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

In an early issue it was stated that 'the Chronicle does, and will do, its utmost to ensure that its reporting 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 of Current Events that contains accounts of violations of human rights (numbered) and the words in square brackets. Also added, as a help to the general reader, are: the list of abbreviations, the illustrations and all material relating to the illustrations, the index of names, the bibliographical note, the veracity of all its contents. Nor do we take responsibility for any opinions or judgments which may appear or be implied in its contents. Yet Amnesty International continues to regard A Chronicle of Current Events as an authentic and reliable source of information on matters of direct concern to our own work for the worldwide observance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
The Struggle for Human Rights in the Soviet Union Continues

A Chronicle of Current Events

The Death of Juri Kukk

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, Article 19

On 5 April a ‘literary reading’ took place in a Moscow flat in memory of Juri Kukk. Moscow refuseniks A. Aberson, K. Balkhasyants, V. Vail, G. Vigdorov, V. Kats, R. Klotz, V. Magarik, O. Popov, A. Akindin, I. Sapiro, N. Fradkova and N. Khasina sent this statement to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

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.

On 1 May an ‘Open Statement from a Group of Estonian Citizens’ was sent to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet (with a copy to the USSR Prosecutor-General):

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 after his trial, at the age of 40.

On 8 January 1981 Juri Kukk was sentenced to two years’ deprivation of freedom for slander (under article 194-1 of the Estonian Criminal Code). Was Juri Kukk capable of slander? Slander presupposes deliberate deception, and this was not in his nature. He was one of the few people who are capable of speaking the truth and of dying for it. He had a keen mind and a pure heart. Thousands of ordinary people, who are not charged with slander as he was, will not find anyone among them to equal him, a man who managed and dared to do so much.

Juri Kukk commenced his hunger-strike on 22 November 1980, while his case was under investigation, and maintained it right up to his death, which, according to some accounts, can be dated 24 March 1981. Juri Kukk died. There have been cases when people have maintained a hunger-strike for over a year. His co-defendant Mart Niklus has been on hunger-strike since 23 August 1980.

What is the price of a human being, as opposed to a statistical unit?

Juri Kukk is dead. Could a slanderer, deceitful by
Anatoly Marchenko was arrested in Moscow on 17 March. He was arrested when approaching his father-in-law’s house. Conducted by a Senior Investigator of the Vladimir KGB, Captain Marchenko was allowed to take home the bag of provisions the RSFSR Criminal Code. His case, No. 41, is being conducted by a Senior Investigator of the Vladimir KGB, Captain Marchenko was sentenced for the fifth time for 'culpable violation of the rules of administrative surveillance' (Chronicle 9). Marchenko was sentenced for the fifth time for 'culpable violation of the rules of administrative surveillance' (Chronicle 9), the 'case' and his exile term lasted from 1975 to 1979 and are described in his book From Tarusa to Chuna.1 In April 1980 the authorities threatened him yet again with arrest, and encouraged him to leave the USSR (Chronicle 96).

On 17 March four searches were carried out in connection with Case No. 41. The search at Marchenko’s home in the town of Karabanovo, 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 Svetlana Artsimovich were confiscated. Issue No. 60, Marchenko’s diary entries were confiscated. Marchenko was held in Vladimir Prison.

Marchenko (b. 1938) served his first sentence (1954-60) when he was convicted of participating in a brawl (he was, in fact, trying to separate the brawlers); his second (1960-66) after being convicted under article 64 of the RSFSR Criminal Code (this period is described in his book My Testimony); his third (1966-71) for ‘violation of the residence regulations’ (Chronicle 3), and his fourth (1969-71) when convicted of charges under article 190-1 of the Code (Chronicle 9). Marchenko was sentenced for the fifth time for ‘culpable violation of the rules of administrative surveillance’ (Chronicle 9); the 'case' and his exile term lasted from 1975 to 1979 and are described in his book From Tarusa to Chuna.1 In April 1980 the authorities threatened him yet again with arrest, and encouraged him to leave the USSR (Chronicle 96).

On 17 March four searches were carried out in connection with Case No. 41. The search at Marchenko’s home in the town of Karabanovo, 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 Svetlana Artsimovich were confiscated. Issue No. 60, Marchenko’s diary entries were confiscated. Marchenko was held in Vladimir Prison.
with Marchenko's voice: what did he know of his anti-Soviet activities? (nothing); had Marchenko given him literature of any kind? (no); which of Marchenko's works had he read? (none). Krivov wanted to know why Zaitsev 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':

Ilya 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 My 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 - about today's Soviet camps, is one of those individuals of whom the country and people who gave him birth may be really proud. Now, 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 him.

On 22 March V. Peflov 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 Ostrov and many, many others who are today languishing in the depths of the bottomless Gulag, which continues to devour more and more victims.


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 publicistic articles and letters. Anatoly Marchenko has been circulated in samizdat and also published abroad.

Anatoly Marchenko's life is a testimony to opposition to evil, to the pride and honesty of a living, suffering person who resists this machine. 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, his sensitive conscience and his heart responsive to the misfortunes of others was 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 inadequate. On 24 March KGB officials tried to obtain his hearing aid, without which he cannot hear, from his family.

On 9 April I. 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. Pradkin 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. Daniel 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.

Pashmin 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 Peřlov. Pashmin refused to answer 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 Ohmu and that he met Marchenko there. He described Marchenko as 'an extremely 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 defaming the Soviet state?'

'I deny having signed that record: after I had signed a caution, 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 13 May S. Nekipelov wrote a statement:

To the Head of the Investigation Department of the
Vladimir Res, P. Pleshkov.

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 immedi-
ately from its content, this was the record of my interroga-
tion of 31 May 1978, 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
necessary to explain why I signed the document without
having read it.

In May 1978, 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 7ºC. I had a wet plank
bed to sleep on and no warm clothing, there was no glass
in the windows of the concrete-floored and cemented
的女孩

The conference adopted the appeal 'To All Doctors of
the World for the Prevention of Nuclear War', which
opened in Washington on 21 March.

The conference adopted the appeal 'To All Doctors of
the World', 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;
they have striven to create an atmosphere of trust and
frankness 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 members of the human rights movement in the USSR,
and in the first instance - the arrested women.

* * *

From 31 March to 2 April the Moscow City Court, presided
over by V. G. Lubentsova (Chronicles 58), heard the case
of Tatyana Semenovna Osipova (b. 1940; arrested 27 May
1980 - Chronicle 57), who was charged under article 70
of the RSFSR Criminal Code. The prosecutor was Deputy
Procurator-General of the USSR, M. Polyakov the defence
lawyer was V. Shovelov (Chronicles 17, 23, 61).
The trial took place in the People's Court of the Lyublino District of Moscow. Besides the 'special public', Osipova's mother, stepfather and grandmother were present in the courtroom. 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 (IGEI), 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'v, was stopped by a police cordon at the approach to the court building and ordered to 'clear off'. Koval'v 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 imposed another condition: it was permitted to leave the court only during the long dinner-time recess. Every day, before the trial began and when Koval'v 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'v to place his notepad on the table in front of her immediately and leave the courtroom. When Koval'v had placed the notepad on the table, 'Ivanov' removed him out of the courtroom and the reading of the judgment continued behind firmly closed doors. Before Osipova was escorted from the courtroom, 'Ivanov' demanded and received a receipt for the portable tape-recorder they confiscated from him. 'Ivanov' promised to return the tape-recorder after the trial. When Osipova was escorted out of the building, 'Ivanov' showed him the tape-recorder which he had confiscated. 'Ivanov' from the corridor as well, so that he could not see his wife.

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 farm workers' rights to emigrate and to leave the collective farm' (Chronicle 49), No. 53 - 'To the International Olympic Committee and the President of the ICC, Lord M. Killanin' (Chronicle 51), No. 78 - 'Ten years later' (Chronicle 51), No. 87 - 'Jewish collective farm workers in the Village of Ilinka are forcibly tied to the land and refused permission to emigrate' (Chronicle 51), No. 69 - '30 years of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights' (Chronicle 52), No. 67 - 'On instances of politically motivated persecution' (Chronicle 52), No. 85 - 'Violation of socio-economic Human Rights in the USSR: The Right to Work' (Chronicle 53), No. 93 - 'Freedom for all the Helsinki Group members imprisoned in the USSR' (Chronicle 52), No. 100 - 'Arrests for ideological reasons' (August 78, August 79) (Chronicle 54), and No. 119 (on the invasion of Afghanistan - Chronicle 55).

- writing together with V. Nekipelov - Chronicle 57, keeping and circulating three articles in the series 'Oprichina-78' (Chronicle 49, 51).

- writing together with A. Poberezhnitskii, keeping and circulating 'An Appeal to the US Congress' (Chronicle 61): reproducing and circulating the 'Memorandum of the 43' (it was signed in all by 43 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 'To Those who Tolerate International Gangsterism 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 Antontshonko's Technology of Power and volumes One and Two of Bolotin's 'The History of the KGB': (Chronicle 51), the letter 'To Those who Tolerate International Gangsterism 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:

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 and 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. Kaliastrov (although Kaliastrov 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.
Immediately began disputing this assertion. She did not allow
mentioned 'Appeal', Osipova explained that, under the
Group and the co-author of the documents cited against
not have, in Osipova's opinion, a specific political
capacity against which it is difficult to
were taken as a whole. The newspaper Russian Thought
newspaper.
may have been typed on typewriters confiscated from her, may have been typed
she was a co-author of the 'Oprichnina-78' articles and
her; also that she had circulated them. She confirmed that
was only a rough draft, which was not sent anywhere or
sufficient to include it in the trial record.
was essentially a trial of the whole Group.
confirmed that she was a member of the Helsinki
and the co-author of the documents cited against
also that she had circulated them. She confirmed that
as a Co-author of the 'Appeal to the US Congress', that she had
'Memorandum of the 45' and the letter 'On Those who Permit
International Gangsterism...'. She did not deny that much
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 kept copies of A Chronicle
Current Events and intended to circulate them.
explained that the 'Appeal to the US Congress'
was only a rough draft, 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 context 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 problems the question of nuclear disarmament had
first priority and must be the first to be resolved.
Concerning the books by A. V. Turshinov and Solodchenko,
she said that they were anti-Stalinist and not anti-Soviet,
but this point had not yet been decided, and her
wishes, willed as a literary work, 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
texts 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. Halanov, Osipova's mother and stepfather, stated that
they had little to do with their daughter's upbringing;
at first she had been 'completely on her own', 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
the most 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 Dnepropepetsk Special Psychiatric Hospital described the mental illness of Terelya
(Chronicles 47, 48, 51, 54, 56): they, the doctors, only
managed to force him to take his drugs. She 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', she began, but
the Judge interrupted her and said that she was being asked
about examples of sane people being sent to hospital
'specially'.
The Deputy Chairman of the 'Rossiya' collective farm,
the Chronicle of Current Events is part of this farm.
Chronicles 48, 51 said that there were no obstacles for
those who wished to leave. After Osipova had questioned
him, it turned out that, 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 collective farm: they, the doctors, only
managed to force him to take his drugs. She Budkevich
asserted that there had not been a single instance of a
person being placed in a Special Psychiatric Hospital
'specially'. It was true, there was one, Lutsik (Chronicle
51), who had been admitted 'not specially', she began, but
the Judge interrupted her and said that she was being asked
about examples of sane people being sent to hospital
'specially'.
The Deputy Chairman of the 'Rossiya' collective farm,
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Chronicles 48, 51 said that there were no obstacles for
those who wished to leave. After Osipova had questioned
him, it turned out that, 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 collective farm: they, the doctors, only
managed to force him to take his drugs. She Budkevich
asserted that there had not been a single instance of a
person being placed in a Special Psychiatric Hospital
'specially'. It was true, there was one, Lutsik (Chronicle
51), who had been admitted 'not specially', she began, but
the Judge interrupted her and said that she was being asked
about examples of sane people being sent to hospital
'specially'.
The Deputy Chairman of the 'Rossiya' collective farm,
the Chronicle of Current Events is part of this farm.
Chronicles 48, 51 said that there were no obstacles for
those who wished to leave. After Osipova had questioned
him, it turned out that, 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 collective farm: they, the doctors, only
managed to force him to take his drugs. She Budkevich
asserted that there had not been a single instance of a
person being placed in a Special Psychiatric Hospital
'specially'. It was true, there was one, Lutsik (Chronicle
51), who had been admitted 'not specially', she began, but
the Judge interrupted her and said that she was being asked
about examples of sane people being sent to hospital
'specially'.
Andreyev wrote:

In a foreign communique TASS correspondent Konstantin

On the evening of 31 March I. Bovaldv issued a statement

entitled 'On the First Day of the Trial':

Prisons and Camps') - the court had 'no documents relating

net to this transfer'.

norm, when others fulfilled it by 120%.

broke regulations and deliberately failed to fulfil the

good conditions in which prisoners lived and said that

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. Kovalev 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 try to stop me

attending the trial. I was forbidden to take notes in
court on pain of expulsion from the courtroom.

This court does not recognize humane principles. I

cannot even show my wife a bouquet of flowers: I was

forbidden to take notes in court or gain of expulsion from the courtroom.

Nevertheless, despite everything, my fragile little

Tanya gives battle. 'Today in the whole Helsinki Group

there is this duel', Tanya said. Today the court, with its
'special public', is testing the reality of the principles

proclaimed in the Helsinki Agreement. And in this court

these principles are represented and defended by my wife.

In a foreign enunicat TASS correspondent Konstantin

Andreyev 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 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 acts 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 undermin-

ing 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 notebooks 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

domestic 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

Movement', by the anti-Soviet newspaper Russian Thought,

Chronika 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

represents particular points and methods of combating the

Soviet authorities; the defendant submitted, 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 make it appear that

she did not see any illegal in the activities she was

engaged in before her arrest.

However, the examination of witnesses demonstrated the

groundlessness of such claims. Witnesses Mutov, Osipova,

Zhelov, Budkevich and others testified that Tatyana

Osipova showed them the documents she had com-
piled, 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

the 24 documents of the Moscow Helsinki Group which contained
The court immediately rose and left, thus depriving Osipova of the right to make a final speech. Andreyev wrote:

"I consider the defence of human rights my life's work, because violation of human rights causes human tragedy," she said.

The judge immediately rose to the assistance of Osipova and to make a final speech.

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 RSFSR 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."
On 16 April Kovaldv issued a letter entitled 'Leniency':

As necessary after a medical examination, and as a result she would never be able to have children.

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 tried to blackmail her by saying 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 Ginzburg's toilet, or cartridges in K. Podrabinek's suitcase. It's 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 cycles. During the investigation doctors confirmed this. 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 said to him whether 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 Nabayan spent just over six months in such a camp. She 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 Ginzburg's toilet, or cartridges in K. Podrabinek's suitcase. It's 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 cycles. During the investigation doctors confirmed this. 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 said to him whether 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 investiga-
our own, a selected public which is not in its first
year of working for the organs (KGB). But we have to
think of these people as individuals too! We cannot sub-
ject their steadfastness to such a test again; they will
see and hear their fill, and might remember that KGB
identity cards are not the only things they possess.
And even that these people are their compatriots, as
it were. And they might start to write slanderous state-
ments demanding that the so-called rights of a so-called
human being be observed.
And what would happen to security, comrades, and
especially to our personal comforts? The show-trial stage
manager would have to go and be a metal-worker in a
factory: you wouldn't be able to find a job as a watchmen,
for that you have to have at least a doctorate, or they
won't take you. No, a new trial or any sort of legality
are not for us. I have another idea, which is more suited
to the sportive spirit of our organization. This is what
we will do...
I cannot guarantee that just such a monologue took
place, but on 16 April I was asked for my copy of the
judgment 'for a minute'...and by sleight of hand...it
was returned to me containing the words: 'to serve in
a camp with strict regime'. Well, your 'boys' can be
fast noyers too!

Osipova, 20 April 1981

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
defendant had made a mistake in the text of the judgment
(according to the Code of Criminal Procedure the sentence 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. Lawyer Shveitser stated that when the judgment was read out
in court, it had stated 'five years' ordinary-regime'.
Procurator Polyakov stated that 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 corres-
ponence) of ordinary regime to nothing.

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.

In the second he said that the court had passed judgment
in Osipova's case stating, in particular, that confiscated
property, 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 the dictaphones
and other things had to be destroyed, in accordance with
point 3 of the same article. Kovalyov wrote that these things
had been confiscated in breach of article 171 and used
as material evidence (in breach of article 83 of the RSFSR
Code of Criminal Procedure), and that the court had not
proved that the money, possessions and food had been
obtained by criminal means. He therefore asked that they
be returned to him. He also asked for the return of the
dictaphones and all the books, documents 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, it only let
them know the address of the place where the prisoner would
serve his sentence (this is in contravention of article
359 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). A few days later
Kovalyov received notification that Osipova had been sent
to Nordovian Camp 3.

PERSECUTION OF THE WORKING COMMISSION
ON PSYCHIATRIC ABUSES

The Trial of Koryagin

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 confederated in the Warsaw
 Pact, the World Psychiatric Association and the
National Association of Physicians in the USA).

Anatoly Ivanovich Koryagin is a man of wide knowledge,
unshakable honesty, steadfast principles and great
kindness. He is a highly skilled psychiatrist, loved
and respected by his numerous patients. He was literally
born for his profession - he possesses the art and wisdom
of healing 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 'socially
dangerous' - as a weapon of repression and imprisonment.
He is the father of three children aged 13, 10 and three.
His principles render him incapable of doing anything
which might be classed as a crime.

We demand the immediate release of Anatoly Koryagin
and the restoration of all his rights as a citizen and
a doctor! We call on the delegates to the 26th CPSU
Congress not to allow a lawless act to take place, and to bring the rampant tyrants of Kharkov to a halt! We are appealing to world public opinion to organize the most extensive possible campaign in support of Dr Koryagin! May his suffering serve as yet another serious warning to all: the future of human rights remains a real and burning issue for the USSR, even if it should in the next few years disappear from the pages of the world press.

At the beginning of April a search was carried out at the home of Koryagin's sister, who lives in Kursk Region. Before 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 her that his husband had been charged with trying to 'overthrow the Soviet state'.

In Kalinin, Vladimir Golitsyn (Chronicles 57, 58) was interrogated in connection with Koryagin's case. Golitsyn said that he did not know Koryagin. When asked how he came to have the draft 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 fears that the authorities intend to increase their use of psychiatric persecution for political reasons.

From 3 to 5 April the Kharkov Regional Court, presided over by Navalny, heard the case of Anatoly Ivanovich 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). No case was heard under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the RSFSR Code) and article 218 part 1 of the RSFSR Code ('illegal possession...of a firearm'). The prosecutor was V.I. Popov, Senior Assistant to the Kharkov Regional Prosecutor; the defence lawyer (officially appointed) was A.P. Misevra. Koryagin refused to accept the services of the appointed defender here. Nevertheless, at the demand of the Prosecutor, his petition was turned down (this contravenes the Code of Criminal Procedure).

- authorship and circulation of the following: the article 'Unwilling Patients', published in the journal Possev No. 7/1981, which 'defames the Soviet state and the CPSU'; the article 'Good, Evil, Violence', published in the Lancet, and note 14 in this, which was 'malicious and slanderous in nature'; a psychiatric report on his examination of A.A. Bukov, in which 'anti-Soviet slander is present in the form of an interview with a patient';

- authorship of the following: a letter to Yu. Belov (Chronicle 54), defaming the 'Soviet system, the peaceable policies of the USSR, democratic principles, and the CPSU'; notes defaming 'Soviet democracy and such outstanding expressions of the political consciousness and enthusiasm of the Soviet people as communist Saturdays (days on which people voluntarily work without pay) and ideastorms! the heroic past of the USSR and the CPSU in the Stalin period'; notes containing 'slanders of the social system about the democracy and the administrative machinery of the Soviet state'; extracts copied out from A.I. Solzhenitsyn's libellous work giving advice on how to conduct oneself during interrogations, when arrested and under investigation: the poem 'In the World of Deformity', which is 'of an anti-Soviet nature and contains malicious slander of the Soviet state'; a letter to his grandfather, Yu. Blagikh, in the USA, in which he 'slandered democracy, the Soviet system, the CPSU and the collective farm peasantry, and expressed a desire for the restoration of private ownership and capitalism in the USSR'; his 'Autobiography'; in which he 'slandered Soviet reality', 'Statement in Case of my Arrest' (Chronicle 61), which was 'maliciously slanderous in nature'; the document 'A Hypersensitive Psychopath', comprising 'malicious slander of the peaceful policies of the USSR and the CPSU, anti-Soviet views and calls for the overthrow of the Soviet state';

- possession of the following: foreign journals containing articles slanderous of the Soviet state and social system, in particular - an article by General Grigorenko about the poet Rudenko, two articles concerning the state authorities and the health system in the USSR; two articles by Yu. Belov (including extracts from Yuri Sudoplatov's anti-Soviet pamphlet 'The Gulag Archipelago'); tape-recorded extracts from the book A. Popov's 'Psychiatry'; and a letter by the German writer Oskar Duden's book about his stay in the USSR, containing 'malicious slander about the persecution of priests and believers in the USSR'; and a letter from A. Vorona containing 'malicious slander of the KGB and the Soviet state';

- oral anti-Soviet agitation, making propaganda aimed at undermining and weakening the Soviet state; and husband connections with anti-Soviet individuals in the USSR and abroad. Koryagin was also charged with 'illegal possession of a sawn-off hunting gun, confiscated during a search at the flat of M. Blagikh'.

