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Preface

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

In an early issue it was stated that 'the Chronicle does, and will do, its utmost to ensure that its strictly factual style is maintained to the greatest degree possible. . .' The Chronicle has consistently maintained a high standard of accuracy. As a regular practice the editors openly acknowledge when a piece of information has not been thoroughly verified. When mistakes in reporting occur, those 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 Chronicles 40, 41 and 42, is, like previous ones, a translation of copies of the original typewritten texts. The editorial insertions are the endnotes (numbered) and the words in square brackets. The table of contents, abbreviations, illustrations, index of names, bibliographical note and material on the outside and inside of the cover have been added to help the general reader. None of this material appears in the original texts.

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

Since Amnesty International has no control over the writing of A Chronicle of Current Events, we cannot guarantee the veracity of all its contents. Nor do we take responsibility for any opinions or judgements which may appear or be implied in its contents. Yet Amnesty International continues to regard A Chronicle of Current Events as an authentic and reliable source of information on matters of direct concern to our own work for the worldwide observance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Amnesty International
June 1979

Abbreviations

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

CPSU  Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

KGB  Committee for State Security.

Komsomol  Communist Youth League.

MVD  Ministry of Internal Affairs.

OVVD  Department of Internal Affairs.

OV IR  Department (of the MVD) for Visas and Registration.

SSR  Soviet Socialist Republic, of which there are 15 in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR).

UVD  Administration for Internal Affairs.
Everywhere 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.

Ninth Year of Publication
The Chronicle is publishing the following samizdat article, 'Thought Trials must not be Allowed', by T. S. Khodorovich, a member of the Initiative Group.

Spring 1976 ...

Trials have been held in Odessa, Moscow, Omsk and Vilnius, in which people have again been tried and sentenced for the thoughts they had expressed and even for thoughts they had not expressed.

The sentences and court decisions rang out:
- Vyacheslav Igrunov — sent to an ordinary psychiatric hospital;
- Andrei Tverdokhlebov — 5 years' exile;
- Mustafa Dzhemilev — 2½ years in strict-regime camps;
- Valery Marusi — 6 months' corrective labour.

Certain citizens of the USSR and of Western countries, seeing in these sentences the beginnings of liberalism, sighed with relief: at last a psychiatric hospital — not a psychiatric prison; exile — not a labour camp; two and a half years — not seven!

It is our duty to give a warning:

Normal people should not harbour illusions about Soviet trials! Because the point is not merely that people are arrested for nothing. It is not merely that people are sent for trial without a concrete criminal charge, and are condemned only for their beliefs, that is, for having the courage to exist as individuals!

That is not all. Trying someone for his beliefs means putting on a juridical stage-production; it is only a formal excuse for the future isolation and destruction of an individuality and of a person in general.

A trial removes a man from the world and hands him over to State Security. That is the beginning of a martyr's life for that man.

Vyacheslav Igrunov, 27 years old, has now been branded as a 'psycho' by the decision of the Odessa regional court. Remember, when you open your mouth or write a few lines, moved by some injustice, or when you read a 'forbidden' book: you are not yet in hell, only on the threshold! From now on Vyacheslav Igrunov will for ever live with the threat of clanging doors, of being bolted in a psychiatric prison, and this will also keep his friends and relations in fear and trembling.

The sentence of a Soviet court is not a punishment for a crime committed, it is an unlimited opportunity for further unobserved reprisals, psychological and physical, against an individual.

Alexander Feldman — a prisoner of conscience, whom the Kiev court declared to be a criminal two and a half years ago and, by its sentence, thrust into the society of real thieves, rapists and murderers — was the victim of an attempt on his life at the end of March this year: his head was split open by a spade. Alexander Feldman was taken to the hospital. The camp commandant, Akhinskii, did not report either the date of the attack or the name of the culprit. He refused to allow Feldman's father to visit him or to send him a parcel.

Vladimir prison is now full of prisoners who are witnesses to the fact that the KGB have been given the opportunity for further unobserved reprisals precisely by courts of law. The isolation afforded by the barbed wire fence around a labour camp seemed insufficient to State Security, so at its behest camp tribunals incarcerated the following in stone prison cells: Vladimir Bukovsky, Kronid Lyubarsky, Alexander Sergienko, Vladimir Balakhonov, Mustafa Dzhemilev, Zinovy Antonyuk and many others.

As they say, it is the first step that counts.

Semyon Gluzman, a young psychiatrist and doctor well known for his defence of people declared to be mentally ill by Soviet courts, is being threatened with new legal reprisals in camp, because of the documents he produced there, including the Manual on Psychiatry for Dissenters', dedicated to Leonid Piyushch, which was published in the West. In March of this year, Semyon Gluzman was transferred from the camp to a prison in the town of Perm, where attempts were made to 're-educate' him. There he was warned by officials of State Security that a 'case' was being prepared against him in camp under article 70, paragraph 2 ('Anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda', a paragraph on recidivists). Semyon Gluzman has now been sent back to the camp from the prison. There has been no further news of his fate.

The worst of this is not so much that the legal norms of judicial procedure are not being observed, but that they cannot be observed.

There is no legal justice. Nor will there be, while courts are given the right to try a man because he is an individual, because he thinks!

We should not ask for mercy or gracious pardons for prisoners of conscience, we should demand immediate freedom for them! Freedom and acquittal on all charges in the name of justice!

Freedom for those who have already been incarcerated for a long time: for all prisoners sentenced for their Free Speech in Vladimir prison, for all the Free Speech prisoners in the camps and psychiatric prisons.

Freedom for those who have been sentenced to such torment quite recently: Sergei Kovalyov, Anatoly Marchenko, Vyacheslav Igrunov, Mustafa Dzhemilev, Andrei Tverdokhlebov.

Freedom for them all and acquittal on all charges. They are not guilty of anything, they are not criminals!

Statement by Tatyana Khodorovich

Statement by Tatyana Khodorovich
Freedom for those threatened by trials for their Words!
And such a trial is once more approaching ...
This will be the trial of Semyon Gluzman.
There is also the trial of Mikhail Naritsa, a ‘prisoner of all periods’, a
65-year-old artist and writer from the Latvian town of Jelgava. The aim of
his trial is the same as always: to shut a man’s mouth, to prevent Mikhail
Naritsa from singing his “Unsong Song”.

We must speak out in defence of Semyon Gluzman and Mikhail Naritsa
now, before they are brought to trial!
Above all, thought trials must not be permitted!
People should not be ‘pillars of thought’, they must express their thoughts by
transforming them into Words. For, as Heine said, ‘The world is the
imprint of the Word. Take note of that, proud men of action! You are no
more than unconscious and unskilled workers serving men of thought …’
April 1976

The Trial of Andrei Tverdokhlebov

Andrei Nikolayevich Tverdokhlebov was born in Moscow in 1940; he is a
physicist. He was one of the founders of the Human Rights Committee (in
December 1972 he left the Committee — see Chronicle 29). In September 1973
he founded ‘Group 73’, together with V. Arkhangelsky, V. Albrecht and I.
Kornayev (Chronicle 30). He was one of the compilers of the samizdat Amnesty
International volumes (ibid.). He was the secretary of the Soviet Amnesty
International group (the president is V. Turchin). At the beginning of 1975 the
book Andrei Tverdokhlebov in Defence of Human Rights (editor V. Chalidev)
was published by the Khronika Press publishing house (New York). After a
number of searches and interrogations in the winter of 1974–75 (Chronicles
34–35), Tverdokhlebov was arrested on 18 April 1975 (Chronicle 36).

The trial of Tverdokhlebov, like that of Dzhemilev (see below in this issue), was
originally fixed for 6 April. By that time the Moscow City Court had received
a declaration from Tverdokhlebov’s friends and relations. They asked for
arrangements to be made to ensure that the courtroom would be large enough
to accommodate all those who wished to be present and who had announced
their intention in advance. The authors cited as a precedent the trial of V.
Igrunov in Odessa (see below in this issue). The declaration was signed by 35
persons.

On 4 April E. Bonner and A. Sakharov gave out the following statement to
the press:
Two trials are to take place on 6 April — that of Andrei Tverdokhlebov in
Moscow and that of Mustafa Dzhemilev in Omsk.

Andrei Tverdokhlebov is a very close friend of ours, almost like a member
of our family. On countless occasions his help, advice, sympathy and his
mere presence have supported us in our tense and difficult life. We should like
to be near him during the trial, even if we and our friends are not allowed
into the courtroom, which has unfortunately become a shameful tradition
as regards political trials in the U S S R.

However, the trial in Omsk is taking place in even more tragic circum-
stances. Dzhemilev, one of the leaders of the Crimean Tatar movement to
return to the Crimea, is being threatened with a fourth term of imprisonment.
For nine months he has been on hunger-strike in protest against the charges,
which are based on false evidence. In Omsk there are no facilities for foreign
 correspondents, not even the limited means of publicity which exist in
Moscow.

Faced with a difficult choice, we have decided to travel to Omsk. We hope
that public opinion in our country and abroad will concentrate equally on
both trials. We are hoping for international interventions in defence of Andrei
Tverdokhlebov and Mustafa Dzhemilev.

However, on 6 April the trial of Andrei Tverdokhlebov (like that of Dzhemilev)
was postponed — ‘because of the illness of the judge’. In addition, measures
were taken on that day to keep undesirable members of the public away from
the courtroom. For example, Tatiana Velikanova was refused permission to
take a day off work at her own expense on 6 April.

The trial of Tverdokhlebov, like the trial of Dzhemilev in Omsk and that of
Valery Maresin in Vilnius, began a week later, on 14 April. The case was heard
by an assizes session of the Moscow City Court on the outskirts of Moscow,
in the building of the Lyublino district people’s court (14 Egorevskaya street).

As usual, the courtroom turned out to be full in advance. Only the closest
relatives were allowed in, while other people were first pushed away from
the courtroom door and then pushed out of the courthouse altogether on to the
street.

A group of citizens (27 persons) sent a collective telegram to the Procurator-
General. The telegram reported that the trial was being conducted ‘with viola-
tions of basic procedural norms such as the publicity of court proceedings’. The
Procurator-General was asked to take ‘immediate steps to restore legality’.

The First Secretary of one of the departments at the U S embassy made an
attempt to get into the court. He was asked for an authorization from his
ambassador. When he returned half an hour later with such an authorization, he
was asked to obtain permission from the U S S R Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
The diplomat did not trouble to go to the Ministry, but stayed on the street
together with the other people who had not been allowed in.

* * *

A Chronicle of Current Events No. 40

The Trial of Andrei Tverdokhlebov
From the indictment:

**Judge Bogdanov:** Does the accused wish to challenge any of the members of the court?

**Tverdokhlebov:** I don't challenge anyone.

**Bogdanov:** In other words, you trust the court?

**Tverdokhlebov:** No, I don't trust the court. But I don't wish to make use of my right to challenge anyone.

Bogdanov announced that out of 29 witnesses summoned, 16 were present. The following witnesses were missing — I. Rudakov, V. N. Tverdokhlebov, Lyubarskaya, Kalenko (the last two were employees of the Dnepropetrovsk special psychiatric hospital), R. Pimenov, V. Kozlov, Kuznetsova, Kirsanova, Keller, and also the prisoners V. Arkhangelsky, Vituris, Gricius and Kurnikov.

The court decided to proceed with the trial without the absent witnesses. The defendant asked the court to allow anyone who wished to do so to attend the trial — his relatives, friends and acquaintances.

The judge asked Tverdokhlebov to say exactly whom he wished to see in the courtroom. Tverdokhlebov asked that all those who had signed a declaration asking for permission to be present in court (see below) be allowed into the courtroom, but did not name anyone. He felt that all those who had come to the courthouse should be allowed in. Procurator Prazdnikov objected: 'The defendant is asking us to let just anyone in ...' Defence counsel Yudovich supported Tverdokhlebov's request insofar as it applied to his relatives. The court denied the request.

Tverdokhlebov asked for permission to re-examine volume 40 of the evidence. He explained that he had not read this volume carefully enough, and, in addition, he suspected that some new documents might have been added to it.

The prosecutor objected. The judge insisted that there was no evidence unknown to Tverdokhlebov in volume 40. The defendant again asked to be given the opportunity of glancing at the contents of this volume 'if only for a few minutes'. The court allowed him this opportunity. Tverdokhlebov turned over the last few pages and stated that he had been right — there was some new evidence in the volume. The court gave Tverdokhlebov ten minutes to examine these documents.

Tverdokhlebov also inquired why he had not been released from detention after the pre-trial investigation was over, and asked to be shown the document sanctioning his detention after 18 November. The judge replied that Tverdokhlebov had been held under arrest on a lawful basis.

From the indictment:

A. N. Tverdokhlebov, having chosen as a form of criminal activity the drawing up of collective letters, declarations and appeals which contained libels against the Soviet system, during 1970-5 prepared, drew up, reproduced and distributed them ...
The indictment states how each of these documents was made use of, by which hostile forces — Radio Liberty, the “Possev” publishing house, the newspaper Novoe Ruskoe Slovo, imperialist propaganda, and the Chronicle of Current Events.

In 1973, on his ‘Continental’ typewriter, he reproduced Solzhenitsyn's lampoon — A Letter to the Soviet Leaders, which includes demands for the abolition of the existing system in the USSR and its replacement by a multi-party parliamentary system...

In 1974, he used the same typewriter to reproduce and distribute among his friends Sakharov's review of the above-mentioned lampoon by Solzhenitsyn, which contained libellous statements, such as the following: ‘Solzhenitsyn's unrivalled role in the spiritual life of our country is due to his uncompromisingly accurate and deeply revealing portrayal of the people's sufferings and of the regime's crimes, which are unrivalled in their mass cruelty and secrecy'...

In the same year he reproduced and distributed among his acquaintances Sakharov's article ‘The World Half a Century from Now’, which gives a libellous account of the actions of the party and the government...

There was now a discussion of the order in which the witnesses were to be called. The prosecutor suggested that witnesses who were relatives of the accused should be called last.

Tverdokhlebov demanded that his relatives should be questioned first. In that case, the defendant explained, they could be present in court from the very beginning, which would, of course, be of interest to them.

Defence counsel supported this request. He explained that the relatives had been summoned to give evidence on the character of the defendant and that they should therefore be heard first.

The court granted this request only with regard to the defendant's mother, and decided to question her first.

Cross-examination of the defendant

Judge: Do you understand the charges against you?

Tverdokhlebov: Yes ... I am charged with what I would call exchanging information. I regard it as any man's inalienable right to write and to distribute what he has written.

I do not dispute the factual circumstances the indictment deals with. However, the spreading of information, which I am being tried for, is related to certain other general principles existing in the world, in particular, to the principle of legal proceedings being open to the public...

Judge: You're speaking in a very unconnected manner, the secretary is finding it difficult to record. There's no need to theorize, you're an educated man and should be able to express your thoughts concretely.

Tverdokhlebov: During the investigation I was asked, ‘Did you take any measures to make sure that your material would not be used by hostile publishing-houses and newspapers?’ I explained that in our circumstances an individual can have no control over publication in the West ... I too could not avoid unwanted publication without putting myself under the control of the government ... However, there is a Convention on the control of publications and on the international law regarding the exchange of ideas and opinions. It is a great pity that the USSR is not a party to that convention; if it were, of course, it would have no need to force its citizens to disown their publications...

Judge: I call your attention to the following: first, you must speak about particular episodes, then about whether they have been proved or not, and then your main documents.

Tverdokhlebov: From the documents of the case I see that the persecution of citizens for exchanging information on the subject of human rights has become normal in our country, however hard the authorities try to prove the opposite. This is a bad habit and I tried not to become the object of such persecution ... I understand that the infringement of established customs leads to punishment ... It was inevitable that I would be punished (Tverdokhlebov went on to give evidence concerning episodes).

I admit the fact that I signed the letter about Solzhenitsyn. I don't consider it important that the text was used by Radio Liberty.

The indictment is correct about the compilation of the documents written by Medvedev, Volpin and Chalidze: I sent them to the Commission on Legislative Proposals, to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, to the Ministry of Health, and abroad.

Next point. Together with others, he drew up and sent an appeal to the Congress of Psychiatrists ... This refers to the same collection of documents as the last point. I can state that the practice of putting people in psychiatric hospitals for political motives exists in the USSR ... It is my opinion that such things happen. However, the text of the appeal does not itself contain documentation. The collected documents include a warning about the danger of misusing science, particularly medicine.

Judge: Does this refer to doctors?

Tverdokhlebov: Yes, that's right. Next, there is the letter of Zhiltikova. I confirm that I sent this letter with comments of my own. However, I consider
it meaningless to discuss whether it was or was not libellous ...  

On all the other points of the indictment, Tverdokhlebov admitted the facts — that he prepared, drew up, reproduced or distributed material, but rejected the charge of libel.

Concerning the ‘Declaration of 44’, Tverdokhlebov said: ‘I asked for Superfin and investigator Syshchikov to be called as witnesses; this has been refused, which is bad. Syshchikov could tell us a great deal.’

On being asked by the prosecutor what means he used to send material abroad, Tverdokhlebov refused to answer, stating only that he had put the letter to Dr. B. Dixon into a post-box in the Solokl district. (This letter was intercepted in the Moscow international post-office and added to the case-evidence — *Chronicle*).

During the examination of the episode when Sakharov’s work ‘The World Half a Century from Now’ was distributed, defence counsel Yudovich asked the court to take into evidence a telegram he had just received from A. Sakharov. The prosecutor objected. The court refused defence counsel’s request.

(The telegram was addressed to the Moscow City Court, with copies sent to the Procurator’s office and defence counsel Yudovich. The text of the telegram was as follows:

As far as I understand from an interrogation of Turchin, Tverdokhlebov is being charged with distributing my article ‘The World Half a Century from Now’. This charge is based on a misunderstanding. My article is basically futurological, scientific and technical. The article calls for humane values and increased co-operation between nations. I and I alone take full responsibility for its contents and distribution. I ask the court to add this declaration to the case-evidence.

4 April 1976.
Andrei Sakharov, Academician, three times Hero of Socialist Labour.)

Cross-examination of the witnesses

Sara Yulevna Tverdokhlebova, mother of the defendant, a pensioner.

**Judge:** What can you tell us about your son?

**Tverdokhlebov:** May God give every mother such a son ... When investigator V. S. Gusev summoned me, he said during our talk, he assured me that on no account would I have to appear as a witness at the trial ... I shall not give any evidence at the trial of my own son ...

**Judge:** Well, you said you had a good son. So tell us about him.

**Prosecutor:** How he grew up, whether he was healthy ...

**Tverdokhlebov:** The investigator already asked me about that; he found out that I never took my son to any neurologist ...

**Prosecutor:** Why are you talking about neurologists? I never mentioned any neurologist ...

Tverdokhlebov: I’m talking about it because the investigator was interested in that. I repeat, I am not going to give any evidence.

Later, the following prisoners were questioned, one after the other — Mikolai Dudenas, Jonas Paulauskas, Meliton Dzhaburin (their names are included in the ‘List of prisoners known to the Chronicle in the Perm camps’ in *Chronicle* 33, with minor mis-spellings, as Dzhaburin, Dudinas; on the latter, see also the ‘Polemics with Sukharev’ in *Chronicle* 39).

In answer to the similar questions put to them, they answered that they had been sentenced for treason (Paulauskas had ‘stayed in the forest to avoid fighting’, Dzhaburina ‘was taken prisoner and later worked for the Germans’), the conditions in the camp were normal, ‘liveable’, the administration did not punish the prisoners without reason. In response to questions from defence counsel, they said they did not know Gluzman, Opanasenko, Svetlichny or Pronyuk (Paulauskas and Dzhaburina had seen Gluzman, but only fleetingly).

L. A. Ladyzhensky, a prisoner from Perm camp 36, sentenced under article 65 of the Latvian S S R Criminal Code, 3 year term (see *Chronicle* 34).

He was now seeing Tverdokhlebov for the first time, but he had heard of him. The witness described how he had become convinced, on getting into prison, that life in the camps was much easier than he had thought from reading samizdat. In Ladyzhensky’s opinion, 90 per cent of the reports from camps in samizdat literature were untrue. Concerning the attitude of the administration to the prisoners, he said that he had ‘not seen any deliberate cruelty, they mistreated people not consciously, but rather unconsciously, because of their low cultural level ... He did not know Gluzman, Opanasenko, Pronyuk or Svetlichny.

I. I. Nevara, about 60 years old, a policeman, a neighbour of Tverdokhlebov.

**Judge:** Tell us about your relationship with the defendant.

**Nevara:** It was normal. We had no disagreements.

**Prosecutor:** Did many people visit Tverdokhlebov?

**Nevara:** People came every day, in ones and twos and in groups ... They didn’t disturb me ...

Later the witness stated that Tverdokhlebov often talked on the telephone, sometimes reading something out from a prepared text for hours, making calls abroad, often to London. The witness confirmed that the voice recorded on a tape (evidently confiscated during a search — *Chronicle*), which he had listened to at the pre-trial investigation, belonged to Tverdokhlebov.

Alexei Popov, physicist, a fellow student of Tverdokhlebov.

The witness stated that, at the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Tverdokhlebov had been regarded as a capable student. He had been quite friendly with the defendant. After leaving the institute they had met once or twice; they had talked about physics.
V. Belokhov, technician at a savings bank in Saratov, sentenced under article 70, released in September 1974 on a pardon (V. Belokhov is an exposed informer, see Chronicle 32).

He did not know the defendant, but had heard about his social activities.

Prosecutor: From whom did you hear about this?
Belokhov: It was a matter of common knowledge ... My wife told me that
Tverdokhlebov had helped her when I was in a camp ...
Prosecutor: What were the circumstances in which you were detained?
Belokhov: I was going to see Tverdokhlebov when the police stopped me on
the street.
Prosecutor: You had in your possession a letter from the prisoner Bolenkin,
addressed to Tverdokhlebov. It was dated 13 September, while you were
released on 16 September. How do you explain the fact that the letter was
found in your possession?
Belokhov: By a combination of circumstances.
Tverdokhlebov: Are you getting on well at work?
Belokhov: At first everything was all right at work, but now there has been
some unpleasantness.
Tverdokhlebov: How long were you imprisoned?
Belokhov: Two years, under article 70.
(Noise in court. Shouts of 'Not enough!')

F. K. Pruss, former Head of Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital, a
doctor with 32 years of experience; had been on a pension for two months.
The witness described his hospital, and how its conditions were designed to
assist the rapid recovery of the patients; he described how well Plyushch had
been looked after, so that he had not been in need of anything. The patients were
allowed to order any literature, even foreign journals, 40-65 per cent of the
patients were usually engaged in work-therapy — they wove nets, sewed trousers,
allowed to order any literature, even foreign journals, 40-65 per cent of the
patients were usually engaged in work-therapy — they wove nets, sewed trousers,
participated in repair work ... There was no apathy ...
Prosecutor: Is there any truth at all in Tverdokhlebov's letter to you about
Plyushch?
Pruss: None. It's all untrue. (Tverdokhlebov had sent Pruss a letter about
Plyushch's condition; Pruss sent this letter to the Ministry of Internal Affairs; see Chronicle 30).
Tverdokhlebov: Is your rank that of lieutenant-colonel in the internal security
forces?
Pruss: No, I'm a doctor.
Tverdokhlebov: Strange, isn't it, that the case materials contain a document
showing that you ...
Judge: Defendant, you must ask questions which are relevant to the case.
Tverdokhlebov: All right ... Is the hospital guarded?
Pruss: The hospital is guarded.

Prosecutor: The hospital is guarded.
Tverdokhlebov: By troops attached to the Ministry of Internal Affairs?
Pruss: Well ... yes. By the way, that's in the interests of the patients.
Tverdokhlebov: Is it to stop unauthorized visitors entering?
Pruss: You have to understand ... they're like children ... there is a reason for
it ...
Tverdokhlebov: When you sent my letter to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, you
added your own comments to it ... You wrote 'Tverdokhlebov has never
been in our hospital ...'
Pruss: That's right, you have not been in our hospital.
Judge: To avoid disputes, the court will have the letter read out: 'I send you
this letter from A. Tverdokhlebov and request you to take appropriate mea-
sures. I affirm that Tverdokhlebov has never been in the hospital and there-
fore has no right to discuss it in this way.'
Tverdokhlebov: In other words, I was not a patient of yours?
Pruss: I meant that you could have been there as a relative or a patient, as a
friend ... you could have visited the hospital, seen something or other and
expressed your opinion. Nobody is forbidden to do that. But you were not
in it ...
Tverdokhlebov: I was right in thinking, then, that you did not mean ... ?
Pruss: That you were ill? No.
(Disturbance in the courtroom.)
Pruss: There are other ways ... of determining that ...

Dvornik, a nurse at Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital since 1968.
Plyushch, like all the other patients, had been kept in comfortable, sanitary
conditions. The hospital had a cinema, the patients played chess and draughts ...
The patients could wear their own clothes. The wards were clean and well-lit.
Prosecutor: You treat all the patients alike, don't you? Sick people are sick
people, aren't they?
Dvornik: Yes.
Tverdokhlebov: Tell me, is 0.45 milligrams of triflazazine a large dose?
Dvornik: It's the normal therapeutic dose. But doses of 0.60 and more can be
given. It depends on what the doctor prescribes.

Nikolai Vasilevich Illarionov, academic secretary of the All-Union Institute
of Scientific and Technical Information, attached to the USSR Academy of
Sciences.
The witness stated that Tverdokhlebov had come to the Institute after
graduating from the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology and taking
a higher degree there, and had worked there for four years. He was not com-
pletely dedicated to his work, he had other interests. He did not take part in
social life. When the witness Illarionov was asked if he had known that
Tverdokhlebov was a member of the Committee of Human Rights, he replied that he had known and had often talked to Tverdokhlebov about it, trying to influence him in some way.

Timur Nikolayevna Sergeeva, junior research officer at the same Institute. The witness stated that Tverdokhlebov had got on well with people at work. She could not pass judgement on the defendant's work, as she had worked in a different department. She had got to know that Tverdokhlebov was a member of the Committee of Human Rights from discussions at the institute's 'triangle' (three-person committee), of which she was a member. Tverdokhlebov had given her some of the Committee's documents to read.

Margarita Bolonkina, wife of A. Bolonkin, who is serving a sentence under article 70 (Chronicle 30). She knows Tverdokhlebov. 'He's a good, kind man.' She had come to see Tverdokhlebov after her husband had been arrested.

Prosecutor: Did Tverdokhlebov give you money?

Bolonkina: I don't remember ... I think he did, when they took my husband away ... I think he gave me a present ... for the 8 March holiday ...

Prosecutor: At the pre-trial hearing you said that Tverdokhlebov had given you a warning. He advised you to take more care?

Bolonkina: He only wanted to explain things to me, so that I wouldn't be afraid. You don't know how terrible it was, when they searched me before I visited my husband and undressed me so that I was naked ...

Tverdokhlebov: Rita, how's your son? Did you manage to leave the child somewhere?

Bolonkina: Thank you, Andrei Nikolayevich, everything's all right. He's here. I'll be taking him away with me at once.

(Bolonkina had been in the witnesses' room with her nine-year-old son from 9.00 am to 6.50 pm. The child had been allowed to walk outside by himself when the witnesses had been able to go and have lunch from 1.45 to 2.45 pm.)

Yulia Borisovna Zaks, working at the Scientific Research Institute for Plastic Masses as a senior researcher; sister of the defendant.

Judge: What are your relations with Andrei Tverdokhlebov?

Zaks: I'm on very good terms with him. He's my favourite brother ...

Prosecutor: You are asked merely to answer concrete questions put to you. Zaks: I know that by law I have the right to begin by stating freely what I know ... Especially as no one has as yet explained to me what my brother is accused of.

Judge: The prosecutor has asked you a concrete question ... so answer it.

Prosecutor: Were you at the send-off for Litvin ... on 14 April 1974?

Zaks: No, I was not at a send-off for Litvin. I was at the send-off for Litvinov.

Prosecutor: Don't quibble about word-endings. Did you see the text of the appeal on behalf of Superfin being drawn up at the send-off for Litvinov?

Zaks: I was present at the send-off for Litvinov, not when the text of the appeal was drawn up.

Prosecutor: I have no more questions ... Tell us about your brother as a man.

Zaks: I have rarely met anyone in my life as honest and decent as my brother ... He loved his work, but he was also interested in questions of legality. In particular, he was concerned about the fate of Plyushch, who has now been acknowledged in the West to be mentally healthy.


You just wanted to bring that up!

Alexander Lvovich Shuster, senior research officer at the All-Union Scientific Research and Development Oil Institute, co-author with Tverdokhlebov of several scientific works, husband of his sister.

Shuster: In accordance with article 283 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, I wish to state all that I know of this case. I have known Tverdokhlebov for about 20 years. Positive assessments of our combined scientific work, signed by Academician A. D. Sakharov and M. L. Levin, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, are included in my declaration to the Procurator's Office, in which I asked to be allowed to visit Tverdokhlebov, in order to discuss our future work ...

Judge: Try to keep to matters about which you were asked at the pre-trial investigation.

Shuster: I am stating all that I know about the case. In his scientific work Tverdokhlebov always tried to achieve accurate results and carefully checked them. I cannot imagine the charge that he concocted deliberately false stories to be true.

Judge: Don't try and instruct us!

The Prosecutor asked Shuster where, when, and in what circumstances he had signed the 'Declaration of 44'.

Shuster: The way in which the signatures were collected did not interest me. I don't know whether they were other signatures on it, and if so whose, as I don't remember.

Tverdokhlebov: Shura, I wrote something here in my prison cell ... Did they give it to you?

Judge: What sort of question is that? This has nothing to do with the case!

Tverdokhlebov: The subject is my scientific activities, which give some idea of my character.

Shuster: No, they didn't give me anything from you.

Valentin Fyodorovich Turchin, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences,
Chairman of the Soviet group of Amnesty International.

Prosecutor: On 18 April 1975 a search was carried out at your flat. Do you agree with that statement?

Turchin: Before answering any questions, I should like to tell you, in accordance with article 283 of the RSFSR Penal Code, that I consider the witness’s behaviour to be inadmissible! The dispute went on for quite a long time. Then the judge allowed Turchin to say what he knew about the case. Turchin: Firstly, Tverdokhlebov is the Secretary of the Soviet group of Amnesty International.

Judge: Well, now you’ve put your cards on the table! I tell you, that organization has nothing to do with the case... We do not have the right to broaden the scope of the judicial investigation in that way. What other facts do you have to tell?

Turchin: I know Tverdokhlebov to be a man of great honesty and high principles; he has never spread deliberately false stories and would never do so. Tverdokhlebov has studied Soviet law carefully and has often pointed out breaches of Soviet laws to various authorities. To define the facts reported by him as deliberately false statements, i.e. to allege that he knew these facts were false, would mean that you, citizen judges, are setting yourselves against truth and conscience.

Prosecutor: This is sedition! I consider that the witness Turchin is insulting the court! I suggest that the examination of this witness should be ended immediately, as he is behaving in an inadmissible manner. I refuse to put any questions to him at all.

Turchin: That’s a pity, as I am willing to answer concrete questions... If the prosecutor has no questions to ask me, perhaps the defence counsel has?

(Laughter in court.)

Turchin said, in answer to questions from the judge, that he had received the article ‘The World Half a Century from Now’, confiscated during a search, from the author, Academician Sakharov.

The voluminous anti-Soviet literature which gave Tverdokhlebov the opportunity to express his views was confiscated. The court decided which facts are important and which are not.

Prosecutor: During the search a copy of Sakharov’s article ‘The World Half a Century from Now’ was confiscated. Do you confirm that?

Turchin: No. I should merely like to begin by telling the court some important facts.

Judge: The court decides which facts are important and which are not.

Prosecutor: I consider the witness’s behaviour to be inadmissible!

The court declared an intermission until the morning of the next day, 15 April.

15 April. As before, no one was allowed into the courtroom. Just before 9 am, when there were only five people in the courtyard — Vera Lashkova, Malva Lands, Yury Orlov, Alexander Podshibeyk and Sergei Khodorovich, the police began to push them around and demanded that they should leave the court building altogether. No one hurried to obey. Someone got the Constitution and read the article on the public nature of trials. A policeman wearing an athlete’s ‘Mister of Sport’ badge answered: ‘That’s for you, not for us’, and demanded that they leave the courtyard. S. Khodorovich, who was standing about ten metres away from the entrance, was told that he was preventing people entering the courtroom. ‘I am not in anyone’s way,’ he said. Then the police seized S. Khodorovich, pushed him into a car and took him to police station 103. The other four also went there. They handed in written evidence on the circumstances of Khodorovich’s detention (see ‘News in Brief’).

Later, there were about 20-30 people at the court building, among them foreign journalists and an American diplomat. One of the agents was photographing the crowd. A foreign journalist was photographing the photographer.

A short summary of Prosecutor Prazdnikova’s speech for the prosecution.

The whole Soviet people is ceaselessly working, in a patriotic fervour, to achieve an aim of great importance, struggling to achieve a pure life for Soviet people. The Soviet people live by a principle — that man is to his brother man a friend and comrade...

Later Prazdnikova defined the role of socialist legality in the task of building Communism and also the role of the USSR in the struggle for human rights by exposing the class character of concepts like ‘democracy’, ‘justice’ and ‘freedom’, and compared article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code with corresponding laws in the USA, England, West Germany, Italy and Sweden, and remarked that they all provided for the defence of the state against slander (which was punished almost everywhere by sentences of 3 years).

We do not deny that there are a few people in our country who express opinions contrary to communist ideology. But we do not try people for their views, but for actions contrary to the laws.

What can we say about Tverdokhlebov’s character? These were his circle of acquaintances — his spiritual idol Chalidze, on whom his country has closed its doors because of his anti-Soviet activities; Volpin — a mentally-ill man; then there are the relatives and friends of people sentenced for especially dangerous crimes against the state and other offences.

The voluminous anti-Soviet literature which gave Tverdokhlebov the oppor-
A short summary of the speech by defence counsel Yudovich

In my speech I shall keep to purely legal points, especially as other aspects have been covered in the prosecutor's speech. I shall state my opinion on whether the crime has been proved, whether the defendant's motives have been proved, and whether the definitions of the charges, which you heard from the prosecutor, have been proved.

Thus in the first instance Tverdokhlebov is charged only with signing letters. In other instances he is also charged with compiling, reproducing and distributing material. I draw the court's attention to the fact that article 190-1 of the Criminal Code does not mention signing anything in the text. Signing something is not a crime. Such a broadened interpretation of the said article is not, in my opinion, based on law.

To continue: Tverdokhlebov categorically refused to agree that the information contained in the documents in evidence is false. I quote the comment of the authors of the Commentary on the RSFSR Criminal Code, published by Yurizdat [Juridical Publishing-house] in 1971: "The defendant definitely must admit that the information spread by him (expressed in publications) is false" (commentary on article 190-1). The investigation has not proved that Tverdokhlebov had information at the time when he distributed material, that the material was libellous.

