and
other victims of psychiatric repression...
The trial took place in the People's Court of the Lyublino District of Moscow. Besides the 'special public', Osipova's mother, stepfather and grandfather were present in the courtroom after they had given evidence. They were brought to Lyublino in a car by KGB officials. They walked freely into the courtroom and took their places in the front row. They did not greet Osipova and did not look at her. Eight or nine staff members from the Centre for Geophysical Expeditions (CGE), where Osipova worked until her arrest, whom she hardly knew, were also in court (see 'Miscellaneous Reports').

On the first day of the trial Osipova's husband, Ivan Koval'tsev, was stopped by a police cordon at the approach to the court building and ordered to 'clear off'. Koval'tsev said that if his wife did not see him in the courtroom 'the trial would not take place', and that very soon 'everyone would know' about this. A few minutes later Koval'tsev was allowed through into the court building. There the usher, who introduced himself as 'Ivan Sergeyevich Ivanov', and his assistant, who did not introduce himself, imposed the following condition: Koval'tsev would be allowed into the courtroom if he left behind his bouquet of flowers and let himself be searched for 'sound-recording devices'. Koval'tsev agreed, but demanded and received a receipt for the portable tape-recorder they confiscated from him. 'Ivanov' promised to return the recorder after the trial.

On the first day Lubentsova stopped another condition: Koval'tsev must not take notes. When Koval'tsev went out into the street during the recess, 'Ivanov' stated yet another condition: it was permitted to leave the court only during the longer recesses. Every day, before the trial began and when Koval'tsev returned after the recess, 'Ivanov' searched him.

On the last day of the trial (when only the reading of the judgment took place) Lubentsova interrupted the reading of the judgment in mid-word (an unprecedented occurrence) and shouted at Koval'tsev to place his notepad on the table in front of her immediately and leave the courtroom. When Koval'tsev had placed the notepad on the table, 'Ivanov' attempted to seize it out of Koval'tsev's hand and the reading of the judgment continued behind firmly closed doors. Before Osipova was escorted from the courtroom, 'Ivanov' and his assistant ejected Koval'tsev from the corridor as well, so that he could not see his wife.

Subsequently, when escorting Koval'tsev out of the building, 'Ivanov' showed him two photographs which he had confiscated on the first day and demanded the receipt back. When he was given it, he pulled back the hand holding the recorder and said that he would not give it back - 'to teach you not to bring a tape-recorder here again'.

Osipova's 'case' consists of 36 volumes. She was charged with:

- preparing, keeping and circulating Moscow Helsinki Group documents: No. 49 - 'On the violation of collective farms workers' rights to emigrate and to leave the collective farm' (Chronicle 49), No. 53 - 'To the International Olympic Committee and the President of the IOC, Lord M. Killanin' (Chronicle 51), No. 58 - 'Ten years later' (Chronicle 51), No. 63 - 'Jewish collective farms workers in the Village of Italka are forcibly tied to the land and refused permission to emigrate' (Chronicle 52), No. 70 - 'On instances of politically motivated persecution' (Chronicle 52), No. 72 - 'Violation of socio-economic human rights in the USSR: The Right to Work' (Chronicle 53), No. 83 - 'Freedom for all the Helsinki Group members imprisoned in the USSR' (Chronicle 53), No. 90 - 'Arrests for ideological reasons: August 78, August 79' (Chronicle 54), and No. 99 (on the invasion of Afghanistan - Chronicle 55).

- writing (together with V. Nekipelov - Chronicle 57) and reproducing and circulating 'An Appeal to the US Congress' (Chronicle 61):

- writing (together with A. Podrabinek - Chronicle 57) and reproducing and circulating 'The Memorandum of the 45' (it was signed in all by 68 people from the Baltic republics; Osipova and eleven others signed a postscript to the document in which they expressed their support of the demand for a real exercise of the right to self-determination - Chronicle 54), the letter 'On Those who Tolerate International Gangsters and Remain Tough in their Fight against Free Thought', Information Bulletin No. 8 of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled (Chronicle 56), and Issue No. 56 of A Chronicle of Current Events:

- possessing and intending to circulate Antokhovn's Technology of Power and volumes One and Two of Solzhenitsyn's Gulag Archipelago, a manuscript copy of 'If you are ill with freedom, or a Report from the Stomach of a Cannibal' by A. Shatravka (Chronicle 51), two issues of the journal Kon-tinent, two issues of the journal Possess, a letter by the NTS People's Labour Alliance, base a road! entitled 'This is My Country', an NTI document also states that Osipova acted on the recommendations of the NTS, that she did not give any evidence during the pre-trial investigation, that she also ignored the measures of re-education which were applied to her. The indictment referred to the evidence of numerous witnesses, including that of S. Kalistratova (although Kalistratova refused to give any evidence whatever).

The indictment also states that Osipova acted on the recommendations of the NTS, that she did not give any evidence during the pre-trial investigation, that she also ignored the measures of re-education which were applied to her. The indictment referred to the evidence of numerous witnesses, including that of S. Kalistratova (although Kalistratova refused to give any evidence whatever).

The First Day

Osipova presented over 30 petitions to the court (most of them with the support of her lawyer); she requested the production of documents and information by Soviet institutions, supplementary expert examinations and the calling of extra witnesses. All her petitions were rejected.
After this, Osipova began to read out a statement she had written, in which she described the motives, forms and methods of her activities and the activities of the Moscow Helsinki Group as a whole, and also demonstrated that the charges against her lacked substance. Osipova noted in particular that the main charge against her was her participation in the Helsinki Group. Lubencova immediately began disputing this assertion. She did not allow Osipova to read her statement in full and refused her petition to include it in the trial record.

Osipova totally denied any guilt and also denied any anti-Soviet intent in her actions or the actions of the Helsinki Group as a whole. She said that the trial was essentially a trial of the whole Group.

Osipova confirmed that she was a member of the Helsinki Group and the co-author of the documents cited against her; also that she had circulated them. She confirmed that she was a co-author of the 'Appeal articles and the 'Appeal to the UK Congress', that she had signed the 'Memorandum of the 45' and the letter 'On Those who Permit International Gangsterism...'. She did not deny that much of the material confiscated from her, which, according to the findings of an expert examination, had been retyped on typewriters confiscated from her, may have been typed by her. She did not deny that she had kept copies of A Chronicle of Current Events and intended to circulate them.

"Osipova explained that the 'Appeal to the UK Congress' was only a draft rough, which was not sent anywhere or circulated. She refused (as she did in response to similar questions relating to other points in the indictment) to name her co-author. As regards the content of the aforementioned 'Appeal', Osipova explained that, under the influence of Academician Sakharov, she had changed her point of view and now thought that in comparison with any internal problem the question of nuclear disarmament had first priority and must be the first to be resolved.

Concerning the books by Antorshianov and Solshennitsyn, she said that they were anti-Stalinist and not anti-Soviet (this point the Judge interrupted her and forbade her to talk about the content of the books). The Technology of Power had been registered for circulation but had not been circulated. She had borrowed the Galia Archival to read it for a month before the search in her house (Chronicle 51), during which the book was confiscated (Chronicle 50): she had intended to return it to its owner.

Osipova had been given Shatrovskaya's manuscript to read too, but they had finished her arrest. She had finished it after the investigation finished (i.e., when recovering the confiscated materials in prison) and did not consider it anti-Soviet when taken as a whole. The newspaper Russian Thought did not have, in Osipova's opinion, a specific political tendency and she found it interesting simply as a free newspaper.

Osipova regarded Possev and the NTS documents as anti-Soviet; she was given then three days before her arrest for her own personal reading. Her interest in this material had been aroused when, for example, the investigator who interrogated her in connection with Weil's case said that dissenters were in league with the NTS and acted on its recommendations (Chronicle 56). Osipova therefore wanted to know what sort of organization it was. The journal Kontinent interested Osipova a purely literary point of view, and as a journal which published the work of writers with very different outlooks. Osipova obtained the Chronicle as often as she could. She kept all these materials without intending to circulate them. The only exception was the Chronicle of Current Events.

The witnesses were then questioned. G.I. Osipova and A.G. Malenev, Osipova's mother and stepfather, stated that they had little to do with their daughter's upbringing; at first she had been 'completely one of us, a Soviet person' and then she had fallen under an 'alien influence' and now she had 'slid down into the dock'. In describing Osipova's childhood, her mother said: 'She liked reading best of all. The greatest punishment for her was to take away her book'. Finally she began to reproach her daughter for disgracing her family and 'betraying the Motherland'. Her stepfather said that he had told Osipova: 'Well, what's the point of struggling against shortcomings? Where will you find a country without any?' but Osipova had not agreed and remained obstinate.

Psychiatrist Budkevich of Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital described the mental illness of Terelya (Chronicles 47, 48, 51, 54, 56); they, the doctors, only just managed to force him to take his drugs. Budkevich asserted that there had not been a single instance of a same person being placed in a Special Psychiatric Hospital 'specially'. It was true, there was one, Lutsik (Chronicle 51), who had been admitted 'not specially', he began, but the Judge interrupted her and said that she was being asked only about examples of sane people being sent to hospital 'specially'.

The Deputy Chairman of the 'Rossiya' collective farm, Zheltov, (the village of Ilmenka is part of this farm - Chronicles 48, 50) said that there were no obstacles for those who wished to leave. After Osipova had questioned him, it turned out, however, that the farm workers had in fact not been allowed to leave the farm, and precisely because they wished to emigrate. Despite being shouted down by the Judge, Osipova managed to explain that those who wished to leave the farm: since they were not given such a reference they had been forced to leave the farm. Replying further to the Judge's deluge of questions, Zheltov 'corrected' his evidence, explaining that the farm workers were refused permission to leave the farm in the first instance for reasons related to production, and only in the second instance because they wanted to emigrate. When the defence lawyer asked him under which article of the collective farm statute the workers had been refused permission to leave the farm, Zheltov was unable to answer.

The evidence of several absent witnesses was read out. V. Kapitanchuk (Chronicle 58) gave evidence mainly about the way in which the Helsinki Group conducted press conferences. He himself had been present at some of them and
Andreyev wrote:

On the evening of 31 March I. Bovaldv issued a statement entitled 'On the First Day of the Trial':

...the court had 'no documents relating to this transfer'.

One of the 'absent' witnesses turned out to be Vyacheslav Bakhmin, who had been transferred from his camp and was in Lefortovo Prison during Osipova's trial (see 'In the Prisons and Camps') - the court had 'no documents relating to this transfer'.

On the evening of 31 March I. Kovalyov issued a statement entitled 'On the First Day of the Trial':

Today my wife Tatyana Osipova is on trial. She is a member of the Moscow Helsinki Group and this is actually why she is being tried. Mindlessly violating its own norms and regulations, the court is not letting her defend herself. Tanya is constantly being interrupted, she is not allowed to call essential witnesses or demand the production of essential documents. The court shows little interest in the facts contained in the Group's documents: it concentrates all its efforts on discovering the names of the authors of 'anti-Soviet libel' and the circumstances in which this was written.

This is a closed kangaroo court. None of Tanya's friends who have come are being allowed even to approach the court building. The authorities even tried to stop me from attending the trial. I was forbidden to take notes in court on pain of expulsion from the courtroom.

Nevertheless, despite everything, my fragile little Tanya gives battle. 'Today is the whole Helsinki Group's day', Tanya said. Today the court, with its practices, is testing the reality of the Helsinki Agreement. And in this court those principles are represented and defended by my wife.

In a foreign communique TASS correspondent Konstantin Andreev wrote:

Today in Moscow the open trial on criminal charges of Tatyana Osipova began. 32-year-old Tatyana Osipova, who worked as an engineer at the Centre for Geophysical Expeditions in Moscow, is charged with the fact that, during the past three years she - alone and with the help of accomplices - prepared, kept and circulated slanderous materials, defaming the Soviet political and social system; these falsifications were circulated not only in the USSR but were sent abroad with foreigners to be used there by anti-Soviet centres and the organs of bourgeois propaganda, to the detriment of the USSR's political interests. In the indictment these actions are described as premeditated and undertaken with the aim of undermining and weakening the Soviet state.

The indictment was read out in court. In it Tatyana Osipova is charged with the fact that in 1978-80 she - alone and with the help of accomplices - prepared, kept and circulated slanderous materials, defaming the Soviet political and social system; these falsifications were circulated not only in the USSR but were sent abroad with foreigners to be used there by anti-Soviet centres and the organs of bourgeois propaganda, to the detriment of the USSR's political interests. In the indictment these actions are described as premeditated and undertaken with the aim of undermining and weakening the Soviet state.

After the reading of the indictment, defendant Tatyana Osipova was questioned: she admitted the facts set out in the indictment: it is quite obvious from Tatyana Osipova's testimony that, acting with the aim of undermining and weakening the Soviet state, she conducted anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda in 1978-80, she compiled, gave to others and sent abroad slanderous 'statements', 'letters', 'petitions' and 'appeals', in which the reality of Soviet life was maliciously distorted.

The defendant did not deny that among the items which were confiscated from her and included in the case as material evidence were notepads of foreign production on which one can write self-erasing notes; she was unable to refute that her actions were deliberate and purposeful and harmful to the Soviet system, and she also did not deny her awareness of the fact that her falsifications, which grossly distorted Soviet reality, were used by Western reactionary propaganda organs, including the radio stations 'Liberty' and 'Free Europe', which are financed and controlled by the CIA, by the publication Possev, published by the fascist emigrant 'People's Labour Alliance', by the anti-Soviet newspaper Russian Thought, Kronika Press, Kontinent, and the Samizdat archive.

The material evidence presented to the court included a letter from the anti-Soviet publication Possev, which had been brought into the USSR illegally, and an appeal from the so-called 'People's Labour Alliance', which recommends particular ways and methods of combating the Soviet authorities; the defendant acted according to these recommendations.

Warnings had been given to Tatyana Osipova: she was warned on several occasions by state officials and social representatives about the inadmissibility of her illegal activities. Nevertheless, Tatyana Osipova tried to present matters in court in such a way as to appear that she saw nothing illegal in the activities she was engaged in before her arrest.

However, the examination of witnesses demonstrated the groundlessness of such claims. Witnesses Matrosov, Shchetinov, Beselov, Rudnevich and others testified that Tatyana Osipova showed them the documents she had compiled, and they confirmed that these documents contained gross slander of the Soviet system.

The Second Day

During the process of 'examination of the documents', which was formal in nature, Osipova asked the court to read out 24 documents of the Moscow Helsinki Group which contained...
facts to corroborate the truth of Document No. 69. The court refused her request.

Then, on the court's initiative, Osipova's grandmother, V.P. Sheshina, who had been in court on the first day, was unexpectedly summoned as a witness. Her testimony corroborated that of Osipova's mother and stepfather, although she gave details and expanded the theme of the "alien influence" to which her granddaughter had succumbed. Sheshina testified that the change in Osipova's behavior occurred after she married Ivan Kovaly her mother and stepfather had noted this change earlier, and they also spoke of the noticeable intensification of the "alien influence" on Osipova in connection with her marriage.

The Procurator also took the "alien influence" at the starting point of his speech. He then explained that in reality there was no "Helsinki Group", but the same was used as a cover by a small handful of malicious "so-called" dissenters, who sought out the "facts of our negative reality" true, he immediately corrected himself to "negative facts" and went there to the West. These people did not need to verify any information, because they sucked all their information out of their own pens. They distorted, slandered and besmirched everything. Their documents were malicious libels, and the "Oprichnina" articles were anti-Soviet lampoons. For him the fundamental proof of the slanderous and anti-Soviet nature of the documents was: their character was simply clear to everyone. Noting the moral purity of the investigators, the Procurator demanded for Osipova, taking into account her age and that this was her first conviction, five years in camp and three years exile.

The defense lawyer began his speech by describing Voronkov and Soldatennya's books as 'anti-Soviet', then went on to say that the charges had not been proved. He said that if he were fully to agree with what was stated in the indictment and consider the charges proven, he would nevertheless demand redefinition of the charges under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. However, whatever the charges, he could find no grounds on which his client had committed a crime.

After this, Osipova was permitted to make her final speech. "I consider the defense of human rights my life's work, because violation of human rights causes human tragedy", she said.

"What do you ask of the court?" interrupted Lubentsova.

"I don't ask anything", replied Osipova.

The court immediately rose and withdrew to confer.

Andreyev wrote (extracts):

Osipova admitted openly in court that she - alone and with the help of accomplices - compiled and kept materials containing slanderous fabrications, defaming the Soviet political and social system, and that she circulated them among a wide circle of people in the USSR and sent them abroad, where they were used by organs of anti-Soviet propaganda.

During the pleadings Procurator Mikhail Poyakov, upholding the state charges, noted in his speech that Osipova ignored several important by state officials and representatives of society about the inadmissibility of her illegal activities: the Procurator emphasized that Osipova's criminal activity was of a premeditated nature and was aimed at undermining and weakening the Soviet state...

Lawyer Vladimir Shevsky, for the defence, admitted in his speech that the charges were justified: he stated that Tatiana Osipova's crime had been proven and had been correctly defined under article 70 of the USSR Criminal Code. The lawyer also drew the court's attention to the fact that Tatiana Osipova had no previous convictions, and had received favourable reports on her work as a specialist from the places where she had worked: on the strength of this, and also noting Osipova's sincere behaviour in court, the lawyer asked the court to make allowances.

Having heard the defendant's final speech, the court rose and withdrew to confer.

The Third Day

On 2 April Lubentsova announced the sentence: five years in ordinary-regime camps and five years' exile. The text of the judgment was effectively a repetition of the indictment.

Andreyev wrote:

The judgment was announced today at the end of a three-day open trial...those present in the courtroom greeted the judgment with approval.

As regards the official record of the court hearing, (1) it contains the full statement which Osipova was not permitted to read out in court; (2) the petition she presented to the court are recorded not in the form in which she presented them, but as taken from her rough draft (confiscated in a secret search); (3) Osipova's replies and the testimony of witnesses are distorted (for example, the sentence 'They did not allow them to go, not because they wanted to leave the country, but for another reason, which I have already mentioned', was attributed to Zheltov - see above); (4) the lawyer's speech ends in the record with the words: 'All that has been said gives me grounds to ask you to bring in a lawful verdict' (see above); and (5) a 'final speech' has been invented for Osipova.

After the Trial

On 2 April the Moscow Helsinki Group issued Document No. 161, "I Consider the Defence of Human Rights my Life's Work" (the trial of Tatiana Osipova). On 3 April A. Sakharov sent a telegram to Moscow from Gorky:

The sentence imposed on Tanya Osipova, an infinitely honest and courageous young woman, who has selflessly and voluntarily concerned herself with the fate of suffering people, with obtaining openness and justice,
On 16 April Kovaldv issued a letter entitled 'Leniency':

She came to our house five years ago, already a mature person. She came to help at a difficult moment... She brought on the active goodness and the inexhaustible warmth of her heart. I love her very much.

I belong to the generation of Tanya's parents. We share a common historical experience. Today the investigators do not beat political prisoners with their own hands; they frighten witnesses with the loss of life's comforts, but do not beat them either.

But there is a bright spot in the midst of this whole nightmare - it consists in the personalities of Tanya Osipova and her husband Vanya Kovaldv.

On 9 April Osipova had a half-hour visit from her husband. She said that during the investigation she was threatened with charges under article 64 of the RSFSR Criminal Code (the maximum penalty is execution) if she persisted in refusing to give evidence, and that Investigator Gubinsky (Chronicles 48, 57, 60) tried to blackmail her by saying that she would not receive the medical treatment prescribed as necessary after a medical examination, and as a result she would never be able to have children.

After the visit Kovaldv issued a statement entitled 'Blackmail':

Shortly before her arrest, doctors told Tanya that she would have to undergo gynaecological tests; she had barely begun having chills. During the investigation doctors confirmed that it was essential to continue the tests and the related treatment. Then Gubinsky told Tanya that the tests would continue only if she began to give evidence. When Tanya maintained her position, he realized that he would thus be depriving her of the possibility of having children later. Gubinsky replied: 'Everything is in your hands'. Tanya said that she considered needles under the nails a more humane way of conducting an investigation, and declared a hunger-strike in protest, which she maintained for five days.

After this the blackmail stopped

On 16 April Kovaldv issued a letter entitled 'Leniency':

Formally, the court showed...leniency by imposing an ordinary rather than a strict-regime sentence. In actual fact this is an even crueler punishment for Tanya. Our friend Sirvard Avakyan spent just over six months in such a camp. He spent three months in the camp prison and about two months in the cooler.

She was beaten. Men - camp officials - and women prisoners did the beating. Five to eight people took part in these beatings. They struck with their hands and feet. This continued until there was foam on the victim's lips, and she vomited and lost consciousness.

Sirvard left the camp barely alive, black and blue, having lost 32 (!) kilograms in weight. She is still unable to relax completely. As soon as she closes her eyes, she imagines that they will throw her into the cooler again, will give her nothing to eat, that they will again beat her, beat her, beat her...Sirvard spent about six months in the camp. Tanya is faced with about four years. What will become of her?

I cannot exclude the possibility that they will arrest me, too (it has become known that evidence against Kovaldv, defined under article 70 of the Code, has been extracted from the investigation of Osipova's case - Chronicle).

In that case, there will be no one to go and visit Tanya in camp and later describe the conditions she lives in. Then their hands will be completely free...

On 16 April the administration of Lefortovo Prison asked Osipova, 'For a moment', for her copy of the judgment, which she had been given in accordance with the law. She was given back her copy amended - it now stated 'serve in a camp with strict regime'.

On 20 April Osipova sent a letter (through the prison administration, as the law permits) to the Chairman of the USSR KGB, Andropov:

Citizen Andropov!

It has long been a good tradition in the Committee for State Security, of which you are the Head, to stage little surprises when arresting and searching Members of the human rights movement, sparing neither trouble, nor conscience: for example, planting foreign currency in Ginsburg's toilet, or cartridges in M. Podrabinek's ear. And now your 'boys' want to indulge in some sport on the judicial field.

I cannot exclude the possibility that they will arrest me, too (it has become known that evidence against Kovaldv, defined under article 70 of the Code, has been extracted from the investigation of Osipova's case - Chronicle).

Leniency is in your hands. It won't be long before the whole herd is contaminated!

It can, of course, be done legally: repeal the judgment, and the related treatment. Then their hands will be completely free...

We'd allow that, of course: openness is not still an infant here. Let it function in the courtroom, too. Let it function in the court-room. And now your 'boys' want to indulge in some sport on the judicial field.

In your work, slips occur, and so it was that the court sentenced me, under article 59, to an ordinary-regime camp. They even gave me a copy of the judgment, where it is printed in black and white. And then, it seems, they realized: how can one let such a goat into such a garden! Legality, there, is a delicate matter: it can, of course, be done legally: repeal the judgment, stage a new trial (we are good at that!); but it's not a good idea, comrades, not a good idea! If there's a new trial, then it means the defendant will have to be there again, and she, comrades, doesn't march in step with our company: she is always trying to say something. And then Europe might not keep quiet. Europe still has such an unreliable thing as public opinion, and we must bear this in mind as we want to obtain various things, even quite a lot, from that quarter. And Europe is still not entirely in the hands of our organs, although a great work is being done in that direction. There would be publicity again. We'd allow that, of course: openness is not still an infant here. Let it function in the court-yard, but there's no way it will get into the courtroom. With us the courtroom is for the public, a public all
money, possessions and food had to be turned into revenue. On 29 May Kovalyov delivered two statements to the City Court. In the first he asked for permission to correspond with his wife until such time as she was sent to a camp, and he said that the court had passed judgment in Osipova’s case stating, in particular, that confiscated money, possessions and food had to be turned into revenue for the state, in accordance with article 86 point 4 of the RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure. And he asked for the return of the money, possessions and food which he had been able to obtain by criminal means. He therefore asked that they be returned to him. He also asked for the return of the dictaphones, and other materials confiscated earlier, which had not been accepted as material evidence by the court. Lubentsova accepted the statements. The same day Lubentsova gave Kovalyov permission to visit his wife in few days earlier she had said she was busy and refused to give permission. But it turned out that on the evening of 28 May Osipova was sent off to camp. When he found out about this, Kovalyov immediately telephoned Lubentsova. She told him that the court did not inform relatives when prisoners were sent to camp. 

Osipova sent a complaint to the USSR Procurator-General about the alteration of her sentence. In answer she was shown a note from Judge Lubentsova stating that the typist had made a mistake in the text of the judgment (according to the Code of Criminal Procedure the judgment is written in longhand in the judges’ consulting room and it is this which is read out in court — only later is the text copied out by a typist). On 19 May the appeal was heard in the USSR Supreme Court. Prosecutor Polyakov stated that following Osipova’s complaint, a check had been made, but ‘her statements were not confirmed’. He also said: ‘I heard the sentence — strict regime — being passed with my own ears, and later saw it with my own eyes in the text of the judgment’. The sentence — five years’ strict regime plus five years’ exile — was left in force. That day Kovalyov told foreign journalists that he regarded the change in the sentence, even though it had involved such infringement of the law as falsifying the judgment, as an achievement. He explained that he had been afraid that his wife would be sent to a criminal camp in his view, the increased severity of regime was an illusion, since the usual practice of camp punishments easily reduced the advantages (basically: more visits and unlimited correspondence) of ordinary regime to nothing.

On 22 February a statement was sent to the 26th Congress of the CPSU (with copies to: the UN Human Rights Commission, the governments of the countries taking part in the Madrid conference, the World Psychiatric Association and the National Association of French Psychiatrists): Anatoly Ivanovich Koryagin is a man of wide knowledge, unapproachable honesty, steadfast principles and great kindness. He is a highly respected psychiatrist, loved and respected by his numerous patients. He was literally born for his profession — he possesses the art and wisdom to see into the soul of his patients, to discover and keep their secrets, to feel and ease other people’s pain. His diagnoses are always objective, based on the mental state of the patient and nothing else. He considers that neuroleptic drugs and sulphur are inadmissible forms of ‘treatment’ when administered to undeniably healthy people, whose brains a certain someone wants to ‘set right’. He sees an abyss opening up before our society as a self-seeking Mafia (of psychiatrists) uses the admission cards of mental patients — stamped ‘sociopathically dangerous’ — as a weapon of repression and imprisonment. 

Anatoly Koryagin was born on 5 November 1926, in Kastropil near Minsk. His father was a doctor! We call on the delegates to the 26th CPSU
At the beginning of April a search was carried out at the home of Koryagin's sister, who lives in Kursk Region. Before a sawn-off hunting gun, saying that Koryagin had given V. Sidelnik told Koryagin's wife during a meeting with Abakan. Nothing was confiscated. After this, Investigator carried out at the home of Koryagin's mother-in-law in the search began, her husband M.F. Blagikh handed over her that her husband had been charged with trying to 'overthrow the Soviet state'.

Golitsyn, in connection with Koryagin's Case, Golitsyn said that he did not know Koryagin. When asked how he came to have the document text of a psychiatric examination of Butko (Chronicle 51), signed by Koryagin, he refused to answer.

On 5 April the Moscow Helsinki Group Issued Document No. 162, "The Arrest of Anatoly Koryagin": (extract)

The arrest of Koryagin puts a definite end to the humane and legal activity of the Working Commission to investigate the use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, and gives rise to the fear that the authorities may now increase their use of psychiatric persecution for political reasons.

The arrest of Koryagin was announced in the Kharkov Regional Court. Koryagin, consultant to the Working Commission to investigate the use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, and Doctor of Medical Sciences (b. 1938; arrested 15 February - Chronicle 61), was charged under article 82 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (amended article 70 of the RSFSR Code) "authorship and circulation of the following: the article 'Unwilling Patients', published in the journal Possess No. 2/1981, which 'defames the Soviet state and the CPSU', the article 'Good, Evil, Violence', published in The Lancet (extract9), which was "malicious and slanderous in nature": a psychiatric report on his examination of A.A. Butko, in which 'anti-Soviet slander is presented in the form of an interview with a patient'.9

The arrest of Koryagin is a result of his refusal to accept the services of the appointed public defender here. Nevertheless, at the demand of the Procurator, his petition was turned down (this contravenes the Code of Criminal Procedure).

Koryagin refused to answer any personal questions (the judge announced that during the pre-trial investigation Koryagin had refused to read the indictment or to sign it). Koryagin stated: 'I do not consider myself guilty, and I refuse to be questioned because this is not a trial but punishment for cooperating with the Working Commission...'

I wish to give an evaluation of the indictment and to answer two questions - about my detention in prison and about...
works, Rudometov replied: 'I - no. I just know that he...'.

When the Judge asked him whether he had read Solzhenitsyn's newspaper - some book: 'He spoke highly of Solzhenitsyn'.

Official from the military registration office where Koryagin was convicted. 'Often, when I came to see him, he would hide something under a newspaper - some book': 'He spoke highly of Solzhenitsyn'.

Koryagin, however, was very critical of him: 'Often, when I came to see him, he would hide something under a newspaper - some book': 'He spoke highly of Solzhenitsyn'.

Described Koryagin as 'conscientious' and said that 'people who worked with him had a good opinion of him'.

Serik (chairman of the clinic's trade union committee) said that Koryagin refused to do propaganda work and that he, Serik, had reported this to the chief doctor. 'As for the political information sessions he conducted...everything he said was correct and as it should be.'

Yu. V. Dzyuba (Chronicles 57, 60, 61) said that he 'knew nothing of Koryagin's anti-Soviet activities' and that he therefore refused to give evidence and considered his summons to the court to be provocative. Then the evidence which Dzyuba had given during the pre-trial investigation, in which he described the circumstances of his acquaintance with Koryagin, was read out.

Dmitrieva is a doctor from an ordinary psychiatric hospital in Dnepropetrovsk said that Koryagin used to come and visit a patient named P. Vlasenko, who suffered from chronic schizophrenia. 'Vlasenko was a psychiatrist. He was some sort of believer, or belonged to a sect. He used to go round the houses in the settlement of Pystikhatki, talking about something; they say he painted slogans on fences... Koryagin's conduct and manner of speaking were abrupt. He said that a healthy person had been admitted to hospital and decided to discharge Vlasenko, since they considered the illness a神经症. 'At first Vlasenko was in the acute section...' 'Oh, can memory):

Then he said: 'In his statements Koryagin says several times that he does not consider himself guilty and did not intend to undermine or weaken the Soviet state. Neither the pre-trial investigation, nor the court hearing, nor the evidence of the witnesses has shown that Koryagin pursued such an intention... As regards the possession of a fire-arm, neither the investigation nor the court has a sentence for exceptional crimes against the state. I do not think that he would say anything material or necessary to this case'.

Varshavsky (head of the hospital in Dneprstet) said that Koryagin had been aware of what he was doing. The Procurator demanded for Koryagin a sentence of seven years in camp and five years' exile under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code and five years in camp under article 218 of the RSFSR Code.

The defence lawyer began his speech by referring to Koryagin's conscientious attitude to his duties as a doctor. Then he said: 'In his statements Koryagin says several times that he does not consider himself guilty and did not intend to undermine or weaken the Soviet state. Neither the pre-trial investigation, nor the court hearing, nor the evidence of the witnesses has shown that Koryagin pursued such an intention... As regards the possession of a fire-arm, neither the investigation nor the court has a sentence for exceptional crimes against the state. I do not think that he would say anything material or necessary to this case'.

Then Koryagin made his final speech (quoted here from memory):

I began to cooperate with the Working Commission to investigate the use of psychiatry for political purposes as a consultant psychiatrist in 1979, and immediately experienced persecution by the KGB. Since that time, I have been searched three times (first in December 1979, on Kharkov Station: second - see Chronicle 60: third - see Chronicle 61), and I have been arrested. The day I was arrested, I was not allowed to sleep all night. I was subjected to an intensive night-time interrogation, which I regard as the exertion of psychological pressure on me.

I was not told of any charges against me. In protest against this, I declared a dry hunger-strike - no food or water - from the first day, demanding either that I be released immediately, or that charges be brought against me. Nevertheless, I was not charged, and at the end of every 12 hours I was informed that I was being held for the next 12 hours, which, as a psychiatrist, I regard as torture. Keeping a hungry man in a state of nervous tension and ignorance for several days, letting him hope that he may be released within the next few hours - this is severe Jesuitical torture.

On the fourth day I was taken to the KGB, where my
Assistant to the Regional Procurator, subjected me to an intensive eight-hour interrogation, although they knew I was on hunger-strike. This did not deter them from interrogating me and trying to obtain the evidence they needed. During the interrogation I sat on a hard, uncomfortable stool. I was in poor physical shape and at one point I felt so ill that I had to lie down on the floor in the interrogation room; only then was I told of the charges against me.

As soon as I was told of the charges, I refused to take part in the investigation and stated that I would not answer any questions. Nevertheless, I was summoned from my cell in the usual way and taken to the KGB for regular interrogations.

During the interrogations no method was disdained: I was threatened and humiliated, and my feelings for my sons, my wife and father were exploited. Literally my family, my friends, my work, my ideas were exploited. Literally: '...I will send you to the cooler.' Just like in South Africa. I submitted a complaint about the fact that it was I who had behaved like a hooligan. These were those same subordinates of his who had trampled on me, put me in handcuffs, pushed me into a car, showering me with abuse, and still took me to be interrogated. Just like in South Africa. I submitted a complaint about this to the Regional Procurator, but the Assistant Head of the prison informed me that he had witnesses to the fact that it was I who had behaved like a hooligan. These were those same subordinates of his who had trampled on me and put me in handcuffs. I was put in the cooler for ten days, and only after two days was I informed that my complaint had been sent to the Regional Procurator. Furthermore, I have not received a reply to this letter, neither to this complaint, nor to another that I sent to the Regional Procurator.

How about the cooler. A man is locked in a cement-floor prison cell, where the temperature is 12-13°, he is fed on bread and water and is only half clothed - this is an example of the methods used by the KGB to make a person behave in the way they require. As a doctor I maintain that this is physical torture, aimed at the mind.

The prison authorities coordinated their actions with those of the KGB. The methods and behaviour to be found in prison do not greatly differ from KGB methods: humiliation, threats, insults, mockery and foul language, only in a worse form than at the KGB. No earlier than yesterday - a black warden informed me: 'If they order me to, I will force you to keep walking round the cell doing goosestep', when I objected that conditions in the cell were similar to those in the cooler. We were made to roll up our straw mattresses and put them on the top bunk, then we ourselves were forced to lie on the bare iron bars. They probably think we have grown fat on the prison grub and it doesn't hurt us to lie like that. I was even given the national newspapers Pravda and Izvestia once or twice a week. I was unable to obtain the works of Marx, Engels or Lenin, although I knew they were in the prison library. I could say much about the KGB's methods and procedures, but do not see any point in doing so here, to this kangaroo court. I only wish to say, paraphrasing their motto, that they do not have such clean hands, burning hearts and cool heads as Felix Dzerzhinsky wanted to see in his crack Chekists (original name for the KGB: Dzerzhinsky was their head).

When I began to work for the Commission, I became thoroughly convinced of this and I will repeat it once more: 'In our country mentally healthy people are placed in special hospitals because they are dissenters: they are kept there for years and subjected to compulsory "treatment" with drugs'.

I have sat here for a long time and reflected; I have analysed my actions and do not consider myself guilty - I have in no way gone against my conscience or my duty as a psychiatrist. I am not surprised by what is happening, because all the five other members of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes - Vyacheslav Sakhimin, Leonard Ternovsky, Alexander Podrabinek, Irina Grivnina, Felix Serebrov - are already in prison, and so it is now my turn.

I am charged with circulating anti-Soviet documents - with the aim, furthermore, of undermining and weakening the present system, as the Prosecutor stated several times in his "spirited" speech. However, not a single instance of my having circulated these documents has been proved by the Investigation or the court, and the Regional Procurator knows this. It is true that some pieces of paper and foreign publications, as well as official published works, were confiscated from me during a search. But who has proved that these papers were circulated? And even the letter from The Lancet, enclosing a copy of my article (which, incidentally, was removed from my letter-box by KGB officials), does not prove that the article was circulated, since no one has demonstrated how it reached The Lancet. So, not one instance of my having circulated these documents has been proved. It is impossible to prove anything of this kind, because all the five other members of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes - Vyacheslav Sakhimin, Leonard Ternovsky, Alexander Podrabinek, Irina Grivnina, Felix Serebrov - are already in prison, and so it is now my turn.