The First Day

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 speak 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
the investigation - and to make my final speech.' Then the witnesses were examined. V.P. Rudometov (an official from the military registration office where Koryagin was employed as a psychiatrist on the medical commission) said: 'I think Stalin was a great person, and although he made mistakes, he nevertheless did a lot of good. 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. When the Judge asked him whether he had read Solzhenitsyn's works, Rudometov replied: 'I - no. I just know that he fought in the war, left his company in 1942 and gave himself up as a prisoner', and that after his release he was convicted.'

M.F. Blednykh said that the gun which Koryagin had left with him was 'old, useless and rusty'. Cherepilov (driver from the clinic where Koryagin worked) described Koryagin as 'consistent' 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 far as 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 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 Pytchakhchi, talking about something; they say he painted slogans on fences... Koryagin's conduct was never of a speaking sort. He said that a healthy person had been admitted to hospital because of...The following day a commission was decided to discharge Vlasenko, since they considered him well'. 'But surely you wanted to discharge him in the next few days anyway?' asked the Judge. 'Yes, answered Dmitrieva, 'he may have stayed another two or three weeks...perhaps I would have been discharged.'

Varahavsky (head of the hospital in Dnepropetrovsk): 'At first Vlasenko was in the acute section... 'Oh, can schizophrenia be cured in a month?'. asked the defence lawyer. 'Not in a month, but in six weeks. There are various courses the illness can take', answered Varahavsky.

After the witnesses had been questioned, Koryagin's references were read out: from school ('he avoided social work'); from the Medical Institute ('he avoids social work, is egotistical, sometimes rude to his comrades, cunning'); from his job in Abakan ('he took an active part in social life'); from his job in Kyzyl ('he concerned himself only with his own affairs - hunting'); he encouraged his colleagues to go around with the administration and to write complaints to various bodies, including newspapers and the Supreme Court'; from the Kharkov clinic ('he was conscientious in his duties as a doctor, but took no part at all in social life'). The judge then read extracts from Koryagin's letter to his grandfather and his article 'A Hypersensitive Psychopath'.

In his speech the Procurator repeated several times that Koryagin 'conducted anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, and pursued evil designs'. He particularly emphasized 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 proved that he owned it, nor that it was in his custody'.

Then Koryagin made his final speech (excerpted 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 fast 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 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 to the Regional Procurator. Furthermore, I have not received a reply to this complaint 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 my sons, my wife and father were exploited. Literally just like in South Africa. I submitted a complaint about their exploitation, and still they needed to give me with abuse, and still took me to be interrogated. During the interrogation I sat on a hard, uncomfortable stool. I was in poor physical shape and my sons, my wife and father were exploited. Literally just like in South Africa. 

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 - Vycheslav Bakmin, Leonard Ternovskey, Alexander Podrabsky, Irina Grilina, Felix Dzerzhinsky - are already in prison, or, if necessary, to destroy me altogether. In particular, the Head of the Investigation Department, Babusenko, informed me (these are his exact words): '...I will send you to the cooler.'

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 - Vycheslav Bakmin, Leonard Ternovskey, Alexander Podrabsky, Irina Grilina, Felix Dzerzhinsky - are already in prison, or, if necessary, to destroy me altogether. In particular, the Head of the Investigation Department, Babusenko, informed me (these are his exact words): '...I will send you to the cooler.'

During the interrogation no method was disdained: I was threatened and humiliated, and my feelings for my sons, my wife and father were exploited. Literally just like in South Africa. I submitted a complaint about them to the Regional Procurator, but the Assistant Head of the prison informed me that he had witnesses to the fact that I was looted by the Gestapo. These were those same subordinates of his who had trampled on me and put me in handcuffs. I was put in the cooler to make a person behave in the way they require. As a doctor, I maintain that this is physical torture, aimed at the mind, in order to break a man.

They probably think we have grown fat on the prison grub, so much so that the person was summoned to this place as a witness. What happens? He circulates 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 those to live for 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 in exile under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code, and two years in camp under article 218 of the RSFSR 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 be brought against Yu. Deyuba 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 in the prison that Koryagin had already been sent off to camp. In June Koryagin arrived at Perm Camp 37.

The Grivnina-Serebrov Case (Chronicle 61)

On 19 March B. Smushkevich (Chronicle 60) and L. Kardasevich (Chronicles 29, 32) were summoned for interrogation by Investigator Kapayev of the Moscow KGB. Smushkevich was interrogated by Investigator Kapayev, Kardasevich by Investigator Popov. They both admitted that they knew I. Grivnina (for her arrest see Chronicle 60) and F. Serebrov (for his trial see this issue), and that criminal charges would be brought against Yu. Deyuba for refusing to give evidence in court.

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. Bykov; on 11 April E. Alaksan- 

senko'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. Kovaliv. The search took place in the flat of Valentin Mitskevich (Chronicle 60), a friend with whom Kovaliv had lately been staying (for his trial see this issue), and who had recently been told that the KGB officials would arrive to search. They were subjected to body-searches. Nothing was confiscated from them. Kovaliv signed
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.

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.

On 29 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.

Kalistratova only for her.

Kalistratova People have been saying lately: 'Now the KGB has gone after the women'...

Kalistratova Well, if you're so sorry for her, let her go: you yourself say that everything is in your hands.

Kalistratova Can't - you're only an official.

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 your hands...

Kalistratova I feel very sorry for Grivina.

Kalistratova only for her.

On 20 May KGB official Tikhonov issued Kalistratova with a 'warning according to the Decree'. From the items confiscated from you 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!' On 29 April Kapayev interrogated Kalistratova 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 Lubyanka prison. Kapayev asked about Grivina, Serebrov, Kuvakin, Bakhmin 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
The same day Alekseyeva wrote a letter describing the course of the interrogation and addressed to Brezhnev (with copies to Rekunov and Andropov):

Dear 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 to Gorky; they shouted and threatened. 'You know what 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 anything to do with it. I was still holding in my hands. Kapayev again began to shout: 'I'll throw you out into the corridor also.' I said that I had to give evidence if I did not wish to lose my job. In my agitation, which was natural in such circumstances, I began to leaf through the book, which is both an insult and mockery. I ask you to take note of Balashov 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 (Chronicle 29, 30, 38, 39, 58) in connection with 'the case of Serebrov, charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code'. Kosterina said that she had met Serebrov a few years ago, probably at Grigorenko's: she knew nothing about Serebrov's 'criminal activity'. I regard this not as juridical illiteracy, but as evidence that the investigation is obviously prejudiced. This circumstance gives me additional grounds for refusing to appear in the investigation of this case. And after all this, my behaviour was described in the record as 'provocative'. I did not sign the record, I did not even enter my comments there, because Kapayev and Balashov acted illegally, threatening to deprive me of my job and to take me to court, deciding the punishment in advance. 'To start with, we'll fine you 50 roubles' - and thus taking the court's function upon themselves. Kapayev shouted at me, threatened to use physical force, and addressed me in the familiar form.

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 began to shout: 'You're not allowed to read the book out of the window, and you can then crawl about and pick up what's left of it.' And he began to tear it out of my hands. I could not give him the Pushkin book after his promise to throw it out of the window. Furthermore, when asking questions, Investigator Kapayev talked about Serebrov's 'criminal activity'. I regard this not only as juridical illiteracy, but as evidence that the investigation is obviously prejudiced. This circumstance gives me additional grounds for refusing to have any dealings with its representatives, not to talk to them and not to give evidence in connection with any case. The events of the last interrogation have only strengthened my conviction that I had chosen the right course. Investigator Popov behaved correctly and 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.

I decided never to have any dealings with its representatives, and only managed to say 'No'. Then he rushed up to me and shouted: 'I won't, I refuse!' I took a book out of my bag, a small volume of Pushkin's poetry. Kapayev immediately, I repeat, immediately shouted: 'I'm telling you to put the book away!' I was obliged to give evidence under article 73 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. Kosterina said that she had met Serebrov a few years ago, probably at Grigorenko's: she knew nothing about Serebrov's 'criminal activity'. I asked Kosterina's son (Aleksei Smirnov - Chronicle 61 and 43) if he had been involved in compiling it. 'As far as Serebrov is concerned - I don't know.' When Kapayev exclaimed that the letter contained slander, I repeated: 'I'll throw you out into the corridor with your book: I'll push you down the stairs, throw the book out of the window, and you can then crawl about and pick up what's left of it.' And he began to tear it out of my hands. I could not give him the Pushkin book after his promise to throw it out of the window.
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 Grivnina 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 have 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 Grivnina and the other members of the Working Commission.

On 22 May KGB official Kapayev returned some 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 how the news of whether his wife had informed them. They asked a similar question about Serebrov's poems, which had been published in Kontinent and Possev. Serebrova was also asked about her contact with the e sinki Group. She refused to answer.

From the way the questions were asked it was clear that the investigators' hypothesis was that Serebrova sent her contact with the e sinki Group. She refused to answer.

Serebrov's arrest had reached Western radio-stations and newspapers. Serebrova was also asked about whether his wife had informed them. They asked a similar question about Serebrov's poems, which had been published in Kontinent and Possev. Serebrova was also asked about her contact with the e sinki Group. She refused to answer.

On 18 June Serebrov and his lawyer, E.A. Remilova, concluded their study of the case.

The Trial of Azadovsky

On 16 March the Kulybyhev District Court in Leningrad, presided over by A.S. Lukovnikov, heard the case of Doctor of Literary Science Konstantin Markovich Azadovsky (b. 1941; arrested 19 December 1980 - Chronicle 60). He was charged under article 324 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 tight 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 30 March the People's Court in the Gagarin District of Moscow, presided over by D. Balandin, heard the case of Georgy Ivanovich Shepel'ev (b. 1950; arrested 24 February - Chronicle 61). He was charged under article 96, 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 bottle outside the factory grounds, and that when detained he was on his way to the police station to hand it 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), E. Komarnitsy, and E. Krylova, A. Nemenovich 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 Balandin pronounced sentence...
The Trial of Erumenko

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

In 1964-74 Erumenko 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 Erumenko. 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, Erumenko 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. He was interrupted and not allowed to speak. He was sentenced, 'taking into account the numerous mistakes and inaccuracies which had occurred when his work was quoted from. He listed his family circumstances', to two-and-a-half years in strict-regime camps (a few days later Erumenko's wife gave birth to a daughter).

The Trial of Sarbayev

On 28 April the Kuibyshev Regional Court, presided over by 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 Phenomenon of Totalitarianism' 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 58).

The court took into account that Sarbayev 'developed a negative attitude to Soviet reality', and that the Kuibyshev KGB officials gave him a 'prophylactic' talk on the subject of his 'politically harmful statements'. Then Sarbayev 'became an active member of a negatively disposed group of young people; he took part in discussions on the founding of an illegal organization in Kuibyshev'. On 27 February 1978 the Kuibyshev KGB issued him with a warning 'according to the Decree'.

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

This is already the third month that they have tormented me by shunting me around detention cells and prisons. Yesterday Syzran Prison, today - Kuibyshev. A transit cell... The cells are overcrowded - up to 40 or 50 people lying side by side. Stufiness, tobacco smoke, stench... On Saturday and Sunday (28 and 29 March) I asked a duty warder to notify the doctor and at least get me something to lower my temperature, an aspirin or something - but in vain. They just said that I was in Kuibyshev Prison, which means, apparently: 'I ought to speak. He was sentenced... I am ill. Everything aches. I have not eaten bread for two months - an ulcer. My heart flounders... And on top of it I have caught cold - I have had a temperature for three days... To end up in a psychiatric hospital in this state means to take the path to death.

On 10 April Zotov arrived at the Forensic Department of Chelyabinsk Regional Psychoneurological Hospital No. 1. The examining commission declared him not responsible (their diagnosis was 'infectious traumatic schizophrenia') and 'socially dangerous'. It recommended compulsory treatment.

The Trial of Zotov

On 22 December searches were carried out at the homes of Boris Mukhametshin, in the settlement of Palatka, Magadan Region, where he is serving his exile sentence (Chronicle 55), and his sister Roza Fedyakina in Moscow, in connection with Erumenko's case (Chronicle 60). Nothing was confiscated from Mukhametshin. From 22 to 29 December Mukhametshin was interrogated by Magadan KGB officials.

The courtroom was full of 'special public'. Erumenko 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 his family circumstances', to two-and-a-half years in strict-regime camps. Sarbayev was released on 30 April.
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 to the purposes of Soviet pictorial art. 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 investigatory prison on Matroskaya Tishina Street. On 13 June V. Tomachinsky (Chronicles 58, 60) sent the Moscow Procurator (with a copy to the Chairman of Moscow City Court) a 'Statement of Complaint':

I find, however, that Yu. A. Burtsev's failure to observe current legislation, did not keep a record of 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.

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

*...the most serious cause for alarm is the fact that a court, 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 Sokirokho's fate even before the Moscow City Court had reached its decision to bring criminal charges against Sokiroko. It is evident from the fact that the 'questioner' carried out his threat to M. Yakovlev by arresting him personally, on the authority of a Moscow City Court decision made 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...*
case in the town of Yurev-Polsky, at the home of V. Fed'ev (Chronicles 57, 60; the search warrant was dated 9 March), who is a member of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled. Confiscated items included a letter from Pavlov to Fed'ev, dated 23 May 1980, the Initiative Group’s Document No. 15 (Chronicle 57) and seven copies of Document No. 18 (Chronicles 60), five copies of the information produced by the Group for the twelfth anniversary of the Olympic Games for the Disabled, Fed'ev’s letter to the 26th Party Congress, and some used carbon paper.

The Arrest of Kuvakin

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 Vsevolod Kuvakin (Chronicles 57, 60). The confiscated items included files and exercise books of typed and handwritten documents, Kuvakin’s manuscripts, Solzhenitsyn’s The Calf Butted the Oak (a photocopy), 49 issues of A Chronicle of Current Events, a typewriter, notebooks, a ‘dagger with a bone handle, decorated with a fascist swastika’ and bullets for a sporting air gun (30 items were listed in the record).

While the search was going on, one of the KGB officials engaged on it entered the next room, where Kuvakin’s sister M. Blazhenova lived, and told her that the KGB knew that she had a brown briefcase belonging to her brother; if she did not surrender it, they would have to search the whole flat. Blazhenova recalled that the previous evening Kuvakin had gone out on to the balcony. The briefcase was drawn up. The briefcase was found to contain letters ‘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 knew 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

The Arrest of Pavlov

Nikolai Sargsyevich Pavlov (about 40 years of age; an invalid from childhood; he walks with the aid of crutches; he has a previous conviction under article 190-1 of the RFSSR Criminal Code) was arrested in March in the town of Alekseyevka, Belgorod Region, after a search. He was charged under article 70 of the RFSSR Criminal Code with ‘preparing, keeping and circulating leaflets defaming the Soviet political and social system’. Major Romanovsky, an investigator of the Belgorod KGB, is in charge of the case.

On 20 March Senior Investigator Captain Krivov of the Vladimir KGB conducted a search in connection with Pavlov’s
Kuvakin confirmed this evidence, pointing out that he could of the procedure for examining complaints and statements. He had not given any documents to foreigners, and had not taken home, and a search was carried out there. Investigator Levchenko conducted the search. Six pages of addresses and telephone numbers were confiscated.

On 14 April KGB officials fetched Kuvakin away from work. Ikonnikov had told him that Kuvakin’s home had been searched the day before, and that a number of anti-Soviet documents had been confiscated. Yeklov informed Kuvakin that Ikonnikov had described Kuvakin’s intentions to four group called ‘Publicity’, which would publicize violations of the procedure for examining complaints and statements. Kuvakin confirmed this evidence, pointing out that he could see nothing illegal in his intention.

The next day it became known that he had been arrested. He had not given any documents to foreigners, and had not seen anything illegal in his intention.

The only thing I have done, quite consciously and deliberately, is to write about how I see today’s ‘most progressive, democratic and humane system’, which, due to a misunderstanding, is often called Soviet and - even more mistakenly - socialist. I do not deny authorship of certain manuscripts and I do not disown them, neither those published in samizdat and foreign publications, nor those which have not yet found publishers or readers.

In my opinion this system is neither legal, nor Soviet, nor finally - constitutional, and I therefore do not admit that my actions contradicted 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 that is why 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 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 view of the real possibility that I will be arrested by the KGB, I consider it necessary to make the following statement:

I find it difficult to foresee what sort of actual ‘crime’ I will be charged with. Probably the standard one in our country: ‘preparing and circulating slanderous fabrications defamatory of the Soviet system’. I state in advance that I have committed no crime and have not prepared or circulated any ‘slander’. The only thing I have done, quite consciously and deliberately, is to write about how I see today’s ‘most progressive, democratic and humane system’, which, due to a misunderstanding, is often called Soviet and - even more mistakenly - socialist.

In my opinion this system is neither legal, nor Soviet, nor finally - constitutional, and I therefore do not admit that my actions contradicted the law and I do not regard them as anti-Soviet, since there is no Soviet system in the USSR.
A Chronicle of Current Events (in typescript) were among the materials (these being the documents confiscated from Denisov during the search the day before). After this, Denisov, who had at first said that he did not remember where he had obtained the confiscated documents, confirmed Kuvakin's testimony.

On 14 April Investigator Nikitin conducted a search at Denisov's home, in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case. The confiscation of works by Solzhenitsyn, Solntsev, and Alekseyenko confirmed Kuvakin's testimony, written in his own hand, stating that all the confiscated items belonged to him.

At this time the editorial board of The Duel consisted of Bykov, Yu. Denisov, N. Denisova, N. Ikonnikov and E. Osipova (Chronicle 61) and also E. Alekseyenko and V. Shchelov.

A Search at the Home of Gotovtsev

On 14 April a search was carried out at the home of Alexander Gotovtsev (Chronicles 56, 60) in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case. Two packets of 'typed and handwritten documents', part of a typescript copy of Solntsev's 'Letter to Soviet Leaders', personal notes, postal receipts and old prescriptions were confiscated. Popov confirmed that all the confiscated items belonged to him. He refused to sign the record. After the search Popov interrogated Gotovtsev. Kapayev came into the room several times during the interrogation. Popov said that he had obtained the documents from Gotovtsev during the search the day before. After this, Denisov, who had at first said that he did not remember where he had obtained the confiscated materials, confirmed Kuvakin's testimony.

On 14 April Investigator Nikitin conducted a search at Denisov's home, in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case. The confiscated items included works by Solntsev, Solntsev's 'Letter to Soviet Leaders', personal notes, postal receipts and old prescriptions were confiscated. Popov confirmed that all the confiscated items belonged to him. He refused to sign the record. After the search Popov interrogated Gotovtsev. Kapayev came into the room several times during the interrogation. Popov said that he had obtained the documents from Gotovtsev during the search the day before. After this, Denisov, who had at first said that he did not remember where he had obtained the confiscated materials, confirmed Kuvakin's testimony.

On 14 April investigator Nikitin conducted a search at Denisov's home, in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case. The confiscated items included works by Solntsev, Solntsev's 'Letter to Soviet Leaders', personal notes, postal receipts and old prescriptions were confiscated. Popov confirmed that all the confiscated items belonged to him. He refused to sign the record. After the search Popov interrogated Gotovtsev. Kapayev came into the room several times during the interrogation. Popov said that he had obtained the documents from Gotovtsev during the search the day before. After this, Denisov, who had at first said that he did not remember where he had obtained the confiscated materials, confirmed Kuvakin's testimony.

On 14 April a search was carried out at the home of Alexandre Gotovtsev (Chronicles 54, 62) in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case. Two packets of 'typed and handwritten documents', part of a typescript copy of Solntsev's 'Letter to Soviet Leaders', personal notes, postal receipts and old prescriptions were confiscated. Popov confirmed that all the confiscated items belonged to him. He refused to sign the record. After the search Popov interrogated Gotovtsev. Kapayev came into the room several times during the interrogation. Popov said that he had obtained the documents from Gotovtsev during the search the day before. After this, Denisov, who had at first said that he did not remember where he had obtained the confiscated materials, confirmed Kuvakin's testimony.

On 14 April Investigator Nikitin conducted a search at Denisov's home, in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case. The confiscated items included works by Solntsev, Solntsev's 'Letter to Soviet Leaders', personal notes, postal receipts and old prescriptions were confiscated. Popov confirmed that all the confiscated items belonged to him. He refused to sign the record. After the search Popov interrogated Gotovtsev. Kapayev came into the room several times during the interrogation. Popov said that he had obtained the documents from Gotovtsev during the search the day before. After this, Denisov, who had at first said that he did not remember where he had obtained the confiscated materials, confirmed Kuvakin's testimony.

On 14 April Investigator Nikitin conducted a search at Denisov's home, in connection with the Grivnina-Serebrov case. The confiscated items included works by Solntsev, Solntsev's 'Letter to Soviet Leaders', personal notes, postal receipts and old prescriptions were confiscated. Popov confirmed that all the confiscated items belonged to him. He refused to sign the record. After the search Popov interrogated Gotovtsev. Kapayev came into the room several times during the interrogation. Popov said that he had obtained the documents from Gotovtsev during the search the day before. After this, Denisov, who had at first said that he did not remember where he had obtained the confiscated materials, confirmed Kuvakin's testimony.
Vul said that he did not agree with the investigator's publicize what took place, in order to correct shortcomings: were confiscated from you during the search, that the aim 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 this could only serve to strengthen socialist democracy.