I ask the court to note that the reporting of facts to state authorities with the aim of informing these authorities expeditiously of breaches of the law is not a crime. This opinion is shared by Mikhailov and Nazarov, the authors of the book Ideological Diversions (published in 1969): "... The reporting of ... fabrications directly to representatives of Soviet state authorities ... is not a crime and cannot be defined as such under article 190-1." (p. 55).

The charges of illegal links with persons serving terms of imprisonment has not been proved by the investigation and is mere assertion. The persons concerned have not been questioned by the investigators.

In analysing the position of the defendant and the different points of the charges against him, defence counsel repeated more than once that intent to commit a crime had not been proved.

A few words concerning Tverdokhlebov's character. In the character reference provided by the Institute in which Tverdokhlebov had worked, it was stated that 'he was an industrious and well-qualified colleague, who took an active part in the social life of the department'.

Tverdokhlebov continued his scientific work after being put in an isolation cell during the investigation. Tverdokhlebov has an under-age daughter to support. I ask the court to take into account the arguments put forward by the defence before passing sentence.

Tverdokhlebov's final statement (in shortened form)

Tverdokhlebov: All that I am accused of is, in my opinion, an activity inseparable from my concept of man, of his natural activity in society. I have been warned more than once, by the KGB and at the Procurator's Office, that such activity is impermissible in Soviet society. All the arguments for this ... were of a political nature ... In my own way I am grateful for these warnings, because they were in essence threats, and they forced me to make a final choice.

I should like to quote a conversation between a certain member of Parliament and a Soviet dissident ... (the judge interrupts him). This parliamentarian asked me: 'Do dissidents favour détente?' I replied that they did. He was pleased and said that in that case it would be a good thing if everyone were to become a dissident. I said that communists were also for détente, and that perhaps he considered it would not be a bad thing if everyone were to become a communist. But he did not approve of the question being put to him in this way ...
Judge: I am warning you for the third time.
Tverdokhlebov discussed the limitations on human rights which are permitted by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. He quoted Brezhnev’s words: ‘We are for the exchange of information, but within the laws and customs of each country’.
Tverdokhlebov: ... customs everywhere are different. And while the custom exists in communist countries of putting dissidents behind bars ...
Judge: Tverdokhlebov! Stop making speeches! Keep to the point.
Tverdokhlebov: Are you stopping me from speaking?
Judge: You should change your final statement so that it concerns only the circumstances of this case.
Tverdokhlebov: I shall speak as I intended to ...
The prosecutor makes a movement of the hand. The judges retire to decide on the sentence.

The passing of the sentence.
The court considered that Tverdokhlebov’s guilt had been proved on all counts in the indictment. It was further stated that:

Tverdokhlebov had not been sentenced before. He had admitted the factual circumstances of the charges against him. Taking this into account, the court found it possible to apply article 43 of the RSFSR Criminal Code to Tverdokhlebov and to sentence him to a form of punishment which would not involve imprisonment. On this basis, the Moscow City Court for criminal cases sentenced Andrei Nikolayevich Tverdokhlebov to 5 years’ exile.

Tverdokhlebov would be taken under guard to his place of exile. The whole time spent in detention and under guard would count as part of the term of exile, one day under guard being reckoned as three days of exile.

* * *

In defence of Andrei Tverdokhlebov
The sentence of 5 years’ exile passed on A. Tverdokhlebov cannot be called severe by Soviet standards. However, its relative mildness does not make the sentence either lawful or just.
A. Tverdokhlebov has been sentenced to exile for his activity in defence of others, for his courage and goodness. None of his activities had anything criminal in them.
As we are convinced of this, we demand a re-investigation of the case and annulment of the unjust sentence.

This declaration was signed by 144 people.

* * *

The Trial of Mustafa Dzhemilev

Mustafa Dzhemilev (Abduldzhehmid) was born in November 1943. During the deportation of May 1944, his family — his mother and her four children (his father was at the front) — ended up in Uzbekistan. In 1966 Mustafa was expelled from the third-year course of the Tashkent Institute of Irrigation because of his participation in the national movement and called up into the army. He refused to enter the army, as he declared he did not possess the rights of a citizen, and was sentenced to 11 years’ imprisonment.

After coming out of a camp, Dzhemilev continued to take an active part in the Crimean Tatar movement. He became involved in the human rights movement; in May 1969 he became a member of the Initiative Group (Chronicles 8, 9). In September he was arrested (Chronicle 10). In January 1970 he was tried with Ilya Gabai in Tashkent, under article 190-1 (Chronicle 12) and sentenced to 3 years’ imprisonment. A book about this trial, Six Days, has recently appeared in samizdat.

On 13 May 1974, before the thirtieth anniversary of the deportation, he was arrested on a false charge and detained for 15 days. As a result of a hunger-strike by Dzhemilev he was released early, but a month later he was called up for military exercises. As he was still ill, he refused, and on 22 July he was arrested and sentenced to 1 year in a labour camp (Chronicle 32).

In Omsk Camp UKh 16/3 a new case under article 190-1 was prepared against Mustafa, and three days before he was due to be released he was arrested (Chronicle 37).

In September the pro-trial investigation ended and the case was passed to the Omsk regional court. In October the case was sent for supplementary investigation. The trial was fixed for 17 December, but on that day it was put off ‘because the judge had suddenly fallen ill’ (Chronicle 38).

Another delay

From 25 December to 25 February the case was being investigated at the Supreme Court of the RSFSR. Mustafa’s relatives received official notice of this fact only in March, in a reply from the Ministry of Justice to their declaration addressed to the 25th party congress. Earlier the Supreme Court had denied that it was dealing with the case (Chronicle 39), while in Omsk Judge Anosov had confirmed it by word of mouth, but had refused to give any
details about the transfer of the case, 'so that you can’t quote me to Moscow', as he said to Mustafa’s sister. The letter from the ministry stated that the Omsk regional court had been instructed to deal with the case as soon as possible.

Nevertheless, the trial was fixed only for 6 April, but was then again put off. On the day before the trial, the judge told Dzhemilev’s brother and sister that the trial would take place, and they summoned their sick mother. On the morning of 6 April the Sakharovs, who had arrived for the trial, handed in a declaration to Anosov, asking to be allowed into the courtroom. Anosov replied that the hearing would be in closed court, in accordance with a decision of the court administrative hearing on 4 December. He even leaped through the case evidence and found the relevant document (but did not show it). ‘But the absence of the defence counsel worries me,’ said Anosov, ‘as we cannot begin without him.’ (Defence counsel Shveisky had remained in Moscow, as on the previous evening someone had telephoned him and told him that the trial was being postponed.)

Anosov proposed to Mustafa’s relatives, who were very upset by this new delay (Mustafa was in the tenth month of a hunger-strike), that they should either summon Shveisky or engage a new lawyer in Omsk. Half an hour later, when they had rung Moscow and ascertained that Shveisky would be leaving immediately, the situation in court changed. A report came from the prison that a state of quarantine had been declared there and Anosov then held a lightning-quick court session:

‘All stand. The court is in session. Because of the state of quarantine the defendant cannot be brought to the courtroom. The hearing is therefore postponed.’

Those who had come to attend the trial demanded an explanation, but they were surrounded by vigilantes and policemen: ‘Leave the office and the entrance-hall, don’t get in the way of people working.’ The relatives were similarly admonished by a lawyer who had come out of Anosov’s office — the would-be applicant for the ‘vacant’ post of Dzhemilev’s lawyer. Anosov categorically forbade Mustafa’s relatives to visit him and allowed only written conversations with him.

Prison governor Surov, benevolently chatting with Mustafa’s relatives while they were waiting for an answer from him, assured them that Dzhemilev was still strong: ‘I allow him to go to the library by himself and he climbs right up to the top shelves.’ Surov explained why a sanitary commission had declared a state of quarantine that morning. On 1 April the drains in the building had begun to leak and had seeped into two or three of the cells, and on analysis some bacilli had been discovered.

Mustafa wrote:

My state of health is quite reasonable — I can still stand on my feet, speak and I have not, I think, lost my wits, which is obviously the reason why the trial is being endlessly put off. The prison governor told me yesterday that the trial had been put off until 14 April — he had been told this by the court before the quarantine was declared, so the quarantine has nothing to do with it.

Further on:

I send my warmest greetings to Andrei Dmitrievich, Elena Georgievna, Pyotr Grigorevich, Zinaida Mikhailovna and all my friends and dear ones. Your interest in me and your efforts on my behalf fill my heart with gratitude and give me the strength to hold out to the end.

(On the same day the trial of Tverdokhlebov in Moscow was postponed. The drains in Lefortovo prison were in order, but the judge fell ill — see above in this issue.)

On 7 April his lawyer visited Dzhemilev. Quarantine was observed — they both had to wear white overalls.

On 9 April the lawyer received a telegram from the regional court: the case would be heard on 14 April and the trial would be in open court.

On that day Mustafa’s friends and relatives, 16 persons altogether, again travelled to Omsk.

The trial (14-15 April 1976)

The presiding judge at the trial was Yu. I. Anosov (chairman of the regional court); the People’s Assessors were Kolobov and Mechnik; the prosecutor was procurator Kalutsky and the defence was conducted by the lawyer Shveisky.

The courtroom had been filled beforehand by people who had been let in through the back door. In the ante-room Mustafa’s friends and relatives were waiting for the trial to begin. At 10 o’clock they were told that there was no room left in the courtroom and that only close relatives would be admitted: Makhtsure Mustafayeva, Mustafa’s mother, his sister Vazfiye Khairova, and his brothers Asan and Anafi Dzhemilev. The 12 people left outside in the corridor continued to insist on their right to attend a trial held in open court. A policeman and some men in civilian clothes began to push them away forcibly, laying hands on them. Then Sakharov hit the policeman and his wife Elena Bonner slapped one of the men in civilian clothes (he turned out to be the court superintendent). The Sakharovs were taken to a police station. A. Sakharov apologized in writing to the policeman, while pointing out the illegality of the entire conduct of the trial and, in particular, of the behaviour of the police.

(One of the ‘civilians’ told the Crimean Tatars on the street: ‘We’ll take to you in a different way tonight — with a long knife.’)
At the start of the hearing the defence counsel made three requests:

(1) That 12 more witnesses should be called, including certain correspondents of Mustafa's whose letters had been included in the case evidence (the letters were passed by the camp censorship but were later confiscated from Mustafa).

(2) That Dvoryansky's personal file should be sent for from the labour colony.

(3) That the investigation department of the procurator's office should be asked to provide the pages missing from the criminal case (the request about the missing pages had been made earlier to the court, but the procurator's office had then replied that the pages removed had concerned only Dvoryansky).

Dzhemilev also asked for 15 additional witnesses to be called (including some of those on the defence counsel's list) and asked the court to explain to him why the trial was to be held in closed court: 'If this hearing is in open court, then why was the courtroom filled up beforehand and my relatives and friends left out on the street?' The judge replied that the trial was in open court, that he did not know who had got into the courtroom and how; if anyone had not been allowed in, it was only because there were no places left. Vasfiye said: 'We had to show our passports to get in, and then only four of us were allowed in.' 'That is not my business,' said the judge, 'and I shall send you out if you disagree with me and make a noise.'

The charges against Dzhemilev were, first, that while serving a sentence in Corrective Labour Colony UKh 16/3 in the city of Omsk, he spread slanderous fabrications in conversations with the prisoner Dvoryansky, alleging that the Crimean Tatar national problem had not been solved and that Crimean Tatars did not have equal rights in the USSR. Secondly, Dzhemilev was charged with writing and distributing (or preparing for distribution) the following libellous documents:

- A letter to an acquaintance, Ilmi Ametov, criticizing an article about Crimean Tatars in a journal (the letter had been passed by the camp censorship);
- A draft 'Declaration of principles of the Crimean Tatar movement': Russian (in Arabic letters), Tatar and English texts of the 'Declaration' figured in the indictment as three separate documents;
- Letters and postcards received by Dzhemilev in the camp were also used as evidence; the indictment perceived in these a nationalist spirit undoubtedly inspired by the influence of the recipient.

At first his relatives could see Mustafa quite well: he was pale from illness, with his face bandaged (because of furunculosis); it was painful for him to speak and even to breathe. Sometimes he stood up. During a short intermission a broad-shouldered policeman stood in front of Mustafa. His mother and brothers asked the guard to move a little. In reply there were protests from the arrested 'public' and the captain in charge of the guard said: 'I am responsible for guarding him; let the guard go on standing there. And you keep quiet, or when the court members come back we'll put you out.'

The court decided to begin by questioning the defendant, but Dzhemilev refused to give evidence first.

Vladimir Dvoryansky was called. He is 26 years old and had received a 10-year sentence in 1973 for murdering a man who had insulted his sister, in the course of a fight. He had been in a camp near Barnaul. There he had written complaints about being badly treated and had asked to be transferred to Uzbekistan, because of his health (he had one lung missing). As a result, he was sent to Omsk. There, he was assigned to a 'lower' invalid group (thus making his working conditions more difficult): he complained again and was again put in the cooler. All this was referred to in his written 'Evidence' of 11 February 1975, later sent out by him (Chronicle 37) and added to the case evidence by the defence counsel. In his 'Evidence' Dvoryansky described in detail how KGB officials and camp officials had tried to recruit him to give false evidence against Dzhemilev (Chronicle 37).

At the trial Dvoryansky immediately renounced the evidence he had given during the pre-trial investigation, stating that it had been obtained by means of threats: under pressure from the investigator and the officials working for the security organs he had signed prepared texts, while he had written statements 'in his own hand', dated 15 and 16 May, when he was already in a punishment cell (the last statement was, in fact, the official pretext for bringing a criminal case against Dzhemilev). 'But you were put in the punishment cell on 16 May, yet your first statement is dated 15 May,' said the judge. Dvoryansky repeated that he had written the required statement in the punishment cell. During a three-hour interrogation, the judge and the prosecutor tried in vain to persuade Dvoryansky to return to his former testimony, 'I am now speaking freely,' said Dvoryansky at the trial, 'but then there were five men around me, three in civilian dress and two from the camp. They showed me photographs of my father and daughter, saying: "You have a long sentence, you might never see them again", I was in their hands. "And do you now imagine that you have escaped from their grip?" said the judge. "You'll get two years for giving false evidence in court." Dvoryansky replied: "I am now telling the truth, but I gave the false evidence under pressure." But surely there was a supervisory procurator in the camp?' asked the procurator. 'Did you complain to him that you were being blackmailed?'"'The supervisory procurator told me,' said Dvoryansky, 'that if I was thinking of renouncing my evidence, I would do better to commit suicide.' Dvoryansky said that he himself had described the conversation of 11
February in his 'Evidence' and had sent it out of the camp (here Dvoryansky was interrupted by Dzhemilev, who said it was he who had sent out the 'Evidence'). Dvoryansky stated that he had been influenced not only by threats but also by promises: they had promised to transfer him to Uzbekistan, to release him early, to give him a job at a university.

Aftter being questioned, Dvoryansky was led away, although defence counsel asked that he be allowed to stay in the courtroom.

Sokolov, the next witness to be questioned, said that he had not known Dzhemilev well, but that he had been well acquainted with Dvoryansky since Barnaul. There Dvoryansky had not been interested in politics and did not read anything. But as soon as he came to know Dzhemilev, he began to read a lot and was writing something (Dvoryansky was summarizing Marx, Engels and Lenin 'in an anti-Soviet spirit'. Possibly there was some reference to this during Dvoryansky's interrogation). After meeting Dzhemilev, Dvoryansky brought 'all kinds of rubbish' into the barracks and carried on anti-Soviet conversations. Mustafa asked Sokolov about his previous testimony, from which it followed that Sokolov had been watching Dvoryansky and had handed in some of his notes to the security section. 'Was it your duty to pick up notes and hand them in?' said Sokolov. 'What? Am I a spy? I only took them and handed them over. Why are you tormenting me? I'm sweating all over as it is.'

From questions put by the defence counsel it turned out that, soon after giving evidence at the pre-trial investigation, Sokolov had been released from the camp and transferred to a 'free settlement regime' (he had two years left to serve, out of 12).

The prisoner Fedotov, who had worked as some sort of supervisor in the camp, stated that Mustafa had been assigned to be his assistant on his arrival in the camp, but Dzhemilev had soon refused to do this work, as his conscience did not allow it; and, in any case, the authorities would not keep a 'political' in such a post.

The next two witnesses were camp guards, who had been among those who searched Dzhemilev's work-room on 14 May 1975. They had not read the papers confiscated; some of them had in any case not been in Russian. When the prosecutor asked if Dzhemilev had denied that the papers were his, they replied: 'No, we only asked us to number them and make a list of them. But we said, 'Why? We're giving them all to the officer in charge in your presence.' The defence counsel asked: 'Where was the record of the search drawn up?' 'We compiled the report at the security department,' said one of the witnesses. The judge disallowed a question from defence counsel as to whether the witness knew the correct search procedure. These two witnesses, unlike those before them, were allowed to remain in the courtroom.

The testimony of Markov, Dzhemilev's former superior at work, was read out (he had died before the trial). Markov referred favourably to Dzhemilev.
to call them,' said Dzhemilev, 'they would tell you how many years they were kept hanging about, how they suffered, living without a residence permit, how they were driven out. The whole nation cannot return to the Crimea in that way.' "Well, I myself cannot get a residence permit in Moscow, for example," said the judge. 'Even in Omsk people are kept hanging about. Certain norms exist! It's not a question of nationality.'

Concerning the 'Declaration' which had been confiscated from him, Dzhemilev explained that this had been a draft, an unfinished expression of his views. 'As the national problem exists for me, I was developing my thoughts on the subject.' There were not three documents, but one — in different languages; the variant readings which existed in them, and which had led to the indictment referring to three separate texts, could be explained by lack of accuracy in translation. During the trial Dzhemilev succeeded in showing that the translator (she was present in court) had taken his Tatar text for Turkish, as it was written in the Latin alphabet and not in the officially used Russian alphabet. The meaning of certain words in these in general closely related languages was quite different and Dzhemilev gave examples of mistakes in the translation. He had done the translation into English to give himself practice in the language.

It is stated in one of the sections of the 'Declaration' that the Crimean Tatar national movement should act within the framework of Soviet law, but that if the government refuses to make a just decision, it would be right to appeal to international organizations. Dzhemilev confirmed this: he considered that if the Soviet Union had signed the Declaration of Human Rights and other international agreements, it should be permissible to demand that these be carried out in practice. The judge again repeated that the nationalities question had been settled in our country and that, if the government did not consider it necessary to make a decision on some matter, it could not be discussed by some sort of international organizations; to appeal to the latter meant to slander our system. These were our internal affairs, and we would not allow anyone else to interfere in them. 'We do not recognize every international agreement,' Dzhemilev replied: 'Here we are speaking of those agreements which have been signed by our government.'

Another principle of the Crimean Tatar national movement which was noted in the 'Declaration' was also discussed: that 'membership of the movement need not depend on political views or place of residence'. The judge said: 'Why go to such extremes?' said Dzhemilev. 'Of course, some qualifications could be made. But this is not the final text, after all.'

The prosecutor asked: 'You allege that this is only a draft. Were you preparing to finish and distribute this document?' Dzhemilev replied that, if he had completed the text and had thought it through to the end, he might have started to show it to others. Answering a question put by his lawyer, Dzhemilev said that no one in the camp had read the 'Declaration' and could not have done so: even the Russian text was written in Arabic script.

Judge: This article was printed by the 'Naika' publishing house. You are defaming an official Soviet institution.

Dzhemilev: The article states that most Crimean Tatars live in the Crimea, but according to our statistics for 1967-8, after the 1967 Decree 12,000 persons returned to the Crimea, but those able to remain there numbered...

Judge: What do you mean — your statistics? Statistics can be compiled only by government departments. Who gave you the right to assemble statistical data?

Dzhemilev: At any rate, to do so is not forbidden and is not a crime.

Judge: Private individuals are not allowed to conduct a census.

Interrupting Dzhemilev, the judge told him more than once that he was not in the witness box in order to spout propaganda. In answer to one such remark, Mustafa said: 'What do you mean by propaganda? The audience here are all your people, there are only four of my relations present.' The judge replied: 'I don't know anything about the audience. They came here on their own.'

At the beginning of the hearing on 15 April, the defendant and the defence counsel put forward some new requests. The defence counsel asked, first, that a letter from Dvoryansky to Alim Muzafarov, dated 13 July 1975, should be added to the evidence. In it, Dvoryansky tells of Dzhemilev's arrest and hunger-strike, and writes, in addition, that there are documents in existence proving that the case against him has been fabricated. The counsel's second request was that the court should send for Dvoryansky's library card from the corrective labour colony in Barnaul, in order to establish that there he was already reading the books in which, according to the indictment, he had made notes of a prejudiced nature under the influence of Dzhemilev. Defence counsel also asked for Dvoryansky's notes to be obtained from his personal file (evidently the notes that had been handed in to the security section by Sokolov.)

Dzhemilev asked for the following witnesses to be called: (1) the prisoner Sergeyev who, according to Sokolov, had heard anti-Soviet remarks by Dvoryansky which had been inspired by his acquaintance with Dzhemilev; (2) Basyr Gafarov, Candidate of Philological Science, Professor Reshid Muzafarov and the writer Ehredi Shamkho, who could give evidence on the language and literature of the Crimean Tatars; as he, Dzhemilev, was being accused of libel on these matters; (3) Reshat and Zera Dzhemilev, Aishe Seitmuratova, Remzi Ablayev, Gulnar Seidaliyeva, to give evidence on residence registration in the Crimea. 'You don't have to look far for these witnesses,' said Dzhemilev, 'they are here.'

The request concerning Dvoryansky's letter was granted; the rest were rejected by the court. It was stated that the very existence of Crimean Tatar academics and writers proved that there was no discrimination against them.
In his speech for the prosecution, procurator Kalutsky said that Dvoryansky had given the right evidence at the pre-trial investigation, but that Dzhemilev had worked on him and that was why he had renounced his evidence in court, flattering the investigating authorities and the supervisory procurator into the bargain. The prosecutor called Dzhemilev an amoral person, a hardened and incorrigible criminal. He rejected Dzhemilev’s statement that the text of the ‘Declaration’ was not the final draft, by making the following comment: “There is a point concerning membership of an organization, and this is mentioned last. This means that the document is complete and ready for distribution.” Dzhemilev had called on all Tatars who had formerly lived in the Crimea to unite, including even anarcho-fascists; in the text he did not make the qualifications of which he had spoken during the trial. He called for the organization of a protest campaign, for interference in Soviet internal affairs, i.e. for disobedience and opposition to Soviet power.

Dzhemilev had called the actions of the Soviet government in 1944 unjust, when the whole world was celebrating the victory of the Soviet people.

The prosecutor demanded a sentence of 3 years in a strict-regime camp for Dzhemilev.

In addition, he demanded that Dvoryansky should be prosecuted for giving false evidence in court.

Defence counsel Shveisky said in his speech for the defence that in examining this case it was impossible to avoid speaking of the problem of nationality. This question was especially important for our multi-national country, and the sentence should strengthen friendship between nations. As defence counsel, he would not defend the opinions held by his client, as he would then appear to share his views, which he did not. However, he could not put forward the point of view held by the prosecution, as he would then be a second prosecutor.

He saw it as his task to analyse only the legal aspect of the case: did the facts uphold the charge of disseminating knowingly false fabrications libelling the Soviet system? The charge of oral dissemination was based solely on the evidence of Dvoryansky, which mentioned Dzhemilev’s slanderous utterances only generally, with no concrete examples. The defence counsel was convinced that Dvoryansky’s renunciation of his previous evidence was sincere. However, to be objective, either all Dvoryansky’s evidence — at the trial and during the pre-trial investigation — should be rejected as unreliable, or the contradictions in it should be investigated and the methods used in the investigation should be checked out.

The documents written by Dzhemilev had not been distributed. That was obvious from the very means by which they were produced. The defence counsel rejected the charge that Dzhemilev had written them ‘in code’ to hide a crime. The investigation had found it relatively easy to translate or read the texts, but their form had excluded any accidental distribution. Dzhemilev’s explanation that the present text was not meant for distribution had not been disproved in any way.

The defence counsel quoted a published article in which it was stated that criticism of particular government measures was not subject to prosecution under article 190.1. Dzhemilev might have a mistaken opinion of whether the Crimean Tatar problem had been solved or not, but this was his opinion and not a fabrication. It could be due to various causes: for example, he might not know the real situation because of his long period of imprisonment.

His letter to Ametov was an elementary polemic against a journalistic article.

In October the court had sent the case for further investigation, due to insufficient pre-trial investigation and the insufficiently concrete nature of the charges. However, no new facts had been uncovered. There was nothing criminal in Dzhemilev’s actions. The defence counsel considered the charges unproven and asked the court to bring in a verdict of not guilty.

Dzhemilev’s Final Statement

“My fate is linked with the fate of my people, who were deported in 1944.” The judge here interrupted him: “We’re not discussing that now.” The judge kept on interrupting Mustafa while he was trying to speak about his earlier trials and how they were connected with the present trial. Asan shouted from the courtroom: “This is his final statement. Why are you interrupting him?” The judge ordered Asan to leave the courtroom and two policemen went up to him. Asan’s expulsion led to a stormy scene outside the courtroom doors. As on the day before, order was restored by means of brute force. When Mustafa’s speech was broken off because of the noise going on outside, Vasfiye said in Tatar: “Those are our friends. The loudest voice is that of Shaker (i.e. “sugar” [meaning Sakharov]).” The judge told her to leave the courtroom for ‘prompting’ the defendant, but she categorically refused to do so. She was dragged out of the courtroom, at which point Sakharov again hit one of the guards. Mustafa’s mother herself left the courtroom in tears. She shouted in Russian and Tatar: “Murderers! You don’t even allow my son to make a final statement. He’s been on hunger-strike for ten months, he can hardly speak, yet you interrupt him.”

The judge declared an intermission of 15 minutes, during which time everyone was dragged from the entrance-hall into the street. Sakharov and E. Bonner (who had already been taken to the police room at the courthouse) were driven to the police station. There a doctor who examined E. Bonner at her insistence confirmed that she was badly bruised.

After the intermission the judge again warned Dzhemilev: “Don’t try to make propaganda.” Mustafa replied, “What kind of propaganda can I make? There’s only one of my brothers in the courtroom.” (Vasfiye and Asan had not been allowed back into the courtroom, and his mother was in no condition to attend.) Dzhemilev continued his speech.

I did not want to participate in this trial, as sentences are decided beforehand,
regardless of the evidence. But then I decided to take an active part in the trial, so that it could not be said that I had indirectly admitted my guilt, that I had no defence against the charges.

The charge is based on evidence given by Dvoryansky. He pronounced it here, saying it had been written under the pressure of blackmail and threats. One would think that the prosecution would be shaken, that there should be an investigation to prevent similar actions with regard to other prisoners. However, that would require honesty and civil courage.

Judge: You are insulting the prosecutor.

Dzhemilev: He insulted me — doesn't that matter?

Judge: No one insulted you. I warn you, you will be deprived of your final statement.

Dzhemilev: It is our habit to exaggerate the role of personality in history. I am being dealt with because it is thought that I play a decisive role in the movement. Mind you, the prosecutor made me out to be a lone individual, pretending that no movement existed. But my place will be taken by others; perhaps they will act more rightly.

I will continue my hunger-strike for as long as my imprisonment lasts. I am taking this extreme measure to prevent similar reprisals being taken on other people.

I do not expect any mercy from the court. I don't need mercy. I need justice.

The sentence of the court fully upheld the indictment on all points, including the incrimination of Dzhemilev with three 'Declarations'. It was counted as additional proof of guilt that the list of 15 witnesses proposed by Dzhemilev include Tatars now living in the Crimea. Dzhemilev's guilt had been proved by Dvoryansky's evidence at the pre-trial hearing. His renunciation of this evidence was declared false and disproved by his interrogation as a witness, and by the evidence of other witnesses and the defendant.

The sentence stated that Dzhemilev had been sentenced three times and had not reformed.

The court sentenced Dzhemilev to 2½ years' imprisonment in a strict-regime corrective labour colony.

The court also made a separate ruling to start criminal proceedings against Dvoryansky for 'giving false evidence at a trial'.

On the same day Mustafa's relatives were allowed to visit him (all together).

Before the visit they spoke to Radchenko, the deputy-governor of the prison, about Mustafa ending his hunger-strike, if he consented to do so. Radchenko promised he would have medical attention, a special diet, a quiet cell and parcels at any time, including fruit juices, which are essential for persons

emerging from a hunger-strike.

The visit took place through a double glass barrier. His relatives told Mustafa that all his friends, including the Grigorenko family and the Sakharovs, were asking him to end his hunger-strike. Everything was being done to publicize the case. If he ended his hunger-strike, it would help him in the appeal court. His mother tried to persuade Mustafa more than anyone else — for her own sake and that of his sick father.

Mustafa agreed to end his hunger-strike.

The prison governor, Surov, upheld Radchenko's promise to give Dzhemilev a single cell of his own choice or a cell shared with 'quiet old men', and not to put him in an ordinary cell, where 'his criminal territory and any excesses are possible'.

At the end of April E. G. Bonner had a parcel containing fruit juices, which she had sent to Mustafa, returned to her with a label reading: 'Returned as not from a relative.' (Such a restriction has no basis in law and is unprecedented.)

There are fears that if the appeal court confirms the verdict, Dzhemilev will resume his hunger-strike.

Protests and Appeals

To the women of the world

My son Mustafa Dzhemilev has been sentenced for the fifth time. The first time, he was sentenced without a trial, together with our whole Crimean Tatar nation, to exile from our homeland ...

From his childhood Mustafa dreamed of returning to the land of his fathers with our whole people. To this end he has devoted his whole life ... I was at the court hearing in Omsk ... I myself saw how all the charges and the whole trial were based on lies, and that the only aim of the court was to punish my son for his love of his people ...

This trial was nothing more than revenge ...

Help me to save my son!

Makhture Mustafayevna-Dzhemileva, Uzbek S S R, Syr-Darin Region, g. Gulistan, Oktyabrskaya ul. 16.

* * *

On April 17 the well-known historian Alexander Nekrich issued a statement for the press, 'Can we remain silent?'

... Dzhemilev, a Crimean Tatar, has devoted many years of his life to the struggle to restore the civil rights of the Crimean Tatars and to assist their return to their historical homeland in the Crimea, from which they were deported by force in 1944. Although the illegality of that act was later acknowledged by the Soviet government and the rights of Crimean Tatars
have been formally restored, they are not allowed to live in the land of their forefathers...

Nekrich says 'they are afraid to release Dzhemilev', and he speaks of the false accusations and 'the spirit of violence and inhumanity' surrounding the court hearing.

I appeal to everyone who considers himself a decent human being:
Do not close your eyes to this arbitrary and unlawful act.
And I ask you: Can we remain silent?
I appeal above all to my colleagues, to historians in the U.S.S.R and abroad who have a professional duty to tend the flame of truth lit by Prometheus:
Let us stand up in defence of Dzhemilev, Bukovsky, Superfin, Kovalyov and the others rotting in prison for their beliefs. Let us fight for a general amnesty for political prisoners throughout the world, but first of all in our own country. Today we must save Dzhemilev.
This is our duty — both human and professional.
And let us end our shameful silence.

Lev Kopelev, in an article and appeal, 'Save Mustafa Dzhemilev!' (dated 22 April), writes of Dzhemilev's earlier trials and the recent trial. He declares:
'This monstrous sentence must be rescinded, to save the life of Mustafa Dzhemilev, and to save us all — his countrymen and fellow-citizens — from a shameful guilt.'

Kopelev names people sentenced in recent years 'in defiance of the Soviet Constitution', and remarks that observance of the outward legal formalities (in contrast to the Stalinist three-man tribunals) does not rule out the arbitrary settling of accounts or unlawfulness.

'Can it be that those who carry out such repressions and the propagandists, men of letters and others, who try to justify this, do not understand that they are merely showing their lack of trust in the strength of the Soviet state and the persuasive power of the ideas they allege they are defending?'

Kopelev calls for the use of legal and non-violent means to gain publicity and true freedom of speech, and to demand an amnesty.

'Only in this way can we prevent the stubborn "heirs of Stalin", uncaring and conscienceless officials, from infringing our civil rights and from inflicting on people the kind of suffering that Mustafa Dzhemilev is now being subjected to.'

On 18 May, P. G. Grigorenko and A. D. Sakharov issued a declaration calling for support for Vladimir Dvoryansky. The declaration tells how Dvoryansky was brought into Dzhemilev's case — by means of promises, threats and punishments — first as an informer and then as a witness.

The decision of the court was an act of revenge for honesty, directed against a man who, having slandered a fellow prisoner, repented of what he had done and found the courage to confess that he had lied. The court wishes to create a precedent for taking vengeance on anyone who might not want to lie at the behest of the punitive authorities. The court handed over a defenceless prisoner to those who forced him to give the false evidence necessary to the investigation. A physical attack on Dvoryansky by criminal prisoners is especially to be feared.

We appeal to you to speak out in defence of Vladimir Dvoryansky!


This declaration or, rather, article does not only express the author's attitude to the 'Dzhemilev case'. It reports that in 1968-9 Mustafa completed a historical work which was confiscated by the K.G.B and never saw the light. P. G. Grigorenko, relying on the summary of this work given in fact by Mustafa at his trial in 1970, outlines the history of the Crimean Tatars since ancient times. He also describes, with the help of many statistics, both their deportation from the Crimea and the nation's position today. The author contrasts the attitude of the government to the demand of this nation of 850,000 people for an autonomous national existence in their homeland with its expressions of respect for small nations abroad.

At any rate, the attitude of the Soviet government to the Crimean Tatars does not correspond in any way to the spirit of Helsinki. The peoples of Europe must not tolerate this. I refer especially to Europe's small nations. If they do not now come to the defence of the Crimean Tatars, they may find themselves in a similar situation in the future. For example, the hills and valleys of Switzerland may appeal to someone, and the Germans, French and Italians who used in the past to live in Switzerland may appear there instead of the Swiss.

The Group to Assist the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements (see below in this issue) has compiled a document on the infringement of humanitarian articles of the Final Act of the European Conference in the 'case of Dzhemilev'.

149 people signed the following declaration.

In Defence of Mustafa Dzhemilev
The trial of Mustafa Dzhemilev in Omsk on 14-15 April 1976 showed a cynical disregard of the law on the part of the authorities — even within the limits of the anti-constitutional articles of the Criminal Code which are used to try Soviet dissenters and fighters for civil rights. Dzhemilev has already spent seven years in labour camps. The persistent efforts of the authorities to prolong his imprisonment at any price, the means by which they tried to fabricate false evidence, the unceremonious way in which the court ignored the argument of defence counsel that the crime was completely nonexistent — all this bears witness to the fact that Stalinist methods of dealing with uncompromising persons are still very much alive.