I am charged with circulating anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda. But not one witness has confirmed that I engaged in such agitation or propaganda. It was not my idea to undermine or weaken the Soviet state. I did not engage in agitation, nor did I call for any action aimed at undermining the state. I had definite ideas and views, my own ideas, ideas which were more correct than those of the KGB. These ideas had a political aspect. We talked, just the two of us, and then in some way our conversation became everyone's property, so much so that the person was summoned to this place as a witness. What happens? He circulating the information: I am here as the defendant, but no one touches the witnesses.

My investigation and trial do not constitute an act of justice, but a means of suppressing me for my views. I know that the sentence will be harsh, I do not ask anything of this court. Regardless of the sentence imposed on me, I state that I will never accept the situation which exists in our country, where mentally healthy people are imprisoned in psychiatric hospitals for trying to think independently. I know that long years of physical
imprisonment, humiliation and mockery await me. Fully aware of this, I embark on it in the hope that it will increase the chances for others to live in freedom. I know that a hard life, full of material deprivation, bitterness and perhaps direct persecution by the authorities, awaits my family, but I cannot change anything. I am convinced that all the cases of people charged with so-called anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda will in the very near future be reviewed, and will receive the genuinely just and objective evaluation they deserve. I believe in a bright future for my Motherland...

The Third Day

The sentence was announced: seven years in camp and five years' exile under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code, and two years in camp under article 218 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, and two years in camp under article 218 of the RSFSR Criminal Code: combined: seven years in strict-regime camps and five years' exile (Koryagin: 'The greater the sentence, the more disgraceful the trial').

The court judgment deprived Koryagin of the rank of 'Senior Lieutenant'. In addition, the court announced two further decisions: to submit a request to the Higher Degrees Commission that Koryagin be deprived of his doctoral degree, and that criminal charges would be brought against Yu. Dzyuba for refusing to give evidence in court.

After the Trial

Koryagin refused to appeal. His wife tried for several days running to obtain permission to visit him. Finally she was told that she could visit him on 25 June. However, on 23 June she was told that her husband had already been sent off to camp. In June Koryagin arrived at Perm Camp 37.

The Grivina-Serebrov Case (Chronicle 61)

On 19 March B. Smushkevich (Chronicle 60) and L. Kardasevich (Chronicles 29, 32) were summoned for interrogation by Investigator Kononov of the Moscow KGB. Smushkevich was interrogated by Investigator Kapayev, Kardasevich by Investigator Popov. They both said that they knew I. Grivnina (for her arrest see Chronicle 60) and F. Serebrov (for his arrest see Chronicle 61). But that they would not answer the other questions (Concerning the Working Commission's Information Bulletin and the signatures on a letter in Support of Vyacheslav Bakhin - Chronicle 58). Kapayev told Smushkevich that it would be a good thing if the authorities could 'impose a two-year sentence for a refusal to give evidence'. Kardasevich tried to write into the record her opinion of Grivina and Serebrov and her complaints against Popov, but Popov refused to let her do this. Kardasevich then refused to leave. In order to get rid of her, Popov actually had to resort to the help of some Procurator or other.

On 2 April searches were carried out at the homes of V. Kuvakin and V. Shepelev: they were afterwards interrogated (see 'The Arrest of Kuvakin'). On 9 April a search was carried out at the home of Yu. Zhukov: on 11 April I. Aleksyenko's home was searched. After the searches they were both interrogated (see 'Searches, Interrogations').

On 14 April Senior Investigator A.A. Levchenko of the Moscow KGB conducted a search at the home of I. Koval'v. The search took place in the flat of Valentin Mitskevich (Chronicle 60), a friend with whom Koval'v had lately been staying. The real place of residence, according to the record, KGB officials K. Yakovlev and V. Aleksandrov also took part in the search.

Issues 52 and 58 of A Chronicle of Current Events, a bundle of issues of the Bulletin (1968) were briefly lodged in Munich by C. Lubarsky - on whom see Chronicle 67). Moscow Helsinki Group documents, Informational Documents, Searches and Reflections. No. 5 and No. 8, various samizdat and CONFIDENTIAL items, articles by Koval'v himself, notebooks, letters and a dictaphone with cassettes were among the confiscated items. In addition, a radio-cassette belonging to Mitskevich, a knife inherited by him from his grandfather, and six 16-calibre hunting cartridges were confiscated.

During and after the search Koval'v made statements that he did not confine, but nor did he deny ownership of the books that were found, and that he asserted with perfect confidence that the Mitskeviches were in no way connected with the confiscated printed and manuscript material.

Koval'v also stated that the confiscated documents contained correct information and that he therefore protested against their confiscation. Mitskevich demanded the return of his radio-cassette and Koval'v of his dictaphone and cassettes. Levchenko did not allow Koval'v and Mitskevich to enter their observations in the record in full or in their own hand.

During the search the Mitskeviches' neighbours, convinced that thieves had broken into the flat, called the police. A police detail arrived in two cars. Aleksandrov went out 'to explain'. He did not let the policemen into the flat, but went out to the forecourt and then escorted them on to the street.

On 14 April searches were also carried out at the homes of Yu. Danilov and A. Gotovtsev: they were both interrogated afterwards (see 'Searches, Interrogations').

On 17 April Kapayev and KGB officials Belov and Lebedev conducted a search at the home of S. Kalistratova. Confiscated items included Moscow Helsinki Group documents, documents containing information and samizdat, letters, notebooks, photocopies of M. Zotev's paintings (for his trial see this issue), drawings by V. Sysoyev (Chronicles 53, 54, 57, and 'Letters and Statements' in this issue) and a typewriter. In addition, what was described in the record as a 'plaster bas-relief with a portrait of Stalin' was taken (this bas-relief depicted a donkey with large eyebrows, wearing a suit, and, above it, a small portrait of Stalin; the inscription read: 'Every donkey dreams of being decorated').

During the search V.V. Ogurtsov and E.M. Derevenskova (I. Ogurtsov's parents), S. Zheludkov and Yu. Zhukov came to see Kalistratova. They were subjected to body-searches. Nothing was confiscated from them. Kalistratova signed
the record, stating that all the confiscated items belonged to her, and noted in the record that 'the confiscated documents, letters, books and objects have no connection with any criminal case'.

On 22 April Kapayev interrogated Kalistratova. The questions concerned Serebrov, V. Kuvakin (arrested on 14 April - see below), M. Zotov, V. Sysoyev and the confiscated documents. Kalistratova did not answer any of the questions. In addition, an off-the-record conversation took place between Kalistratova and the investigator:

Kalistratova Why was Kuvakin arrested?
Kapayev Why, he's a militant anti-Sovietist.

Kalistratova Why have you joined Serebrov, Grivina and Kuvakin together in one case?
Kapayev Just as we've joined them, so we'll separate them; everything is in our hands...

Kalistratova I feel very sorry for Grivina.
Kapayev I can't - I'm only an official.

Kalistratova People have been saying lately: 'Now the KGB has gone after the women'.
Kapayev There is no one else left to take.

Kalistratova Well, if you're so sorry for her, let her go: you yourself say that everything is in your hands.
Kapayev I can't - I'm only an official.

Kalistratova Well, if you're so sorry for her, let her go: you yourself say that everything is in your hands.
Kapayev I can't - I'm only an official.

On 20 May KGB official Tikhonov issued Kalistratova with a 'warning according to the Decree'. From the items confiscated from her we have learned that you compile, duplicate and circulate politically harmful documents', he said. Kalistratova signed the warning, but objected that her human rights activity was of a legal and open nature.

On 24 April Kapayev interrogated A. Ivanchenko (Chronicle 53). Ivanchenko said that he did not know Grivina and that he knew Serebrov and Kuvakin only slightly; he did not remember where he had met them and did not know anything about their activities. Kapayev replied that they 'gave longer sentences to people like Ivanchenko; if Ivanchenko had a bad memory and had previously done badly in his studies, perhaps he was on the out-patients' list at a psychiatric clinic! Other people have had their memories refreshed'. Ivanchenko protested at Kapayev's threats, to which the latter replied: 'Go ahead and complain!' KGB Ris gone after the women'.

On 29 April Kapayev turned up at the house of V. Tolts (Chronicles 56, 60) and interrogated him as a witness in 'the Grivina-Serebrov case'. Kapayev explained to Tolts that he had come in person to interrogate him, since Tolts was an invalid and would have found it difficult to get to the Lubovanka prison. Kapayev asked about Grivina, Serebrov, Kuvakin, Bahman and Ternovsky. Tolts did not answer any of his questions and refused to sign the record. Off the record, Kapayev said that during 'our' (i.e. the KGB's) investigation of actual cases mentioned in the Working Commission's documents, it had become clear that these people really were mentally ill and in need of treatment. When KGB officials had pointed this out to the above-mentioned people, who were under investigation, they had said each time that mistakes did occur. In Kapayev's opinion, everyone was free to think whatever they liked about psychiatry: 'We don't punish people for that'. However, compiling documents about it, especially with mistakes, was a crime; after all, these documents were used as hostile propaganda. Other people claimed in other documents that there was 'totalitarianism' and a 'lack of democracy' in our country: Kapayev thought it permissible to think like this and to discuss it in private, although it was a mistake: 'Full democracy does not exist anywhere; it's only an ideal'. Therefore, to write about 'the absence of democracy' in documents was 'deliberate slander'.

When Tolts asked about Grivina, Kapayev replied that he was 'a legal consultant to the Working Commission'. Kapayev also stated that, the evening before, he had returned to Grivina's husband everything confiscated from her during searches except a typewriter, and advised Tolts to ask Investigator Zhdanov again to return the things confiscated from him during a search a year ago (Chronicle 56).

In April M. Utevsky (Chronicle 61) was interrogated by Investigator 'Vladimir Pavlovič'. Utevsky said that he had known Grivina since 1979 and Serebrov since 1975-6, and that he thought they were good people; he knew nothing about their 'slanderous activities'; he had heard (from whom he could not remember) that they belonged to the Working Commission; he was familiar with the Information Bulletin. Utevsky was shown a copy of the collective letter in defence of Bahman, which had his signature on it. The investigator wanted to know whether Utevsky had signed the letter himself, or whether Grivina had done it for him; several of the signatures (so the investigator thought) were in her hand. Utevsky replied that he had signed it himself.

On 23 April the telephone was disconnected at the home of V. Neplukhovitch, Grivina's husband. The same day Kapayev informed Grivina's mother that the investigation of her husband 'was complete'; it was time to look for a lawyer. On 4 May Kapayev informed the Working Commission of this and it was arranged that the Working Commission's documents and the collective letter would be returned to Bahman.

On 14 May Popov interrogated E. Alekseyeva (Chronicles 56, 57, 60). Alekseyeva refused to answer his questions 'for personal reasons'. Popov said: 'Why is it that some people place themselves above the law and do not consider it necessary to observe it? If you do not wish to answer questions today, we can meet tomorrow, then a few times more, even every day; whatever happens you will answer, for example when you are interrogated by us in another capacity... No one behaves like this, everyone behaves like this.'
The same day Alaksheyeva wrote a letter describing the course of the interrogation and addressed to Brezhnev (with copies to Rekunkov and Andropov):

Deeply Respected Leonid Ilich!

On 13 May I sent you a letter about the fact that I had been illegally refused a visa to leave the USSR. The following day I was brought a summons from Investigator V.N. Kapayev to come for interrogation as a witness to the Investigation Department of the Moscow KGB. I refused to answer questions for personal reasons (the interrogation was conducted by Investigator Popov and concerned the case of Felix Serebrov). A year ago I was detained by KGB officials and taken to a police station, where, without any explanation, I was forbidden to travel or dine in public; they shouted and threatened. 'You know who we are and we do not throw our words to the winds', they said at the end of the 'talk'. It was then, having experienced the lawless behaviour of this organization, that I decided never to have any dealings with its representatives, not to talk to them and not to give evidence in connection with my case. The events of the last interrogation have only strengthened my conviction that I had chosen the right course. Investigator Popov behaved correctly and I politely refused to answer. He warned me of the consequences of refusing to give evidence and said that I might be interrogated in another capacity (that of an accused?), but, I repeat, he behaved quite politely.

Today I went for a second interrogation, which was conducted by Investigator Kapayev. While he was going through the information from the previous interrogation, I took a book out of my bag, a small volume of Pushkin's poetry. Kapayev immediately repeated, 'Put that book away!' I asked why, and only managed to say 'No',. Then he rushed up to me and shouted: 'I won't, I refuse!' The Head of the Investigation Department, Balashov, so bellowed so loudly that I was at first rendered speechless. Kapayev and Balashov are well-known for their threats, and insults, and mockery. I ask you to take note of Balashov's and Kapayev's activities, so that similar incidents will not happen again, to me or to anyone else.

On 18 May Kapayev interrogated E.A. Kosterina (Chronicles 26, 30, 38, 39, 58) in connection with the case of Serebrov, charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code: 'forcing (someone) to give evidence by means of threats or other illegal actions on the part of the persons conducting the inquiry of pre-trial investigation'. Unfortunately, threats, and insults, and mockery all occurred. Kapayev also shouted: 'She's mindless!', which is both an insult and mockery. Kapayev also shouted 'You can leave the country'. In answer to Kosterina's question as to whether she had been involved in compiling it. 'As far as Serebrov is concerned - I don't know.' When Kapayev exclaimed that the letter contained slander, which Kosterina said that she had not written, she asked what had been involved in compiling it. 'As far as Serebrov is concerned - I don't know.' When Kosterina asked who had written it, Kapayev replied: 'I'm telling you to put the book away!' I took a book out of my bag, a small volume of Pushkin's poetry. Kapayev immediately repeated, 'Put that book away!' I asked why, and only managed to say 'No',. Then he rushed up to me and shouted: 'I won't, I refuse!' The Head of the Investigation Department, Balashov, so bellowed so loudly that I was at first rendered speechless. Kapayev and Balashov are well-known for their threats, and insults, and mockery. I ask you to take note of Balashov's and Kapayev's activities, so that similar incidents will not happen again, to me or to anyone else.

On 25 May Grivnina and her lawyer A.A. Sarne-Rubanova con-
cluded their study of the case. Neplekhovich sent the following letter to the Chairman of the German Social-Democratic Party, W. Brandt:

Mr Chairman,

My wife Irina Grivntina will soon appear in court on charges of slandering the Soviet system. She was a member of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes. The Commission's work was exclusively humane and non-violent in nature, and Soviet citizens the right to criticize. Irina's arrest has inflicted a severe trauma on our eight-year-old daughter.

I ask you, during your forthcoming visit to the USSR, to intervene with the Soviet leaders and ask them to release my wife Irina Grivntina and the other members of the Working Commission.

On 22 May KGB official Koroldv returned some of the items confiscated during the search on V. Serebrov. On 23 May Kapayev returned some more of the confiscated items to her. He demanded a receipt from Serebrova, to the effect that everything had been returned to her intact. She wrote out the receipt, but when she checked she discovered that several items (letters, Serebrov's poems) had not been returned. Kapayev then confirmed that the charges against her husband came under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

On 29 May Balashov and Yakovlev had a 'chat' with Serebrova in Lefortovo Prison. As a preliminary, they led her through the basement to the part of the investigations building where prisoners are interrogated. The investigators were interested in the nature of whether his wife had informed them. They asked a similar question to the effect that everything had been returned to her intact. She wrote out the receipt, but when she checked she discovered that several items (letters, Serebrov's poems) had not been returned. Kapayev then confirmed that the charges against her husband came under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

On 31 March V. Shepel'ev (Chronicle 61) was sentenced to two years in ordinary-regime camps. He was sent off to camp on 14 June.

TRIALS

The Trial of Azadovsky

On 16 March the Kubyshev District Court in Leningrad, presided over by A.S. Lukoninov, heard the case of Doctor of Literary Science Konstantin Markovich Azadovsky (b. 1941; arrested 19 December 1980 - Chronicle 60). He was charged under article 224 part 3 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Illegal...acquisition, possession...of narcotics'). The case featured a note which Azadovsky had sent illegally to his fiancee S. Lepilina, who was arrested on 18 December 1980 on similar charges (Chronicle 60). In the note Azadovsky asked Lepilina to 'stick firmly to the evidence you gave at the investigation regarding the powder on the fourth shelf of my bookcase and the fact that you were putting on my jacket. This will not harm you in any way, but it is very important for me... I tried to help the investigation and the organization supervising it to find a way out of the situation which has developed, at the price of a small lie... Azadovsky was sentenced to two years in ordinary-regime camps. He was sent off to camp on 14 June.

The Trial of Georgy Shepel'ev

On 10 March the People's Court in the Gagarin District of Moscow, presided over by Danilov, heard the case of Georgy Ivanovich Shepel'ev (b. 1950; arrested 24 February - Chronicle 61). He was charged under article 190, part 1, of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Petty theft of state...property').

Neither Shepel'ev's family, nor his lawyer were informed in advance of the date of the trial. On the morning of 30 March, Shepel'ev was informed by telephone that the trial would begin in 25 minutes. Lawyer G. Padve was also contacted by telephone, and immediately went to the court to study the case (he had not been permitted to do so earlier). G. Shepel'ev pleaded not guilty, saying that he had found the batteries outside the factory grounds, and that when detained he was on his way to the police station to hand them in. He was sentenced to six months' deprivation of freedom (the maximum under this article).

On 31 March V. Shepel'ev (Chronicle 61), S. Nekhotin (Chronicle 60), K. Krylova, A. Nebenovitch and E. Komarnitsky (Chronicle 60) issued a 'Statement for the Public':

Despite logical and convincing evidence for the defence, despite the absence of sufficient evidence, despite the defendant's denial of his guilt, Judge Danilov pronounced sentence...

Georgy Ivanovich Shepel'ev has not been sentenced in accordance with the article under which he was charged by the authorities. The real reason for this lawless act is Georgy Shepel'ev's part in writing the novel 'Dysh
The Trial of Ermenko

At the beginning of April the Magadan Regional Court, presided over by Deputy Court Chairman P.A. Rybachuk, heard the case of Arnold Aloyshevich Ermenko (arrested 12 December 1980 - Chronicle 60). He was charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

In 1964-1974 Ermenko served a ten-year sentence in a hard-regime camp under article 88 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Violation of the regulations on currency transactions'). He later graduated from the Magadan Teachers' Training Institute: until his arrest he taught evening classes at this Institute. In 1977 a manuscript entitled 'Turned by the October Revolution' was confiscated from Ermenko. He spent 40 days in prison, wrote a 'confession', signed a warning 'according to the Decree', and was released. In the spring of 1980, before going on holiday, Ermenko gave a manuscript of his to Gennady Bogolyubov and asked him to send it 'to the mainland' - i.e. central Russia. In June, however, when Bogolyubov tried to give the manuscript to an acquaintance who was flying out, the manuscript 'burned' - it fell into the hands of the authorities. In September Ermenko returned from his holiday. On 12 December he was arrested.

On 22 December searches were carried out at the homes of Burti Mukhametshin, in the settlement of Palatka, Magadan Region, where he is serving his exile sentence (Chronicle 59), and his sister Roza Fedyakina in Moscow, in connection with Ermenko's case (Chronicle 60). Nothing was confiscated from Mukhametshin. From 22 to 24 December Mukhametshin was interrogated by Magadan KGB officials.

The courtroom was full of 'special public'. Ermenko pleaded not guilty, stating that his work was not slanderous and had been written from a Marxist point of view. He listed the numerous mistakes and inaccuracies which had occurred when his work was quoted from. He was interrupted and not allowed to speak. He was sentenced, 'taking into account the family circumstances', to two-and-a-half years in strict-regime camps (a few days later Ermenko's wife gave birth to a daughter).

The Trial of Sarbayev

On 28 April the Kuibyshev Regional Court, presided over by A.V. Dunayev, heard the case of Anatoly Andreyevich Sarbayev (b. 1955: arrested 30 June 1980 - Chronicle 57). He was charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. The prosecutor was Procurator L.M. Nazarova, the defence lawyer V.N. Tershchukov.

Sarbayev was charged with producing the articles 'The Foundations of Anti-communism', 'Soviet Society according to the 1977 Constitution' and 'The Constitution of Society Behind the Iron Curtain (1977); works 'on questions of terrorism' (1978), 'Information Leaflet' No. 1 of the Middle Volga Group for the Defence of Human Rights (1979), and the article 'A Word for Viktor', dedicated to V. Davydov (on his trial see Chronicle 56).

On 28 April the Kuibyshev Regional Court, presided over by Deputy Court Chairman P.A. Rybachuk, heard the case of Anatoly Andreyevich Sarbayev (b. 1955: arrested 30 June 1980 - Chronicle 57). He was charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

Sarbayev was charged with producing the articles 'The Foundations of Anti-communism', 'Soviet Society according to the 1977 Constitution' and 'The Constitution of Society Behind the Iron Curtain (1977); works 'on questions of terrorism' (1978), 'Information Leaflet' No. 1 of the Middle Volga Group for the Defence of Human Rights (1979), and the article 'A Word for Viktor', dedicated to V. Davydov (on his trial see Chronicle 56).

On 13 April the Moscow Helsinki Group issued Document No. 165, 'The Arrest of Mikhail Zotov':

- The Trial of Zotov

On 25 March Mikhail Zotov (Chronicle 61) was dispatched under guard from Syzran Prison to Chelyabinsk, for a forensic psychiatric examination. He wrote in a letter:

- The Trial of Zotov

On 25 March Mikhail Zotov (Chronicle 61) was dispatched under guard from Syzran Prison to Chelyabinsk, for a forensic psychiatric examination. He wrote in a letter:

- The Trial of Zotov

On 25 March Mikhail Zotov (Chronicle 61) was dispatched under guard from Syzran Prison to Chelyabinsk, for a forensic psychiatric examination. He wrote in a letter:

- The Trial of Zotov

On 25 March Mikhail Zotov (Chronicle 61) was dispatched under guard from Syzran Prison to Chelyabinsk, for a forensic psychiatric examination. He wrote in a letter:

- The Trial of Zotov

On 25 March Mikhail Zotov (Chronicle 61) was dispatched under guard from Syzran Prison to Chelyabinsk, for a forensic psychiatric examination. He wrote in a letter:
On 13 and 14 July the Kuibyshev Regional Court heard the case of Mikhail Vasilievich Zotov (b. 1923), arrested 27 January, charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. Zotov himself was not in court, since he had been declared not responsible. The court decided to send Zotov for compulsory treatment to a psychiatric hospital of ordinary type. The court also ordered that the manuscript of Zotov's novel The Dissidents, and nine of his paintings, be destroyed.

On 4 December 1980 a case was instituted against Mikhail Yakovlev, under article 181, part 1, of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Perjury': the charges relate to Yakovlev's interrogation during the trial - Chronicle 58). Yakovlev was arrested and sent to the investigations prison on Matroskaya Tishina Street. On 10 June V. Tomachinsky (Chronicles 58, 60) sent the Moscow Procurator (with a copy to the Chairman of Moscow City Court) a 'Statement of Complaint':

On 3 June I gave evidence as a witness in the criminal case against citizen M. Yakovlev, charged under article 181 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. Senior Investigator Yu. A. Burtsev of the Moscow City Procuracy, ignoring my demand that the interrogation be conducted according to current legislation, did not keep a record of the interrogation. At first he arbitrarily said that the facts and circumstances I described were generally irrelevant to the case, and then, agreeing that the facts I had mentioned gave a general picture of the circumstances in which M. Yakovlev was placed immediately before and in connection with his giving evidence as a witness in court, he still refused to make a record of the interrogation and proposed that I should recount directly to the Procurator all that I knew in connection with this case.

I find, however, that Y. Burtsev's failure to observe articles 20, 21, 59, 64, 69, 70, 71, 102, 104, 118, 124, 140, 141 and 158 of the RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure amounts to a crime, one defined in article 142 of the RSFSR Criminal Code as negligence. I am therefore including in my statement a complaint against Burtsev (in accordance with article 22 of the RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure) and demand that he - Yu. A. Burtsev - be prosecuted. I am also including an account of the circumstances in which M. Yakovlev was 'forced to give evidence by means of threats...by the person conducting the examination or pre-trial investigation' - see article 179 of the Criminal Code.

Further on, Tomachinsky describes in detail the aforementioned incident in the witness room during the trial ofAbrinkin. In conclusion he writes:

...the most serious cause for alarm is the fact that a court acts, not according to the law, but in response to orders from sources outside the court. This is evident from the fact that Yakovlev's 'questioner' knew Sokirko's fate even before the Moscow City Court had reached its decision to bring criminal charges against Sokirko. It is evident from the fact that the 'questioner' had said out loud to Yakovlev that he would 'make him disappear' seven months previously. It is evident from the fact that the court does not take any action when the staff of the punitive organization break the law and commit serious crimes. The court is obviously in league with the punitive organs.

Our history has already demonstrated the dangerous consequences of conceding the prerogative of the Law to the punitive organs. As a responsible citizen, I cannot allow myself to remain silent about fatal trends. I therefore insist:

1. that I be officially interrogated as a witness;
2. that all the questioners, investigators, procurators and judges who are guilty of the crime I have described...
Gefter is Summoned

Burtsev had tried since the spring of 1981 to get M. Ya. Pavlov to Fefelov's letter to the Moscow City Court to grant my summons for interrogation as part of a 're-trial of Kuvakin's case in the town of Yurev-Polsky, at the home of V. Fainberg and V. Borisov, documents by the Moscow Helsinki Group and SMOT 'Free Inter-trade Association of Working People - FIAWP, a selection of documents stamped 'For official use', containing a description of production crises in the USSR, the samizdat journals Variants, Socialism and the Future and Left Turn, and five stamps from various institutes'. (The record has 32 entries).

After the search Kuvakin was taken to the Lubyanka, where Investigator Yakovlev and Balashov interrogated him in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case. Kuvakin said that he had Grivnina and Serebrov only slightly and had not received any documents from them. He had found out that they were members of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes from radio broadcasts. He did not consider the Working Commission's activities illegal.

The remaining questions concerned Kuvakin himself. He was asked about the confiscated briefcase and its contents. Kuvakin confirmed that the briefcase and its contents belonged to him, and that the letter addressed to Fainberg was actually intended for the latter. He also said that he had not given anyone any papers for safe-keeping.

Yakovlev showed Kuvakin the record of M. Ikonnikov's interrogation (he was interrogated while Kuvakin's home was being searched – see 'Searches, Interrogations'), where it was stated that Kuvakin had asked Ikonnikov to type out the text of the Pravda of the Supreme Soviet's Decree concerning the procedure for examining complaints (as it later turned out, the investigator who interrogated Kuvakin was not the one listed in the record).

On 2 April Investigator Kapayev of the Moscow KGB conducted a search in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case (see above) at the home of V. Fainberg and V. Borisov, documents by the Moscow Helsinki Group and SMOT 'Free Inter-trade Association of Working People - FIAWP, a selection of documents stamped 'For official use', containing a description of production crises in the USSR, the samizdat journals Variants, Socialism and the Future and Left Turn, and five stamps from various institutes'. (The record has 32 entries).

After the search Kuvakin was taken to the Lubyanka, where Investigator Yakovlev and Balashov interrogated him in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case. Kuvakin said that he had Grivnina and Serebrov only slightly and had not received any documents from them. He had found out that they were members of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes from radio broadcasts. He did not consider the Working Commission's activities illegal.

The remaining questions concerned Kuvakin himself. He was asked about the confiscated briefcase and its contents. Kuvakin confirmed that the briefcase and its contents belonged to him, and that the letter addressed to Fainberg was actually intended for the latter. He also said that he had not given anyone any papers for safe-keeping.

Yakovlev showed Kuvakin the record of M. Ikonnikov's interrogation (he was interrogated while Kuvakin's home was being searched – see 'Searches, Interrogations'), where it was stated that Kuvakin had asked Ikonnikov to type out the text of the Pravda of the Supreme Soviet's Decree concerning the procedure for examining complaints (as it later turned out, the investigator who interrogated Kuvakin was not the one listed in the record).

On 2 April Investigator Kapayev of the Moscow KGB conducted a search in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case (see above) at the home of V. Fainberg and V. Borisov, documents by the Moscow Helsinki Group and SMOT 'Free Inter-trade Association of Working People - FIAWP, a selection of documents stamped 'For official use', containing a description of production crises in the USSR, the samizdat journals Variants, Socialism and the Future and Left Turn, and five stamps from various institutes'. (The record has 32 entries).

After the search Kuvakin was taken to the Lubyanka, where Investigator Yakovlev and Balashov interrogated him in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case. Kuvakin said that he had Grivnina and Serebrov only slightly and had not received any documents from them. He had found out that they were members of the Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes from radio broadcasts. He did not consider the Working Commission's activities illegal.

The remaining questions concerned Kuvakin himself. He was asked about the confiscated briefcase and its contents. Kuvakin confirmed that the briefcase and its contents belonged to him, and that the letter addressed to Fainberg was actually intended for the latter. He also said that he had not given anyone any papers for safe-keeping.

Yakovlev showed Kuvakin the record of M. Ikonnikov's interrogation (he was interrogated while Kuvakin's home was being searched – see 'Searches, Interrogations'), where it was stated that Kuvakin had asked Ikonnikov to type out the text of the Pravda of the Supreme Soviet's Decree concerning the procedure for examining complaints (as it later turned out, the investigator who interrogated
Kuvakin confirmed this evidence, pointing out that he could of the procedure for examining complaints and statements. A group called 'Publicity', which would publicize violations had been confiscated. Yakovlev informed Kuvakin that at the time, he had been present during the search. He was not given any documents to foreigners, and had not received any from them.

V. Shepelëv (Chronicle 61), who was visiting Kuvakin at the time, had been present during the search. He was taken home, and a search was carried out there. Investigator Levchenko conducted the search. Six pages of addresses and telephone numbers were confiscated. After the search Levchenko drove V. Shepelëv to the Lubyanka, where he interrogated him. Shepelëv stated that he knew neither Grivnina nor Serebrov; when Levchenko asked him who else had been visiting Kuvakin the previous evening, Shepelëv replied that the question had no bearing on the case. Levchenko also tried to find out who wrote the statement in defence of G. Shepelëv and who collected the signatures for it (see "The Trial of Georgy Shepelëv").

On 14 April KGB officials fetched Kuvakin away from work. The next day it became known that he had been arrested and charged under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. A "Statement for the Press", which Kuvakin wrote on 12 March in case of his arrest, is circulating in samizdat:

"I do not conceal that my aim was to try, at least in some measure, to facilitate the earliest possible disintegration of the political and social system which has arisen in my country against the wishes of my fellow-citizens. In my opinion this system is neither legal, nor Soviet, nor - finally - constitutional, and I therefore do not admit that my actions contravened the law and I do not regard them as anti-Soviet, since there is no Soviet system in the USSR."

All that I have done and am doing, I have done and am doing consciously and deliberately, and the only thing I will regret after my arrest, it will be that I managed to do so little. But I am deeply convinced that I have acted and am acting in a just, right and noble cause, which will not be destroyed by arrests, trials, prison and camps, exile and banishment. Others will undoubtedly replace us, and they will differ from us only in that they will be more courageous, more consistent, more decisive, more uncompromising. This is all that I can and wish to say to my friends and like-thinkers, my fellow-citizens and all who empathize with the struggle for human rights and the democratization of our country. I will say this after my arrest, for until one's very last day of freedom, one can and must, honestly and silently, do one thing: serve our Motherland, serve Russia."

In April people interrogated in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case were also asked about Kuvakin (see 'The Grivnina-Serebrov Case' and 'Searches, Interrogations').

On 16 June at 2.30 pm Irina Nagle (Chronicles 57, 61) was approached at work (she works at the Centre for Geophysical Expeditions (CGE), where A. Lavut and T. Osipova were employed) by L. Stolyarova of the special section, who said: 'Ira, come and see me at four o'clock - I need you'. Stolyarova refused to explain the reason for the summons, so Nagle refused to go. At 4 pm A.S. Kashik (Chronicles 61) was called by telephone. When asked why he was summoning her, he said: 'I do not understand how this can have any bearing on a criminal case'; in the record. For example, Nagle's reply to the question: 'What do you know about the preparation, duplication, signing and circulation by Kuvakin of any articles?' was: 'I do not understand how this can have any bearing on a criminal case'; in the record Levchenko wrote: 'There was no reply'. Levchenko also tried to question Nagle about the collective appeal 'To People and Organizations of Good Will', dated 15 July 1980 (about the 'Olympic' hospitalization of V. Gershuni - Chronicle 57), which Nagle, among others, had signed: he got no response. When Nagle tried to make some notes in the record, Levchenko took the pen out of her hand. Nagle did not sign the record.

When the interrogation was over, Levchenko left his office at the disposal of two KGB officials who did not introduce...
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Vul said that he did not agree with the investigator's publicize what took place, in order to correct shortcomings: and various types of renegade. What is your opinion of correct information and were intended, not to discredit, appraisal: he considered that the documents contained beliefs. Furthermore, the aforementioned collections Vul referred to his reply to t e prey ous quest on. en and social system, discredit socialist democracy and the was its sole user - she needed it for her work. persecution on account of their political and religious the content of these documents?' In reply to this question, falsify or defame anything, but on the contrary - to - it was for 10 am on 10 April. He went to the interroga- tion. He was asked 18 questions. When he was asked his - it was for 10 am on 10 April. He went to the interroga- tion. He was asked 18 questions. When he was asked his purpose in keeping the documents confiscated from him in the position of suspect, which would limit his rights as a witness. When asked whether he had given anyone the Kronika Press documentary publications which had been confiscated from him, whether he had sent anything to this publisher, and whether he had taken part in the preparation, duplication, and circulation of A Chronicle of Current Events, Vul referred to his reply to the first of the questions. Levchenko wrote in the record against one of the questions: 'It can be seen from the material in the case that the documents shown to you, as well as other hand- and typewritten texts confiscated from you during the search, were compiled with your personal participation, together with other people, and were intended for inclusion in an issue in the series of so-called Chronicles of Current Events.' Vul was also asked whether he knew F. Serebrov and I. Kuvakin for a long time'. He gave an example: the Chronicle had stated that Jews in Petrozavodsk wished to emigrate and that they had been dismissed from their jobs; however he, 'Nikolai Borisovich', had made special inquiries and found out that the Jews had submitted statements asking to be dismissed. Vul objected that in many places it was necessary to be dis- missed in order to obtain a reference from one's place of work to submit to OVIR. Vul gave an example of an obviously unjust conviction. 'Nikolai Borisovich' promised to look into it and asked Vul not to publicize the contents of these documents. In reply to this request Vul said that he did not agree with the investigator's appraisal; he considered that the documents contained correct information and were intended, not to discredit, falsify or defame anything, but on the contrary - to publicize what took place, in order to correct shortcomings: this could only serve to strengthen socialist democracy.
that they had not finished their discussion and would probably have to talk again. Vul said that there was no point: if, for example, he were a witness or defendant, he would not give any evidence and would not answer any questions, so why should he answer questions during a 'chat'?

In May Vul received in the post a new invitation from Israel. Two new invitations are getting through to Moscow at present.

A Search at the Home of Legler

On 17 March Investigator Larichev of the Moscow Procuracy carried out a search at the home of Viktor Legler, Doctor of Geological and Mineralogical Sciences (the search-warrant was signed by Yu. A. Burtsev). The confiscated items included: a manuscript dealing with the position of scientists and the state of scientific research in the USSR, which Legler had been working on for several years; tamaizdat and samizdat, including copies of books by Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn and of Pasternak's Dr Zhivago; Searches and Reflections, and that in his opinion the material he did not know the editors of Searches, or those of Searchs and Reflections. and that in his opinion the material

On 13 May Legler and his wife were summoned for interroga
tion to the Moscow Procuracy. Burtsev interrogated Legler. G.V. Ponomarev interrogated his wife, Natalya Legler. Legler said that he did not know the editors of Searches, or those of Sear-
ches and Reflections, and that in his opinion the material

On 2 June B.B. Karatayev (Chronicles 57, 61) and escorts came to Legler's home unexpectedly. Karatayev demanded that Legler and his wife come with him 'for a chat'. Legler replied that he would not go without a summons. Karatayev then called the police. When a policeman arrived, Legler agreed to go. While they were all getting into the car, Natalya Legler, choosing her moment, ran off. Seeing that she was not there, Karatayev began shouting at his fellow-passengers. Nevertheless, they and Legler got into the car and drove off. When she returned home, Natalya Legler saw a figure dash away from the doors to her flat. They soon came for her again, and she submitted.