Furthermore, the aforementioned collections and whether Vul had been instrumental in compiling these sections. Vul referred to his reply to the first of the questions: it can be seen from the material in 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. Grinblat. He replied that his personal acquaintances were his own affair, and what he knew about Serebrov's part in compiling and circulating a number of the documents which had been confiscated from Vul - Serebrov having been named as one of the authors (the reply: 'I don't know anything about it').

On 13 April Vul's wife was interrogated.

On 17 April Vul had a 'chat' with Moscow KGB official 'Nikolai Borisovich', who had spoken to him at the police station on 20 February before the search of his flat.

At the beginning of the 'chat', 'Nikolai Borisovich' asked Vul to keep their conversation secret. Vul replied that he would not buy a pig in a poke. If his interlocutor wished him to keep some part of their conversation secret, he should say - in advance of that part of the conversation - what it would be about, and Vul would then decide whether to promise or not.

The greater part of the conversation was devoted to an explanation of Vul's views on domestic and foreign policy (Czechoslovakia, Afghanistan, Chile). Vul answered the questions, without concealing his views. For the reminder of the interview, 'Nikolai Borisovich' tried to convince Vul that 'your Chronicle' contained a great deal of slander. 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, 'Nikolai Borisovich', had been 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 discouraged 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 person's name yet. 'Nikolai Borisovich' asked Vul again whether he did not intend to leave the USSR. When Vul protested that KGB officials had confiscated his invitation from Israel, 'Nikolai Borisovich' replied to this effect: 'They took it away - they can also give it back'.

At the end of the conversation 'Nikolai Borisovich' said
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. His friends had asked, after 20 February, for the invitation to be sent: very few invitations are getting through to Moscow at present.

Case No. 50611/14-79 (Chronicle 60)

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; samizdat and tamizdat, including copies of books by Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn and of Pasternak's Dr Zhivago. Searches and Reflections, No. 1 and 2; A Chronicle of Current Events No. 54; and a typewriter (about 50 items were listed in the record).

Legler wrote in the record:

I presume that a number of confiscated items, such as my wife's school diary, photocopies of books published in the USSR and my personal notes on geology, cannot in principle have any connection with a criminal case, and that their confiscation will only be temporary. I have no further grievances.

After the search Legler was driven off for interrogation. When asked where he had obtained Searches and Reflections, and that in his opinion the material be returned to him. He would not give any evidence and would not answer any questions, so why should he answer questions during a 'chat'?

On 13 May Legler and his wife were summoned for interrogation. 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 I.P. Kornakov of the Moscow Procuracy conducted the search. The confiscated items included: tamizdat and samizdat, notes on political prisoners, correspondence, notebooks, postal receipts. In addition, Romanova's personal summaries of books by Averintsev 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 knocked her work. On 4 May Romanova's telephone was disconnected. On 6 June two policemen (one of them a district policeman) turned up at Romanova's home after 10 pm, to check that her passport was in order. They also tried to find out where she worked.

A Search at the Home of Khodorovich

On 17 April 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 included: 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 tapes and a radio. The search record listed 44 items. Khodorovich refused to sign the record. At the end of April Khodorovich'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 Continent, an issue of the Paris journal The
Towards the end of March a number of A. Smirnov's colleagues at work were interrogated in Moscow. Smirnov works at the District Computer Information Centre of the RSFSR Ministry of Supplies. The investigators wanted to know whether Smirnov typed during working hours, and whether he had voiced opinions on political matters. Shuvalov replied in the negative.

A typewriter and some papers had been taken from the apartment of another person involved in the 'Hothouse Case'. At the same time five of Bozhko's acquaintances, including the writer N.V. Serebrovskii and university sociologist V.M. Kandel, were brought to the KGB building. During the night of 1-2 April, searches were carried out at the homes of Serebrovskii and Kandel. Literary papers were confiscated from Serebrovskii and religious and scientific ones from Kandel. A search was also carried out at the home of another person involved in the 'Hothouse Case'.

Serebrovskii was threatened with psychiatric sanctions: attempts were made to persuade the rest of those being interrogated to say that he was mentally abnormal. When the interrogations were over, Bozhko was issued an 'Official Caution', according to which, if Bozhko should continue her 'activities', she could easily go mad.

Towards the end of March a number of A. Smirnov's colleagues at work were interrogated in Moscow. Smirnov works at the District Computer Information Centre of the RSFSR Ministry of Supplies. The investigators wanted to know whether Smirnov typed during working hours, and what he had typed. From his colleagues, replies to these questions were not entirely clear, although he would not show them the text he used to cover up journalism. At the same time A. Smirnov was interrogated in Gorky (until he was called up for the Army in autumn 1980), KGB official wanted to know if Smirnov had used a typewriter during working hours, and whether he had voiced opinions on political matters. Shuvalov replied in the negative.

The 'chats' continued for two days.

On 14 March, at about 10 pm, Svetlana Probatova (b. 1944) and Elena Sannikova (b. 1959) were detained by several policemen and 'plain-clothes' officers on Melidovo Station, where they were waiting by the 'October' railway line for the train to Moscow.

The following were confiscated: Probatova's manuscript on social security in the USSR, documents of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled, N. Ya. Mandel'shtam's memoirs and some notebooks. Sannikova and Probatova 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 Melidovo 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 luggag office at the station. Station employees told that 'officials' had taken them.

On 30 April Probatova 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, where 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 mentally unstable and if she continued her 'activities', she could easily go mad.
In December 1980 Group member Olga Zaitseva (Chronicle 60) travelled to Chistopol (Tatar ASSR) to see F. Khusainov (Chronicle 60), another member. On 23 December several military police 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 Khusainov. Zaitseva then had a 'chat' with a man who introduced himself as 'KGB official Teleshin'. "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 3 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.

On 7 January V. Banilov, Assistant Procurator of Chistopol, replied:

...You were detained by security officials in the grounds of a secret establishment, while you were trying to photograph this institution. Your camera has been returned to you, but the film was spoiled when it was developed.

On 9 March Zaitseva's husband, Group member V. Feofilov (Chronicle 60), received a reply from E.A. Dmitrievsky, Senior Assistant Procurator of the Tatar ASSR:

...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 the film's value of 35 kopeks, since it turned out to be spoiled.

**EVENTS IN THE UKRAINE**

**The Trial of Altunyan**

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) arrested 16 December 1980 - Chronicle 60). He was charged under article 62 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.

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 'brilliant cinematographic equipment mechanic G.O. Altunyan before the start of the show'.

Altunyan submitted the following petitions: that he be given time to sort out his copy of the indictment (its pages were out of order and corrections had been made in pencil and in ink), by comparing it with the copy in the court's possession; that the following be summoned as witnesses: S.K. Podolsky (in connection with the search on 30 May 1980 - Chronicle 57), A. Ya. Litvin and A.A. Tolchinsky (in connection with the charge of 'circulating deliberately false fabrications' - Chronicle 61); that the forensic expert be called to clarify the 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. (For which he was given 20 minutes) last.

Altunyan was charged that:

- In June 1973 he had described the sending of troops into Czechoslovakia and Mongolia as an invasion, and said that it would be better for the Soviet Union to employ the resources it allocated to socialist and developing countries for helping its own people (Kosul's testimony);
- In May 1977, while visiting V. Borovsky (Chronicles 49-51) in a psychiatric hospital, Altunyan had said that insane people were kept in mad-houses in the USSR (Dr Gritsenko's testimony);
- Altunyan had given the father of V. Borovsky a photocopy of an article in French about Borovsky, which included his photograph (Zinchenko testified that he had seen this photocopy in Altunyan's home; it was confiscated from V. Borovsky's father);
- In September 1979 Altunyan had told Zinchenko and Ndobora that the Helsinki Agreement would benefit only the Soviet Union, and he had spoken favourably of Sakharov and Grigorenko (Zinchenko's testimony); witness Ndobora's testimony should be disregarded, since he has a personal interest in the case;
- Altunyan had given Turovets a copy of The Gulag Archipelago by Solzhenitsyn and Living History from 1917 to
1975 by Korovin. Turovets' testimony: Korovin and Sazonko 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 had told his colleagues Petrenko, Timofeyev and Titov, in the presence of KGB Captain Shafarinov (Chronicle 49), that the state had delegated its responsibilities in the field of domestic policy to the KGB (testimony of Petrenko, Timofeyev and Titov):

"A Short Note on Two Conversations" and sent it abroad to the Chronicle of Current Events, published in New York. It was not cited against him at his last trial. Altunyan had 'fabricated a slanderous text entitled A Short Note on Two Conversations' and published in A Chronicle of Current Events, published in New York. It was not cited against him at his last trial.

In February 1985, Altunyan had enclosed 'slanderous poems by N. Rudenko' in a letter to Yury Belyaev, 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 Kharkov KGB, and not all of the Kharkov KGB, but specifically Babushkin, Yakovenko, Sidelnik, Murzin and Drotenko: I wish to state that I went on hunger-strike for 23 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 my visit to Borovsky, but investigator Yakovenko did not even wish to know his name, and threatened to search his home when I mentioned it. The testimony of Borovsky's mother cannot be taken as proof of his innocence. Incidentally, not one witness has testified to my talks with Gritsenko, since she says only that she and her husband visited us at home on that day, but she did not hear our conversation...I did not have the first and second volumes of the book The Gulag Archipelago: consequently, I did not give them to anyone.

Judge, do you say this because they were not confiscated from you?

Altunyan: I say it because I really did not have them. I did have the third volume, but I did not give it to anyone.

Judge, do you explain the fact that Turovets gave such evidence against you?

Altunyan: By the fact that he was interrogated for four days. Several hours per day. He himself later told me about the KGB's threats. He denied that he obtained the books from me, and his wife denied it. Then they asked his wife to name their friends, they interrogated these people, and Korovin testified that he got the book volumes 1, 2 and 3 from Turovets, after which Turovets testified under pressure that he got the books from me.

Judge, have you read these books? Altunyan: Yes.

Judge, where did you get them from?

Altunyan: I don't remember...

Judge, did you say that the state had delegated its responsibilities in the field of domestic policy to the KGB?

Altunyan: Yes.

Judge, what have you to say about the document 'A Short Note on Two Conversations'?

Altunyan: I vouch for every letter of that document. Everything in it, down to the last full stop, is true, but I did not send it abroad.

Judge, do you have to say about the fact that you sent Rudenko's slanderous poems to Belyaev?

Altunyan: Those 'slanderous' poems were published in Pravda. I know Rudenko personally, I am proud to know him, and I consider him a fine poet. I set the poems to music because he was in Russia and would have liked to read something in Ukrainian.

Judge, The New York-published Chronicle of Current Events, containing a slanderous article about you, was confiscated from you. How did this article arrive abroad?

Altunyan: Firstly, it is all true and not slander, and secondly, the Chronicle is published in Moscow and the article was reprinted without my knowledge...
Altunyan and his wife were seriously ill, and that Altunyan's father was dying.

Dr Gritsenko did not appear in court - but her testimony, and demanded the maximum penalty for Altunyan. The defence lawyer noted that none of the points in the indictment had been proved, except Altunyan's conversation with his colleagues (the director of Kinotekhprom' Cinema and Yakovenko). The KGB have thrown down a dangerous challenge to the organs of justice. I am afraid that Kharkov justice will pioneer the way for a return to the sort of Stalinism under which one point in the indictment. My guilt has not been proved, I do not admit any guilt, and so I do not ask for leniency.

The Procurator upheld 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 incriminating 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 punished in an undemocratic and unconstitutional manner. The defence lawyer noted that none of the points in the indictment had been proved, except Altunyan's conversation with his colleagues. He pointed out, in particular, that Altunyan and his wife were seriously ill, and that Altunyan's father was dying.

Recent mistakes are still fresh in our minds. Before you reach your verdict, 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.

For a return to the sort of Stalinism under which...
Prisoners’ Day. Let us support it.

On 11 January, on their way back from a friend’s birthday party, they passed up one leaflet along the way. Naboka, Lokhvitskaya and Chernyavskaya put up another leaflet in 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, at which a policeman was standing. He detained all three of them, Milyavsky and Parkhonenko, who arrived in the next trolleybus, were also detained. They were all taken to the police station, where they were subjected to body searches. One leaflet was found on Naboka and a second on Parkhonenko. On the arrival of a KGB official they were taken to various police stations, not official 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 Devilds and The Fateful Eggs. His father-in-law’s archive (the so-called WPCEC), 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 radio dictionary (words used in the period 1920-50), which Milyavsky had compiled himself, and an issue of the newspaper Israel Today were confiscated. A radio and a typewriter were confiscated from Chernyavskaya. The same day Parkhonenko was released: ‘Pray for your child, we are letting you go for her sake’ (Parkhonenko and Naboka have a daughter, born in 1979).

Senior Investigator V.B. Tarnovsky of the Kiev Procuracy was in charge of the case. The accused did not deny the actions with which they were charged, nor their critical attitude to Soviet reality; they related many facts about their lives, a number of which were used by the investigation as material for the indictment. For example, Milyavsky testified that he had read an issue of the journal Kontinent. The accused also testified that in the summer of 1980 they had tried to make a hectographic plate for printing leaflets (about Afghani- tan) for the Moscow Olympics, but were unsuccessful. Unfortunately they were unable to persuade the accused to recant, promising to close the case if they did so; he also threatened to charge them with ‘malicious hooliganism’. Witness Andrei Coryn gave extensive evidence.

From 25 to 29 June the Kiev City Court, presided over by V.N. Malboanenko, heard the case of Sergei Vladimirovich Naboka (b. 1935; he was in his final year as an external student at Kiev University’s Faculty of Journalism; he was employed as an editor by the publishing house ‘Mistetstvo’); Leonid Iavlislavich Milyavsky (b. 1951; a graduate of the Spanish Department of the Institute of Foreign Languages; he worked as a translator from German at the Ukrainian Technical Information Research Institute); Larisa Yurevna Lokhvitskaya (b. 1955; he was in his final year as an external student at Kiev University’s Computer Centre of the Railway Administration); and Inna Borisovna Chernyavskaya (b. 1954; a graduate of the Biology Faculty of Kiev University; she worked at the Endocrinology Institute and was preparing to defend her thesis). They were charged under article 185-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 190-1 of the Russian Code). The state prosecutor was Procurator L.M. Abramenko: the social accusers were S.R. Tkach and L.D. Gogolev (from the publishing house ‘Mistetstvo’). The defence lawyers were: Makarenko (for Naboka), Fedorenko (for Milyavsky), Karpenko (for Lokhvitskaya) and Safonova (for Chernyavskaya).

Only a ‘special public’ was allowed into the courtroom. The families of the defendants were summoned as witnesses and were not questioned until the penultimate day of the trial (this prevented them attending the trial earlier).

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;

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

Naboka was charged with:
- in 1976 he wrote the poem ‘Grant Us, O Lord’, in which he claimed that there was a lack of freedom in the USSR; he included in this poem, ‘in collaboration with a person unknown, he prepared a slanderous document “At the Crossroads: Pseudosocialism”’, 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’;
- at the beginning of 1980 he wrote a poem entitled ‘Pray for Your Child’, in which he claimed that the USSR was an empire.

In 1980 he wrote the document ‘No: 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.

Milyavsky and Naboka that at the end of 1978 they ‘circulated’ issue No. 8 of Kontinent (the only criminal item found in it was Solzhenitsyn’s “Spanish Interview”).

Lokhvitskaya and Chernyavskaya were charged that:
Guilty. According to the judgment, the defendants:

At the start of the trial, Naboka presented a petition Ukrainian - this was denied. The defendants pleaded not guilty. According to the judgment, the defendants:

- In 1980 they 'compiled and circulated a text in the form of a slanderous poem', in which they claimed that dissidents were persecuted in the USSR and tried to justify the activity - hostile to the USSR - of renegades from the ranks of ordinary citizens;
- In 1980 they 'compiled a document of slanderous content' entitled 'Charter', in which they claimed that society in the USSR was being militarized, dissidents were suppressed, great power chauvinism and any sort of discussion between the USSR's peoples were being kindled, and the economy had fallen into decay.

It was cited against Naboka, Milyavsky, Lokhvitskaya and Chernyavskaya that:

- 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 (in fact, the defendants were unable to carry out their plan and they 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' these are the words of the judgment: the full title, 'The Prospects for Filling the Spiritual Vacuum of Soviet Society', was not included in the judgment); in which they claimed that the USSR lacked democratic freedoms, that the Soviet state system was one of 'Soviet imperialism', and where they compared it to a fascist regime;
- in 1980 they compiled a 'Manifesto' in which they claimed that a 'spontaneous act of power' had been put forward for an extension of human rights and democratic freedoms in the USSR. It proved impossible to find out what happened to the said document in the course of the investigation. A second copy of the 'Manifesto', made by Naboka, was confiscated from him during the search of his flat; in fact, only Naboka's note 'Some Reflections' on the 'Manifesto' was confiscated during the search of his flat; this note was all that was known to the investigators about the 'Manifesto';
- In 1980 they 'compiled a document of slanderous content' entitled 'Charter', in which they claimed that society in the USSR was being militarized, dissidents were suppressed, great power chauvinism and any sort of discussion between the USSR's peoples were being kindled, and the economy had fallen into decay.

It was charged that in 1981 Lokhvitskaya compiled the text of a leaflet entitled 'Charter', in which she claimed that a 'spontaneous act of power' had been put forward for an extension of human rights and democratic freedoms in the USSR. It proved impossible to find out what happened to the said document in the course of the investigation. A second copy of the 'Manifesto', made by Naboka, was confiscated from him during the search of his flat; in fact, only Naboka's note 'Some Reflections' on the 'Manifesto' was confiscated during the search of his flat; this note was all that was known to the investigators about the 'Manifesto';

It was charged that in 1981 Lokhvitskaya compiled the text of a leaflet entitled 'Charter', in which she claimed that a 'spontaneous act of power' had been put forward for an extension of human rights and democratic freedoms in the USSR. It proved impossible to find out what happened to the said document in the course of the investigation. A second copy of the 'Manifesto', made by Naboka, was confiscated from him during the search of his flat; in fact, only Naboka's note 'Some Reflections' on the 'Manifesto' was confiscated during the search of his flat; this note was all that was known to the investigators about the 'Manifesto';

In March a search was carried out at the home of Kraviz-
sky, who is serving his exile sentence in Tiumen Region.

On 26 March a search was carried out at the home of M.V. Surovtseva (Chronicle 54) in Uman. 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. Domogetskaya.

On 1 April a search was carried out at the home of the imprisoned L. Lukyanenko in Kiev, where Surovtseva usually stayed when she came to the city. Surovtseva's memorials, tapes of her oral stories, and documentary material relating to Domogetskaya'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 investigation. 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 handbag and ran off towards the main road, where a car was waiting for him: he got into it and drove off. The handbag contained her passport and poems by N. Rudenko (Chronicle 61) which had evaded 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). R. 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 Grigory Gurchak (Chronicle 48) and his wife Lyudmila Litovchenko (Chronicle 367). KGB officials refused to explain which case the search was connected with, mentioning only the article - article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code. Gurchak himself was not at home - he had been collected from work for interrogation. Litovchenko was interrogated after the search. The questions were mainly about V. 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 several 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 N.F. Shevchenko (Chronicle 53) issued L. Murzhenko with a warning "according to the Decree".

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 theft-like 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 Ukrainian Criminal Code, turn his works into material evidence in the case, and thus, once and for all, bury...
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 UVD, Noyikov, informed Semyannikova that Antsupov had been charged under article 187-1 of the Criminal Code. On 28 April the Head of the Investigations Department of the Kharkov Regional Procurator-General informed Semyannikova that Antsupov had been charged with trying to escape, to hinder the流通 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 29 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 ask that I and my children be allowed to leave as soon as possible to go and live permanently in another country.

Kiev

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

Kiev

On 31 March the appeal in the case of Stepan Khmara, Vitaly Shevchenko and Alexander Shevchenko (for their trial see Chronicle 60) was heard in the Ukrainian Supreme Court. The defendants' wives, and also Raisa Rudenko, were present. The court left the sentences unchanged.

On 20 May Lieutenant A.V. Khomov of the Ukrainian KGB asked A. Shevchenko's wife Lydya 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 (V. 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: 'Khmara 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. Badzhi).

She is threatened with arrest if she should go.

In April, KGB officials had several talks with Galina
Melnik, wife of historian Mikhail Melnik, who committed suicide (Chronicle 53). She was asked about her 'untrustworthy' acquaintances.

On 11 June, Senior Lieutenant Zimin conducted a search in connection with 'Case No. 14' at the home of Tetsyna Ragazovskaya (the warrant was signed by Major Sinbakhanyan - Chronicle 52). The following were confiscated: a manuscript (of about 300 pages) by the Odessa prose writer Lovov, who has emigrated to Israel; Orwell (in English); Koryagin's article 'The State and Us'; several typewritten articles about V. Vysotsky; and notebooks over 20 items were listed in the record.

After the search Ragazovskaya was interrogated. She was asked about the books she read, about the people she knew. The interrogator, introducing himself as the 'Head of one of the Departments', asked her not to mention any conversation with him. Ragozovskaya retorted: 'I don't know who you are', he said that his name was 'Zakharenko'.