After ten months of a protest hunger-strike against the falsified charges, the sentence of 21 years' strict-regime passed on M. Dzhemilev could well be equivalent to a death sentence. We appeal to world public opinion and, in particular, to Moslem leaders to speak out strongly in defence of Dzhemilev. At the same time we consider it necessary to call attention once more to the problem of the Crimean Tatars.

The chief witness of the prosecution, the prisoner Vladimir Dvoryansky — in practice, the only witness — is now in danger. At the trial he renounced false evidence he had given earlier, in spite of pressure from the judge and the prosecutor. He stated that evidence he had signed during the pre-trial investigation had been the result of threats and pressure put on him.

We demand a full re-investigation of the case and the release of Mustafa Dzhemilev.

A protest against the new sentence passed on Dzhemilev, addressed to party and government authorities, has been signed by about 1,600 Crimean Tatars living in Central Asia and more than 800 from the Crimea and surrounding districts.

The Face of Inhumanity

On 14 April 1976 Mustafa Dzhemilev was tried in Omsk. Why in Omsk? Because Mustafa was serving his most recent sentence in a camp not far from Omsk. That's Reason Number One. Also, because Omsk is a town offering great advantages for conducting an open trial: it is strictly off limits to foreigners. That's Reason Number Two. In Omsk, far from the eyes of foreign correspondents, it is easier to screen people, allowing some into the courtroom and leaving others on the doorstep. This kind of screening is done in all our cities, even in Moscow. But in Moscow you can't do it without some trouble and fuss, whereas in Omsk who cares about the Tatar Mustafa? Among the Omsk residents, Dzhemilev is as much of a freak as a cypress would be in the forest around Omsk.

But it did not prove possible to try Mustafa Dzhemilev in total quiet and without attracting any outsiders. It is not completely in vain that Dzhemilev has spent one-quarter of his life in labour camps (eight of his thirty-three years). The trial was postponed three times; and each time his kin and friends flew into Omsk from thousands of kilometres away. And they flew in a fourth time: from Uzbekistan, the Ukraine, Oryol and Moscow. There were sixteen persons in all; but no place was found for them in the courtroom. At first no one was let in; then only immediate relatives, but even they were not permitted to attend the whole trial.

Figure it out for yourself. What good does it do to have the defendant's friends and relatives in the courtroom? That's not the kind of audience the court needs. Clear out, citizens, and let us work! This courtroom isn't made of elastic, citizens. There isn't enough room for everybody. You can see for yourselves how many people are here. (After all, this is not just some ordinary trial: it's open and public. Naturally, there'll be an audience. We're sticking to the law. We brought in our own special, selected audience early — through the rear entrance.) People are sitting outside the door. His mother? Well, we can probably let his mother in. She is, of course, a mother, and we are of course humanitarians. Just imagine not letting his mother in! It's unthinkable! When it's okay, we'll let her in, and when it's not, we'll put her out. Well, all right, his brothers and sister can come in, but the others have to stay outside. And if they start to make trouble, there's some black eyes in store for them, and a trip to the police station, because they're interfering with our work. Those other spectators we let in early will pinion their arms and drag them through the corridor. They're skilful professionals, and this is a routine job for them.

... Why am I writing about Mustafa Dzhemilev's trial? Do I have any hopes of helping him? None. But at this trial the features of inhumanity showed themselves so plainly that the failure to get them down on paper would be unpardonable. I shall begin with the end. It is the sacred right of every defendant, whoever he or she may be, to make his final statement, to address himself for the last time to the judges' minds and hearts — to appeal to their sense of justice, duty and honour. The defendant's right to make his closing statement, be it long or short, is protected by law in all nations of the world. And it is protected by Soviet law. Actually, however, the defendant is rarely allowed to get all the way through his summation, especially when he is not so much concerned with quibbling over intricate technicalities as with substantiating his way of thinking — explaining the basic reasons for his actions.

The court did not allow Mustafa Dzhemilev to make his final plea, even though cutting him off was not only a violation of the law but a crime against humanity.

Dzhemilev stood before the court after being on a hunger strike for ten
The concept 'anti-Soviet' is as vague as it is all-inclusive. It is verily an insatiable bottomless pit sucking in human ideas and human lives — hundreds, thousands of lives: silently, without a trace, and to no purpose.

Meantime, the judge was suffering from atrophiéd human feelings. He was the man with the full belly who does not understand the sick person; the judge whose judicial armchair has all four feet firmly planted on the K G B platform. He was that inhuman individual capable of cutting off the defendant's last statement, even though he knew it might be almost the last word Mustafa spoke on this earth.

'Let him speak,' Mustafa's brother begged. But the judge ordered him out of the courtroom, just as he had expelled Mustafa's sister, 'for disturbing public order'.

Order?

Oh, when will we see the order disturbed in the Soviet Union which permits the authorities to close the mouths of people who are speaking? The Soviet Constitution guarantees freedom of speech to citizens. The laws also guarantee it. But two formulae whose emptiness and compass are beyond all belief — 'anti-Soviet propaganda' and 'anti-Soviet slander' — guarantee the destruction of that freedom and of the individual, regardless of whether he is speaking the truth or lying. 'A man's sore spot is what he talks about.' Mustafa Dzhemilev's sore spot is the Crimea, and that's what he talks about. The Tatars, shamelessly deported by force from the Crimea in 1944, want to return to the land that they cultivated and loved. Why, in Dzhemilev's non-violent remarks, must one discover 'anti-Soviet propaganda' and not a non-violent remark? The concept 'anti-Soviet' is as vague as it is all-inclusive. It is verily an insatiable bottomless pit sucking in human ideas and human lives — hundreds and thousands of lives: silently, without a trace, and to no purpose.

Right now, in addition to my concern for Dzhemilev, I am worried about the fate of another man who took part in Mustafa's trial. His last name is Dvoryansky, and he is 26 years old. The whole trial was essentially built around him and his testimony. He, too, is a prisoner in a labour camp, although I don't know whether he is a political prisoner or a common criminal.

I know nothing of his past, but when I think of his future, my hair stands on end.

Dzhemilev was convicted because of his alleged 'anti-Soviet propaganda' while in a labour camp near Omsk. Who heard him utter the prohibited words? Dvoryansky. The new investigation against Dzhemilev began three days before he was to be released after serving his previous sentence. The camp gates are about to open before you, but it's no good counting the hours: you're not going to get out, because a new case has been brought against you.

In protest against this refined and calculated humiliation, Dzhemilev declared a hunger-strike. It didn't help. They force-fed him through a tube; and on 14 April, half-dead, he was brought to trial. And then something happened that I can only call a miracle. The witness Dvoryansky — the man on whose testimony the new trial was based — stood tall in the courtroom and in a truly human voice declared that the depositions he had given during the investigation of Dzhemilev's case were false. (It reminds me of a man crawling out of a fox-hole and into a hail of bullets.) Dvoryansky declared that his false depositions during the investigation were given under duress. Among the means employed were promises and threats that included the punishment cell. He resisted, and was thrown into the punishment cell on five different occasions. 'Testify against Dzhemilev, and we'll move you nearer to home. We'll get your sentence reduced. But if you don't testify against him, there'll be trouble for both you and your family, and you'll have only yourself to blame.' But now he declared that he had never heard anything defamatory of the Soviet system from the mouth of Dzhemilev.

I don't know what kind of person Dvoryansky was before; but at the trial he behaved like a real human being. A brave man. And did the judge behave like a human being?

I am not a jurist. But even without legal training, on the basis of simple common sense I know precisely what the judge was obliged to do in this case.

First, he should have released Dzhemilev immediately. After all, the prosecution's case had collapsed, had it not? Then he should promptly have initiated criminal proceedings against the investigators who extorted the false depositions from Dvoryansky.

But that could have happened only if the court had been judging the case on the basis of truth and the law. Then Dvoryansky's statement would have changed things. But the court was deciding the case on the basis of injustice and illegality and, most important, in accordance with orders from above received in advance.

Did I see those orders? No, I did not. Nobody ever sees such orders: we merely experience their results.

The court sentenced Mustafa Dzhemilev to two years and six months in strict-regime labour camps for anti-Soviet propaganda. Two and a half years,
plus three days — the three days left over from the sentence not quite served out.

The court also issued a 'separate ruling' for instituting criminal proceedings against those who do you think? The investigators who extorted false testimony from Dvoryansky? No, against Dvoryansky himself. For giving false testimony. That's right. But what false testimony — his depositions in the labour camp? Not at all: his testimony at the trial.

And there you have it: the face of inhumanity.

Moscow, 23 April 1976

* * *

Two more documents

The pamphlet reproduced below was found by many Crimean Tatars in their post-boxes round about January 1976, i.e. long before the trial. Nevertheless its authors, as the pamphlet shows, had access to some of the case-evidence.

"Azit arkadashlar!! (Dear Countrymen!!)

We have been aware for a long time that there are some who regard our people as a 'grey mass' which can be intoxicated and led astray. We have formed a certain opinion of these persons. We consider it our duty to share our views with our people.

1968-70 saw the appearance of activists such as P. G. Grigorenko, I. Ya. Gabai and Mustafa Dzhemilev, who started to think and decide matters on our behalf. Finally, in order to adapt our thoughts and concerns to their egoistic interests, they composed a National Charter, allotting themselves a leading role in it. However, the absurdity of this undertaking was so evident that it was rejected without question by those in whom these would-be strategists had placed their hopes. Having failed, these renegades did not give up, and found themselves 'true friends' in the West. According to their tastes, they presumptuously rewrote national documents, paying no attention to the protests of those involved.

Recently A. D. Sakharov, with the help of people like M. Dzhemilev, has again been trying to foist on us something resembling the already-rejected charter. They have composed a draft 'Declaration'. Its second point, as we have managed to discover, reads roughly as follows:

'Any fellow-citizens of Crimean Tatar nationality may be members of this society, without regard to their country of residence or their political opinions.'

According to their infamous scheme of A. D. Sakharov's and M. Dzhemilev's, it turns out that Heroes of the Soviet Union Uzeir Abdiramanov, Seitrafe Seitveliev, Abdraim Reshitov and other veterans who participated in the fight against Fascism should now make it up and unite with those who

On 14 April the TASS news agency issued a report stating that the Sakharovs had pushed their way into the courtroom in Omsk, had demanded that they be given seats, and, when they were called to order, had struck a policeman and the court superintendent.

The day after the trial another TASS report appeared:

On 15 April the following events occurred. The Sakharov couple were taken to the police station in the town of Omsk, where an investigation took place concerning the acts of hooliganism they had committed the day before. However, Sakharov and E. Bonner refused to go to the police station, thereby infringing Soviet law. Instead they set off for the courthouse where the criminal case of Dzhemilev was being heard. The brother and sister of the defendant came out of the courthouse to meet Sakharov; the presiding judge had been forced to expel them from the courtroom for interfering with court procedure, interrupting the witnesses by shouting and insulting the judges. The Dzhemilevs stood talking something over with Sakharov, then he went up to the policeman standing outside the courthouse, and, without saying anything, hit him on the face. This aroused indignation among citizens in the street. When they asked Sakharov and E. Bonner to calm down, the latter began a fight, this time with the citizens who were condemning their behaviour.

fought against us on the side of the Hitlerite forces which attacked our Motherland.

They should unite, for example, with people like Memet Muedinov, former editor of the pro-fascist newspaper _Aza Krym_, or Edige Krymal, former henchman of the fascist authorities in the Crimea, or others like them who live abroad and hold political views opposed to ours.

All this is an insult to us as Soviet people, this unheard-of mockery of the bright memory of the heroic partisans Abdul Dagdzhi and Alime Abdenanova, who died courageously at the hands of the fascist executioners.

Only those who have broken with the people and arrogantly despise all that is holy and precious to the people, could have thought of such things.

We have no doubt that the dirty intrigues of these renegades will call forth a just and stern condemnation on the part of our whole people.

Representatives of the Crimean Tatar intelligentsia.

* * *
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The Trial of Vyacheslav Igrunov

From 11 to 13 March a case was heard in the Odessa regional court concerning the ordering of medical treatment for Vyacheslav Igrunov. His actions were defined as subject to article 187-1 of the Ukrainian SSR Criminal Code (corresponding to article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code).

According to the 'Resolution of the investigative authorities on bringing the case to court' (a document analogous to an indictment):

Vladimir Vladimirovich Igrunov, born 28 October 1948, Russian, with a secondary education, who had worked as an electrician in the regional communal services department until his arrest, arrested 1 March 1975, had been involved in 1972-5 in preparing and distributing 'anti-Soviet libellous works'.

In 1972-4, Igrunov distributed the following libellous works: over ten issues of the Chronicle of Current Events, the article 'Think!' by L. Ventsov, works by Amalrik and Sakharov, the books The First Circle, Cancer Ward, August 1914 and The Gulag Archipelago by Solzhenitsyn.

In 1974-5 he distributed, reproduced or tried to reproduce Avtorkhanov's works The Origins of the Partocracy and The Technology of Power and The Gulag Archipelago by Solzhenitsyn.

He introduced the witness Mirolyubov to the police, with the aim of distributing it, the article 'Report from the Beria Reserve' by V. Moroz, which was handed over to the KGB in August 1974 by Igrunov's wife S. Artsimovich.

He also kept at home, for the purpose of distribution, issue 32 of the Chronicle of Current Events, and showed it to S. Artsimovich. Together with S. Artsimovich he made a card index (of names) for this issue, using 616 cards, to which he transferred part of the libellous information from the Chronicle. Both the Chronicle and the card-index were confiscated from Igrunov during a search on 1 March 1975.

With the aim of distributing them, he kept at his parents' flat a copy of Avtorkhanov's The Technology of Power and the following anti-Soviet, libellous works: 'Draft of a Basic Law for Russia', the author of which is the mentally-ill V. Kharitonov, The Three Russian Revolutions and The Antigospel of Maria Dementnaya.

Igrunov has suffered three cranio-cerebral injuries: in 1964 he underwent in-patient treatment at a psycho-neurological clinic. Igrunov was described by his parents as an irritable and abrupt man. During the investigation he behaved strangely and reticently; 'a fear of responsibility for his actions' was observed, together with a groundless hot-temperedness. He refused to give evidence.

Igrunov's behaviour during the investigation gave rise to doubts about his sanity, as a result of which a decision was taken, on 14 April 1975, to carry out a forensic-psychiatric diagnosis in a hospital.

According to the conclusions reached by experts from Odessa Psychiatric Hospital Number 1 (Sedykh, Maier, Kravitsova, Chernysheva and Lyamina), Igrunov 'displays a psychopathic personality structure against a background of an organic disease of the central nervous system, without symptoms of a psychosyndrome'. However, taking into account the severe nature of the illness, the commission did not decide the question of Igrunov's responsibility at the time of the criminal actions and recommended that a further diagnosis be carried out at the Serbsky Research Institute of Forensic Psychiatry.

The diagnosis carried out at the Serbsky Institute (by Pechernikova, Lunts, Taltse and Azamatov) proved that Igrunov was suffering from a severe mental illness in the form of chronic schizophrenia. Igrunov is not responsible. Because of his psychic condition, and taking into account his tendency to conceal his morbid emotions, and also the nature of the acts committed:

— he represents a serious danger to society and needs compulsory treatment in a special psychiatric hospital.

The course of the pre-trial investigation in Igrunov's case has been described in detail in issue 38 of the Chronicle. However, that account included certain inaccuracies:

— V. S. Alekseyev-Popov is not a philologist but a historian;
— on 9 August 1974 the memoirs of Khrushchev, not his speech to the 20th party congress, were confiscated from Igrunov;
The trial of Vyacheslav Igrunov was provided over by Judge Meshkova, assisted by People's Assessors Butuzov and Kabanova. The state prosecutor was Sadikova. Igrunov was defended by counsel Nimirinskaya. Psychiatric experts were Azamatov (from the Serbsky Institute) and Lyamina (from Odessa City Psychiatric Hospital Number 1). The case was heard in Igrunov's absence.

The hearing on 11 March. It was discovered that the expert Azamatov was absent. The proceedings were suspended until 9 o'clock on the following day. 12 March. All designated participants for the judicial investigation were present, with the exception of witness Alekseyev-Popov, who was in hospital. A decision as to the necessity of this witness's presence was put off.

The 'Resolution' quoted above was read out.

Witness Nikolai Evdokimovich Mirolyubov, born 1913, a member of the CPSU, a metal worker, said that Igrunov used to visit the Mirolyubovs and in the course of conversation 'mentioned the Solzhenitsyn question'. He had given them *The Gulag Archipelago* to read. Mirolyubov had read 100-150 pages and had returned the book, as he had not liked it. This was in about May or June 1974. The copy had evidently been photocopied on an 'Era' machine, and was recognized at the investigation by Mirolyubov. Igrunov sometimes used to discuss democracy. This subject 'was treated by him in an interesting way: he said there was no democracy in our country'. According to Igrunov, democracy meant freedom of speech and action (on the whole—'anarchy'). Mirolyubov summed up, Igrunov used to say that the workers had 'not developed' sufficiently to be able to take charge of the government. Igrunov spoke only negatively of our society.

Defence counsel: Did you notice anything strange in Igrunov's behaviour?

Mirolyubov: Yes. I found it strange that he was against everything. The lawyer made the question more precise.

Mirolyubov: He's artistic, condescending and takes pride in people following his 'lead'.

Witness Valery Fyodorovich Rezak, born 1945, Russian, an engineer with the Crimean Anti-Hail Task Force living in the village of Zolotoye Pole, Crimean region, stated that he had known Igrunov since 1968-9. They had met rarely. Formerly, at Igrunov's request, he had photocopied and typed various books for him, for example, Bulgakov's *Master and Margarita*. On 11 February 1975, in the afternoon, Igrunov had come to Zolotoye Pole and called Rezak away from his work. He had brought 10-15 rolls of film and some photographic paper and asked him to make prints from the films (for a payment). A few days earlier Rezak had received a parcel from Igrunov containing photo reagent. He did not have time to copy anything as there was a search on 14 February and everything was confiscated. He did not know what was on the films.

Prosecutor: At the pre-trial investigation you said they contained material by Avtorkhanov and Solzhenitsyn.

Rezak: It was not I who said so; the investigators told me this when they confronted me with the films.

The prosecutor referred to a handwritten 'Declaration on the crime committed', which Rezak wrote on 16 February 1975. Rezak insisted that he was telling the truth.

In the spring of 1974, when Rezak was working temporarily in the town of Belogorsk, Oleg Kursa had visited him twice and had brought him some films, saying that Igrunov had sent them. There were 6-10 films, in very bad condition, and Rezak had returned them, saying there was no point in printing them. At the pre-trial investigation Rezak had recognized these films, which were confiscated in August 1974 from Kursa (the investigator had told him that these, too, contained material by Avtorkhanov). At the same time O. Kursa had taken away two copies of the *Gulag Archipelago* which Rezak had made. Both copies were identified by Rezak at the pre-trial investigation. (One had been handed in to the KGB by Alekseyev-Popov, the other had been confiscated from O. Kursa — *Chronicle*.)

Prosecutor: What did Igrunov say about democracy?

Rezak: We didn't speak about that. Igrunov is an economist by education, and we used to talk about the national economy. Igrunov considered that economic competition between industrial enterprises was necessary, that it would be a good stimulant.

Prosecutor: And what did he say about freedom of speech?

Rezak: He says that freedom of speech, in our country as in any other, is still subject to certain limitations.

Prosecutor: So you agreed to help him out, not knowing what he had given
The witness Kulakova (wife of Rezak) confirmed that Igrunov had visited them on 11 February, had stayed the night and left in the morning. According to her husband, he had asked him to copy some sort of rare book — she did not know what it was. Her husband himself had not known. Igrunov had brought a lot of photographic paper with him.

The witness Nikolai Fyodorovich Shkorbut, born 1955, who was temporarily working as a watchman at the laboratory of the Crimean Anti-Hail Task Force in February 1975, stated that Igrunov had entered the laboratory (in March or April) and asked for Rezak. Rezak had, according to the witness, warned him that a friend of his might come. When Rezak was asked again about this, he refused to confirm that he had said this. (The witness Shkorbut, according to those present in court, did not really understand what was going on, and was clearly confused: he asked other witnesses if there was a possibility that he himself might be put inside.)

Vyacheslav's father, Vil Nikiforovich Igrunov, was then questioned; he was born in 1924, is a member of the CPSU and works as director of a fur supply-base.

Since 1968 he had had virtually no contact with his son. The reasons for the rift between them were that his son had joined the history faculty against his wishes, that he had gone from one job to another, often not working at all for lengthy periods, and that he had married. They had met for the last time 'in 1970 or 1971, I think'.

Until his 11th year at school, his son had grown up like other children. Then 'deviations appeared — he made friends, among whom was the 23-year-old A. Rykov'. It was only later that V. N. Igrunov found out that in 1968 they had been visited 'by the KGB'. The libellous work '2000 Words' had been confiscated from Vyacheslav and from Rykov. In 1975 there was a search at the home of the Igrunovs and, in the room formerly occupied by Vyacheslav, 'a pile of documents and a book were discovered'. 'My son must have brought them in when I wasn't at home.' Vyacheslav Igrunov had not made any 'negative comments' in his father's hearing. The witness knew nothing about his son's liking for anti-Soviet literature. He felt it was all the fault of the influence exerted by A. Rykov. V. N. Igrunov stated that his son had been on the register of a psycho-neurological clinic, 'because of his glaucoma' (?). He had always been a good student and read a great deal. In his second year he had taken some sick leave — 'because of his glaucoma.' The witness had not had any thoughts doubting his son's mental health. His son was stubborn, and not always with good reason. He was excitable. There had been no sudden changes in his character, although the witness remembered that in his tenth year at school he had become more excitable and his attitude to his parents had changed. He had no particular liking for philosophy. He painted 'abstract pictures'.

Vyacheslav's mother, Appolonia Ivanovna Polyanskaya, born 1921, a doctor.

She considered her son to be normal, still developing, like all children. He had always behaved well to his mother and still did; he was on good terms with his sister and was very fond of her. He had normal relationships with his friends. She did not think that any change had taken place in her son's character in his 10th year at school. Her son was a good, modest, polite man, somewhat excitable. At school he had liked physics and chemistry. When he grew older, he began to be interested in philosophy — he had read Marx, Engels and Lenin. At the age of eight he had received an injury to the skull (some boys had pushed him off a tram). Then he had begun to have headaches; sometimes he was sick at school. At the age of 15 the pains began again. They had gone to the psycho-neurological clinic; there it was diagnosed as basal arachnoiditis.

According to the psychoneurologist, there were no pathological changes in her son's mind. The arachnoiditis was treated with magnesium and glucose and vitamins. He obtained sick leave because of his asthenia. He worked during the vacations. He had always worked hard, though with gaps between jobs.

Later he had had further knocks on the head.

The witness knew nothing of her son's liking for anti-Soviet literature. She had seen the material confiscated only at the time of the search and did not know how it had got into the flat. In answer to a question from the prosecutor about her son's relationship with his father, she replied: 'They have the same sort of characters; they have never made allowances for each other.' She had a good relationship with her son. Vyacheslav used to visit her, bringing his grand-daughter with him. She had last seen her son in February 1975.

Witness Gleb Olegovich Pavlovsky, born 1951, expelled from the Young Communist League for not paying his membership dues, was a graduate of Odessa State University history faculty. He had been unemployed since February 1976. He announced his refusal to give evidence. The witness's relationship with Igrunov concerned matters 'of a purely theoretical and ideological character'.

The present hearing was, in Pavlovsky's opinion, 'unjust, unlawful and impossible'. The trial of a man for spreading ideas was a trial of ideas. 'I am a communist by conviction and I consider that such a trial is impossible for a socialist society,' said Pavlovsky.

The judge reminded Pavlovsky that he had given evidence at the pre-trial investigation. Pavlovsky replied that the evidence he had given to the KGB had not clarified matters, as he had intended, but had obscured them. In that sense it was false, and he renounced it. Pavlovsky was aware of the responsibility he incurred for giving false evidence, but he explained that at the time he had been a family man and had feared for his relatives. The evidence had been the result
How was your evidence false? Were your answers not to the point?

Judge: How was your evidence false? Were your answers not to the point?

Pavlovsky: The questions were not to the point. I should have made this clear to the investigator.

Igrunov's wife, Svetlana Feliksevna Artsimovich, born 1950: until October 1975 she had worked as a teacher in a kindergarten.

Judge: Was there a search at your home and what was confiscated? What did you hand over voluntarily?

S. Artsimovich: Are you talking about August 1974? I didn't hand in anything voluntarily; the search was carried out without any documents being shown; after the search, I was confused and wrote a 'declaration of voluntary surrender of goods', which was dictated to me. A paper-case and some papers were confiscated. During the search on 1 March 1975, the Chronicle of Current Events number 32, some photographic equipment, some paper, and a card-index to the Chronicle were discovered. The Chronicle belonged to my husband and myself, so that there can be no question of distribution. We made the card-index together. I refuse to say why — and I also refuse to give any further evidence.

Judge: Why?

S. Artsimovich: I have known Vyacheslav for many years as an honest and thoroughly decent man. He had not committed any crimes. He is quite normal. I refuse to take part in his trial.

Judge and Prosecutor: This is not a trial. We are not trying him.

Defence counsel: Do you also refuse to answer my questions?

S. Artsimovich (waiving): Yes.

Judge: Will you answer questions from the medical experts?

S. Artsimovich: No.

An intermission was now announced.

After the intermission the court again summoned Pavlovsky and tried to persuade him to confirm the evidence he had given at the pre-trial investigation.

Pavlovsky: The questions put to me by the KGB should not have been asked; they were unlawful. Like the investigation as a whole.

The judge reminded Pavlovsky of the 'handwritten declaration to the authorities', dated August 1974, which he had signed.

Pavlovsky: I remember quite well all I said in it, but I categorically refuse to give evidence. I also repudiate the document itself, that is, without denying its existence I refused to confirm the facts mentioned in it. The interpretation expressed in my explanations was imposed on me by KGB officials Kasyan, Dovzhenko and Captain Alekseyev. I refuse to discuss the contents of this document, as it does not correspond to reality. I did not wish to mislead anyone. I myself have been mistaken about this case as a whole.
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The trial of Vyacheslav Igrunov

Judge: How have you been mistaken?

Pavlovsky: In that my friendship with Igrunov and our relationship have been regarded as official matters and are the object of investigation by the State Security authorities. This is not their business. I should have refused to answer their questions then, giving my reasons.

Judge: You got to know Igrunov and wanted to obtain some literature... After all, there was nothing criminal in that?

Pavlovsky: Of course there was nothing criminal about it. I could have written about it in a letter. But it was absurd and immoral to write about it to the investigative authorities.

Judge (reading extracts from the 'handwritten declaration'): ... I had the impression that Igrunov had too critical a frame of mind... As a whole, I saw him as a man leading a highly unorganized form of existence... I occasionally received samizdat literature from him. Igrunov himself offered to pass on this literature to me at his own discretion... He brought me Solzhenitsyn's book 'August 1914', 10 to 15 issues of the Chronicle, 'Think!' by L. Ventsov, and Tsvetayeva's poems. This was from January 1972 to the summer of 1973. He brought the Chronicle later on as well. In 1974 I obtained the Gulag Archipelago from Igrunov. Without Igrunov's knowledge, I offered to lend this book to Alekseyev-Popov, in order to hear his opinion as a historian...

Pavlovsky was shown the document and confirmed that its contents agreed with the text just read out. Pavlovsky categorically refused to give further evidence.

The court decided that it was impossible to proceed with the case in the absence of the witness Alekseyev-Popov. At the suggestion of the prosecutor, the evidence given by Alekseyev-Popov at the pre-trial hearing was read out.

Vadim Sergeyevich Alekseyev-Popov, born 1912, a senior lecturer at the Odessa State University faculty of history; in 1970-1 he got to know the student Pavlovsky, keeping in touch with him even after he had finished the course. In June 1974 Pavlovsky brought a copy of The Gulag Archipelago to Alekseyev-Popov's dacha, as Alekseyev-Popov had wanted to read it, being a historian. At his request, Pavlovsky had first brought a few chapters, and then the whole book (a photocopy). The book had seemed tendentious to him, and the 'personal prejudices' of the author gave 'a maliciously distorted, libellous picture of life in our country'.

The expert psychiatrist Alfred Gavrilovich Azamatov now appeared before the court; born in 1934, with clinical training in forensic psychiatry, and with over ten years' experience. He had taken part in the forensic-psychiatric diagnosis of Igrunov's case which was carried out at the Serbsky Institute from 26 June to 1 September 1975.

The prosecution, in accordance with the Code of Criminal Procedure, put written questions to the expert:

(1) Did he uphold the conclusion reached by the report of 1 September, taking
into account the evidence furnished in court?

(2) Did he support the recommendation made as a result of the diagnosis — for treatment in a special psychiatric hospital?

Judge: How much time do you need to prepare answers to these questions?

Azamatov stated that he was ready to answer the first question at once. As to the second question, taking into account the fact that over six months had gone by since diagnosis, he would have to study the medical findings during this period, to talk to the doctors in charge of Igrunov’s treatment and to examine Igrunov himself. Thus, the expert could not answer the second question earlier than the following day.

The judge announced an intermission of 15 minutes. After the intermission, which lasted considerably longer, Azamatov was no longer in the courtroom — he had gone to carry out the examination.

The psychiatrist Vera Eliseyevna Lyamina now appeared; she was born in 1923, had worked as a doctor for 25 years, and was now a consultant in the clinical department at Odessa City Psychiatric Hospital Number 1. She took part in the first diagnosis in Igrunov’s case. Lyamina had been called by the defence in connection with the fact that, in making the diagnosis, the members of the commission had disagreed as to the mental health of Igrunov. Lyamina explained that she herself had supported the diagnosis of ‘schizophrenia’; the opposing view — for ‘psychopathy’ — had been supported particularly by Sedykh, the chairman of the commission.

(Defence counsel: Well, I didn’t know which one of you to call!) The prosecutor made the following requests:
- that a number of materials should be added to the case-evidence (including the verdict in the case of V. Moroz, the court decision in the case of Kharitonov, author of the ‘Draft of a Basic Law for Russia’), and the results of a handwriting test proving that the parcel containing the photographic reagent was sent to Rezak by Igrunov;
- that Pavlovsky’s evidence at the pre-trial hearing should be read out. The defence counsel opposed the reading out of Pavlovsky’s evidence. ‘The law allows that possibility in the case of contradictions in evidence given at the pre-trial hearing and in court. But here we are dealing with a categorical refusal to give evidence in court.’

The court turned down the prosecutor’s request that Pavlovsky’s evidence should be read out. The prosecutor’s remaining requests were granted.

The defence counsel made the following requests:
- that a new diagnosis should be made, not by Azamatov alone, but by a commission, in accordance with the law; the lawyer based this request on the procedure for compulsory medical treatment, which provides for diagnosis by a commission every six months;
- that character references from Igrunov’s place of work should be read out.

The prosecutor made the following requests:
- that a number of materials should be added to the case-evidence (including character references from Tgrunov’s last three places of work);
- that a new diagnosis should be made, not by Azamatov alone, but by a commission, in accordance with the law; the lawyer based this request on the procedure for compulsory medical treatment, which provides for diagnosis by a commission every six months;
- that character references from Igrunov’s place of work should be read out.

The judge announced an intermission of 15 minutes. After the intermission, which lasted considerably longer, Azamatov was no longer in the courtroom — he had gone to carry out the examination.

The psychiatrist Vera Eliseyevna Lyamina now appeared; she was born in 1923, had worked as a doctor for 25 years, and was now a consultant in the clinical department at Odessa City Psychiatric Hospital Number 1. She took part in the first diagnosis in Igrunov’s case. Lyamina had been called by the defence in connection with the fact that, in making the diagnosis, the members of the commission had disagreed as to the mental health of Igrunov. Lyamina explained that she herself had supported the diagnosis of ‘schizophrenia’; the opposing view — for ‘psychopathy’ — had been supported particularly by Sedykh, the chairman of the commission.

(Defence counsel: Well, I didn’t know which one of you to call!) The prosecutor made the following requests:
- that a number of materials should be added to the case-evidence (including the verdict in the case of V. Moroz, the court decision in the case of Kharitonov, author of the ‘Draft of a Basic Law for Russia’), and the results of a handwriting test proving that the parcel containing the photographic reagent was sent to Rezak by Igrunov;
- that Pavlovsky’s evidence at the pre-trial hearing should be read out. The defence counsel opposed the reading out of Pavlovsky’s evidence. ‘The law allows that possibility in the case of contradictions in evidence given at the pre-trial hearing and in court. But here we are dealing with a categorical refusal to give evidence in court.’

The court turned down the prosecutor’s request that Pavlovsky’s evidence should be read out. The prosecutor’s remaining requests were granted.

The defence counsel made the following requests:
- that a new diagnosis should be made, not by Azamatov alone, but by a commission, in accordance with the law; the lawyer based this request on the procedure for compulsory medical treatment, which provides for diagnosis by a commission every six months;
- that character references from Igrunov’s place of work should be read out.

The trial court of Vyacheslav Igrunov

The prosecutor opposed the first request, pointing out its lack of legal basis — Igrunov was not yet receiving compulsory treatment.

The court rejected defence counsel’s first request and granted the second. Character references from Igrunov’s last three places of work were read out, mostly positive in character (only the character reference from the philosophy department of a medical institute mentioned his lack of discipline).

The court hearing came to an end. The court assigned its next hearing for Saturday, 13 March.

* * *

The court hearing of 13 March began with the testimony of the expert Azamatov.

In answer to the first question, the expert stated that he fully supported the diagnosis made by the Serbsky Institute: Igrunov was suffering from schizophrenia and was not responsible. The court investigation had produced no new facts on this question.

The second question is — does Igrunov need compulsory treatment at this time in a special psychiatric hospital? In making recommendations of this kind, an expert depends largely on the presence or absence of pathological personality changes and on the nature of the crimes committed.

Schizophrenia was a fast-moving illness and that was why it had been necessary to examine Igrunov at the present time. ‘On 12 March I carried out such an examination. I also made myself familiar with the medical findings over the last six months.’ He had not discovered any basic disease of the central nervous system. During their conversation Igrunov had behaved arrogantly, in an affected manner, ‘smiling inadequately’; in the course of conversation, he would suddenly tense himself and lapse into silence; it was noticeable that he had a paranoid attitude to the doctors and lacked self-criticism; for example, the doctor’s questions about his illness of the duodenum were regarded by him as deliberate provocation. When asked if he intended to continue his activities in future, he answered no, he did not intend to, ‘as he did not want to end up in a psychiatric hospital’.

Igrunov’s mental condition had improved over these six months: he had become more concrete in his replies. From this, and from the fact that the actions Igrunov was accused of did not pose a great danger to society, the expert considered it possible to reject the conclusion of the Serbsky report on the necessity of treatment in a special psychiatric hospital and recommended treatment in an ordinary psychiatric hospital.