Karatayev talked to the Leglers in the reception room of the USSR KGB building. He tried to persuade them to tell him where they had obtained the literature that had been confiscated from them, and threatened them. He also kept looking openly at his watch and spun things out. At the end of their talk he invited Legler to come for another talk the following day. On 3 June Karatayev had a similar talk with Legler.

A Search at the Home of Romanova

On 17 April Police Captain Gordeyev and an 'official' who introduced himself as Shukhov, came to see Avgusta Romanova (Chronicles 56, 57) at work. They drove her home, where a search had been going on since the morning (Burtsev had signed the search-warrant). Senior Investigator L.P. Kornakov of the Moscow Procuracy conducted the search. The confiscated items included: tamaizdat and samizdat, notes on political prisoners, correspondence, notebooks, postal receipts. In addition, Romanova's personal summaries of books by Averintiev and Plutarch were confiscated (the search record listed 38 items).

Romanova wrote in the record:

1. Two people took part in the search: a man and a woman; their names are not mentioned in the search record.
2. During the search, items which have no connection with any criminal case were confiscated.

Romanova also made a strong oral protest about the confiscation of her personal summaries of works by authors published in the USSR, and the way in which the searchers conducted the search. After the search Legler was driven off for interrogation.

A Search at the Home of Khodorovich

On 17 November Investigator Krylov of the Moscow Procuracy conducted a search at the home of the administrator of the Political Prisoners Aid Fund, Sergei Khodorovich (Chronicles 56, 57). Items confiscated: tamizdat and samizdat, notebooks, private notes, notes on political prisoners (about 200 pages), photocopies of A Chronicle of Current Events, two cameras and films, cassette cassettes and a radio. The search record listed 44 items. Khodorovich refused to sign the record. At the end of AprilKhodorovich's telephone was disconnected.

The 'Hothouse Case' in Tomsk

At 6.30 am on 1 April, five KGB officials arrived at the orangery in the Tomsk flower nursery, to conduct a search at the home of the orangery's watchman, S. Bozhko. In Bozhko's presence, photocopies of an issue of the [Paris] journal Continental, an issue of the [Paris] journal The...
The chats continued for two days. During working hours, and whether he had voiced opinions on political matters. Shuvalov replied in the negative.

Although he would not show them the text: he used to cover what he had typed. From his colleagues' replies it transpired that Smirnov had told them that he was typing poetry, and then something else was discovered.

At the end of March a number of A. Smirnov's (Chronicle Committee) colleagues at work were interrogated in Moscow. On 11 May Sannikova was taken to the airport and put on a plane to Moscow. As the police station they were shown a statement about a robbery on the Riga-Moscow train; it contained an accurate description of the appearance of the two women. After this the were asked to turn out their bags: they were told that people were often detained on suspicion of one thing, and then something else was discovered.

The following were confiscated: Probaytova's manuscript on social security in the USSR, documents of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled, N. Ya. Kandel's memoirs and some notebooks. Sannikova and Probaytova were not given a copy of the search record. They were released around 1 am.

A few days later, Sannikova went to the village in the vicinity of Mishkova Station where she rented a room and worked in a kindergarten. She discovered that her landlord had taken the papers she had in her room and handed them over to 'the organs' (the KGB). She said that it had been her duty, 'as a communist', to do so.

A typewriter and some papers had been taken from the left luggage office at the station. Station employees said that 'officials' had taken them.

On 30 April Probaytova received a reply from the Kalinin Transport Procuracy to the complaint she had sent:

...In the course of our inquiry it was established that a warrant was issued to search for a woman who had stolen a passenger's belongings.

Due to the fact that citizen Sannikova somewhat resembled the description of the wanted woman, she was asked to come to the duty police office to establish her identity. You were also asked to come, since Sannikova had tried to give you a parcel.

At the police office you and Sannikova were found to be in possession of anti-Soviet literature. You were not actually detained, you were taken to the police office to establish your identity.

On 11 May Sannikova was detained in a sanatorium for the disabled near the town of Saki in the Crimea. She was "conducting a survey" of the inmates. She was driven to the Crimean KGB in Simferopol, where she was held and interrogated for three days. On 14 May Sannikova was transferred to Crimea Regional Psychiatric Hospital No. 1, where she was examined by three commissions.

On 25 May she was taken to the airport and put on a plane back to Moscow (at the state's expense). At the time of her discharge she was told that she had been pronounced healthy, but that she was mentally unstable and if she continued her 'activities' she could easily go mad.
Akhtyamova: the defence lawyer was V.P. Korablev. A KGB official took a "chat" with a man who introduced himself as 'KGB official T'as'lin'. "Have you brought the Bulletin?" he asked, and began to shower Zaitseva with all manner of threats. She was not released until late evening.

On 5 January Zaitseva addressed an inquiry to the Chistopol Procuracy as to the reason for her detention by the KGB. In addition, she demanded her confiscated film back. Zaitseva's camera was held a camera at the time she was detained and was returned to her, but the film was spoiled when it was developed.

From 26 to 31 March the Kharkov Regional Court, presided over by First Deputy Court Chairman Chernukhin, heard the case of Genrikh Ovanesovich Altunyan (b. 1933). Altunyan had been expelled from the CPSU and dismissed to the reserve (Chronicles 5, 7). In 1969 he was a co-founder of the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR (Chronicle 4).

In 1969 Altunyan was sentenced to three years in ordinary-regime camps under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the Russian Code - Chronicles 9, 11, 22). After his release from imprisonment, Altunyan, who is a radio engineer, got a job repairing cinematographic equipment.

...citizen Zaitseva...was detained in the act of photographing a state establishment, which is out of bounds for such purposes. Zaitseva's actions constituted a gross violation of point 1, par. 69, of the relevant regulations laid down by the USSR Council of Ministers. It is evident from Zaitseva's own explanation that she was actually holding a camera at the time she was detained and was using it. The actions of the Internal Affairs officials who detained Zaitseva were quite lawful. Your claim that KGB officials took part in this is not borne out by the facts. There are no grounds on which you may be refunded your bill for his report: and that the letters, photographs and documents which had no bearing on the case be returned to him. The court granted the defence lawyer's first petition: that he be allowed into the courtroom (but their documents were not checked). The defence lawyer submitted a petition for a photocopy of an article in French about Borovsky, which contained a photograph of Borovsky's father: est c nematographic equipment mechanic G.O. Altunyan before the start of the show'.

Apart from the 'special public', only Altunyan's family were allowed into the courtroom (but their documents were not checked). The defence lawyer submitted a petition for inclusion in the case of the following: a certificate from the investigations prison concerning Altunyan's state of health (he has a duodenal ulcer which has become acute); the 16 proposals on how to increase production which Altunyan drew up in a camp; the 1 December 1979 issue of the newspaper Lenin's Successors, which contained a photograph with the caption: 'Best cinematographic equipment mechanic G.O. Altunyan before the start of the show'.

In December 1980 Group member Olga Zaitseva (Chronicle 66) travelled to Chistopol (Tatar ASSR) to see Fu Khasanov (Chronicle 60), another member. On 23 December several men in army uniform and civilian clothes detained her in the street, took her off to the prison and took away her camera. The developed film contained only pictures of Khasanov. Zaitseva then had a 'chat' with a man who introduced himself as 'KGB official T'as'lin'. "Have you brought the Bulletin?" he asked, and began to shower Zaitseva with all manner of threats. She was not released until late evening.

On 5 January Zaitseva addressed an inquiry to the Chistopol Procuracy as to the reason for her detention by the KGB. In addition, she demanded her confiscated film back. Zaitseva's camera was held a camera at the time she was detained and was returned to her, but the film was spoiled when it was developed.

In 1969 Altunyan was sentenced to three years in ordinary-regime camps under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the Russian Code - Chronicles 9, 11, 22). After his release from imprisonment, Altunyan, who is a radio engineer, got a job repairing cinematographic equipment.

In 1969 Altunyan was sentenced to three years in ordinary-regime camps under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the Russian Code - Chronicles 9, 11, 22). After his release from imprisonment, Altunyan, who is a radio engineer, got a job repairing cinematographic equipment.
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In December 1980 Group member Olga Zaitseva (Chronicle 66) travelled to Chistopol (Tatar ASSR) to see Fu Khasanov (Chronicle 60), another member. On 23 December several men in army uniform and civilian clothes detained her in the street, took her off to the prison and took away her camera. The developed film contained only pictures of Khasanov. Zaitseva then had a 'chat' with a man who introduced himself as 'KGB official T'as'lin'. "Have you brought the Bulletin?" he asked, and began to shower Zaitseva with all manner of threats. She was not released until late evening.

On 5 January Zaitseva addressed an inquiry to the Chistopol Procuracy as to the reason for her detention by the KGB. In addition, she demanded her confiscated film back. Zaitseva's camera was held a camera at the time she was detained and was returned to her, but the film was spoiled when it was developed.

In 1969 Altunyan was sentenced to three years in ordinary-regime camps under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the Russian Code - Chronicles 9, 11, 22). After his release from imprisonment, Altunyan, who is a radio engineer, got a job repairing cinematographic equipment.

In 1969 Altunyan was sentenced to three years in ordinary-regime camps under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the Russian Code - Chronicles 9, 11, 22). After his release from imprisonment, Altunyan, who is a radio engineer, got a job repairing cinematographic equipment.
1975 by Korkov. Turovets's testimony: Kozoruk and Solenko testified that Turovets had given them these books: during the search of Altunyan's home Living History and the first two volumes of The Gulag Archipelago were not found.

In February 1975, Altunyan told his colleagues Petrenko, Tuniev and Titov, in the presence of KGB Captain Shafman, that the state had delegated its responsibilities in the field of domestic policy to the KGB (testimony of Petrenko, Tuniev and Titov):

"A Short Note on Two Conversations" and sent it abroad for publication, as is confirmed by its appearance in A Chronicle of Current Events, published in New York. In the KGB's opinion, the article was confiscated from Altunyan in 1967 and was not cited against him at his last trial; 5.

- Altunyan had enclosed 'slanderous poems by N. Rudenko' in a letter to Tury Burya, who was then imprisoned. Regarding the indictment, Altunyan said:

...First of all, I protest against the actions of the KGB: not all of the KGB, but the Kharov KGB, and not all of the Kharkov KGB, but specifically Babunenko, Yakovenko, Sidelnik, Mursin and Drotenko; I wish to state that I went on hunger-strike for 25 days in the investigations prison in protest against actions of these officers committed before this case was instituted. They interrogated many witnesses before the case was instituted. Without keeping a record, they put great pressure on them, they carried out a search without any foundation, during which the law was grossly violated - before the case was instituted. The case has been completely fabricated by these KGB officials.

Citizen Podolsky was present when I talked to Dr. Gritsenko. During our talk, he threatened to search Altunyan's home. I wish to state that I went on hunger-strike for 25 days in the investigations prison in protest against actions of these officers committed before this case was instituted. They interrogated many witnesses before the case was instituted. Without keeping a record, they put great pressure on them, they carried out a search without any foundation, during which the law was grossly violated - before the case was instituted. The case has been completely fabricated by these KGB officials.

- Turovets's testimony: Kozoruk and Solenko testified that Turovets had given them these books: during the search of Altunyan's home Living History and the first two volumes of The Gulag Archipelago were not found.

In February 1975, Altunyan told his colleagues Petrenko, Tuniev and Titov, in the presence of KGB Captain Shafman, that the state had delegated its responsibilities in the field of domestic policy to the KGB (testimony of Petrenko, Tuniev and Titov):

"A Short Note on Two Conversations" and sent it abroad for publication, as is confirmed by its appearance in A Chronicle of Current Events, published in New York. In the KGB's opinion, the article was confiscated from Altunyan in 1967 and was not cited against him at his last trial; 5.

- Altunyan had enclosed 'slanderous poems by N. Rudenko' in a letter to Tury Burya, who was then imprisoned. Regarding the indictment, Altunyan said:

...First of all, I protest against the actions of the KGB: not all of the KGB, but the Kharov KGB, and not all of the Kharkov KGB, but specifically Babunenko, Yakovenko, Sidelnik, Mursin and Drotenko; I wish to state that I went on hunger-strike for 25 days in the investigations prison in protest against actions of these officers committed before this case was instituted. They interrogated many witnesses before the case was instituted. Without keeping a record, they put great pressure on them, they carried out a search without any foundation, during which the law was grossly violated - before the case was instituted. The case has been completely fabricated by these KGB officials.

Citizen Podolsky was present when I talked to Dr. Gritsenko. During our talk, he threatened to search Altunyan's home. I wish to state that I went on hunger-strike for 25 days in the investigations prison in protest against actions of these officers committed before this case was instituted. They interrogated many witnesses before the case was instituted. Without keeping a record, they put great pressure on them, they carried out a search without any foundation, during which the law was grossly violated - before the case was instituted. The case has been completely fabricated by these KGB officials.
Altunyan and his wife were seriously ill, and that Altunyan's father was dying. That Altunyan's colleagues (the director of Kinotekhprom Cinema Technology Industry, Petrenko, party organizer Tuniev, worker Klimenko), Kosulin - husband of a cousin of Altunyan, V. Borovsky's mother, Yu. Dzyuba and Nedobora were all questioned in the court. Dr Gritsenko was not in court and that Podolsky, who had been severely sentenced for free thought, did not appear in court - but her testimonial in her speech, and demanded the maximum penalty for Altunyan and that he has been severely sentenced for free thought - one can fight books and free speech, and for a book.

In his final speech Altunyan said, turning to the judges and the Procurator: Today I am being tried on the strength of a denunciation, tomorrow they will let me bring up my young children - this time you may not let me be with my elderly parents as they embark on their last journey.

The judgment reiterated all the points of the indictment. The court sentenced Altunyan to seven years in strict-regime camps and five years' exile. It deprived Altunyan of his rank of major and requested the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet to deprive him of his medals. The court issued decisions to extract from the case file the evidence implicating Yu. Dzyuba and Turovets, for action to be taken.

On 7 April the Moscow Helsinki Group adopted Document No. 16, 'The Trial of Genrikh Altunyan'...

It is perfectly obvious from the text of the judgment itself that Altunyan did not commit any criminal offence, and that he has been severely sentenced for free thought and free speech, and for a book.

In his final speech Altunyan said, turning to the judges and the Procurator: Today I am being tried on the strength of a denunciation, tomorrow they will let me bring up my young children - this time you may not let me be with my elderly parents as they embark on their last journey.

Genrikh Altunyan's conviction shows that the persecution of all dissenters in the USSR has intensified.

The Trial of Naboka, Milyavsky, Lokhvitskaya and Chernyayvskaya

unsubstantiated denunciation proves sufficient to convict someone. They only have to hard down the victim and the rest will be done by people like Babusenko, Brezenko and Yakovenko. The KGB will acquire the right to break into any flat, carry out illegal searches, and shadow people. Today they are shadowing me, tomorrow they will shadow you (turning to the Procurator) and the day after tomorrow they will shadow you (turning to the judges). I am in the dock today, tomorrow it will be you.

Recent mistakes are still fresh in our minds. Before you go to confer, I ask you: do not make a mistake, think before you reach your verdict. If I have offended anyone here, I beg their pardon, I am like that. Although my wife manages my impulsive temperament beautifully. I thank all my friends and family who have come here: I know how difficult it was. I ask my family's forgiveness: I am guilty before them, for I have ruined their lives: but God sees that I did not wish to.

One more thing, citizen judges. Before you go to confer, I would like to remind you that last time you did not let me bring up my young children - this time you may not let me be with my elderly parents as they embark on their last journey.

Compatriot! 12 January is Ukrainian Political

Contest's announcement was somewhat inaccurate. Sergii Naboka, his wife Natalya Parkhomenko, Leonid Milyavsky, Larissa Lokhvitskaya and Inna Chernyayvskaya decided that, in memory of the arrests of 1972 (Chronicle 24), they would paste up leaflets in Ukrainian, of approximately the following content: 'Compatriot! 12 January is Ukrainian Political
Prisoners' Day. Let us support it."

On 25 to 29 June the Kiev City Court, presided over by V.N. Parkhomenko, heard the case of Sergei Vadimovich Naboka (b. 1954), and Inna V.N. Maibozhenko, who arrived in the next trolleybus, were also detained. They were all taken to the police office at the metro station, where they were subjected to body searches. One leaflet was found on Naboka and a second on Parkhomenko. On the arrival of a KGB official they were taken to various police stations, put in separate cells and interrogated the same night.

Searches were carried out on 12 January. The following was confiscated from Naboka: his own poems and stories in Ukrainian, Mikhail Bulgakov's Devilina and The Fatally Egg. His father-in-law's archive (the so-called WIGECK) two issues of the journal KHLAM (Cultural and Literary Almanac; it was produced by a circle of friends; two issues had appeared since 1979), and a typewriter. Stories (in Russian), diaries and a typewriter were confiscated from Lokhvitskaya. The search at Milyavsky's home was carried out without a warrant, record or witnesses. A newspaper dictionary (first used in the period 1920-50), which Milyavsky had compiled himself, and an issue of the newspaper Izrael today were confiscated. A radio and a typewriter were confiscated from Chernyavskaya. The same day Parkhomenko was released: 'Pray for your child, we are letting you go for her sake' (Parkhomenko and Naboka). At this moment the trolleybus reached a stop, a practically empty trolleybus. A man rushed up to them, shouting 'They put people in prison for this', and seized one of them. At this moment the trolleybus reached a stop, where a policeman was standing. He detained all three of them. Milyavsky and Parkhomenko, who arrived in the next trolleybus, were also detained. They were all taken to the police office at the metro station, where they were subjected to body searches. One leaflet was found on Naboka and a second on Parkhomenko. On the arrival of a KGB official they were taken to various police stations, put in separate cells and interrogated the same night.

According to the judgment, Lokhvitskaya was guilty of the following:

- In 1977-8 she compiled 'Notes of a Radio Listener' (a commentary on Western radio broadcasts she had heard), 133 pages;
- at the beginning of 1980 she wrote an article entitled 'To Choose Freedom', in which she claimed that there was no political freedom in the USSR, human rights were violated, dissenters were persecuted, and the state was founded on political oppression, economic adventurism and illiteracy;
- in 1980 she 'prepared for circulation' an article entitled 'The Future of Our Society: Trends in its Development'.

Lokhvitskaya was also charged with discussing the occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968, disapproving of the incursion of troops into Afghanistan, and approving of 'Solidarity' (according to the testimony of Shcherbakov, Pilipenko, Golovan and Lementarchuk).

Naboka was charged that:

- In 1976 he wrote the poem 'Grant Us, O Lord', in which he claimed that there was a lack of freedom in the USSR;
- In 1977, 'on an unidentified typewriter, he prepared for circulation the miscellaneous insight, in which he adopted a slanderous point of view and an supernaturalism which appeared, making the reader think that the democratic freedom was lacking in the USSR, for which purpose he included in the said miscellaneous a number of texts in the form of decadent poems, the themes being linked to the 60 years of Soviet rule';
- in 1977, 'in collaboration with a person unknown, he prepared for circulation the slanderous document 'At the Crossroads: Pseudosocialism', which deliberately false fabrications to the effect that the mass media in the USSR did not depict the truth about Soviet life, but poured out 'an avalanche of lies, prosperity and self-satisfaction';
- at the beginning of 1980 he wrote a poem entitled 'Praise Be to Thee', in which he claimed that the USSR was an empire;
- in 1980 he wrote the document 'Not a Few Hopes', in which he claimed that the slogans 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity', in the name of which the October Revolution was carried out, 'were and have remained empty words'.

Lokhvitskaya and Chernyavskaya were charged that:

- In 1976 they 'compiled and issued' the document 'Spanish Interview', in which the author, 'in the name of the 60 years of Soviet rule', the mass media in the USSR did not depict the truth about Soviet life, but poured out an 'avalanche of lies, prosperity and self-satisfaction'.
At the start of the trial, Naboka presented a petition requesting that the court proceedings be conducted in Ukrainian - this was denied. The defendants pleaded not guilty. According to the judgment, the defendants:

- in 1980 they compiled a leaflet entitled 'Manifesto';
- in July 1980, in Chernyavskaya's flat, they prepared a leaflet calling for support for a boycott of the Olympic Games, on the grounds that the USSR had occupied Afghanistan; the defendants were unable to carry out their plan and described the incident themselves during the investigation;
- at the beginning of autumn 1980, in Naboka's flat, they compiled the document 'The Prospects for Filling the Spiritual Vacuum of Soviet Society', which was not included in the judgment; in which they claimed that the USSR lacked democratic freedom and where they compared it to a fascist regime;
- in 1980 they compiled a Manifesto, in which they claimed that a usurpation of power had taken place in the USSR, 'demagogic demands' were put forward for an extension of human rights and democratic freedoms in the USSR, and 'all the power of the Soviets has passed into the hands of the Communist party';
- in 1981 Lokhvitskaya compiled the text of a leaflet entitled 'Manifesto II' and, with Chernyavskaya's help, duplicated it at the latter's home for circulation.

The defendants' claims that the episodes referred to in court, although only two were put up and two more confiscated, do not dispute their part in preparing the works cited against them, however they believe that none of the documents cited against them contains deliberately false, untrue and invented statements intended to defame the Soviet political and social system.

In their final speeches the defendants said that they intended to study politics and economics, so that they could criticize the state system from a position of knowledge. Naboka also said in his speech: 'I did not for a second doubt that we would be convicted. And our conviction is the best argument in our favor.' From Milyavsky's final speech: 'One is not usually held criminally responsible for one's views. History will show that we were right.'

The court sentenced each of the defendants to three years in ordinary-regime camps. The judgment referred to the radiors confiscated during the searches, as well as the typewriters, as being instruments of the crime. The defendants refused to appeal.

The Arrest of Didenko

On 19 March PBtr Pavlovich Didenko an Adventist was arrested in the town of Pochaev, where he was living under surveillance. The same day searches were carried out in Lvov at the homes of Mikhail Goryn (Horin) and his wife Z. Krasivsky (Chronicles 36, 60). During the search at Goryn's home, carried out by eight people, an envelope containing an appeal to the Madrid Conference, supposedly compiled by the Helsinki Group, was surreptitiously placed on the table. Goryn and his wife immediately told the searches that this was not there at the start of the search.

as such, do not correspond to fact: the slanderous fabrications defaming the Soviet political system contained in the works they compiled, are obvious, and they knew them to be false, since they live in the Soviet Union, make use of the privileges, rights and freedoms of its citizens, and are aware of our country's peaceable policies, of the extensive rights of its citizens, and of its national minorities policy; nevertheless, they circulated in their documents deliberately false, untrue and invented statements intended to defame the Soviet political and social system.
sky, who is serving his exile sentence in Tyumen Region. On 26 March a search was carried out at the home of N.V. Surovtseva (Chronicle 54) in Kiev. Her memoirs and notes on her reminiscences of Soviet writers were confiscated. On 28 March a search was carried out at the home in Kiev of Surovtseva's niece, L. Domogitskaya.

On 1 April a search was carried out at the home of imprisoned L. Lukyanenko in Kiev, where Surovtseva usually stayed when she came to the city. Surovtseva's memoirs, tapes of her oral stories, and documentary material relating to Domogitskaya's mother were confiscated.

On 29 April a search was carried out at the home of Atena Pashko (Chronicle 61), wife of political prisoner V. Chornovil (see "In the Prisons and Camps" in this issue). Chornovil's letters to his wife from exile and camp, and statements by the Chornovil family to official bodies, were confiscated.

In May Atena Pashko was summoned by the KGB - at a day's notice - for interrogation. She is being threatened with arrest. On 14 May (the eve of her wedding), Irina Pashko, Atena's daughter, was summoned for interrogation. In May Pashko's mother (who is about 80) was summoned for interrogation in connection with Kandyba's case. She was questioned about the papers confiscated during the search at her daughter's home.

On 6 April the Moscow Helsinki Group adopted Document No. 165, "In the Ukraine Ivan Kandyba has been Arrested": "We are unable to find out what charges have been brought against Ivan Kandyba. But we are convinced that I. Kandyba would not have done anything contravening the USSR Constitution, or anything illegal.

The Arrest of Raisa Rudenko

On 21 March Raisa Rudenko (Chronicles 57, 61), took a bus from Kiev to the Koncha Zaspa district, where she lived, and was walking home along a path. An unknown man (the neighbours said that he had been hanging around in the small grove near their homes for a few days) grabbed her hand bag and ran off towards the main road, where a car was waiting for him: he got into it and drove off. The hand bag contained her passport and some poems by N. Rudenko (Chronicle 61) which had avoided the camp censorship.

On 15 April a search was carried out at Raisa Rudenko's home, after which she was arrested. Letters and typewritten texts were confiscated (about 60 items were listed in the record). N. Rudenko was charged under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the Russian Code).

On 16 April a search was carried out in Kiev at the home of former political prisoner Grigori Gershak (Chronicle 48) and his wife Lyubov Litovchenko (Chronicle 57). KGB officials refused to explain which case (the search was connected with, mentioning only the article - article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code. Gershak himself was not at home - he had been collected from work and taken for interrogation. Litovchenko was interrogated after the search. The questions were mainly about R. Rudenko.

On 16 May a search was carried out at the home in Kiev of Lyubov Murzhenko, wife of political prisoner A. Murzhenko (see "In the Prisons and Camps" in this issue). Her husband's letters, a typescript, and photographs were confiscated.

On 29 May Senior Investigator Captain Zinich of the Kiev KGB interrogated L. Murzhenko in connection with R. Rudenko's case, on the orders of Senior Investigator Captain Fakhno of the Ukrainian KGB. L. Murzhenko said that she had known Raisa Rudenko for severn years and they were on good terms: 'I know nothing about her keeping, preparing or circulating...literature of anti-Soviet content'. L. Murzhenko was then shown the items confiscated from her during the search. She said: 'My husband's letters were typed out by an acquaintance named Nata Kaganovskaya, and I gave them to her as she was leaving the USSR for Israel'. She said she did not remember how she came to have the two handwritten sheets.

After the interrogation, KGB Senior Lieutenant K.F. Sheremet (Chronicle 53) issued L. Murzhenko with a warning "according to the Decree".

regarding the fact that she maintains written contact with persons who have been convicted of anti-Soviet activities. She compiles, and sends to various departments of state organs, ideologically harmful letters and statements.

On 26 June an investigator from the Ukraine tried to interrogate T. Velikanova in Mordovian Camp 3. She refused to answer questions: 'I consider that to take part in such a case in any capacity - as witness, investigator, judge, defendant, etc. - immoral'.

The Arrest of Antsupov

On 20 March Evgeny Antsupov (Chronicles 57, 60, 61) sent a statement to the USSR Procurator-General demanding the return of the academic works confiscated from him during a search on 22 August 1980:

"Today the Kharkov KGB has no legal grounds whatsoever for continuing to hold my works in such thieves fashion. In a country such as ours (and this is the most advanced democracy in the world), such "freedoms" with regard to the law are indefensible. I suggest that you should not wait a year, or 18 months, while the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet examines the question of my renunciation of Soviet citizenship, but settle the matter swiftly and categorically: arrest E.M. Antsupov, charge him with all the articles in the 'special category' of the UkrVSS Criminal Code, turn his works into material evidence in the case, and thus, once and for all, bury
then in the archives. I think that after this, not one dog in the USSR will remember that before Antsupov's arrest his work was for seven months kept - when all's said and done - illegally by the KGB.

In mid-April Antsupov sent a statement to the Kharkov Regional Procurator demanding that he check on the activities of Kharkov OVD, which had for six months refused to issue emigration forms to the Antsupov family. In the statement the following prognosis was put forward:

Most likely, I will be subjected to arrest and conviction. In our country any method, any delay or trial must be used to hinder emigration - this has been well mastered in the localities. A bitter country, a bitter government, a bitter people, bitter laws, bitter customs!

On 24 April Antsupov was detained in Penza Region, where he had gone to earn some income. On 27 April S.M. Storozhenko, an investigator for Specially Important Cases of the Kharkov Regional Procuracy, informed Semyannikova that Antsupov had been arrested on the authority of a warrant Storozhenko had issued on 24 April, and that he would be held in the Investigations prison of the Kharkov Region UVD.

On 16 December 1980 Antsupov had written a 'Statement which I Ask to be Published in the Event of my Arrest':

Everyone!

The institution of a criminal case against me is an act of reprisal for my political and scholarly beliefs... I am the victim of the most genuine, most gangsterish political reprisal... I ask my family, friends and enemies to bear in mind that I refuse to take part in the comedy of the investigation and trial... I am not convicted - as revenge, reprisal, persecution and punishment for dissent.

On 24 April the Head of the Investigations Department of the Kharkov Regional UVD, Novikov, informed Semyannikova that Antsupov had been arrested (article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code = article 140-1 of the Russian Code).

The same day, Semyannikova submitted a statement to the Kharkov Regional Procurator (with a copy to the USSR Procurator-General):

On 24 April, after numerous appeals and statements, our documents renouncing our citizenship were finally accepted. However, due to a strange combination of circumstances, my husband, Evgeny Mikhailovich Antsupov, was arrested on this same day, 24 April.

I demand his immediate release and an end to the persecution of our family. I ask you to exercise supervision over the transmission of our documents for leaving the USSR to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, over the observation of time limits (this same Presidium laid down the limit of two months, and the examination of our statements, and I ask you to make sure that the decision taken is justified.

On 30 April Semyannikova wrote in a statement to Brezhnev that she considered her husband's arrest direct persecution of a man for his political and scholarly beliefs, and also for his wish to emigrate... As a protest against this I insist on the swift granting of my request to give up my Soviet citizenship and I ask that I and my children be allowed to leave as soon as possible to go and live permanently in another country.

On 30 April Antsupov's brother, S. Antsupov, appealed to the USSR Procurator-General in a statement:

It is my profound conviction that criticism of the work of official Soviet, party, social, economic and other organs is an inalienable, constitutional right, and does not constitute the circulation of deliberately false fabrications... If I am mistaken, however, I demand that this be explained to me, with indication of the concrete facts which have served as the basis for instituting the present criminal case.

MISCELLANEOUS

On 20 May Lieutenant A.V. Khomov of the Ukrainian KGB asked A. Shevchenko's wife Lyudia to come and see him, so that he could give her a story that her husband had translated from English. The favour turned into a 'chat'. Khomov wanted to know: Did she have enough money to live on? Had she been telling anyone about her husband's case? He said that 'material had been intercepted', from which it was evident that she or Maria Shevchenko (A. Shevchenko's wife) were spreading 'information' about their husbands' case.

KGB officials have been treating V. Shevchenko with antipathy. The Head of the Lvov Investigations Prison said to him: 'Khara is simply an enemy, but you are a political journalist and these journals are the work of your pen. You want a Peace Prize, like Sakharov'. A. Shevchenko was sent off to camp in the first half of May, and V. Shevchenko in the first few days of June.

Svetlana Kirichenko is not allowed time off from her compulsory labour (Chronicle 60) to visit her husband (Yu. Badzâ). She is threatened with arrest if she should go.

In April, KGB officials had several talks with Galina...
On 23 March the Armenian Supreme Court, presided over by S. Asatryan, examined the case of Alexander Manucharyan, doctor of historical science (b. 1929; arrested 14 May 1980). There is an inaccuracy in Chronicle 52, Ashot Apikyan and Sahak Melkonyan. They were charged under article 65 of the Armenian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the Russian Code) and article 67 ('organizational activity aimed at committing especially dangerous crimes against the state, and also membership of an anti-Soviet organization'). The prosecutor was Procurator Eremyan.

Neither Apikyan nor Melkonyan was imprisoned before the trial, or during it. Manucharyan was charged with writing the articles 'All About the National Question' and 'Imperialism'. The sentence was: four years in strict-regime camps and two years' exile for Manucharyan; and two years' exile for Apikyan and Melkonyan.

Until his arrest Manucharyan was a senior researcher at the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography of the Armenian Academy of Sciences. He is an expert on Armenian medieval inscriptions: his work has been published in the USSR and in Italy. In recent years he had been collaborating with Polish scholars on research into Armenian inscriptions in Poland, to which country he travelled twice in 1977 and 1979 in connection with this work.

Manucharyan's wife Eliz Gekoglanyan fell ill soon after his arrest, and is in Erevan Psychiatric Hospital. Their children Aran (aged 12) and Akop (10) have been left in the care of their aunt, and live in poverty. Manucharyan's parents were arrested in 1937. His father (People's Commissar for Communications in Armenia) died in a camp.

Apikyan taught drawing and painting in a secondary school in the village of Chichkhan. Melkonyan taught German in a secondary school in the village of Ishkhan.

The Trial of Margret Arutyunyan, Vartan Arutyunyan, Melkonyan, Koryagin and Agababyan

From 29 March to 9 April the Armenian Supreme Court examined the case of Margret Arutyunyan (b. 1940), Vartan Arutyunyan (b. 1960), Ishkhan (Prince) Mkrtchyan (b. 1957), Samuel Koryagin (b. 1959) and Gagik Agababyan (b. 1954). They were charged under articles 65 and 67 of the Armenian Criminal Code.

They were charged with forming a group called the 'Union of Young Armenians', and writing and circulating poems 'in which the idea of an independent and free Armenia was glorified'. The indictment named the group's 'Instructor and inspirer' as N. Arutyunyan and its 'practical leader' as Mkrtchyan. The defendants (except for Agababyan, who, it is said, admitted his guilt 'under pressure from his family') pleaded not guilty.

M. Arutyunyan stated in court that the aim of the group was to propagate 'the idea of Armenia's secession from the USSR', and that the 'Dashnak Party was the only real defender of the nation's interests'. The Dashnak Party, he said, 'is the diamond whose light illumines Armenia and inspires her people to heroism in the name of liberty and independence: it is the only legal and patriotic party in Armenia. There is so much evil in the new communist order that later on people will realize the scale and depth of communist depravity... The time has come to declare communist parties in all countries outside the law. This is what will happen in the future, in independent Armenia'.

Merkhchyan defended the basic idea in Arast Aragonyan's letter to Chicherin, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs (under Lenin): 'The future Armenia will be led by the Dashnak Party, as the only national party'. S. Melkonyan (for
his trial see above) appeared as a witness. He tried to
give the impression of a link between the two groups.
On the last day of the trial the defendants demanded
that a telegram be sent in their name to US President
Reagan, 'wishing him a speedy recovery and expressing the
hope that he will remain faithful to his promises'.

The sentences were as follows: M. Arutyunyan and Mkrtchyan
were sentenced to seven years in strict-regime camps and
five years’ exile; V. Arutyunyan to five years in strict-
regime camps and three years’ exile; Egiazaryan to four
years in strict-regime camps; and Agababyan to three years
in strict-regime camps.

M. Arutyunyan’s mother, Asya Bubuyan, appealed to the
Moscow Helsinki Group and to Amnesty International:
...I have spent my life on the KGB's doorstep. First
of all on account of my husband, who served in Drastamat
Kanayant's (General Dro's) legion and was sent into exile
for it; then on account of my elder son Shagen Arutyunyan,
who was sent to prison for the first time in 1968 for
so-called 'anti-Soviet activity' and again in 1977 on
a trumped-up charge (he was a member of the Helsinki
Group. Now it is because of my younger son, Marzpet.
I appeal to you to raise your voices in defence of
my son Marzpet Arutyunyan, who is being punished for
his beliefs in our enlightened twentieth century.

EVENTS IN LITHUANIA

The Trial of Vaiciunas

On 25 March engineer Vytautas Vaiciunas (Chronicle 41),
a member of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, was arrested
in Kaunas. On 23 April the Catholic Committee to Defend
Believers' Rights sent its Document 48 to the Central Com-
mittee of the Lithuanian CP:

...Thousands of believers are asking: when will all this
end? If all Soviet citizens, including believers, have
the right to march in procession through the streets
on 1 and 9 May or 7 November, then why are processions
of Soviet religious citizens to holy places like the
Hill of Crosses or Silius, or to the cemetery on All
Souls Day, treated as crimes?

...The arrest of Vytautas Vaiciunas and Mecislovas
Jurevicius (see below - Chronicle) has aroused indignation
all over Lithuania and deepended the puf between believers
and the Soviet authorities...