On 15 June Ragazovskaya was given back one of her notebooks at the KGB's headquarters. She was asked to collaborate with the KGB, and, in conclusion, was issued a warrant 'according to the Decree'.2J.

Lovov
In February Atena Pashko's telephone was disconnected.

Kharkov
I.M. Moshkovich was summoned by the KGB at the beginning of May. Colonel Protzenko warned him, 'according to the Decree', to stop his 'anti-Soviet activities', and said that if Moshkovich went on 9 May to the monument to the victims of fascism (near the tractor factory on the site of May. Colonel Drotenko warned him, 'according to the Decree', 'do not waste your strength'.

On 9 May about 80 people (150 were intending to come, but many of them were 'warned', like Moshkovich) gathered at the monument, laid wreaths, and said the Kaddish 'Jewish Prayer for the Dead'. A hundred of 'observers' stood by.

See also 'Persecution of the Working Commission', 'The Right to Leave' and 'After Release'.

EVENTS IN ARMENIA

The Trial of Manucharyan, Apikyan and Melkonyan

On 22 March the Armenian Supreme Court, presided over by Dr. Asatryan, examined the case of Alexander Manucharyan, Doctor of Historical Science (b. 1929; arrested 14 May 1980 - there is an inaccuracy in Chronicle 57), Ashot Apikyan and Sahak Melkonyan. They were charged under Articles 65 of the Armenian Criminal Code (20 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 Il'yanov.

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 Ghoklanyan 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 art history and drawing in a secondary school in the village of Chichkhan. Melkonyan taught German in a secondary school in the village of Idamashen.

The Trial of Margarit Arutyunyan, Vartan Arutyunyan, Mкрtrchyan, Kigvart and Agababyan

From 29 March to 9 April the Armenian Supreme Court examined the case of Margarit Arutyunyan (b. 1940), Vartan Arutyunyan (b. 1941), Ishkhan (Prince) Mкрtrchyan (b. 1957), Samuel Kigvart (b. 1959) and Oghanes Agababyan (b. 1958). 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 'ideological leader and inspirer' as M. Arutyunyan and its 'practical leader' as Mкрtrchyan. 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 illuminates 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 maw of communism 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'.

Mкрtrchyan defended the basic idea in Awetis Agaroyan'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
Kanayan'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 ESTONIA

The Trials of Kalep, Niitsoo and Madisson

On 17 March the Supreme Court of the Estonian SSR sentenced
Veljo Kalep (born 1934, arrested 20 October 1980
- Chronicle 60) to two years in strict-regime camps, accor-ding 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 Niitsoo (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
Criminal 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.

The Trial of Vaiciunas

On 25 March engineer Vytautas Vaiciunas (Chronicle 61),
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
Committee 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 Siluva, or to the cemetery on All
Souls Day, treated as crimes?

EVENTS IN LITHUANIA

The Trial of Vaiciunas

On 25 March engineer Vytautas Vaiciunas (Chronicle 61),
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
Committee of the Lithuanian CP:

...You have found no documents to prove that I orga-nized
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?

...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 Macislovas Jurevicius (Chronicle 66), a member
of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group and a worker (recently
he had been working as a sacristan in a church), was arrested
in Stalinal. (After the arrest of Vaiciunas and Jurevicius,
two members of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group remained at liberty - Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene and Fr Bronius Laurinavius.

On 25 and 26 June the Supreme Court of the Lithuanian SSR, with Judge Ignotas presiding, examined the case against Jurevicius. 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 Tytuvai to Siluva in August 1979 and August 1980.

The accused pleaded not guilty and stated that he had participated as an ordinary believer in the processions mentioned in the charges.

The court considered it an aggravating circumstance that Jurevicius had already served a sentence under Stalin, he was given a 25-year sentence for allegedly leading a 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, 30% of people in Lithuania are atheists and 70% are believers. I'm 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 been there 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. And their number will increase, even though I - as 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 Stanislavskis, Sadunaites, Kovaliuses and Skudasis 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!'

Forty-six Lithuanians sent a declaration to the Central Committee of the Lithuanian CP concerning the trials of Vaitkus and Jurevicius:

...We protest
1. at the sentencing of innocent people for their participation in religious processions, that is, for their convictions (so far, the authorities have not given permission for such processions);
2. at the refusal to admit relatives and friends of the accused to an open trial, while only secret agents, their guests, policemen and soldiers were admitted.

PERSECUTION OF BELIEVERS

Lithuanians in Estonia

From 31 July to 3 August 1980 a summer camp for young Christians was conducted in the settlement of Medemeeste 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 Villju 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 of tents from the grove.

On 1 August the camp was set up beside the Lutheran church on settlement territory. The doucement of the local church was 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 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 Tilt Pidam, a fifth-year student of architecture at the Estonian State Institute of Art, was expelled from the Institute under the following circumstances.

Pidam 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: he was released in spring 1981). A few minutes after this meeting took place, two men in plain clothes searched Pidam on suspicion of theft and made him go with them to KGB headquarters. During an interrogation, in the course of which Pidam'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
been his doing: the order had come from the KGB.

Catholics in Lithuania

On 23 April the Catholic Committee to Defend Believers' Rights sent Document 67 to N. Sybenko, 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 Kaubys, deputy chairman of the Kaisaiodis 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 Jasanienie. This arbitrary behaviour on the part of the Soviet officials was prompted by the disgraceful behaviour of Fr Paulikas, 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 Kindeikai... 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 lay people subject to the godless). And we are convinced that the Soviet regime does not want to drive the Church in Lithuania underground.

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 strict-regime camps.

The Trial of Ardahevanidze and Sayapina

From 16 to 23 March Nativa Valkyevna Ardahevanidze (born 1959) and Maria Vasilevna Sayapina (born 1930), 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 Donpropetrovsk and Vera Stepanovna Kaduk (born 1927) from Kalinin, facing charges under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code, were on trial in Kalinin. Kaduk was charged 'subject to 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 and Kaduk - two years in ordinary-regime camps. Kovalchuk - three years in ordinary-regime camps

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 19 May an article by V. Nesterova, 'Secrets revealed', was published in the Kalinin paper "Kalininskaia Pravda": ...Kaduk, Kovalchuk and Fokanov were engaged in setting up an underground publishing centre, from which the dirty, lying pamphlets, 'open letters', and so on, that they produced oozed out all over the country... A powerful electric motor was found in the house. Kaduk had four typewriters, a hectograph and a duplicator, large scores of printing ink, typing and carbon paper, 85 packets of printing paper and other printing materials...

The Trial of Galetsky and Chulkova

On 16 and 25 March Nikolai Nikolaevich Galetsky, a minister of the All-Union Church of True and Free Seventh-Day Adventists (TSDAs) (born 1948, arrested 1 July 1980 - Chronicle 57), and Maria Sergeyevna Chulkova (born 1947), were facing charges under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code, were on trial in Ryazan. In addition, Galetsky was charged under article 227, part 1, of the Code ("Violation of the personality and rights of citizens under the guise of performing religious rites"). The investigation was carried out by A. Kh. Kukorev, a Senior Investigator of the Ryazan Procuracy. Galetsky was sentenced to five years, Chulkova to three years, in ordinary-regime camps.

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 187-2 of the Ukrainian Code.

The Trial of Genchuk

In May Anna Trofimovna Genchuk (born 1936, arrested 12 March - Chronicle 61) was sentenced to two-and-a-half years in camp, 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 TSDAs)

On 29 January Nikolai Filipchenko and Evgeny Cherkish, residents of Vinnitsa, were fined 50 roubles each for being present at a religious gathering. On 12 March KGB officials in Kherion grabbed Lyubov Gatus and took her to a venerological clinic of the custodial type. 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 Taranenko was beaten up in Kiev. Earlier he had often been threatened with a beating. On 20 March KGB officials detained Olga Zalomunya in the village of Davideko (in the Chechen-Ingush ASSR) and took her to Grozny, where they arranged an interrogation at the Procurator's Office. After the interrogation Zalomunya 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 Zaleznova 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 TFSDAs ends with these words:

At present it is those of our fellow-believers who sent to court their written testimonies in defence of Vladimir Andreyevich Shelkov, leader of our Church (Chronicles 51, 55), 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 TFSDAs.

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 decisively 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 TFSDAs" - 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 atheistic 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 atheistic violence and coercion - are continuing their criminal activity with redoubled energy. While increasing state repression, they are spreading slanderous fabrications about our Church among the people...

Hypocrisy, deception and misinformation of world public opinion are the favourite means used by the persecutors of pure religion and the believers 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 are unscrupulously violating the international agreements and commitments they themselves have made, while carrying out 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 fulfil 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. 90

**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 Drozdy psychiatry hospital.

The Trial of Bolko

On 29 September 1980 Nikolai Bolko (born 1922), leader of the Odessa Baptist congregation, was arrested in Odessa. In the middle of December an Odessa court sentenced Bolko 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 personal liberty and rights of citizens under the guise of performing religious rites').

All who wanted to attend the trial were allowed into the courtroom. Bolko refused to take part in the proceedings. Among the witnesses questioned were the headmistress of School No. 23, R.R. Tali (from her evidence: I visited the prayer house more than once... This sect's efficient organization surprised me... They give lessons...taught by modern methods, which lead to young people becoming more active. I was also amazed that 60 to 70 young people were present at the services'), Concharuk, A.S. Frus, Ros- zyna, Petrenko, Kryvchuk, Ratkova and Volnikov (they stated that the local Baptist congregation had increased its activities since Bolko had come to Odessa), and also the believers Sukhina and deacon Timychak (who had led the congregations before Bolko). 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, Bolko 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, Bolko was exculpated. In 1968 Bolko was arrested: at the time of his arrest his exculpation certificate was confiscated and has still not been returned. The court then sentenced Bolko, 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 Kobko's case is unjust and inhuman. The declaration carries 122 signatures.

The Trial of Lakatosh, Deshko and Fenchak
On 21 March, in the town of Vovkiv, Rovno Region, presbyter Nikolai Lakatosh and Mikhail Deshko and Vasiliy Fenchak each received sentences of three years in ordinary-regime camps, under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Code (for arrest - see Chronicle 61) under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code. Lakatosh was arrested on 30 November 1980, Lakatosh and Deshko on 8 January 1981.

The Trial of Levitsenyuk
On 3 April, in the town of Dubno, Rovno Region, presbyter Anatoli Levitsenyuk 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). Levitsenyuk suffers from polyarthritis. He has eight children.

The Trial of Kosorezov
On 14 April the Voroshilovgrad Regional Court sentenced Aleksei Kosorezov, 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, Chairwoman 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.

Arrests264
On 11 January V.M. Shehenko was arrested in Sumy. 40 Baptists from Sum 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, Oshek Region. A criminal investigation was also initiated there against Maria Tyoma, an invalid of the third group. On 31 March Nikolai Dikman was arrested in the settlement of Maryanovka, Oshek 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 arelice 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, 541, 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. Pirozhkov (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 roubles, and immediately the sum of 50 roubles 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 61) 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.M. 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 Syncheva, 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 F.N. Okuneva, have been fined 1,000 roubles 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...

On 1 November searches took place in four houses; many hymn-books and various religious manuscripts were taken away.

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 members 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. 1 Cosatov 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 torment women
On 7 December 1980 a prayer-meeting in Krasnodor was broken up. On the street, they beat and kicked him, while Loban tried to choke Alexander Drilbukhod and beat him so that there was a great deal of blood beside the car and inside it.

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. Drilbukhod and S.G. Germanyuk.

On the same day, in the village of Nezruki, a search (unnoticed 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 46 Flitaov 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.N. Balatsky, father of six small children, was taken straight from work to the district police headquarters and sentenced to eight days' imprisonment.

On the eve of 3 June, the feast of the Velikoretskoye ikon of St. 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 Alexeyevich 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...
On the night of 6-7 August 1980 Kurnosov was detained in Moscow by the police officers. Afterward 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. The investigation lasted three and a half months, and in May 1980 it was closed after Kurnosov wrote a complaint to the Central Committee of the CPSU about his illegal detention, illegal dispatch to a psychiatric clinic, and illegal psychiatric examinations.

On 2 September 1980 Kurnosov was arrested at home (his wife had crossed out ‘Liable for military service’ and added ‘Husar’ in his passport). On 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 sane, and Kurnosov was discharged. He wrote a complaint to the Central Committee of the CPSU about emigrating to the USA. He did not receive a reply.

On 24 May Kurnosov sent his passport and a 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 added ‘Husar’ in his passport.

On 2 December Kurnosov studied the case file, in which, besides the testimonies of the policemen who had detained him, were Kurnosov’s statements to the USSR Supreme Soviet about the renunciation of his citizenship and his application to emigrate to the USA. (Lyakishev said to Kurnosov that he had ‘created too much of a fuss’ in connection with his desire to leave, so he should be made to sit it out for a while — ‘to cool down’).

The trial took place on 19 and 22 December 1980. The charge of ‘malicious hoolliganism’ was in the end changed to article 192-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code (‘Insulting a police officer...’), since the duty policeman Lieutenant Zelenov, called on behalf of Kurnosov, gave evidence that contradicted the evidence given at the pre-trial investigation: Kurnosov ‘did not insult anyone’, ‘did not swear foully’, and behaved ‘politely and correctly’. Another witness, detained with Kurnosov in the suburban train on the night of 6-7 August, gave similar evidence.

The court considers that Kurnosov’s guilt in insulting police officers in the course of their duty to preserve the peace has been fully proven by the evidence of Antipin, Budkin, Privoten, Glebov and Zelenov, that Kurnosov has been charged with using foul language over a lengthy period of time while under detention at ‘Platform 47 kms’ and in the duty office of the police station. This part contains conflicting evidence of witnesses, Glebov and Zelenov allege that he did not swear, the rest of the witnesses — that he did. There are doubts concerning their evidence which must be interpreted in favour of the accused.

The sentence — six months of ordinary-regime camps (maximum term under this article).

At the beginning of March 1981 Kurnosov was released from imprisonment and started living at his wife’s place of residence. On 14 April he applied to the Ramenskoye Police Department for a permit to live there, and sent a similar application to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The chief police officer gave Kurnosov a written warning that he was violating the registration rules and asked him to leave Ramenskoye. On 26 May Kurnosov sent his passport and a statement renouncing his citizenship to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. On 25 May he declared a hunger-strike of
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-strike. 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 come on 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 up 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. Ragdanov, the also tried Yu. Grint - Chronicle 58 - and A. Livot - Chronicle 60, examined the case of Doctor of Technical Science Viktor Luviash Brailovsky (born 1936; arrested 13 November 1980 - Chronicle 60, charged with article 190-1 of the KSPR Code) under the trial of the pre-trial investigation Brailovsky studied the case file without a barrister; he was immediately refused a substitute barrister by the court and conducted his defence himself. Brailovsky was charged with compiling, producing 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 journal: that a cultural decline could be observed in the USSR, 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 exactly from whom. 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 Shashkov (Chronicle 61) 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. To the question which of the other signatories of the letter he knew (about 40 people), Shashkov said that it would be simpler to ask whom he did not know. Shashkov had never once seen the journal. Prazdnikova, after reminding Shashkov of his testimony at the pre-trial investigation that he had once been present at a scientific seminar in Brailovsky’s flat, asked what kind of a seminar it had been, what had been discussed the time Shashkov had been there. He replied that it was a seminar of mathematicians and physicists; when he had been present, the subject of discussion was the Beilis case of 1911. “You see, said Prazdnikova, you say ‘mathematicians and physicists’, but you discussed subjects which should have interested you.” (However, Brailovsky was not charged with taking part in the seminar; it was not mentioned in the judgment.)

Vladimir Prazdnikova (Chronicle 61) refused to answer the court’s questions, stating that he considered the trial a closed one, and was unable to give evidence at such a trial.

Grigory Kreidlin (Chronicle 62, 63) testified that he had received the journal 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.

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
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 (corrective labour for up to one year or a fine of up to 200 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 Victor 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 years after applying to emigrate, he was dismissed 'on redundancy grounds'. For one-and-a-half years he looked for work in his specialist field without success. He gave private lessons, and has recently been working as a secretary.

The Case of Chernobylsk

2 May is the Worldwide 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 pass off without interference. However, this year under various pretexts several Jews were summoned to their local police stations. The KGB officers 'warned' them of the possible 'consequences' of their taking part in the activities in Ovrazhki. Some were threatened with criminal liability, others were promised that the path to Israel would be 'closed' to them for ever. Among those warned were P. Abramovich (Chronicle 61), V. Prestit (see above), Yu. Koshelevsky (Chronicle 61), A. Gurevich (Chronicle 61), L. Tesmenitsky (Chronicle 60), V. Brodsky (Chronicle 60), M. and G. Kremen (Chronicle 50), M. Chernobylsky (Chronicle 50), M. Livovsky, A. Expert, M. Yakobson, I. Sheyngold (Chronicles 50, 61) and L. Makar-Limanov (Chronicle 61).

Many Jews were telephoned at home and pressure was put on them, too, not to go to Ovrazhki, with threats of 'consequences'. 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, Livovsky 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:
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 these talks, 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 no directive 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 on you and the department of which you are head.

On Sunday 10 May about 150 Jews assembled in a wood, a kilometre from Ovralshki 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 'ceremonial' part began. A veteran of the Great Patriotic War, S.A. Vantovsky, reminded those present of the tragedy of the Jews - six million of whose clothes 'accompanied' the group. At the same time the cleaning of the wood was 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.

At 10.30 the 'ceremonial' part began. A veteran of the Great Patriotic War, S.A. Vantovsky, reminded those present of the tragedy of the Jews - six million of whose clothes 'accompanied' the group. At the same time the cleaning of the wood was 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.

On 9 June Chernobylsky was detained on the street in Moscow and sent to Krasnogorsk - 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.

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 term of imprisonment changed: part 1 is one year, under part 2 - five years).

On 12 June Chernobylsky was released on a written undertaking not to leave the city. On 23 June he began to study the case file. The case was nevertheless still not opened: interrogations continued. In the case materials there are testimonies of 10 and 11 May from all the policemen and voluntary police which say nothing about Brechko's physical attempt to detain Chernobylsky, the latter's resistance or about any violence on his part.

On 18 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 term of imprisonment changed: part 1 is one year, under part 2 - five years).

On Chernobylsky's petition, Popov, Temenitsky, 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 141 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.)

At the beginning of May Tokar sent a statement to the KGB in which he asks, 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'.

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

On 20 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. The one who started the conversation called himself Valery Pavlovich, then he introduced the second one as his boss. In a conversation which took place later on
3. View of the approach to the Lyublino District People's Court in Moscow during the trial of Tatiana 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 school-teacher sentenced to 15 years for a self-defence speech in court and for 'agitation' in camp.

6. Friends of longstanding dissenter Genrikh Altunyan, some of whose names featured in his trial. Sentence: 12 years. Back row, l to r: Vladimir Ponomarev, Arseny Podolsky, Vladimir Nedobora, Arkady Levin, Alexander Kalinovsky, Roman Kaplan; front row: Sofia Karasik (wife of Nedobora), Petr Grigorenko, Tamara Levin, Andrei Grigorenko, Kharkov, 1974. 7 & 8. Leonid Milyavsky (l), a translator and Sergel 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 Komarenitsky — 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 Viciunas, engineer and member of Lithuanian Helsinki Group; sentence: 2½ years.


15. Galina Ukhtomskaya, Pentecostal activist (Chronicle 57) eventually allowed to emigrate, with her son Pavel (b. 1969).
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 Kislekov, 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.

20. Vasiliy Kovalchuk, b. 1957, from Dnipropetrovsk: 3 years.
21. Ivan Fokanov of Moscow, b. 1952: 3 years. 22. His brother Vladimir Fokanov, b. 1956: 3 years.
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 Chernobytsky was arrested and later given one year in a labour camp.

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 Natasha Shcharansky. Viktor Brailovsky, refusenik, Moscow scientist. 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. 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.
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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 (i.e. KGB 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 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 Ilmaha, Telonya District, Voronezh Region, where two families live (the Fiskarevs 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

31. Alexandra Kozorezova of Voroshilovgrad Region, Ukraine, sentenced to 3 years in camps (suspended) for chairing the Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives, with her ten children. 32. Her husband Aleksei Kozorezov, sentenced a few days earlier, also to 3 years. 33. Nikolai Boiko, b. 1922, leader of an Odessa Baptist community, given 5 years in camps. Earlier he had spent 24 years in captivity under the Nazis and 20 in the USSR.
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 Sciences, 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 is a legal limit of two 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 to you by 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 1968 forbids that letters be readdressed to those organizations against which the complaint is being made. The decree makes it compulsory, 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 OVD of the Moscow City Soviet, to the Moscow Soviet, the Committees for People's Control of Moscow and the USSR, the Procurator of Moscow and the USSR, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Procuracy of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Central Committee of the CPSU and the 26th 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, there has been no reply. In every case except the deputy head of UVIR at the USSR MVD N.V. Kovalenko admitted that in the examination of my application to emigrate the above-mentioned decree had been violated in the most flagrant manner, and promised that an answer would be given me within ten days. His promise has not, of course, been kept.

Hubris and inertia are to be expected from bureaucrats. But you, an outstanding, famous physicist, not subject to the influence of deadlines and politics, have not shown me a way out. For I was counting on the common sense, objectivity and humanity of a scientist.