The judicial investigation ended at this point. Statements by the two sides now began.

Speech of Prosecutor Sadikova

It has been established that for a prolonged period Igrunov was involved in
producing, storing and distributing libellous literature defaming the Soviet system. This consisted partly of literature published abroad, and partly of samizdat works. All these contain libels on our system, on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and on the history of the USSR.

Igrunov stored, distributed — or tried to distribute — The Technology of Power by Avtorkhanov, his Origins of the Partocracy, and Solzhenitsyn's Letter to the Leaders and Gulag Archipelago. All the works referred to contain libels on the Soviet system and 'on the origins of Soviet power.' Igrunov's guilt is confirmed by the evidence of Rezak, Kulakova, Shkorbut and Mirolyubov. It is also clear from Mirolyubov's evidence that Igrunov spread slanderous reports in oral form.

In 1972-4 Igrunov distributed libellous anti-Soviet materials, including the so-called Chronicle of Current Events, the 32nd issue of which he showed to his wife, and drew her into the work by making a card-index based on this issue. By a comparison of the text of the Chronicle's reports with the court records of criminal cases mentioned in it, the libellous character of this bulletin is revealed. In addition, it contains libels on the internal policies of the USSR and 'on places of imprisonment'; it advertises anti-Soviet literature.

These facts are confirmed by the evidence of both the pre-trial investigation and the court hearing.

The distribution of The Gulag Archipelago and over ten issues of the Chronicle is confirmed by the evidence of Pavlovsky (although he refused to give evidence in court) and that of Alekseyev-Popov. Pavlovsky's evidence also confirms the distribution of Ventsov's article 'Think!', in which questions of culture and ideology are depicted in a libellous light.

Igrunov kept at home an article by Moroz which libels the nationalities policy of the USSR and the activities of the Soviet administration. The case-evidence now includes the court decision sending V. Kharitonov, author of one of the libellous documents kept by Igrunov at his parents' home, to a psychiatric hospital for forcible treatment. We know that Moroz was also held criminally responsible for his article.

Thus it has been proved that Igrunov committed a crime. However, we must still decide a number of questions:

---

1. was the person who committed the crime responsible?
---

2. if not, should measures of a medical nature be taken, and what kind of measures?

The in-patient diagnosis has shown that Igrunov is suffering from mental illness in the form of schizophrenia and committed the actions he is charged with in a state of non-responsibility. Igrunov is in need of compulsory treatment. At the same time, it must be taken into account that the crime committed by Igrunov is not considered a major crime by law and does not constitute a great danger to society.

Igrunov has committed an action defined under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian S S R Criminal Code and is in need of compulsory treatment in an ordinary hospital.

Speech of defence counsel Ninirinskaya

Above all, we must make clear whether the socially dangerous actions mentioned in the 'Resolution' ever took place, and if so, whether they come under the provisions of article 187-1 of the Ukrainian S S R Criminal Code.

To go through it point by point:

1. That Igrunov gave Pavlovsky works by Solzhenitsyn and Ventsov and the Chronicle has not been established in court. We cannot check in court the evidence he gave at the pre-trial hearing. Pavlovsky stated that he had misled the investigation and refused to give evidence. The evidence of Alekseyev-Popov does not clarify matters — he obtained the Gulag Archipelago from Pavlovsky but does not know where Pavlovsky got the book. This evidence concerns only Pavlovsky, not Igrunov.

2. The evidence given by V. Rezak, that in the summer of 1974 Igrunov gave him films of The Technology of Power, by way of O. Kursa, is unconvincing and contradictory. It was revealed in court that, contrary to his evidence at the pre-trial investigation and his 'Declaration on the crime committed', dated 16 February 1975, Rezak did not know what he had been given, or how much, or from whom it originated. Rezak asserts that he got to know all this from the investigator. That Kursa had obtained the film of The Technology of Power from Igrunov, Rezak knew only from what Kursa said. He did not speak to Igrunov about it. The films were confiscated from Kursa. Here we are trying the case of Igrunov, not Kursa. If it was not considered necessary to call Kursa into court, it means that the evidence of Rezak, a man guilty of socially dangerous activity, reflects merely the opinion of the investigators and not any established facts.

3. The episode of February 1975, when Rezak was given a film, is not disputed by the defence.

4. The storing of 'Report from the Beria Reserve' by V. Moroz, Chronicle number 32, also The Technology of Power, 'The Three Russian Revolutions' and other works found at the home of Igrunov's parents, must be excluded from the indictment. Storing anything is not a crime covered by article 187-1.

Responsibility for storing anti-Soviet literature is covered by article 62 of the Ukrainian S S R Criminal Code, not article 187-1.

The material confiscated during the search at the home of Igrunov's parents cannot be relevant to this case, as there is no direct evidence to prove that it belonged to Vyacheslav Igrunov.

Concerning issue 32 of the Chronicle. The indictment states that 'Igrunov showed it to his wife.' Igrunov's wife, S. Artemovich, began to give evidence in court, but unexpectedly refused to continue. However, it is clear from what she said that she and her husband owned the Chronicle together. The
notes in the card-index are partly in her handwriting. This episode should also be deleted.

(5) The incident when Mirolyubov was given the book *The Gulag Archipelago* is not disputed by the defence. The spoken assertions have also been proved.

Concerning the forensic-medical diagnosis, the defence cannot quarrel with a diagnosis made by specialists. However, it should be noted that this case is very complicated.

Until 25 May the doctors could not come to any conclusion and decided, so to speak, that no decision could be made: "The clinical picture is unclear. It is essential to continue observations." But on 29 May, for some reason, the doctors refused to carry out further observations or to come to a decision — because of the complicated nature of the case. It is true that the expert Lyamina told us of the doubts experienced by some members of the commission and of the fact that some of them were 'on the side of' schizophrenia — but the report itself speaks only of a psychopathic structure of the personality. At the Serbsky Institute a diagnosis could not be made at once either — the report of 28 July lists a number of symptoms, but does not make a diagnosis. It was only on 1 September that his non-responsibility was categorically decided on and his diagnosis given as 'schizophrenia'.

Even in this report the need to send him to a special psychiatric hospital was not strongly argued, and on this point the defence was prepared earlier to disagree with the report. The fact is that article 187-1 does not apply to especially dangerous crimes; the actions covered by this article do not constitute a great danger to society. Then in court the expert Azamatov himself rejected the Serbsky's point; he considered that assignment to an ordinary hospital would be sufficient. An expert opinion is not, of course, bound to be accepted by the court, but it should be taken into account. The defence asks that a decision be taken to recommend compulsory treatment in an ordinary hospital.

The court retired for consultation. An intermission was declared and lasted for about two hours. After the intermission, the Decision of the court was read out:

In the course of 1974-5, Igrunov disseminated libellous fabrications defaming the Soviet political and social system.

The court considered as proved: the incidents concerning Rezak (summer 1974 and February 1975); the incidents involving Mirolyubov; the fact that *Chronicle* 32 was shown to S. Artsimovich and a card-index made together with her.

The charge of giving Pavlovsky the book *The Gulag Archipelago*, issues of the *Chronicle* and L. Ventsov's article 'Think!' was deleted, because the evidence given by Pavlovsky at the pre-trial hearing could not be verified.

Because there was no proof of intention to disseminate this material, the charges concerning the storage of *The Technology of Power* by Avtorkhanov, *The Anti-gospel of Maria Denzentnaya*, the articles 'The Three Russian Revolutions' and 'Draft of a Basic Law for Russia' at his parents' home were deleted. The charge relating to the storage of 'Report from the Beria Reserve' by V. Moroz was deleted.

The forensic psychiatric diagnosis had established that Igrunov was suffering from a mental illness — chronic schizophrenia.

The decision of the court was:

That Vyacheslav Vladimirovich Igrunov should be given compulsory treatment in an ordinary psychiatric hospital.

The court made a separate ruling concerning the witness G. O. Pavlovsky — to prefer criminal charges against him for refusal to give evidence in court. (The penalty prescribed for this in the relevant article of the Ukrainian S S R Criminal Code is up to 3 months' corrective labour — *Chronicle*.)

The untraditional legal correctness of the trial (if the almost complete lack of proof concerning the criminal nature of the texts involved is not taken into account) and the unusual fact that an expert reviewed the recommendations of the psychiatric report were in keeping with the tone of the trial's conduct. Judge Markhova observed the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure (even to the extent that S. Artsimovich, formally a Lithuanian by birth, and A. I. Polyanskaya, formally a Pole by birth, were offered the services of an interpreter. However, the Ukrainian Mirolyubov and Shkorbut were not offered interpreters). Neither the judge nor the prosecutor interrupted witnesses or threatened them (compare the trials of Tverdokhlebov and Dzhemilev, in this issue). The trial was basically conducted in a calm and businesslike manner. All those who wished to attend were allowed into the courtroom (they were even invited to come in!). There were hardly any K G B officials or agents in the courtroom or in the corridors of the courthouse. On the last day of the trial the courtroom turned out to be full of young people, who said they were medical students, and Igrunov's friends and relatives had nowhere to sit. Then the chairman of the Odessa regional court assigned a larger half for the hearing, where there was enough room for everyone to sit down.

The appeal hearing was unsuccessful, and on 25 March V. Igrunov was transferred from prison to Odessa Regional Psychiatric Hospital Number 1. Until that moment, Igrunov did not know that the court hearing had taken place, or that the investigation was over, or even of the results of the psychiatric diagnosis.

From the moment of his arrest, Igrunov consistently refused to participate in any way in the investigation or the diagnosis.
The Trial of Valery Maresin

On 14 April 1976 the Supreme Court of the Lithuanian SSR heard the case of Valery Maresin, who was charged with refusal to give evidence (article 189 of the Lithuanian SSR Criminal Code). The hearing was presided over by A. Jankauskas, a member of the Supreme Court of the Lithuanian SSR. The People's Assessors were V. Tereshina and M. Baronas; the prosecutor was senior counsellor of justice Kuznetsov.

There were only a few people — friends of the defendant — in the small courtroom.

Maresin immediately stated that he did not intend to answer any of the court's questions. He refused the services of a lawyer.

Earlier he had written a declaration about his refusal to participate in the legal proceedings (Chronicle 39). In this he had asked, on the basis of article 246, paragraph 2, of the RSFSR Penal Code, that he should not be called to appear in court. Maresin received the reply that there was no such article in the Penal Code of the Lithuanian SSR.

The indictment stated:

At the pre-trial investigation, on 12 February 1975, and at the court hearing in the case of Kovalyov, on 10 December 1975, Maresin gave evidence that on 9 October 1974 he and Yu. P. Dobrachev had gone together to the laboratory of the Experimental Veterinary Institute, in order to make a film of A. Solzhenitsyn's book *Culture and Ethics* for Dobrachev. Making use of the fact that there was no one else in the laboratory, Maresin began to film A. Solzhenitsyn's book *The Gulag Archipelago*, parts 3 and 4, published abroad, which he had brought with him in his brief-case, together with Schweitzer's book and other works. While copying the *Gulag Archipelago* Maresin was discovered by laboratory worker V. N. Chikina and V. A. Gorbatov, the head of the laboratory, who confiscated the said book from him.

Having been warned that he would be held criminally responsible for refusing to give evidence, under article 182 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and article 189 of the Lithuanian Code, Maresin refused, during the pre-trial investigation and at the court hearing, to testify as to the person from whom he had obtained the confiscated book *The Gulag Archipelago*. V. M. Maresin had admitted that he was guilty, in part, of the charge against him and had testified that during the entire pre-trial investigation and the trial of S. A. Kovalyov he had refused to give evidence about the person from whom he had obtained the book, not, however, from any desire to mislead the investigation or the court, but acting from personal moral considerations.

In his declaration of 9 February 1976, addressed to the Procurator of the Lithuanian SSR, V. M. Maresin had renounced his testimony and refused to participate in the criminal case.

The indictment further makes reference to the evidence of Gorbatov, Chikina and Dobrachev.

The questioning of witnesses began.

The witness Gorbatov stated that Dobrachev had come to him the day before, had asked for permission to reproduce some literature and had promised to repair some of the laboratory equipment. Dobrachev had made such requests before; however, Gorbatov had not allowed him to take charge of the photocopying apparatus, but had given this job to a senior laboratory worker. When Dobrachev began to repair the equipment, Gorbatov took the book, leafed through it and having made sure that it had been published in the Soviet Union, though only for academic libraries, he had given permission for it to be copied. Some time later, Chikina rang him and informed him that Maresin had filmed one book and was now filming another. Gorbatov went to the photographic laboratory. When he discovered the book by Solzhenitsyn, he confiscated it. Later Dobrachev came in and declared that he had not known of Maresin's intentions, that Maresin had acted dishonestly and that he was embarrassed by his behaviour. He asked for the book to be returned. Gorbatov did not return the book, but handed it over to the KGB. According to Chikina, Maresin and Dobrachev had given her the film to check after copying the book by Schweitzer, but had themselves gone on filming. Following Gorbatov's instructions, she had rung him and told him what was going on.

Dobrachev testified that he had intended to make a copy of Schweitzer's book and some articles. However, he had not managed to complete his work, as he had been called out for an examination. When he returned, he was told about Maresin's attempt to copy the *Gulag Archipelago*. He did not know who the book belonged to. Maresin had explained what had happened by saying that there had been no obstacles in the way of the task, and the book had just been to hand.

**Prosecutor:** And if he had told you that he was going to film this second book? Would you have agreed to help him?

**Dobrachev:** Probably not...

**Prosecutor:** What if it had been leaflets?

**Dobrachev:** I'm a Soviet person ... You should ask me concrete questions!
The prosecutor's speech

... There are no easy criminal cases ... behind each case stands a Soviet citizen, whose fate is being decided ... The defendant secretly copied a book ... he got into a laboratory by dishonest means ... The book *The Gulag Archipelago* is of an anti-Soviet nature. We know this from the press and we shall not discuss it here ... The defendant has not denied the facts of the case, although he later renounced his evidence. But we shall proceed not from the whims of the defendant, but from the proven facts ... The book belongs to Kovalyov. Kovalyov has confirmed this at the investigation and in court. There is no need to call Kovalyov as a witness. He himself spoke eloquently about it in court. He wrote a letter, in which he asked for the book to be returned. From the relations between Maresin and Kovalyov, we cannot doubt that the defendant obtained the book from Kovalyov. Maresin should have given evidence about this in court, but Maresin has declared, daringly and tactlessly, 'I shall not tell you!' This declaration is tactless and meaningless, the more so as Maresin cannot either lighten Kovalyov's sentence or make it more severe.

The prosecutor then depicted Maresin's outward behaviour in an unfavourable light — that is, his refusal to answer questions from the court. Going on to the question of the degree of punishment, he remarked that the defendant's crime was not a serious one, and therefore was not severely punished by the law, but it hid within itself a social evil: 'suppose everyone were to refuse to give evidence! How could we carry on the struggle?' The character reference from Maresin's place of work spoke only of his narrow administrative capabilities. It did not speak of character, of his moral nature, nor of his moral suitability. However, we knew from the Kovalyov case that anti-Soviet conversations were carried on in the laboratory.

The prosecutor then depicted Maresin's outward behaviour in an unfavourable light — that is, his refusal to answer questions from the court. Going on to the question of the degree of punishment, he remarked that the defendant's crime was not a serious one, and therefore was not severely punished by the law, but it hid within itself a social evil: 'suppose everyone were to refuse to give evidence! How could we carry on the struggle?' The character reference from Maresin's place of work spoke only of his narrow administrative capabilities. It did not speak of character, of his moral nature, nor of his moral suitability. However, we knew from the Kovalyov case that anti-Soviet conversations were carried on in the laboratory.

The prosecutor demanded the maximum penalty provided for in the corresponding article — 6 months' corrective labour. He stated that he would request the court to send a special court order to Maresin's place of work. 'I suggest that his work as a senior research officer cannot be continued ... He cannot work in such a position after this kind of behaviour ... Such employees must be respected not only for their hard work, but also for their political qualities. After all, they're not ordinary workers ... I ask that the defendant's unsuitable behaviour be made the subject of a special court order ...'

After an interval of two hours, the sentence was announced: 6 months' corrective labour, to be performed at his place of work and with deduction of 20 per cent of his wages. The legal costs, 53 roubles 40 kopecks, were to be paid by the defendant to the state.

**In Memory of Efim Davidovich**

On 24 April 1976 Efim Aronovich Davidovich, retired colonel and veteran of the Second World War, holder of eighteen medals and military honours, died; he spent his last years fighting for the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel.

Efim Davidovich was born in Minsk in 1924. At the age of eighteen he went to the front as a volunteer. He was wounded five times. After the war he graduated from the Frunze Academy with honours. While serving in the army, he suffered two heart attacks and was retired from active service in 1969.

As he was not indifferent to the fate of his people, who had suffered terribly in recent decades (200,000 Jews perished in the Minsk ghetto and among these were Davidovich's parents and his three younger brothers), Davidovich spoke out loudly and honestly against anti-Semitism. The letters, appeals and protests written by Davidovich attracted attention to him, particularly the keen attention of the state security authorities. In 1972 a criminal case was brought against him with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda. On 1 December 1972 Davidovich was arrested, but was released a day later after signing an undertaking not to leave town. For half a year Davidovich was questioned; the prolonged and intensive interrogations he was subjected to led to fainting fits and heart attacks. After a routine interrogation on 21 February 1973 Efim Davidovich was placed in a respiratory unit, and his life hung by a thread.

Because of the pressure of public opinion the case against Davidovich (case 97) was dropped in May 1973. But the campaign of persecution against him did not cease, indeed, it grew. Biased articles were published about him; he was not allowed to travel to Moscow and was taken off the train by force.

In May 1975, after speaking at an anti-fascist meeting in the area where the Minsk ghetto formerly stood, Davidovich was deprived of the rank of retired colonel and of the pension and medical care that went with it (Chronicle 39),
This soon had an effect on his health: on 1 March 1976 Davidovich suffered his fifth heart attack.

Davidovich fought against injustice to his last day. It can be said without exaggeration that he lived like a man and died like a warrior.

Those who knew Davidovich will remember him — as a good, honest and fearless man.

* * *

During Davidovich's last illness, European activists were trying to obtain permission for him and his family to emigrate to Israel. On 17 March L. Ovsishcher, I. Nudel and A. Lerner were received in this connection by V. Obidin, head of the All-Union Visa Department, who promised to give them an answer shortly.

On 21 March Davidovich was visited in Minsk by V. Rubin and S. Lipavsky, a Candidate of Medical Science. After examining Davidovich, Lipavsky sent urgent telegrams to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs and to First Secretary Masherov of the Belorussian Communist Party, pointing out Davidovich's serious condition and stating that a radical change in his living conditions could lead to his recovery. On 25 March 1976 the Visa Department refused to consider Davidovich's application to emigrate, as 'the Visa Department has information that Davidovich is feeling fine'. On receiving this answer, A. Lerner, I. Nudel, L. Ovsishcher, V. Rubin and S. Lipavsky went to the central reception office of the KGB and handed in the following declaration:

Our appeal to the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs, asking for an urgent and humanitarian consideration of the question of allowing Efim Davidovich to emigrate in accordance with the Helsinki Agreement, has had no result. No one in the world would believe that the emigration of a mortally-ill man, who retired over seven years ago from the army, could be a threat to the security of the Soviet Union. There can be no doubt that the new situation will lead to an outburst of indignation all over the world.

On the same day, Lerner, Nudel, Ovsishcher, Rubin and Lipavsky sent a telegram of similar content to A. Gromyko and to H. Wilson in London:

The life of Efim Davidovich, hero of the Second World War and a leading fighter for the rights of the Soviet Jews, is in mortal danger. The refusal to allow the emigration of a sick man, who has suffered his fifth heart attack, is a blatant infringement of the Helsinki Agreement. We ask you to take appropriate measures immediately.

On hearing of Davidovich's death, 57 Soviet citizens issued the following declaration:

What some people have been trying to achieve for a long time has happened.

* * *

Colonel Efim Davidovich, hero of the war against the fascists, holder of eighteen Soviet military honours and medals, unyielding fighter for the rights of Soviet Jews, a man of rare courage, has died. He was murdered by the KGB. He was murdered because he fought unselfishly for the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel, and because he defended every victim of persecution without sparing himself. What Hitler's bullets could not do has been cold-bloodedly achieved by the executioners of the KGB. This was their reward for the blood Davidovich spilled fighting for Russia, the Ukraine and Belorussia, for his decision, as a Jew, to emigrate to the land where a Jewish state has been built up, where his daughter and grandson, those near and dear to him, would not have to put up with insults from the anti-Semites in power. This was a murder without any beatings, without needles being pushed under nails, without the use of standing cells and other accessories of the Stalin epoch. The contemporary heirs of Beria and Ezhov know how to kill without leaving any traces... After his fifth heart attack, when there was a real threat to his life, we appealed to the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. We warned them that Efim Davidovich was in a critical condition, and asked that he be allowed to emigrate to a country which he considers his own. It is possible that this would have prevented his untimely death, but even if he had soon died in Israel, his last wish would have been fulfilled — to die in his homeland. However, those to whom we appealed to fulfil the last wish of a dying man answered us in the words of Albert Ivanov (of the Central Committee) and Vladimir Obidin (of the Ministry of Internal Affairs), that according to their information, Davidovich was feeling fine. Eternal memory to the hero and martyr Efim Davidovich.

* * *

The funeral of Efim Davidovich took place in Minsk at 17.00 on 26 April. Over 300 people were present, among them 17 Jewish activists from Moscow, Vilnius and Tallinn. The Israeli flag was draped over the coffin and those who took part in the funeral procession were armbands, with a blue ribbon on a white background. At the graveyard speeches were made by L. Ovsishcher, A. Lerner and V. Rubin, and a few words were said by M. K. Davidovich, the dead man's widow. Then the kaddish — the Jewish requiem prayer — was read out.

On the same day, at 18.00, the kaddish was said in the Moscow synagogue. After the kaddish a mourning assembly took place outside the synagogue, attended by about 50 people. V. Fain made a speech at this meeting.

On the morning of 26 April police officials visited a number of Jewish activists and tried to persuade them not to attend the meeting. There were many policemen and KGB agents in civilian clothes near the synagogue.

The meeting took place without incident.
Psychiatric Diagnosis of Valentin Moroz

On 1 June Valentin Moroz should have been transferred to a labour camp after six years in prison.

Raisa Moroz had not received any letters from her husband since March. In answer to her many inquiries the prison governor informed her that V. Moroz had been sent to 'a medical institution' to determine the type of physical work he was fit to do in the camp. Attempts to find out from the prison administration what kind of medical institution this was met with no success. Then R. Moroz travelled to Moscow and went to inquire at the Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions and at the medical department of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Even here she did not obtain an answer immediately. Kulinets, a (female) official of the medical department, responsible for Vladimir region, refused to answer when asked if this 'medical institution' was connected with psychiatry. On 17 May R. Moroz told her that, if it was a psychiatric hospital, she would not keep quiet, as she was convinced of her husband's sanity: 'You'll have another Plyushch on your hands.'

The next day R. Moroz was received by V. N. Popov, deputy head of the medical department. There were five other people in his office. Popov said that V. Moroz was in the Serbsky Institute for 'a somatic examination'. At the Serbsky Institute it turned out that Moroz had arrived on 10 May for a psychiatric diagnosis, because it had been observed lately that he was in 'a depressed mood', and that the examination would continue for about a month.

R. Moroz was told this by V. Moroz's doctor, Margarita Feliksovna (her surname is a secret). The doctor also informed her that Moroz was calm, polite, friendly, and on good terms with his neighbours.

On 19 May Moroz was allowed an hour's visit from his wife, and Raisa heard from her husband that V. L. Rogov, psychiatrist of the Vladimir regional health department, had written down two symptoms in his referral: (1) Moroz had practised self-mutilation; (2) he was excessively religious (V. L. Rogov also gave religious faith as a symptom of illness in his referral for psychiatric diagnosis of Igor Ogurtsov, who was later declared healthy by experts).

Raisa told her husband that 'she would get him out of this psychiatric hospital, even if it killed her.' Moroz, grateful for her determination, said only that it might not be in her power to do so. 'I am not alone,' she replied, 'everyone has already heard that you're here'.

The Chronicle reminds readers: Valentin Yakovlevich Moroz, born 1936, a Ukrainian historian and journalist, was first arrested during the August 1965 campaign of repression against intellectuals in the Ukraine (at the same time I. Svitlicheny, the Goryn [or Horyn, in Ukrainian] brothers, M. Osadchy, I. Gel [or Hel] and others were first arrested). He was sentenced to 4 years in a camp and was sent to Mordovia. There he wrote the now well-known article 'Report from the Beria Reserve'.

In August 1972 a criminal prisoner, who had been put in Moroz's cell, slashed his stomach with a sharpened spoon handle. This incident is now called self-mutilation by Rogov, although the prison governor then confirmed in writing that it had been an attack.

After this incident, when he was placed in a solitary cell 'at his own request', Moroz carried out a 145-day hunger-strike in 1974 (Chronicles 32, 33).

The threat to use psychiatric repression on V. Moroz, suggested by psychiatrist V. L. Rogov, was reported in Chronicle 36.

The United States Congress recently stated that Valentin Moroz was included on a list of persons in whose fate the Congress took a special interest.

In the Prisons and Camps

Vladimir Prison

The right to correspond
From the end of 1975 governor Zavyalkin of Vladimir Prison actively took charge of supervising the prisoners' correspondence. From December 1975 stereo-postcards which arrived in letters were not given out. From February 1976 there was an increase in the number of incoming and outgoing letters being confiscated. Written reasons for confiscation were no longer given. Outgoing letters were confiscated as 'suspicious in content'. No reasons were given for confiscating incoming letters. Specific places in the text of prisoners' letters, demonstrating the reason for confiscation, were not indicated; prisoners were not allowed to make corrections in letters which did not satisfy the censor. On 11 March Zavyalkin gave orders that prisoners were no longer to be informed of the confiscation of incoming letters and were to be told that outgoing letters had been confiscated without the reason being given (in fact, this practice had already been introduced in February). Registered letters were no longer delivered.

In January, 60-70 per cent of the correspondence addressed to Lyubarsky — about 40 letters — was confiscated. In February two of his attempts to send his regulation letter was stopped by the censor. On 23 February 1976 Lyubarsky declared that he refused to send any more letters until the illegal confiscation of correspondence ceased. He made a legal complaint against the prison admin-
administration. The court concerned did not begin to investigate the case, replying that the relations between prisoners and the prison administration was not subject to law. Lyubarsky appealed against this decision.

Earlier, M. Makarenko had ceased corresponding with his family, for the same reasons as Lyubarsky.

Yu. Vudka's correspondences — his letters to his parents — was confiscated more than once. His letters to friends got through, though with difficulty. Letters from Yu. Vudka's fiancée in Israel were often not allowed through. On 23 March, before being sent to a camp, Vudka declared a hunger-strike because of the difficulties in his correspondence.

A letter sent in January by Pushnin was sent after a delay of 12 days. Out of 12 postcards enclosed in the letter, only one was left in the envelope. A letter sent in February was confiscated.

Davydov rewrote his January and February letters several times. On 17 March 1976 he wrote the following letter: 'Greetings ... Goodbye.' This text satisfied the censor.

G. Superfin had to rewrite his January letter three times. In answer to numerous queries Colonel Zavyalikin replied: 'G. Superfin has the right of correspondence.'

When Superfin sent an academic enquiry to the journal 'Decorative Art, Zavyalikin enclosed a note in the letter. The note, addressed to the chief editor of the journal, pointed out the undesirability of a correspondence with the prisoner Superfin.

Superfin wrote an official letter to the publishing house 'Khudozhestvennaya Literatura' [Creative Literature] about the confiscation of his Bible. He asked that the prison administration should be informed of the Bible's literary and creative value. A note by Zavyalikin to the chief editor of 'Decorative Art' was found in this letter, as in the former one, although the letter's addressee bore no relation to that journal.

The prisoners wrote many complaints about their correspondence to various official bodies. They made the following demands:

1. That all letters still not sent should be delivered.
2. That illegal confiscation of incoming and outgoing letters should cease.
3. In the case of the censor discovering passages which are impermissible from his point of view, he should, before taking a decision to confiscate the outgoing letter, point out these passages to the prisoner and suggest that he correct the text of the letter accordingly.
4. Only that part of an incoming letter in which impermissible passages are found should be confiscated.
5. Prisoners should be informed in writing of the confiscation of any letter.
6. The reason for confiscation should be given.
7. Prisoners should be given the opportunity to put their personal signatures on the form confirming that they have received letters addressed to them.

The prisoners wrote many complaints about their correspondence to various official bodies. They made the following demands:

1. That all letters still not sent should be delivered.
2. That illegal confiscation of incoming and outgoing letters should cease.
3. In the case of the censor discovering passages which are impermissible from his point of view, he should, before taking a decision to confiscate the outgoing letter, point out these passages to the prisoner and suggest that he correct the text of the letter accordingly.
4. Only that part of an incoming letter in which impermissible passages are found should be confiscated.
5. Prisoners should be informed in writing of the confiscation of any letter.
6. The reason for confiscation should be given.
7. Prisoners should be given the opportunity to put their personal signatures on the form confirming that they have received letters addressed to them.

The prisoners wrote many complaints about their correspondence to various official bodies. They made the following demands:

1. That all letters still not sent should be delivered.
2. That illegal confiscation of incoming and outgoing letters should cease.
3. In the case of the censor discovering passages which are impermissible from his point of view, he should, before taking a decision to confiscate the outgoing letter, point out these passages to the prisoner and suggest that he correct the text of the letter accordingly.
4. Only that part of an incoming letter in which impermissible passages are found should be confiscated.
5. Prisoners should be informed in writing of the confiscation of any letter.
6. The reason for confiscation should be given.
7. Prisoners should be given the opportunity to put their personal signatures on the form confirming that they have received letters addressed to them.

8. Postal receipts should be handed out when registered letters are sent off.
9. N. Mityukov, the censor, and Colonel Ugodin, the head of the security section, who are personally responsible for organizing and putting into practice the unlawful infringement of the prisoners' right to correspond, should be removed from their posts.
10. Letters should be delivered to the punishment cells.

All the complaints were sent back to Vladimir Prison. Governor Zavyalikin answered: 'The action taken by the administration is correct.'

From 15 March onwards, a mass confiscation of complaints began, without reasons being given. It is interesting that copies of the same complaint were sometimes sent and sometimes confiscated.

When asked the reasons for confiscating a routine series of complaints, Captain Doinikov replied: 'The authorities know what they're doing.' Doinikov based his remark on the instructions given by Procurator-General Rudenko, who, he said, had recently visited Vladimir Prison.

**Cooler Number 1 — the best punishment cell**

There are about 50 punishment cells in Vladimir Prison. According to the deputy head for regime at the prison, cooler number 1 is the best. It is twice as big as the others (its area is 1.2 metres by 2.2 metres); instead of a latrine-bucket there is a water-closet.

There is no ventilation in the cooler and, as the water-closet has no flushing apparatus, the cooler smells. The window has no small ventilation window set in it, the glass is broken, and prisoners in the cooler have papered it over, one after another, with bits of newspaper. There is a bare cement floor. The seat is a half-cylinder of cement attached to the wall (height 50 centimetres, length along the wall 30 centimetres, depth 22 centimetres). The cylinder has a board on top of it, ringed with iron. It is difficult to sit on this construction: one's legs and back quickly get tired and the sharp protuberances of the cement 'covering' cut into one's back. The cooler is cold.

Anyone put in the cooler is deprived of all his warm clothing; he is dressed in a thin cotton tunic; no jacket and bedding are given out, even at night. For the sleeping period, a heavy wooden trestle-bed, bound with iron, is dragged into the cell.

* * *

On 22 August 1975 Vudka, Rode and Chekalin got 7 days each in the cooler, after they had complained about the inedibility of the fish.

On 12 October 1975 Grodetsky got 10 days in the cooler, for refusing to stand up during a half-hour visit to the cell by procurator Obraztsov.

On 26 September Safronov got 8 days in the cooler, for making a complaint about A. D. Larin, the deputy head supervisor of the Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions. Later this punishment was rescinded. The procurator's reply read: 'It has been established that A. V. Safronov was sub-
Alexei Safronov was on hunger-strike from 26 December 1975 to 15 January 1976, demanding to be transferred from cell 2-36. This cell is next to the section for infectious diseases (patients with tuberculosis, venereal diseases and other illnesses). The sanitary system is a common one for all the prisoners on that floor.

On 15 January Safronov’s request was granted.

On 13 and 16 February 1976 the prison psychiatrist Rogov talked to V. P. Fedorenko. After the talks Fedorenko was given two injections. On 20 February Fedorenko was put in handcuffs and his moustache was shaved off. This action took place under the supervision of Major Kiselev. On the same day Fedorenko was thrown into the cooler for 15 days. He was only given his jacket to wear in the cooler after the other prisoners protested. On 27 February Fedorenko was visited in the cooler by Zavyalkin and Larin. They tried to persuade him to stop his hunger-strike and promised to let him out of the cooler. Fedorenko refused. Nevertheless, he was released from the cooler three days early.

At the end of March Fedorenko was continuing his hunger-strike. His condition is serious — he has abscesses all over his body and one arm and one leg are paralysed.

Ukrainians in Vladimir Prison

The Ukrainians often come into conflict with the administration because of their desire to use their native language. During a visit from his son, Vladimir Moroz was forbidden to speak in Ukrainian. A document was drawn up accusing Moroz of ‘infringing the rules and not obeying orders’.

In spite of the fact that the law stipulates that letters must be checked through within three days, letters written in Ukrainian are often kept back for a month, the reason given being the need to translate them into Russian.

V. F. Zavyalkin said to A. K. Zdorovy in April 1975: If you want it to be quicker, write in Russian, like normal people.’

There have been cases when complaints written in Ukrainian have been returned. One of the replies recommended that ‘If declarations are to be examined in detail, they should be written in Russian.’

Captain Doinikov returned to Zdorovy letters which were addressed to official institutions in Dnepropetrovsk, demanding that the addresses should be rewritten in Russian.

The same Doinikov told Prikhodko: ‘You should be grateful to us for not taking money from you for translating what you write into Russian.’

The prison library refuses to order any periodicals in Ukrainian. Subscriptions to Drug Chizacha [‘The Reader’s Friend’] and Perets [‘Pepper’] are not allowed. Subscribing to other Ukrainian periodicals is also made difficult.

---

Vladimir Bukovsky has been put on strict regime for refusing to work. Since 19 February he has been receiving the lower food norm and is being kept in a solitary cell. Like Lyubarsky and Makarenko, he renounced the right of correspondence because it was constantly interfered with. Nina Ivanovna Bukovskaya, after conversations on 17 May with officials from the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Administrative Department of the CPSU Central Committee, received the impression that her son was on hunger-strike.

From 10 December 1975 to 13 January 1976 Vladimir Ivanovich Konstantinovsky was on hunger-strike. He was alone in his cell.