On 25 June the Supreme Court of the Lithuanian SSR, with
Judge Jankauskas presiding, examined the case of Vaiciunas
(born 1930), who faced charges under article 199-3 of the
Lithuanian Criminal Code ('Organization of, or active parti-
cipation in, group activities which violate public order').
The prosecution was conducted by Procurator Murauskas.
The accused declined to have defence counsel. Vaiciunas
was charged with having organized a procession of religious
believers from Tytuvenai to Siluva.

In his defence speech Vaiciunas said:
...You have found no documents to prove that I organi-
ized the procession. The charge is based only on the evidence
of witnesses hired by you. Why did you not question any
of the people I pointed out on photographs of the pro-
cession?

You accuse me of not asking the authorities for per-
misson to hold the procession. I didn't ask as I was
not organizing it.

...I took part in the procession and made a speech.
I went to the Holy Virgin Mary, and will go on doing
so, asking her to intercede for the Lithuanian nation
and its young people, to save the people from alcoholism
and immorality.

I protest against this charge and consider myself not
guilty...

The court sentenced Vaiciunas to two-and-a-half years in
ordinary-regime camps.

The Trial of Jurevicius

On 25 March Mecislovas Jurevicius (Chronicle 56), a mem-
er of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, was arrested
in Kaunas. On 23 April the Catholic Committee to Defend
Believers' Rights sent its Document 48 to the Central Com-
mittee of the Lithuanian CP:

...You have found no documents to prove that I organized
the procession. The charge is based only on the evidence
of witnesses hired by you. Why did you not question any
of the people I pointed out on photographs of the pro-
cession?

You accuse me of not asking the authorities for per-
misson to hold the procession. I didn't ask as I was
not organizing it.

...I took part in the procession and made a speech.
I went to the Holy Virgin Mary, and will go on doing
so, asking her to intercede for the Lithuanian nation
and its young people, to save the people from alcoholism
and immorality.

I protest against this charge and consider myself not
guilty...

The court sentenced Vaiciunas to two-and-a-half years in
ordinary-regime camps.

Events in Estonia

The Trials of Kalep, Nitssoo and Madisson

On 17 March the Supreme Court of the Estonian SSR sentenced
Veijo Kalep (born 1934, arrested 20 October 1980 - Chronicle
60) to two years in strict-regime camps, according to
article 68 of the Estonian Criminal Code (= article 70
of the RSFSR Code).

On 24 April the Supreme Court of the Estonian SSR sentenced
Viktor Nitssoo (born 1952, arrested 4 December 1980
- Chronicle 60) to two years in strict-regime camps and
two years’ exile, according to article 68 of the Estonian
Code. He was charged with having made a toast at a party,
calling on a Komsomol Secretary to resign from the Komsomol.

On 16 May the same court sentenced Tiit Madisson (born
1950, arrested 20 October 1980 - Chronicle 60) to four
years in strict-regime camps and two years’ exile, according
to article 68 of the Estonian Code.
two members of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group remained at liberty - Owa Lukauskaitė-Poskiene and Fr Bronius Laurinavičius.

On 25 and 26 June the Supreme Court of the Lithuanian SSR, with Judge Ignotas presiding, examined the case against Jurevicius (born 1927), who faced charges under article 196-1 of the Lithuanian Criminal Code. The prosecution was conducted by Procurator Rukulinis. The accused declined to have defence counsel. While the court was examining the details of his biography, Jurevicius declared that he had been born in independent Lithuania and was a Lithuanian citizen.

Jurevicius was accused of having organized a procession to the Hill of Crosses in July 1979, and processions from Tytuvenai to Siluva in August 1979 and August 1980.24.

The court considered it an aggravating circumstance that Jurevicius had already served a sentence (under Stalin resistance group, but six years later he was released). In his final speech, Jurevicius said:

...You have not let my friends into the courtroom, only hired witnesses. According to official statistics, 70% of people in Lithuania are atheists and 70% are believers. I am being tried by a minority that fears the majority. None of our processions took place under anti-Soviet slogans or with violent intentions, but rather under a banner calling for temperance and morality among Lithuanians. The crowd was made up of people who had come from all corners of Lithuania, realizing that they could be tried for their actions. Could such a thing have been organized in opposition to people's wishes? It is a great honour for me - an uneducated man - to be considered the organizer by you. Take a look at the First of May demonstration: it's just a handful of communists and people who fear administrative penalties! Our religious processions show that there is a religious revival in Lithuania. Those who have seen them say that formerly there were no such processions.

You are afraid of the Cross. The Hill of Crosses has been destroyed many times, but more and more Crosses are erected there. After a certain number will increase, and the processions to Siluva will continue, even though I am their 'organizer' - will be in prison.

Thank you for putting me on trial for the faith. It's a great honour for me to sit in the dock where Stanelyte, Sadunaite, Kovaliu and Skuodis once sat. I ask you not to mitigate my punishment.

When the sentence was announced - three years in strict-regime camps - Jurevicius said: 'Thank you! This is for the glory of God and Lithuania!' 25.

Lutherans in Estonia

From 31 July to 3 August 1980 a summer camp for young Christians was conducted in the settlement of Medenwiese in southern Estonia. On the evening of 31 July, when the participants had erected tents in a pine grove not far from the settlement, state officials drove up in a car. On getting out, most of them in plain clothes, they began to inquire what was going on. Pastor Wiljo Jurjo was taken away for an interrogation at which a representative from the Council for Religious Affairs in Tallinn was present. Jurjo was released the same evening, but asked to remove the camp from the grove.

On 1 August the camp was set up beside the Lutheran church on settlement territory. The doocums of the local church were fined 30 roubles for wilfully pitching tents on the territory of the local soviet (ie in the grove).

In earlier years such summer camps were not subject to harassment.

At the end of 1980 Archbishop Edgar Hark, the head of the Lutheran Church, and Pastor Jurjo were summoned by the Commissioner for the Estonian SSR (of the Council for Religious Affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers). The Commissioner announced that Jurjo was to be deprived of his parish (in the town of Viru) because of his activities. The Commissioner referred to himself as a good man, as he gave permission for Jurjo to go on working until the New Year.

In October or at the beginning of November 1980 Tart Põdam, a fifth-year student of architecture at the Estonian State Institute of Art, was expelled from the Institute under the following circumstances.

Põdam had helped with the practical arrangements for the European Conference of the World Council of Lutheran Churches, which took place in Tallinn in September 1980. In October he received a telephone call from a man who said he wanted to meet him in order to give him a letter from Herbert Nord (a religious activist who was in prison for infringing the residence regulations) and was released in spring 1981). A few minutes after this meeting took place, Põdam was arrested for suspicion of theft and made go with them to KGB headquarters. During an interrogation, in the course of which Põdam's temperature went up to 40 degrees (centigrade), it turned out that the KGB knew a lot about his religious activities. He was offered work as an informer for the KGB. He refused.

When his fellow-students went to the Rector to find out why he had been expelled, the Rector told them it had not
On 23 April the Catholic Committee to Defend Believers' Rights sent Document 47 to N. Dybenko, Second Secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian CP.

In February 1981 the believers of the Roman Catholic parish of Palomene appealed to the Catholic Committee to Defend Believers' Rights, describing an episode of unbelievably arbitrary behaviour by Soviet officials. On 26 February 1981 Mrs Gudaitiene, chairman of the Palomene collective farm, and Kaubrys, deputy chairman of the Kaisiadorys District Soviet EC, 'chose' the parish committee of the Roman Catholic church in Palomene, that is, they picked 20 surnames, stated that these persons constituted the parish committee, and that it was to be chaired by Aldona Jasioniene. This arbitrary behaviour on the part of the Soviet officials was prompted by the disgraceful behaviour of Fr Paulus, Rector of Palomene, towards the believers.

A few years ago, Soviet officials 'chose' a church committee in a similar manner in the secondary school building at Kindeiskiai... The Catholic Church in Lithuania will never consent to such an atheist policy, which prescribes that the Church be led not by the bishops and their assistants - the priests - but by lay people (furthermore say people subject to the godless). And we are convinced that the Soviet regime does not want to drive the Church in Lithuania underground.

The Trial of Ivan Fokanov
From 16 to 18 March Ivan Sergeyevich Fokanov (born 1952) was on trial in Moscow, charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code. He was sentenced to two years in ordinary-regime camps.

The Trial of Ardzhevanidze and Sayapina
From 16 to 18 March Mziya Valikoyevna Ardzhevanidze (born 1959) and Maria Vasilevna Sayapina (born 1930) were on trial in Kalinin, charged under article 206-1 of the Georgian Criminal Code. They were sentenced to three years in ordinary-regime camps each.

The Trial of Vladimir Fokanov, Kovalchuk and Kaduk
From 23 to 25 March Vladimir Sergeyevich Fokanov (born 1955), from Moscow; Vasily Petrovich Kovalchuk (born 1957) from Dnepropetrovsk; and Vera Stepanovna Kaduk (born 1927; from Kalinin) were on trial in Tbilisi. They were sentenced to two years in ordinary-regime camps each.

Adventists

The Trial of Ivan Fokanov
From 16 to 18 March Ivan Sergeyevich Fokanov (born 1952) was on trial in Moscow, charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code. The sentence was three years in ordinary-regime camps.

The Trial of Ardzhevanidze and Sayapina
From 16 to 23 March Nataya Vasilyevna Ardzhevanidze (born 1959) and Maria Vasilevna Sayapina (born 1930), facing charges under article 206-1 of the Georgian Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code), were on trial in Tbilisi. They were sentenced to two years in ordinary-regime camps each.

The Trial of Vladimir Fokanov, Kovalchuk and Kaduk
From 23 to 25 March Vladimir Sergeyevich Fokanov (born 1955) from Moscow; Vasily Petrovich Kovalchuk (born 1957) from Dnepropetrovsk; and Vera Stepanovna Kaduk (born 1927; from Kalinin) were on trial in Kalinin. Kaduk was charged with article 15 of the Code ('Responsibility for preparing a crime and attempting a crime').

The sentences were as follows: V. Fokanov got three years in strict-regime camps, Kovalchuk - three years in ordinary-regime camps and Kaduk - two years in ordinary-regime camps.

On 19 May an article by N. Nesterova, 'Secrets revealed', was published in 'the Kalinin paper: Kalininska Pravda':

Kaduk is seriously ill: who had to be supported by the arms when led into court. Even relatives were not allowed into the courtroom. The trial was filmed by a team of cinema people from 'Leningrad Film'.

On 27 April the Vinnitsa Regional Court passed a suspended sentence on Petr Pavlovich Didenko (born 1938, arrested 19 March) of one-and-a-half years 'with compulsory hard labour', under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Code.

The Trial of Didenko
On 27 April the Vinnitsa Regional Court passed a suspended sentence on Petr Pavlovich Didenko (born 1938, arrested 19 March) of one-and-a-half years 'with compulsory hard labour', under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Code.

The Trial of Genchu
In May Anna Trofimovna Genchu (born 1954, arrested 12 March - Chronicle 61) was sentenced to two-and-a-half years in camps, under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Code.

Miscellaneous

According to a statement of 2 April by the Council of the All-Union Church of True and Free Seventh-Day Adventists ITFSDA

On 29 January Nikolai Pilipchenko, L. Korsolenko, residents of Vinnitsa; Vitaly Cherkashin, L. Vlassikov, A. Sychov, L. Vlassikov, L. Pilotchenko, residents of Vinnitsa, were fined 50 roubles each for being present at a religious gathering. On 12 March KGB officials in Kharivian grabbed Lyubov Gatus and took her to a venerological clinic of the custodial kind. There she was interrogated by the Commissioner of the Council for Religious Affairs and a KGB official, who threatened to leave her in the clinic for ever; they released L. Gatus only after three days.

On 16 March Alexander Tarasenko was hanged up in Kiev. Earlier he had often been threatened with a beating. On 20 March KGB officials detained Olga Zalomova in the village of Davideko (in the Chachmen-Ingush ASSR) and took her to Grozny, where they arranged an interrogation at the procurator's office. After the interrogation Zalomova was left alone in the room. Some time later an 'official...
of some kind came into the room and began to make advances to her, with the aim of raping her. After Zaloznaya slapped him, he hit her on the face till it was bleeding, but stopped making passes at her.

The report issued on 2 April by the Council of the All-Union Church of TFSIAE added these words:

At present it is those of our fellow-believers who sent to court their written testimony in defence of Vladimir Andreyevich Shelkov, leader of our church, and who are specially subject to persecution and arrest...

350 unlawful searches have been carried out in the homes of our fellow-believers since the arrest in March 1978 of the Chairman of the All-Union Church of TFSIAE. Seventy members and ministers of the Church have been arrested during the same period.

...We call on world public opinion to raise its voice in defence of the prisoners of conscience in the USSR, the victims of state atheist violence and terror, and to protest about this to the persecutors of independent religious and independent believers in the Soviet Union.

* * *

'Letter to the Madrid Conference from the Church of TFSIAE' - dated 15 April:

...We, the Church of True and Free Seventh-Day Adventists, have more than once sent to Madrid collections of material testifying to the victimization and persecution for our faith which we have hitherto suffered at the hands of the state atheist dictatorship in the USSR. However, the persecutors - instead of admitting their own injustice and ending the campaign of persecution against completely innocent religious citizens who are defending themselves against state atheist violence and coercion - are continuing their criminal activity with redoubled energy. While most cases of repression are spreading slanders and fabrications about our Church among the people...

...Hypocrites, deception and misformation of world public opinion are the favourite means used by the persecutors of pure religion and all who believe in it. So we appeal once again to the participants at the Madrid Conference to look at the real faces of the state atheists, who unscrupulously violate the international agreements and commitments they themselves have made, while carrying out in practice a policy of genocide with regard to religion. We appeal to them to ask urgently for firm guarantees from the representatives of our country that they will fulfill all the provisions of the Final Act adopted at Helsinki...

Baptists

This section is based mainly on reports in the Bulletin of the Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives, No. 94, May 1981.

The Trial of Vladimir Khailo

Vladimir Khailo (Chronicle 48), father of 15 children, was forcibly detained in hospital on 22 September 1980. A psychiatric examination declared him not responsible (the experts asked him, among other things, if he believed in the resurrection of Jesus Christ). In December the Voroshilovgrad Regional Court sent Khailo for forcible treatment in a special psychiatric hospital. He was sent to the Shampetrovsk SP.

The Trial of Boiko

On 29 September 1980 Nikolai Boiko (born 1922), leader of the local Baptist congregation, was arrested in Odessa. In the middle of December an Odessa court sentenced Boiko to five years in strict-regime camps, under article 138, part 1, of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ('Violation of the laws on separation of the church from the state, and the school from the church!') and article 209, part 1 ('Violation of the personality and rights of citizens under the guise of performing religious rites').

All who wanted to attend the trial were allowed into the courtroom. Boiko refused to take part in the proceedings. Among the witnesses questioned were the headmistress of School No. 23, K.B. Gobina (from her evidence: 'I visited the prayer house more than once... This sect's efficient work of proselytizing...'... We call on all who are free to make their voices heard, to the effect that the local Baptist congregation had increased its activities since Boiko had come to Odessa, and also the believers Sukhina and deacon Tymchak (who had led the congregation before Boiko). An excerpt from Sukhina's cross-examination follows:

Prosecutor Who gave you the right to bring up your children in a religious way?

Sukhina Where I am, there my children will be too.

Prosecutor Are you aware of your daughter's evidence?

Sukhina She was questioned in the presence of a teacher.

Prosecutor What right did you have to question a child without her mother being present? She could be taught to say anything.

Prosecutor You don't allow the child to be happy. She will be taken away from you, so that your daughter can be a Soviet person.

Sukhina She is my child!

Prosecutor That's the law!...

In 1941, on the eleventh day of the war, Boiko was taken prisoner. He spent four years in German camps. Then he escaped and fought again, after which he was sentenced by a Soviet tribunal to 15 years in camps. After ten years in the camps of Vorkuta, Boiko was exculpated. In 1968 Boiko was arrested: at the time of his arrest his expulsion certificate was confiscated and has still not been returned. The court then sentenced Boiko, under the same articles as now, to five years in camps and five in exile. At the present trial the prosecutor asked for a copy of the tribunal's sentence to be included in the case file.

* * *
the USSR Procurator-General, the Procurator of Odessa and the Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives, the believers of Peresypskaya church in Odessa write that the sentence in Khomenko's case is unjust and inhumane. The declaration carries 122 signatures.

The Trial of Lakatosh, Deshko and Fenchak
On 14 April the Voroshilovgrad Regional Court sentenced Aleksei Lakatosh, a minister of the Baptist Church, to three years in strict-regime camps, under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (- article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code). Fenchak was arrested on 30 November 1980, Lakatosh and Deshko on 11 January 1981.

The Trial of Levitsennik
On 3 April, in the town of Dubno, Rovno Region, presbyter Anatoliy Levitsennik was sentenced to three years in ordinary-regime camps, under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Code. Believers were not allowed into the courtroom. They sent a declaration to the head of the local KGB, stating that the congregation had repeatedly applied for registration and been refused (the declaration was signed by 41 people). Levitsennik suffers from polyarthrosis. He has eight children.

The Trial of Kosorezova
On 14 April the Voroshilovgrad Regional Court sentenced Alexandra Kosorezova, a minister of the Church, to three years in strict-regime camps. He was arrested on 26 December 1980. He has 10 children, seven of them minors and one an invalid of the first group.

The Trial of Kosorezova
On 19 April his wife Alexandra Kosorezova, Chairman of the Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives, was sentenced to three years in camps, under articles 138, part 1, and 187-1 of the Ukrainian Code.

Arrests
On 11 January V.M. Sheshenko was arrested in Sumy. 46 Baptists from Sumy signed a letter to the Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives and 'All Christians of the world' (with a copy to Brezhnev), concerning the increase in repression.
On 21 March Ivan Vail, Yakov Dirksen and Elizaveta Reimer were arrested in the village of Apollonovka, Omsk Region. A criminal investigation was also initiated there against Maria Tevs, an invalid of the third group. On 31 March Nikolai Dikman was arrested in the settlement of Maryanovka, Omsk Region.
On 7 April Grigory Kostyuchenko, a minister of the Baptist Council of Churches, was arrested in Krasnodar. He is accused of infringing the residence regulations. In the special detention centre, where he is being held, there are lice and filth, but no daylight. Kostyuchenko has ten children. On 15 April A.S. Redin, a minister of the Baptist Council of Churches (Chronicles 53, 54), was arrested. He has nine children.

On 10 February Bagin, deputy head of the Sverdlov District OVD in the city of Perm, took I.S. Novozhilov (66 years old) and S.P. Proshkov (70 years old) from their homes to the police station, for a 'chat'. There they were placed under arrest for 15 days. Novozhilov's wife was unable to find him for two days. In a letter to the editor of the journal Man and the Law, Novozhilov writes:

For praying, you get fined 50 rubles, and immediately the sum of 50 rubles is confiscated from your pension. It has happened to me more than once. All this is generally referred to as cultural and ideological work.

The case against V. Khomenko (for arrest - see Chronicle 41) under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code is being conducted by Investigator Runov of the Moscow KGB.

Breaking up of Prayer-meetings
From an open letter by 27 Baptists in Perm:

In 1980, under the direction of M.N. Bashlykova, Secretary of the Sverdlov District Soviet EC in Perm, on Sundays police and plain-clothes men formed a barrier outside the house where believers met for religious services. They would not allow anyone into the house, giving as their reason the fact that the congregation was not registered, even though the EC is in possession of an application from the congregation.

On 8 February 1981 Synacheva, a deputy from the EC, came to the house... She shouted loudly: 'Stop this and get out, you're not allowed to meet for prayers, you're not registered.' ...The owners of the house where prayer-meetings are held, G.P. Okunev and P.N. Okuneva, have been fined 1,000 rubles altogether. G.P. Okunev is 83 years old and receives no pension.

From a letter by 58 members of the Novovolynsk Baptist church, dated 30 November 1980:

On 21 November, in our town, police officials broke into a house where a service was going on and prevented the service from continuing...

From a letter by 113 Baptists in the town of Dergachi in Kharkov Region:

Since 15 March 1981 believers have continuously had their prayer-meetings broken up, been fined and tried. During this period twenty numbers of our church have been sentenced to 10-15 days' imprisonment on charges which do not correspond with the facts, for example 'making an attempt on the life of a policeman', 'wilful insubordination', and so on.

On 17 April believers had gathered for prayer at No. 31 Cosgarin Street. The service ended and everyone was preparing to go home. At this point the police arrived, led by Police Chief Loban and his deputy Strukov, closed the door and would not allow anyone to leave. Major Strukov began to twist people's arms and to shout women
On 7 December 1980 a prayer-meeting in Krasnodon was broken up. Four people were put under arrest for 10-15 days. After a search, carried out without a warrant from the Procurator, and the confiscation of religious literature and a tape-recorder, three out of ten people taken to the police-station were sentenced to short terms of imprisonment: I.T. Gontar, A.I. Drihnokhod and S.G. Gerenshteyn.

On the same day, in the village of Nezruki, a search (unannounced by the Procurator) was carried out at the home of Borona, a 70-year-old woman, by the chairman of the village soviet and the local policeman, who put a transistor radio out of action by breaking its wiring system, saying while doing so: 'You won't be listening to any more broadcasts now'.

From a letter by 75 Baptists from Voroshilovgrad:

On 5 April this year we were prevented from holding a peaceful service at 96 Filatov Street. Police officials, headed by Captain Butchak and assisted actively by men in plain clothes who refused to give their names, by means of force and physical violence took away two of our brethren, one of whom was the pastor A.N. Balatsky. A.R. Balatsky, father of six small children, was sentenced to ten days in the Preliminary Detention Cells at a time when his wife was in a maternity hospital...

The police chief of the Artsevsk District OVD, Lieutenant-Colonel Shkutko, with one hand was pulling a completely innocent man by the hair, and with the other beating him on the forehead, yelling: 'We won't allow what's going on in Police here!'

On 6 April brother P.V. Sazhnov, father of four children, was taken straight from work to the district police headquarters and sentenced to eight days' imprisonment.

On 10 April a prayer-meeting at 31 First Poperechny Lane was broken up. The believers were taken to the District OVD and allowed to go home, apart from three teenage sisters... Calling them obscene names, officials threatened to terrorize them, they put them in a cell occupied by male criminals. This went on until 11 pm.

On 7 December 1980 a prayer-meeting in Krasnodon was broken up. Four people were put under arrest for 10-15 days.

On 8 March 1981, in Bryansk Region, a prayer-meeting at the home of Glushchenko, an invalid of the first group, was broken up.

Miscellaneous

In the village of Cherewki, Ovruch District, Zhitomir Region, pensioners who were believers were not sold bread.

A.A. Kalyashin, a resident of Murom, was fined 50 roubles for having sung 'Christian songs' in the street on 8 February, together with young people, while he was in Ivanovo. In the settlement of Maryannsk, Omsk Region, Procunry investigator Lyubimov and KGB official V.I. Shpitiansky questioned children in school, in the presence of their form teacher L.I. Roskopf but in the absence of their parents: the latter were stopped from entering the school building by police. The children were forced to sign statements.

Orthodox

On the eve of 3 June, the feast of the Velikoretskoye Ikon of Saint Nicholas, the village of Velikoretskoye, Kirov Region, was surrounded by soldiers and police. Pilgrims were not allowed into the village. A guard stood by the spring for five days. A guard was also placed along the bank of the river Velikaya: no one was ferried across the river.

THE RIGHT TO LEAVE

Moscow

The trial of Kurnosov

Valery Alekseyevich Kurnosov (born 1943) has been living in Moscow since 1968. Recently he worked as a machine-operator at the Moscow factory of tractor hydraulic units; in 1976 he graduated with an external degree from the Saratov Law Institute. In February 1978 Kurnosov was deprived of his Moscow residence permit, for having lived at the place on his permit for over six months' absence of his former wife. In September 1979 Kurnosov married L.I. Kuznetsova, a worker at the same factory, with a temporary residence permit, who was living in the factory hostel in Ramenskoye, Moscow Region.

Kurnosov sent letters to the factory director and the USSR Supreme Soviet, informing them that he could not continue working at the factory as he had nowhere to live. A month later he was dismissed 'for absenteeism'. He appealed to the People's Court in the Kalinin District of Moscow for reinstatement in his job. Kurnosov's appeal was dismissed. The Procurator said: 'Of course, according to the USSR Constitution the factory was obliged to provide accomodation for you and your wife, but even if you have nowhere to live, you still do not have the right to give up your job, as otherwise we would have no one to work.' In December 1978 the factory administration provided Kuznetsova (after the birth of her child) with a separate room in a workers' hostel in Ramenskoye, but without a residence permit, and on condition that Kurnosov 'did not appear' there. Kurnosov's attempts to register at his wife's temporary accommodation did not succeed. Kurnosov appealed to many organizations from the Ramenskoye District OVD to the USSR Supreme Soviet, to register him in his wife's room or provide his family with other accommodation.
On the night of 6-7 August 1980 Kurnosov was detained in Moscow by police officers, together with his wife and child. The reason for his detention was that Kurnosov had crossed out ‘Liable for military service’ and written ‘Russian’ in his passport.

On the night of 6-7 August 1980 Kurnosov was detained in a suburban train at the station ‘Platform 47 kms’ and escorted to the duty office of the Ramenskoye line police station. From where he was sent to the Ramenskoye Psychiatric Clinic. A commission of three doctors led by the head doctor Medvedev declared him insane, and Kurnosov was discharged. He wrote a complaint to the Central Committee of the CPSU about the illegal detention, illegal dispatch to a psychiatric clinic, and illegal psychiatric examination. He did not receive a reply.

On 2 September 1980 Kurnosov was arrested at home by police officers, moreover on one of these occasions he was beaten up. The reason for his detention was that Kurnosov had ended his hunger-strike, as a result of which he developed a stomach ulcer and haemorrhoids. Kurnosov was declared sane.

In August 1979 Kurnosov sent a statement to the USSR Supreme Soviet renouncing his Soviet citizenship and applying for permission to emigrate to the USA on political grounds. He did not receive a reply but soon afterwards police officers started appearing at his home, stating that they would never register Kurnosov with his wife as the latter was living in a women’s hostel. In December 1979 and January 1980 three records were drawn up against Kurnosov ‘for violating the residence regulations’ (he was living unregistered with his wife and child), but soon afterwards a criminal case was brought against him under article 198 of the RSFSR Criminal Code (‘Violating the residence regulations’). The investigation lasted three-and-a-half months, and in May 1980 Kurnosov wrote a complaint to the Central Committee of the CPSU. The reception of his letter was reported to the duty officer of the Ramenskoye line police station.

In January 1980 Kurnosov received a reply from the Ramenskoye Police Department to his statement to the USSR Supreme Soviet about emigrating to the USA. He was refused permission to leave, as he was ‘not registered in the Ramenskoye district’.

In May 1980 Kurnosov was twice detained in Moscow by police officers, moreover on one of these occasions he was beaten up. The reason for his detention was that Kurnosov had crossed out ‘liable for military service’ and written ‘Russian’ in his passport.

On 2 September 1980 Kurnosov was arrested at home by police officers, moreover on one of these occasions he was beaten up. The reason for his detention was that Kurnosov had crossed out ‘liable for military service’ and written ‘Russian’ in his passport.

In August 1979 Kurnosov sent a statement to the USSR Supreme Soviet renouncing his Soviet citizenship and applying for permission to emigrate to the USA on political grounds. He did not receive a reply but soon afterwards police officers started appearing at his home, stating that they would never register Kurnosov with his wife as the latter was living in a women’s hostel. In December 1979 and January 1980 three records were drawn up against Kurnosov ‘for violating the residence regulations’ (he was living unregistered with his wife and child), but soon afterwards a criminal case was brought against him under article 198 of the RSFSR Criminal Code (‘Violating the residence regulations’). The investigation lasted three-and-a-half months, and in May 1980 Kurnosov wrote a complaint to the Central Committee of the CPSU. The reception of his letter was reported to the duty officer of the Ramenskoye line police station.

In January 1980 Kurnosov received a reply from the Ramenskoye Police Department to his statement to the USSR Supreme Soviet about emigrating to the USA. He was refused permission to leave, as he was ‘not registered in the Ramenskoye district’.

In May 1980 Kurnosov was twice detained in Moscow by police officers, moreover on one of these occasions he was beaten up. The reason for his detention was that Kurnosov had crossed out ‘liable for military service’ and written ‘Russian’ in his passport.

On 2 September 1980 Kurnosov was arrested at home by police officers, moreover on one of these occasions he was beaten up. The reason for his detention was that Kurnosov had crossed out ‘liable for military service’ and written ‘Russian’ in his passport.

On the night of 6-7 August 1980 Kurnosov was detained in a suburban train at the station ‘Platform 47 kms’ and escort- ed to the duty office of the Ramenskoye line police station. From where he was sent to the Ramenskoye Psychiatric Clinic. A commission of three doctors led by the head doctor Medvedev declared him insane, and Kurnosov was discharged. He wrote a complaint to the Central Committee of the CPSU about the illegal detention, illegal dispatch to a psychiatric clinic, and illegal psychiatric examination. He did not receive a reply.

On 2 September 1980 Kurnosov was arrested at home by police officers, moreover on one of these occasions he was beaten up. The reason for his detention was that Kurnosov had crossed out ‘liable for military service’ and written ‘Russian’ in his passport.

On the night of 6-7 August 1980 Kurnosov was detained in a suburban train at the station ‘Platform 47 kms’ and escorted to the duty office of the Ramenskoye line police station. From where he was sent to the Ramenskoye Psychiatric Clinic. A commission of three doctors led by the head doctor Medvedev declared him insane, and Kurnosov was discharged. He wrote a complaint to the Central Committee of the CPSU about the illegal detention, illegal dispatch to a psychiatric clinic, and illegal psychiatric examination. He did not receive a reply.

On 2 September 1980 Kurnosov was arrested at home by police officers, moreover on one of these occasions he was beaten up. The reason for his detention was that Kurnosov had crossed out ‘liable for military service’ and written ‘Russian’ in his passport.

On the night of 6-7 August 1980 Kurnosov was detained in a suburban train at the station ‘Platform 47 kms’ and escorted to the duty office of the Ramenskoye line police station. From where he was sent to the Ramenskoye Psychiatric Clinic. A commission of three doctors led by the head doctor Medvedev declared him insane, and Kurnosov was discharged. He wrote a complaint to the Central Committee of the CPSU about the illegal detention, illegal dispatch to a psychiatric clinic, and illegal psychiatric examination. He did not receive a reply.

On 2 September 1980 Kurnosov was arrested at home by police officers, moreover on one of these occasions he was beaten up. The reason for his detention was that Kurnosov had crossed out ‘liable for military service’ and written ‘Russian’ in his passport.

On the night of 6-7 August 1980 Kurnosov was detained in a suburban train at the station ‘Platform 47 kms’ and escorted to the duty office of the Ramenskoye line police station. From where he was sent to the Ramenskoye Psychiatric Clinic. A commission of three doctors led by the head doctor Medvedev declared him insane, and Kurnosov was discharged. He wrote a complaint to the Central Committee of the CPSU about the illegal detention, illegal dispatch to a psychiatric clinic, and illegal psychiatric examination. He did not receive a reply.
protest. The reasons for his actions: he is refused permission to leave the USSR, his wife is not being listed as a person without citizenship, he is denied registration at his wife and daughter's place of residence, he is being persecuted for living without a residence permit, and his wife is not being provided with permanent accommodation.

On the evening of 11 July Kurnosov appeared at the Moscow synagogue with a placard saying '40 days on protest hunger-strike'. Kurnosov was about to leave when two cars drove up. About five policemen got out and went up to the hunger-striker. All the people standing outside the synagogue immediately surrounded them. The policemen politely requested that the placard be shown to them, then equally politely enquired about the reason for the hunger-strike and asked him to accompany them to help them investigate what the matter was. Kurnosov refused, and requested the police to conduct an investigation without his participation. He explained his fears by his previous experience of having been beaten by police. Then one of the policemen asked him to produce his identity card. To this he received the reply that his passport, together with a statement renouncing his Soviet citizenship, were at the Supreme Soviet. The policeman once again, this time more insistently, told him to come and 'clarify his identity'. After stating that he was submitting only to the threat of physical force, the police demand being illegal, Kurnosov agreed to go, while the police, in turn, agreed that one of the bystanders could come along as a witness. The police promised to return with the detained man in an hour, and left. After a short while the man who had accompanied Kurnosov returned alone. He said that Kurnosov was being held at Police Station No. 26, where his identity would be clarified. The police intended to pursue this over a period of 30 days. 'We'll feed him at the same time - they had said at the police station. A few days later the duty officer at Police Station No. 26 said that Kurnosov had been released, but refused to give any details.

The Trial of Brailovsky

On 17 and 18 June the Moscow City Court, presided over by V.V. Bogdanov, heard the trial. Yu. Gries - Chronicle 58 - and A. Lavov - Chronicle 60 - examined the case of Doctor of Technical Science Victor Luviouch Brailovsky (born 1936; arrested 13 November 1980 - Chronicle 60). Charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR CIVIL CODE, the prosecutor was Procurator Przhizniykov (who had already emigrated). At the end of the pre-trial investigation BRAILOVSKY studied the case file without a barrister; he also immediately refused the barrister appointed by the court and conducted his own defence.

Braillovsky was charged with complicity in publishing and circulating the journal Jews in the USSR - Chronicles 52, 53, 56; after the 20th issue the journal ceased publication) and two letters from 'refusenik' Jews, both of which were signed by several dozen people (the first was written in the spring, and the second in the autumn, of 1976).

Brailovsky was accused of the following 'slanderous assertions' contained in the journals: a collapse of ideology, a revival of Great Power chauvinism; that international friendship between peoples was no more than a myth - discrimination against Jews existed in the USSR; in the letters with which he was charged it said that the authorities were trying to crush Jewish emigration; in the course of this, infringements of the law were occurring, people barred from emigrating had no means of contesting the arbitrary actions of the authorities.

Brailovsky took virtually no part in the trial, did not give evidence and did not put any questions to the witnesses. He reserved only the right to make a speech in his own defence.

At the trial four witnesses were questioned.

Mark Novikov (Chronicle 56) said that he had received the journal Jews IN THE USSR at the synagogue; he could not remember where from. He was then shown the first of the two letters with which Brailovsky was charged. Novikov was unable to remember whether he had actually signed it, as that particular letter was five years old. In the question what he could say about the contents of these letters Novikov replied that if he were writing now he would write them differently.

Leonid Shabashov (Chronicle 41) was presented with the same letter: he also could not remember whether he had signed it. He did not remember who had given it to him to sign, but did not think his signature could have been obtained by deception. He confirmed that the signature seen on the other letter was not his. He had never seen the journal. Prazdnikova, a Doctor of Science (those were her exact words!) and could not give evidence and did not put any questions to the witnesses.

Vladimir Prestim (Chronicle 41) refused to answer the court's questions, saying that he considered the trial a closed one, and was unable to give evidence at such a trial.

Grigory Kreidlin (Chronicle 41) testified that he had heard of Brailovsky from someone who had already emigrated, that he now saw Brailovsky for the first time, and that he had never previously heard of his name. Prazdnikova said that Shabashov was almost a Doctor of Science (those were her exact words!) and could have worked for the good of the state and received 500 rubles; but instead of this he had gone to work as a secretary for 70 rubles.

In his defence speech Brailovsky quoted word for word from the stories and articles published in the journal. He said that he could not understand why on the basis of these articles the Procurator spoke about the state as a whole, when in each of them there were specific complaints about specific persons and institutions, but there were no generalizations about the state as a whole: he could not understand why the Procurator needed to hang such a label on the whole state. An article was published in the...
with the utterances of the Black Hundreds I pre-revolutionary
democracy and ideology held Black Hundred views. Brailovsky did
not understand why the Procurator needed to identify these
two people with the whole of Soviet ideology.