In the absence of a reply from UVIR, Magarik conducted his hunger-strike from 29 March to 12 April. On 30 March V. Vail (Chronicle 60) joined him, and on 2 April Vail's wife I. Sapeira (who on 30 March had been summoned to UVIR) began her own hunger-strike.

The eldest of the 'refuseniks' is 78 years old. On 12 April nine Moscow 'refuseniks' were sent to Siberia.

At the end of April an officer of the Moscow City UVIR, Zhinkenko, informed Magarik that he had been refused permission to leave for Israel as far back as February 1981, 'because he was only distantly related to those inviting him'. To the question why the refusal had not been reported at the proper time, instead of two-and-a-half months later Zhinkenko refused to reply. Magarik sent a number of letters to the highest Soviet and party bodies in which he protested against the illegal actions of the MVD UVIR.

On 23 March and 4 April, 11 Jewish 'refusenik' women arrived...
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 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 answers we have received have been either completely meaningless or incomprehensible. That the period of refusal be calculated from the time the application was made. That in this connection comrade Sorokin (of the USSR MVD) is obliged to receive within a month those of the undersigned who have disagreed with the fact or the duration of a security-based refusal. 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. They said:

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.L. Smolenskaya and A. Ku. Korostelov - issued an open letter on 26 May, in which they write that Borisov, Irina's husband, they received the refusal, dated 19 March, only on 4 May. They also state that letters and parcels hardly reach them, friends of the family are being intimidated, demands are made on them not to go to the Kapluns' house, even doctors visiting the house 'do not pass unnoticed by the KGB'.

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

In June the friends of the family, appeal to international opinion, the trade-union organizations of all countries, and all independent trade unions of the world, the Helsinki groups of all countries that participated in the Helsinki Agreement, and the International Red Cross:

Involve yourselves in the fate of these people, demand from the Soviet government that it cease this lawlessness and the cruel persecution of this family; help in its reunification!

On 12 May E. Alksayeva (see also 'The Grivina-Serebrov Case') was summoned to Moscow Regional OVIR where its chief, Romanenkov, in the presence of a man 'in civilian clothes', announced that she had been refused permission to emigrate...
For lack of the motive of family reunification. Then 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 OVIR had refused to allow Irina McClellan to join her husband, and he is not allowed an entry visa into the USSR (Chronicles 41, 45).

On 10 April 1981 Irina McClellan brought a suit in the district court: referring to article 19 of the Code on Marriage and 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 OVIR 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". I. McClellan lodged a personal complaint which was examined by the Moscow City Court on 28 April (Judges Koshewnikova, Kiske and Ketova). Alekseyeva's judgment was ruled to be correct.

29 'refusenik' Jews have sent a statement to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

We, the undersigned, as a protest against the lawless actions of OVIR, which violate the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, refuse to take part in the supplementary elections to the Council of Nationalities in Moscow City Electoral District No. 1, set for 12 April 1981.

Since February OVIR has not been accepting invitations on which the seals of validity have 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". This document reports on the arrest and conviction of K. Fridman, the arrest of E. Lein, Ya. Lokshin and V. Taiseman, 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. The US legal norms and laws regulating matters of emigration are lacking, therefore citizens wishing to leave the USSR cannot complain through legal channels about the acts 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.

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 EC, burst into the flat. He insisted that the lecture be stopped, and the lecturer continued to speak and the audience to listen. Police photographers took photographs without interruption of everyone there and of the doors of the flat. Then they began to remove the audience from the flat by force. In the commotion one of the policemen who had pushed Tatiana Finkelshtein aside said: 'She hit me!' (The next day Finkelshtein received 12 days in prison for "disturbance of the peace"). Evgeny Lein pushed away the hands of a policeman who was dragging him along: 'That constitutes resistance!'

Somin Alik, 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 UVIR 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 UVIR 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
the reception room detained them and wrote down the data in their passports. However, after they were all released.

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 she refused 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 OVD, Fradkova declared a 15-day hunger-strike (from 16 April to 2 May).

The refusenik Knokh, a teacher of Hebrew, has received a warning 'according to the Decree'46 for his participation in press conferences and for communicating with foreign correspondents.

The Trial of Fridman
On 10 March 1979 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' (the refusal to go to a job-placement commission, as at the time he was already working on a book). On the same day a judge of the Donetsky District, O. Olesnik, 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

The Trial of Kislik
On 19 March, at around 24.00 hours, Vladimir Kislik (Chronicle 57) 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 Zhuravlev, 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 OVD. 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 Svyatenky conducted the case) said that Kislik had hit Shubalin across the face without inflicting flesh wounds, and also attempted to kick witness Zhuravlev on the legs. Inspector Grabovsky of the Shevchenko District OVD, 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 sent to the newspaper Evening Kiev under the heading 'He sent to

Six Kiev refuseniks have published the article 'The 70th Bellis Anniversary in Kiev':

...There was everything: a wild outbreak 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: '...the ordeal to which Russian Justice is being subjected in the eyes of the world is a tough one, and if the jurors emerge from it with honour, it will mean that conditions no longer exist in Russia in which an accusation of ritual murder can be squared 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 the 'Beilis case'...
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 entwos which Belis 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 except 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.
Belis was acquitted, but his 'case' lives on! Lives on in the 'Kislik case', in the 'Brailovsky case', in the 'Fridmann 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 Belis.
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. Please 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 S.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 prosecu-
tion, 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 set down. A few minutes later some young people wearing
Komsomo badge (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 in the negative. To the question
why in that case it was necessary to leave, he announced after some vacillation that it was Polikarpova's instruc-
tion. 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
not allowed to be present in court and tried to enter, a KGB officer known to many Jewish refuseniks as Misshenko
(Chronicle 40, and also below) hit her in the stomach, and would not let them in. Only a few relatives and friends
of Kislik were admitted.
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 from emig-
ing 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 Urals as a researcher in metallurgic 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,
the KGB officer known to many Jewish refuseniks as Misshenko (Chronicle 40, and also below) hit her in the stomach,
and was kept 'for observation'.
On 7 July the Moscow Helsinki Group 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.
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. Tereshchanko) received a reply from the Procurator of the Darnitsky District of Kiev, V. I. Kaveshnikov, 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 protest against the decision of People's Judge Kovalchuk.

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 14 and 15 May Zubko's mother A. Levitskaya (she is 68) was summoned to the local police inspector. The man who 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 his wife) 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, confiscated 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 fridge?' To the surprise of the occupants, they pulled out from underneath it an 'unloaded TT pistol'. After the search Zubko was led away. (Immediately after Zubko's arrest a Kiev refusenik happened to witness the following scene at the police station: several men entered the building chief. The pistol was in place and the hashish was in place.)

Zubko's case is being conducted by Investigator of the Darnitsky OVD V.A. Versin. Zubko is charged with possession of narcotics and a fire-arm. Versin does not reject the possibility that the hashish was planted: 'Give us the names of the people who visit the house. Maybe they put it there,' he said to Levitskaya.

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, or that he was helping many refuseniks and, by his fearless 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 - five-year imprisonment of V. Pilnikov (Chronicle 57), the arrest of V. Klisik (see above), the five-year sentences of S. Zubko (six times), I. Knizhnik (three times), I. Berenstein (twice), V. Kamensky, V. Kislik, V. Levinshtein, S. Mikhas 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 ask 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 on charges of concealing documents for the purpose of emigration. In a letter to the Board of Guardians of the Pechera District Soviet EC, Yu. Gradun: 

"I report that on 10.11.80 a specialized psychiatric ambulance was sent to our address. The patient was brought to the ambulance station. The ambulance was called out by officers of the Pechera District police station. In accordance with a directive at the station issued by a psychiatrist of the Pechera Psychoneurological Clinic (Verkhnyaya Street 4) to hospitalize our wife, Dr. N. Tishin, wrote on 24 March: 

complaints of arc in connection with attempts to hospitalize your wife. The deputy head of the Kiev City Health Department informed you of the necessity of your wife's treatment on the basis of the conclusion reached by a doctor at the Pechera Psychoneurological Clinic: the patient has not been put on the clinic's out-patient register."

On 23 March 1981 the Ocheretyanskys 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 human 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 of the Kiev City Ambulance Service, B.F. Voskodin, wrote on 24 March:

I report that on 10.11.80 a specialized psychiatric ambulance was sent to our address. The patient was brought to the ambulance station. The ambulance was called out by officers of the Pechera District police station. In accordance with a directive at 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-

trict Soviet EC and a statement by her mother. As a result of the examination a tentative diagnosis was established. With the purpose of confirming the diagnosis a hospitalization order was issued by a doctor at the Pechera Psychoneurological Clinic for an in-patient examination, in connection with which the ambulance brigade went to your address.

The deputy head of the Kiev City Health Department informed you of the necessity of your wife's treatment on the basis of the conclusion reached by a doctor at the Pechera Psychoneurological Clinic: the patient has not been put on the clinic's out-patient register."

On 27 March a search was carried out at the home of Leonid Galinovsky by Senior Investigator of the Kiev UVD M.I. Soldokin in connection with 'the case of the explosions' in Kiev between December 1980 and March 1981. The search-warrant said that 'information exists that explosive substances are being kept in the flat'. The search lasted over four hours. The items confiscated included: literature on the history of the Jews and on Israel, collections of poems by Mandelshtam, Gunst, Khlebnikov, Shershnevich and Brodsky, two books by Halonen, Kolovam by Platonov (in type-script, photocopy and verex COPIE) and a typewriter (15 items in all).

On 15 May Mikhail Elbert (a refusenik since 1979) was stopped on the street by a policeman who stated that Elbert 'ressembled a man suspected of seducing minors'. Elbert and his mother were taken to the police station and searched; Jewish literature was confiscated.

On 20 May, 14 refuseniks sent a 'Statement of claim' to the USSR Supreme Court.

In accordance with the law, we have submitted statements and all the necessary documents to the Department of Visas and Registration (OVIR) of the Administration of Internal Affairs at the Kiev City Soviet EC. On 24 March, 1981, from the attached copy of the procurator's telegram and letter, we have all been refused permission to leave for permanent residence in Israel because of the absence of direct relatives there. This is a crude violation of points 1 and 2 of the Basic Principles of Civil Law restricted on Civil and Political Rights. We have addressed a complaint against OVIR's actions to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the responsible officials at the ministry, Zotov and Ovchinnikov, have confirmed that our refusal is for the above-stated reason.

As the complaintants know that thousands of Jews have 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.
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imposed by an institution which supports the law – the USSR MVD.

On the basis of the above, and guided by articles 88 and 89 of the Basic Principles of Civil Law, articles 444, 445 and 446 of the RSFSR 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 29 June a reply came from the USSR MVD.

Complainants I. Kh. Brandt, V.L. Koretsky and V.M. Tereshchenko (three of the 14 - Chronicle) were invited to the Department of Visas and Registration in Kiev. A representative of the UVIR 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 case 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) were locked up in detention cells. An hour and a half later they were released with apologies, and everything that had been taken away was returned. However, the recording made on a cassette tape turned out to have been erased.

On 27 March I. Goldshtein (Chronicle 61) was returning from a visit to Kharkov. After the documents of all the passengers on the bus had been checked, Goldshtein and another person – a lecturer at Tomsk University – were taken off. They were conveyed to Shegarka, where the detainees were searched on suspicion of murder. While their things were being carefully examined, Goldshtein and another person – a lecturer at Tomsk University– were taken off. They were conveyed to Shegarka, where the detainees were searched on suspicion of murder. When their things were being carefully examined, Goldshtein and another person – a lecturer at Tomsk University – were taken off. They were conveyed to Shegarka, where the detainees were searched on suspicion of murder.

The couple Yosif and Faina Berenshtein (Chronicle 60) have been trying for about a year to institute proceedings against 'Mishchenko': he threatened them that criminals would rape their daughter. After this incident their daughter almost went blind from nervousness.

In Kiev those who have received refusals 'because the relationship is not close enough' have been informed in UVIR that 'their cases have been closed for good'.

Kishinev

The Arrest of Lokshin and Tsukerman

On 10 May a group of Jews assembled by the synagoge in Kishinev to take to the city UVIR a statement in which complaints were made against the work of UVIR in examining applications to emigrate to Israel: it was demanded that legality be observed in deciding matters of emigration. Those who assembled were detained and taken off to different police stations. Only Lokshin and Vladimir Tukerman were arrested. They were charged under article 203-3 of the Moldavian Criminal Code ('Organization or active participation in group actions which disturb the peace'). The rest were released a few hours later.

Tbilisi

On 27 March I. Goldshtein (Chronicle 61) was returning from a visit to I. Mudel (chronicle 50) who is in exile in the Tomsk Region. The bus in which he was travelling was stopped by a police car and a black Volga. After the documents of all the passengers on the bus had been checked, Goldshtein and another person - a lecturer at Tomsk University - were taken off. They were conveyed to Shegarka, where the detainees were searched on suspicion of murder. While their things were being carefully examined, both were locked up in detention cells. An hour and a half later they were released with apologies, and everything that had been taken away was returned. However, the recording made on a cassette tape turned out to have been erased.
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On 6 April 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 give me an appointment, saying that you had been instructed by Ordzhonikidze to do so. Ordzhonikidze, who said: 'You know I don't know anything about it. The KGB knows about your article,' sent the statement to Ordzhonikidze, who said: 'It is possible that General Shaduri did not know about your article, nor that the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of 12.04.1968 forbids the Complaints and statements are left with complaints and statements, there are examples of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

I bring the following to your attention:
1. I have not worked anywhere at all for over nine years, and before that I worked as an ordinary engineer in the Research Institute of Metrology VNIASM and have not received any inquiry from the KGB about whether security restrictions were ever placed on me.
2. In the second half of 1980, I. Elikia, who had been working as a chief engineer at VNIASM since 1973 and was responsible for getting classified research into production, left the USSR. Maybe Colonel Ordzhonikidze did not agree for the reason that the aforementioned General Shaduri recognized him as a competent expert.

I am not asking you to punish your first deputy, General Shaduri, or to cease and desist. I do not even know anything about it. The KGB knows about it. But I am asking you to authorize me to leave for Israel immediately.

Shaduri sent the statement to Ordzhonikidze, who said: 'You know I don't know anything about it. The KGB knows about your article, nor that the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of 12.04.1968 forbids the complaints and statements from being made. However, it is not excluded that you claimed in your article: 'The level of paper work with complaints and statements, there are examples of red tape, formalities and callousness. Complaints are frequently given vague, unclear answers in which the essence of 'the question and the requests made are left to one side.'

I request you, citizen Minister, to receive me and personally answer this question: For what reason and on what legal basis (if there is such) have I been refused permission to leave for Israel for nine-and-a-half years? I hope you will not refuse to receive me, for this would contradict your own claim (and I quote from your article): 'With the aim of improving the reception of citizens and the examination of their statements, the Ministry has been holding so-called 'open days' for five years now, when visitors can without hindrance see any loading official.'

On 26 May the brothers Goldshtein addressed a complaint to the USSR Procurator-General leave 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 of Tbilisi, on 26 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 check if no work directives has 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 26 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 would not be employed as a master worker.'

On 26 May the brothers Goldshtein addressed a complaint to the USSR Procurator-General leave to citizens, and the examination of their statements, the Ministry has been holding so-called 'open days' for five years now, when visitors can without hindrance see any loading official.'

On 10 April 1981 the Soviet EC of the Lenin District did not agree for the reason that the aforementioned associations are secret and, should you not be allowed to go abroad, therefore you would not be employed as a master worker.'
Blow was inflicted. However, the chair-leg was taken into wards. In hospital Baazova was given 12 stitches in the head and concussion was diagnosed. Baazova told the investigators from the Criminal Investigation Department, who interrogated her the same day in hospital, that her son had been forced to write which he would prefer - the job of a midwife or the job of a dentist.

Kavadze: 'You stated that the jobs enumerated were not in your specialist field and asked to be employed in any kind of work, i.e. you refused.' The respected Procurator is contradicting himself. If G. Goldshtein was not employed in any kind of work, then he did not refuse to work. The jobs enumerated of technological engineer or constructor are, indeed, not in the specialist field of a theoretical physicist. It is of interest whether Procurator Kavadze would have managed to choose if he had been forced to write which he would prefer - the job of a midwife or the job of a dentist?

We ask you, citizen Procurator-General of the USSR, to see that:

1. we are offered work in accordance with article 40 of the USSR Constitution;
2. provocations against us from various officials be stopped;
3. G. Goldshtein be legally exculpated and those guilty of his illegal conviction punished!

On 30 June the brothers Goldshtein wrote to the President of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Central Committee of the CPSU and the USSR Procuracy:

We have been refused permission to leave for Israel since 1971. As grounds for refusal officers of the Georgian KGB referred to a commission resolution of the Research Institute of Metrology (VNIIAM) where we worked up to the second half of 1971.

In December 1980 we were informed that we had been cleared of security restrictions. This information was also confirmed by the fact that Lev Elkind, who had worked at VNIIAM until 1973 on the same subject matter as ourselves, left the USSR in 1980...

Sources in the Georgian KGB confirmed that we had been cleared of security restrictions, but said the refusal of our exit visa was determined by a higher Moscow body. In October 1980 KGB Major Kalandadze informed us that our case would not be re-examined until 1987...

We ask you to inform us what legally established means exist of complaining to a court about the actions of officials, so that we have the chance to institute a case against the head of the All-Union OVIR.

Sofia Abramovna Bazova (born 1909) is a Doctor of Medical Science, a professor, an Honoured Scientist of Georgia, chief neurologist for Georgia's resorts, and a member of the CPSU. Bazova is the wife of a famous Georgian-Jewish writer, Gerts Maland, who perished in 1937. (During the Khutorchev era Bazova was legally exculpated.) Bazova has stated repeatedly that she wishes to emigrate to Israel. Two of her grand-daughters emigrated in 1979 and 1980.

In February 1981 an attempt was made on Bazova's life: in the entrance to the house where she lived she was hit over the head with a chair-leg, which Bazova's son (the father of the girls who emigrated) picked up soon afterwards. In hospital Bazova was given 12 stitches in the head and concussion was diagnosed.

Bazova told the investigators from the Criminal Investigation Department, who interrogated her the same day in hospital, that her son had been forced to write which he would prefer - the job of a midwife or the job of a dentist. However, the chair-leg was taken into wards. In hospital Baazova was given 12 stitches in the head and concussion was diagnosed. Baazova told the investigators from the Criminal Investigation Department, who interrogated her the same day in hospital, that her son had been forced to write which he would prefer - the job of a midwife or the job of a dentist.

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 Procuror of Tadzhikistan 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?'
Sirvard Avakian, who was released in March, has sent this statement to Brezhnev:

I, a former worker at the Ekhegnadzor 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 Iriktusk, 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 reman the same as I always was, uncon- 

promising 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.

Sergei Soldatov (Chronicle 61) was released in January. He, too, began a hunger-strike the day of his release: 7 February (Chronicle 61). During his strike he was summoned to the military enlistment office and sent there to a medical commission. The medical commission recommended that he be sent for a psychiatric examination. Bulakh did not go despite repeated summonses. He was told in the enlistment office 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 permit to Israel. However, a short while later he was refused permission to leave on either his American or his Israeli passport. In OVIR he was told to submit documents for an exit permit to Israel. However, a short while later he was refused permission to leave on either his American or his Israeli passport. If he were declared sick, he would be treated. 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. 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.

Bulakh did not go despite repeated summonses. He was told in the enlistment office 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.

On 30 June the Moscow Helsinki Group issued Document No. 171, ‘New Cases of Persecution of Citizens of German Nationality who wish to leave the USSR’.

On 31 March the artist Dina Grossman (Chronicle 61), a participant in the two-week hunger-strike during The Moscow Olympics, of the ‘marches’ of Moscow Jews in the autumn of 1980-1 on the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, OVIR, the Moscow City Soviet and the RSFSR Procuracy (Chronicles 60, 61), and of the demonstration on 24 December 1989 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 in the ‘marches’ Samuil Azarkh (Chronicle 60) left from Moscow. On 15 April an actor from the ‘youth amateur theatre, Igor Vinogradov (Chronicle 60), a participant in the hunger-strike and the ‘marches’, left from Moscow. On 19 May Natalya Khvorskaya, who declared a hunger-strike at the time of the 26th Congress of the CPSU (Chronicle 61), left from Moscow. In June Pentecostalist Galina Neksnockskaia (Chronicle 57) left from Moscow.

Sergei Soldatov (Chronicle 61), who was released in January, was advised to leave the USSR before 1 May: however, he did not manage to finish processing his documents by that date. On 10 May he went for a meeting with his son Alexander in the camp where he is held (Chronicle 58). He was refused a meeting on the pretext that it was a ‘holiday’ in the camp. The following day S. Soldatov handed in his passport, without having been able to see his son. On 18 May Soldatov emigrated.