Konstantinovsky is 34 years old, married, and has two children. Until his arrest he was living in Kaliningrad; he is a military man. He was arrested under article 64 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. The trial was in Moscow. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison, plus 5 years’ exile. He was charged with espionage. Konstantinovsky and his co-defendant V. Lysenko were mentioned in Chronicle 38.

Konstantinovsky’s wife is called Lyudmila Nikolayevna, his sons are Volodya and Ivan. His mother is Antonina Fedoseyevna Konstantinovskaya; she lives in Leningrad, at Prospekt Shaumyana 73, flat 34. Her telephone number is 210-875.

Balakhonov spent 28 October to 19 November (apart from one day) in the cooler.

From 10 to 14 November 1975 a hunger-strike took place in the prison, in protest at the increased number of incarcerations in the cooler (Chronicle 38). Smetansky was in the cooler from 21 January to 2 February and from 17 February to 3 March 1976 — for complaining.

On 6 February Makarenko got 10 days, and on 8 February Lyubarsky got 12 days. They were both punished for knocking on the wall to communicate with Superfin.

On 7 February Pushnin got 10 days in the cooler for making complaints.

In the middle of March Sergienko was put in the cooler.

On 26 March Abankin was put in the cooler for 15 days — ‘for communicating between cells’.

On 10 December 1975 to 13 January 1976 Vladimir Ivanovich Konstantinovsky was on hunger-strike. He was alone in his cell.

Konstantinovsky is 34 years old, married, and has two children. Until his arrest he was living in Kaliningrad; he is a military man. He was arrested under article 64 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. The trial was in Moscow. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison, plus 5 years’ exile. He was charged with espionage. Konstantinovsky and his co-defendant V. Lysenko were mentioned in Chronicle 38.

Konstantinovsky’s wife is called Lyudmila Nikolayevna, his sons are Volodya and Ivan. His mother is Antonina Fedoseyevna Konstantinovskaya; she lives in Leningrad, at Prospekt Shaumyana 73, flat 34. Her telephone number is 210-875.

Alexei Safronov was on hunger-strike from 26 December 1975 to 15 January 1976, demanding to be transferred from cell 2-36. This cell is next to the section for infectious diseases (patients with tuberculosis, venereal diseases and...
Since 1 October 1975 Ukrainians have been having their moustaches forcibly shaved off. The administration bases this practice on a secret Order Number 0125, dated 30 May 1973, of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. From 1 to 20 October Lukyanenko, Sergienko, Zdorovy and Fedorenko were subjected to this procedure.

On 17 January 1976 Zdorovy refused to shave off his moustache, which had grown again. He regarded the order as an insult to his personal and national dignity. Zdorovy did not display active resistance but the warders did not want to use force. Then Major Kiselev, the assistant prison governor on duty, himself twisted Zdorovy's arms behind him, pulled his face back and ordered a prisoner in attendance to start shaving him. After this 'execution' Zdorovy could not move his arms or head for a long time.

Major Kiselev drew up a document complaining that Zdorovy had 'infringed the regime regulations by refusing to obey an order and not carrying out a hygiene regulation'.

[Various Information]

The following were put on strict regime for refusing to work: On 20 December 1975 — A. Zdorovy (for a second term of 6 months); on 6 January 1976 — Yu. Vudka for 24 months, until the end of his prison term; on 20 March I. Vakhman's term of strict regime came to an end (see Chronicle 39).

* * *

On 20 March G. Rode returned from Riga. He had been given the opportunity to visit his father's grave, and was driven round the town. Gunars Rode was offered the chance to appeal for a pardon, but he refused.

* * *

On 15 March, two weeks after being put in the cooler, Yakov Suslensky was taken to the prison hospital in a serious condition. The doctor, Larisa Kuzminichna Sukhacheva, made the following diagnosis: a cerebral-vascular crisis. The prison psychiatrist Rogov took an interest in the illness: he detected 'symptoms of psychiatric illness' and summoned civilian psychiatrists.

After medical treatment Suslensky felt better.

On 16 March there was an examination, and the visiting doctors upheld the diagnosis made by Sukhacheva.

* * *

On 22 February Ma-Khun returned to Vladimir (he is the Yui-Shi-Lin referred to in Chronicle 39). He had been in Moscow for a re-investigation of his case. The Chinese who gave evidence against him now say they did so under pressure from the investigator. There has been no re-trial, but Ma-Khun hopes that his sentence may be reduced.

On 22 February Ma-Khun returned to Vladimir (he is the Yui-Shi-Lin referred to in Chronicle 39). He had been in Moscow for a re-investigation of his case. The Chinese who gave evidence against him now say they did so under pressure from the investigator. There has been no re-trial, but Ma-Khun hopes that his sentence may be reduced.

On 19 March the KGB summoned G. Davydov. Davydov was asked to use his influence with his wife to stop her writing to Ma-Khun. The security man remarked that Davydov's wife could lose her Leningrad residence permit.

* * *

Chronicle 39 has already reported the anti-religious activities of the Vladimir Prison administration. Here are some more examples.

In 1974 L. Lukyanenko had the cross he wore confiscated. Earlier, V. Moroz had his cross taken away and his prayer-texts were confiscated.

On 20 November 1975 Zavyalakin said to Pashnin: 'Chernoglaz threatened to make a great fuss about this matter, but he went elsewhere, and there was no great fuss. That's why we've been confiscating crosses and we'll go on confiscating them.'

On 13 April Pashnin's cross was returned.

On 19 October 1975 a Jewish religious calendar was confiscated from Yu. Vudka. When he complained about this, Kapkanov, head of the A.C.L.I. of the U.V.D. [Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions in the Internal Affairs Administration] of the Vladimir Regional Soviet Executive Committee, replied: 'As synagogues are not state or public publishing houses, the calendar was rightly confiscated.'

* * *

As already reported, on 22 January 1976 G. Superfin declared a hunger-strike, because a Bible, a prayer-book and three issues of the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate had been confiscated from him (Chronicle 39). Because of his refusal to surrender the religious literature voluntarily, Superfin spent the first six days of his hunger-strike in the cooler. Superfin continued his hunger-strike for 35 days — from 22 January to 26 February.

In answer to the numerous complaints made by prisoners, I. F. Sychugov, an Assistant Procurator of Vladimir Region, and N. P. Kapkanov, head of the Vladimir Regional Soviet Executive Committee's A.C.L.I. U.V.D., made the same reply: 'The actions taken by the administration are lawful.'

After ending his hunger-strike Superfin was put on a special diet.

* * *

Chronicle 38 included a report on Airapetov. More details are now known about his case. Airapetov is a doctor, an oral surgeon; he is 47 years old and comes from Baku. After his arrest he was subjected to a psychiatric diagnosis. He was declared responsible, although the diagnosis spoke of his paranoid personality development. Airapetov was charged with writing insulting letters.
to L. I. Brezhnev and sending them through the post. The letters concerned personal and social matters. The Supreme Court on the Azerbaidzhan S S R sentenced Airapetiv to 7 years' imprisonment under article 63 of the Azerbaidzhan S S R Criminal Code (corresponding to article 70 of the R S F S R Code); of these, three years were to be spent in prison.

* * *

On 20 October 1975 Davydov made an appeal to K. T. Mazurov, Chairman of the Committee for the Organization of International Women's Year in the U S S R. G. Davydov referred to the existence of women's political labour camps in the U S S R. A country which has political labour camps is in a state of civil war, he wrote. The clearest evidence that an undying civil war is going on is the existence of women political prisoners in this country. Davydov demanded that political camps for women should be liquidated.

At the same time as he made this appeal G. Davydov declared a hunger-strike.

* * *

Letter by K. Lyubarsky of 1 June 1975. The subject of the letter is the decision of the Higher Academic Degrees Board to deprive Lyubarsky of his degree of Candidate of Physics and Mathematics, because of his anti-patriotic activities. Recently the same thing happened to A. Bolonkin (Candidate of Chemical Sciences), V. Lisovoi (Candidate of Physics) and G. Dubovov (Candidate of Physics and Mathematics). The most shameful effect of this, in the opinion of Lyubarsky, is the spiritual corruption that takes place in those who voted for this Higher Academic Degrees Board decision.

The declaration ends with these words: '...A man can be "dismissed" from the Candidates of Science, but not from the ranks of the learned.'

* * *

Georgy Davydov has been punished for trying to send information out of the prison.

In the Mordovian Camps

Camp 17

The regime has become more severe during the last few months. This was especially so during the Party Congress. During searches people were stripped naked. Punishments were increased. One-day hunger-strikes have begun to be punished by terms in the camp prison. People have begun to be punished for supporting hunger-strikes. Postcards with dedications on them have begun to be confiscated. It is a custom among the prisoners to give each other such postcards on their birthdays or on other festivals. Since the new year it has been forbidden for people outside the camp to take out subscriptions to newspapers and journals for prisoners. Prisoners cannot subscribe to periodicals published in other Soviet republics. Recently, it has been forbidden to put cocoa in parcels.

* * *

In July 1975 representatives of the administration at Institution ZhKh 385 assured Purur Airikyan's parents that their son would soon be coming home. In the same month Airikyan received an official reprimand. He sent a complaint to the procurator and was immediately deprived of facilities at the camp shop for the rest of August. On 11 August Airikyan took part in a hunger-strike (Chronicle 37). He demanded that his case should be reviewed, that the National United Party of Armenia should be legalized and that a referendum should be held in the Armenian S S R on the question of independence for Armenia.

Airikyan's demands were supported by Graur, Popadyuk and Kheifets. In addition, Kheifets declared that he was protesting against the infringement of the Helsinki agreements. After this, Kheifets was deprived of access to the camp shop for a month and Popadyuk was transferred to Vladimir Prison.

On the fourth day of his hunger-strike Airikyan did not go out for roll-call (hunger-strikers should be isolated on the third day of their strike), and he was then deprived of his next visit; before that, he had been deprived of access to the camp food shop until the end of September. On 27 August Airikyan was transferred to the punishment cells for 5 months, 'for systematic infringement of the regime regulations'.

While he was in the cells, he was twice deprived of facilities at the camp shop, in October and in November. The authorities wanted to continue this into December, but thanks to the interference of the procurator, his access to the camp shop was restored in December. The sanitary conditions in his cell were unbearable. In the 5 months he was in the cells Airikyan had the right to send three letters. The first disappeared without reaching the person it was addressed to; the second was confiscated twice; while the third version of this letter was examined for about a month and its fate is still unknown; the next letter, in January, was sent only in February, after being rewritten three times.

E. Sirotenko, an acquaintance of Airikyan's, made enquiries addressed to Krivov, the head of regime in ZhKh 385. She received an explanation stating that Krivov and his staff act on the basis of 'a general directive about all the methods of punishment at his disposal'. Krivov explained that he could not give a formal reference to this directive.

In February, after he had already been released from the cells, Airikyan received two official reprimands 'for infringing the regulations on dress'.

After Airikyan's return to the camp zone, he was not given letters in the Armenian language, the lack of a translator being given as a reason. (In the neighbouring camp 19, Airikyan had been given his letters at once.) On 19 February 1976 P. Airikyan went on hunger-strike because of the way his letters
In the Prisons and Camps

Camp 19
In February 1976 R. Markosyan refused to work, demanding that he be given the medical treatment he needed (he has a stomach ulcer), and that he be held together with other Armenian political prisoners.

Vladimir Osipov is being subjected to constant baiting by the administration. In particular he is not allowed to spend his extra two roubles in the camp shop, although he has not infringed the regulations at his work and has fulfilled his norm.

In February-March Yu. Khramtsov had the cross he wore torn off while he was in the baths. He had been taken into the baths in handcuffs.

Camp 3
On 7 February S. Shabatura declared a hunger-strike. She began the hunger-strike because drawings she had made were taken away from her (Chronicle 39). It is known that she maintained the hunger-strike for at least ten days.

In the Penn Camps

VS 389/35 (during the Congress)
On 20 February Lieutenant Rogozov rendered the camp zone 'harmless'. In the morning, a detachment of four ensigns arrived at the factory to take away Gluzman and Kalynets. They were immediately taken to Perm for prophylactic talks. After dinner Zakharchenko, Svetlichny and Pronyuk were taken away. They were taken to camp 37 and put in the cooler (soon after the transfer Pronyuk was taken to the medical section in camp zone 37). Marchenko and Demidov, despite their protests were taken to the cooler in camp 36. On the way, Marchenko began to have an attack of renal colic, which made his chronic nephritis worse.

On 24 February declarations addressed to the presidium of the 25th Congress were sent by Altman, Asselbaums, Basarab, Butman, Verkholyak, Zagrobyan, Kivilo, Kirend, Kryuchkov, Mamchur, Matkov, Motryuk, Ogurtsov, Pidgorodetsky, Pridylsyk, Soroks, Shakhverdyan and Shovkovy. Those deported from the camp — Gluzman, Demidov, Zakharchenko, Kalynets, Marchenko, Svetlichny and Pronyuk — also sent declarations to the Congress. All 25 prisoners observed a one-day hunger-strike.

Soon afterwards, Major Pimenov summoned D. Basarab and told him that he was punishing him by putting him in the cooler for nine days, for insulting the Congress. During the conversation D. Basarab had a heart attack and was
carried out of the camp commandant's office to the medical section. (Dmitry Pavlovich Basarab was arrested on 5 September 1953 and sentenced on 12 November 1954 to 25 years' imprisonment in corrective labour camps under article 54-1a of the [old] Ukrainian S S R Criminal Code, by a Military Tribunal of the Transcarpathian military region in the town of Stanislav).

Soroka and Verkholyak received answers from the Perm regional party committee. Their complaints about the prison administration had been sent to the prison administration. 'After investigation, the allegations were not substantiated.'

On 2 March Svetlichny and Zakharchenko returned to the camp; on 4 March Marchenko was brought back; Demidov was left in camp 36.

* * *

Shakhverdyan was deprived of access to the camp shop in March. On 21 February Zhilin, the engineer in charge of technical safety, told the camp commandant that Shakhverdyan had not been at his work-place from 17.00 to 21.00 hours; ensign Barkovsky reported that, on that day, Shakhverdyan had refused to work at all. On that day, Shakhverdyan had been working.

Camp 36

Sergei Kovalyov was deprived of the right to a visit in February. Later, he was put in the cooler (the term and the reason for it are unknown to the Chronicle).

Since the end of February, no letters have been received from him. In answer to inquiries from his wife, the camp commandant informed her, at the end of April, that Kovalyov was alive.

* * *

Yury Vudka arrived in the camp from Vladimir on 3 April.

Before he was transferred, the following objects were confiscated from Vudka: clean paper, stamps, family photographs, letters from his family and friends (which had been passed earlier by the prison censor), and a volume of Pasternak's poems.

* * *

The following text has been received from camp 36: 'Telegram. To Simas Kudirka [Chronicle 33]. We remember and love you and all people of heart and conscience. We are with you on the freedom march. Political prisoners of Kuchino.'

(There was a 'march of freedom' in the USA — a demonstration in support of Soviet political prisoners.)

In Camps for Common Criminals in the Ukraine

Alexander Feldman (the case of the cake — Chronicle 30) is serving his term in an intensified regime camp near Kherson (institution YuZ 17/10).

Onischenko, the deputy head of the camp for regime, and M. M. Kondratove, his section head, continually proclaim that a 'special watch' is being kept on Feldman. Kondratov has forbidden him to go to the library or the reading room. He is not allowed to receive books through 'Books by Post'. Kondratov does not hide his anti-Semitic views in any way.

Letters addressed to Feldman are mostly kept from him. No letters have been received from him since the end of February. His father was not allowed to visit him in January ('We have no building for visitors') or in April ('He only left the medical section yesterday'). According to information as of 12 April, Feldman was not given his regulation parcel and package ('not allowed'). Feldman wrote complaints.

On 25 March a common criminal unknown to Feldman came into the boiler-house where he was working, and, in the presence of other prisoners, hit him over the head with a shovel. Feldman was in the medical section until 10 April. He is tormented by headaches.

On 13 April I. Ya. Nudel wrote a declaration to the head of the USSR Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions, demanding the trial of the criminal for attempted murder, and that of the administrative authorities for permitting the attack.

A. Feldman still has about a year to serve.

* * *

In January 1976 Mikhail Shtern (Chronicle 34) was invited to write a plea for a pardon. Shtern (who is in an ordinary-regime camp near Kharkov) wrote a declaration asking to be pardoned because of his state of health, but did not express any repentance. His wife wrote a similar declaration.

At the end of March or the beginning of April Shtern was refused a pardon.

Releases

On 10 March Valery Graur was released. Graur is about 35; his whole family was released from special settlement regime in 1956-7 and emigrated from the USSR to Rumania. But Graur decided to remain.

Graur was arrested in 1972 for discussing the possibility of the Moldavian S S R joining Rumania. Graur and his co-defendants, Gimpsu, Usatyuk and Shaltoyan, were charged with 'anti-Soviet agitation' and sentenced, respectively, to 4, 6, 7 plus 5 and 6 plus 5 years of camps and exile.

Graur served his term in Camp 17 (Mordovia), but was taken to Kishinyov for visits from his parents, who travelled there from Rumania. It was in Kishinyov that he was released.
Events in Lithuania

Issue 2 (42) of the journal *AuSra (Dawn)*, dated 16 February 1976, has come out. Its table of contents includes the following: — Declaration of Lithuanian independence — New doses of russification at school — Mindaugas Tamonis — The spirit of Muravyov’s epoch — When was Lithuania a sovereign state? — To whom is silence useful? — We express our solidarity with Russian dissidents — News.

A report on issue 1 (41) was given in *Chronicle of Current Events* No. 39.

Another samizdat journal, *God and Motherland* (translated title), has appeared. The contents of the first issue include: a polemic against the article 'The Subterfuges of Modern Theologians', published in the republic’s journal *Science and Life* (number 1, 1976); and — for the first time in Lithuanian — the 'Universal Declaration of Human Rights'.

Between 19 March and 7 April, 15 Vilnius school-leavers were summoned by the police and the KGB. They were interrogated about the former political prisoner Viktor Petkus, particularly about the lessons he had been giving them on Lithuanian history.

The journal *Komunist* (organ of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, published in Lithuanian and Russian) has printed an interview with M. Ignotas, a member of the Supreme Court, who presided at the trial of S. Kovalyov, under the headline ‘A Slanderer Punished’. The content is similar to that of the Sukharev interview in the journal *Novoe Vremya* number 1 (Chronicle 39). Even here, the Chronicle, the main butt of the accusations made in the article, is not named, but, unlike in the Sukharev interview, it is mentioned — under the pseudonym of ‘an anti-Soviet publication’. Its local associations are also noted. Ignotas, in ‘answering a question’ — ‘Kovalyov’s trial was held in Vilnius. What is his connection with Lithuania?’ — states: ‘S. Kovalyov and his associates working on an anti-Soviet publication also printed libels about Lithuania. They sought out the facts they wanted from the activities of nationalist elements and from the collaboration of the Lithuanian nationalists with the Hitlerite occupation forces’.

And once again Dudenas appears (see Chronicle 39, ‘Polemics with Sukharev’, and ‘The Trial of Tverdokhlebov’ in this issue).

From the ‘Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church’ (number 21, 25 January 1976)

The *Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church* [C.L.C.C] reprints the section on ‘The Trial of Sergei Kovalyov’ from *Chronicle of Current Events* No. 38, and adds to it an article on ‘The Days of the Kovalyov Trial in Vilnius’.

Two or three weeks before the trial, people were already being summoned (sometimes through the military enlistment office or the police) and questioned by KGB officials, if they were suspected of intending to go to the trial. Among these people was the scientist Juozas Prapienstis.

On 9 December A. Terleckas, V. Petkus and V. Smolkin (Chronicle 38) were detained at the station and told at KGB headquarters that A. Sakharov was mentally abnormal and that many Moscow dissidents were immoral people. Colonel Baltinas threatened to put Terleckas and Petkus in a psychiatric hospital.

It has already been reported, in Chronicle 38, that the Lithuanians were barred from entering even the courthouse building. The C.L.C.C 31 writes that Mielislav Jurevièius from the town of Šiauliai was taken out of the courthouse by force and driven to KGB headquarters. He was threatened with criminal proceedings because, according to the KGB men, he wrote for the C.L.C.C. At the same time they promised that they could get him a good job, with even the right to have a Christmas holiday (see below on his lawsuit concerning this).

Then Jurevièius was taken back to Šiauliai with an escort.

The trial and these persecutions have shown that Lithuanians and Russians can be brought closer together by the activities of the state security forces.

Lithuanians and Catholics are grateful to S. Kovalyov for his generous, manly spirit and they pray the Almighty to support and bless him and keep him in good health. The sacrifices made by Russian dissidents have helped Lithuanians to see Russian people in a different light.

When the Russian scientist S. Kovalyov comes out of prison, we shall greet him as our brother and best friend.

In a long letter to Yu. A. Andropov, Antanas Terleckas has described the series of persecutions to which the KGB has been subjecting him for 30 years.
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Events in Lithuania

Bishop Steponavičius should be allowed to return to his duties, which he was forced to leave in 1961, when he was exiled. Since then the archdiocese has been without a Bishop. The declaration states that the Bishop has never been involved in political activity, and that his conflict with the Commissioner for Religious Affairs was caused by the wrong behaviour of the latter — his interference in the internal affairs of the church and his attempts to make Stepanavičius act in a way contrary to his duty as a pastor.

In a declaration addressed to Brezhnev, dated 23 June 1975, Father Cerniauskas made a complaint about the refusal of the authorities to allow repairs to his church and other such instances of persecution. He reports that, when he asked for a written reply to one of his previous complaints, Commissioner Tunberis told him: ‘If we give you a written reply, it will immediately be broadcast by foreign radio stations.’

In the Vilnius Museum of Atheism the book of visitors’ comments has been hidden away. Visitors who ask for the book are questioned by the museum attendant as to who they are and where they come from.

In June 1975 Bronė Kiblickaitė (a close friend of N. Sadunaite’s who ‘appeared as a witness’ at her trial — Chronicle 37), an engineer at the Computer Centre in the faculty of mechanics and mathematics of Vilnius University, was dismissed ‘at her own request’ from her job. The dean, the party organizer and the head of the Computer Centre had been trying to obtain a written statement of resignation from her for almost a year, without giving her any reasons, but justifying themselves by saying pressure was being put on them from above: ‘If you refuse, we’ll be dismissed ourselves.’ At their parting, the head of the Computer Centre found the nerve to tell her the reason for her dismissal — ‘religion’.

M. Jurevičius took legal proceedings against those who dismissed him in January 1975 for ‘absenteeism’ — he did not go to work on four days which were religious feast-days, notifying the administration each time and offering to make the time up (Chronicle 36). In his statement of claim and his appeals, Jurevičius pointed out that in the nine years he had worked there, he had been given many special awards and had never been penalized. He demanded recogni-
tion of the fact that his absence from work had been for good reason, as article 124 of the U S S R Constitution and articles 143 and 145 of the Criminal Code of the Lithuanian S S R guaranteed him the freedom to perform his religious duties. Jurvetièius took his case as far as the Supreme Court of the republic, but lost it. The C L C C publishes the full texts of his statements and the court decision.

It is reported in the section 'News from the Dioceses' that:

In Karkaliskis the believers cannot obtain the return of their church, which was closed in 1961 and has been standing empty ever since.

In Autumn 1975 believers placed crosses, as is the custom, on the Hill of Crosses at Matkuciai. A group of young people brought a large cross in a coach. In November, also by tradition, a special brigade destroyed and carted away the crosses (over 400 of them). The brigade chopped down an ancient maple tree, which was hung with crosses and holy pictures.

Emilija Gelambauskiene, a resident of the town of Matkuciai, for a long time did not allow a cross she had put up by her house to be destroyed. Her complaint to KGB about this was intercepted at the local post office. On 3 December, when Gelambauskiene had been enticed out of the house, the cross was sawn down and taken away. She was later sent a bill for 50 rubles for this work.

In Kaunas, in the funeral parlour there, a set of rules passed by the City Soviet Executive Committee on 31 February 1975 has been put up:

'In this building it is forbidden to:
—alter the decoration in the rooms;
—make use of religious images;
—sing religious songs;
—utilize the services of cult servants [i.e. priests];
—organize funeral processions with religious rites on the premises.'

The Kaunas City Executive Committee has forbidden the workshop which makes tombstones to portray the cross on them.

It is reported that the performance of certain religious ceremonies has been hindered. In a number of cases the ban has had no effect.

In an article entitled 'The persecution of youth continues', the C L C C writes about the amateur film studio 'KP I-Film' at Kaunas Polytechnic Institute. Since 1971 certain studio members have been summoned by the KGB, and questioned about the atmosphere at the studio; sometimes the KGB has tried to recruit them as informers. In 1972 R. Kausa, the head of the studio (and a former prisoner), was suddenly dismissed, and since then the studio has been without a paid manager. Recently the KGB official Rusteika has been taking an interest in the studio. In June 1975 he interrogated the KPI lecturer R. Pata€ius for four hours (unofficially). To begin with, he called him maliciously anti-Soviet and threatened to have him dismissed; later he tried to find out from him who had said what at the studio, and finally he asked him to keep the conversation secret. Pata€ius did not promise to do so. In September 1975 Rusteika summoned to KGB headquarters P. Kimbrys, a former member of the KPI film laboratory, and told him that sufficient material had been gathered on him to bring him to trial. He told him what some of the charges would be: he had hung a map of the 16th century Grand Duchy of Lithuania on his wall at home, he had kept a copy of the book Archive of Lithuania, he had helped to found the C L C C, and so on. As a result of a four-hour 'conversation', Kimbrys answered certain questions and promised to 'draw his own conclusions'.

The film studio is well known for producing many good films; its film The Face, about the ethnographer V. Buraas, took the first prize at the republic's film competition, but was not allowed to compete in the Baltic amateur showings. The enthusiasm of the studio members is fading under the pressure of the KGB, and recently the collective has begun to disintegrate.

The C L C C also mentions other cases of the suppression of various initiatives and amateur activities among Lithuanian young people in recent years — ethnographers' clubs, art clubs, discussion groups, and so on.

There is a permanent section 'In Soviet Schools' in the C L C C.

On 16 September 1975, at the Technical Training College in the town of Statuliai, during a meeting of a group of grinders, the pupils were told to fill in application forms to join the Komsomol. Those who refused were made to fetch their parents, and some pupils were made to stand for half an hour, with their hands held above their heads, by instructors Gilys and Milius. Nevertheless, half the group still refused to join the Komsomol.

At the school in Gargzdai, all 32 pupils in class 7 informed their teacher that they were church-goers and would not enrol in the atheists' club. The teacher enrolled four persons against their will.

In Rudli€ke the headmaster of the secondary school summoned Petras Stalys, a pupil in class 9, and told him to sign a statement saying that he served as an altar-boy because the priest had asked him to. Petras refused, saying that he did it because he himself wanted to. After a few more talks, he received a low mark for behaviour. Jadviga Poplavskaya, a pupil in class 11 at the same school, received a low mark for behaviour because she went to church and was told that she would be given such a bad character report that she would not be accepted by any higher education institute.

Other instances of religious pupils and their parents being persecuted by teachers are also reported.
Persecution in the Crimea

The Crimean Regional Party Committee submitted the following document to the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party:

To Vladimir Vasilevich Shcherbitsky, Central Committee, Communist Party of Ukraine.

6 Ya/24/3

In answer to your communication number 3051/012 of 29.XII.75 concerning the telegram from citizen Kh. K. Cholbash.

The question of residence permits in the Crimea for citizens of Tatar nationality has been considered by us. It has been established that, after the passing of the Decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 5.9.67, over 4,500 persons of Tatar nationality travelled to this region and obtained residence permits here.

At the same time, many citizens of Tatar nationality are evading existing laws by acquiring houses at speculative prices in various towns and districts of the Crimea, and are deliberately breaking the residence regulations.

The administrative authorities and those of the party and local soviets are making it clear that there must be strict enforcement of the residence regulations on the territory of the Crimean Region.

Attached: The telegram from citizen Cholbash, 1 page.

(signed) N. Kirichenko, Secretary of the Crimean Regional Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party.

Telegram 3. Clarified. Declassified. Sent to the archives, 30/1/76. Registration number 3051/012 C C of the Ukranian C P.

31-XII-75: personally handed by I. Lutak to Kirichenko.

(Cholbash is a tank officer, a retired lieutenant-colonel, living in Tashkent. The exact text of his telegram to Shcherbitsky is not known to the Chronicle).

* * *

Enver Ametov (Chronicle 34), living in the settlement of Novo-Alekseyevka, was taken to KGB headquarters in the town of Genichesk on 15 April 1976 (he had not obeyed a summons to go there). Here he had a conversation with his old acquaintances P. P. Popov, an official of the Kherson regional KGB, and Major Demidov, head of the Genichesk district KGB, and also with a certain lieutenant-colonel, the main speaker, who did not give his name.

They accused Ametov of subversive activity and treason, because he had given an interview about the position of Crimean Tatars to a foreign journalist: 'Your name is being used by imperialist propaganda.'

Then an 'official warning' was read out, which Ametov refused to sign. The lieutenant-colonel warned Ametov that he already had 'one leg in the forest, felling timber'.

Ametov had bought a house in the Crimea, in the village of Melekhovo, and had been preparing to settle there. On 10 May the former owner of the house was summoned to the village soviet and asked to sign an order requiring that the house be pulled down. The owner said that she would not sign the document, as she had already sold the house. On 11 May the house was demolished (see below: 'Emergency Report').

* * *

To Comrade A. D. Sakharov, Chairman of the Human Rights Committee in the USSR:

A Declaration

I., R. Yunusova, live in the village of Gorlinka, Belgorod district. On 13 May 1976 a gang broke into my house, under the leadership of Sidorov, party secretary of the Gorny collective farm. Without showing any authorization, they pushed me aside and began to throw my belongings into the street. The time was 9.30 in the morning. My daughter was lying in bed, and when she saw what was going on, she began to scream in a strange voice; the child was so frightened that her nose began to bleed. I left everything and, taking my child with me, ran for help. Making use of the opportunity, the party secretary then brought up a bulldozer and they demolished the house, throwing our things on to the street, where by now our family was standing with a sick, paralysed child.

All four of my husband's brothers died heroes' deaths in the war, defending their great homeland, and in the first instance their small home country, their houses, those near and dear to them. There is a monument in Gelendzhik to one of them — Asan Berber, a squadron commander. Enver Berber was a company commander and died outside Bryansk. Edem Berber took part in the defence of Sevastopol. Reading their letters, they never saw or heard of the kind of horrors that we have experienced in our own native land, the Crimea.

I ask you once more, publicize my letter and help us in whatever way you can.

With respect, R. Yunusova. 18.5.76.

* * *

An 'Emergency information report from Crimean Tatars to the foreign press, radio and television, April-May 1976' has been sent from the Crimea.

... In the Sovetsky district immigrants are being obstructed and insulted in all sorts of ways at the behest of Pasyuta, chairman of the District Soviet Execu-
Persecution in the Crimea

Plekhanov, chairman of the collective farm, and party organizer Sidorov, attempted to expel from their home the family of a 72-year-old man, but were forced to retreat by the pressure of fellow-villagers.

On the same day, in the village of Gorlanka, which is subordinate to the Bogatoye village soviet, the same people succeeded in expelling the family of Memet Seitveli. They threw their belongings out on the street and boarded up the house, leaving the family outside under the open sky (a family of five); during the night, the small daughter began to freeze; thanks to neighbours, she was saved, but in the morning the child had to be taken to hospital.

Then the same people tried to destroy the house of Usein Umash (a family of nine) in the village of Krasnaya Sloboada, but, thanks to the multi-national Russian and Ukrainian population, this crime was averted; many of the people concerned were not accepted at their places of work on the following day.

Crimean Tatars registered as residents, who were present at these events, also lost their jobs.

All this is in accordance with the words of Krutova, chairman of the Town Soviet Executive Committee; we quote her expressions: ‘The authorities of the party, police and KGB are considering the question of a new deportation of the Crimean Tatars who have returned to the Crimea;’ ‘Do not forget 1944.’ All these activities were organized by the zealot chauvinist N. L. Kravets, chairman of the District Soviet Executive Committee.

He thinks that he himself is both law and justice!

The Soviet government does not want to allow discussion of our case; obviously the UN is unable to help our people, as numerous appeals have remained unanswered. So we are appealing to people of good will to raise their voices in defence of the just demands of our nation. Let all the nations of the world know of the conditions in which the native population of the Crimea — the Crimean Tatars — are living.

This is a matter of saving a nation, of defending the principles of national self-determination and equality proclaimed in the United Nations Charter.

Copies of this document, with 295 signatures, have been sent to: The Prosecutor for supervision of the Committee of State Security; The Executive Committee of the Crimean Regional Soviet and the Executive Committee of the Belogorsk District Soviet.

Photocopies of this document have been sent to many departments.

Simferopol — Belogorsk. 16 May 1976.
Negotiations in the Central Committee of the CPSU

A shortened transcript of the conversation which took place on 16 February 1976 in the reception rooms of the Central Committee of the CPSU, between six representatives of the Jews trying to obtain the right to emigrate to Israel (Mark Azbel, Vladimir Lazaris, Yuly Kosharovsky, Vitaly Rubin, Vladimir Slepak and Anatoly Shcharansky) and Albert Ivanov, head of the Administrative Department of the Central Committee, together with Vladimir Obidin, head of the All-Union Visa Department [OVIR].

Ivanov: The Central Committee has received your letter, in which you express the wish to discuss the question of emigration with competent representatives of the Central Committee. Vladimir Sergeyevich and I are such representatives and we are ready to answer questions that are of interest to you.

Kosharovsky: What are the general grounds on which emigration visas to Israel from the USSR are refused?

Ivanov: First of all, I want to say that the great majority of people who have wanted to emigrate (98.4 per cent) have gone. In deciding this question we are guided by Soviet laws, by the humane principles laid out in international documents signed by the Soviet Union and by the interests of the state. So emigration visas from the USSR are refused mostly for the following reasons: (1) Considerations of security. But that's not for ever. Security terms end, information becomes obsolete and people emigrate. (2) The material claims of parents, and also those of former wives, demanding the payment of alimony. In addition, we must know the attitude of parents to the emigration of their children, as we don't want to be guided by purely financial considerations. Often parents are morally against the emigration of their children.

Obidin: The length of security clearance periods will not be announced in advance. Matters which were not secret yesterday could become secret tomorrow, and vice versa. So it is quite possible that a man who had a high security rating may emigrate at once, while someone who has a third-grade security rating will be refused a visa, because his particular field has begun to develop in a profoundly secret way.