In the case file there was an expert literary opinion from
the state censorship (Glavlit) on C. Freiman's 'It
turns out I'm a Jew' (Chronicle 51), which detected slander
of the Soviet political and social system in it. However,
the essay also discussed violations of the rights of Jews
by individual mathematicians, by the Higher Degrees Comis-
sion, and by mathematicians at the Steklov Institute, Vinograd-
row for example. People and organizations subjected to
criticism are mentioned by name. Therefore Brailovsky did
not understand why the actions of these people were regarded
as the policy of the whole state. As for the arbitrary
decisions of the authorities discussed in the letters with
which Brailovsky was charged, his own fate and that of
his family were a clear example and proof of the fact that
the letters were not false.

Brailovsky concluded his speech by saying that he was
not so naive as to think that this speech would help him.
But if, there were only two people in the room listening
to his carefully - and there were such people (Brailovsky's
wife and son) - the speech was worth making for their sake.
Almost all the charges against Brailovsky were included
in the judgment: just one or two episodes regarding the
journal were excluded. Specifically, a charge was excluded
which concerned the publication in the journal of a critical
article by Bahtalsky (Chronicles 52, 53) about Solzhentzyn,
'Notebooks for Grandsons'. In which, the judgment said,
it was alleged that Solzhentzyn was a great Russian writer.
Frazetskaya explained that it was incorrect to evaluate
this allegation as slanderous since it was a personal opin-
ion, and the label 'slander' was pinned to it without reason.

Taking into account that this was Brailovsky's first
appearance in court article 43 of the RSFSR Criminal Code
('Designation of a lighter sentence than that prescribed by law',
without a justifiable reason) was erroneous. The charges
were 'accompanied' to work, Tesmenitsky was 'accompanied'
by one of the witnesses, did a lorry stop alongside, with
a policeman sitting next to the driver, and the vehicle
started revving to muffle the witness's story. However,
when a correspondent turned his camera on the lorry, the
vehicle left immediately.

On 27 June the Moscow Helsinki Group issued Document No.
170 'The Trial of Viktor Brailovsky'.

Again - a trial against free thought, the uncensored
word, the gathering and circulation of information, and
with the label 'slander' pinned to it without reason.
The typical feature of this trial was the complete lack
of evidence from witnesses confirming the charges.

Brailovsky, in full accord with the texts of the letters
and publications he was charged with, argued that they
contained criticism and protests in respect of individual
persons and organizations, with accounts of specific episodes
which actually took place.

In the judgment the Court refers to article 43 of the
RSFSR Criminal Code, which allows for a lighter sentence
than that prescribed by law, but in actual fact it is
designating a harsher sentence than that provided for
under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, since
five years of exile is indubitably a harsher sentence
than the mildest punishments under this article (correc-
tive labour for up to one year or a fine of up to 100
roubles).

From the text of the judgment itself it is clear that
this man is 'guilty' only of having dared to think freely
and express his thoughts freely, 'guilty' only of having
tried to realize, within the boundaries of Soviet laws
and international agreements formally recognized by the
USSR, the right to free uncensored speech and the right
to emigrate.

In 1965 Viktor Brailovsky received the degree of Doctor
of Technical Science. He then worked as a senior researcher
in the Institute of Electronic Operating-machines as a
specialist in 'Mathematical statistics', and accumulated
about 40 scientific publications to his name. In 1972,
one-and-a-half months after applying to emigrate, he was
'accompanied' to work, his family were a clear example and proof of the fact that
the letters were not false.

The Case of Chernobylsky

2 May is the World Wide Day to honour the Jews who died
during the Second World War. On that day Moscow Jews have
been taking trips to Ovrazhki Station. Usually the picnics
have passed off without incident. However, this year under
various pretexts several Jews were summoned to their local
police stations. There KGB officers 'warned' them of the
possible 'consequences' of their taking part in 'the activi-
ties in Chernobylsky'. Some were threatened with criminal liabil-
ity, others were promised that the path to Israel would
be 'closed' to them for ever. Among those warned were P.
Abramovich (Chronicle 61), V. Prestin (see above), Yu.
Kosharevsky (Chronicle 61), A. Gurevich (Chronicle 61),
L. Tesmenitsky (Chronicle 61), V. Brodsky (Chronicle 61),
M. and G. Kremen (Chronicle 50), B. Chernobylsky (Chronicle
50), M. Lvovsky, A. Shvartsman, M. Yakobson, I. Shkergleva
(Chronicle 61, 62) and L. Makar-Limann (Chronicle 61).

Many Jews were telephoned at home and pressure was put
on them, too, not to go to Ovrazhki, with threats of 'con-
sequences'. In the morning of 3 May, a Sunday, several
dozen Jews were repeatedly called at home and advised not
to go to Ovrazhki. Brodsky, Gurevich, Lvovsky and Kremen
were 'accompanied' to work, Tesmenitsky was 'accompanied'
around the whole of Moscow by two cars right up to 3 pm.
In actual fact, because of bad weather it had been decided
to transfer the picnic to another, more suitable day.

On 9 May 40 Jews sent a letter to Andropov,

-82-

-83-
Dear Yury Vladimirovich,

In recent weeks, officers of the organization of which you are head have been holding talks with many Moscow Jews. In these talks they have been demanding a refusal to participate in the traditional celebration which Moscow Jews have been holding for a number of years now, near Ovrazhki Station outside Moscow, under police and state security surveillance. In the course of this, your officers have been making unjustified threats, with reference to the fact that this celebration allegedly constitutes a 'Zionist' gathering. It is also reported that some directives exists which restricts the freedom of movement of Jews.

We respectfully object to the discriminatory attempts being undertaken by your organization to deprive Moscow Jews of the right to celebrate, in accordance with Soviet law, which guarantees freedom of assembly, their national and universal holidays and their special days.

We inform you that we intend to assemble on 10 May 1981 to celebrate the day of victory over fascism, the day in memory of countless victims of the Jewish people, the day of glory of your and our heroes.

We are assuming that you will not punish or make threats against Jews who assemble for the celebration. Otherwise responsibility for this will fall upon you and the department of which you are head.

On Sunday 10 May about 150 Jews assembled in a wood, a kilometre from Ovrazhki Station, to celebrate Victory Day and Israel's Independence Day. In view of the unexpectedness for the appropriate organs of the place where the celebration was held, only seven persons 'in civilian clothes' accompanied the group. At the same time the wood around Ovrazhki Station was cordoned off by detachments of policemen, voluntary police and 'plain-clothes men' 'accompanied' the group. At the same time the movement of Jews was forbidden. A Chaika car, several Volgas and a lorry and several buses were parked near the station. All those arriving at Ovrazhki Station had their documents checked. Local people were allowed to continue but 'non-locals' were detained. No one was allowed into the wood on the grounds that 'the wood was being cleaned.'

At 10.30 the 'ceremonial' part began. A veteran of the Great Patriotic War, S.A. Yantovsky, reminded those present of the tragedy of the Jews and their millions of sons and daughters who had perished at the hands of the Nazis. All stood for a minute's silence in their memory. Yantovsky also spoke of the heroism of the Jews in the struggle against Nazis, both in the ranks of the Soviet Army and in the armies of the Allies and in the Resistance, among the partisans and in the ghettos. 'At this time' - Yantovsky continued - 'we are not only celebrating the victory over fascism, we are also marking the day of Israel's independence, a country where Jews have once more acquired a homeland to which we all aspire.' He finished his speech with the traditional 'Next year in Jerusalem.' Then those present performed songs in Hebrew, played sports, etc.

At about 12.00 a large detachment of police and voluntary police accompanied by men in civilian clothes arrived at the picnic place. Police Lieutenant A.M. Brechko announced to those present that, in accordance with a resolution of the Moscow Regional Soviet EC of 12 April this year, large-scale festivities were prohibited without the authorization of the local soviet, and therefore everyone had to leave the wood and go to the station. In the event that the participants of the picnic refused to carry out this instruction, force would be used against them, force to which they were threatening participants with the use of force, Brechko replied: 'We are not using force. I'm just telling you that if you don't obey the instruction, things will be bad for you.'

The policemen tried to find out who was 'in charge,' but there turned out to be no such person. To Chernobylsky's question as to what 'large-scale festivities' meant, one of the policemen replied: 'Move then the people.

They began to chase the Jews out of the wood. Someone tried to start an argument with the policemen but Chernobylsky silenced him with: 'There's no point in talking to these fascists!' One of the policemen was checking O. Popov's (Chronicle 61) documents at the time. A man in civilian clothes went up to the policeman, and, pointing to Chernobylsky, said: 'That one over there, Chernobylsky is his name, he called you a fascist.'

About ten minutes later, when Chernobylsky and his friends were already standing to one side, a policeman came up and attempted to strike up a conversation with him. Chernobylsky demonstratively turned away. The policeman did not give up. In the end Chernobylsky said: 'I don't talk to fascists.' The policeman immediately walked away. Soon afterwards most of the people left, but a small group (about ten people with children) were allowed to stay.

On 9 June Chernobylsky was detained on the street in Moscow and sent to Kransogorsk - to the place where the 'crime' was committed. He was charged under article 191-1, part 1, of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Resisting a police-officer or a member of the voluntary police'). In the resolution on the institution of proceedings it said that Chernobylsky had refused to comply with the legal demands of police-officers to give his name or show his documents. He had also refused to go to the police station and, in the course of this, shown resistance.

Chernobylsky was in a Detention Cell for 72 hours. Police Lieutenant Brechko and Yu. Elyakimov, a police inspector, and police officers V.I. Ribichev, V.V. Poyarkov and A.P. Shabrov testified that Chernobylsky had refused to give his name, he called you a fascist.'

On 30 June, as he was concluding his study of the case, Chernobylsky noticed that the classification had been changed: part 1 had been replaced by part 2 (the maximum sentence for part 2 is five years).

On Chernobylsky's petition, Popov, Tesmenitsky, A. Radin (Chronicle 61) and V. Magarik (Chronicle 61) were summoned as witnesses. In the record of the conclusion of the pre-trial investigation Chernobylsky wrote this statement:
I consider myself completely innocent, as the charge against me of resisting the police is a complete fabrication, and I request that the case against me under article 491 be closed.

Miscellaneous

David Tokar, a fifth-year student at the Moscow Mining Institute, has since June 1980 been unable to hand in his documents to OVIR in Chernovtsy, where he is permanently resident, because his 'invitation is not from close relatives.'

In September 1980 Tokar was removed from an aeroplane as he was about to leave for a seminar of 'private' teachers of Hebrew in the Crimea, and was not allowed to leave Chernovtsy for eight days. From January to April 1981 he was unable to obtain medical certificates for reinstatement at the institute after his study leave. He succeeded in being reinstated only 40 days before the term began. The administration of the institute put obstacles in his way over a long period; they delayed assigning him to course projects and made it difficult for him to conduct laboratory work.

On 26 April KGB officers 'had a talk' with Tokar in the institute building. Tokar was threatened with a trial for singing Jewish songs on a suburban train ('inciting national dissension'), for organizing outings of Jews to a wood near Ovrazhki Station, and 'being responsible for the state of the wood' in this spot. He was threatened that he would not be allowed to graduate from the institute if he did not terminate his 'organizational activity' among Jewish youth. 'What are you doing here? go and live in that Israel of yours!', they told him. Thereupon Tokar wrote a statement requesting that he be deprived of Soviet citizenship and allowed to leave for the state of Israel for religious reasons. However, KGB officers refused to accept his statement. (Students of Tokar in the Hebrew study group are also being threatened and intimidated. 'Talks' have been held with relatives of several of them at their work-places. Some students have received anonymous letters advising them to stop learning Hebrew.)

Leonid Tesmenitsky has sent this letter to the Central Committee of the CPSU:

On 26 February this year I was summoned to Police Station No. 25 in Moscow. In the police station two plain-clothes men who called themselves officers of the central KGB were waiting for me. They refused to show any identification. They questioned me, specifically, whether it is prohibited to sing all national songs or only Jewish ones.

On 21 May six of Tokar's friends, students of the Moscow Institute of Transport Engineers, were summoned to the party committee at the institute, where they were interrogated by KGB officers. The students were threatened with expulsion from the institute if they did not testify that Tokar was engaging in anti-Soviet propaganda and inciting national dissension. In June Tokar was expelled from the institute for 'poor academic progress.'
3. View of the approach to the Lyublino District People's Court in Moscow during the trial of Tat'yana Osipova, a Helsinki Group member, who received 10 years. 3 policemen stand beside a temporary 'No Entry' sign to prevent unauthorized people from passing. 4. Anatoly Koryagin, Kharkov psychiatrist given 12 years for defending psychiatric ethics. 5. Vasily Ovsienko (b. 1949), Ukrainian schoolteacher sentenced to 15 years for a self-defence speech in court and for 'agitation' in camp.

6. Friends of longstanding dissenter Gušnik Altunyan, some of whose names featured in his trial. Sentence: 12 years. Back row, 1 to r: Vladimir Ponomarev, Arseny Podolsky, Vladimir Nedohora, Arkady Levin, Alexander Kalinovsky, Roman Rapoport; front row: Sof'ia Krasil'chik (wife of Nedohora), Petr Grigorenko, Tamara Levina, Andrey Grigorenko, Kharkov, 1974. 7 & 8. Leonid Milyavskiy (l.), a translator, and Sergei Naboka, a journalism student, both given 3 years in Kiev for pasting up leaflets and for other dissenting activity.

9. L to r: Sergei Nekhotin, Georgy Shepel'ev, Evgeny Kononenko - Russian (non-Jewish) refuseniks belonging to the 'Right to Emigration' group. Shepel'ev was sentenced to 6 months of forced labour. 10. Herbert Murd, Estonian Lutheran given 1 year for religious activism. 11. Tiit Madisson, Estonian worker sentenced to 6 years for dissent. 12. Vytautas Vitieunas, engineer and member of Lithuanian Helsinki Group; sentence: 2½ years.
16 & 17. Svetlana Probatova and Elena Sannikova, persecuted by the KGB for actively supporting the Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled. With Probatova: her husband Mikhail, their children, and Group member Yury Kiselev, who has no legs and is lying on his trolley. 18. Group member Fatulla Khusainov of Chistopol, who, though confined to a wheelchair, has been persecuted by the authorities.

23-24. Gathering of Jewish refuseniks in the woods at Ovrazhki near Moscow, with races for the children, May 1980. In May 1981 the KGB mounted a large but only partially successful operation to put an end to such gatherings. Boris Chernobylsky was arrested and later given one year in a labour camp.

25. Irina Brailovskaya (r) outside the court where her husband Viktor Brailovsky was sentenced to 5 years' exile for editing the samizdat journal Jews in the USSR. With her: Ida Milgrom, mother of political prisoner Nikolai Shchotansky. 26. Viktor Brailovsky, refusenik, Moscow scientist. 27. Kim Fridman, Kiev Jew, refusenik for 9 years, sentenced to 1 year in camps.
28. View from a building in a camp in Donetsk City, Ukraine (address: g. Donetsk-2, uchr. YuE-312/2). Note the inner wooden fence, then a barbed-wire fence, then the high outer fence; also the watchtower and the guard on patrol.

29-30. Two views of a camp near Shakhtersk, Donetsk region (address: g. Shakhtersk, pos. Stoshkovskoe, uchr. YuE-312/57). 29. Prisoners are lined up before a barracks. The white arrow points to the Baptist Valentin Naprienko (Chronicles 53, 56). 30. They are taken along a barbed-wire corridor to their workplace.
OP 4. "The telephone Valery Pavlovich gave his surname as Andreyev. Judging by how the police-officers behaved with Andreyev, and by the fact that he had talks with acquaintances of mine in the First Section of KG131 offices of their institutions, he really is a KGB officer, although possibly he has a different name (otherwise I cannot understand why he refused to show his identification). The essence of the two-hour conversation which took place on 20 February comes down to the request that I sign a paper in which I undertake 'not to engage in anti-State activity in the future', and to the threat that if I refuse to sign such a paper I will never be able to leave for Israel, and, moreover, will be imprisoned. (I applied to emigrate to Israel in February 1979 and was refused in December 1979, as my brother has access to secret documents. It is possible that the very fact of applying is regarded by KGB officers as anti-State activity. What else it can refer to - I have no idea.)

After this conversation I was shadowed for two weeks...

In a conversation with one of my acquaintances, 'Andreyev' admitted I was being 'followed' on the grounds that, first, I was a madman from whom anything could be expected, and secondly, I hated everyone and everything here, and thus also constituted a danger.

My father lands up in hospital after a heart-attack. My mother is alone in the flat, and I live in a flat which I have been renting for two years. Nevertheless, they phone my parents' flat and hold completely pointless conversations which are designed only to frighten my mother. On 14 April my father dies. On the third day after the funeral the phone-calls begin again. Once more they start trying to find me at my mother's flat, knowing that I don't live there. And finally, on the night of 2-3 May, 'Andreyev' or one of his colleagues phones my mother all night long and explains to her that if I don't behave myself I'll be put in prison. Whose methods do 'Andreyev' and his comrades use? From whose books did they learn their trade?

I demand that you put a stop to this lawlessness by the KGB. The way in which the refusal of emigration was worded and my subsequent 'adventures' make me think that someone is settling scores with me, and a favourable decision in my case is being held up on KGB instructions. I hope that the times when the KGB freely disposed of people's lives have long passed and will never return.

On 2 June Tesmenitsky and Aleksei Lorentsson (Chronicle 60) arrived in the village of Ilinka, Telovaya District, Voronezh Region, where two families live (the Piskarevs and the Matveyevs) who are actively seeking permission to emigrate to Israel. For four years they have refused to work on the collective-farm and been corresponding with the authorities about the registration of their departure from the collective-farm 'Rossiya', membership of which constitutes an obstacle to applying to OVIR (see 'The Trial of Osipova').

At about 11 pm a police sergeant and a man in civilian clothes who introduced himself as deputy chief of the local police station, Lieutenant Varnavsky, burst into the home of Moisei Matveyev. Varnavsky reported there had been a theft in the area of a tape-recorder, two guitars and some
other musical instruments. Information had allegedly reached
the police that the theft had been carried out by two
that Tesmenitsky and Lorentsson intended to leave Ilinka.
On 3 June, he copied out the contents of their documents
and left. On 3 June at 3 pm two cars drew up at the Piskarev's
home, bringing Varnavsky, a senior police lieutenant, a
major in the Voronezh KGB and the chairman of the District
Soviet XC, Zotov. Besides the tape-recorder, this time
Varnavsky was also interested in cameras. Tesmenitsky and
Lorentsson agreed to go to the local police station to
help clarify whether they were connected with the theft:
with them, to the mention whether they would be able to
return to Ilinka. A negative reply was given.
At the police station a bag containing cameras and
cassette tapes was confiscated from Tesmenitsky and Lorent-
ssohn without witnesses present. Varnavsky attempted to 'have
police have managed to save The police 'from the wrath
out not be able to', and they 'could get beaten up'. To the
question why criminal proceedings had not been instituted
Varnavsky said: 'The village has its own morals.' A KGB major also
attempted to 'chat' with Tesmenitsky, beginning with the
question why criminal proceedings had not been instituted
against the people who had threatened violence, Varnavsky
said: 'The village has its own morals.' A KGB major also
attempted to 'chat' with Tesmenitsky, beginning with the
question why criminal proceedings had not been instituted
with them, to the mention whether they would be able to
return to Ilinka. A negative reply was given.

On 15 June Tesmenitsky arrived at a telephone office (in
Voronezh) when Tesmenitsky began to give the names and addresses
of the inhabitants of Ilinka, but 'next time we might
question why criminal proceedings had not been instituted
Varnavsky said: 'The village has its own morals.' A KGB major also
attempted to 'chat' with Tesmenitsky, beginning with the
question why criminal proceedings had not been instituted
with them, to the mention whether they would be able to
return to Ilinka. A negative reply was given.

On 28 March V. Magarik, a senior research officer at the
Institute of Earth Physics at the USSR Academy of Sciences
and a Doctor of Physical-mathematical Science, sent this
letter to President of the USSR Academy of Sciences
Aleksandrov:

---

...On 13 February this year I sent you a letter which said that my application to emigrate to Israel had been under examination for a period of 17 months, when there was a legal limit of 2 months. I also directed your attention to the natural desire of my three-year-old daughter and myself to be reunited, to our right to happiness.

The other day, in reply to my enquiry, your colleague informed me that my letter had been sent by you to the organs of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and that you refused to receive me or reply on the matter in hand.

A decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 12 April 1978 forbids that letters be readdressed to those organizations against which the complaint in being made. The decree makes it compulsory for the complaint itself to be submitted. In any event, that the declarant be notified not later than within one month of the state of his case. Both these requirements of the decree have been violated by you.

During the last five months I have addressed statements to the UVIR of the Chief UVD of the Moscow City Soviet XC, to the Moscow Soviet, the Committees for People's Control of Moscow and the USSR, the Procuracy of Moscow and the RSFSR, the UVIR at the USSR MVB, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Central Committee of the CPSU, the 25th Congress of the CPSU, on the personal and the related legal aspects of my emigration. In every case except one there has been no reaction. In the single exception, one there has been no reaction. In the single exception, there was a reaction, which I shall carry out from 29 March to 12 April as a protest against the manipulation of the lives of people who wish to emigrate to Israel.
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at the CPSU Central Committee for a meeting with a deputy head of the Administrative Organs Department, Ivanov (Chronicle 57), and he was promised to look into the case (which he did not do on either occasion). On both occasions the women left letters addressed to the Central Committee of the CPSU in which, amongst others, the following demands were set forth:

1. That replies be given within one week to all those who have been waiting for over six months.
2. That all refusals, the reasons for which are not covered by the list of reasons produced by K.I. Zotov, be annulled, and the families who have received these refusals be allowed to leave.
3. That the validity period of refusals on grounds of state security be stated in each specific instance. That the period of refusal be calculated from the time the application was made. That in this connection comrade Sorochkin (of the USSR MVD) be obliged to receive within a month those of the undersigned who have disagreed with the fact or the duration of a security-based refusal.
4. That instructions be given to the judicial organs to investigate fully complaints against the illegal actions of the USSR MVD.

On 30 May the same women sent an 'Open letter' to Soviet institutions involved in questions of emigration from the USSR (with copies to the newspaper Washington Post, to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the USSR Ministry of Justice, the Committee of Soviet Women, and the UN Commission on Human Rights):

We, a group of Jewish women, have been trying for several months now to obtain from official Soviet bodies a reply to this question: 'Why are we and our families being prevented from leaving the USSR?' However, all official attempts to communicate to us, or have got rid of us on completely meaningless pretexts. Such generally established men endowed with high rank, in the face of a tiny group of women, surprises us. If you do not intend to fulfill the requirements of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which was ratified by you, then say so openly, so that we and the whole world know who we are fighting with. If you intend to continue this policy, with which we have come into conflict up till now, of avoiding giving an answer, then this, in our view, quite natural question arises: 'What sort of superpower are you, if you are afraid of giving a straight answer, even to women?'

We demand, at last, a substantiated written answer to our applications to emigrate from the USSR!

1. Kaplun's (Chronicle 57) relatives - her mother M.L. Kaplun, aunt A.T. Smolianskaya and A. Yu. Korostelev - issued an open letter on 24 May, in which they write that Borisov, Irina's husband, has been refused permission to leave to join V. I. Kaplun's (Chronicle 57) relatives - her mother M.L. Kaplun, aunt A. T. Smolianskaya and A. Yu. Korostelev - they have been refused permission to leave (on a guest invitation). However, officials from OVIR said that L. Kaplun's and V. Borisov's daughter (she is not yet two years old) could be left in her father, and her safety would be guaranteed.

On 9 June the Kaplun were again told that they had been refused permission to leave (on a guest invitation). However, officials from OVIR said that L. Kaplun's and V. Borisov's daughter (she is not yet two years old) could be left in her father, and her safety would be guaranteed.

In June lat the end of a six-month period the Kaplun's telephone was re-connected. On 3 June an open letter was published 'In defence of Irina Kaplun's child'; under which signatures are being collected at the present time:

A year has passed since the day Vladimir Borisov came of the founders, and a member of the Council of Representatives of SMOT, the Free Inter-trade Association of Working People, and earlier a member of the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR. He was forcibly deported from the USSR. The deportation was a logical culmination of many years of persecution of Borisov by the authorities: out of his 34 years he had spent 11 in psychiatric hospitals, where in the best native traditions of struggle against dissidence he was subjected to forcible 'treatment'...

Vladimir Borisov's wife Irina Kaplun died in a car accident on 23 July 1980. Irina had long been famous for her activity in defence of human rights: as early as 1969-1970 she was held under investigation in prison for ten months, accused of preparing leaflets; later she became one of the founders of the Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes; and in 1979-80 she took part in the formation and activity of SMOT.

These people separated by force need to meet - it will thereby be easier to overcome their mutual grief, while the future of the child demands immediate and absolutely personal consideration... The situation of the family is getting worse and worse, and, it would seem, the probability of a successful outcome is decreasing, as the authorities take the liberty of offering M.L. Kaplun and A.T. Smolianskaya an inhuman choice - either, having lost a daughter, to accept the conditions of the authorities and renounce their granddaughter by sending her alone to her father; or, to stay in the USSR - i.e. to take upon themselves responsibility for the health and life of the child, thereby be easier to overcome the mutual grief, while the future of the child demands immediate and absolutely personal consideration... The situation of the family is getting worse and worse, and, it would seem, the probability of a successful outcome is decreasing, as the authorities take the liberty of offering M.L. Kaplun and A.T. Smolianskaya an inhuman choice - either, having lost a daughter, to accept the conditions of the authorities and renounce their granddaughter by sending her alone to her father; or, to stay in the USSR - i.e. to take upon themselves responsibility for the health and life of the child, thereby be easier to overcome the mutual grief, while the future of the child demands immediate and absolutely personal consideration... The situation of the family is getting worse and worse, and, it would seem, the probability of a successful outcome is decreasing, as the authorities take the liberty of offering M.L. Kaplun and A.T. Smolianskaya an inhuman choice - either, having lost a daughter, to accept the conditions of the authorities and renounce their granddaughter by sending her alone to her father; or, to stay in the USSR - i.e. to take upon themselves responsibility for the health and life of the child, thereby be easier to overcome the mutual grief, while the future of the child demands immediate and absolutely personal consideration...
he tried to persuade Alekseyeva to withdraw her application to emigrate and to write a corresponding statement. Alekseyeva refused.

On 4 May 1974 the marriage was registered between a US citizen W. McClellan and a Soviet subject. Up till now OVR had refused to allow Irina McClellan to join her husband, and he is not allowed an entry visa into the USSR (Chronicles 61, 65).

On 10 April 1981 Irina McClellan brought a suit in the district court: referring to article 19 of the Code on Marriage and the Family in the RSFSR ('The right of spouses to a joint decision on matters of family life, to a free choice of occupation, profession and place of residence'), she requested that OVR be restrained from prohibiting her to join her husband.

On 13 April Judge Alekseyeva ruled that she refused to accept the suit on the grounds that the case was beyond the jurisdiction of the court. The court's report said that the case should be submitted to a 'higher organization'. L. McClellan lodged a personal complaint which was examined by the Moscow City Court on 28 April judges Khouzenilova, Kishe and Katoval. Alekseyeva's judgment was ruled to be correct.

Since February OVR has not been accepting invitations on which the terms of validity has been extended, nor invitations with corrections or ink blots on them.

On 8 July the Moscow Helsinki Group issued Document No. 173, 'The Persecution of refusenik Jews continues'. The document reports on the arrest and conviction of K. Fridman, the arrest of E. Lein, Ya. Lokshin and V. Tsukerman, and the detention of N. Elbert (on these events see below).

The facts enumerated by us are only a small proportion of the lawless acts and harassment perpetrated by the authorities towards persons wishing to emigrate to Israel. In the USSR legal norms and laws regulating matters of emigration are lacking, therefore citizens wishing to leave the USSR cannot complain through legal channels about the actions of the authorities, who, in turn, do not take into account either the articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or those of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, or the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, which was signed by the government of the Soviet Union.

---

Leningrad

The Arrest of Lein

For about two years a seminar on the history, culture and religion of the Jewish people has existed in Leningrad. In March 1981 a police raid was carried out on the participants of the seminar; they were all detained in connection with 'the burglary of a flat', a flat which was quite a distance from the flat where the seminar was held.

On 10 May a policeman was posted at the entrance to the house where the seminar was to take place. He refused the participants of the seminar entry to the house, on the pretext that they were intending to hold a drunken orgy there.

On 17 May, during a regular session of the seminar, policemen and men 'in civilian clothes' led by a certain A.I. Leikin, who introduced himself as head of the Department of Culture of Kalinin District Soviet CC, burst into the flat. The policeman stated that the lecture be stopped, and the audience to listen. Police photographers took photographs without interruption of everyone there and of the decor of the flat. Then they began to remove the audience from the flat by force. In the meantime one of the policemen who had pushed Tatiana Finkelstein aside said: 'She hit me!' (The next day Finkelstein received 12 days in prison for 'disturbance of the peace'). Evgeny Lein pushed aside the hands of a policeman who was dragging him along: 'That constitutes resistance!' Semyon Averbak, who suffers from very high blood-pressure, almost fainted and asked for permission to leave the flat. He sat down on the floor and was carried out of the flat by his hands and feet. At the police station an ambulance had to be called for him, and he was sent to hospital.

All those driven out of the flat had the data in their passports copied down, then they were led out of the house and along a corridor of men 'in civilian clothes' to a bus which took them off to a police station and voluntary police point. The people observing this 'operation' called out: 'Shoot the lot of them! Pity Hitler didn’t finish them off!'

A few hours later all except Lein were released. Lein has been charged under article 191-1, part 1, of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('Resisting a police-officer or voluntary policeman'). At the end of June the charge was reclassified under part 2 of the same article (under part 1 the term is up to one year, under part 2 - up to five years). All Lein's petitions for summoning witnesses have been granted. They have given detailed evidence that Lein was pushed against the door and offered no resistance.

Miscellaneous

On 18 March the refusenik Boris Rivkin arrived at Leningrad OVR for a reception with its head, Bokov; however, the latter refused to receive him. Then Rivkin hung a placard round his neck with the inscription: '5 years of refusal equals 5 years of insults and 5 years of torture'. Five minutes later the deputy head of OVR came out, tore the placard from Rivkin's neck and attempted to lead him out. Rivkin's acquaintances, who were present, started to defend him. Then some 'unknown persons in civilian clothes' in
In September 1979 Nadezhda Fradkova (born 1946) received a refusal in connection with the 'secret work' of her father S. Fradkov, who lives in Moscow and works at the Central Research Institute 'Kometa'. Fradkova has lived apart from her father virtually since the day she was born, and has seen him only a few times in her life. In March 1980 the refusal because of the 'secret work' of her father was confirmed.

On 11 April, after another submission of her documents, a fresh invitation was demanded from Fradkova. As a protest against her illegal detention in the USSR and the illegal actions of Leningrad OVR, Fradkova declared a 15-day hunger-strike (from 18 April to 2 May).

The refusenik Knokh, a teacher of Hebrew, has received a warning 'according to the Decree' for his participation in press conferences and for communicating with foreign correspondents.

The Trial of Fridman

On 18 March Kim Beniaminovich Fridman (a refusenik over nine years: his wife and daughter have been living in Israel for many years now) was arrested 'for resisting the authorities' (he refused to go to a job-placement commission, as at the time he was already working as a bookbinder). On the same day a judge of the Dneprovsky District, Oleinik, sentenced him to ten days of administrative arrest. On 28 March Fridman was taken from the special reception centre to his home, where a search was carried out (in the record there are 19 items, namely books in Hebrew), after which he was sent to Kiev's Lukyanov Prison. The resolution on the institution of criminal proceedings against Fridman says that he has led a parasitic way of life and lived on unearned income. With the aim of avoiding prosecution found himself a job and worked for about a month. Taking the above into account, institute criminal proceedings against Kim Beniaminovich Fridman under article 214 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 209 of the RSFSR Code).

The case was set to be heard on 9 June. All the witnesses received summonses for this date. However, in the late evening of 15 May (Friday) Fridman's barrister was informed that the case had been transferred to 18 May, and so the barrister was able to inform only the accused's mother about the date of the trial. The trial, under the chairmanship of Judge Oleinik, took place without a prosecutor and without witnesses.

From the evidence of witnesses during the pre-trial investigation it was clear that in the past year there had not been a single month during which Fridman would not have worked if he had not been on sick leave. Living off 'unearned income' was not proven by any official document. From materials put forward by the barrister it was also clear that numerous procedural violations had been committed in the case.

In his final speech Fridman pleaded not guilty and stated that he regarded his conviction merely as a temporary halt on his way to Israel. He stated that he had become a victim of the KGB, which had been preventing his departure to Israel for nine years. The sentence - one year of ordinary regime camps (the maximum sentence under article 214, part 1).

The Trial of Kislik

On 19 March, at around 24.00 hours, Vladimir Kislik (Chronicle 79) was standing at a trolleybus stop. Someone pushed him from behind. When he turned around he saw a woman (who subsequently turned out to be the witness Shabalin) a student from the Kiev Trade Institute, who began shouting that he had hit her. A policeman who ran up twisted Kislik's arm behind his back and pushed him into a car. The next day Kislik's father found him in the Shevchenko District OVR. A few days later Kislik was placed in Lukyanov Prison. He was charged under article 206, part 2, of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ('malicious hooliganism').

During the investigation Kislik refused to give evidence, stating that he was a victim of a provocation by the organs of internal affairs. The indictment investigator Syrymchenko conducted the case) said that Kislik had hit Shabalin across the face without inflicting flesh wounds, and also attempted to kick witness Zhuravlev on the legs. Inspector Grohovsky of the Shevchenko District OVR, who had allegedly been passing the stop by chance, also took part as a witness. (A week after the arrest an article appeared in the newspaper Evening Kiev under the heading 'He sank to this...'. In which it was written that Kislik had beaten up two people - a woman, and a man who intervened on her behalf. Besides this, the article alleged that while being detained Kislik had resisted the representatives of authority.)

Six Kiev refuseniks have published the article 'The 170th Bellis Anniversary in Kiev':

The trial of Kislik was legs.

...There was everything: a wild outburst of anti-Semitism, calls for a pogrom, the deliberately false line of the investigation, and a specially selected collection of jurors... The newspaper Russkie vedomosti wrote: ...there was no one in the eyes of the world is a tough one, and if the jurors emerge from it with honour, it will mean that conditions... There was no longer exist in Russia in which an accusation of ritual murder can be squashed with the people's conscience. Despite the efforts of the [Fascist] Black Hundreds organizations and the cooperation of the Ministry of Justice, the sinister campaign about 'Jewish ritual murder' failed catastrophically - Mendel Beilis was acquitted.

And this is how, 70 years later, the Kiev authorities are celebrating in worthy fashion the anniversary of the anti-Semitic orgy surrounding the 'Bellis case'. Exactly 70 years later, almost to the day, in Kiev, in the very same district, the Jew Vladimir Kislik was seized. The Jew Vladimir Kislik is charged that late
in the evening of 19 March 1981, on the Jewish holiday of Purim, being in a state of intoxication, he swore in foul language at a woman and slapped her across the face. Of course, the intoxication and the swearing and the slap across the face have the same relation to reality as the extras which Beilis supposedly mixed with the blood of a child. The arrest was timed to coincide with this day because the competent authorities realized that intoxication was a sin for a believing Jew on the one occasion in the year of Purim.

But what progress! What a softening of hard traditions! From ritual murder and virtual cannibalism to ritual intoxication, foul abuse and a slap across the face! Now the ritual of the investigation is taking place and a scenario for the trial is being elaborated. Then will come the ritual trial and, in the final ritual act, in the name of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic the judges will pronounce the will of the KGB.

Beilis was acquitted, but his 'case' lives on! Lives on in the 'Kislik case', in the 'Khalilovs case', in the 'Fridman case'.

We call on all honourable people to speak up in defence of Vladimir Kislik and other Jews persecuted for seeking repatriation, in memory of the Salvation of Beilis.

11 Kiev refuseniks have sent an 'Open Letter' to the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian CP, Shcherbitsky:

The trial being prepared completes the chain of persecution (administrative arrests on fabricated charges, forcible placement in a psychiatric hospital, searches, beatings, illegal detentions, a libellous campaign in the press) to which Kislik has been subjected for eight years now, only because he wishes to live in his native land.

If a trial takes place, it will be a mockery of justice...