In April the KGB requested the key to Alexander Babychnev’s (Chronicle 60) work-room. Many of his colleagues were summoned to the special section (KGB office) and warned about being ‘careful’ in their dealings with him. At these meetings.
brieferings it was said, specifically, that Babunyshhev had
been to Corky to see Sakharov and had brought back some
photographs.
On 24 April Babunyshhev was summoned to his district DVS,
where officer Stroka inquired whether he had changed his
mind about emigrating, asked him not to become embittered.
and said that Babunyshhev would probably be allowed to leave.
A few days later Babunyshhev was telephoned by UVIR and
asked to come for a visa. (He had been waiting for permis-
sion for about two years. In February he received an oral
refusal.)
On 5 May Babunyshhev was given a final date for the valid-
ity of his exit visa - 16 May. The same day his telephone
was cut off. On 16 May Babunyshhev 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 (Babunyshhev was one
of the active compilers of this collection) was confi-
sicated from him. A talk was conducted with Babunyshhev, which
sometimes adopted a fairly menacing tone. Until 21 May
(Sakharov's birthday) he was demonstratively shadowed.
On 19 June A. BabUrlyshev and his mother S.E. BabUnysheva
(Chronicle 56) were admitted to UVIR. (Sakharov's birthday) he was demonstratively shadowed.
On 21 May 1981 I was in Perm and was told in Perm
Procuracy, Shirinkin, referred Sirotenko to him.
Sirotenko complained about this ban to the USSR
Prosecutor-General about the 'overrunning of the permitted
time of detention has the right to forbid parcels; this was the right of the prison
head. At the same time, he attempted to interrogate Siro-
tenko, asking her the value of the food supplies sent in
1979 to Zhilin (he was especially interested in the cost
of the stock cubes). Sirotenko's reply on the amount of
customs duty she had paid for a parcel from abroad contain-
ing stock cubes did not satisfy him, although he made a
note of it. No record was drawn up. Sobolev suddenly cut
the 'chat' short, and, disregarding Sirotenko's protest,
carried out an 'examination' of the contents of her handbag.
He explained later that he was searching for a tape-recor-
der.
On her return to the prison, Sirotenko told the prison
head what Sobolev had said. But he demanded that Sirotenko
bring him Sobolev's permission in writing, promising that
if she did, he would accept the parcel that same day.
Sobolev, however, repeated to Sirotenko everything he
had said about the investigator's rights. 'If I allow it,' he
said, 'you'll say I could forbid it as well.' He promised
to find out the reasons why Babunyshhev was forbidden to
receive parcels and to let Sirotenko know within a week.
In this way, for a third consecutive month Babunyshhev
received no parcels. According to the 'Statute on Pre-
trial Imprisonment under Custody', the administration
of a place of detention has the right to forbid parcels.
Parcels may be forbidden for one month for an infringement
of discipline.'
On 22 May Sirotenko was informed by telephone by the Perm
Regional Procuracy and Perm Regional Court that Airikyan's
case had been passed to the court.
On 24 May Sirotenko sent a complaint to the USSR
Prosecutor-General about the 'overrunning of the permitted
time of custody that Paruir Arshavirovich Airikyan is being
held for during the investigation':

...In the last ten days of December 1980, the require-
ments of article 201 of the RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure
were carried out by the investigator, but at that time
you asked to be sent the case file and it was referred
by your order for further investigation. The arrest
warrant issued by the RSFSR Procuracy was valid until
18 January 1981. On 30 January 1981 the case was referred
by the Perm Procuracy to Perm Regional Court. At an admin-
istrative session of the court on 17 February the case
was referred back for further investigation. Not until
the beginning of April was a warrant for his arrest
issued, valid until 20 May 1981. From what the investi-
gator has said, I know that Airikyan was held in custody
for one-and-a-half months without a warrant, on the sole
basis of a document stating that the investigator had
submitted a petition for the term of arrest to be exten-
ded. On 21 May 1981 I was in Perm and was told in Perm
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 investigation prison. Thus, in violation of articles 11, 66 and 97 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 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 him 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.

The Case of V. Ovsienko

Vasily Ovsienko (Chronicle 52) has been charged under article 62, part 1, of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= article 70 of the RSFSR Code). He is charged with ‘agitation and propaganda’, both oral (his final speech at his trial in 1979) and written (a letter to the UN written in camp, the extension of his term of custody) and to all honest people. I appeal to the Heads of all the 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.

The Case of Bolonkin

On 20 April Alexander Bolonkin’s (Chronicle 51) second camp term was due to end. However, on 10 April he was charged under article 70, part 2, of the RSFSR Criminal Code. On 30 April the Moscow Helsinki Group issued Document No. 166, ‘Alexander Bolonkin’s term of imprisonment is becoming a life sentence’.

...Since in camp conditions any activity, including ‘anti-Soviet’ activity, is effectively impossible, the charge under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code is simply absurd. The punishment stipulated under article 70, part 2, is up to 10 years’ imprisonment, followed by up to five years’ exile.

Since Alexander Bolonkin has already served a sentence under article 70 he will inevitably be ruled an especially dangerous ‘recidivist’, which will entail a sentence under the inhuman conditions of a special-regime camp. After nine years in camps and exile Bolonkin’s health has been irreparably undermined (chronic gastritis, cystitis of the colon, inflammation of the rectum) and a new long sentence could become a life sentence for him.

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, Governments which signed the Helsinki Agreement, to all 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.

Chistopol Prison

Yu. Butchenko (Chronicles 51–5, 56) and M. Khodobyan (Chronicles 52, 56) have been transferred here from Perm Camp 36, and M. Marinovich (Chronicles 56, 60) from Perm Camp 3.

From November to December 1980 M. Kazachkov and V. Balakhonov attempted suicide several times. Once Kazachkov’s belt broke; on another occasion, guards pulled him out of the nose: 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 5 May 1981 the head of Chistopol Prison, R. Galiullina, told L. Boitsova in reply to her question that her husband S. Koval’ev had been ‘recruited for socially useful work’, but was not fulfilling the norm: on 10 February he 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. Vinogradov, replied to Boitsova that a letter written by Koval’ev in May had been ‘sent to the addressee, but a letter written in May, in accordance with the Statute on Internal Agreements for Corrective Labour Institutions, article 631, paragraph 3, had not been sent to the addressee, of which fact he (Koval’ev - Chronicle) had been informed; it was then destroyed’. A letter written by Koval’ev in May passed the censors. Since the beginning of the year only three letters from his wife have been delivered to him.

The Moldovan Camps

Camp 3

Major A.A. Zinchenko has been replaced as Camp Commandant by his Deputy in charge of discipline, Major V. Pavlov, in charge of the political camp-zones (uchr. ZMB-385/3-3) is Captain S. Gainichenko (Chronicle 58).
and brought Listvina some sulphur-mercury ointment. After Listvina rubbed this ointment on herself twice, a rash 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. On 6 July Geinitschenko and three KGB 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 is the third time repairs have 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. The second complaint was sent by the administration; the first was not.

The Perm Camps

Camp 35

G. Tesemosas and P. Poceliunas who were tried in the same case (trial in Chronicle 60) have arrived here. In April M. Morozov arrived (trial in Chronicle 61). V. Poresh (trial in Chronicle 57) is serving his sentence here.

In October 1980 A. Shcharansky was sent several times to clear the forbidden strip. He refused and was put in the cooler. At the end of 1980 Shcharansky was appointed nightman. Since M. Ostrovsky, who had this job, did not want to leave it (persons working in this job are given increased food rations), Shcharansky refused. For refusing to work he was put in the punishment block for six months. On 13 January 1981, in February Shcharansky went on strike, demanding to be allowed normal correspondence. On 10 and 28 September 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 Poresh; prayers, psalms also published in the USSR were confiscated from Shcharansky. Shcharansky, still on strike, demanded in addition that his psalms be returned to him.

In October 1980 V. Poresh was on hunger-strike. Lieutenant Volkov announced that any hunger-striker who did not go out to work would be punished for refusing to work. On 19 March Poresh was already too weak to go out to work. On 19 March Poresh was already too weak to go out to work. Poresh continued his hunger-strike; Yu. Butchenko, Sturmanis and Bogachev went on strike; demanding that Poresh's life be saved. For this, Butchenko was given 15 days, and Sturmanis and Bogachev Sturmanis and Bogachev resumed their strike. On 1 April Poresh was force-fed for the first time (at this point the guard V. Bormcov knocked out one of his teeth). Poresh's unsuccessful hunger-strike lasted 70 days.

On 8 July Osipova was to have a long visit from her husband. On 6 July Geinitschenko and three KGB 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 is the third time repairs have 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. The second complaint was sent by the administration; the first was not.
After the cooler Butchenko was put in the punishment block for two months. From there he was transferred on 24 March to Chistopol Prison until the end of his sentence (in 1975 he was given eight years' strict-regime camp under article 64 of the RSFSR Criminal Code for attempting to escape abroad). As protest against his sentence, Morozov has twice slashed his veins. In April he declared a dry hunger-strike (38.4° to 38.6°). In a letter to his mother Yu. Fedorov last three months: 'If you recognize me at all, it won't be right away.'

In June Yu. Fedorov was transferred back to Camp 36 (see 'In Extremis'). The camp Commandant is now Chikina (Chronicles 57, 58).

In Other Prisons and Camps

On 6 June A. Lavut (trial in Chronicle 60) arrived in a camp with the following address: 85/73, Khabezovsky krai. On 4 July (a Saturday) the foreman of the workshop where Lavut was working told him to come to work at 8 pm on Monday. On 6 July in the morning an order was read out to Lavut, stating that he was deprived of a 'long' visit for not returning to the camp and waiting there until his son was discharged from hospital. Her parcel, which contained various food supplies, tobacco, spectacles and a pipe, was given to him. (See also 'Camp 36'.)

While he was in the cooler, 30 days in November-December 1980 (Chronicle 60) and 10 days in January 1981 (Camp 36) he declared a hunger-strike, protesting against letters being withheld from him. For this reason he was released from the punishment block only on 26 March. Private notes have been confiscated from Orlow.

On 4 May Yu. Orlow, V. Yakunina (trial in Chronicle 56), Kuznetsov, Belov, Lukanovich, Izvolkin, Chitrova, Yurev and apparently two others held a hunger-strike protesting against the Soviet Union's failure to implement the humanitarian articles of the Helsinki Final Act and demanding official recognition of political prisoners status in the USSR.

On 6 June A. Lavut (trial in Chronicle 60) arrived in a camp with the following address: 85/73, Khabezovsky krai.
after which the officer gave Kirill back his poems. Kirill demanded that the poems be returned, but the head guard. The sergeant who arrived immediately hit Kirill: Kirill hit him back. 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 obl., Novoulyanovsk, uchr. YuI-78/2.

On 4 May Kirill's father, P.A. Podrabinek, sent a letter to the Medical Administration of the USSR MVD:

Your son receiving treatment as an out-patient. Hos-
of the false information about my son being in a hospital tuberculosis ward, and what was the purpose of this distortion?

2. To explain to me the symptoms according to which tuberculous patients are hospitalized in the network of the Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions, whether in accordance with Order No. 669 of 3 September 1973 of the USSR Ministry of Health or other directives.

3. Why K.P. Podrabinek ‘does not need’ to be hospitalized when this is obviously necessary.

P. Podrabinek sent copies of this statement to Popov and Peredukhov.

On 29 May P.A. Podrabinek sent a letter to Amnesty International, the International Red Cross, the Committee to Defend the Podrabinek Brothers and the Moscow Helsinki Group. 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 assault may entail new charges, resulting in an increase in his term of imprisonment, which is already six years. At our meeting in Usman, 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 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 a complete course of active treatment, which Kirill has never obtained. My son does not need out-patient 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.


We are opposed on principle to the use of force against lawlessness, but Kirill Podrabinek’s reactions to attempts to humiliate him and to physical violence, were unavoidable, as he had no other means of self-defence at his disposal. The events described in P.A. Podrabinek’s letter give reason to fear for Kirill Podrabinek’s future fate. Any increase in the severity of his sentence, which is already beyond his strength, could result in his death.

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 Usman-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 Vyacheslav Bakhmin (Chronicle 61) was transported by plane to Moscow for ‘The Trial of Osipova’. He was transported back to the same camp no later than 6 April.

On his return to camp he was given a job as storekeeper, but was then transferred to manual labour.

In the spring S. Gorbachov (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 P. Dyadkin (Chronicle 61) for conditional early release with compulsory reconviction for labour, but in June, a week before the hearing, Dyadkin was transferred to another camp: Tyumen Region, uchstr. Yats-34/2.

On 28 April camp security officers Major Tamakov and Captain Tereshkov confiscated the following items from Chornovil (Chronicle 60): the judgment in his case, an appeal drawn up by his defence counsel, a transcript of defence counsel’s speech in court, and an appeal by Chornovil himself to the Yats ASSR Supreme Court.

At the beginning of February R. Dzhemilev (Chronicle 56) showed the Deputy Commandant of his camp, O. Vakhotanov, a letter addressed 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 Sushentsev, 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 of food was reduced to a half. Dzhemilev (Chronicle 60) provokes sentiments of national hostility against Dzhemilev among the camp inmates, and encourages denunciations against him.

Dzhemilev, who has been operated on for a duodenal ulcer, is a Group 3 invalid (post-operative hernia, chronic cystitis of the colon). He suffers from constant hunger pains and needs a special diet, but cannot get one. Eating small portions of food every one-and-a-half to two hours, bread saved from his own packed lunch, lessens the pain, but Dzhemilev was once got out of bed after lights out, taken to the guard house and threatened with the cooler for starting bread.
On 25 August the head who was cohabiting with Uvarova, then by deputy head guard afternoon Uvarova came to the barracks, accompanied by Yu. A. Kozlenko and three or four others kicked her. On Uvarova said at this point: 'You're going to die here.' which Yakovenko made her spend the night on some chairs several men, whom she told, 'Take her to the men's zone as much as you like - I'll be responsible.'

On 23 July Avakyan was beaten up by detachment head G.I. Sorokaput, the camp Commandant's duty assistant V. Puzin, Captain Avakyan asks for something in the name of the law, beat her up, then said that she had refused to work. In the drying-room. On 5 September Avakyan was issued a sheet, where she was beaten up by Bashkevich.

On 21 July 1980 Sirvard Avakyan (trial in Chronicle 56) arrived in this camp: Irkutskaya obl., uchr. - /11. On 22 July Avakyan was bitten by a rattlesnake. On 23 July Avakyan was beaten up by detachment head G.I. Fritsuk (a woman) and by prisoners. The instructions were not then taken out to work until the end of her term in the punishment block. On 5 September Avakyan was beaten up again. On 14 September, on instructions from Uvarova, Avakyan was beaten up by prisoners, whom she told, 'Take her to the men's zone as much as you like - I'll be responsible.'

On 25 October Avakyan's dress was stolen, when she started asking for it back, the drunket Fritsuk 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 14 November Avakyan was sent to work in the canteen. The head of the canteen said: 'You're a journalist, you'll write about us, how we live and how we eat'. Yakovenko and the head cook then beat her up and chased her out of the canteen. On 17 November Uvarova told Avakyan: 'Spy, scoundrel, anti-Soviet element, parasite, we'll see each other tomorrow in the cooler.' On the night of 17 to 18 November Avakyan was put in the cooler until the end of the month, where she was beaten up by chief warder (supervisor) I. Teliphayev. 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 taken in the night to the punishment block for three months.

On 13 December the supervisory Procurator came to the punishment block, but refused to hear Avakyan out. On 5 and 13 January 1981 Avakyan was beaten up again. On 14 January Avakyan was handcuffed for two hours and then beaten up. After taking her in the cooler, Avakyan was put in the punishment block for three months.

On 28 January Avakyan was taken to work, where she was beaten up by prisoners. On 29 January Avakyan was put in solitary, and was not then taken out to work. On 2 March, when a fellow in the punishment block for three months, started strangling her. From 1 to 13 March Avakyan was beaten up again. On 17 March Avakyan was put in solitary, and was then taken out to work. On 2 March, when she had been turned away from the work, Avakyan was put in the punishment block until the end of her sentence, 10 March.
Fascist intelligence service, and it is deliberately trying to train enemies to fight the Soviet state and Lenin's Party.

Sir vard 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 Sir vard Avakyan, out of Komsomol naivety, for promoting the interests of the State, has ended up in prison and is being perniciously persecuted by enemies of the Soviet State.

* * *

Alexander Nakimov (Chronicle 55, 56) is serving his sentence in Dnepropetrovsk Region: g. Zhdanivka, ussr, Dial 385/26. On 4 April 1980 he was sentenced under Articles 196 ('infringement of residence regulations') and 214 ('assassination') of the Ukrainian Criminal Code to one year and six months of ordinary-regime camp. In March A. Stasevich (Chronicle 56) was transferred to Vladimir Prison. He is being put in the punishment cells.

The unsurmounted colonial heritage of pre-Revolutionary Ukraine: the constant pressure of an assimilationist, ideologically and morally outmoded, imperialist, anti-Ukrainian, anti-Russian tradition, and the all-encompassing falsification of Ukrainian history. The CPSU Programme in the sphere of national relations - a 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, etc. On the contrary, a victorious proletarian revolution should, according to theory, increase citizens' opportunities for free thought, self-expression and initiative, and make individual freedom a reality for everyone. The CPSU, however, which in its propagandist character of the USSR's policy of centralization and great-power chauvinism, a policy which is feasible in the conditions of 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. Sir vard Avakyan is an honest Komsomol member: she worked in a munitions factory and fought against anti-Sovietism, a policy which is feasible in the conditions of 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, etc. On the contrary, a victorious proletarian revolution should, according to theory, increase citizens' opportunities for free thought, self-expression and initiative, and make individual freedom a reality for everyone. The CPSU, however, which in its propagandist character of the USSR's policy of centralization and great-power chauvinism, a policy which is feasible in the conditions of 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.
three-day hunger-strike with the aim of drawing the attention of communists, the workers of France, and 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 cruel 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 25 April of this year.

Yu. BadzU: '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 nullifying 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 uncontrollable 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 contradicts 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, 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 being a principle incompatible with a democratic organization of society. Such a position, even if one disagrees with the right to freedom of thought and of scientific research, cannot serve as the basis for legal prosecution since 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 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 16 April of this year.

N. Pogiba: 'Open Letter' (June-August 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 TYPANNY 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 Ukrainian human rights movement: Yuri Badz, Nikolai Rudenko, Nikolai Krytenik and Dmitri Mazur, and representatives of the Lithuanian human rights movement Vytautas Skuutis and Anastas Janulis.

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

...the main exploiter in the USSR is the state and the state-party bourgeois class which serves it...I have become convinced that in our country there exists a society of state capitalism with a totalitarian form...
R. Reagan (21 March 1981)

P. Miorova, L. Murzhenko: 'To the President of the USA,粉碎

concludes:

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 Ukrain-

ian Criminal Code. We have appealed to everywhere. We have lost hope of seeing them free, as every possible Soviet department, even Congresses of Internal Affairs, to the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the CPSU Central Committee, to the 25th and 26th Congresses of the CPSU, but were refused everywhere.

(P. Fidorova and L. Murzhenko sent letters of similar content to the US Congress and to Senator Jackson.)

To A. Solzhenitsyn' (21 March 1981)

Alik and Yura are the last of 12 persons to remain prisoners... Now that early release has been granted to Mendele- 

vich, the last Jew among the 'aeroplane people', we have lost our last hope of early release for our boys. Their physical condition is disastrous. We fear they will not survive.

We have appealed for a pardon to the USSR Minister of Internal Affairs, to the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the 

CPSU Central Committee, to the 25th and 26th Congresses of the CPSU, but were refused everywhere.

(P. Fidorova and L. Murzhenko sent letters of similar content to E. Kuznetsov and A. Ginzburg.)

P. Fidorova, L. Murzhenko: 'To the Lawyer D. Jacoby (France)' (20 April 1981)

On 8 April 1981 Yura Fidorov had a visit from his mother: three hours in the presence of two guards who continually interrupted the conversation - they were only allowed to talk about his health - and threatened to cut the visit short, so that mother and son were silent most of the time: Yura said at the end: 'if they don't get me out of here soon, I'll die.' It was the first time in all his years as a prisoner that his mother had heard such desperate words from him.

On 13 April Alik Murzhenko had a visit from his wife and two-year-old daughter. It lasted three hours in the presence of five guards and everything said was recorded, even though Alik had been warned beforehand that he was only allowed to talk about family matters. However, during the last few minutes of the visit he said that on February he had been deprived of a parcel and money for the camp shop for lying down on the bunk in his cell after work. He begged her to do everything possible to get him out of his unbearable captivity.

We are desperate, and fear for the lives of our loved ones - our son and husband. We are shocked at the injustices shown to them when all those convicted with them have already been released. We know that you have taken on the difficult task of defending Yura Fidorov and Aleksei Murzenko and have requested the Soviet authorities to 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 Fidorov and Alik Murzenko.

E. Bonner added a note to this letter:

Dear Mr Jacoby,

As I send you Lyuba Murzenko and Polina Fidorova'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 Fidorov and Murzenko.

In Defence of Political Prisoners

P. Fidorova, L. Murzhenko: 'To the President of the USA, R. Reagan' (21 March 1981)

The mother of Yu. Fidorov and the wife of Aleksei Murzen-

ko, men convicted with a group of Jews in 1970 in Leningrad in the 'aeroplane case', appeal to you. The entire group, consisting of 12 persons, aimed to show the world the plight of people wishing to leave our country, and to obtain free emigration for all who wish to leave the USSR. They had no other intentions and committed no act of violence. Thanks to their trial, the road to freedom has been opened to tens of thousands of Jews and people of other nationalities.

Two of them are still prisoners: the Russian Yury Fidorov, sentenced to 15 years, and the Ukrainian Aleksei Murzenko, sentenced to 14 years. 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 hope of seeing them free, as the state of their health is disastrous.

of political power.