Shcharansky: In many cases, no reasons whatever have been given. If we assume that all these strange refusals can be attributed solely to the unfairness or arbitrary decisions of the local authorities, it still compromises the policy of emigration, and its relation to those humane principles and international norms of which you spoke at the start. All this shows the necessity for a law on emigration, which would regulate practice in such a way that arbitrary refusals would become impossible.
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Slepakov: ... That has turned out to be more difficult to obtain, sometimes, than a character reference. Firstly, a certificate must also be signed by the 'triumvirate' [three key work-place officials]; secondly, it must show that you owe nothing materially to your place of work. This means that you must hand in all material goods belonging to it — books, tools, working clothes, and so on. In practice, it often means that you have to leave your place of work before applying to emigrate.

Obidin: In such cases people can obtain a certificate from their place of work after their application to emigrate has been considered.

Shcharansky: Until now that has been impossible. Can Jews now apply to you if O V I R refuses to accept their applications without such a certificate?

Obidin: Yes, you can.

Lazaris: There is now a widespread practice of calling up young people for army service after they apply for emigration to Israel. What, in your opinion, is the point of such call-ups and of military training for people whose aim is to live in Israel?

Ivanov: Until a former citizen of the U S S R has crossed the border, he is still a citizen of the U S S R and, as a result, he has to continue fulfilling his duties as a citizen, above all that of army service.

Shcharansky: In 1975 three young Jews — Anatoly Malkin (from Moscow), Alexander Sakhovskiy (from Krasnodar) and Yakov Vinarov (from Kiev) — were sentenced to terms in prison for refusing to serve in the army. All these young men were expelled from colleges because of their desire to emigrate to Israel, and this made it possible for them to be called up into the army.

Ivanov: We shall not give a higher education to someone who wants to emigrate to Israel.

Shcharansky: Do you regard it a natural situation, when a young man is thus deprived of the possibility of emigrating by immediately being called up into the army?

Ivanov: They must do their army service and then they can emigrate.

Lazaris: Is army service in itself not used as an excuse for refusing a visa? For example, G leb Kuperman (from Chernovtsy), before his call-up into the army, specially warned the army authorities of his desire to emigrate to Israel, and this was noted down in his military documents. However, now, two years after being demobilized, he has been refused a visa because of his army service.

Ivanov: Service in the army cannot be a reason for refusal, in itself. Many people have emigrated immediately after their army service. The Kuperman incident shows that O V I R should phrase its replies more accurately.

Shcharansky: We should also like to bring up the question of the fate of those who were sentenced in Leningrad in 1970 for planning to hijack an aeroplane to Israel. The law punishing hijacking was passed only in 1973, and the maximum penalty under this law is 10 years — less than the sentences passed on three of the defendants in the Leningrad trial. Can we hope for a review of their case and a shortening of their prison terms?

Ivanov: I am not the procurator and I am not prepared to answer this question now. However, we shall bear in mind your interest in this matter.

Astel: Unfortunately, I must point out that we have not received specific answers to all our questions. When you justify existing practice by saying that Soviet citizens will start emigrating to Israel to avoid army service, or that 70 per cent of the doctors in a polyclinic could try to emigrate all together, then we, although we are greater optimists than you about emigration, find it difficult to take you seriously. However, we understand that such busy people as you would not waste two hours of your time in talking to us without telling us something new. Would you like us to pass on any message to the 70 Jews who are waiting for us downstairs at the reception rooms of the Central Committee?

Ivanov: Of course, we cannot answer all your questions at once. However, we will take note of your concerns. As you see, we have written down your questions; now we have to think all this over and let it ferment, as the saying goes...

Shcharansky: It's important not just to let all this go unacted on...

Ivanov: However, I must say again that the truth is a concrete matter. So let everyone apply directly to Obidin and his case will be reviewed, with guidance from the Central Committee.

Lazaris: And will this review take place within a fixed period?

Ivanov: Well, yes, we'll try to keep it within a month.

Lazaris: And after that, can we come to you again and discuss the results of this re-examination?
Problems in the Field of Linguistics

At the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Linguistics

On 25 January 1976 the New York Times published an article by I. A. Melchuk, in which he defended S. A. Kovalyov and A. D. Sakharov from the attacks they had been subjected to.

Igor Alexandrovich Melchuk, Candidate of Philology, an outstanding Soviet linguist and one of the founders of research into machine translation, was working at the time in the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Linguistics as a senior research officer.

On 26 March a meeting of the Learned Council of the institute took place, at which the question of I. A. Melchuk's re-confirmation in his post for a new period was to be discussed. The meeting took place under the chairmanship of Prof. V. N. Yartseva, director of the institute and a corresponding-member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and of Yu. S. Eliseyev, academic secretary of the institute and deputy director.

Before the re-confirmation procedure began, V. N. Yartseva ordered that all 'outsiders' (those who did not work at the institute) should leave the room; these included all I. A. Melchuk's friends, both linguists and mathematicians. When Melchuk requested that his friends be allowed into the room, Yartseva replied: 'Only staff members of the institute are invited to everyday, normal working sessions ... No, this is not a closed session. At a closed session, only members of the council are present. This is, really, a question of discipline within the institute ... we must, obviously, decide our internal work problems without outsiders being present ...'

In accordance with procedure, at the beginning of the meeting of the Learned Council, I. A. Melchuk gave a report on his scholarly and academic-organizational activity over the last five years.

From 1971 to 1973 Melchuk published over 40 scholarly works, in all more than 65 author's sheets. In addition, Melchuk has completed other works, which were handed over to the publishers long ago but have still not been published; among these is the second part of his basic monograph The Problems of Thought-texts. I. A. Melchuk has given academic lectures at conferences on linguistics in his own country and has lectured at various departments of the USSR Academy of Sciences and institutes of higher education. He has given a number of lecture courses at various institutes of higher education in different cities; he has often been consulted (on the problems of automatic text translation) by representatives of different departments and organizations; he was the academic secretary of the department of structural and applied linguistics. In 1971-5 I. A. Melchuk was invited more than once to participate in international conferences and symposia and prepared lectures for them, but he did not receive the necessary permission to take part in even one of them, and a number of invitations did not reach him at all. Not long ago the institute authorities refused to allow him to read lectures even at the universities of Kiev and Lvov. The authorities did not let him give a copy of Thought-texts to 'Fink-Verlag' Publishers (Munich), which had offered to publish it.

While I. A. Melchuk's report was being considered, Eliseyev pointed out that many scholarly works from the institute were experiencing delays in publication, not only I. A. Melchuk's monograph. Some manuscripts had been at the publisher's since 1960. As to the publication of I. A. Melchuk's monograph in West Germany, this had been forbidden on the grounds of priority: 'First it should be published in our country; then let anyone who likes translate it.' (In the USSR, the book was refused publication as a whole, the reason given being that the number of sheets was too high for someone who only had a Candidate's degree.) Later, Eliseyev remarked: 'The academic side of Melchuk's work is sufficiently clear from his report, but how does it compare with his socially-oriented work — his participation in methodological seminars, his attendance at political lectures?'

Melchuk reminded the members of the Learned Council that he had never refused 'any assignment whatever'; he had indeed 'often failed to attend' methodological seminars, as their subject-matter was of little interest to him and he considered that 'participation in methodological seminars was a voluntary matter'. The director of the institute said: 'No, the methodological seminars are most important for the ideological and political instruction of the staff.' M. M. Gukhman, Doctor of Science, asked Melchuk if he knew that he was 'the only person in the institute who did not attend these seminars'. Melchuk replied: 'No, I didn't know that, and I think it odd that I'm the only one who finds them uninteresting.'

In their speeches about Melchuk's academic activity, the members of the

[An author's sheet is roughly 8,000 words; it is the standard unit of measure for calculating royalties in the USSR.]
Learned Council referred mostly to 'I. A. Melchuk's lack of participation in the socially-oriented work of the institute' and reminded him that his letters 'had been used abroad to the detriment of our country'. The director of the institute, V. N. Yartseva, 'about this action, which is impermissible not only for our institute's academic collective, but also for the collective of the Soviet people as a whole.' Dr. M. M. Gukhman said: 'Igor Alexandrovich's report to us was very academic in content. However, recently he issued a letter which is a libel on our country, our way of life, our ideology and politics ... Igor Alexandrovich is a grown man, and he must understand that his opposition to Soviet ideology is harmful, not only to our country, but to the whole of progressive mankind ... it is the fuel of imperialist propaganda. This action of his is not merely a mistake; it is a hostile act, which makes it impossible for Igor Alexandrovich to remain in our collective.'

From the floor someone asked: 'Can't we hear the contents of the letter?' Melchuk replied that he was prepared to read out the text of the letter, but suggested that he should do so after the vote had been taken, as he did not feel that the question of his re-appointment to his post should be mixed up with the article in the New York Times. He rose and quoted an extract from the 'International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights', ratified by the Soviet Union. Eliseyev said: 'By way of explanation I wish to say that, in accordance with instructions ... a Soviet academic must be irreproachable with regard to morals and politics ... Therefore, quoting some sort of agreement cannot artificially prevent criticism of an academic for limiting himself to a narrow academic field of activity.'

In addition, I. A. Melchuk has spoken before against Soviet ideology, but admitted then that he was mistaken in his actions.' (Eliseyev was referring to letters in defence of Sinyavsky and Daniel, of Ginsburg and Galanskov, and in protest against the invasion of Czechoslovakia.)

Melchuk emphasized the fact that he had expressed repentance for these actions. 'However,' he said, 'I must be honest and say that I did so only under the influence of fear, and that I behaved in a cowardly manner. But I have got tired of being afraid. I'm not afraid any more.'

Eliseyev said: 'People were asking about the contents of the letter to the New York Times. I have not seen the text of the letter myself, but as far as I know, it is written in support of A. D. Sakharov and is basically concerned with three points:

1. Melchuk decisively protested against the persecution of "a very honest Soviet scientist", which is how he describes Sakharov.'
have listened to your report; in my opinion everything is quite clear. Let us go on to deal with the next question before us.' These were the results of the secret vote:

19 members of the Learned Council voted against the re-confirmation of senior research officer I. A. Melchuk in his post for a new term;
2 members were for his re-confirmation;
3 votes were declared invalid.

A few days later Melchuk was informed that he would cease to be employed on 18 May 1976.

In recent years the Russian Language Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences (whose director is F. P. Filin, a corresponding-member of the USSR Academy of Sciences) has dismissed the following linguists as having been 'not of sufficiently high standard in competition with others' (or has made them resign under threat of being declared 'not of sufficiently high standard'): Yu. D. Apresyan, L. N. Bulatova, N. A. Esykova, L. L. Kanatkin, L. P. Krysan, G. A. Pozharitskaya, V. Z. Sanukov, E. M. Smorgunova, E. I. Khangira and T. S. Khodorovich. All of them either 'signed' something, or defended the 'signers', or defended the defenders.

At the M. Thorez Moscow State Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages

At the M. Thorez Moscow State Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages the faculty of general linguistics has had, for about 20 years, a Laboratory of Machine Translation — the L M T.

The L M T is one of the acknowledged centres of academic life for Moscow linguists working in the more contemporary fields of linguistics. It publishes a bulletin, Mechanical Translation and Applied Linguistics, which is well-known in the USSR and abroad, and also a series of duplicated articles produced by the group for experimental and applied linguistics at the Russian Language Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The Laboratory runs seminars and conferences in linguistics and carries out research in the field of machine translation and automatic processing of texts. The L M T is responsible for deciding the subjects of academic research within the framework of COMECON.

The academic work of the Laboratory has been organized continuously on a voluntary basis by Viktor Yulevich Rozentsveig, assistant professor, Candidate of Philosophy (he defended his doctoral dissertation at the end of 1975), a senior research officer at the Thorez Institute. The L M T employs five institute staff members and about 40 research workers, engineers and laboratory assistants, who have been working there for many years on contract rates.

Contracts with customers for 1976 were completed in time and attested by

A few years ago Borodulina was responsible for the Laboratory breaking off its long-term association with its research consultant I. A. Melchuk (see above). Soon after this, A. K. Zholkovsky, the well-known linguist, who in 1968 signed with Melchuk a letter in defence of Ginzburg and Galanskov, was dismissed from the Laboratory.

M. K. Borodulina, rector of the Institute, and G. V. Kolshansky, pro-rector of the scientific research section (also administrative head of the Laboratory). The sums contracted for were enough to pay all wages and leave a surplus. The timetables were also kept to. However, the official order on staff lists for the year, i.e. the document on whose basis the contract members of staff were paid, was not issued until 25 March. Accordingly, almost all employees of the Laboratory had been working for some time without receiving any pay. Finally, on 25 March, rector Borodulina issued the order, without the knowledge of Kolshansky. It omitted the names of the following six persons:

Sergei Isakovitch Gindin, senior research officer, Candidate of Science, who has published over twenty works and has been with the L M T since he was a student;
Efimovna Anna Gurevich, junior research officer, who has been working at the L M T since 1968;
Lev Yevich Elinsk, junior research officer at the L M T since 1971;
Nina Yuvovna Libedinskaya, senior laboratory assistant at the L M T since 1969;
Elena Vladimirivna Uryson, junior research officer at the L M T since 1968;
Irina Alekseyevna Tseltlina, junior research officer at the L M T since 1972.
(Of the above, I. A. Tseltlina is not Jewish; she has taken her husband's surname.)

V. Yu. Rozentsveig refused to confirm the incomplete staff-list and stated that, if the order was brought into force, he would resign as head of the Laboratory. The rector then declared the Laboratory closed: in the course of 1976 all the staff would be dismissed, including the five permanent staff-members. The dismissals would take place in three stages: in August, October and December. The employees were told to find new jobs for themselves.

At present the authorities are explaining the closing of the Laboratory by saying that the L M T 'is an alien body in the Institute', as it is not directly involved in the teaching process.

A few years ago Borodulina was responsible for the Laboratory breaking off its long-term association with its research consultant I. A. Melchuk (see above). Soon after this, A. K. Zholkovsky, the well-known linguist, who in 1968 signed with Melchuk a letter in defence of Ginzburg and Galanskov, was dismissed from the Laboratory.

A New Public Association

On 12 May 1976 a declaration was issued announcing the formation of a new public association in Moscow — the Group to Assist the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR. The declaration states:
The Group's aim is to promote the observance of the Final Act of the Conference on Co-operation and Security in Europe. We will focus on the following articles of the Final Act:

First, on the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States, principle VII, which is headed 'Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief';

and secondly on the section 'Co-operation in Humanitarian and Other Fields', subsections (1) Human Contacts (notably point b) — 'Reunification of Families', (2) Information, (3) Co-operation and Exchanges in the Field of Culture, and (4) Co-operation and Exchanges in the Field of Education.

The Group considers that its first goal is to inform all heads of the states which signed the Final Act on 1 August 1975, and also to inform the public, about cases of direct violation of the articles named above. With this aim, the Group:

(1) accepts directly from Soviet citizens written complaints about personal experiences which relate to violations of these articles, and in a concise form will readdress them to all heads of the states which have signed the Act and also to the public; the Group will retain the original, signed documents;

(2) collects with the help of the public any other information about violations of the above articles, analyses this information and gives a detailed evaluation of its reliability, and will then send it to the heads of state and the public.

In some cases, when the Group comes across concrete information about special manifestations of inhumanity, for example:

- the taking away of children from religious parents who wish to educate their children according to their beliefs;
- forcible psychiatric treatment with the purpose of changing people's thoughts, conscience, religion or beliefs;
- the most dramatic instances of divided families;
- cases which reveal special inhumanity in regard to prisoners of conscience;

in these cases, the Group intends to appeal to the heads of state and the public with requests to form international commissions to check the information on the spot, since the Group will not always be able to conduct its own direct investigation of such important and crucial information.

The Group hopes that its information will be taken into account at all official meetings which are envisaged in the Final Act under the point 'Further Steps from Helsinki'.

In its activity the members of the Group proceed from the conviction that the issues of humanitarianism and free information have a direct relationship to the problem of international security, and they call for the public of other countries which took part in the Conference at Helsinki to form their own national assistance groups in order to facilitate a complete fulfilment of the Helsinki Agreements by the governments of all countries. We hope that in the future a corresponding International Committee will also be formed.

Yury Orlov has been declared the leader of the Group. The members of the Group include: Lyudmila Alekseyeva, Mikhail Bernshtam, Elena Bonner, Alexander Ginzburg, Alexander Korchak, Pyotr Grigorenko and Vitaly Rubin. The declaration also bears the signature of Anatoly Marchenko, who was exiled to Eastern Siberia last year (Chronicles 35, 37). Later it became known that Anatoly Shcharansky was also in the Group.

Malva Landa also joined the Group, declaring however that she was not fully in agreement with the content of the declaration. The declaration, in her opinion, ignores the fundamental difference between the situation of the Soviet Group and the situation of the proposed similar groups in other countries.

***

The authorities reacted quickly to the formation of the Group. First there were attempts to summon Yu. Orlov to K G B headquarters, then on Saturday, 15 May he was detained on the street and taken to the K G B offices in the Cheremushki district. There he was read a 'Warning' according to the Decree of 25 December 1972 [see Chronicle 30].

On the same day T A S S published abroad the following announcement (the Chronicle presents a re-translation from the English):

**Warning to a Provocateur**

Moscow, 15 May, 17.40 hours

As has become known to a T a s s correspondent, State Security authorities today officially warned a certain Yury Orlov about the inadmissibility of his anti-constitutional activity.

Orlov, who was once engaged in scientific work and was elected a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, has fully devoted himself to anti-Soviet activities in recent years. Seeking to gain popularity in the eyes of the opponents of relaxation of tension and the enemies of the Soviet Union, Orlov in particular set about knocking together a group of dissidents under the high-sounding and provocative name of Organization for Checking the Observance by the Soviet Union of the Provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

It is difficult to evaluate Orlov's actions in any other way than as an attempt to cast doubt in the eyes of the international republic on the sincerity of the Soviet Union's efforts to implement strictly the international obligations it has assumed, as yet another provocation aimed at hampering the process of relaxation of international tension.
On 15 May Orlov was summoned to the State Security bodies where, in accordance with the law effective in the country, he was given an official warning about the inadmissibility of his unlawful actions. Such a warning has a dual purpose: to cut short Orlov's provocative activity, and also to prevent the perpetration by Orlov and persons connected with him of actions punishable by law.

In response to the TASS Statement Andrei Sakharov, Laureate of the Nobel Peace Prize, and Valentin Turchin, chairman of the Soviet 'Amnesty International' group, issued a statement. They thoroughly approved of the formation of the Group and considered the Group's aims to be extremely important. They supported the call made by the Group for the formation of similar groups in other countries that were signatories to the Helsinki Agreement.

The authors consider the TASS Statement to be an attempt to discredit the Group indirectly, as it would be embarrassing to attack such a group directly. It is noted that the name of the Group is distorted in the Statement. As for the attempts to cast doubt on Orlov's academic qualifications, the authors write:

The TASS Statement tries to create the impression that Professor Orlov has recently abandoned his academic activity. In reality he is continuing to work actively and in the course of the year 1974-5 he published three original works of research and sent another to the publishers. It is true that, since the beginning of 1974, Orlov has not been on the staff of any teaching institution, but only because, in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, he is refused employment out of political considerations.

The first action of the Group was to study the case of Mustafa Dzhemilev (see above in this issue). The Group issued a document pointing out the infringement of the Helsinki Agreements in this case.11 [Here is a summary]:

The circumstances in which the trial was prepared and conducted lead the members of the Group to the conclusion that it was not a legal proceeding but 'a deliberately predetermined reprisal'. This fact 'does not permit the application to Dzhemilev's case of the article in the Final Act on non-interference in internal affairs, for this article is interpreted in the Final Act in terms of respect for the laws and customs of sovereign states, not of respect for lawlessness disguised by falsification'.

The document was signed by the following members of the Group: Yu. Orlov, M. Bernshtam, E. Bonner and A. Ginzburg.

News in Brief

In Vladimir prison A. Sergienko had a visit from his mother, O. Ya. Meshko, at the end of December, during which he told her that his health had taken a sharp turn for the worse (Sergienko has tuberculosis). Since then no letters have been received from Sergienko. His mother has received information that he was put in the cooler for two weeks in March 1976.

On 30 April 1976 O. Ya. Meshko had a talk about her son with a doctor specializing in tuberculosis at the Health Department of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The doctor informed her that her son was receiving treatment with medicines.

'But surely it is customary to give tubercular patients supplementary food and longer exercise periods — after all, his cell has only diffused light and no sunshine at all. And is the cooler really allowed in tubercular cases?'

'We cannot make changes in the prison regime: if he has broken the rules, he will be put in the cooler. We only give medical treatment.'

O. Ya. Meshko asked the doctor about the possibility of her son being released.

'Do you know who gets released early? Stretcher cases. And we manage that only with difficulty.'

To this, O. Meshko replied that the release of a dying man was chiefly of benefit to the prison: its statistics looked better and it did not have to care for the prisoner. Credit did not belong to the doctors:

'You would do better to release people in time to forestall their deaths.'

'That is not in our power. Ask the Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions for a change in a prisoner's regime.'

On the same day O. Ya. Meshko went to the RSFSR Procurator's Office to see Bolysov, the relevant supervisory procurator. There she tried to find out why her seriously ill son had been put in the cooler for two weeks. In reply Bolysov told her that her son had written 84 complaints in the last year, besides which he had written not only about himself, but also about others. When O. Meshko asked what exactly her son had complained about, Bolysov replied that the complaints consisted of impermissible expressions and that he could not repeat them all. Bolysov regretted that O. Ya. Meshko had brought her son up badly.

'It did not fall to me to bring him up, as I was in a camp for ten years. He was brought up if he stands up for others when he's in great difficulty himself.'

On 4 May O. Meshko was received at the Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions. Here she again suggested that such a prison-regime should not be applied to her son and insisted on the necessity of his release on medical grounds; finally she suggested: 'If my son and I don't fit in here, let us go
**Moscow.** At the end of August 1975 Andrei Konstantinovich Ivachkin (an engineer by education, born 1942) was summoned to the KGB headquarters for the Kiev district of Moscow, as a result of a declaration made by a certain person. In the words of the KGB officials, the author of the declaration had handed in a copy of the book *The Gulag Archipelago* by A. Solzhenitsyn, and had written that he had got it from Ivachkin. The KGB officials, threatening to make out a case against him under article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, demanded that Ivachkin should tell them where he had obtained the book by Solzhenitsyn and to whom he had given it. A. Ivachkin declared in writing that it was the first time he had seen the book.

Just over two months later, on the evening of 31 October, some men in police uniform and some in civilian clothes came to A. Ivachkin’s room and took him by force to police station number 7. In the morning he was given a 15-day sentence by Judge Dyakov.

Soon someone calling himself ‘Sonny’ appeared in his cell, introducing himself as a professional thief. ‘Sonny’ questioned Ivachkin about his relations with Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn, asked him about the *Gulag Archipelago* and promised to help him by phoning his friends and telling them what had happened. ‘Sonny’s’ stories about himself and his case later turned out to be lies.

Ivachkin was interviewed by First Lieutenant V. I. Likhachev and Lieutenant-Colonel Lidov, head of the Criminal Investigation Department of the district police station in the Leningrad district. They threatened to make out a case against him under various articles of the Criminal Code. As an alternative, they proposed that he should be honest with them and co-operate.

When he was released A. Ivachkin made a complaint to the Procurator’s Office about the actions of the police. Assistant procurator Gorokhova replied that Ivachkin had been legally sentenced.

The written testimony by witnesses of his detention was absent from the case materials, and neither were these witnesses questioned. The head of police station 103 had told them that the trial would take place only on the following day.

The judge read S. Khodorovich extracts from reports made by policemen and vigilantes, which contained fantastic allegations about his behaviour; Khodorovich said these were lies. The judge wrote out an order and told Khodorovich that he would be under arrest for 15 days for wilfully disobeying the police.

For the first two days Khodorovich was held at police station 103, where he was not given any food, but food parcels were accepted. For the remaining 13 days, he was put in the remand cells at police station 71. There the following regime was in force: prisoners had to sleep on the bare floor; from 6 am to 11 pm lying down was forbidden; no parcels were accepted; smoking was forbidden; there was no towel, toothbrush or hankiechief; shaving and cutting one’s nails were forbidden — and there was nothing to do it with; there was no bath or shower throughout the 15 days. The cell was not ventilated and there was no exercise period. The food was as follows: 8 am — tea without sugar, with bread; 3 pm — soup with a meatball with vegetables; 8 pm — half-sweet tea with bread.

While he was under arrest, Khodorovich categorically refused to work. On 30 April S. D. Khodorovich was released.

On 20 April S. Khodorovich’s wife sent a complaint to the district procurator. She asked for the case to be reconsidered with the participation of the witnesses. There was no reply to this complaint.

**Moscow.** On 17 April, during the Jewish Passover, some men who refused to show any identification detained two young Jews in Arkhipov Street, near the synagogue. They also beat one of them up, Andrei Okunev.

The names of two of those who beat him up have become known: Viktor Vasilevich Korotikh and Mikhail Alexandrovich Grudman (or Grutman). Okunev was taken to police post 6 of police station 26, where he was searched and beaten up again. This took place in the presence of Yury Nikolayevich Bannikov, head of the mass-defence section of the Kalinin District Komsomol Committee.

At police station 26, investigator Kravtsov said to Okunev: ‘Where did you say they hit you? I’ll hit you in the same spot!’ Kravtsov removed Okunev’s testimony about the beating from the interrogation record.

A medical examination, carried out on 18 April at the medical station of the Volgograd district in Moscow, recorded the traces of the beating.
They explained their actions by saying that Nekipelov had been 'inside' recently (see Chronicle 32) and referred to a secret order from the head of the district department for internal affairs.

V. A. Nekipelov wrote a protest against the unlawful police entry into his flat.

Magadan. At the beginning of November 1975 G. Bogolyubov got to know from his neighbours that, in his absence, unknown persons had visited his flat.

On 11 November Bogolyubov was detained on the street, taken to a police station and questioned about two explosions which had occurred (according to his interrogators) in Magadan on 8 and 9 November. The detained man categorically rejected the accusation of involvement in the explosions, considering the question to be a provocation. At the police station, Bogolyubov was subjected to an unsanctioned search, while his attempt to resist this illegal act was met by violence. 'We're not the KGB, who might still stop to discuss philosophy with you!', said one of the policemen, hitting him in the stomach. They pulled out of Bogolyubov's shopping-bag the 'Letter of F. Raskolnikov to Stalin', the 'Letter of E. Genni to Ehrenburg' and other samizdat texts. No record was made of the search, in spite of requests by Bogolyubov to do so.

Then he was taken home, and here KGB official V. S. Myasnikov and others carried out a search. They confiscated two volumes of The Gulag Archipelago, August 1914 [by Solzhenitsyn] and Ten Years after 'One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich' by [Zh. Medvedev]. The search took place without a warrant from the procurator and without a record being made.

Gennady Bogolyubov, born 1942, works as a house painter at the Magadanstror construction firm. In September 1975 he was called as a witness at one of the building organizations of the town, was summoned to the town KGB headquarters for a talk with assistant procurator Solovyov and Kiselev, the head of the KGB operations section. The conversation concerned Gridasov's intention of renouncing Soviet citizenship (he had announced this in a letter to the Supreme Soviet) and his links with US consul Napper.

Gridasov was warned that his contacts with foreigners were regarded as criminal activity and that, if he continued such contacts, he would be 'placed in a psychiatric hospital' or subjected to 'more effective measures'.

When Gridasov asked what 'more effective measures' they had in mind, he received no answer.

Moscow. On 1 April 1976 the historian and orientalist Mikhail Semyonovich Bernshtam was summoned to the reception rooms of the KGB attached to the USSR Council of Ministers. There he had a conversation with KGB Major-General Vasily Petrovich Zakharov and First Lieutenant Yuriy Semyonovich Zdornov. Zakharov said that the authorities were in possession of evidence that M. Bernshtam was helping to compile a collection of writings Across the Bug (a summary of this philosophical-journalistic collection was among the material confiscated from the Leningraders Tron and Zemtsov - Chronicle 39).

Zakharov accused Bernshtam of initiating and organizing the forthcoming collection and told him that, if the volume were published, Bernshtam would soon be brought to book under article 70. If Bernshtam managed to escape punishment (he was getting ready to emigrate - Chronicle), one of his friends would be arrested. ('By the way, Vladimir Borisov is apparently waiting for you downstairs. Tell him that he's in a critically dangerous position; he would do well to emigrate too."

M. Bernshtam told the KGB officials that, as far as he knew, the collection Across the Bug was not going to be published.

The conversation was carried on calmly. Bernshtam was offered assistance in obtaining work or in getting emigration visas for himself and his family.

After the unofficial talk Bernshtam was read a 'Warning' under the Decree of 25.12.72. Bernshtam signed the 'Warning', but added his protest against the accusations made against him.

This was the second 'Warning' issued to M. Bernshtam. The first was in October 1974.

On 22 April Bernshtam was again summoned to the KGB, and V. B. Zakharov declared that, according to information he had, Bernshtam was continuing to work on the collection. Zakharov emphasized that the warning remained in force, wherever and under whatever title the collection might appear.

V. V. Grekova, Mikhail Bernshtam's wife, and her daughter are experiencing delay in obtaining permission to emigrate.
voluntarily hand over any 'literature' he had; threats were made that if he did not, a search warrant would be sent for. Gordeyev handed over some books, including \textit{Forever Flowing} by V. Grossman. When the KGB officials asked him to give a written undertaking that he would not take part in anti-Soviet activities, Gordeyev wrote that he would not take part in activity which was contrary to the Constitution.

On the same day, officials questioned Gordeyev's former wife about him; on the next day, they questioned a close friend of his.

\* \* \*

\textit{Moscow.} Details have become known of a conversation between KGB official A. Shevchuk and V. Arkhangelskaya, wife of Vladimir Arkhangelsky, who was sentenced in September last year (\textit{Chronicle} 38).

A. Shevchuk had taken part in the search carried out at the Arkhangelskys' flat on 15 July 1975. A few days later, he came to see V. Arkhangelskaya and, while trying to persuade her to co-operate, he expressed a few interesting opinions:

- All sorts of false rumours are going round about us, but in actual fact those who work for the KGB are simple Soviet people, the sort you find anywhere.
- I myself once worked in a factory, then I was transferred, and now I'm doing investigation work ... People react to me in different ways. If they don't let me in through the door, I climb in through a window ...
- They tell all sorts of horror stories about prisons, but it's all lies. Take Tverdokhlebov, for instance: he had gold crowns put on his teeth in prison, ate his fill and got quite fat ... The food's good there, and you've got lots of free time when you can do what you like — read or work ... But in general I don't have much experience of this; I don't have anything to do with prisons, I'm interested in other matters ...
- We don't try these people for their beliefs but for collecting all the dirt, carrying it out of our hut and giving it to the West. There are defects everywhere, in our country as well, but we have a lot that's good and they just collect all sorts of dirt ...
- What do they all want? They're almost all educated people, but they're not satisfied. Take Albrekht ... he's too clever by far, that dishevelled type ... Your husband isn't doing the work he was trained for either. They're doing that on purpose, to show how bad things are here ...
- Your husband will have to spend some time inside, that'll cool him down. But if you help us, he'll come back to his family and everything will be all right ... We must unite our forces to get him out ...
- In Israel — one has to work there; here things are easier in that regard ...
- If we had the necessary authorization we could send everyone to gaol at once ... That would be easier for us ... But we try to re-educate people, rather than imprison them again ...

\* \* \*

\textit{Leningrad.} On 24 February, the day the 25th Congress of the CPSU opened, three young people scattered about 100 leaflets from the gallery of the Gostiny Dvor building onto the Nevsky Prospekt. The leaflets were printed in Russian; the text ended with the words: 'Long live the New Revolution! Long live Communism!' On 4 March one of those who took part in this action was arrested — Andrei Reznikov, a 17-year-old first-year student at Leningrad University's faculty of mathematics and mechanics, a graduate of Mathematical School 121.

Charges were preferred against him under article 150-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. Reznikov was under investigation for about a month in the inner prison of the Leningrad KGB ('the Big House'), after which he was released into the custody of his parents. His case was passed on to the Minors' Commission of the Leningrad City Soviet Executive Committee. He has not been formally expelled from the university, but is not allowed to attend lectures.

The two other participants in the events of 24 February (who were either in their last year at school or had left school last year) are being summoned for questioning. Graduates of Mathematical School 121 are being questioned, among them Strogov, a first-year student at Leningrad University's faculty of history. A 15-year-old senior pupil from School 317 has been interrogated for ten hours. Many of those questioned are members of the city tourist club, of which Reznikov had also been a member. Almost all those questioned have been expelled from school and from the Komsomol. In School 317 the expulsions from the Komsomol took place at a Komsomol bureau meeting (without a preliminary investigation by the local Komsomol organization); speeches were made by orators from the district committee of the party; and a representative of the KGB was present. Reznikov's former class-teacher was sacked, as was the secretary of the school's party organization. In School 121 a sharp reduction in the number of class 9s and class 10s is being planned (instead of nine or ten there will be only two next year); in connection with this, a massive reduction in the number of teachers is planned. A pupil from class 10 at School 121 who won the All-Union Mathematics Olympics this year is not being allowed to go abroad for the International Olympiad.

Searches connected with this case were carried out at the homes of A. Reznikov and V. Smirnov.
Moscow at the beginning of April. During the visit to the USSR of O. Palme, Prime Minister of Sweden, Uvarov was detained near the Swedish Embassy. He was wearing banners with roughly the following messages on them: ‘I ask for asylum!’ ‘I don't know any military secrets.’

Anatoly Uvarov was sent to the Serbsky Institute. Further details of his fate are unknown to the Chronicle.

[News in Brief]
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Pyatigorsk. On 15-19 September 1975 a court hearing took place in Pyatigorsk concerning the application of measures of a medical character to Mikhail Stefanovich Zverev. The defending lawyer was a local man; the legal representative of the defendant was his wife.

Zverev was accused of disseminating about 20 articles libelling the Soviet system, and of compiling and disseminating leaflets of a libellous nature (he sent these documents by post, by putting them in post-boxes). He was arrested on 5 February 1975. The charge against him was at first formulated under article 190-1, but in the course of the investigation it was re-defined under article 70.

In the spring of 1975 Zverev was sent for a forensic-psychiatric diagnosis to the Serbsky Institute. He was declared not responsible, the diagnosis being 'paranoid development of the personality' (reformist delusions, an uncritical attitude to himself, and so on).

The court issued an order for compulsory treatment in a special hospital.

An appeal was made against the decision by Zverev's wife, as the defence lawyer refused to appeal against the court order. The appeal court, which took place in Stavropol on 14 November 1975, upheld the decision of the court.

At the end of December 1975 M. Zverev was put in the Chernyakhovsk special psychiatric hospital.

Zverev is 50 years old and an electrical engineer by specialty. He has two children. His daughter is a 7-year-old schoolgirl. His son is 18 years old and is serving in the army.

There was a short report about M. S. Zverev in Chronicle 39.