12 Kiev refuseniks have written a letter to Brezhnev:

It is in your power to avert the judicial revenge now being prepared. We call on you - intervene before it is too late, release Vladimir Kislik and let him, at last, be reunited with his family and people in the land of Israel!

On 26 and 27 May the trial took place in Kiev of Vladimir Samuilovich Kislik (born 1935, a Doctor of Technical Science). The trial was set for 12 o'clock. On the notice-board there was no mention of the trial, and all Court officials refused, on different pretexts, to say when the trial would begin and in what room. Judge I.A. Polikarpova stated that everything was posted up on the notice-board, and insisted that people stop pestering her in the corridor. 40 minutes later Polikarpova's secretary came out on to the stairway and began calling witnesses for the prosecution, but it turned out that none of them was present. To a question from Kislik's relatives about when and where the trial would take place, the Judge replied: in the semi-basement. However, the trial took place not there, but in an upstairs room. When Kislik's friends (17 persons) went upstairs and entered the room, it was empty and they sat down. A few minutes later some young people wearing Komsomol badges (about ten persons) came in and sat down in the back row. A policeman then entered and demanded that they all leave. To the question whether the trial would be closed, he replied negatively. To the question why in that case it was necessary to leave, he announced after some vacillation that it was Polikarpova's instruction. Everyone got up except for the young people wearing badges. Kislik's relatives objected, then also left the room. The policemen then sent everyone out of the room, cleared the corridor and made them go downstairs; finally he insisted they all go out into the street. However, a short while later the young people wearing badges were invited back into the room. The others moved forward immediately behind them but the policemen stopped them and would not let them in. Only a few relatives and friends of Kislik were admitted.

During the adjournment Kislik's relatives asked whether they could give him some sandwiches, to which Polikarpova at first replied that it was the escort's job, and then added that it was not allowed, as sandwiches had to be subjected to a special examination. The escort would not allow Kislik to be given food, and all his friends were sent out of the room. Then refusenik Elena Gofshen, who is eight months pregnant, attempted to clarify why they were not allowed to be present in court and tried to enter, a KGB officer known to many Jewish refuseniks as Mishchenko ('Chronicle 60, and also below) hit her in the stomach. Gofshen was taken to hospital, where she was kept for observation.

In his final speech Kislik said that everything that was happening to him was a provocation on the part of those organs of power which had been preventing him for eight years from emigrating to Israel for so long. The sentence - three years of ordinary-regime camps.

After graduating in 1958 from the Institute of Non-Ferrous Metals and Gold named after Kalinin, Vladimir Kislik worked in the Ural as a researcher in metalurgical engineering. In 1966 Kislik defended his dissertation. The same year he was transferred to a Kiev Isotope Laboratory, where he worked as head of the section for scientific research. From 1968 Kislik worked at the Institute of Physics of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, as leader of the atomic energy group, and at the Academy's Institute of Nuclear Research. As well as in educational institutions in Kiev, Kislik is the author of many scientific publications on questions of the physics and technology of metals. In 1971, in connection with his application to emigrate to Israel, Kislik was forced to leave scientific and teaching work.

On 7 July the Moscow Helsinki Crop Issued Document No. 172, 'The Arrest and Conviction of Vladimir Kislik':

Yet another citizen of the USSR has been convicted on a fabricated criminal charge. Yet again the authorities are clearly demonstrating their scornful attitude to the humanitarian articles of the Helsinki Agreements signed by the Soviet Union in 1975.
Then they set off for the kitchen and asked: 'What's under place."

Darnitsky OVD V.A. Verzin. Zubko is charged with possession at the police station: several men entered the building chief. The pistol was in place and the hashish was in

Opening the patkage, they announced that it was hashish: a Kiev refusenik happened to witness the following scene and said to the person who met them: 'Everything's OK, possibility that the hashish was planted: 'Cive us the names

On 14 and 15 May Zubko's mother came with the summons had been very insistent, but the first day the inspector was not in his place, and on the second day, after a vague conversation about her son's behaviour, which lasted about two hours, she was allowed to go. Zubko was at work at this time, so neither of his flat's two occupants (his mother and he) was at home.

On 16 May a search was carried out at Zubko's flat on suspicion that he had taken part in an unsuccessful attempt to burgle a neighbouring flat. Those carrying out the search explained that Zubko resembled the 'bearded man' suspected of the attempted burglary.

The officials rummaged around the whole flat for some time, confiscating the Torah and all books in Hebrew. Then they went over to the sideboard and pulled out of an empty sweet-box a small package (the size of a sweet) in aluminium foil. To the question 'What is this? Levitskaya said she supposed that it was an old sweet she had forgotten about. Opening the package, they announced that it was hashish: they noted in the record - 'a small piece of a dark substance'. (A few days later the investigator said to Levitskaya that expert analysis had established it was hashish.) Then they set off for the kitchen and asked: 'What's under

On the eve of the opening of the Madrid Conference, and a few days before the beginning of the 26th Congress of the CPSU, the authorities did not like either the fact that he was actively seeking permission to emigrate to Israel, or that he was helping many refuseniks and, by his four-lens behaviour, setting an example for them. He is the only refusenik to have been subjected to six arrests, besides which as a protest against his last ten-day arrest he maintained a hunger-strike throughout the ten days. This courage has not passed unnoticed. In Kiev one must pay for courage.

On 17 February, 13 refuseniks from Kiev sent a telegram of complaint to the USSR Procuracy in connection with another conviction of Stanislav Zubko (Chronicle 60) for 'petty hooliganism'. On 19 March one of the senders (V. Tereshchansko) received a reply from the Procurator of the Darnitsky District of Kiev, V.I. Ravnshnikov, who said that Zubko while at a bus stop... used foul language in the presence of women and children. In this connection a record was drawn up by a divisional inspector of the Darnitsky District OVD, Senior Police Lieutenant Makin, about his disturbance of the peace... There are no grounds for protesting against the decision of People's Judge Kovelschuk.

The reply also says:

It was established by a check through the Kiev OVD OVR that all the persons who signed the complaint had been refused permission to emigrate for permanent residence in Israel in December 1980-January 1981, because of absence of direct relatives there.

On 16 May a search was carried out at Zubko's flat on suspicion that he had taken part in an unsuccessful attempt to burgle a neighbouring flat. Those carrying out the search explained that Zubko resembled the 'bearded man' suspected of the attempted burglary. The officials rummaged around the whole flat for some time, confiscating the Torah and all books in Hebrew. Then they went over to the sideboard and pulled out of an empty sweet-box a small package (the size of a sweet) in aluminium foil. To the question 'What is this? Levitskaya said she supposed that it was an old sweet she had forgotten about. Opening the package, they announced that it was hashish: they noted in the record - 'a small piece of a dark substance'. (A few days later the investigator said to Levitskaya that expert analysis had established it was hashish.) Then they set off for the kitchen and asked: 'What's under
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On 16 May a search was carried out at Zubko's flat on suspicion that he had taken part in an unsuccessful attempt to burgle a neighbouring flat. Those carrying out the search explained that Zubko resembled the 'bearded man' suspected of the attempted burglary. The officials rummaged around the whole flat for some time, confiscating the Torah and all books in Hebrew. Then they went over to the sideboard and pulled out of an empty sweet-box a small package (the size of a sweet) in aluminium foil. To the question 'What is this? Levitskaya said she supposed that it was an old sweet she had forgotten about. Opening the package, they announced that it was hashish: they noted in the record - 'a small piece of a dark substance'. (A few days later the investigator said to Levitskaya that expert analysis had established it was hashish.) Then they set off for the kitchen and asked: 'What's under

The Arrest of Zubko

On 17 February, 13 refuseniks from Kiev sent a telegram of complaint to the USSR Procuracy in connection with another conviction of Stanislav Zubko (Chronicle 60) for 'petty hooliganism'. On 19 March one of the senders (V. Tereshchansko) received a reply from the Procurator of the Darnitsky District of Kiev, V.I. Ravnshnikov, who said that Zubko while at a bus stop... used foul language in the presence of women and children. In this connection a record was drawn up by a divisional inspector of the Darnitsky District OVD, Senior Police Lieutenant Makin, about his disturbance of the peace... There are no grounds for protesting against the decision of People's Judge Kovelschuk.

The reply also says:

It was established by a check through the Kiev OVD OVR that all the persons who signed the complaint had been refused permission to emigrate for permanent residence in Israel in December 1980-January 1981, because of absence of direct relatives there.

On 16 May a search was carried out at Zubko's flat on suspicion that he had taken part in an unsuccessful attempt to burgle a neighbouring flat. Those carrying out the search explained that Zubko resembled the 'bearded man' suspected of the attempted burglary. The officials rummaged around the whole flat for some time, confiscating the Torah and all books in Hebrew. Then they went over to the sideboard and pulled out of an empty sweet-box a small package (the size of a sweet) in aluminium foil. To the question 'What is this? Levitskaya said she supposed that it was an old sweet she had forgotten about. Opening the package, they announced that it was hashish: they noted in the record - 'a small piece of a dark sub-

he said to Levitskaya.

13 Kiev refuseniks have sent this letter to the delegations of the states participating in the Madrid Conference:

...he could not consent to the fact that he had been deprived of the right of repatriation to his historic Motherland. He began actively to seek permission to leave. Precisely this is the only reason why an intellectual, a scientist, has become a 'hooligan'. It is indicative that Zubko has shown himself to be a 'hooligan' exactly at those moments when the Kiev authorities have become frightened by a particular rise in the level of anger among refuseniks. This is what happened on the eve of a group trip to Moscow, on the day of the trial of refusenik V. Pilnikov, on the eve of the opening of the Madrid Conference, and a few days before the beginning of the 26th Congress of the CPSU...

...the authorities did not like either the fact that he was actively seeking permission to emigrate to Israel, or that he was helping many refuseniks and, by his four-lens behaviour, setting an example for them. He is the only refusenik to have been subjected to six arrests, besides which as a protest against his last ten-day arrest he maintained a hunger-strike throughout the ten days. This courage has not passed unnoticed. In Kiev one must pay for courage.

Stanislav Zubko (born 1938): a Doctor of Chemical Science worked as a senior researcher in one of Kiev's scientific-research institutes until 1979, when he applied to emigrate to Israel. Recently he has been working as a loader in a shop, and as a book-binder."

Miscellaneous

Kiev refusenik Jews have appealed to 'public organizations and people of good will':

The purpose of our appeal is to attract the attention of world public opinion to the ever-increasing repression against us, despite the fact that our actions are strictly legal both in essence and in form.

After discussing the persecution to which refuseniks have been subjected from May 1980 to March 1981 - the five-year imprisonment of V. Pilnikov (Chronicle 57), the arrest of V. Kiselik (see above), the attempt to deport S. Zubko (six times), I. Kniahinska (three times), I. Bironbaitz (twice), V. Kamensky, V. Kiselik, V. Levinshtein, S. Mikhalis and K. Fridman - the refuseniks conclude their appeal with these words:

The threat of judicial revenge is hanging over the heads of refuseniks like the sword of Damocles. Therefore we appeal to all public organizations and all people of good will to help us by any means at their disposal to obtain the release from imprisonment of Valery Pilnikov and Vladimir Kislik. We ask you to address demands to higher party and government organs that they cease repression against Jews who wish to live in their native land and are being forcibly kept in the USSR.
At the beginning of 1979 the family of Mark Ocheretyansky received permission to leave for Israel. All the necessary documents were handed in and the tax (1400 roubles) was paid. However, the visas which had already been written out were unexpectedly held up. Over a period of ten months Ocheretyansky was threatened with criminal proceedings, which forced him to abandon his departure.

In February 1980 Ocheretyansky was arrested and after a three-month investigation was sentenced to a year of corrective labour without imprisonment 'for abusing his official position' (before applying to emigrate Ocheretyansky worked as head of a section in the factory 'Building Materials').

In December 1980 Ocheretyansky presented his sentence to OVIR and a document saying it had been carried out, but he was still not handed the visas. The family have addressed many complaints to higher bodies but not received any replies.

On 23 March 1981 the Ocheretyansky's were told they had been refused permission to leave 'because those who invited them are not closely related'. The tax has gone into the state coffers. On 24 March Ocheretyansky wrote a 'Statement to the Participants in the Madrid Meeting':

For over a year and a half we have suffered crude tyranny and lawlessness. We have dragged out a miserable existence, deprived of documents, rights, means of subsistence and elementary humanitarian conditions, since we sold all our furniture and belongings to pay the tax. My son has been deprived of a childhood since the age of 11; this is the second year he has not attended school, he sleeps on the floor and wears second-hand things... At the present time the family is ruined and on the verge of despair and poverty.

Ocheretyansky has sent similar statements to Kurt Waldheim and to the International Red Cross.

Leonid Varvak (Chronicle 61) has received answers to his complaints of 17 March in connection with attempts to hospitalize his wife Liliana. The Deputy Head Doctor of the Medical Section of the City Ambulance Service, B.F. Yatsishin, wrote on 24 March:

I report that on 10.11.80 a specialized psychiatric ambulance brigade, made up of Doctor S.D. Bublik, medical assistant M. Yu. Belousova, orderly G.F. Stanislavskaya and orderly-driver V.I. Berdyshevskaya went out to your wife.

The ambulance was called out by officers of the Pechera district police station, in accordance with a directive of the station issued by a psychiatrist of the Pechera Psychoneurological Clinic (Verkhnyaya Street 4) to hospitalize your wife.

On 7 April Varvak received a reply from the deputy head of the Health Department of Kiev City Soviet EC, Yu. Gradun:

Kiev City Health Department reports that your wife was examined at home by a psychiatrist in accordance with a request by the Board of Guardians of the Pechera Dis-
officers in operations against refuseniks. He took part in the trial of V. Kislik. He hit the pregnant Elena Gofshtein nevertheless, 'Mishchenko' regularly appears amongst KGB officers in operations against refuseniks. He took part in the last three administrative arrests of S. Zubko. During the trial of V. Kislik he hit the pregnant Elena Gofshtein.

On the basis of the above, and guided by articles 88 and 89 of the Basic Principles of Civil Law, articles 44a, 44b and 44c of the RFSR Civil Code, and article 26, point 1, of the USSR Law on the USSR Supreme Court we REQUEST:

- that our case be examined by a court of first instance;
- that our right to leave for Israel be recognized, and the respondent be obliged to draw up exit visas.

On 26 May the USSR Supreme Court replied to the complainants that the complaint had been sent to the USSR MVD for examination. On 14 June the complainants sent a telegram to the USSR Supreme Court requesting they be informed of the date of the examination of our statement of claim. On 14 June a reply came from the USSR MVD:

Complainants I. Kh. Brandt, V. L. Koretsky and V. H. Tvershchenko (three of the 14 - Chronicle) were invited to the Department of Visas and Registration in Kiev. A representative of the OVIR administration in Kiev, comrade D. V. Komar, on behalf of the USSR MVD and at its behest, stated that it was not appropriate to address such a claim to judicial bodies, as it was beyond the jurisdiction of a court.

On the same day the complainants sent a telegram to the USSR Supreme Court, insisting on a court examination of their claim and requesting that they be informed of the date of the court hearing.

Husband and wife I. Gerashchenko and I. Ratushinskaya, representative of the OVIR administration in Kiev, comrade D. V. Komar, on behalf of the USSR MVD and at its behest, stated that it was not appropriate to address such a claim to judicial bodies, as it was beyond the jurisdiction of a court.

They base their request on the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and articles 4 and 29 of the USSR Constitution.

In his reply to the telegram from refusenik Jews (see 'The Arrest of Zubko') Kaveshnikov also wrote:

I inform you that there is no officer by the name of Mishchenko on the Kiev KGB staff, and it is not within the competence of the KGB organs to institute administrative proceedings.

Nevertheless, 'Mishchenko' regularly appears amongst KGB officers in operations against refuseniks. He took part in the last three administrative arrests of S. Zubko. During the trial of V. Kislik he hit the pregnant Elena Gofshtein.
On 6 April 1981, E. Bykova (the wife of I. Goldshtein) sent a statement to the First Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs in Georgia, Shaduri:

"Five weeks ago you personally stated to me that you would investigate the reasons for the refusal of my exit visa. Today, 6 April 1981, your assistant refused to tell me what had been said to you. I refer you to the Head of the Georgian MVD, General Ordzhonikidze. I have already informed him of my case and told him that the KGB decides on such matters, allegedly for security reasons. The KGB has no claims on me and the question of my exit visa must be decided in the Ministry of Internal Affairs. I bring the following to your attention:

1. I have not worked anywhere at all for over nine-and-a-half years, and before that I worked as an ordinary engineer in the Research Institute of Metrology VNIINSM. VNIINSM has not received any inquiry from the KGB about whether security restrictions were ever placed on me.

2. In the second half of 1980 Lev Elkind, who had been working at VNIINSM as a chief engineer since 1973, left the USSR. Maybe Colonel Ordzhonikidze does not know that the Committee for State Security KGBI has no claims on me and the question of my exit visa must be decided in the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

I demand that this tormenting of me and my young son cease, and we be authorized to leave for Israel immediately.

E. Bykova"

On 6 April 1981, E. Bykova sent the statement to Ordzhonikidze, who said: "You know I don't know anything about it. The KGB knows how much permission to leave cost Elkind?"

On 26 May 1981, the brothers Goldshtein addressed a complaint to the USSR Procurator-General (copy to the Central Committee of the CPSU):

"We have both been out of work since December 1971. We are both physicists by education, Doctors of Technical Science, scientific workers deprived of the possibility of engaging in scientific work.

In 1978 G. Goldshtein was illegally, without a corpus delicti, sentenced to 1 year. He was charged with so-called 'parasitism'. In the Soviet EC of the Lenin District it is recorded that on 24 June and 1 October 1980 G. Goldshtein was allegedly invited there and offered the job of engineer in the industrial associations 'Electro-locomotive Constructor' (Elektrovozostroitel) and 'Machine-tool Constructor' (Stankostroitel), but he allegedly refused.

On 6 November 1980 G. Goldshtein made an application to Procurator Kavsadze of the Lenin District of Tbilisi. In which, specifically, he requested the Procurator to send the Soviet EC issue a certificate confirming that no work directives had ever been issued to G. Goldshtein.

In a letter of 15 May 1981 addressed to G. Goldshtein, Procurator Kavsadze writes that the 'corresponding check was carried out' by him and 'it was established' that the post of engineer had been offered to the declarant on 24 June and 1 October 1980! Evidently to embellish a blatant lie, Procurator Kavsadze added (and we quote): '...You did not agree for the reason that the aforementioned associations are secret and, should you not be allowed to go abroad, therefore you asked to be employed as a manual worker.'

Citizen Procurator-General of the USSR! Did Procurator Kavsadze not reveal secret state secrets by writing that associations 'Electro-locomotive Constructor' and 'Machine-tool Constructor' have secret output. It is incomprehensible what 'secret' Procurator Kavsadze is writing about. If he has the brothers Goldshtein in mind, then their requests to leave the USSR have remained unsatisfied for ten years now. So our job-placement should not be linked with our tragedy as people held hostage.

In Procurator Kavsadze's letter there is some truth. On 10 April 1981, the Soviet EC of the Lenin District did offer G. Goldshtein work in the association 'Freight-auto-repair' (Gruzavtoremont). Again we quote Procurator Kavsadze: "A person who is not an engineer..."
The following day the remaining 11 people went to the Central Committee once again and left a collective complaint in the reception-room (copies to the Prosecutors of Tadjikistan and Dushanbe) against the actions of the police, in which they asked specifically: 'Since when has an appeal to higher instances been considered a crime?'

The Arrest of Marsal

On 19 June, by resolution of the Dushanbe Procuracy, the German Artur Mikhailovich Marsal (Chronicle 54), who has
Sirvard Avakian, who was released in March, has sent this statement to Brezhnev:

In my 28 years I, a former worker at the Khengarzdoer radio-relay factory, have had to experience such barbaric methods of persecution and personal insults that one could not help but compare it all with the actions of the Fascists during the war years.

Without reason - work dismissals and violent beatings; without reason - psychiatric hospitals; without reason - prison and long prison convoys to Irkutsk, slave labour in a penal settlement... Where I had to experience cruel treatment from the administration. I was beaten until my blood flowed and I lost consciousness: without reason I underwent months of punishment cells and starvation: my relatives were not told where I was. All of this was carried out by people who have lost their human aspect, with the ferocious zeal and stupidity of loud-mouthed soldiers executing an order to torment me as cruelly as possible. They could humiliate me physically, but spiritually I remain the same as I always was, uncompromising in the face of lawlessness and human vileness.

After all these terrifying, inhuman experiences I am forced to turn to you with one single request: to deprive me of Soviet citizenship and allow me to emigrate. Let me feel bad abroad without my Motherland, without relatives and friends, but even one's native land can be hateful when tyranny and callousness prevail. To carry out this difficult task I will stop at nothing, since henceforth my living in the USSR is deprived of all meaning.

Armenia

98 Germans (from 23 families) have addressed an open letter to Brezhnev, in which they ask for his help in obtaining permission to leave. Four of them have been applying to leave since 1972, 25 (from six families) since 1974.

Estonia

Pentecostalist E. Bulakh kept up the hunger-strike he had started on 7 February (Chronicle 61) until 8 March. During his strike he was summoned to the military enlistment office and sent from there to a medical commission. The medical commission sent him to a psychiatric examination. Bulakh did not go despite repeated warnings that if he were declared sane, he would be tried for not having gone at once to the Clinic: if he were declared sick, he would be treated.

In the Lithuanian MVD they promised to resolve his case, but in OVIR he was told to submit documents for an exit visa to Israel. However, a short while later he was refused permission to leave on either his American or his Israeli invitation.

Vilnius

On 31 March the artist Dina Grossman (Chronicle 61), aparticipant in the two-week hunger-strike during the Moscow Olympics, of the 'marches' of Moscow Jews in the autumn and winter of 1980-1 on the President of the USSR Supreme Soviet, OVIR, the Moscow City Soviet and the RSFSR Procuracy (Chronicles 60, 61), and of the demonstration on 24 December 1980 outside the Lenin Library (Chronicle 60), emigrated from Moscow.

On 13 April Alexander Shipov (Chronicle 61), a participant of the 'marches' and the demonstration, left from Moscow. On the same day, participant sent him a psychiatric examination, and was told that if he were declared sane, he would be tried for not having gone to the Clinic: if he were declared sick, he would be treated.

In the Lithuanian MVD they promised to resolve his case, but in OVIR he was told to submit documents for an exit visa to Israel. However, a short while later he was refused permission to leave on either his American or his Israeli invitation.

Armenia

Sirvard Avakian, who was released in March, has sent this statement to Brezhnev:

In my 28 years I, a former worker at the Khengarzdoer radio-relay factory, have had to experience such barbaric methods of persecution and personal insults that one could not help but compare it all with the actions of the Fascists during the war years.

Without reason - work dismissals and violent beatings;
briefer it was said, specifically, that Babunyshev had been to Cork to see Sakharov and had brought back some photographs.

On 24 April Babunyshev was summoned to his district OVD, where officer Straka inquired whether he had changed his mind about emigrating, asked him not to become embittered', and said that Babunyshev would probably be allowed to leave. A few days later Babunyshev was telephoned by UVIR and asked to come for a visa. He had been waiting for permission for about two years. In February he received an oral refusal.

On 5 May Babunyshev was given a final date for the validity of his exit visa - 16 May. The same day his telephone was cut off. On 16 May Babunyshev was detained on the street by two civilians who produced criminal search-warrants - he had a 'suspiciously large' bag. A search was carried out, during which a small part of the collection devoted to the 60th birthday of A.D. Sakharov (Babunyshev was one of the active compilers of this collection) was confiscated from him. A talk was conducted with Babunyshev, which sometimes adopted a fairly menacing tone. Until 21 May (Sakharov's birthday) he was demonstratively shadowed. On 19 June A. Babunyshev and his mother S.E. Babunysheva (Chronicle 56) left the USSR.

At the end of April and beginning of May, B.B. Karatayev (Chronicle 57) telephoned Yu. Gastev (Chronicle 57) several times, to remind him that it was time for him to take a decision about leaving. (The KGB first suggested to Gastev that he emigrate in November 1977.) On 5 May Karatayev talked with Gastev at the Lubyanka Prison. Gastev was given the period of validity of his exit visa - until the end of May, after that he would 'have only himself to blame'. On 25 May Karatayev phoned Gastev again and informed him that he was expected at UVIR at 19.00. In reply Gastev enquired about the fate of his statements to Andropov, Karatayev promised to give an oral answer. Gastev insisted on the answer 'in the proper form'. Karatayev promised to continue the conversation on Monday (he was phoning Friday). The same day Gastev handed in his documents to UVIR. On 21 June, the day the visa expired, Gastev was not admitted for a long time to the customs inspection, as a result he missed the aeroplane. On 22 June Gastev left the USSR.

The Case of Airikyan (Chronicles 60, 61)

When E. Sirotenko brought a parcel to P. Airikyan, who was held in Perm Prison, the receptionist refused to take it, saying that Airikyan had been forbidden by the investigator to receive parcels. Sirotenko complained about this ban to the duty Procurator of Perm Regional Procuracy, Shirinkin, who told her that...
On 30 April the Moscow Helsinki Group issued Document No. 166, 'Alexander Bolonkin's term of imprisonment is becoming a life sentence'.

On 20 April Alexander Bolonkin's (Chronicle 51) second camp term was due to end. However, on 3 April he was charged under article 70, part 2, of the RSFSR Criminal Code. The KGB is in charge of the case. Ovsienko is taking no part in the investigation.3

On 29 May Sirotenko was told in the court that the case file had been collected two days earlier by the investigator: it was now listed as being in possession of the Procuracy and was not being examined by the court. On 3 or 4 June the Procuracy informed her that the case had reached them, so that Airikyan could study the case materials further. On 4 June Sobolev told Airikyan's lawyer P. Abrikosov (from Moscow) that the warrant for his arrest (the extension of his term of custody) was in the case file.

Regional Court that they had not received the case from the Procuracy. In the Procuracy office the secretary informed me that the decision to end the investigation (article 201 of the RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure) had not yet been signed by Airikyan and that the investigator had gone to see him in the investigations prison. Thus, in violation of articles 11, 46 and 47 of the RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure, Airikyan has been held in custody since 21 May 1981 without legal grounds and should be released immediately. I request you to consider this complaint urgently and to take measures to restore the legality which has been violated.

On 3 May A. Sakharov published an 'Appeal in Defence of Alexander Bolonkin':

I appeal to Alexander Bolonkin's mathematician colleagues in the USSR and in all countries, to all scientists, statesmen and public figures, to men of culture and businessmen who are able to influence the Soviet leaders, I appeal to Amnesty International: come to Alexander Bolonkin's defence!

Yu. Butchenko (Chronicles 51, 56) and M. Kholodyan (Chronicles 52, 56) have been transferred here from Perm Camp 34. M. Kazachkov and V. Balakhonov attempted suicide several times. Once Kazachkov's belt broke: on another occasion, guards pulled him out of the moose: when he slashed his veins, the blood did not flow. Balakhonov slashed his veins in his cell, then attempted to hang himself from the window-bars in a punishment cell: on both occasions he was saved by guards. Kazachkov was given three-and-a-half years (Chronicle 61) under only one article: article 206, part 2, of the RSFSR Criminal Code ('malicious hooliganism').

On 20 May the Deputy Head of the Tatar ASSR MVD S. KovalMv had been 'recruited for socially useful work', told L. Boitsova in reply to her question that her husband was deprived of a regular visit for 'infringing prison discipline'. On 20 May the Deputy Head of the later ASSR MVD Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions, Lieutenant-Colonel G.M. Vinogradov, replied to Boitsova that a letter written by KovalMv in January had been 'sent to the addressee, of which fact he (KovalMv - Chronicle) had been informed: it was then destroyed'. A letter written by KovalMv in May passed the censors. Since the beginning of the year only three letters from his wife have been delivered to him.

The Mordovian Camps

Major A.A. Zimenko has been replaced as Camp Comrade by his Deputy in charge of discipline, Major U.V. Pavlov. The man directly in charge of the political camp-zones (uchr. ZHKh-385/3-4 and uchr. ZHKh-385/3-5) is Captain S. Gainichenko (Chronicle 58).
broke out all over her body and her temperature rose to 39°. Then a dermatologist came and prescribed treatment.

On 8 July Osipova was to have a long visit from her husband I. Kovaly (the first visit in camp). On 6 July Gainichenko and three KG officers arrived in the camp. In the evening of 7 July the woman on duty told her that on 8 July repairs would begin in the premises where visits took place. This was the third time repairs had been made in the last nine months. The first was in October 1980, just before T. Velikanova’s visit. The second was in February, before Silivonchik’s visit.) On 10 July Osipova wrote a complaint to the Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions and to the Procuracy for the Mordovian camps. This second complaint was sent by the administration; the first was not.

The Perm Camps

Camp 35

O. Poveshchik was taken to the Ukraine for ‘re-education’. In mid-July the zone contained six persons: Tatiana Vilkova, Tatjana Osipova, Galina Silivonchik, Lyudmila Listvina, Maria Semenova and Aleksandra Khvotkova.

In April Silivonchik requested a pardon (her 13-year camp sentence ends on 3 June 1982; she still faces five years’ exile). On 8 July she received a refusal. On 9 July 12 of her camp mates requested a short visit. On 6 July Listvina wrote a request for a pardon: that day she had served five years in a state prison. On 21 January 1981, in February Shcharansky went on strike, demanding to be allowed normal correspondence (since October 1980 letters from his brother have stopped reaching him, and about one out of ten letters from his mother have been delivered). He was given four consecutive 15-day sentences in the cooler. For this reason, he wrote that he would not leave the punishment block until September (a term served in the cooler is no longer counted as part of a term in the punishment block).

On 10 March a Bible published in the USSR, prayers and religious postcards were confiscated from Poveshchik and about one out of ten letters from his mother have been delivered). He was given four consecutive 15-day sentences in the cooler. For this reason, he wrote that he would not leave the punishment block until September (a term served in the cooler is no longer counted as part of a term in the punishment block). On 10 March a Bible published in the USSR, prayers and religious postcards were confiscated from Poveshchik, psalms also published in the USSR were confiscated from Shcharansky, Shcharansky, still on strike, demanded in addition that his psalms be returned to him. He was given four consecutive 15-day sentences in the cooler. For this reason, he wrote that he would not leave the punishment block until September (a term served in the cooler is no longer counted as part of a term in the punishment block).

On 11 March Poveshchik was forced to the first time (at this point the guard V. Bormakov knocked out one of his teeth). Poveshchik’s unsuccessful hunger-strike lasted 70 days.
The camp Commandant is now Chalka (Chronicles 51, 52).

Camp 36 (Special-Regime)

On 4 June A. Shvedenko arrived here (trial in Chronicle 60). He is very ill. B. Gajuszka complains of pain in his eyes; V. Stus is feeling ill. His shoulder joints still ache: Stus was 'carried' in handcuffs to an interrogation, as he refused to go of his own accord. Before being transported to Kiev Stus had about 150 poems and book synopses confiscated. In camp all his draft poems are confiscated, as they contain 'slanderous fabrications'.

Yu. Murzhenko has been transferred to a barracks. A. Bondnik, I. Gel, B. Rebrik and nine 'war criminals' are living with him. Murzhenko is very thin, has shadows in his cheeks, and feels ill. In May Rebrik was transported into exile (see 'Exile').

The Comandant of the special-regime zone is Major Pshirov.

Camp 36 (Strict-Regime)

On 6 June A. Shvedenko arrived here (trial in Chronicle 60), and on 16 June O. Altynjan (trial in this issue). In June Yu. Pshirov was transferred back to Camp 36 (Chronicle 61). Prior to this he underwent an examination in the medical unit of the investigations prison in Perm. Work. (Pshirov had previously been diagnosed as suffering from polyarthritis.) He is 38, 1.68 m, and weighs 66 kg. In Camp 36 he is suffering from deteved diseases of the kidney and lungs. In the camp medical his technicians report that he has a temperature of 38.5°. In a letter to his mother Yu. Pshirov last month: 'If you recognize me at all, it won't be right away.'

In March A. Ogorodnikov of the Moscow KGB (Chronicle 57) interrogated A. Terleckas. He said he was interrogating in connection with the case of I. Kovaltsev and Yu. Shkhankovich, and explained that at a search of A. Lavut's home a manuscript copy of Chronicle 55 containing editorial markings in Shkhankovich's handwriting had been confiscated, and that according to KGB information the latter had edited Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact (Chronicle 56). Novikov was trying to get his Bible back: he has permission to subscribe to the 'Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate', and has been allowed to see a priest, and to take a correspondence course with some theological academy. On 16 March he declared a hunger-strike, demanding to be given back the Bible taken away from him while he was being transported. Force-feeding was begun only on 24 April. Ogorodnikov was allowed to register his marriage to his de facto wife, Elena Levashova: they were not granted a WIZA after the registration of their marriage. V. Makigalov is suffering from migraine. He has low blood pressure (80/60).

Camp 37

On 26 March P.S. Fedorova came for a short visit with her son. She was told in the camp that Yu. Pshirov had already been in hospital for three months (in fact he had only arrived in Camp 37 on 10 March). The next day P.S. Pshirova went to the camp hospital in Vsesvyatskaya. There she was refused permission for the visit, the reason being that there were no premises for this purpose, and advised to return to the camp and wait there until her son was discharged from hospital. Her parcel, which contained various food supplies (tobacco, spectacles and a pipe), was accepted. P.S. Pshirova later found out that Yu. Pshirov had been transferred to hospital on 26 March, after receiving a telegram announcing that she had set off for the visit: on 27 March only the spectacles and the pipe were given to him. (See also 'Camp 36'.)

While he was in the hospital, Yu. Orlov spent 60 days in the cooler; 30 days in November-December 1980 (Chronicle 60) and 10 days in January (for a hunger-strike protesting against letters being withheld from him). For this reason he was released from the punishment block only on 24 March. Private notes have been confiscated from Orlov.

On 26 May Yu. Orlov, C. Yakunin (trial in Chronicle 61), P. Usen (trial in Chronicle 59), A. Lenshov (trial in Chronicle 59), and A. Orlovsky (trial in Chronicle 59), have arrived here. At the beginning of March, Ogorodnikov had been transferred back to Camp 36 (Chronicle 61) and V. Prokhanov (trial in Chronicle 61) have arrived here. Shortly before Yakunin's arrival all Bibles in the camp were confiscated. Yakunin's Bible, too, was confiscated from him on arrival.

In Other Prisons and Camps

On 6 June A. Lavut (trial in Chronicle 60) arrived in a camp with the following address: Solnechnoye, u/nos. Novinsk, u/nos. Yab-257/16. On 4 July (Saturday) in the afternoon an order was read out to Lavut stating that he was deprived of a 'long' visit for not
going to work. The foreman of the workshop, who happened to be passing by at the time, confirmed the instructions he had given on Saturday, but to no avail.

While L. Teremovskiy (trial in Chronicle 60) was in Moscow (Chronicle 61), he was put in the prison hospital with acute jaundice. On 22 May he arrived in a camp with the following address: 440503, Kulybashvinskaya oblast, ul. K. Lyapin, 2, r. 3A. Pakhtyunis (trial in Chronicle 61) is serving his sentence in Sverdlovsk Region, ul. Chelyabinskaya, 2, r. 3B. On 13 June A. Magidovich (trial in Chronicle 61) was transported from his camp in Arkhangelskaya oblast, ul. Velsal, 42/1-3, to the prison hospital in Arkhangelsk luch. We received a patient on 13 June, who was placed in the tuberculosis ward. He was tormented by coughing, right side of his body, and sometimes in his whole right leg. He was robbed on the journey. Magidovich was examined in his presence, but the officer grabbed the poems he had written. Kirill demanded that the poems be returned, but after a struggle, he was set free to go out on to the platform and raise his arm to hit another guard. The head guard handed him back his poems.

Before K. Podrabinek (trial in Chronicle 61) was dispatched to Saratov (Chronicle 62), he was sentenced to three years' strict-regime camp. According to him, his crime consisted in the fact that he 'played the hooligan with a fork, and I received the following letter from Lipetsk UVD:...

At first K. Podrabinek was serving his sentence in Usan, Lipetsk Region (uchr. 323/1-8). Despite his tuberculosis, he was apprenticed to a lathe operator. During a visit of the inspection, he complained that he was feeling worse (sweating, weakness). At the end of April K. Podrabinek was sent to a new camp.