In 1975 Pogiba was sentenced by Kiev Regional Court to three years' imprisonment under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (= 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 concludes:

The latest events in Poland have shown clearly that the working class is capable of fighting for its rights and freedoms and for a real improvement in the standard of living, and that the effectiveness of this struggle depends on the level of working class solidarity and the extent to which it organizes itself.

I consider that every human being, even if he is working-class, is entitled to circulate his views both in oral and in written form. Persecution for this is a gross violation of human rights. I ask the Ukrainian Human Rights Group to bring my letter to the attention of the Soviet and world public, and first and foremost to the World Trade Union Movement.

In Defence of Political Prisoners

P. Fidorova, L. Murzhenko: 'To the Lawyer D. Jacoby (France)' (20 April 1981)
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 Alia while they are still alive.

Fifteen Jews published the following letter in samizdat:

On 6 June the Yury Fudorov and Aleksei Murzhenko (1 June 1981)

A. Sakharov: 'To L.I. Brezhnev. Request for a Pardon for Fifteen Jews'

published the following letter in samizdat:

169, 'The Lives of Prisoners Yury Fudorov and Aleksei Murzhenko and Yury Fudorov were imprisoned. They were sentenced to 14 and 15 years' imprisonment for intending to hijack a plane in order to leave the Soviet Union. On 15 June 1981 eleven years will have passed since Aleksei Murzhenko and Yury Fudorov were imprisoned. They have long since been free, almost all of them having been released early - despite this, Murzhenko and Fudorov 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...


I request you, and through you the President of the USSR Supreme Soviet, for a pardon for Yury Fudorov 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 Fudorov and Aleksei Murzhenko are in Danger!'

In 1970 there was no specific law in the USSR stipulating prosecution 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 three- to ten-year term of imprisonment, is applicable to the actions with which Yur. Fudorov and A. Murzhenko were convicted. As a general rule, a law prescribing more lenient punishment is retroactive.

While admitting that Fudorov 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 212-2 and 63 ('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, Fudorov 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 Fudorov 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. Fudorov 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 that the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, for a pardon for Yury Fudorov and Aleksei 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 Kovalév. 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 three people. Recently, after being imprisoned for almost a year in an investigation's prison, Tatyana Osipova, the wife of Ivan Kovalév, Sergei Kovalév'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 Kovalév... 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). Tanya Osipova and Ivan Kovalév are members of the Moscow Helsinki Group; Sergei Kovalév was charged with editing and circulating the samizdat information journal A Chronicle of Current Events.

I have known Sergei and Ivan Kovalév and Tanya Osipova for years and can vouch for their unimpeachable honesty and altruism, and their whole-hearted dedication to the non-violent, public defense 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 Kovalév and Tanya Osipova. You can easily check all this out from materials published in the West - there people are not threatened with arrest for reading such things. I do not know your political views or the extent of your sympathy for the Soviet system, but what I am asking you to do is not politics. To save three honest and courageous people in danger of their lives - three victims in the same family - is a duty to which humanity and honesty compel us. Use your authority, appeal to Soviet leaders and leaders of Western countries: do everything within your power.

Twenty years ago, without having net, 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 hear me to help Tanya Osipova and Sergei and Ivan Kovalév.
I. Gajauskiene: 'To the President of France, F. Mitterrand' (May 1981)

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 is now 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 7 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 had 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. Struchich: 'To the USSR Procurator-General: A Statement' (6 July 1981)

This is the 29th year that my husband Miroslav Vasilevich Struchich has been serving a sentence in various corrective labour institutions where people convicted for political crimes are held. He was released on completion of his three-year sentence on 27 April 1955 from the camp in Shushensky village, Khar'kov region. He was placed under surveillance for one year. A local policeman told Pidgorodetsky a在当地 than any letter (Struchich did not know what letter) and told him he had to contribute to society.

On 29 March 1955 Pidgorodetsky (Chronicles 53-5) was released after 28 years' camp for his movement in the UPA-OUN (Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists). He went to live in Krushelnitsky village, Skole District, Lvov Region. He was placed under surveillance for one year. A local policeman told Pidgorodetsky to find a job, but he is being offered work which is beyond his strength (in camp Pidgorodetsky toiled in 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 Arutyunyan (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 no papers on being released, although three prisoners released with him received theirs.

On 29 March 1980 Evgeny Buzinnikov (trial in Chronicle 51) was released on completion of his one-year sentence. On 19 March Lev Volokhonsky (trial in Chronicle 55) was released on completion of his one-year sentence. On 22 March Razmik Markosyan (chronicle 61) was released.

On 18 May Evgeny Buzinnikov (trial in Chronicle 51) was released on completion of his three-year sentence. He was given no papers on being released, although four prisoners released with him received theirs.

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 all 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.

Recent events in camp Yame-310/88 in Zaporozhe Region (his fellow-inmates are being summoned to the camp security unit and told to testify to Struchich's anti-Soviet statements) show that my husband has been transferred to Ukrainian territory 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.

On 22 December 1980 Shagen Arutyunyan (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 no papers on being released, although three prisoners released with him received theirs.

Releases

On 29 March 1955 Pidgorodetsky (Chronicles 53-5) was released after 28 years' camp for his involvement in the UPA-OUN (Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists). He went to live in Krushelnitsky village, Skole District, Lvov Region. He was placed under surveillance for one year. A local policeman told Pidgorodetsky to find a job, but he is being offered work which is beyond his strength (in camp Pidgorodetsky toiled in 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 29 March 1955 Pidgorodetsky (Chronicles 53-5) was released after 28 years' camp for his involvement in the UPA-OUN (Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists). He went to live in Krushelnitsky village, Skole District, Lvov Region. He was placed under surveillance for one year. A local policeman told Pidgorodetsky to find a job, but he is being offered work which is beyond his strength (in camp Pidgorodetsky toiled in 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 Arutyunyan (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 no papers on being released, although three prisoners released with him received theirs.

Releases

On 29 March 1955 Pidgorodetsky (Chronicles 53-5) was released after 28 years' camp for his involvement in the UPA-OUN (Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists). He went to live in Krushelnitsky village, Skole District, Lvov Region. He was placed under surveillance for one year. A local policeman told Pidgorodetsky to find a job, but he is being offered work which is beyond his strength (in camp Pidgorodetsky toiled in 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 29 March 1955 Pidgorodetsky (Chronicles 53-5) was released after 28 years' camp for his involvement in the UPA-OUN (Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists). He went to live in Krushelnitsky village, Skole District, Lvov Region. He was placed under surveillance for one year. A local policeman told Pidgorodetsky to find a job, but he is being offered work which is beyond his strength (in camp Pidgorodetsky toiled in 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.
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 make 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 authorised it.

The Head Doctor of the clinic told Sakharov that he had case 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. G. 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 May Sakharov wrote to L. Pauling asking him to help the Koval’ev family (see '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:

Dear 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.
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Before he left the camp, Buzinnikov's head was shaved bare. 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 exile (Chronicles 56). A man in plain clothes showed him his MVD-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 55 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 Kлавдия 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 visit to Gorky from Moscow. On 12 March A.D. Sakharov received an invitation to go to a paying dental clinic on the afternoon of 13 March he was undergoing treatment for his teeth at the same 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 for 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 inside my door, and are again placing me in danger.

On the evening of 13 March (a Friday) E.G. Bonner was about to make another visit to Gorky from Moscow. On 12 March A.D. Sakharov received an invitation to go to a paying dental clinic on the afternoon of 13 March he was undergoing treatment for his teeth at the same 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 for 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
asked them to cross out his signature of receipt for the letter in question (the fourth). They refused. The signature of receipt remained and the letter was withheld.

21 May was A.D. Sakharov's 60th birthday. On 20 May former political prisoner Vitaly Pomazov (Chronicles 5, 8, 16, 18, 19, 47, 48, 60) came to Gorky. He arrived at Sakharov's house in a taxi with Tsvetkov, a friend of his from Gorky, on 21 May. Although the taxi stopped some distance from the house, the friends were immediately surrounded by a number of security officers, who took them to the support point. There Pomazov was searched and put on a train (the ticket was bought at police expense - it turned out that Pomazov had no money; he was told that Tsvetkov 'was already at home'). Pomazov was warned not to get off at any station. And indeed, at every station a police detail stood outside the carriage and prevented Pomazov from getting out.

On 21 May Maria Petrovna and Sergei Khodorkovich came to Gorky from Moscow. They met Sakharov in the street and set off for his house. Not as they approached the house they were detained and sent back to Moscow by plane (see also 'Samizdat News').

IN EXILE

Releases

After the days spent in transport had been taken into account, each day counting as three days' exile, Major Alishev, Commandant of Saralzhin village, told Valery Marchenko (Chronicle 41) that his exile would end on 29 April. 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 Rekunkov:

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.

Marchenko. Perpetual exile

The reference drawn up by the Head of Ulinsky 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 Ulinsky District Soviet EO, S. Kapishev: '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 my 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': '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 29th. 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 THE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS

Kazan SPh

Since 1968, when the priest Father Iosif Mikhailov of Ufa has been held here, he has been charged under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code with writing letters to the UK complaining about the local authorities, who were interfering in parish life. The nun Valeria Makeyeva (Chronicle 53) has been transferred from here to Moscow Regional Psychiatric Hospital No. 5.

Chernakovsky SPh

Fedor Sidenko is being held here (Chronicle 56 contains an error).

Dnepropetrovsk SPh

V. Gladyshev has arrived here (see 'Persecution of Believers').

In Ordinary Hospitals

On 12 March the Makeyeva City Court, presided over by Kobristyi, again (Chronicle 52) resolved that the compulsory treatment of Vasiliy Svinokho, who is held in a local hospital, should be continued. After his relatives complained, the court, presided over by Zabolot, the report of psychiatrist V. M. Zabolot, again decided he should continue to receive compulsory treatment. Svinokho's relatives were not notified of the date of the trial.

IN THE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS

On 12 March the Makeyeva City Court, presided over by Kobristyi, again (Chronicle 52) resolved that the compulsory treatment of Vasiliy Svinokho, who is held in a local hospital, should be continued. After his relatives complained, the court, presided over by Zabolot, the report of psychiatrist V. M. Zabolot, again decided he should continue to receive compulsory treatment. Svinokho's relatives were not notified of the date of the trial.

AFTER RELEASE

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

On 30 March Stepan Sapelyak (Chronicle 48) 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 1) 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 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 confer my passport. In January 1981 I applied to the Head of a District OVD under the Leningrad Regional Soviet EC for permission to register in Nikol'skoye village, Tsno District, Leningrad Region, where Nadezhda Vladimirovna, whom I wish to marry, lives. I also said that I had seen no intention of engaging in anti-Soviet activities.

On 15 February 1981 the chief of the Ulyanovka District Police Department, Captain Gavrilov, was informed by me that I had obtained a job as an electrical repairman in a branch of the Leningrad Institute for Geological Expeditions (VIRIN), 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
moving to another place of residence. However, on the way to Leningrad Region, at Lvov railway station (on 6 March 1981), I was taken to the police station, where I was searched on suspicion of theft. Six persons were present at the search, only one of them in police uniform, the others in plain clothes. Only the policemen gave his surname. I was not allowed to check my belongings during the search. Notebooks, letters from friends and a Bible were thrown on the floor. I was then released and travellers to Nikolaev. In my absence, my fiancée, N.V. Natsyshen was summoned by a KGB officer from that I would not be registered here unless I publicly repented of my past activities, and asked her to tell me this.

On 12 March 1981 I had a talk with a KGB officer (Deputy Head of the security section), who again told me either (...') or to go away wherever I please. I had no choice but to go away, leaving the person I love, KGB officers of the Ukrainian SSR and Leningrad have forced us to part, thus causing a severe emotional trauma.

The KGB of Leningrad Region, at Leningrad railway station (on 6 March 1981), I was taken to the police station, where I was searched on suspicion of theft. Six persons 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 the political and social system, and producing and circulating in written form deliberately false fabrications defaming the personal and social system, and producing and circulatating a pornographic story, has been proved by the evidence given by A.A. Myasnikov during the pre-trial examination. In the RSFSR Supreme Court with the participation of the Procurator, the hearing of the case in the RSFSR Supreme Court has been noted down for special attention.

On 12 March 1981 I had a talk with a KGB officer (Deputy Head of the security section), who again told me either (...') or to go away wherever I please. I had no choice but to go away, leaving the person I love, KGB officers of the Ukrainian SSR and Leningrad have forced us to part, thus causing a severe emotional trauma.

Missellaneous Reports

In the RSFSR Supreme Court the appeal hearings in the cases of A. Magidovich (trial in Chronicle 61) and L. Terenovskiy (trial in Chronicle 60) were held in April. The sentences were left unchanged. Ternovsky gave his surname. I was not allowed to check my belongings during the search. Notebooks, letters from friends, and a Bible were thrown on the floor. I was then released and travelled to Nikolaev. In my absence, my fiancée, N.V. Natsyshen had been summoned by a KGB officer from that I would not be registered here unless I publicly repented of my past activities, and asked her to tell me this.

On 12 March 1981 I had a talk with a KGB officer (Deputy Head of the security section), who again told me either (...') or to go away wherever I please. I had no choice but to go away, leaving the person I love, KGB officers of the Ukrainian SSR and Leningrad have forced us to part, thus causing a severe emotional trauma.

On 12 March 1981 I had a talk with a KGB officer (Deputy Head of the security section), who again told me either (...') or to go away wherever I please. I had no choice but to go away, leaving the person I love, KGB officers of the Ukrainian SSR and Leningrad have forced us to part, thus causing a severe emotional trauma.

On 12 March 1981 I had a talk with a KGB officer (Deputy Head of the security section), who again told me either (...') or to go away wherever I please. I had no choice but to go away, leaving the person I love, KGB officers of the Ukrainian SSR and Leningrad have forced us to part, thus causing a severe emotional trauma.

N.V. Matyushenko had been summoned by a KGB officer from that I would not be registered here unless I publicly repented of my past activities, and asked her to tell me this.

On 12 March 1981 I had a talk with a KGB officer (Deputy Head of the security section), who again told me either (...') or to go away wherever I please. I had no choice but to go away, leaving the person I love, KGB officers of the Ukrainian SSR and Leningrad have forced us to part, thus causing a severe emotional trauma.
the evidence given by Mysnikov, and it was up to the court to select from Mysnikov's evidence that which it considered 'crucial'. The Prosecutor stated that the article '173 Reasons...' was slanderous. The Prosecutor also repeated the conclusions of the expert examinations stating that there was a fifth copy of the article. Finally Savinkov asked that the sentence remain in force. After a 20-minute consultation the court left the sentence unchanged.

Nysnikov's case file contained an order to close the criminal case against Oleg Popov (Chronicles 61) under article 190-1 of the USSR Criminal Code, for lack of sufficient evidence.

On 3 July a First Lieutenant of the police visited Oleg Popov with a notice ordering him to go to Police Station No. 54 in Moscow. The policeman said he did not know the car. Popov refused. Then the policeman asked him to telephone the Deputy Head of the Criminal Investigations Department, who needed to have a talk with him lasting no more than ten minutes. In reply to Popov's question, as to the purpose of the conversation and the reason for the summons, Savinkov told him he had received a complaint about Popov from residents, but the contents of the conversation could not be discussed by telephone.

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 right to detain him for three hours. Popov was allowed to telephone his wife, then was accompanied by police to the reception room of the Moscow KGB Administration at Lubyanka Prison.

Popov also refused to 'have a talk' at the Lubyanka case. Popov refused. He asked whether he would like to study his own case. Popov told him he had turned up interrogation records (Chronicle 60) and was sure that the KGB was now forced to issue Popov a caution according to Decree No. 54 in Moscow. The policeman said he did not know the CGE administration at the time.

On 7 April Kashik issued Stepanets a severe reprimand 'for absence from work on 31 March'. On 10 April the following was added to the order: 'absence until 1 pm'. Nagle was punished likewise.

Nagle (see 'The Arrest of Kuvakin'), at which he told them not to have the texts with him, but gave an account of their contents and pointed out their inappropriate tone. After the hearing the Deputy Party Head, Gapeyenkov, went up to Pasin and said, 'What do you mean, you b...! You nearly wrecked the whole meeting with your provocational 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 11), on the next day, eight. However, after a go-over at work, the CGE employee who had disappeared on the second day reappeared 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 asked: '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's case. He told them that no one in the CGE expedition group had attended, and 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 Lyublin 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 administration issued the staff who attended the trial 'political information' about it in the various departments.
of the organization.

In expedition group 16 (where A. Lavut had worked) Abrinkosov 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 typewriters? Abrinkosov also said that the defence lawyer was unable to answer as to what this article was. When article she herself would be tried. At the 'political information' session in group 3 Pretsov said that Osipova had behaved very arrogantly at the trial, and when the Procurator 'offered her three years, she refused'.

After Sergei Khodorovich was sacked from the Computer Centre of the Main Moscow Fruit and Vegetable Combine (Chronicle 57) and his 'spiritual children' were at the time. They ordered the people gathered to show their documents, threatening arrest. Khodorovich and his 'students' were arrested. He was asked to draw up a record stating that 'a mass of people adhering to the Orthodox faith was going out'.

On 23 March a policeman and a KGB officer visited the flat where Father Dmitry Dudko (Chronicle 57) and his 'spiritual children' were at the time. They ordered the people gathered to show their documents, threatening arrest. Khodorovich and his 'students' were arrested. He was asked to draw up a record stating that 'a mass of people adhering to the Orthodox faith was going out'.

On 28 May Investigator Sorokin of the Moscow KGB told Dudko that on 22 May the case against him had been closed. The order stated that the case was being closed after he had found none of the persons who had summoned him at the district military recruitment office, and on his way home was attacked by three unidentified persons. He managed to fend them off. A day later the section head of the recruitment office, who had summoned him, asserted that he had been at his post at the appointed time (he later denied this assertion). He stated that he had urgently summoned Lozovsky in order to paste into his military papers an order for mobilization - which he now immediately stamped and inserted.

On 29 May S. Shibayev (Chronicle 60) was taken away from the flat where he was to be at 11 pm. When he arrived at the appointed time, Lozovsky found none of the persons who had summoned him at the office, and on his way home was attacked by three unidentified persons. He managed to fend them off. A day later the section head of the recruitment office, who had summoned him, asserted that he had been at his post at the appointed time (he later denied this assertion). He stated that he had urgently summoned Lozovsky in order to paste into his military papers an order for mobilization - which he now immediately stamped and inserted.

On the morning of 30 March he was told in the personnel department that since his temporary contract had run out, his temporary contract had been released. However, towards evening, who refused to give him a job (he had supposedly informed him of his decision some days earlier), the chief of personnel and the personnel officer were received by the director, who had forgotten to tell Khodorovich at the time.

On 16 April Larissa Poluektova (Chronicles 54, 55, 56) was summoned to Investigator V.D. Makarov in the Moscow KGB. Poluektova was shown an order stating that on 2 November documents given to her by Poluektova had been found in her possession; a letter from Poluektova addressed to an entitled 'Report on Work Carried Out' (about a religious sermon) to the priest Elchaninoff from L. Rudakova quoted the article, she was asked under which article she herself would be tried. At the 'political information' session in group 3 Pretsov said that Osipova had been brought to the flat. A guard was also set up at the door of Brailovsky's flat, where the regular session was to take place. A similar seminar is also being held in A. Ya. Lerner's flat. A guard was also set up outside his door.

At the end of May S. Shibayev (Chronicle 60) was taken off the register in Tarusa 'for prolonged absence from his place of residence' (this 'absence' was confirmed by his mother). He has found a job in Moscow as a carpenter.

On 26 April a police guard was set up at the door of Brailovsky's flat, where the regular session was to take place. A similar seminar is also being held in A. Ya. Lerner's flat. A guard was also set up outside his door.

On 16 April Larissa Poluektova (Chronicles 54, 55, 56) was summoned to Investigator V.D. Makarov in the Moscow KGB. Poluektova was shown an order stating that on 2 November documents given to her by Poluektova had been found in her possession; a letter from Poluektova addressed to an entitled 'Report on Work Carried Out' (about a religious sermon) to the priest Elchaninoff from L. Rudakova quoted the article, she was asked under which article she herself would be tried. At the 'political information' session in group 3 Pretsov said that Osipova had been brought to the flat. A guard was also set up at the door of Brailovsky's flat, where the regular session was to take place. A similar seminar is also being held in A. Ya. Lerner's flat. A guard was also set up outside his door.

On 29 May S. Shibayev (Chronicle 60) was taken away from the flat where he was to be at 11 pm. When he arrived at the appointed time, Lozovsky found none of the persons who had summoned him at the office, and on his way home was attacked by three unidentified persons. He managed to fend them off. A day later the section head of the recruitment office, who had summoned him, asserted that he had been at his post at the appointed time (he later denied this assertion). He stated that he had urgently summoned Lozovsky in order to paste into his military papers an order for mobilization - which he now immediately stamped and inserted.

On 18 April the Moscow writer Leonid Novak (Chronicle 60) who was sacked after the trial of I. Dyadykin and S. Gorbachyov (Chronicle 58), was given back his job as a senior scientific researcher. In May 1981, after complaining to the Procuracy, he was put back on the waiting list for a flat.