Kiev. Viktor Mikhailovich Maresin, who was arrested in the summer of the year before last on suspicion of participating in a money-forging group, expressed some 'anti-Soviet' opinions in the course of the investigation. In December 1974 he was sent for a psychiatric diagnosis and declared to have become ill during the course of the investigation. The diagnosis was schizophrenia in paranoid form.

The trial of the forgers has taken place; Maresin's case has apparently been separated, and the investigation of it has been suspended. Maresin himself is in Kiev psychiatric hospital number 21. According to the doctor treating him, he is in danger of being transferred to the Dnepropetrovsk special psychiatric hospital. The same doctor is of the opinion that a man who holds the views expressed by Maresin should not be living in freedom.

Viktor Maresin is the brother of Valery Maresin, whose trial is reported in this issue of the Chronicle.

Ukraine. In January 1976 a member of the 'Jehovah's Witnesses' sect was tried in the town of Zhdanov for refusing to serve in the Soviet army. The details are unknown to the Chronicle.

Volgograd Region. In the town of Uryupinsk 19-year-old Kirill Dmitrievich Sonin was sentenced for refusing to serve in the Soviet army out of religious motives.

Viktor Petrovich Chamovskikh (Chronicle 33), after serving out his 4-year sentence in a camp, was sent into exile, where he was placed under open administrative surveillance. (In the summer of 1975 the police of Chuna settlement, Irkutsk Region, tried to place the exile Anatoly Marchenko under surveillance, but this attempt was blocked as unlawful by the procurator's office).

On 24 April 1976 Chamovskikh was sentenced to 1 year in camps for infringing the surveillance rules.

On 5 February (in Chronicle 39 this date was wrongly given as 5 January) Vyacheslav Petrov, co-defendant of Georgy Davydov (Chronicle 29), finished
his term in camp and was sent off from Perm camp 35 to a two-year exile.
On 18 February he arrived at Tomsk prison, and on the following day he went
on hunger-strike, demanding that he be allowed to travel to Moscow and Lenin-
grad to visit the procurator's office (Petrov is trying to prove that some of the
charges in the indictment against him were false).
He continued his hunger-strike even when he was transferred from the
prison to his place of exile, the settlement of Kargasek. On 4 March he reached
this place. Petrov ended his hunger-strike on 8 March, but is continuing to
demand permission for his trip.

Pero. On 20 March Gennady Paramonov
was released from an ordinary
psychiatric hospital (Chronicle 38).

Vladimir. Between 10 and 20 May M. I.
Kokolouka was released from an
ordinary psychiatric hospital (Chronicle 39).

Jelgava, Latvian S S R. The investigation in the case of Mikhail Aleksanrovich
Naritsa, who was charged under article 198 of the Latvian S S R Criminal Code
(corresponding to article 190-1 of the R S F S R Code), has come to an end. Two
forensic-psychiatric diagnoses, in Riga and at the Serbsky Institute (by Pro-
fessor Lunts), have declared Naritsa responsible.
On 7 May Naritsa was taken from the prison in Riga, where the investigation
took place, to Jelgava. The procurator in Jelgava told Naritsa that he was
being released from detention on condition that he signed a promise not to
leave town. The procurator said that it had not yet been decided if the case
should be handed over to a court, or if proceedings should be stopped, and
that a great deal depended on Naritsa himself: 'Do you promise to change your
behaviour?' Naritsa replied by asking: 'Are you trying to forbid me to do
creative work?', and did not promise anything.
At the same time, Naritsa's wife was talking to her husband's recently
appointed new investigator. He told her that Naritsa was no longer under
arrest and returned some of Naritsa's works, which had been confiscated in
searches: two or three stories and the manuscript of a textbook called
Perspective.
Naritsa was arrested on 20 November 1975 (Chronicle 38). On 3 December
he was taken to Riga psychiatric hospital. Here he refused to answer the
doctor's questions, which resembled an interrogation, and resisted an injec-
tion. Then two policemen, an assistant doctor and an orderly severely beat him
up. The policeman also threatened to charge Naritsa with assaulting them and
to draw up the corresponding testimony.

On 20 May the 6-month term allotted for investigation of the case, including
the time needed [for Naritsa and his lawyer] to study the case, comes to an
end. The evidence on which the charges are based consists exclusively of
Naritsa's own works. He refused to give any evidence himself.

Vilnius. The lawyer who will lodge a supervisory appeal in the case of S.
Kovalyov received permission on 17 May from the Supreme Court of the
Lithuanian S S R to examine the case materials, but was not able to obtain
the materials themselves. It turned out that they had been demanded by the
Lithuanian K G B and then sent to Moscow.

Moscow. During the 'Nobel Prize campaign' against A. D. Sakharov an article
by Max Léon from the newspaper L'Humanité was reprinted in Literaturnaya
gazeta on 3 December 1975; a week later the same newspaper printed a letter
from the 'well-known progressive writer' Mary Dawson from Canada.

Viktor Kudrin, a research officer at one of the institutes of the U S S R
Academy of Sciences, sent Léon and Dawson a letter protesting against this.
At the same time he sent a copy of the letter to Literaturnaya gazeta, asking that
it should be published.
On 15 March 1976 Ya. Borovoi (of the foreign department of Literaturnaya
gazeta) sent Kudrin the following reply:
In our paper, we do indeed have a good tradition of giving people with
differing points of view the opportunity to defend themselves. However, such an
opportunity is given only on condition that the opponents (whatever they
disagree about) should feel sympathy for our system and desire success
in the task of building Communism in the U S S R.
We do not intend to make Literaturnaya gazeta a platform for lampoons
and enemies of our society.

Moscow. In September 1975 Ermakov, the head of the editorial staff for Soviet
literature of the Literary Encyclopaedia, was dismissed by order of the Chairman
of the State Publishing Committee. He was told orally that he was being dis-
mised for continuing to criticize the cult of personality, and that under this
guide people were working for him who did not find our reality to their taste.
Some of the employees of the editorial staff fear that they too might become
unemployed.
The conflict began after the editorial staff prepared a 'Literature' section in
the article on the R S F S R for the 22nd volume of the Large Soviet Encyclo-
paedica. Earlier, this editorial staff had produced a similar article on 'Russian
Soviet literature' for volume 6 of the Literary Encyclopaedia, which was published in 1972. The text of the new article (essentially repeating the 'canonized' earlier text) was sent back from the party Central Committee with the following cuts: references to the 20th party congress were removed, as well as references to the 1958 resolution of the Central Committee, which softened the well-known resolution of 1948; and in a list of 'classics', The Master and Margarita, Tyorkin in the Next World and In the Trenches of Stalingrad had been deleted.16

The head of the editorial staff was in fact dismissed for protesting against these changes.

Seven members of the editorial board of the Literary Encyclopaedia sent a letter to the Central Committee's Department of Culture, expressing their displeasure at the situation developing on the editorial staff. They received no reply. Alexei Surkov, the chief editor and member of the editorial board of the Large Soviet Encyclopaedia's literature section, declared that he would resign from both positions if the changed text was published. He received no reply.

The article on the 'RSFSR' in volume 22 of the Large Soviet Encyclopaedia was published in a new version. According to rumour, A. Surkov is now refusing to work on the editorial staff and is not even signing editorial documents which are sent to him at home.

Moscow. In the middle of April, at a meeting of the Learned Council of the Higher Nervous Activity Institute, Podachin, an official of the institute, suggested that a request be made to the Higher Degrees Awards Commission that Yury Geinisman, who emigrated to Israel three years ago, should be deprived of his doctor's degree. The proposal was supported by Academician Asratyan, the director of the institute, and it was unanimously adopted. Then someone remembered that two years ago Myahodokhy, a Doctor of Biology, had also emigrated to Israel.17 The same decision was taken concerning him.

Moscow. On 12 April 1976, the day after the election of people's judges, T. S. Khodorovich called a press conference. She described how, the day before, attempts had been made to persuade her to go and vote. 'In our country only sentenced criminals and mentally ill people don't vote.' What would it cost you to go? Go there, cross it out and that's all there is to it; If you don't go, we shall give the empty room in your flat, which your daughter is applying for, to other tenants.' T. Khodorovich explained to foreign correspondents the reasons for her refusal to vote: elections with only one candidate are not elections; Soviet courts are not subordinate to the law; and the elected judges are members of the CPSU and are therefore not independent.

Moscow. In the Trenches of Stalingrad had been published in a new version. According to rumour, A. Surkov is now refusing to work on the editorial staff and is not even signing editorial documents which are sent to him at home.

Moscow. On 12 April 1976, the day after the election of people's judges, T. S. Khodorovich called a press conference. She described how, the day before, attempts had been made to persuade her to go and vote. 'In our country only sentenced criminals and mentally ill people don't vote.' What would it cost you to go? Go there, cross it out and that's all there is to it; If you don't go, we shall give the empty room in your flat, which your daughter is applying for, to other tenants.' T. Khodorovich explained to foreign correspondents the reasons for her refusal to vote: elections with only one candidate are not elections; Soviet courts are not subordinate to the law; and the elected judges are members of the CPSU and are therefore not independent.

Moscow. On 12 April 1976, the day after the election of people's judges, T. S. Khodorovich called a press conference. She described how, the day before, attempts had been made to persuade her to go and vote. 'In our country only sentenced criminals and mentally ill people don't vote.' What would it cost you to go? Go there, cross it out and that's all there is to it; If you don't go, we shall give the empty room in your flat, which your daughter is applying for, to other tenants.' T. Khodorovich explained to foreign correspondents the reasons for her refusal to vote: elections with only one candidate are not elections; Soviet courts are not subordinate to the law; and the elected judges are members of the CPSU and are therefore not independent.

The writer Anatoly Gladilin has left the USSR. See Chronicle 39 for details of his expulsion from the Writers' Union.

Josef Meshener has left the USSR (see Chronicle 16). Meshener's release after 5 years in labour camps under article 62 of the Ukrainian SSR Criminal Code (corresponding to article 70 of the RSFSR Code) was reported in Chronicle 39.

At the beginning of April an OVIR inspector told the artists on the telephone that their application would not be considered. The reasons for this refusal were:

1. OVIR did not consider applications from groups of persons;
2. OVIR did not consider applications for visits to more than one country;
3. OVIR did not consider applications without an invitation from abroad.

In addition, the artists were told that in any case they would require character references from party and professional organizations and from administrative authorities.

The artists sent a complaint to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, insisting that they be given a proper answer.

On 30 April 1976 the poetess Anna Aleksandrovna Barkova died in Moscow at the age of 75, after a long serious illness which she originally contracted in the camps. She was born into a worker's family, in the town of Ivanovo-Voznesensk.

In the 1920s her collection of poetry Woman was published. The originality of her talent was highly praised at that time by Lunacharsky in his introduction to the collection. Blok and Bryusov commended her.

Barkova traversed a long road of imprisonment and exile:
— from 1934 to 1939 her first imprisonment, followed by exile;
— from 1947 to 1956 her second imprisonment;
— from 1957 to 1965 her third imprisonment.

She was exculpated in full, at different times, in all three 'cases'.

Her verses, marked by deep pessimism, sorrow, tragic feeling and sharpness
of thought, passed from hand to hand in samizdat, both as individual leaflets and as small collections. She was helped by Tvardovsky and Fedin to move from an old people's home in Potma to Moscow, and also to obtain a pension. She was not a member of the Writers' Union.

Letters and Statements

Open letter to the organization Amnesty International and the European Commission of Human Rights, 19 March 1976, from the following mothers and wives of political prisoners: N. Bukovskaya, O. Meshko (Sergienko), G. Salova (Lyubarskaya), N. Buzyreva (Fyodorova), V. Isakova (Davydova).

The authors of the letter report that the administrative authorities at Vladimir Prison have recently been taking measures to isolate the political prisoners completely. The prisoners are losing the last rights they possessed: — the right to write to their nearest and dearest and to receive letters from them. (On the correspondence of political prisoners in Vladimir, see ‘In the Prisons and Camps’ in this issue); — the right to receive the rare visits provided by law.

The authors write that the method used by the censors of confiscating letters for their ‘suspicious’ contents is universal and gives full opportunities for ‘educating’ prisoners and taking revenge for complaints and protests by the latter. In addition, the prisoners are constantly being denied their prescribed visits.

Mendelevich has been denied a visit from his father for the past two years; Yu. Fyodorov (sentenced to 14 years) has not seen his wife and infant daughter for more than a year;

Dzhemilev’s sick mother travelled to Omek prison from the other end of the country and begged to be allowed to visit him, but in vain.

All protests by relatives to the Procurator’s Office and other responsible organizations have been fruitless.

‘Is it really necessary, before anyone finally helps us, to await the death from hunger of V. Bukovsky, M. Dzhemilev or V. Moroz?’ — the letter ends with these words.

The authors are supported by the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the U S S R, which asks that special attention be paid to this letter and that it should be publicized as widely as possible.

Vera Lisovaya: Four letters to Georges Marchais, the secretary of the French Communist Party, to the Communists of Canada, to the International Committee for the Defence of Human Rights and to the organization Amnesty International (March 1976).

The wife of political prisoner Vasily Lisovoi, former Candidate of Philosophy (Chronicle 30), asks for help in obtaining her husband’s release. When she visited him in January 1976 — a visit that took place in the K G B investigation prison in Kiev — her husband told her that he was a Marxist and did not consider himself to be guilty of anything, either ideologically or legally.

Lisovoi is now in camp 19 in the Mordovian camp-complex.

The priest Gleb Yakunin and Lev Regelson, in a long letter to the Secretary-General of the World Council of Churches, dated 6 March 1976, point out that Soviet laws on religion prove that religious discrimination is sanctioned by the state, as they demand the ‘unlawful’ registration of religious congregations, deprive religious congregations of the right to own their places of worship and essential religious cult objects, forbid missionary and cultural-social activity on the part of religious congregations, and also forbid private religious education and upbringing in an organized form. The authors quote many examples of contradictions between internal Soviet legislation on religion and international documents binding on the U S S R.

1,729 Soviet Germans living in the Kirgiz S S R have appealed in an open letter to the 25th Congress of the C P S U and to L. I. Brezhnev, Secretary-General of the C P S U Central Committee, and have also sent a declaration to the C P S U Central Committee, asking for permission to emigrate ‘to the historical homeland of our ancestors — Germany’.

I. Dvoretsky: Open letter to American railwaymen.

The author of the letter, a diesel-locomotive engineer, tells the following story: on 1 November 1967, at 6 o’clock in the morning, train 3502 at the station of Post-Volynsky (Ukrainian S S R), which he drove, was diverted onto a side-track occupied by an oil-tank train. With great difficulty the engineer averted an accident in which hundreds of people might have died. Immediately afterwards, he began to make inquiries as to those responsible for this criminal negligence and tried to bring to justice the railway chief P. F. Krivonos, ‘the originator of the Stakhanovite movement in railway transport’; this cost the plaintiff dear. A medical board declared him mentally ill; he was several times placed in a psychiatric hospital and was sacked from his job. After some attempts to hand in a statement to the highest party authority, Dvoretsky was beaten up by the police, interrogated by the K G B and sent to a psychiatric hospital once again. The Work Fitness Medical Commission, to which Dvore-
sky applied for an invalid's pension, refused to recognize him as an invalid. He was not given his job back either. When Dvoretsky succeeded in appealing personally to V. Shcherbitsky, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian CP and a Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, the latter replied that Krivonos belonged to party history, and that 'we shall not allow his reputation to be stained'.

When Dvoretsky asked for permission to leave and go 'somewhere abroad', he received a rude refusal.

Dvoretsky appealed to American railwaymen:

We are doing the same job — transporting people and all the necessities of life. And, although we are parted by the ocean, the same planet resounds to the sound of our wheels... I beg you, brothers, do not forget that slavery has not yet come to an end everywhere on the face of the earth... I only want one thing: that people should know truth and justice... All the people on this earth — both your people and ours. Without truth, justice and freedom, life on this earth is impossible.

The address of Ivan Grigorevich Dvoretsky is: USSR, Kiev-87, ul. Aviatsii 10, kv. 41.

* * *

S. N. Starobinets: Declaration to the U.S.S.R. Minister of Internal Affairs.

Serafima Starobinets, who has been expelled from the Komsomol and from the institute she was attending (Chronicle 38), asks that 'justice be restored and that all those responsible for a grave infringement of the law be brought to book...'

In answer to this declaration S. Starobinets received the following reply from the Ministry: 'No infringement of the law has been found in the actions of the police.'

* * *

I. Akselrod: 'To the 25th Congress of the CPSU', 16.1.76.

The author comments on the following statement by A. Yu. Sukharev, deputy Minister of Justice of the U.S.S.R, in the journal Novoye Vremya, number 1, 1976 (see Chronicle 39, 'Polemic with Sukharev').

'... practically all the most important international documents about rights by which human society today is guided, reflect the real rights enjoyed by citizens of the Land of Soviets...'

Inna Akselrod, a lecturer in the German language at the faculty of foreign languages of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, and her husband Vitaly Rubin, who studies the history and philosophy of Ancient China, handed in applications for emigration to Israel in February 1972. In August of that year they received a refusal. The reason given was that V. Rubin was 'a notable specialist'.

After their applications were handed in, I. Akselrod and V. Rubin lost their jobs.

I. Akselrod has appealed to L. I. Brezhnev twice, asking him to re-examine the case thoroughly, but has received no reply.

From 28 June to 6 July 1974, during the visit of R. Nixon to the U.S.S.R. V. Rubin was interned in Mozhaisk prison, without a warrant for his arrest and without a trial or an investigation (see Chronicle 32). At that time I. Akselrod was in effect under house arrest: the policeman on duty at the block and an 'agent in civilian dress' allowed no one into her flat.

I. Akselrod attaches an appeal to the editors of the newspapers Unitia and Morning Star, asking them to publish her letter, so that 'ordinary people in the West', whom A. Sukharev had been addressing, could compare his words with reality.

Concerning Public Statements by Leonid Plyushch


The texts of public statements made by L. Plyushch in the West have become known in the U.S.S.R. in re-translations into Russian and are circulating in samizdat.

On 3 February in London Plyushch spoke about himself and his stay in a special hospital.

The Chronicle considers it appropriate to remind readers of the past history of 'the Plyushch case'.

In 1964 he sent a letter to the Central Committee of the CPSU concerning the necessity of democratization; this was his first clash with the KGB — they asked him not to write such letters 'for the next two years' for some reason. In 1966-7 Plyushch wrote some samizdat articles. In 1968 there was his letter to Komsomolskaya Pravda about the case of Ginzburg and Galanskov, followed by his dismissal from his job. He collected information for the Chronicle of Current Events and the Ukrainian Herald. He was a member of the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the U.S.S.R. (Plyushch was arrested; after his categorical refusal to give evidence, he was 'diagnosed' as schizophrenic.)

From July 1973 to 8 January 1976 Leonid Plyushch was held in the Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital (Chronicles 29-39).

According to Plyushch's estimate, there are about 60 'politicals' being held in the Dnepropetrovsk hospital; of these, the majority are sane. The hospital orderlies are criminals serving the end of their sentences there; they often torment the patients, to get bribes — food, clothes, cigarettes and so on. As
punishment for 'bad behaviour', the doctors prescribe painful injections — usually sulphazine (or 'sera').

In a neighbouring ward a criminal prisoner told the doctors that three 'politicals' (one of whom was dumb) were carrying on anti-Soviet conversations ... A note was found on the dumb man — 'How much do oranges cost?' This was taken to be in code. They were given injections of barbamyl in unheard-of doses; at the same time they were given sulphazine injections. The patients were brought into the ward in a state of unconsciousness.

All this took place on the doctors' orders and on their initiative.

A characteristic dialogue:

Patient: 'When will I be released?'

Doctor: 'When I retire on my pension.'

The professional standard was extremely low. Plyushch asked a doctor: 'Why do you make no use of psychotherapy?' The doctor replied: 'Psychotherapy should not be used in psychiatry.'

According to the 'old hands', the conditions in the hospital earlier, 'before Plyushch', were much worse. The orderlies had been known to beat patients to the point of death. At the beginning of the 1970s, for instance, the political prisoner Grigorev died in this way.

Once the orderlies killed a patient. The matter was hushed up, the criminal 'dealers' were packed off to a camp, and Lyubarskaya, the section head, was demoted. Now she is just an ordinary doctor.

(This is the same Lyubarskaya who appeared as a witness at the trial of S. Kovalyov — see Chronicle 38. There she stated, in particular, that there were no wards in the hospital with more than 14 patients, nor was there a surveillance ward. Compare Plyushch's statements: 'In the ward there were more patients than beds. I was put in the third row, between two cots pushed close together. Or again: 'I was transferred to the surveillance ward, where the violent prisoners are kept.')

From the moment Plyushch entered the Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital the regime there grew somewhat less severe. In the hospital Plyushch was kept in the strictest isolation. 'The orderlies and hospital attendants were even forbidden to talk to me; other political prisoners were warned that, if they talked to me, it would be the worse for them.' Most of all, obstacles were put in the way of Plyushch and Plakhotnyuk meeting.

The doctors constantly questioned Plyushch, often asking such questions as 'Who are your contacts outside?' Plyushch naturally refused to reply.

The 'treatment' did not stop for a single day. This is how Plyushch describes its effects:

I was horrified to see how I deteriorated intellectually, morally and emotionally from day to day. My interest in political problems quickly dis-
and spoke about anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R.

In both the first and the second interview, Plyushch emphasized that he had been, and remained, a convinced communist. He said that for him this meant 'fighting for a society in which there will be no Darwinian animal-like struggle for material well-being; for a society in which the spirit will be freed from domination by the stomach and will turn to a creative existence'. Plyushch considered that the only attempt to build a truly communist society was the 'Prague Spring' of 1968. That path was 'absolutely unacceptable for the Soviet bureaucracy ... but I feel that for the population of the U.S.S.R this would be the only possibility, the only feasible way out of the political, social and spiritual dead-end in which it finds itself.'

Open Letter to Leonid Plyushch from T. S. Khodorovich

Did I know, when I began to fight for your release, that you were a Marxist — that is, someone who preaches an ideology hostile to all I consider holy: God, Christianity and liberty as the highest value, inseparable from human well-being, in contrast to the Marxist 'freedom as the recognition of necessity'? Of course I knew it. And all the same I fought for your release. I fought for this chiefly because you had been inhumanly punished for non-violent activity, for your convictions, which you expressed in your words and in worthy actions.

T. S. Khodorovich opposes the thesis which, in her opinion, Plyushch has expressed in his speeches — that the iniquities of Soviet society are a distortion of communist teachings.

'I see no contradiction between the theory of class struggle, which we were taught at school, and the epidemic of arrests, the tears of friends who had lost their parents in one night, the fear which is inseparable from our whole existence ...'

Referring to the 'Prague Spring', so close to L. Plyushch's heart, T. S. Khodorovich points out that F. Engels wrote of the destruction of the Czech nation and other small nations as 'a necessity of nature'. She devotes a great deal of space in her letter to concrete examples of the spirit of violence in Soviet reality.

'However, a man who calls an ideology based on violence, and appealing to violence, a bright and pure ideal, takes a worse sin on his soul than the evil itself, for he is calling evil good and annihilating the gulf between the two.'

We quote the concluding section of the letter:

Respected Leonid Ivanovich, I am not asking you to change your world-view. I have no right to do so, nor do I have the words, or the power, or any hope of doing so. You have preserved your beliefs through suffering, and this can only arouse my deep respect for you.

From the Pages of the Soviet Press

From the Ryazan regional newspaper Priokskaya Pravda (20 December 1975, the article by K. Mikhailov, 'Divergents of the Air').

Well, so what, aren't we allowed to listen to Western radio stations? It's not forbidden is it? Such a question is occasionally asked by certain young people. It is certainly true that nothing forbids it in our country. However, if we follow such super-naive logic, we could go on asking such questions to the point of obvious absurdity.

For instance, we could argue just as successfully about whether people are allowed to crawl under the wheels of passing cars or to jump from high buildings, just out of principle.

To burden human life with specially thought-out prohibitions would be
extremely stupid. And are they even necessary for thinking people who are
mentally and morally healthy? ...

A certain Danilyuk, a former legal consultant at one of the car-works in
the town of Ryazan, has taken the wrong road.

For a number of years he systematically listened to anti-Soviet radio
broadcasts and, under their influence, he began to spread slanderous fabrica-
tions about life in our country, about the politics of our party and state. Those
around him talked to him more than once, pointing out his incorrect be-
aviour, which disgraced a Soviet man, and seriously tried to persuade him
to re-examine his views on life.

Danilyuk took no notice of this well-meaning advice. Seeing himself as a
'personality,' towering above the 'crowd' and having the right to instruct
others, Danilyuk wrote a number of lampoons defaming our system and be-
gan to look for ways of sending his compositions abroad. Various people
tried to warn him not to act wrongly and attempted to save him from falling
into the abyss. But Danilyuk was not accustomed to taking any notice of
other people. The procurator's office was forced to bring the slanderer to
justice and he was sentenced by the regional court.

For a reference to I. F. Danilyuk's case, see also Chronicle 32.

* * *

I. S. Shklovsky, The Universe, Life and Reason, Moscow, Nauka publishing-
house.

N. S. Kardashev has analysed a number of complex paradoxes linked with the
problem of black holes. Before him, this problem was dealt with, in its most
interesting aspects, by the eminent Soviet physicist A. D. Sakharov. Kardashev,
however, can take the credit for uniting ...


N. S. Kardashev has analysed a number of complex paradoxes linked with the
problem of black holes. He can take the credit for uniting ...

* * *

The author is a lecturer in philosophy and scientific atheism at a medical college.
The following are extracts from her article:

Incidentally, the young men and women themselves did not find questions
about the religious influence of the family unexpected. And when I decided
to offer the students of our college a short questionnaire, they answered it
seriously and sincerely.

Our college trains medical personnel largely for village work, and village
children are the majority of its students. As I discovered, almost half of those
questioned have icons at home and celebrate religious festivals in their
families. Five per cent of them wore crosses as a family custom; 5 per cent
had taken part in a christening ceremony as godparents ...

We tried to find out when and where our students had obtained informa-
tion about religion ...

Children were especially subject to the influence of their mothers and
grandmothers. The religious traditions and ideas they accepted were linked in
their minds with the personality who inculcated them; for example, faith in
God is linked with the mother. And, as a result, they subconsciously see
criticism of religion as an insult to the mother ...

In order to obtain professional qualifications and avoid conflict with the
communist scientific world-view, they have to become hypocrites. Hypocrisy
becomes their distinguishing characteristic. Usually they study well, even
excellently, but their knowledge does not become part of their convictions;
while accepting the facts, they refuse to draw the philosophical conclusions
that follow.
Activities in Defence of Human Rights in the Soviet Union Continue

A Chronicle of Current Events

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

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19.
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Suspension of the Case Against Naritsa

M. A. Naritsa, released on 7 May after signing a promise not to leave town (Chronicle 40), was summoned by the Procurator of the town of Jelgava on 31 May. The investigator Grasis was also present during their conversation. In announcing the case being already suspended, the Procurator emphasized that this was being done only on humanitarian grounds, as the criminal nature of Naritsa's activities had been proved. 'But if you continue to take part in such activities,' said the Procurator, 'then you will answer for them to the Law, in spite of your age.' Naritsa wanted to know on what basis he had been accused of 'disseminating knowingly false fabrications', and was allowed to read the investigation's extracts from his ‘Notebook’ and from the articles ‘The Naked Kings’, ‘Which Way is Art Going?’, ‘Education’ and ‘Beginning or End?’. The charges against Naritsa also included his ‘Crime and Punishment’ and ‘My Testimony’ and his statement on emigration. Naritsa commented that the inclusion in the case-evidence of certain quotations looked comic, for example the quotation of two phrases from the ‘Notebook’ which praised certain Chinese national characteristics. The investigator replied that this had not been prepared by himself, but by the previous investigator. (There was no testimony in the case material, either by witnesses or by Naritsa himself, who had refused to participate in the investigation in any way.)

Naritsa was then shown the text of the decree suspending the case, announced by the investigator and dated that same day, 31 May. The decree stated that Naritsa's guilt had been proved by the investigation, but that in view of his advanced age and weak health (in fact, at the age of 67, Mikhail Alexandrovich Naritsa has no complaints about his health — Chronicle), he could be released from criminal responsibility. In addition, as a result of a change of circumstances the accused had ceased to be 'socially dangerous' (article 6 of the RSFSR Criminal Procedure). The typewriter seized during a search of Naritsa's house was confiscated.

The question of Naritsa's emigration from the USSR was also touched on. The Procurator said that he should not apply to the central authorities and that applications to emigrate should be handed to the local police. Naritsa objected that he had been trying to obtain permission to emigrate for 15 years. The investigator hinted that times had changed. Those who talked to Naritsa did 'But if you continue to take part in such activities,' said the Procurator, 'then you will answer for them to the Law, in spite of your age.' Naritsa wanted to know on what basis he had been accused of 'disseminating knowingly false fabrications', and was allowed to read the investigation's extracts from his ‘Notebook’ and from the articles ‘The Naked Kings’, ‘Which Way is Art Going?’, ‘Education’ and ‘Beginning or End?’ The charges against Naritsa also included his ‘Crime and Punishment’ and ‘My Testimony’ and his statement on emigration. Naritsa commented that the inclusion in the case-evidence of certain quotations looked comic, for example the quotation of two phrases from the ‘Notebook’ which praised certain Chinese national characteristics. The investigator replied that this had not been prepared by himself, but by the previous investigator. (There was no testimony in the case material, either by witnesses or by Naritsa himself, who had refused to participate in the investigation in any way.)

Naritsa was then shown the text of the decree suspending the case, announced by the investigator and dated that same day, 31 May. The decree stated that Naritsa's guilt had been proved by the investigation, but that in view of his advanced age and weak health (in fact, at the age of 67, Mikhail Alexandrovich Naritsa has no complaints about his health — Chronicle), he could be released from criminal responsibility. In addition, as a result of a change of circumstances the accused had ceased to be 'socially dangerous' (article 6 of the RSFSR Criminal Procedure). The typewriter seized during a search of Naritsa's house was confiscated.

The question of Naritsa's emigration from the USSR was also touched on. The Procurator said that he should not apply to the central authorities and that applications to emigrate should be handed to the local police. Naritsa objected that he had been trying to obtain permission to emigrate for 15 years. The investigator hinted that times had changed. Those who talked to Naritsa did not reflect directly to the following declaration but perhaps they had it in mind:

To the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR, from Mikhail Alexandrovich Naritsa, born 1909, residing in the town of Jelgava, Latvian SSR, Kr. Baroni Street 5, flat 13.

Declaration
I request you to grant me and my wife, Lyudmila Vasilevna Naritsa (born 1912), a visa to emigrate from the USSR. My world outlook has nothing whatever in common with Marxism and, what is even more important, I cannot endorse a single action taken by the communists (and the Soviet government), either in internal affairs or in foreign policy.

For their part, the representatives of your government display unremitting hostility towards my literary works, describing as libel what I consider to be the plain truth, with no exaggerations.

M. Naritsa. 10 May 1976.

On 2 June Naritsa was told at the police station that applications to emigrate would not be accepted without an invitation from abroad.

Religion in the USSR

A Lecture by Furov

At the end of May 1976 the staff-members working on the Large Soviet Encyclopedia held a lecture by a visiting speaker, [Vasily] Furov, deputy-chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs attached to the USSR Council of Ministers, on the situation of religion in the Soviet Union.

The lecturer stated that in general religious life in the USSR was in decline and was dying out. In support of this view, he reported that over the last five years about 700 religious congregations had ceased to exist and that, out of the Orthodox churches registered, about 1,000 were formally listed but were not in use.

During the years of Soviet power, the number of Orthodox churches was about ten times lower than it had been (out of 77,676 which existed before the revolution, there were now 7,500). Out of the 4,200 Catholic churches which existed in the Baltic area at the moment of its integration into the USSR, 1,000 were left, while in areas where Islam was widespread, 1,000 mosques were left out of 24,000, although only 300 of these were registered, the rest only 'half existed'. Out of 1,500 Old Believer churches of the pre-revolutionary period, only 300 were left; out of 5,000 synagogues — 200 (of these only 92 were registered), but as there were only 50 rabbis in the country, the remaining synagogues functioned only from time to time. The chief rabbi had been found by the Council of Religious Affairs itself — he was a former janitor at the Likhachev factory, who had graduated from the Moscow yeshiva. It was not only among the Jews that there were not enough people to fill the ranks of the clergy. Orthodox teaching institutions, too, could not supply the needs of the church, and were not even managing to replenish the clergy's ranks. They had two applicants for each place, but the selection committee rejected many of
these — on grounds of health, for example, or because they were ‘religious fanatics’. As a result, there were only 5,900 priests for the 7,500 Orthodox churches in the country. Lutheran prayer-houses had pastors for only 50 per cent of them.

There were only 15 theological institutions in the country; moreover the Higher Theological School in Tashkent had been founded by the Council for Religious Affairs itself (chiefly in order to supply the personnel necessary for foreign relations, the lecturer explained). In Ulan-Ude a theological school for Buddhists had been opened (there were only two Buddhist monasteries in the country). In the years 1945-65 the theological academies of Moscow and Leningrad had produced 700 Masters, Candidates and Doctors of Theology.

The lecturer noted with satisfaction a fall in the number of Soviet citizens who observed religious rituals: according to his figures, in 1965 over 30 per cent of all children born were christened (or took part in corresponding rituals for the newly-born in other religions), while in 1975 only 19 per cent were; in 1975 only 2.5 per cent of marriages took place in church, while 40 per cent of funerals were religious.

About 20-25 per cent of all urban residents and 20-25 per cent of rural inhabitants were religious believers. The fading of religious consciousness was observable also in the prevalence of ‘Sunday religiosity’ among those going to church.

There were 48 religions and religious tendencies in the USSR. Among these were sects which had arisen after the revolution, such as the True Orthodox church. In this the moral and political unity of the Soviet people was revealed. The clergy spoke to their flock not merely of patriotism, but of Soviet patriotism; they upheld Soviet power and called on the believers to observe strictly all legal norms.

Furov described the relations between Church and State as ‘normal’, noting that modernist, reforming tendencies were penetrating ever deeper into parish life, actively supporting the home and foreign policy of the USSR. The clergy now observed strictly all legal norms.

Furov remarked proudly. For this reason the government considered it possible to give the church its political support, but, of course, it would not end its ideological struggle against it.

Furov claimed that individual servants of the church and believers allowed themselves to make anti-Soviet statements. Hierodeacon Varsonofy Khaitulin had suggested that as the church was separated from the state, atheism should also be separated from it. Active opposition to the church policy of the Soviet government was being carried on by Regelson, and also by Shafarevich, who had published a book on religious legislation in the USSR.\(^\text{18}\)

Among the 4,000 sectarian congregations which now existed, numbering about 400,000 people, only 60 per cent were loyal to Soviet power. 1,200 congregations of sectarians led an illegal existence, and the majority of these had ‘an anti-Soviet attitude’: these were the schismatic Baptists, the Adventists, the Innokentians (in Moldavia), the Murashkovites and the True Orthodox Christians.