In Saratov Transit Prison Kirill was kicked by a guard as he was being put in a special cell. Furious, he managed to run out into the corridor. Another guard struck Kirill in the face. Kirill struck back and demanded to see the head guard. The officer who arrived immediately hit Kirill on the head. Several guards came running and began beating Kirill up. The beating did not stop until the duty officer, Major Tsaplin, arrived. Kirill demanded a doctor, but a nurse came; she 'did not notice any marks on his body'. Tsaplin told Kirill that he would now be left alone, but refused to draw up a record of the incident. When Kirill was transported from Saratov a report of 'an attack on a soldier inside the prison' was added to his case file. K. Podrabinek's statements to the USSR Procuracy were held up. K. Podrabinek is now serving his sentence at the following address: Ulyanovskaya oblast, uchr. YuI-78/2.

On 4 May Kirill's father, P.A. Podrabinek, sent a letter to the Medical Administration of the USSR MVD:...
The Moscow Helsinki Group sent this document and P. Podrabinek's letter of 29 May to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. On 12 June the Moscow Helsinki Group issued Document No. 168, 'New Persecution of Kirill Podrabinek in Places of Imprisonment', which included the letter as follows:

"After describing K. Podrabinek's situation, he concludes the letter as follows:

Thus my son's natural reaction to attempts to humiliate him and to illegal assaults may entail new charges, resulting in an increase in his term of imprisonment, which is beyond Kirill's strength as it is.

At our hearing in Ulyanovsk, I knew already that my son was seriously ill. The disease in his lungs is progressing. I am a doctor and can assess it objectively. The official reply of the MVD Medical Administration to my enquiry is ridiculous: '...your son is being treated against a relapse, he is under dynamic supervision, his condition is improving'.

It is both untrue and ignorant! Treatment against a relapse should be administered after the patient has been cured, after a complete course of active treatment, which Kirill has never obtained. My son does not need outpatient treatment, he needs constant in-patient treatment until the active process has ceased completely. I hope that you will take all possible measures to save my son's life.

On 12 June the Moscow Helsinki Group issued Document No. 168, 'New Persecution of Kirill Podrabinek in Places of Imprisonment'. We are opposed on principle to the use of force against lawlessness, but Kirill Podrabinek's reactions to attempts to humiliate him and to illegal assault may entail new charges, resulting in an increase in his term of imprisonment, which is beyond Kirill's strength as it is.

The Moscow Helsinki Group sent this document and P. Podrabinek's letter of 29 May to the USSR MVD Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions, so that steps may be taken to investigate and put a stop to the illegal actions of administration officials in Saratov Transit Prison and guards serving on the Ulyanovsk route.

A. Podrabinek (Chronicle 61) was given 15 days in the cooler and, immediately afterwards, six months in the punishment block. He is being punished for refusing to walk around the camp in formation. In May he was deprived of access to the camp shop. A. Podrabinek suffers badly from stomach pains.

In March Yevgeny Vakhonin (Chronicle 61) was transported by plane to Moscow (see 'The Trial of Osipova'). He was transported back to the same camp no later than 6 April. On his return to camp he was at first given a job as store-keeper, but was then transferred to manual labour.

In the spring S. Gorbatchev (Chronicle 61) worked as an orderly. He has chronic cystitis of the colon and gastritis; he was given a special diet. In the spring he underwent a course of general treatment to help his poor eyesight. The camp administration nominated I. Dyadkin (Chronicle 61) for conditional early release with compulsory recruitment for labour, but in June, a week before the hearing, Dyadkin was transferred to another camp: Tyumen Region, u/sb. T-34/2.

On 27 April camp security officials Major Timakov and Lieutenant Tereshkov confiscated the following items from I. Marinov (Chronicle 61): the judgment in his case, an appeal drawn up by his defence counsel, a transcript of his defence counsel's speech in court, and an appeal by Chernovil' to the Yakut ASSR Supreme Court.

At the beginning of February R. Dzhemilev (Chronicle 36) submitted a letter to his family - 'for his perusal', asking Beloborodov to cross out anything suspicious he might find in the letter, but to send the letter. Beloborodov said that the letter was slanderous and issued Dzhemilev a reprimand. Dzhemilev refused to sign a statement that he had read the reprimand order. Then an order was drawn up for Dzhemilev to be confined to the cooler: this order was attached to his personal case file 'until an appropriate occasion should arise'. The head of the security department, Major Suzhentsev, told Dzhemilev that if he wrote another letter of this kind, he would be 'left to rot': he was supposed to write only about his good health.

At the end of February a bag containing tea and one-and-a-half kilos of potatoes was found in the storehouse where Dzhemilev works as a labourer. Dzhemilev, who denied that the items belonged to him, was then deprived of access to the camp shop and his next parcel. On 6 April, Head Captain Tereshkov confiscated the following items from I. Dyadkin (Chronicle 61) for conditional early release with compulsory recruitment for labour, but in June, a week before the hearing, Dyadkin was transferred to another camp: Tyumen Region, u/sb. T-34/2.

At the end of February a bag containing tea and one-and-a-half kilos of potatoes was found in the storehouse where Dzhemilev works as a labourer. Dzhemilev, who denied that the items belonged to him, was then deprived of access to the camp shop and his next parcel. On 6 April, Head Captain Tereshkov confiscated the following items from I. Dyadkin (Chronicle 61): the judgment in his case, an appeal drawn up by his defence counsel, a transcript of his defence counsel's speech in court, and an appeal by Chernovil' to the Yakut ASSR Supreme Court.

At the end of February a bag containing tea and one-and-a-half kilos of potatoes was found in the storehouse where Dzhemilev works as a labourer. Dzhemilev, who denied that the items belonged to him, was then deprived of access to the camp shop and his next parcel. On 6 April, Head Captain Tereshkov confiscated the following items from I. Dyadkin (Chronicle 61): the judgment in his case, an appeal drawn up by his defence counsel, a transcript of his defence counsel's speech in court, and an appeal by Chernovil' to the Yakut ASSR Supreme Court.
On 25 August the head who was cohabiting with Uvarova, then by deputy head guard Yu. A. Kozlenko and three or four others kicked her. On Uvarova said at this point: 'You're going to die here.'

On 30 August Avakyan was dragged into the cooler, where the camp commandant's duty assistant Yakovenko, Captains Yu. A. Kosenko and three or four others kicked her. On 3 September Avakyan's sheets and boots were stolen, after which Yakovenko made her stand the night on some chairs in the drying-room. On 5 September Avakyan was issued a padded jacket (the other prisoners had been issued them several men, whom she told, ‘Take her to the men’s zone and start strangling her. From 1 to 13 November Avakyan was again put in the cooler (for refusing to be transported again). On 14 November Avakyan was sent to work in the canteen. On 12 August Avakyan was beaten up in the workshop. She went back into the zone, Avakyan discovered that her clothes had been torn up. On 3 March Avakyan was refused food. On 5 March Avakyan was put in the cooler, where she stayed until the end of her sentence, 10 March.

On 11 August Avakyan was beaten up in the cooler for refusing to go to work on Saturdays (he is an epileptic fit. He was taken to the medical unit for an injection in the arm, while Yakovenko stood on it. Gil was given nothing to eat until evening. On 16 September, on instructions from Uvarova, Avakyan was given nothing to eat until evening. On 16 September, after working the day shift, Avakyan was sent on a second all-night shift on Uvarova’s orders. At 3 am she felt ill and was taken to her detachment with the foreman’s permission. From 17 to 18 September Avakyan again worked two consecutive shifts. On 17 September she was beaten up by Uvarova.

On 20 November Avakyan was beaten up by a prisoner, while Yakovenko watched through the spy-hole. When Avakyan began to faint, Yakovenko called a doctor. The doctor gave her an injection in the arm, while Yakovenko stood on it. On 30 November Avakyan was again put in the cooler for refusing to be transported again. On 14 December the supervisory Procureur came to the punishment block, but refused to hear Avakyan out. On 5 and 13 January 1961 Avakyan was beaten up again. On 14 January Avakyan was handcuffed for two hours. Then she was given nothing to eat, but the latter beat her up, saying she ‘didn’t ought to be fed’.

On 25 October Avakyan’s dress was stolen. When she started asking for it back, the drunken Fritlik attacked Avakyan and started strangling her. From 1 to 13 November Avakyan did not go to work for health reasons. She was deliberately not fed. Food was brought to her secretly by prisoners. On 6 November Avakyan complained to Puzin that she was not being fed, but the latter beat her up, saying she ‘didn’t ought to be fed’.

On 17 November Avakyan was put in the cooler (until the end of the month), where she was beaten up by chief warder (supervisor) L. Tsiplyayeva. The cell was extensively stained with blood.

On 20 November Avakyan was beaten up by a prisoner, while Yakovenko watched through the spy-hole. When Avakyan began to faint, Yakovenko called a doctor. The doctor gave her an injection in the arm, while Yakovenko stood on it. On 30 November Avakyan was again put in the cooler for refusing to be transported again.

On 7 to 9 February he was unconscious. Then he began to suffer severe headaches. The camp administration replies to Spalin’s wife that his state of health is satisfactory, but that for unacceptable reasons he refuses to go to work on Saturdays, for which he is punished.

On 21 July 1980 Sirvard Avakyan (trial in Chronicle 56) arrived in this camp: 'Irkutskaya obl., uchr. - [11. EC Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions, Bel-...'}
Fascist intelligence service, and is deliberately trying to train enemies to fight the Soviet state and Lenin's Party.

Sirvard Avakyan is an honest Komsomol member: she worked in a munitions factory and fought against anti-Sovietism, against theft and red tape, and refused to pass defective material, testing parts to be used for military purposes. And now Sirvard Avakyan, out of Komsomol naivety, for promoting the interests of the State, has ended up in prison and is being perversely persecuted by enemies of the Soviet State.

Alexander Maksimov (Chronicles 55, 56) is serving his sentence in a punishment cell. In March A. Stasevich (Chronicle 56) was transferred to Vladimir Prison. He is serving one year and six months of ordinary-regime camp. In March A. Stasevich (Chronicle 56) was transferred to Vladimir Prison. He is serving one year and six months of ordinary-regime camp.

The unsurmounted colonial heritage of pre-Revolutionary Ukraine: the constant pressure of an assimilationist, ideological, reinforced by purposeful practical policies, on the nation's consciousness - pressure in the guise of the idea of the reappropriation and negation of nations and the so-called internationalization of Soviet life i.e. the propagation of nihilistic and historical pessimism as regards nations, a propagation which is a powerful means of oppressing the national identity of the non-Russian peoples in the USSR, the diatribe against assimilationist character of the CPSU Programme in the sphere of national relations - a programme which in fact deprives the non-Russian peoples in this country of their right to their own ethnic future; the all-embracing falsification of Ukrainian history in the interests of great-power chauvinism, which cuts Ukrainian history off from the early feudal period and the era of Kievan Rus (the concept of the so-called 'Old Russian nationality', 'the one Russian people of the Kievan period'), denies the right of Ukrainians to a historical existence independent of Russia (the doctrine of unification of the Ukraine and Belorussia with Russia, in essence a theoretical rejection of Ukrainians and Belorussians as individual ethnic groups), ideologically and morally discredits the idea of a separate independent Ukrainian state (in outright violation of the Constitutions of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR), and signifies in methodological terms that Ukraine's political history has totally dissolved within the Russian historical process; the fact that Ukrainian society has no national and political life of its own, which illustrates the fictitious nature of the Ukrainian SSR's political sovereignty; the fact that Ukrainian society has no national and cultural and spiritual atmosphere has been forced to become a provincial appendage of Russian social life, and that Russian has in effect, particularly since the mid-seventies, become the main language of Ukrainian society; cruel suppression of the renascent Ukrainian patriotism, severe persecution for showing the slightest sign of dissatisfaction with the situation of the people's national identity, a persecution aimed at depriving the nation of a full-fledged intelligentsia of its own - such is the tragic reality of the contemporary history of the Ukrainian people, such is the criminal result of the CPSU's policy of centralization and great-power chauvinism, a policy which is feasible in the conditions of party dictatorship and the party's ideological and political absolutism.

On the occasion of the 26th Congress of the CPSU I declare a three-day hunger-strike in protest against the dictatorship of the CPSU, against the violation in the USSR of human rights and the right of nations to self-determination, and against the party's policy of great-power chauvinism, which in the last decade has assumed a particularly blatantly anti-Ukrainian character. The hunger-strike will begin on 23 February of this year.


In the Marxist scientific theory of socialism, the principle of democracy never meant a denial of the political freedoms achieved by bourgeois civilizations, of the appropriate means whereby society supervises the activities of the authorities and whereby citizens participate in the government of the country and in making government policy, a denial of democratic forms of human social life such as freedom of speech and of the press, freedom to form oppositional associations and to demonstrate, the legally guaranteed independence of the press from political interference, the freedom to criticize government policy, a propagation which is feasible in the conditions of political absolutism, which the party dictatorship and the party's ideological and political absolutism.

On the occasion of the presidential elections in France, I declare a
three-day hunger-strike with the aim of drawing the attention of communists, the workers of France, and the French society as a whole to the absence of political freedom in the Soviet Union, to violations of human rights and the right of nations to self-determination, to the brutal persecution of people for criticizing party policy and especially for criticizing the great-power policy of Russification, and to the wholesale undermining of the historical, national and political identity of the non-Russian peoples of the USSR. The hunger-strike will begin on 16 April of this year.

Yu. Badzíh: 'To the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Citizen L.I. Brezhnev' (22 April 1981)

Article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code and analogous articles of the other Union republics which stipulate criminal sanctions against people for so-called anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, by their vague and indefinite nature enable the repressive organs of the authorities to persecute citizens for the slightest criticism of a political or ideological character, thus annuling the officially proclaimed civic rights — freedom of speech, of opinion, of the press, of association, of demonstration, etc. — and transforming the institutions of authority into an uncontrolled force ruling society without supervision. The Constitution of the USSR, which restricts the democratic rights of Soviet citizens in the interests of building communism, eliminates political freedom as a matter of principle, especially if one considers the constitutional article on the leading role of the communist party in Soviet society; this article undermines the corresponding norms of international law and the historical logic of establishing human freedom. And nevertheless I am trying to prove my complete innocence under the law, and the absence under Soviet law of a corpus delicti in the texts and actions imputed against me.

The key idea in my social and political viewpoint is a denial of the leading role of the Communist Party as a being a principle incompatible with a democratic organization of society. Such a position, even if one disregards the right to freedom of thought and of scientifc research, cannot serve as the basis for legal prosecution as the criminal code does not mention political power in general, least of all the power of the party, but speaks of the power of the Soviets of People's Deputies as the elective organs of society as a whole, as the embodiment of the power of the people (article 2 of the USSR Constitution). If, despite this, the Constitution reinforces the leading status of the communists in Soviet society, then this means only that article 2 of the USSR Constitution fundamentally contradicts article 2, which defines the notion of Soviet popular sovereignty, and which should be the sole criterion for interpreting article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code.

On the occasion of the second anniversary of my arrest, I declare a three-day hunger-strike in protest against my illegal conviction, against the party and state policy of great-power chauvinism, and against violations in the USSR of human rights and the right of nations to self-determination. The hunger-strike will begin on 25 April of this year.

N. Pogba: 'Open Letter' (For this letter Badzíh was deprived of a long visit. The letter was not delivered to the addressee: it was withheld as slanderous by the camp administration.)

V. Osipov: 'In Defence of Amnesty International and Prisoners of Conscience' (March 1981)

The central newspaper of the Soviets is continuing its massive campaign against an independent international organization which works for the release of prisoners of conscience throughout the world, including of course communists. In 1973 this organization was represented at the Moscow International Congress of Peace-loving Forces; its former chairman Sean McBride was awarded the international Lenin Prize. The numerous articles about Amnesty International published in the past six months by the newspaper Izvestia are clearly aimed at discrediting this organization — apparently to avenge the fact that the latter, as it continues to assert its moral independence from political pressure of any kind, also asserts its independence from pressure exerted by the USSR. For me, a prisoner, it is also clear that the KGB terror campaign against dissent in the USSR has now developed in all its extensive range: from psychological terror in camps to ideological terror in the press.

The whole of my experience testifies to the fact that against TIMBER all words are useless, any just or heroic pathos will be disgraced before tyranny, because it knows no human emotion except fear. Only frightening actions can curb tyranny.

This is why, in the specific instance mentioned here, I propose that a boycott be declared against the newspaper Izvestia. I propose that this paper be neither bought nor subscribed to in any country, nor any reference made to its articles. Let private, public and political life throughout the world proceed as if this newspaper did not exist. And let this continue until the slanderers express their repentance unambiguously and in a manner clear to everyone.

My call for a boycott of the newspaper Izvestia is joined by the following imprisoned representatives of the Lithuanian human rights movement: Vytautas Skudaitis and Anastas Jamulis.
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In 1975 Pogiba was sentenced by Kiev Regional Court to three years' imprisonment under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (sic. article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code). After his release from camp Pogiba began producing and circulating leaflets, in which he wrote that

Soviet trade unions...do not constitute an independent working class organization...In the USSR there are antagonistic classes...consequently, there also exists a class struggle, which is criminal in nature (the state robs the working class, while the latter steals from the state).

...a 'class struggle' of this kind is profitable only to the state. And we, the dissenting workers, must renounce it and seek new ways of waging a class struggle which could lead to real emancipation of the working class.

Pogiba pasted up his leaflets on notice-boards, public transport vehicles and monuments (in 1979 he was convicted for pasting up leaflets on a monument to Lenin). Pogiba circulating leaflets in which he wrote that

ian Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code).

In 1975 Pogiba was sentenced by Kiev Regional Court to three years' imprisonment under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code. We have appealed to every possible Soviet department, even Congresses of the Communist Party, to grant a pardon, but were refused everywhere.

We have lost our last hope of early release for our boys. Their physical condition is disastrous. They had no other intentions and committed no act of violence. Thanks to their trial, the road to freedom to the state. And we, the dissenting workers, must re-examine their case in accordance with the legislation now in force in the USSR. We are deeply grateful to you and would like to believe that your work, supported by those representatives of society who cherish justice and freedom, will not be in vain. We ask all our friends throughout the world - both those we know and those we do not - help us, save Yura Fdorov and Alix Murzhenko.

E. Bonner added a note to this letter:

Dear Mr Jacoby,

As I send you Lyuba Murzhenko and Polina Fdorova's letter, I share their profound gratitude for the work which you have taken on in again requesting the Soviet Procuracy to re-examine the case of Fdorov and Murzhenko.
It is true that they are certainly now on the brink of physical collapse, and I think every effort is needed on the part of all organizations and individuals who took active steps for the release of the other participants in this trial, in order to obtain freedom for Yura and Alth while they are still alive.

Fifteen Jews published the following letter in samizdat:

On 15 June 1981 eleven years have passed since Aleksei Murzhenko and Yury Fedorov were imprisoned. They were sentenced to 14 and 15 years' imprisonment for intending to hijack a plane in order to leave the Soviet Union. And despite the fact that according to the laws now in force, even for hijacking a plane (without human casualties), the sentence does not exceed ten years' imprisonment, and the fact that all those tried in the same case have long since been free, almost all of them having been released early - despite this, Murzhenko and Fedorov are still prisoners.

We cannot remain indifferent to the fate of these people, who have already paid dearly for their tragic mistake, and who are now painfully and seriously ill and worn out by many years spent under the harsh conditions of a special-regime camp. We call on the authorities to show elementary justice and to release these men now, before they die, before they lose all hope of finding the strength to start a new life, to meet a new and happier face...

A. Sakharov: 'To L. I. Brezhnev. Request for a Pardon for Yury Fedorov and Aleksei Murzhenko' (1 June 1981)

I request you, and through you the President of the USSR Supreme Soviet, for a pardon for Yury Fedorov and Aleksei Murzhenko. This would be an act of humanity and justice, not only towards the convicted men, but towards their families and mothers.

On 6 June the Moscow Helsinki Group issued Document No. 149: 'The Lives of Prisoners Yury Fedorov and Aleksei Murzhenko are in Danger!'

In 1970 there was no specific law in the USSR stipulating punishment for hijacking an airplane. In 1973 an article of this kind was added to the RSFSR Criminal Code (article 213-2). The first part of this article, which prescribes punishment in the form of a seven- to ten-year term of imprisonment, is fully applicable to the actions with which Yu. Fedorov and A. Murzhenko were convicted. As a general rule, a law prescribing more lenient punishment is retroactive.

While admitting that Fedorov and Murzhenko attempted to commit illegal acts, we consider that they were convicted unlawfully and too harshly, and that after article 213 of the RSFSR Criminal Code was introduced their case should have been re-examined and their acts re-classified under articles 213-2 and 83 ('illegally crossing the border'). However, numerous complaints by lawyers, the convicted men themselves, and their relatives to the highest judicial and procuratorial departments have been without result.

If their acts had been judged under the correct article, Fedorov and Murzhenko would already have served the maximum sentence for the crime which they attempted. It is impossible, not only legally but by principle of natural justice, to explain why Fedorov and Murzhenko are still prisoners when all the others have been released.

Many years' imprisonment under the harsh conditions of a special-regime camp have totally undermined their health. Fedorov suffers from chronic nephritis, Murzhenko from a serious form of gastritis and hypertension. To remain longer in places of detention would endanger their lives. We would like to hope that the authorities will show humanity and justice, and we look forward to Fedorov and Murzhenko being released immediately.

A.D. Sakharov: 'To Dr Linus Pauling, Winner of the Lenin Peace Prize and the Nobel Prize for Chemistry' (4 May 1981)

Dear Dr Pauling,

Some years ago I asked you to defend my friend, the biologist Sergei Kovalyev. He was arrested in 1974 and sentenced to seven years' imprisonment in camp and three years' exile, on a charge of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda with the intention of undermining and weakening the Soviet political and social system... You did not respond to my request then. But in recent years other members of his family have also suffered a terrible blow - I now urge you to help to save these people. Recently, after being imprisoned for almost a year in an investigative prison, Tatjana Ospova, the wife of Ivan Kovalyev, Sergei Kovalyev's son, has been sentenced to five years' camp and five years' exile. It is now known that a case has been started against Ivan Kovalyev... and he too can be arrested any day and sentenced to a term of up to seven years' camp and five years' exile (and his wife and father will be deprived of even the rare visits stipulated by the Code, as visits between prisoners are forbidden). Tatjana Ospova and Ivan Kovalyev are members of the Moscow Helsinki Group; Sergei Kovalyev was charged with editing and circulating the samizdat information journal A Chronicle of Current Events.

I have known Sergei and Ivan Kovalyev and Tatjana Ospova for years and can vouch for their irreproachable honesty and altruism, and their whole-hearted dedication to the non-violent, public defence of human rights, in which words are the only weapons. The charges against them of intending to undermine the system are unfounded. Equally unlawful were the investigations and trials of Sergei Kovalyev and Tatjana Ospova. I now urge you to help to save these people. I am sure that your authority, appeal to Soviet leaders and leaders of Western countries: do everything within your power.

Twenty years ago, without having met, we worked for a common cause, opposing nuclear tests. What will your reply be today? This is an open letter. I urge all who are willing and able to help Tatjana Ospova and Sergei and Ivan Kovalyev...
I. Gajauskiene: 'To the President of France, F. Mitterrand'

Mr Francois Mitterrand,

You have just been made President of France. I have heard that you are a kind, sensitive man, and I hope that you will consider my letter.

I am the wife of Lithuanian political prisoner Balya Gajauskas. This is the first time I have written a letter of this kind and I do not even know the best way to write it. My husband is 55 years old. He has spent 29 of them in camp and still has eleven years left. Since the age of 20 he has had only five years of freedom. Now my husband's health had deteriorated sharply. His eyesight is especially poor. His eyes hurt constantly and his sight is getting worse all the time. He is not being treated and does not know what is wrong with him. He works with tiny parts, always in electric lighting, so his eyes are under a constant strain. He is always in a locked cell. He has only one hour's exercise per day; that is the only time he gets fresh air and, if he is lucky, sunshine. I am terrified, but I do not know how to save his health.

I beg you to do everything you can to get my husband released from camp; this would save what is left of his sight and possibly his life.

My husband and I are raising a daughter. She was born while her father was in camp. She is now one year old. God willing, her father will see her this summer for the first time. I plan to take her with me on my visit to the Perm camp. My husband's old, sick mother is now 79 years old and too weak to make the long hard journey to camp to visit her son.

Last month I went to visit my husband. I was given two hours in the presence of a guard. Just to see Balya and support him, I was forced to leave our little girl with friends. It took me a week to get there and back. During the visit we were forbidden to speak our native language; we had to speak Russian the whole time. I must not grow weary, I must have the strength to fight for my husband. Help me in this struggle for the life and health of the man I love. I beg you.

R. Simchich: 'To the USSR Procurator-General. A Statement'

This is the 29th year that my husband Miroslav Vasilevich Simchich has been serving a sentence in various corrective labour institutions. He has been using his spare time to study as much as possible. He has spent a total of 15 years in camp, of which 3 of them were transferred to a camp for people convicted under criminal articles. Here, a sick man, weakened by years of exhausting work, has been showered with punishments for failing to fulfill the production norm, without account being taken of his age (58 years), a whole assortment of illnesses he has contracted, or his selfless work in the past for the sake of his family's welfare. Moreover, my husband is being threatened with fresh misfortune.

On 29 March 1980 Shagen Arutjunyan (trial in Chronicle 60) was released. She was given back her job. On 10 March Stewardsky (see above) was released on completion of his one-year sentence.

On 29 March 1980 Vasily Pidhorodetsky (Chronicle 53-5) was released after 28 years' camp for his involvement in the UPA-GUK (Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists). He went to live in Krushelintsy village, Skole District, Lvov Region. He was placed under surveillance for one year. A local policeman told Pidhorodetsky to find a job, but he is being offered work which is beyond his strength (in camp Pidhorodetsky had to work in blast furnaces in Zaporozhe when he was released in 1963 after 15 years' imprisonment, show that he is able and willing to contribute to society).

Recent events in camp YAYA-310/88 in Zaporozhe Region (his fellow-inmates are being summoned to the camp security unit and told to testify to Simchich's anti-Soviet statements) show that my husband has been transferred to the same camp for the special purpose of inflicting a sentence on him on a fresh charge. My husband is old and infirm. He is no longer able to cause any harm to the authorities and the system, if only because of his physical weakness. For this reason I ask you to intervene and close this fabricated case, so that my husband can have his freedom back after 30 years of imprisonment ending on 30 October 1982, and live with his family.

Various conversations and statements have been imputed against him under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code, i.e. 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'. During my visits in the Mordovian and Ural camps, not once (!) was this subject brought up by camp officials, who mentioned only that he was serving a sentence for a 'crime committed in the past' and that his present behaviour was satisfactory.

The good work references which my husband received when he worked at repairing the rolling-mills of the 'Dneprospetsstal' steel plant and the 'Zaporozhstal' blast furnaces in Zaporozhe when he was released in 1963 after 15 years' imprisonment, show that he is able and willing to contribute to society.

On 22 December 1980 Shagen Arutjunyan (trial in Chronicle 48) was released on completion of his three-year term. He has been placed under surveillance. In February Natalya Maltseva (Chronicle 60) was released. She was given back her job. On 10 March Stewardsky (see above) was released on completion of his one-year sentence.

On 19 March Lev Volokhonsky (trial in Chronicle 53-5) was released on completion of his one-year sentence.

On 29 March 1980 Vasily Pidhorodetsky (Chronicles 53-5) was released after 28 years' camp for his involvement in the UPA-GUK (Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists). He went to live in Krushelintsy village, Skole District, Lvov Region. He was placed under surveillance for one year. A local policeman told Pidhorodetsky to find a job, but he is being offered work which is beyond his strength (in camp Pidhorodetsky had to work in blast furnaces in Zaporozhe when he was released in 1963 after 15 years' imprisonment, show that he is able and willing to contribute to society).
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Recent events in camp YAYA-310/88 in Zaporozhe Region (his fellow-inmates are being summoned to the camp security unit and told to testify to Simchich's anti-Soviet statements) show that my husband has been transferred to the same camp for the special purpose of inflicting a sentence on him on a fresh charge. My husband is old and infirm. He is no longer able to cause any harm to the authorities and the system, if only because of his physical weakness. For this reason I ask you to intervene and close this fabricated case, so that my husband can have his freedom back after 30 years of imprisonment ending on 30 October 1982, and live with his family.

Various conversations and statements have been imputed against him under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code, i.e. 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'. During my visits in the Mordovian and Ural camps, not once (!) was this subject brought up by camp officials, who mentioned only that he was serving a sentence for a 'crime committed in the past' and that his present behaviour was satisfactory.

The good work references which my husband received when he worked at repairing the rolling-mills of the 'Dneprospetsstal' steel plant and the 'Zaporozhstal' blast furnaces in Zaporozhe when he was released in 1963 after 15 years' imprisonment, show that he is able and willing to contribute to society.
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Before he left the camp, Buzinnikov's head was shaved. He was told that he would be under surveillance at his place of residence, which he must reach within two days, and must not leave: he was taken to the train and not allowed to change his clothes. Buzinnikov left wearing his camp clothes. On the way, Buzinnikov tried to get off the train to visit his acquaintance V. Kononovskikh in the dressing-room. A man in plain clothes showed him his I.D. identification and forbade him to get off at the station he wanted.

In the next compartment there were two men in plain clothes, who were often visited by soldiers from another carriage, who drank with them. One of the men in plain clothes offered to sell Buzinnikov some clothes (so he could change out of his camp clothes) for 15 roubles. The latter agreed. Shortly afterwards the two men called Buzinnikov out on to the platform at the end of the carriage: one of them pulled out a knife and asked Buzinnikov for money. A fight ensued, during which everyone was slightly injured, and Buzinnikov managed to grab the knife. When he shouted for help the soldiers ran up and watched the fight, holding the carriage door shut. However, Buzinnikov managed to force the door open and get into the carriage. His assailants, seeing they had attracted the attention of other passengers, gave Buzinnikov back the money taken during the fight and asked him for 80 roubles for the clothes. Buzinnikov gave it to them.

In June and July the religious prisoners of the True Orthodox Church: Anastasia Volkova (born 1906) and Klavdia Volkova (1907) were released from Mordovian Camp 3. They went to live in Gorky, where they were placed under surveillance.

SAKHAROV IN ADMINISTRATIVE EXILE (CHRONICLES 56, 57)

In the evening of 13 March (a Friday) E.G. Bonner was about to make another radio report on the symposium in New York. On 12 March A.D. Sakharov received an invitation to go to a paying dental clinic on the afternoon of 13 March the was undergoing treatment for his teeth at the time and his next visit to the dentist was scheduled for Monday. When he arrived at the clinic he was asked to go to a different office from the usual one ('repairs are being made in that office') and to leave his bag (which he always carried with him, for fear of KGB thieves) in the dressing-room. On leaving the dentist, Sakharov could not find his bag. At home Sakharov found a letter that had been in the bag and which he had not yet posted.

On 17 March Sakharov issued a 'Statement to the Press and Radio':

I report that KGB agents are again sneaking into the flat in which I was forcibly placed over a year ago, and where I am held in conditions of illegal isolation. This time they are, apparently, entering with the knowledge of certain policemen on round-the-clock guard duty outside my door, and are again placing me in danger. I also report that on 13 March 1981 the KGB committed another disgusting crime when they stole a bag containing my manuscripts, my private diary for the past year, copies of letters to my Western and Soviet colleagues, and letters to my children and grandchildren. Three thick exercise books - my diary and purely personal writings, a great many notes made from scientific books and journals, including articles by the 1979 Nobel Prize winners, accounts of new ideas and other materials of scientific research which I need, and my own reflections on physics, literature and many other subjects. Among the stolen items were three thick large-format albums - a manuscript of my autobiography. This compels me to publish it earlier than I had intended. The KGB thieves deliberately left on my table a letter which was in the bag: one I had not yet sent to the Scientific Information Centre (VINITI), possibly to show that they were not interfering in my scientific work. But they did steal my diary, which was to a great extent scientific, as I have written. My Nobel Prize certificate had already been stolen from my Moscow flat. In their latest theft the KGB made it clear that they are determined to deprive me of my memories, records of my ideas, and the possibility of any intellectual life, even in solitude. The responsibility for this theft lies with its perpetrators, the Gorky KGB, and the leaders of the USSR KGB, who authorized it.

The head doctor of the clinic told Sakharov that he had casse aspirations on her 'as a human being and as a woman'. According to her, she had taken the bag from where Sakharov had left it to the operating theatre, whence it had been removed by two unidentified persons.

On 22 March E, Bonner and A. Sakharov published an appeal concerning the arrest of A. Marchenko (see 'The Arrest of Anatoly Marchenko'). On 24 March Sakharov finished his article 'The Responsibility of Scientists'.

On 4 May Sakharov wrote to L. Pauklin asking him to help the Kovalski family in 'Defence of Political Prisoners' in the section 'In the Prisons and Camps'. On 10 May Sakharov sent a letter to the 'Rockford University Symposium' held in New York from 1 to 3 May:

Dearest my friends,

It was with gratitude and great interest that I heard a radio report on the symposium in New York. I feel that this highly representative assembly was not only a great honour for myself, but also an act of support for many people who are suffering repression for non-violent activities in defence of human rights, of support for our common striving for peace and justice. Many highly respected and eminent persons came, often from far away, to attend the symposium and speak at it. I was touched and pleased by the words spoken about my scientific work, although I am also aware of its deficiencies. No less flattering was the description of my civic activities in the fields of human rights and - something which has usually been less spoken of before - the problems of disarmament, nuclear tests, and the prevention of war altogether, especially of nuclear war.
Some days later Dzhemilev was summoned to the police. It transpired that he had disturbed a party meeting at the post office and behaved like a hooligan. He was shown a statement to this effect from post office employees. 'I've dealt with criminals before,' said the investigator, a police captain, 'but you're my first political.'

Releases

After the days spent in transport had been taken into account, each day counting as three days' exile, Major Alishev, Comendant of Sarazhinsk village, told V. Marchenko (Chronicle 46) that his exile would end on 29 April. An order to this effect was issued by the Head of Uilsky District OVD, Major Darmenkulov. Nevertheless, no certificate of release was issued to Marchenko on the appointed day. Alishev said that it was being held up in the District OVD.

On 30 April V. Marchenko sent a telegram to USSR Procurator-General Elasukov:

I protest against the unlawful withholding of my certificate of release by the Aktyubinsk KGB. Even though my high blood pressure has taken a sharp turn for the worse, I cannot obtain specialized medical assistance.

V. Marchenko was not able to obtain his certificate of release until 8 May. Marchenko then returned to Kiev. On 6 July he was shown an order regarding administrative surveillance of him: he was to be at home from 10 pm to 6 am. On 16 July V. Marchenko handed in the following statement to the Kiev Procuracy:

I am aware of no legitimate reason to persecute a person for his views, but this was the main charge against me when the order on administrative surveillance was issued to me.

The reference drawn up by the Head of Uilsy District OVD, Major Darmenkulov, says: 'He has not disrupted public order or infringed discipline, but neither has he changed his views and convictions' (3 May 1981).

The report, signed by Major Darmenkulov and the Chairman of the Supervisory Committee of the Uilsy District Soviet EG, V. Kaptzhik, says: 'The reason for placing him under administrative surveillance is his failure to embark on the path of reform.'

There are no grounds for such a conclusion, as is obvious from the reference. This was also understood by the Radyansky District OVD in Kiev, in order to make any antisocial essence more convincing, they added ‘Since his release Marchenko has so far failed to find a job, and leads a parasitic way of life’ to: ‘Has not embarked on the path of reform, has not changed his convictions’.

I obtained my certificate of release on 8 May, arrived in Kiev on the 12th, came to the Radyansky District OVD on the 15th, and registered and obtained a passport on the 25th. I have a kidney illness and hypertension, I am a Group 3 invalid by decision of the Medical Fitness for Work Commission in corrective labour institution...

IN EXILE

In April or May Oksana Meshko (trial in Chronicle 61) arrived at her place of exile in Ayan village, Khabarovsk Territory, where her son A. Sergienko (Chronicle 55) is serving his term of exile.