On 16 April Larissa Poluektova (Chronicles 54, 55, 56) was summoned to Investigator V.D. Makarov in the Moscow KGB. Poluektova was shown an order stating that on 2 November documents given to her by Poluektova had been found in her possession; a letter from Poluektova addressed to an entitled 'Report on Work Carried Out' (about a religious sermon) to the priest Elchaninoff from L. Rudakova quoted the article, she was asked under which article she herself would be tried. At the 'political information' session in group 3 Pretsov said that Osipova had been brought to the flat. A guard was also set up at the door of Brailovsky's flat, where the regular session was to take place. A similar seminar is also being held in A. Ya. Lerner's flat. A guard was also set up outside his door.

At the end of May S. Shibayev (Chronicle 60) was taken off the register in Tarusa 'for prolonged absence from his place of residence' (this 'absence' was confirmed by his mother). He has found a job in Moscow as a carpenter.

On 26 April a police guard was set up at the door of Brailovsky's flat, where the regular session was to take place. A similar seminar is also being held in A. Ya. Lerner's flat. A guard was also set up outside his door.

Vladimir Popov, a driver living in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk (on the Pacific), sent an inquiry to the Gorky 'City Information Centre' asking for A.D. Sakharov's address. The reply from Gorky was that Sakharov was not listed as living in the city, according to the information available at the address bureau. Some time later he was 'prevented from going to work' and forcibly hospitalized; the diagnosis was 'schizophrenia'. He was soon released from hospital. At the beginning of February Popov travelled to the Germanwings Psychiat-
there was no sound outside. Through the peep-hole I saw a tall stranger and my upstairs neighbour. Then they went away. I continued to have visits from Police Station No. 30 concerning, so they told me (I. Chubukov and Yu. Elpedinsky) a residence regulations check.

Now I am still getting constant telephone calls from the telephone exchange, the Housing Committee, and wrong numbers and silent phone calls. I am constantly followed wherever I go. For example, on 27 March 1981 I found I was being followed. Three 'Zhiguli' cars and about seven persons followed me everywhere. Such are the events of the past two years which are happening around me.

Documents of the Moscow Helsinki Group


Document No. 161 (2 April 1981): 'I consider the defence of human rights to be my life's work' (the trial of Tatyana Dzepova) (see this issue).


Document No. 163 (7 April 1981): 'Ivan Kandyba has been arrested in the Ukraine' (see this issue).


Document No. 168 (1 June 1981): 'New persecution of Kirill Podrabinek in places of imprisonment' (see this issue).

Document No. 169 (6 June 1981): 'The lives of prisoners Yury Fidelov and Aleksei Muzhenko are in danger' (see this issue).


Document No. 171 (30 June 1981): 'New instances of persecution of citizens of German nationality wishing to emigrate from the USSR' (see this issue).


SAMIZDAT NEWS

I. Kovalbv: '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.

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 my feelings. Where the present is concerned, there is still hope. It is sustained not only 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'. I understand 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 oppressed more than they are, despite various expressions of protest, now.

Of course it is difficult to speak of victory when so many people I love are in prisons and camps. But victory probably lies in the very fact that the movement exists, in spite of the efforts of the authorities. And in the composition I notice sometimes in simple people who have had it drummed into them so much: 'They're renegades, enemies, they've sold themselves': it's no use, no one believes it.

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 easily, 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 talk only about the qualities of the various persons involved in the movement.

5. What does 'help from the West' mean? How should one expect for yourself and your family from the West?
Moral support from the West, expressed in various letters, statements and protest demonstrations, is very important to us. It is also important, where a prisoner is concerned, that the campaign in his defence does not cease. In many cases material aid to his family is important. Where protest actions are concerned, it is important that they be given as much publicity as possible. When prisoners of conscience have been defended, it is useful to inform the administration of the camp in question of these actions.

One of the Group's documents addressed to the Madrid Conference spoke in part of the desirability of special research into the authenticity of our documents. I think that if such research were carried out, it would seriously hinder the authorities in their thankless task of convicting an innocent and truthful person on a charge of falsehood.

I want pure and honest 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 even reach our country in spite of custom 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? 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 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 today. People speaking out openly for human rights led ultimately to the creation of the various public groups and associations to defend 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 take shape and establish themselves. It is much 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 no openly acknowledged editorial board; I consider this publication to be virtually indestructible, so great is the demand for reliable and complete information.

If my hopes that in its new phase the human rights movement will simply come 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 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 general 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. Barjadjanu, B. Markovyan, V. Chornovil, V. Kosterin, M. Morozov, M. Gorbak, V. Lissiov and X. and A. Podrabinek, with the recent repeat arrest of A. Bolonkin, 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 them, people can come to them and report or pass on something. But there are few veterans. In the provinces, the 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 him flowers). In every province 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 dissenting and increasing opposition: events in Poland and growing food shortages. Both these factors are outside KGB control.

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 once recently officially called a village, and of course still is one in fact: the part of it that lies beyond the ravine, called Pervomaysky village, is a typical central Russian hamlet. Here, at 42 Lenin Street, stands an unfinished two-storey house. The tragic face of this house and its owner (he owns and built it, Anatoly Marchenko, which is both prosaic and unique, like our whole life, that the time will come when this street will be called Marchenko Street, and with good reason, since in spite of all the unquestionable historical achievements of the first Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, it was not here that he exposed his teachers and colleagues as not being revolutionary enough or loyal enough to the philosophical views of Democrites, Diderot and Feuerbach, whereas Tolya Marchenko's neighbours, if they were sufficiently far-sighted and intelligent, could already be proud of their remarkable fellow-countrysmen and contemporaries.

Sasha Lavut 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 most important thing: we were free!

I am talking about Sasha in particular, only because his imprisoned friends. And it is hard all the same for me to find words worthy of him. Sasha is very kind and warm-hearted. Not only does he love his family (four grandchildren - no kidding) and his friends, but he loves people in general. He is extraordinarily brave, as only modest people are brave (they are incapable of immodesty as well as any lack of taste or culture). Such people speak quietly, not because they are such 'quiet people', but merely because they do not have to speak any louder to be heard. He is genuinely cheerful and somehow inherently witty - his wit, like his intelligence, is not at all obtrusive.

Sasha is amazingly selfless, he has a very fine face and a wonderful smile. I'm glad Sasha Lavut is my friend, and I'm proud of it. I do not know anyone who knows him without liking him. Often it even seems to me that it is impossible not to like him, but I'm obviously wrong here, at least if we agree to regard the employees of the department of frisking and spying as people.

And anyway, why should they like him? After all, he is truly a child of goodness and light. All of him is the triumph of freedom' (quotation from a poem). And it would be strange to expect people who are not free, who crush freedom, to love freedom. Not everyone has the strength to possess this gift, which is truly priceless: one can pay for it only with one's own freedom.


Sasha Lavut 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 most important thing: we were free!

It was then that I got to know Sasha all over again; straightforward we were great friends and I loved him. Since then I have not only always associated this wonderful person with my 'physical' release and the awareness of the freedom of speech to which he devoted himself: for me it was more free!

I am talking about Sasha in particular, only because his imprisoned friends. And it is hard all the same for me to find words worthy of him. Sasha is very kind and warm-hearted. Not only does he love his family (four grandchildren - no kidding) and his friends, but he loves people in general. He is extraordinarily brave, as only modest people are brave (they are incapable of immodesty as well as any lack of taste or culture). Such people speak quietly, not because they are such 'quiet people', but merely because they do not have to speak any louder to be heard. He is genuinely cheerful and somehow inherently witty - his wit, like his intelligence, is not at all obtrusive.

Sasha is amazingly selfless, he has a very fine face and a wonderful smile. I'm glad Sasha Lavut is my friend, and I'm proud of it. I do not know anyone who knows him without liking him. Often it even seems to me that it is impossible not to like him, but I'm obviously wrong here, at least if we agree to regard the employees of the department of frisking and spying as people.

And anyway, why should they like him? After all, he is truly a child of goodness and light. All of him is the triumph of freedom' (quotation from a poem). And it would be strange to expect people who are not free, who crush freedom, to love freedom. Not everyone has the strength to possess this gift, which is truly priceless: one can pay for it only with one's own freedom.
is our country. Your streets, whatever signs you put up or down, whatever idols you raise, cannot and will never exist, all memory of you will not stay during your lifetime. 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)

An essay on the life of Nadezhda Vitalevna Surovtseva, one of the Ukraine's oldest writers (born 1896).

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

The author maintains that Father Dmitry Dudko's 'repentances' (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 Regelis, Viktor Kapitanchuk and other priests before they reached breaking point in court. Father Dmitry insists now that he does not take psychotropic drugs.

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

V. Vardomtsev: '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 Atheist in their Own Language?'
- 'Forgiveness'
- 'Can One speak to the Atheist in their Own Language?'
- 'My Repentance' Father Dmitry asks Christians to forgive him and pray for him. In 'Letters to My Spiritual Children', in addition to asking forgiveness 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. Shatrovskii: 'How I Celebrated the 26th Congress of the CPSU' (19 pages)

The author gives an account of his 'pre-Congress' for-fibrate hospitalization (Chronicle 61) and of the circumstan-fes of his 'Olympic' and November hospitalizations in 1980.

'Prison Transport' (6 pages)

This essay is based on a prisoner's letter.

A. Zelyakov: 'Camp 45' (4 pages)

Group 2 invalid A. Zelyakov dedicates his essay about a camp for disabled prisoners 'to the memory of forgotten and dead disabled prisoners'.

In Donetspetrovsk Prison, along with the cripples waiting for the prison train, I talked to people who had come from there. And I heard:

'It's no good longing to go to that crematorium, old man! It's a real death-trap out there - no treatment, no grub. On the contrary, those bastards try to stuff you off as soon as possible, but without any fuss, so everything will be hush-hush: they'll beat you to death in the cooler and write that you hanged yourself. So you're better off, mate, pottering about in an ordinary labour-camp for a bit than snuffing it in that Soviet Buchenwald.'

From the outside the camp looks no different from an ordinary one, but as a camp for the disabled it has its own specific peculiarities inside, and its own education methods': there is no exhausting trooping off to work, but you won't see any straight columns marching to the con-tent: but almost every day two burly orderlies will drag the next 'liberated' corpse indifferently out of the
A description of how telephones work when fitted with an extra part (diode) not specified by the standard diagram but produced in the Soviet Union. According to the author, such telephone sets can be used to transmit an extra part to gigantic steel barracks to the morgue. And this instructive scene is supposed to exert a salutary influence on the convicts'.

Before I had time to look around, I was summoned to the detachment head. Lieutenant Yatsenko, a young man and ordered me with an insolent smile to do sexually 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, Kiev'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 'boss', security chief Major Godymski.

"What use is a camp for the disabled if we're made to work like healthy people here?" You're the tiresome ballast 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 knocking out the prisoners' gold teeth, as in the 'good old' Nazi 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 Zelyakov 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 diagram by the author, such telephone sets can be used to transmit to 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 - 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 greenery, jubilee and domestic and foreign undertakings of the government with inspired intensive labour.

The author describes certain methods used in achieving fulfillment of the plan. In addition to the voluntary working Saturdays and Sundays, and weeks of shock work 'ballet' 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...the large number of colds related to the influenza epidemic, I order...to organize work on Saturday.

(This order was issued on 21 January in the Lamin Komsomol car factory in Moscow by the Director-General, V.L. Mulnikov.)

"On Academician Sakharov's 60th Birthday" (1981, 13 pages)

The collection contains a biographical chronology entitled 'Some of the Events in Andrei Dmitrievich Sakharov's Scientific and Civic Activity' (in 1965 Sakharov published two scientific articles: in 1966, three; in 1967, four; in 1968, two; in 1971, one; in 1974, one; in 1975, two; in 1979, one; in 1980, three) and an 'Open Letter' to the President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, A.F. Alekperov, dated 20 October 1980 (Chronicle 60)

"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. Fefilov (see Chronicle 60). The Bulletin contains two appeals of the Initiative Group to the President of the Presidium of the 26th 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 to 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 help the helpless and destitute' in their sermons); a note on the decoration of the RSFSR Minister of Social Security, S. Komarova; a reply from the Head of the Department for International Relations of the USSR State Committee on Labour and Social Questions, A.F. Bordelus; to the leaders of the European organisation to assist the Disabled; Initiative Group Documents Nos. 20 - 'Letters Testify....', 21 - 'In an Atmosphere of Love for Mankind! (about the fate of Group member F. Khassanov) and 22 - 'In the Crimea Yu. Kiselev's Home Has Burned Down' (Chronicle 61); reports on the arrest of N. Pavlov (see Chronicle 61); the 'pre-Congress' hospitalization of Yu. Valov (Chronicle 61), and the detention of Group member G. Zaitseva (20 - 'Persecution of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled' in this issue; Group statements in defence of V. Serbov (arrest in Chronicle 61) and V.K. Pervushin (see 'Arrests in this issue); Group statements in defence of the RSFSR Minister of Social Security, S. Komarova (20); the 'pre-Congress' hospitalization of Yu. Valov (Chronicle 61), and the detention of Group member G. Zaitseva (20 - 'Persecution of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled' in this issue; Group statements in defence of V. Serbov (arrest in Chronicle 61) and V.K. Pervushin (see 'Arrests in this issue); Group statements in defence of the RSFSR Minister of Social Security, S. Komarova (20); the 'pre-Congress' hospitalization of Yu. Valov (Chronicle 61), and the detention of Group member G. Zaitseva (20 - 'Persecution of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled' in this issue; Group statements in defence of V. Serbov (arrest in Chronicle 61) and V.K. Pervushin (see 'Arrests in this issue); Group statements in defence of the RSFSR Minister of Social Security, S. Komarova (20); the 'pre-Congress' hospitalization of Yu. Valov (Chronicle 61), and the detention of Group member G. Zaitseva (20 - 'Persecution of the Initiative Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled' in this issue; Group statements in defence of V. Serbov (arrest in Chronicle 61) and V.K. Pervushin (see 'Arrests in this issue); Group statements in defence of the RSFSR Minister of Social Security, S. Komarova (20).
No. 13 (1981, 10 pages)
No. 12 contains 'Completion of the Five-Year Plan' (a comparison of planned and current figures), 'What and How Much Carter Achieved', and a statement by the editors of the journal The Cane (Chronicle 61). No. 13 contains 'Results of the Congress', 'What and For What Price' and 'Russia Supports Poland'.

APPENDIX AND CORRIGENDA

On 6 August 1980 officials of the Moscow City Procuracy carried out a search of the flat of A. Myasnikov (arrest in Chronicle 56, trial in Chronicle 60).

In the search unpublicized works by A. Myasnikov were confiscated: the articles '173 Reasons for National Shame or what the Constitution Falls to Mention' and the tale 'Meetings of 17 May' together with the story 'A Day in the Mountains', the story 'A Whole Life' and the essay 'Far Beyond the Mountainside', the novel 'The Empty Chair', the novel 'What the Constitution Fails to Mention', and the essay '173 Reasons for National Shame'.

On 16 and 17 June 1980 the interior of the Moscow City Procuracy was searched for and seized confiscated works of A. Myasnikov. On 17 June A. Myasnikov was interrogated by investigator Borovik, who conducted the interrogation, attempted in vain to obtain evidence from Myasnikov which would compromise his friend Anatoly. Investigator Vorobyov also failed to obtain the same evidence when he interrogated R. Orlichenko, Myasnikov's wife.

The Case of Lupinos

Here are some additions and corrections to the reports about A. Lupinos in Chronicles 57 and 61. On 15 June 1980 the Cherkassy Regional Court, in the presence of the Chairman of the Cherkassy Regional Court, V.I. Malevanny, and a Cherkassy District People's Court 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 not yet entered into legal force: the time allowed for appeals had not yet expired. Lupinos was taken back to Smela. There, '15 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 Cherkassy Regional Procuracy. Cherkassy 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 not considered, since you were not his guardian prior to 16 July 1980, and were not therefore entitled by law to appeal against the court decision.

I.T. Kushel, Chairman of Smela Town People's Court

I.T. Lupinos received the following reply from the Cherkassy Regional Procuracy:

Cherkassy Regional Procuracy
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 Prosecutor and a lawyer of the Smela Legal Consultation Office, comrade O.I. Nikiforov, participated in the case. The appeal has been ruled groundless.

I. Yo. Storchancey, Prosecutor 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 Cherkassy Regional Court, V.I. Malevanny, said the certificate was not found. He went to the Procurator, who sent him to the legal consultation office. There he was persuaded to fill out a new guardianship form. He went again to the village soviet, where on 16 July 1980 he was issued a new certificate, after which the court replied that he was not his guardian on the day of the trial. I.T. Lupinos was born in 1906 and fought all through the war. Anatoly's mother A.A. Lupinos died in 1979.

In December 1980 A. Lupinos was transferred to Orel SPH. On 6 June 1981 a medical commission recommended that he be transferred to a psychiatric hospital of ordinary type.
ENDNOTES

3 Edited by A. Ginzburg in 1958-60 and later published abroad in GDR, Frankfurt, No. 58 (1965). See also Chronicle 1.
4 On these see Chronicles 32, 36.
6 This 400-page manuscript describes the author's experiences during internments in various mental hospitals. It has reached the West.
7 See note 5 above.
8 In fact, it was the previously mentioned article, "Willing Patients", which was published in The Lancet (11 April 1981).
9 A copy of this report is in the possession of Amnesty International and some other bodies.
10 A 14-page translation of these autobiographical notes is available from Working Group Hon. Sec. Mrs. C. Shaw, 27 Herland Sq., London, W1.
11 Often used Soviet propaganda about Solzhenitsyn, who was never in fact a German prisoner.
12 The Chronicle's word 'published' has been changed here to 'edited'. For details on the bulletin's publication see the Bibliographical Note below.
13 See Chronicle 31, p. 64.
15 See note 13.
16 See note 13.
18 It was published in Possev: Svi Sotsialniy Vypusk, Frankfurt, November 1979. It is 25 accounts, unique in nature, of how his appeal against expulsion from the CPSU was heard by the Party Control Commission.
19 In autumn 1981 Kandyba was sentenced to 10 years in special-regime camps, plus 5 years' exile.
20 In autumn 1981 R. Rudenko was sentenced to 5 years in strict-regime camps, plus 5 years' exile.
21 See note 13.
22 The article was changed, and in August 1981 Antsaukov was sentenced to 6 years in strict-regime camps, plus 5 in exile.
23 See note 13.
24 See photographs of two of these processions in Chronicles 54.
25 Some of the sentences later imposed on Baptistas mentioned in this section (all terms refer to ordinary-regime camps unless otherwise stated): Sheshenko - 3 years, Vall - 5 years, statt - 4 years, Rostyuchenko - 2 years', Kostyuchenko - 2 years' strict-regime, Redin - 3 years.
26 Most of the issues of this journal have been reprinted in Russian in the documentary series Evropeiskii samizdat (Centre for Research & Documentation of E. European Jewry, Hebrew University, Jerusalem), 21 volumes of which had appeared by 1980.
27 See note 13.
28 Later they were both sentenced to 3 years in ordinary-regime camps.
29 Mural was sentenced in August 1981 to 3½ years in ordinary-regime camps.
30 The collection was later published in New York by Khronika Press as Sakharovski Chronicle, 1981, and is due to be published also in French.
31 In summer 1981 Ovsyannik was sentenced to 10 years in strict-regime camps, plus 5 years' exile.
32 In February 1982 Balankin 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.
33 See note 13.
34 See note 13.
35 The camp's address is: Dnepropetrovskaya oblast, Sofievskiy raion, s. Makorty, p/ya 308/45.

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

Chronicles 43-45. Illustration 48: the caption refers erroneously to Dina Kravchenko. It should read: Elya Kasper, b. 1949, Baptist sentenced to 3 years for evangelizing (Chronicle 38), was released in 1977 from a camp in Ust-Lans; see over. (Elya Kasper recently emigrated to W. Germany.)
36 Chronicles 59-61. Illustration 21: add to the caption this further information: sitting, 2nd from 1: Tatyana Shatalova (Chronicles 48, 51). (Shatalova recently emigrated.)
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 in a pocket-sized size with microfiche insert), and numbers 1-16 are also available as translations of the Chronicle and other Lithuanian samizdat in ELTA, 1611 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 2, Washington, D.C. 20009, USA.

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

The most comprehensive source of current, up-to-date information on events reported in the Chronicle is the fortnightly USSR News Brief: Human Rights, edited by Dr Kronid Lubarsky and available from Dr Kronid Lubarsky, 48 rue du Lac, 1050 Brussels, Belgium. It is also a useful source, as are, for Ukrainian Helsinki Group documents, several booklets published in English by Smolensk Publishers, P.O. Box 2106, Ellicott City, Maryland 21043, USA. In French the best source of samizdat texts is Cahiers du Samizdat, 48 rue du Lac, 1050 Brussels, Belgium; also translations of this and other Lithuanian samizdat in ELTA, 1611 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 2, Washington, D.C. 20009, USA.

Nearly 900 photos have been published in the English editions of the Chronicle. They comprise photographs of individuals, demonstrations, labour camps, prisons, psychiatric institutions, other buildings, facsimiles of documentary material and groups of people. An alphabetical index to the first 700 photos appeared as a special supplement at the end of the English edition of Chronicle 94.
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Nearly 900 photos have been published in the English editions of the Chronicle. They comprise photographs of individuals, demonstrations, labour camps, prisons, psychiatric institutions, other buildings, facsimiles of documentary material and groups of people. An alphabetical index to the first 700 photos appeared as a special supplement at the end of the English edition of Chronicle 94.
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