On 21 May V. Marchenko (Chronicle 46) arrived in exile at the following address: 474178, Krasnoyarsk SSR, Tselinogradskaya obl., Kurgalskii raion, pos. Kembari (R. Markosyan - Chronicles 51, 58) served his term of exile.

Mustafa Dzhemilev (Chronicles 53, 54, 57, 60) was given three letters at the post office, together with their certificates of delivery, which should have been sent to the addresses in Ankara, one in Paris. The certificates bore his surname and a postal cancellation stamp (but not that of Zyrayansk). Dzhemilev went on a complaint to the Post Office, saying that someone had forged his signature. He handed two of the fake certificates to the Prosecutor, and complained that the Post Office employees had expired his signature. He handed over the third fake certificate. Dzhemilev asked them to cross out the letter in question (the Courche). They refused. The signature of receipt remained and the letter was withheld.
his house. On this evening they attacked him. As a result of the beating, some lateral parts of Plakhotnyuk's spine were broken.

On 16 and 17 April a local policeman visited Ivan Plakhotnyuk and demanded to know where Nikolai was. According to the police, Nikolai Plakhotnyuk was in Kiev illegally, as he had been ordered to go to Cherkassy Region. The local policeman told Ivan Plakhotnyuk to write an explanatory note stating where his brother had been and on what day - from the moment he was discharged from psychiatric hospital. He threatened Ivan with a fine and a trial.

On 20 March in Tartu S. Superfin (Chronicle 56) was released early from administrative surveillance.

On 30 March Stepan Sapelyak (Chronicle 68) wrote the following statement to Andropov:

> In 1973 I was sentenced at a closed court session in Ternopol to eight years' strict imprisonment (to be precise, five years' camp and three years' exile - Chronicle) on a charge of anti-Soviet activities. After my sentence expired I was registered at my parents' place of residence in the Ukraine (Ternopol Region, Chortkov District, Rosokhach village). Immediately after I arrived, in November and December 1980, so-called talks concerning my repentance were held with me in a department of the Chortkov District OVD. The same sort of talks were then held with my parents, only in the KGB department. I did not accept the public statement of repentance proposed to me, and I also refused to condemn my past actions. Then the police chief told me, 'come on, Stepan Evstakhievich, turn over a new leaf. It'll be better for you and for us.' On 30 January 1981 I applied to the head of a District OVD under the Leningrad Regional Soviet EC for permission to register in Nikolskoye village, Tseno District, Leningrad Region, where Nadezhda Vladimirovna, whom I wish to marry, lives and works. I handed in my application to First Lieutenant V.A. Baranov of the Leningrad Region KGB, who came to Nikolskoye especially to summon me to a talk. I also told him that I had no intention of engaging in anti-Soviet activities.

On 15 February 1981 the chief of the Ulyanovka District Police Department, Captain Gavrilo, was informed by me that I had obtained a job as an electrical repairman in a branch of the Leningrad Institute for Geological Expeditions (VIRTN), and was undergoing medical examination. The director of the above-mentioned institute assured me that I would be registered from March this year.

On 2 March 1981 I was taken off the register in the passport office in Chortkov, Ternopol Region, as I was
The appeal in connection with A.A. Myasnikov's case took place in the RSFSR Supreme Court. Myasnikov's lawyer V.V. Shveisky was not informed of the date of the hearing until the evening of 18 May. Omelchenko was allowed into the courtroom only after showing her marriage certificate.

Shveisky said that although the tale Meetings, with which Myasnikov was charged, contained pornographic and anti-Soviet scenes, they were included not for the purpose of arousing erotic feelings, but for opposite reasons, as could easily be ascertained by studying the text. Their purpose was to condemn pro-Westernism and the fact that not all the witnesses interrogated in connection with the case at that stage had been summoned to testify in court. The court had turned down defence counsel's petition to summon the main witness, M. Gurevich, which had prevented the truth from being ascertained: one witness, N. Elagin, was living outside the USSR, and another denied that he had read the article. The lawyer demanded that in the absence of a corpus delicti Myasnikov be acquitted or the case referred for a new court hearing.

Procurator Suslova said that 'there are no grounds for disbelieving a Soviet court', 'the court could not have made a mistake', and 'it is not permitted to question court decisions'. Gurevich's evidence coincided with some of...
of USSR state security, he would be prosecuted and the caution was released. The 'talk' had lasted about
cease his activities, which were harmful to the interests slanderous literature had been confiscated from Popov.
In this connection he was cautioned that if he did not send abroad to one of the anti-Soviet emigre journals.
unpublished document. Excerpts from Myasnikov's case file read the decree. He asked whether the decree had been
making himself out to be a defender of human rights. There-
authorities and of various official documents, that he had torn up interrogation records (Chronicle 60) and was
him, that he was being rude to representatives of the police.
Popov went to the police station, where he found two
men in plain clothes in Savinkov's office, whom Savinkov introduced simply as KGB officers. They refused to give
their names or show identification. Popov refused to talk
to men who had not named themselves. He also refused to
demand in order to make everything clear. Party organizer Tatarenko said that he did not have the texts with him, but gave an account
of their contents and pointed out their inappropriate tone.
After the meeting the Deputy Party Head, Gapeyenkov, went up to Fashin and said, 'What do you mean, you b...? You nearly wrecked the whole meeting with your provocative question!'
On 30 March, the day before Osipova's trial (see above), the CGE administration appointed ten persons to attend the trial as part of the courtroom 'public'. On the first day nine persons attended (Gapeyenkov was 1), on the next day, eight. However, after a go-over at work, the CGE employee who had disappeared on the second day reap-
peared on the last day of the trial.
On the same day, 30 March, the Director of the CGE, Kashik, held 'cautionary talks' with G. Stepanets and L. Nagle (see 'The Arrest of Kuvakin'), at which he told them that they were not allowed to attend the forthcoming trial. Stepanets, who insisted on his wish to attend Osipova's trial, was told that in that case he would be sacked: 'All available means will be used'. On the morning of 31 March Stepanets, Nagle and V. Kronrod were outside the fence of the court building where the trial was beginning.
On 1 April Kashik demanded an explanation from Stepanets as to the reason for his absence from work on 31 March from 9 am to 1 pm. In his explanatory note Stepanets said that he had been outside Osipova's trial at this time. He described in detail the circumstances surrounding the trial, pointing out in particular that persons wishing to attend were not admitted. Stepanets also remarked that the CGE representatives present in court were only remotely acquainted with Osipova (so she did not know her at all), and it was not clear to him why the decision group had been allowed in. In addition, the attempt to appoint a public defence counsel from the CGE, or even a representative, 'was stopped from the outset':
I draw your attention also to the fact that I have not obtained any satisfactory explanation of these facts from you.
On 7 April Kashik issued Stepanets a severe reprimand 'for absence from work on 31 March'. The order mentions: 'Reason: explanatory note of comrade G.F. Stepanets'. On 10 April the following was added to the order: 'absence until 1 pm'. Nagle was punished likewise.
Kashik had a talk with Kronrod concerning his presence in Lubyino on 31 March. He said that Kronrod had not been issued a reprimand because, unlike Stepanets and Nagle, he had not been warned that such conduct was inadmissible. The CGE management issued the staff who attended the trial 'political information' about it in the various departments
of the organization.

In expedition group 14 (where A. Lavut had worked) Abrinko-ov delivered the 'political information', giving an account of some of the episodes of the indictment (the 'Memorandum of the 63'). He was asked questions concerning
in other people's lives? What was her nationality? Why

accounting this account: who gave Osipova the right to muddle

"offered her three years, she refused'.

After Sergei Khodorovich was sacked from the Computer Centre of the Main Moscow Fruit and Vegetable Combine (Chronicle 60), he was unable to find work anywhere for a long time.Khodorovich who was sacked after the trial of I. Dyadkin and S. Gor-
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On 16 April Larissa Poluektova (Chronicles 54, 55, 58) was summoned to Investigator V.D. Novak in the Moscow KGB. Poluektova was shown an order stating that on 2 November she had been found in possession: a letter from Poluektova addressed to an entitled 'Report on Work Carried Out' (about a religious
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I. Kovalev: 'An Unpublished Interview' (February 1981, 8 pages)
1. What is the present situation of what is known as the 'dissident movement'?

The present situation of the 'dissident movement', in my opinion, leaves no room for hope that it will continue form. This is not the first time I have had to talk about utterly, but never before, perhaps, has this determination been so obvious.

Now the authorities have come down most heavily on the various kinds of free associations, many of which had not been able to exist as a result of the recent destruction. Although there are still some of these associations, many of which have effectively ceased to exist, there is still hope. It is sustained not only by the authorities' determination to destroy this movement, but also by the efforts of the various kinds of free associations, many of which had not been able to exist as a result of the recent destruction.

2. Is there more or less hope now than five or ten years ago?

It is difficult for me to answer this question, as it concerns subjective feelings and I have nothing with which to compare my feelings. Where the present is concerned, there is still hope. It is sustained not by abstract ideas, but, strange as it may seem, by what is happening. For example, I have noticed on occasion that Western sources are sometimes better informed of events in our country than the most well-informed defenders of human rights. This goes to show that, in addition to the 'usual informants' of society, new ones are appearing. It is only a pity that this also indicates that these new informants think of publicity primarily as the transmission of truthful information abroad and are little involved in circulating it within the country.

3. What do you consider to be the victory of the dissident movement?

I feel it is not very appropriate to assess whether the human rights movement is 'useful', whether it makes sense'. I do not see it as a struggle where there can be victories and defeats, but as a profoundly moral phenomenon, having nothing to do with any concept of 'profit'.

On the contrary, I would say that this definition only covers some of the people we call dissenters, defenders of human rights, and dissidents, but it covers the best of them and, if one may use the expression, the most representative. However, if one is to speak of any results deriving from actions in defence of human rights, then, with rare exceptions, one can only presume that if it were not for such actions, human beings would be repressed more than they are, despite various expressions of protest, now...

4. What defects do you see in the dissident movement?

One can speak of 'defects' in the human rights movement - a movement of moral opposition to lies and coercion - only in a moral sense. You see, people get involved in human rights activities for different reasons. I can understand and identify with them more or less all of them, even if they are just doing what they can't help doing when they have nothing else to do. But there are other motives. For example, when they use this activity as a means of leaving the country as soon as possible, or of acquiring 'political capital', as it is called: sometimes they are seeking material gains, for example from the Aid Fund for Political Prisoners...but these are defects of individual people, and one cannot call them defects of the human rights movement without greatly stretching a point. And anyway it is almost impossible to talk about defects of a movement which has no organizational structure; one can only talk about the qualities of the various persons involved in the movement.

5. What does 'help from the West' mean? How should one understand it in concrete terms? For example, what do you expect for yourself and your family from the West?
Adventists, True Orthodox Believers...? Can this become.

Do you think there will always be people like A. Lavut, your wife Tanya, T. Velikanova and others? And why?

They are arrested and imprisoned, they emigrate.

The Chronicle...?

The authorities strive to slander as widely as possible. The authorities are unable by their very nature to remain indifferent to protest actions, which give themselves wholly to others, to be known as altruists, to be known as ordinary people who speak out against lies and coercion, without seeking gain or glory thereby, who give themselves wholly to others, to be known as widely as possible. The authorities strive to slander these people. Therefore it is especially important that their fellow-countrymen know the truth about them. Help in spreading this truth is perhaps the greatest help provided by the West. Many samizdat documents are published in the West, some of them reach our country in spite of customs barriers. Western radio-stations broadcast these documents and Soviet people hear at least a little truth about themselves through the howling of the 'jammers'.

One of the most important Western publications of this kind is, in my opinion, the Chronicle of Current Events (CCE), the samizdat version of which is republished in New York by Valery Chalidze, an activist of the human rights movement who emigrated from the USSR. So I personally would very much like this journal to be read as widely as possible in our country.

6. Defenders of human rights seem to be getting fewer and fewer. They are arrested and imprisoned, they emigrate. Do I think there will always be people like A. Lavut, your wife Tanya, T. Velikanova and others? And why?

I do think that there will always be people like this (this also applies to the question about hopes for the future). The answer to the question why I think so lies in the description of their character: they are altruists, unable by their very nature to remain indifferent to injustice. I think it is natural to hope for the best in people. That is why I hope that even if they are few, there will always be people like this.

7. What do you think about those who are 'underground': Adventists, True Orthodox Believers...? Can this become an example for 'dissidents' or for some of them: the Fund, the Chronicle...?

I realize that underground activity is one of the possible means of opposition, although it does not attract me. Open opposition, publicity, is one of the basic features, perhaps the main feature, of the human rights movement as it exists at present. People speaking out openly for human rights led ultimately to the creation of the various public groups and associations to defend human rights. How the authorities are breaking them up. Even if all the groups are broken up, I do not think that people will cease to speak out openly for human rights. However, I realize that setting up new human rights associations in this situation would lead to their being broken up immediately, before they have the chance to shape and establish themselves. It is more difficult to stop individual persons from defending human rights and publishing information on violations of human rights concealed by the authorities.

It is perhaps in this direction that the human rights movement will develop in its new phase. I do not think this precludes the existence of at least some free associations, probably those that are not altogether 'open' even now. For example, it is no secret that the Fund has one openly acknowledged administrator, but he has many assistants who are not openly acknowledged. Or the journal A Chronicle of Current Events, now in its 13th year, which has one openly acknowledged editorial board: I consider this publication to be virtually indestructible, so great is the demand for reliable and complete information.

I hope that in its new phase the human rights movement will simply take on new forms (probably similar to forgotten, older ones are not justified, and it ceases to exist. I fear that terrorists will take over and then the authorities will retaliate with terror on a scale which is hard to predict. This may turn out to be the end not only of the human rights movement, but also of the country. The only alternative I can see is to continue to speak out openly against tyranny.

Presumably this decision is not just a whim of the local Kharkov authorities. It has a grand political significance: it can be linked with the arrest of another veteran of the human rights movement, A. Marchenko, and with the repeat arrests of V. Barladyanu, R. Markosyan, V. Chornovil, R. Kosterin, M. Morozov, V. Stus, M. Gorbati, V. Liksonov and K. and A. Podrabinek, with the recent repeat arrest of A. Bolobkin, and other similar events. Apparently the KGB, having broken up the main centres of activity of the human rights movement, are now firing at the reserves. Among these reserves are the veterans. Even after they 'go out of action' they remain symbols and communication links of the movement (everyone knows then, people can come to them and report or pass on some-thing). But there are few reserves. In the provinces, many sympathisers have long been being arrested. In Moscow such people stand outside court buildings and chant the names of the accused or sign collective protests, etc. In the provinces they do not even do that much, and one careless word is enough. The victims are chosen arbitrarily: one out of ten or twenty. In each case the trial features gross injustices (Altunyan was no more active than the friends who threw flowers. Indeed, more than the prospect of years tormented by fear and eventually
Will the new KGB tactic succeed? It is difficult to gauge the extent of the moral steadfastness of dissenters. There are, however, two factors capable of arousing outbursts of dissent and increasing opposition: events in Poland and growing food shortages. Both these factors are outside KGB control.

A short biography of Yuri Orlov (trial in Chronicle 50) and Anatoli Shecharansky (trial in Chronicle 50).

The summary conveys the idea that one of the most striking features of the Soviet power machine is the 'isolation of its upper echelon', i.e. those who take part in 'decision-making', from the outside world and from objective information, including information about KGB activities.

The KGB's dangerous freedom of action has increased considerably in recent years: frequent manifestations of it are the jamming of Western radio broadcasts, the treasons of Academician Sakharov, cruel repression against women involved in the human rights movement (Tatiana Gaisanova, Tatyana Velikanova, Maria Landh, Irina Grivina), etc. Personal communications of the chief of another state to the leaders of the USSR is perhaps the only kind of information that automatically gets through the barriers of aides and cannot be blocked by the KGB. Top-level enquiries about the fate of Soviet human rights petitioners handed in person to Brezhnev by public organizations in the West in defence of Orlov, Shecharansky, and others, may have a restraining effect on the Soviet authorities and bring about the tolerance which by some miracle has so far kept Soviet tanks from invading Poland.

Yu. Gastev: 'The House on Marchenko Street' (May 1981, 4 pages)
In Vladimir Region, not far from Aleksandrov, there is the little town of Karabanovo, with its textile mill and railway station. It was quite recently officially called a village, and of course still is one in fact: the part of it that lies beyond the ravine, called Pereyaslavka, is still called a village, and of course still is one in fact: the part of it that lies beyond the ravine, called Pereyaslavka, is still called a village.

Sasha Lat was the first new person I got to know when I came out of camp in 1949...in '56 we didn't have to "open our eyes"...But we found out and realized the extent of the moral steadfastness of dissenters. There are, however, two factors capable of arousing outbursts of dissent and increasing opposition: events in Poland and growing food shortages. Both these factors are outside KGB control.
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Yu. Gastev: 'The House on Marchenko Street' (May 1981, 4 pages)
In Vladimir Region, not far from Aleksandrov, there is the little town of Karabanovo, with its textile mill and railway station. It was quite recently officially called a village, and of course still is one in fact: the part of it that lies beyond the ravine, called Per-
Is our country. Your streets, whatever signs you put up or down, whatever idols you raise, cannot and will not exist, all memory of you will not stay. But ours - ours do and will always exist. And even if neither Tolya Marchenko nor I ever live in a house on Marchenko Street, then certainly our children will go there and live there.

N. Komarova: 'Nadezhda Surovtseva' (April 1981, 3 pages)

Nadezhda Surovtseva spent nearly 30 years (from 1927 to 1956) in the Gulag. Her husband never came back from the camps. Since 1972 she has been subjected to several searches (see for example 'Events in the Ukraine' in this issue) during which her entire literary archive was confiscated.

In life one must always find the strength to hold one's head up high. That is the first lesson I have learned from my acquaintance and close friendship with Nadezhda Vitalevna. In life there is always something to be glad about. And that means one must smile. That is the second lesson. Life is interesting and should be watched. And one must live. That is the third lesson.

V. Vardomtsiev: 'A Pain Everyone Feels' (October 1980, 7 pages)

The author maintains that Father Dmitry Dudko's 'repentance' (Chronicle 57) were achieved by means of psychotropic drugs.

I repeat, it is difficult to doubt that the KGB use psychotropic drugs after hearing about the state of health of Father Dmitry, Lev Regelman, Viktor Kapitanchuk and Father Gero before they reached a goal of court in point. That is the single lot of what he said earlier, and that he will continue his pastoral work and find new ways and means of doing so.

The author calls for forgiveness of Dudko, saying that as a human being he has sinned, while as a priest he did not betray anyone or anything.

V. Vardomtsiev: 'Is Repentance and Self-Restraint Possible without Forgiveness?' (March 1981, 10 pages)

I have in front of me the writings of Father Dmitry Dudko composed after his July 'interview':

- 'My Repentance' - 'Letter to All My Spiritual Children' - 'Can One Speak to the Atheists in their Own Language?'

All three works share the same theme: repentance and forgiveness. In 'My Repentance' Father Dmitry asks Christians to forgive him and pray for him. In 'Letters to My Spiritual Children' he urges his spiritual children to forgive each other's sins and become united. In the article 'Can One Speak...' Father Dmitry finds something for which we owe the atheists repentance too.

Has Father Dmitry's position changed since before his arrest? No! 'Here is my last word: I am the same as I was... Pay no attention to my statement to the press or to my speech on television. They are not mine. My books and sermons are mine.' His position is consistent, fundamental, unchanging. Only new forms are opening up. Not only his guilt, but most of all the cross Father Dmitry must bear, lies in the fact that at a difficult time he found himself disarmed with regard to the rules of battle in this world, and spiritually vulnerable.

...the spectrum of the Christian front is broad. While at one extreme there is the heroic struggle and uncompromising position of people with a Christian heart (A. Sakharov, V. Bukovsky, I. Velikenova), at the other there is the loving open embrace for living people who are tortured and torturing themselves, for the most fallen and lost, for the persecuted but also for the persecutor, for his unhappiness is even greater than ours, because 'we are with God and it is easier for us, while he is without God'.

New tendencies are beginning to appear in the attitude of the authorities to the Russian Orthodox Church. Their intentions are no longer one-sided. Taking everything into account, in the next years a certain amount of freedom will be allowed in matters of church life. But only on condition that all opposition to the basic ideological values, political and national might be given up. This means not only giving up the struggle, but serving those values as well. And here it is again apparent that the voice of Father Dmitry Dudko remains and expresses the conscience of the Russian Orthodox Church.

A. Shatruvka: 'How I Celebrated the 26th Congress of the CPSU' (4 pages)
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A. Shatruvka: 'How I Celebrated the 26th Congress of the CPSU' (19 pages)

The author gives an account of his 'pre-Congress' forces of the Christian front are broad. While at one extreme there is the heroic struggle and uncompromising position of people with a Christian heart (A. Sakharov, V. Bukovsky, I. Velikenova), at the other there is the loving open embrace for living people who are tortured and torturing themselves, for the most fallen and lost, for the persecuted but also for the persecutor, for his unhappiness is even greater than ours, because 'we are with God and it is easier for us, while he is without God'.

New tendencies are beginning to appear in the attitude of the authorities to the Russian Orthodox Church. Their intentions are no longer one-sided. Taking everything into account, in the next years a certain amount of freedom will be allowed in matters of church life. But only on condition that all opposition to the basic ideological values, political and national might be given up. This means not only giving up the struggle, but serving those values as well. And here it is again apparent that the voice of Father Dmitry Dudko remains and expresses the conscience of the Russian Orthodox Church.
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The author gives an account of his 'pre-Congress' forces of the Christian front are broad. While at one extreme there is the heroic struggle and uncompromising position of people with a Christian heart (A. Sakharov, V. Bukovsky, I. Velikenova), at the other there is the loving open embrace for living people who are tortured and torturing themselves, for the most fallen and lost, for the persecuted but also for the persecutor, for his unhappiness is even greater than ours, because 'we are with God and it is easier for us, while he is without God'.

New tendencies are beginning to appear in the attitude of the authorities to the Russian Orthodox Church. Their intentions are no longer one-sided. Taking everything into account, in the next years a certain amount of freedom will be allowed in matters of church life. But only on condition that all opposition to the basic ideological values, political and national might be given up. This means not only giving up the struggle, but serving those values as well. And here it is again apparent that the voice of Father Dmitry Dudko remains and expresses the conscience of the Russian Orthodox Church.

A. Shatruvka: 'How I Celebrated the 26th Congress of the CPSU' (19 pages)

The author gives an account of his 'pre-Congress' forces of the Christian front are broad. While at one extreme there is the heroic struggle and uncompromising position of people with a Christian heart (A. Sakharov, V. Bukovsky, I. Velikenova), at the other there is the loving open embrace for living people who are tortured and torturing themselves, for the most fallen and lost, for the persecuted but also for the persecutor, for his unhappiness is even greater than ours, because 'we are with God and it is easier for us, while he is without God'.

New tendencies are beginning to appear in the attitude of the authorities to the Russian Orthodox Church. Their intentions are no longer one-sided. Taking everything into account, in the next years a certain amount of freedom will be allowed in matters of church life. But only on condition that all opposition to the basic ideological values, political and national might be given up. This means not only giving up the struggle, but serving those values as well. And here it is again apparent that the voice of Father Dmitry Dudko remains and expresses the conscience of the Russian Orthodox Church.
barracks to the morgue. And this instructive scene is supposed to exert a salutary influence on the convicts' mental state.

Before I had time to look around, I was summoned to the detachment head. Lieutenant Yatsenko, a young, benighted man, and ordered me to do some useful work - digging trenches.

'Excuse me,' I objected, 'I'm a Group 2, that's why I was brought here.'

'You can walk,' he yelled, 'and anybody who can walk digs here, you understand? Hurry up, and remember, nobody complains here, Kievo's a long way off and Moscow's even further.'

And I went to work. There were forty men in my crew. And for all of us this unpaid, over-strenuous work was a refined torture, authorized by instructions from above. Practically no money was put on our card, and we knew it. Somehow we asked our 'bosses', security chief Major Godymnik:

'What use is a camp for the disabled if we're made to work like healthy people here?'

'You're the tireless bulwark of our society,' he replied, 'rather than shoot you, it's better to work you to death and get some good out of it for society.'

Those who want to get rich perfect the technique of old 'Hajj and Stalinist days. All the bosses' wives wear the gold of the living and the dead in their ears, thus defining the status of their 'gold-toothed' husbands.

At the end of his essay, Selyakov gives the names of 12 disabled prisoners who died in the camp in 1976 and 1977 for 'trying to send out reports on the atrocities committed here'.

I. Geraschenko: 'The Hidden Reserve' (2 pages)

A description of how telephones work when fitted with an extra part (diode) not specified by the standard design of the telephone exchange anything said nearby while the receiver is down. Removal of the part described does not affect the normal working of the telephone. The author suggests that the reader check the matter out.

N. Alekseyev: 'Notes of a Worker' (1981, 5 pages)

The hubbub of the tenth five-year plan has died down. All over the country, in every factory - from the tiny foundries and secret munitions factories, to gigantic steel foundries and secret munitions factories, people have straightened up in relief: the frenzy of rush jobs, storm work and overtime is past.

But not for long. The next five-year plan is on the horizon. And again we will be urged to mark the congress, jubilee and domestic and foreign undertakings of the government with inspired intensive labour.

The author describes certain methods used in achieving fulfilment of the plan. In addition to the voluntary working Saturdays and Sundays, and weeks of shock work 'bail out' in the press, there are frequent cases of compulsory work on Saturdays and Sundays (by agreement with the trade-union).

In view of complications which have arisen in fulfilling the State plan as a result of...large number of colds related to the influenza epidemic, I order...to organise work on Saturday.

'This order was issued on 21 January in the Lenin Komsomol car factory in Moscow by the Director-General, V.L. Melnikov.'

On Academician Sakharov's 60th Birthday' (1981, 13 pages)


Bulletin No. 11 of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled in the USSR' (30 March 1981, 32 pages)

The title page bears the names of Yu. Kiselev and V. Fefelov (see Chronicle 60). The Bulletin contains two appeals of the Initiative Group to the Presidium of the 25th Congress of the CPSU (calling for an amnesty and for support of the UN initiative declaring 1981 the International Year of the Disabled); open letters from the Group to the Presidium of the Madrid Conference (proposals for financial assistance to the disabled, paid for through reductions in military allocations, and for the introduction of 'moral training' for soldiers); to the Pope urging him to further the establishment in the USSR of a 'wide network of charitable organizations' on a religious basis, and to Patriarch Pimen of All Russia (urging him to recommend priests to 'draw attention to the sacred duty of each Christian to the helpless and destitute' in their sermons); a note on the decoration of the RSFSR Minister of Social Security, D. Komarova: a reply from the Head of the Department for International Relations of the USSR State Committee on Labour and Social Questions, A.F. Bordedyn, to the leaders of the European Organization to Assist the Disabled: Initiative Group Documents Nos. 20 - 'Letters Testifying...'; 21 - 'In an Atmosphere of Love for Mankind' (about the fate of Group member F. Khusainov) and 22 - 'In the Crimea Yu. Kiselev’s Home Has Burned Down' (Chronicle 61): reports on the arrest of N.S. Pavlov (see Chronicle 61): In this issue, the 'pre-Congress' hospitalization of Yu. Valov (Chronicle 61), and the detention of Group member O. Zaitseva (see Chronicle 61): 'Persecution of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled' in this issue: Group statements in defence of F. Khusainov (see Chronicle 61) and V.K. Pervushin, an invalid of the Great Patriotic War who was forcibly hospitalised for complaining about being illegally sacked; and the 'Declaration of the Rights of the Disabled' (a resolution of the UN General Assembly of 9 December 1973).

Information Bulletin' of SMUT 'Free Inter-trade Association of Working People' No. 12 (1981, 10 pages)
Court, which sent the following reply:

Kassy Regional Procurator. Cherkassy Regional Court informed him that his appeal had been forwarded to Smela People's Court on 26 June A. Lupinos's father Ivan Trofimovich Lupinos sent an appeal to Cherkassy Regional Court and to the Cherlassky Regional Procuracy: Smela People's Court informed him that his appeal had not yet expired. Lupinos was taken back to Smela. But he was not accepted there as the court decision had resulted of the Congress, 'What and for What Price' and 'Russia Supports Poland'.

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

Here are some additions and corrections to the reports about A. Lupinos in Chronicles 57 and 61. On 16 June 1980 officials of the Moscow City Procuracy carried out a search of the flat of A. Myasnikov (arrest in Chronicle 60, trial in Chronicle 61).

In the search unpublished works by A. Myasnikov were confiscated: the article '173 Reasons for National Shame and what the Constitution Falls to Mention' and the tale 'Meetin's (it was for these that Myasnikov was sentenced), and the tale 'Far Beyond the Mountainside, the Story A Day and a Whole Life, and the Bones a Voice from the Darkness. At the interrogation which followed the search Myasnikov admitted authorship, but refused to admit any slanderous content in the confiscated works. Investigator Borovik, who conducted the interrogation, attempted in vain to obtain evidence from Myasnikov which would compromise his friend the same evidence when he interrogated K. Onischenco, Myasnikov's wife.

The Case of Lupinos

I.T. Lupinos received the following reply from the Cherkassy Regional Procurator:

Cherkassy Regional Procurator
21 August 1980
No. 4/1266-80

Your appeal has been considered by the Procuracy. Under verification it has been ascertained that Smela People's Court took a decision to change the compulsory medical measures imposed on A.I. Lupinos on the grounds of a petition by Cherkassy Regional Psychiatric Hospital. The assertion in your appeal that a decision in this matter comes under the jurisdiction of the regional court is mistaken, since in accordance with article 422 of the Ukrainian Code of Criminal Procedure this matter is to be decided by the court which imposed these measures, or by a court at the place of treatment.

On the day of the court hearing, i.e. 10 June 1980, you were not his guardian, therefore the People's Court did not notify you of the date of the hearing and you were not entitled by law to submit an appeal. The Procurator and a lawyer of the Smela Legal Consultation Office, comrade O.I. Nikiforov, participated in the case. The appeal has been ruled groundless.

I. Yu. Storchevski, Procurator of the Department to
Supervise Reviews of Criminal Court Cases

I.T. Lupinos has in fact been his son's guardian since 1973, and there is a certificate to this effect in his son's case file. In the Regional Court I.T. Lupinos was told that they needed his certificate of guardianship. He asked the village Soviet for the certificate: they sent him to the district archives; the latter sent him to the Cherkassy regional archives, where the Chairman of the Chernassy Regional Court, V.I. Malevanny, and a Smela District People's Judge, V. Ivanov, resolved to transfer A. Lupinos from an ordinary psychiatric hospital to a special psychiatric hospital on the charge that he had earlier escaped.

On 21 June Lupinos was sent from Cherkassy Regional Psychiatric Hospital No. 1 (in Smela) to Dnepropetrovsk SPH. But he was not accepted there as the court decision had appeal had not yet expired. Lupinos was taken back to Smela. There, '16 June' was amended to '10 June' and he was sent back to Dnepropetrovsk SPH, which accepted him this time.

On 26 June A. Lupinos's father Ivan Trofimovich Lupinos sent an appeal to Cherkassy Regional Court and to the Chernassy Regional Procurator. Chernassy Regional Court informed him that his appeal had been forwarded to Smela People's Court, which sent the following reply:

In reply to your complaint addressed to the Regional Court and Regional Procuracy, Smela People's Court informs you that your appeal against the People's Court decision of 10 June 1980 to change the compulsory medical measures imposed on A.I. Lupinos was returned to you on 22 July 1980, since you were not his guardian prior to 16 July 1980 and were not therefore entitled by law to appeal against the court decision.

B.I. Kushel, Chairman of Smela Town People's Court


Edited by A. Ginzburg in 1958-60 and later published abroad in Grant, Frankfurt, No. 58 (1963). See also Chronicle 1.

On Rusko see Chronicles 32, 34.


This 400-page manuscript describes the author's experiences during internments in various mental hospitals. It has reached the West.

In fact, it was the previously mentioned article, "Unwilling Patients", which was published in The Lancet (11 April 1981).

A copy of this report is in the possession of Amnesty International and some other bodies.

A 14-page translation of these autobiographical notes is available from Working Group Hon. Sec. Mrs. C. Shaw, 17 Norland Sq., London, W11.

Often used Soviet propaganda about Solzhenitsyn, who was never in fact a German prisoner.

The Chronicle's word 'published' has been changed here to 'printed'. For details on the bulletin's publication see the Bibliographical Note below.

See Chronicle 31, p. 64.
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See note 13.

Mikhail Koryakov (a Russian emigrant), Zhivaia istoriya 1917-75, Ekho Press, Munich, 1977.

It was published in Possev: Svet Spetsialnyi Vospusk, Frankfurt, November 1970. It is an account, unlike in nature, of how its appeal against expulsion from the CPUSA was heard by the Party Central Committee.

In autumn 1981 Kindya was sentenced to 10 years in special-regime camps, plus 5 years' exile.

In autumn 1981 K. Rudenko was sentenced to 5 years in strict-regime camps, plus 5 years' exile.

The article was changed, and in August 1981 Aitaukov was sentenced to 6 years in strict-regime camps, plus 5 in exile.

5 in exile.

See photographs of two of these processions in Chronicle 54. Some of the sentences later imposed on Baptists mentioned in this section (all terms refer to ordinary-regime camps unless otherwise stated): Sheshenko - 3 years, Vall - 5 years' strict-regime, Reiner - 4 years, Rostoshchenko - 2 years' strict-regime, Redin - 5 years.


The collection was later published in New York by Khronika Press as Sakharovskii Sbornik, 1981, and is due to be published also in French.

In summer 1981 Ovsienko was sentenced to 10 years in strict-regime camps, plus 5 years' exile.

In February 1982 Bolonkin was sentenced to 1 year in a strict-regime camp, plus 5 years' exile. On 7 April 1982 he read out stumblingly, on Soviet television, a thoroughgoing recantation.

See note 13.

The camp's address is: Dnepropetrovskaya oblast, Soflevsky raion, s. Makorty, p/ya 309A/b.

The collection was later published in New York by Khronika Press as Sakharovskii Sbornik, 1981, and is due to be published also in French.

In summer 1981 Ovsienko was sentenced to 10 years in strict-regime camps, plus 5 years' exile.

In February 1982 Bolonkin was sentenced to 1 year in a strict-regime camp, plus 5 years' exile. On 7 April 1982 he read out stumblingly, on Soviet television, a thoroughgoing recantation.

See note 13.
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE


Earlier issues of the Chronicle are available in English as follows. Numbers 1-16 have been published by Amnesty International Publications as booklets (all except No. 16 inside back cover for details). Numbers 11-16 appeared in a booklet, Dissamed Rusia: the Human Rights Movement in the Soviet Union, London and New York, 1974.

Future issues of A Chronicle of Current Events will be published in English and as they become available.

The most comprehensive source of current, up-to-date information on the sort of events reported by the Chronicle is the fortnightly USSR News Brief: Human Rights at Home, published by Dr. Kronid Lubarsky, available from: P.O. Box 770, Cooper Station, New York, NY 10003, USA.

Nearly 900 photos have been published in the English editions of the Chronicle. They comprise photos of individuals, demonstrations, labour camps, prisons, psychiatric institutions, other buildings, facsimiles of documentary material, and groups of people. An alphabetical index to the first 700 photos appeared as a special supplement at the end of the English edition of Chronicle 64.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nickname</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shevchenko, Mrs. Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shevchenko, Vitaly N.</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheshina, V.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheshenko, Vasily M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheremet, Sergei V.</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shikhanyushchik, Galina</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shikhanovich, Yuriy A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina N.</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina K.</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina I.</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina G.</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina F.</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Z.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina X.</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina W.</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina V.</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina U.</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Q.</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina O.</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina N.</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina K.</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina I.</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina G.</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina F.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Z.</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina X.</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina W.</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina V.</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina U.</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Q.</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina O.</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina N.</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina K.</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina G.</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina F.</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Z.</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina X.</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina W.</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina V.</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina U.</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Q.</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina O.</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina N.</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina K.</td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina G.</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina F.</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Z.</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina X.</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina W.</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina V.</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina U.</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina Q.</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina O.</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina N.</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkolnik, Galina K.</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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