At the conclusion of his lecture Furov emphasized that the Council was doing a great deal of work on strengthening legality in church-state relations and was disciplining over-zealous officials in the localities.

A Letter by Regelson and Yakunin

In Chronicle 40, section ‘Letters and Statements’, a short summary appeared of a letter from Lev Regelson and the Orthodox priest Gleb Yakunin, sent in March 1976 to Philip Potter, Secretary-General of the World Council of Churches (WCC).\(^\text{24}\)

The Chronicle considers it necessary to give here a more detailed account of this letter.

The authors of the letter note with satisfaction the achievements of the 1975 WCC Assembly in Nairobi regarding the fight against the absence of religious rights in various countries of the world, including the USSR. The Assembly’s decision to set up a WCC sub-committee to investigate the position of religion and religious believers in these countries was particularly important.

Regelson and Yakunin propose that the investigation into the position of religion in our country should take as its starting-point the existing legislation on religion.

This legislation was introduced in the USSR in 1929; a decree of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet made certain corrections to it on 23 June 1975.

The authors of the letter draw attention, first of all, to the question of registration of religious congregations. Soviet law regards such registration, not as a statement of fact establishing the existence of a religious congregation, but as permission for it to exist. The right of registration (and the right to refuse registration) is wholly in the hands of the Council for Religious Affairs. In this way:

A religious congregation cannot exist on its own initiative, by the wishes of its members and according to the law: on its own, before registration and without it, the congregation is forbidden to exist, and only the administrative sanction of the authorities can lift this ban in each individual case.

To clarify the situation, let us imagine that, having decided to invite friends to our house for some celebration, or merely to pass free time together, we would not have the right to do so, on pain of criminal prosecution, unless we...
first obtained permission from a special government authority!

This is the situation, not only with regard to registration, but also with regard to gatherings organized by religious congregations and groups. Every such gathering (with the exception of religious services in religious cult buildings) may have special permission from the local authorities. The same applies to religious rites.

The authors of the letter recall that 'the principle of sanction through registration was used as a weapon of religious discrimination even before the revolution (at that time against non-Orthodox congregations), and was subjected to severe criticism in the State Duma.25

Secondly, depriving religious congregations of the right to own their prayer-houses and cult objects, refusing religious societies the right of persons in law, made those religious denominations which were traditionally linked with church services wholly subject to the arbitrary authority of the state administration.

The statute on cult property, which prescribes confiscation if the church itself is closed, is especially difficult for such denominations as the Orthodox, the Catholics and the Old Believers. After all, church canon law and tradition forbid the confiscation of church property (especially the holy vessels) and their use for worldly purposes. Infringement of this canonical prohibition is defined as 'blasphemy' and obliges believers to oppose it by any means. In this regard, the well-known situation which existed in 1922-3 could be repeated at any moment.

The third discriminatory aspect of Soviet legislation on religious cults, as noted by the authors of the letter, is the prohibition of missionary and cultural-social activity by religious congregations. The Soviet Constitution (article 124) gives atheists freedom of anti-religious propaganda, but to believers it gives only the 'freedom to perform religious cult-practices' (while the first Constitution of the RSFSR, in the corresponding article, granted all citizens freedom of both religious and anti-religious propaganda).

The law on religious cults permits preaching on religious themes only in a prayer-house during a religious service. This in fact represents a ban on missionary work.

This ban specifically puts Christians in the position of having to break Soviet law, as nothing can compel Christians, even by force of law, to renounce one of the Saviour's most important commands: 'Go ye and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' (Matt. 28, v. 19).

At present, those who suffer most from the ban referred to are the Baptists and Christians of other denominations who carry out the greatest missionary activity; but in principle it applies to all Christians, and those of other faiths, who regard missionary work as a necessary precept and thus inevitably find themselves in conflict with the state.

In 1966 the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet issued a decree 'On the application of article 142 of the RSFSR Criminal Code', according to which 'the perpetration of deceitful activities with the aim of awakening religious superstitions in the population' is defined as a crime. The Commentary to the Criminal Code (also V. A. Kuroyedov in his article in Izvestia*) identifies such activities with acts of healing at holy places and with 'dissemination of rumours about the end of the world'.

In this connection the letter refers to the fact that, as early as 1918, Deputy People's Commissar of Justice Shpitsberg called for Holy Communion to be banned as 'an act of sorcery'.

'As for the "rumour" about the inevitably approaching "end of the world", or more precisely, the Second Coming of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the whole Christian Church has persisted in disseminating this rumour ... for almost 2,000 years.'

The authors consider the fourth essential characteristic of the religious situation in the USSR to be the discriminatory nature of the education system and the ban on organized forms of private religious instruction and education.

The saturation of compulsory school courses with atheist content is traumatic for religious pupils and gives rise to sharp conflicts within the school.

'The inclusion of atheism and atheist propositions in the compulsory curriculum of educational institutes ... cuts off the path to higher education for religious believers.'

The 1974 Law on National Education lays down that parents must bring up their children in the spirit 'of high communist morality'. Certain interpretations of this law make it possible for parents who give their children a religious education to be deprived of their parental rights.

On the other hand, private religious education of minors by anyone other than their parents is a crime, under the provisions of article 142 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

The logical conclusion of the letter from Yakunin and Regelson is as follows: if the Law on Religious Cults were to be applied in full, religious life in our country would be impossible. However, the actually existing legal restrictions are sufficient for one to speak of the absence of religious freedom in the USSR.

At any moment the law could be used to revive the persecutions of 1918-23, the 1930s and 1959-64. To normalize the relationship between religion and the state, it would be necessary to reform the Law on Religious Cults radically.

A New Way of Fighting against Religion

On 14 July 1976 Alexander Alexandrovich Argentov (born 1951) was summoned to the military registration and enlistment office of the Tushinsky district of...
Argentov had never been registered as a psychiatric patient before.

On his arrival at the clinic Dr Alexander Ivanovich Mazikov told Argentov that the only reason for his hospitalization as a psychiatric patient was his religious belief. While in the hospital he was not allowed to have any visitors, not even on the holy days of the Orthodox Church. On 25 July a letter was sent to V. A. Kuroyedov, Chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs attached to the USSR Council of Ministers. The letter pointed out that the USSR Ministry of Health’s Directives of 26 August 1971 do not apply to the case of Argentov; the letter stated: ‘We, the undersigned, have known A. A. Argentov well for a number of years and consider it our duty to declare that Argentov is mentally healthy and that his forcible confinement to a psychiatric hospital because of his religious beliefs is unlawful and inhuman.’

Argentov’s parents, convinced atheists, have written a declaration to the head doctor of the hospital, insisting on the complete mental health of their son and asking for his release.

On 21 July Alexander Argentov appealed to Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and all Russia: ‘Your Holiness, please intervene on my behalf! ... And if you cannot speak up for me, at least bless in silence my sufferings for the faith.’

On 25 July a letter was sent to V. A. Kuroyedov, Chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs attached to the USSR Council of Ministers. The letter pointed out that the USSR Ministry of Health’s Directives of 26 August 1971 do not apply to the case of Argentov; the letter stated: ‘We, the undersigned, have known A. A. Argentov well for a number of years and consider it our duty to declare that Argentov is mentally healthy and that his forcible confinement to a psychiatric hospital because of his religious beliefs is unlawful and inhuman.’

Argentov’s parents, convinced atheists, have written a declaration to the head doctor of the hospital, insisting on the complete mental health of their son and asking for his release.

On 21 July Alexander Argentov appealed to Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and all Russia: ‘Your Holiness, please intervene on my behalf! ... And if you cannot speak up for me, at least bless in silence my sufferings for the faith.’

On 25 July a letter was sent to V. A. Kuroyedov, Chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs attached to the USSR Council of Ministers. The letter pointed out that the USSR Ministry of Health’s Directives of 26 August 1971 do not apply to the case of Argentov; the letter stated: ‘We, the undersigned, have known A. A. Argentov well for a number of years and consider it our duty to declare that Argentov is mentally healthy and that his forcible confinement to a psychiatric hospital because of his religious beliefs is unlawful and inhuman.’

Argentov’s parents, convinced atheists, have written a declaration to the head doctor of the hospital, insisting on the complete mental health of their son and asking for his release.

On 21 July Alexander Argentov appealed to Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and all Russia: ‘Your Holiness, please intervene on my behalf! ... And if you cannot speak up for me, at least bless in silence my sufferings for the faith.’
The authors of the letter suggest to the authorities a different solution: to issue 29 of the Bulletin of the Council of E C B Prisoners’ Relatives release and exculpate the prisoners and to stop persecuting believers. Then the Council of Prisoners’ Relatives would automatically cease to function.

and Podgorny. The letter states that the persecution and threats directed against activities, criminal charges would be brought against them.

On 6-9 February 1976 a conference of the Council of E C B Prisoners’ Relatives took place in Voroshilovgrad. Constant surveillance was maintained on those who took part in the conference and the house where it was held.

On 9 February at Voroshilovgrad airport Antonina Antonovna Senkevich was searched before boarding an aeroplane bound for Kiev. Tape-recordings, some religious pamphlets and copies of declarations from believers to the government were confiscated from her.

On the evening of the same day some Baptist women were standing at a tram stop in Voroshilovgrad. Under the eyes of a policeman some unknown men snatched from them a bag containing documents belonging to the Council of Prisoners’ Relatives and a typewriter. The thieves hid in a yard. Later an official version emerged: the lost bag had been discovered in the automatic luggage room at Voroshilovgrad station. Now it is in the care of the KGB.

In May the KGB and the Procurator’s Office interrogated the following persons in various towns in the Ukraine: Ekaterina Shevchenko, Tatyana Shovgan, Alexander Kuzmenko, Nina Andriychenko, Galina Rytikova, Valentina Kokurina, Alcvalina Pugacheva and others. They were all accused of participating in the ‘slanderous’ activity of the Council of E C B Prisoners’ Relatives, by compiling petitions and producing its Bulletin.

During interrogation the women were warned that, if they did not cease their activities, criminal charges would be brought against them.

On 29 May 1976 the Council of Prisoners’ Relatives sent a letter to Kosygin and Podgorny. The letter states that the persecution and threats directed against the council will not lead to the results desired by the authorities — there will be new prisoners, new relatives, and new petitions from a re-constituted council ... The authors of the letter suggest to the authorities a different solution: to release and exculpate the prisoners and to stop persecuting believers. Then the Council of Prisoners’ Relatives would automatically cease to function.

On 29 May 1976 the Council of Prisoners’ Relatives sent a letter to Kosygin, Secretary of the Council of Churches, was sentenced (Chronicle 35). His sentence aroused massive protests in the USSR and abroad and attracted public attention to the position of the Council of Churches of the E C B.

Also in 1975, the authorities themselves offered many congregations the opportunity to register, on condition that they did not declare their affiliation to the Council of Churches. Many of the congregations which decided to register soon felt themselves subject to unacceptable state pressure. Some of them began to take back their declarations.

Councils which refused to register were subjected to fresh repressions.

On 29 May 1976 the Council of Prisoners’ Relatives released and exculpated the accused and stopped persecuting believers.

On 9 February at Voroshilovgrad airport Antonina Antonovna Senkevich was searched before boarding an aeroplane bound for Kiev. Tape-recordings, some religious pamphlets and copies of declarations from believers to the government were confiscated from her.

On the evening of the same day some Baptist women were standing at a tram stop in Voroshilovgrad. Under the eyes of a policeman some unknown men snatched from them a bag containing documents belonging to the Council of Prisoners’ Relatives and a typewriter. The thieves hid in a yard. Later an official version emerged: the lost bag had been discovered in the automatic luggage room at Voroshilovgrad station. Now it is in the care of the KGB.

In May the KGB and the Procurator’s Office interrogated the following persons in various towns in the Ukraine: Ekaterina Shevchenko, Tatyana Shovgan, Alexander Kuzmenko, Nina Andriychenko, Galina Rytikova, Valentina Kokurina, Alcvalina Pugacheva and others. They were all accused of participating in the ‘slanderous’ activity of the Council of E C B Prisoners’ Relatives, by compiling petitions and producing its Bulletin.

During interrogation the women were warned that, if they did not cease their activities, criminal charges would be brought against them.

On 29 May 1976 the Council of Prisoners’ Relatives sent a letter to Kosygin and Podgorny. The letter states that the persecution and threats directed against the council will not lead to the results desired by the authorities — there will be new prisoners, new relatives, and new petitions from a re-constituted council ... The authors of the letter suggest to the authorities a different solution: to release and exculpate the prisoners and to stop persecuting believers. Then the Council of Prisoners’ Relatives would automatically cease to function.
extend it even further ...' (Judge Makarychev).

* * *

On 2 May Pyotr Zimens (Chronicle 37) was arrested. On 9 October he was sentenced to 3 years in ordinary-regime camps under articles 130, part 2, and 170-1 of the Kazakh SSR Criminal Code (equal articles 142 and 190-1 of the RSFSR Code), by an assizes session of the Kokchetav regional court; the presiding judge was Katayeva.

A letter from 78 Baptists describes the circumstances of Zimens's arrest and trial. Zimens was charged with the fact that there were minors among the fellow-believers who gathered at his home on 1 May. During a search, religious literature was confiscated, whose contents — in the opinion of the investigators — were libellous and anti-Soviet. (An expert witness discovered anti-Soviet expressions in the Bible, for example.) Not one witness agreed that Zimens was guilty. (In the words of the letter's authors, the guilt of Zimens is the guilt of any believer.) Zimens is not allowed a Bible in his camp (institution OK-160/1, Granitey settlement, Kokchetav region). During a visit by Zimens's parents the administration forbade them to talk to their son in German. In 1976 he was deprived of visits for six months (Bulletin 30, 33).

* * *

On 28 December 1975 a prayer-meeting in Voroshilovgrad was dispersed by force. This was organized by Major L. G. Klochan, deputy police-chief of Kamenobrodsk district in Voroshilovgrad, and Captain Zarubei. A letter signed by 56 Baptists states:

The Major was reminded that an agreement had been signed in Helsinki, guaranteeing us freedom of religious assembly and binding the representatives of authority to respect our rights and ensure their observance. Klochan asked, 'And who signed this agreement? Who read this agreement? Were you there?' He received the reply, 'The Helsinki Agreement was signed by Brezhnev. We read it in the newspaper. This is all rubbish!' retorted student of law Major Klochan. 'Rubbish? The agreement is rubbish? Brezhnev's signature — rubbish?' — the believers were angry. 'Yes, rubbish!' Klochan affirmed (Bulletin 30).

Anna Nikiforovna Sklyar (settlement of Gogolevo, near Mirgorod) was working as a watchwoman when she was told by the authorities: 'Go to the party district committee and say you'll stop going to prayer-meetings, or we'll sack you.' She refused and was sacked (Bulletin 29).

The agronomist Semyon Georgievich Apostu (village of Trusheny, Strashechersky district, Moldavian SSR) was sacked after being told: 'We don't need any...

* * *

religious agronomists' (Bulletin 29).

A complaint from driver of the first class A. N. Shchubinin (town of Izhevsk) describes how the administrative authorities tried to bring about his dismissal 'at his own request' and how, when they did not obtain his resignation, they sacked him anyway, in October 1975. 'During the whole of this time KGB officials Colonel N. F. Shklyayev and Captain L. P. Lukin would not leave me alone; they tried in every way to persuade me to co-operate with them, promising me an annual holiday in a rest-home. But when I refused to work for them, they began to threaten me, and I have to put up with this to this day' (Bulletin 30).

Lena Savchenko from Omsk tried unsuccessfully to apply for a course in accountancy, and was turned down because of her faith. She handed in an application for a training course as a cook, but as soon as it was discovered that she was a believer, her application was returned to her (Bulletin 29).

Ulyana Sergeevna Germyanyuk (town of Lisichansk, Voroshilovgrad region), a qualified doctor, was forced to work as a cleaning-woman and watchwoman; she was also sacked from her job as a watchwoman (Bulletin 29).

Zinilda Kozakova (town of Nikolayev, Ukrainian SSR) was sacked from a factory. She went to a lawyer and received this advice: 'You have only one choice — to renounce God' (Bulletin 29).

* * *

A large part of Bulletin 32 consists of rebuttals of the article written by V. A. Kuroyedov, Chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs attached to the USSR Council of Ministers, on 'Soviet law and freedom of conscience' (Izvestia, 31 January 1976). This section includes ten letters, carrying in all 1,234 signatures. The authors of an Open Letter from the settlement of Budy in Kharkov region (signed by 683 people) disprove Kuroyedov's assertions with many examples. In answer to his words 'In the USSR there are no lists or population statistics indicating religious affiliation', they quote extracts from a Directive by secretary Kashin of the executive committee of Oktyabrsky district soviet in Kharkov to the chairman of a Local Factory Trade Union Committee:

In order to check up on the observance of the law on religious cults, we request you to draw up lists of religious believers working in your enterprise...

All the letters reject Kuroyedov's allegations about G. P. Vins.

Christians of the Evangelical Faith ('Pentecostals')

Kaluga region. After I. P. Fedotov, the leader of the local congregation, was arrested and sentenced (Chronicle 36) persecution of the Pentecostals who have split away from the registered Baptist congregation has not ceased. In the autumn of 1975 administrative commissions in Obninsk and Maloyaroslavets fined 14 believers 50 roubles each — for holding an unregistered assembly in the
village of Filatovo on 28 September 1975.

At one hearing of an administrative commission Alexander Ivanovich Pypkov, a resident of Obinsk, was promised that he would share 'Fedotov's fate'. Fedotov himself is serving his 3-year term of imprisonment in an ordinary-regime camp in Penza. At the beginning of 1976 the camp administration applied to a court for permission to transfer Fedotov to a settlement, in view of his exemplary behaviour and the lack of any complaints about him. The Oktyabersky district court in Penza, under presiding judge Pertseva, refused this application. The court expressed fears that Fedotov would exert a negative influence on those around him.

Vinnitsa. On 15 June 1975 Aleksandr Ivanovich Yurenchuk held a prayer-meeting for her 90-year-old mother in her home. Soon the police arrived, led by deputy district chief N. K. Nesterchuk. The mistress of the house was fined 30 roubles; her four guests were fined 25 roubles each.

Berdichev. I. P. Botsyan, presbyter of the unregistered Pentecostal congregation, has been fined more than once. In the autumn of 1975 the local press devoted a series of articles to the activity of this church ('Stop these Shameful Activities' — in the newspaper Sovetsky Put, 16/9/75; 'Oily Words and Black Deeds' — in the newspaper Sovetskaya Zhitomirshchina, 19/9/75). KGB representative N. V. Dyakin is threatening presbyter Botsyan and deacon Durspek with prison terms if the congregation is not registered.

Stavropol territory. In December 1975 presbyter Pavel Vasilevich Syakov (from Inozemtsevo) was warned that he was being fined for the last time and would be put on trial in future.

Zhitomir region. In the village of Fedorovka, Malininsky district, funerals have been broken up on three occasions. In the village of Sopentsy, Baranovsky district, there was a case of a religious wedding ceremony being broken up.


Zhitomir region. Pyotr Zalesky is serving his term in strict-regime camp IV 301/81. Dmitry Khodakovsky is in strict-regime camp YuYu 309/71.

Zhitomir. Stepan Danylovych Demyanchuk belongs to the local (unregistered) congregation. During the war he worked as an interpreter for the Germans and left with them. He settled in Belgium. A Soviet representative persuaded him to return to his homeland, promising him a pardon. In the U S S R Demyanchuk was sentenced to death; after he had spent two months in a death-camp the sentence was commuted to 15 years' imprisonment. In prison Demyanchuk became a believer. As a result he got 5 years' exile on religious charges.

At the beginning of 1976 pressure on the congregation increased. The news-paper Sovetskaya Zhitomirshchina published an article on 'The God behind whom a Murderer Shelters'. The paper alleges that S. Demyanchuk participated in executions. At the end of January, speakers at a large assembly demanded reprisals not only against Demyanchuk, but also against the other Pentecostals.

On 1 February another article was published in Sovetskaya Zhitomirshchina.

A new criminal case has been brought against Demyanchuk, for war crimes. The congregation has been asked to register. It has been given three months for reflection.

Events in Lithuania

(According to information from the Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church numbers 22, 18/4/76, and 23, 18/6/76.)

On 28 November 1975, after a football match in Vilnius which the local team 'Zalgiris' had won, a crowd of 2,000 marched twice round the stadium and headed for the town centre, chanting 'Zalgiris' and singing Lithuanian songs. After going down the main street, the demonstrators surrounded the block which contains the KGB building. They were dispersed with the aid of troops which were specially summoned. Some of the participants were arrested.

* * *

After a Radio Vatican broadcast about the persecution of the folk-song club in Vilnius, Lithuanian radio began to give out daily announcements about the club's activities. When people who turned up for non-existent events because of these announcements began to express their annoyance, the false announcements had to be stopped.

At the beginning of May, Daunoras, an administrator at the Vilnius House of Trade Unions, suggested to club members Aldona Katkauskaite and Virgija Adamantiene that they should write an article denying the assertions made by Radio Vatican; he promised to supply the club with costumes for concerts and to allow it to participate in the Baltic folksong festival. They refused.

* * *

The Lithuanian village of Smilgiai (Belorussian S S R) was visited by ethnographers from Vilnius. The local inhabitants listened with pleasure to Lithuanian songs and stories about Lithuania and eagerly bought Lithuanian books.

An official of the village soviet turned up and asked the ethnographers for their passports. Then, threatening them with arrest, he told them 'not to arouse nationalist feelings' and go away.

Taliznka, the chairman of the village soviet, forcibly confiscated cameras.
from two girls taking pictures of old buildings, and exposed the film.

... 

In May, Jadvyga Petkevičienė, a nurse at Šiauliai maternity home, was taken off the Kaliningrad-Moscow train in Vilnius by KGB officials led by Major I. Markevičius. When she was searched (according to a statement by Major Markevičius, they were looking for anti-Soviet literature), nothing was found. Major Markevičius questioned Petkevičienė as to why she was visiting Moscow, reproached her for being present outside the courtroom during the trial of Kovalyov, and for meeting the ‘Muscovites’. After the search and the ‘talk’, Petkevičienė left for Moscow on the next train.

... 

Vidmantas Povilonis, who returned in March 1975 from the camps of Mordovia, obtained a job in September. Soon he became a senior quality-control engineer. In March the management told Povilonis that, at the request of the KGB, he was being dismissed, as a person who had no right to be in authority over others (there is an old note in his work-book: ‘Dismissed at the request of the KGB from the Lithuanian branch of the All-Union Research Institute for the Butter and Cheese Industry’).

... 

On 9 April 1976, the Kaunas KGB returned to Monika Gavenaitė (Chronicle 35) some of the books confiscated during a search on 26 November 1974. When she asked for the return of The Great Crossroads by B. Braždžionis, Problems of the Lithuanian Character, the KGB official replied that these were political in content.

... 

In a declaration dated 15 February 1976, addressed to Brezhnev and Kosygin, priests of Vilnius archdiocese ask once again (see Chronicle 40) for Bishop J. Steponavičius to be allowed to resume carrying out his duties.

... 

In February 1976, at an all-republic atheist seminar in Vilnius, the participants were informed that the Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church is edited by Bishop Steponavičius, who lives in exile (in Zagare), that some of its issues are not criminal in nature, and that the Chronicle of the LCC is brought out in a small edition inside Lithuania itself, but is duplicated in Poland.

... 

During an interrogation at the local KGB headquarters, Šukys, the chairman of the Salos church committee, was accused of working for the Chronicle of the LCC.

... 

On 9 September 1975 a cemetery chapel in the Agailiai woods, recently restored by the local inhabitants, was destroyed. Its destruction was overseen by Beržinis, deputy chairman of Šiauliai district soviet executive committee.

... 

When E. Gelambauskienė refused to pay 50 roubles for the destruction, against her will, of a cross she had put up beside her house (Chronicle 40), the administration department of the district soviet executive committee brought charges against her. In court it turned out that not one of the 400 workers employed by the Department had agreed to destroy the cross, so that it had been necessary to employ ‘drunks from the streets’ for this work and to pay them whatever they asked for fifteen minutes’ work (50 roubles).

The Chronicle does not know how the trial ended.

... 

On 10 March 1976 police officials detained the priest Juozas Zdebskis (Chronicles 21-24, 27, 32, 36, 37) while he was driving through Vilnius. In the psychiatric hospital on Vasaros street, where he was taken by the police, his pulse was taken and a report was drawn up, alleging that he was slightly drunk. In spite of insistent requests by Zdebskis, they refused to do a blood test on him. Zdebskis was fined and deprived of his licence for 18 months.

Protests have been written by 5 priests, by Zdebskis’s parishioners (318 signatures), by Vytautas Vaičiunas, and by Zdebskis himself. All these declarations emphasized that Zdebskis is a complete teetotaller.

... 

In a declaration dated 15 February 1976, addressed to Brezhnev and Kosygin, priests of Vilnius archdiocese ask once again (see Chronicle 40) for Bishop J. Steponavičius to be allowed to resume carrying out his duties.

... 

At the beginning of 1976 the inhabitants of the village of Didžiasalis invited their parish priest, Father K. Garuckas, to visit their homes. On 25 February Garuckas fulfilled their request.

On 3 March he was invited to the district soviet executive committee, where deputy chairman A. Vaitonis and KGB district chief Paukevičius told him that priests are not allowed to visit believers in their homes. When asked to point out the law relating to this, Vaitonis took out a piece of paper, but would not allow it to be reproduced or even to be read properly. Paukevičius also threatened to deprive Garuckas of the right to conduct services for three years.

... 

The Pasvalys district paper Darbas reported on 13 May 1976 that the Com-
mission to Check on the Observance of the Laws on Religious Cults had
‘warned’ Father Z. Uldavinys about organizing religious teaching for minors
and about the fact that minors often serve in his church during services.

In the hospital of Biržai, on 3 January 1976, Doctor Janulis told the patient A.
Norkute, ‘As you invited the priest to visit you yesterday, Chief Doctor
Dauguvičius has ordered you to be discharged.’

And although her health had grown worse, they stopped her treatment
and sent her home. On the very same day, Miss Norkute sent a telegram to
the Minister of Health. The next day, a doctor visited Norkute and continued
her treatment at home. On 12 January Norkute thanked the Minister in a special
letter.

In the town of Taurage, Montvilas, a newspaper vendor, sold a number of
Christmas cards reproduced as photographs. He was sacked.

In Kaunas, A. Patackas, a Candidate of Physics and Mathematics and a lecturer
at the Agricultural Academy, has been retired early because of ‘religious
prejudices’.

On 16 February 1976, the anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian inde-
pendence (1918), pupils of Veisiejai school were present at a liturgy requested
by their parents in the church at Šlavantai. When the pupils returned to
Veisiejai, they were grabbed by the school’s headmaster Stabinis and two
teachers, who made the children go to the school and write explanations. At the
same time the children were threatened with some sort of ‘electric shirts’.

The next day three investigators arrived at the school. The children were
interrogated about what they said to the priest during confession. Statements
were wrung from them, alleging that the parish priest of Šlavantai had said dur-
ing his sermon, ‘Long live independent Lithuania!’

As a result of threats and intimidation, some children wrote what was dictated
to them. 14-year-old Gintautas Soroka was beaten up by investigator
Zinkevičius. When he left the office, he tried to commit suicide.

The parents of pupils at secondary schools in Veisiejai and Liepalingis have
sent a protest about what occurred to the Procurator of the Lithuanian SSR.

At school 41 in Vilnius the teacher Janina Petkevičienė took a diary away from
her pupil Simonaite and gave it to the headmaster. From the diary it became
clear that the girl was a believer. Headmaster V. Banevičius told Simonaite to
answer his questions truthfully, as a believer should not lie. He asked her which
church she went to, which priests she saw there, whether the priest gave away
money, where she bought a prayer-book, and so on.

In the school in the town of Sausava on 24 April the teacher Zimantiene, in
questioning pupil E. Navikaite of class 10 about her homework, demanded that
the girl should list the surnames of pupils who accompanied her in the Easter
procession. When the girl refused, she gave her a ‘one’ (the lowest mark). She
explained to the pupil’s mother: ‘We need this for atheist propaganda.’

In the town of Taurage, Montvilas, a newspaper vendor, sold a number of
Christmas cards reproduced as photographs. He was sacked.

In Kaunas, A. Patackas, a Candidate of Physics and Mathematics and a lecturer
at the Agricultural Academy, has been retired early because of ‘religious
prejudices’.

On 16 February 1976, the anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian inde-
pendence (1918), pupils of Veisiejai school were present at a liturgy requested
by their parents in the church at Šlavantai. When the pupils returned to
Veisiejai, they were grabbed by the school’s headmaster Stabinis and two
teachers, who made the children go to the school and write explanations. At the
same time the children were threatened with some sort of ‘electric shirts’.

The next day three investigators arrived at the school. The children were
interrogated about what they said to the priest during confession. Statements
were wrung from them, alleging that the parish priest of Šlavantai had said dur-
ing his sermon, ‘Long live independent Lithuania!’

As a result of threats and intimidation, some children wrote what was dictated
to them. 14-year-old Gintautas Soroka was beaten up by investigator
Zinkevičius. When he left the office, he tried to commit suicide.

The parents of pupils at secondary schools in Veisiejai and Liepalingis have
seen the section ‘Arrests, Searches and Interrogations’.

Tverdokhlebov in Exile

On 1 June Andrei Tverdokhlebov was taken to his place of exile — the settle-
ment of Nyurbachan in Yakutia — and there released by his escorts. So the end
of Tverdokhlebov’s ‘term’ will be in the second half of January 1978.

It is 15 kilometres from Nyurbachan to the district centre of Nyurba. Aero-
planes from Yakutsk and Mirny fly to Nyurba. Tverdokhlebov’s postal address
is: 678266, Yakutskaya ASSR, settlement Nyurbachan, ul. Pushkina 1.

Tverdokhlebov is employed as a worker in a sawmill.

On 26 June Tverdokhlebov’s brother-in-law Alexander Shuster set off to spend
his holiday visiting him. While waiting in Mirny for a flight to Nyurba, Shuster
stopped at a hotel. The aeroplane to Nyurba was due to take off early in the
morning of 27 June. At 2 or 3 o’clock in the morning the other occupant of Shus-
ter’s room and a friend of the latter’s who had come to visit him, offered to drive
Shuster to the airport. However, the private car which they rented from the hotel
drove off in the opposite direction to the airport and stopped at the police
station. Policemen with handcuffs came out of the police station and headed for
the ‘room-mate’s friend’ (it later turned out that this was Guliyev, chairman of
the All-Union Volunteer Organization in Support of the Army, Air Force and Navy in the town of Chernyshevsk). He started a fight with the police. He was dragged out of the car and taken into the police station; Shuster and his 'room-mate' were also asked to come inside. Guliyev and Shuster were locked in cells. Shuster's 'room-mate' disappeared and Shuster did not see him again. In the afternoon of 27 June Shuster was taken to a court and sentenced to 15 days under the Decree of Petty Hoooliganism. The police, when asked what he was 'guilty' of, gave different replies to different people: insulting behaviour to the police, resisting the police, taking part in an affray. For the first five days after being sentenced, Shuster went on hunger-strike. He was released on the evening of 11 July. (Guliyev was fined by a judge for his participation in the same 'incident'.)

On 9 July Tverdokhlebov was taken off work at the sawmill and sent, almost by force, to take part in hay-mowing 20 kilometres from Nyurbachan (on that day Tverdokhlebov's mother and stepfather were flying to Mirny). When he discovered that there was to be no hay-mowing activity because of weather conditions, Tverdokhlebov returned to Nyurbachan on foot. On 11 July (a Sunday) the police drove up from Nyurba, dragged Tverdokhlebov (alone!) out of a local wedding and declared him to be slightly drunk. On 12 July Tverdokhlebov was again sent off to mow hay. Because, as before, there was no hay-mowing going on, Tverdokhlebov returned once more to Nyurbachan.

On 15 July he finally met his relatives.

**Arrests, Searches and Interrogations**

**Yakutia.** On 22 June 1976 Pavel Bashkirov, an official of the Museum of Fine Arts in Yakutsk, was arrested in Nyurbachan.

In December 1975 his flat had been searched (without a warrant) and he had later been interrogated (without a record being made) (see Chronicles 38, 39).

On 11 May Bashkirov was taken by force to meet Deputy Procurator Demin of the Yakut ASSR, who read him a 'Warning' according to the well-known Decree. Bashkirov refused to sign the record of the 'Warning'. While Bashkirov was with Demin someone broke down the door of his flat.

On 22 June Bashkirov flew off to visit Tverdokhlebov. When he got out of the aeroplane in Nyurba he was detained by local police officials, who searched him, confiscated some samizdat and let him go. Half-an-hour after he arrived at Tverdokhlebov's, Pavel Bashkirov was arrested.

Bashkirov was taken to Yakutsk; he faces charges under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

**Moscow.** In April Eduard Paltsev, head of the photo-laboratory at the Advanced Training Institute for Doctors, was arrested on a 'currency' charge. During a search of his office safe a microfilm of the Gulag Archipelago had been discovered.

During a search at the home of cameraman Vyacheslav Egorov a copy of the Gulag Archipelago was found which had been printed from this microfilm.

Paltsev and Egorov were confronted with each other.

Paltsev's case is being conducted by Moscow KGB officials Mokhlov and Sorokin.

**Odessa.** On 16 June 1976 police officials carried out a search at the home of Vasily Vladimirovich Barladyanu. In the search warrant its aim was stated to be the confiscation of falsified documents belonging to V. M. Goncharov.

The following were confiscated: a student card and work-book belonging to Viktor Mikhailovich Goncharov, three officially stamped forms from Odessa University, five diploma forms from Odessa University, a photocopy of Solzhenitsyn's novel Cancer Ward, three photocopied pages of Solzhenitsyn's article 'Live not by Lies', four photographs of Solzhenitsyn, Barladyanu's own articles 'For and Against', 'A Story about the Life and Thoughts of Outcast Intellectuals' and 'No Compromises', his poems, religious literature, two books by Berdyaev, and the collection of essays From the Depths (Iz glubiny).

V. V. Barladyanu is a Moldavian, 37 years old, and an art expert. At the beginning of 1974 he was expelled from the party. In May 1974 he was dismissed from his post as head of the fine arts section at Odessa University and from the post of lecturer in ethics and aesthetics at Odessa Naval Engineering Institute. He is now working at the Museum of Fine Arts.

In 'An Appeal to the whole Christian world, to all people of goodwill', dated 17 June 1976, Barladyanu writes: 'In analysing the works of K. Marx and his followers, I came to the conclusion that I and those like me have been deprived of all human rights, merely because we cannot and do not want to become rootless, because we are not able to renounce our national treasures, our relics, the history of our peoples, whose children we are...'
Not long before this search, Viktor Goncharov had been arrested. Just before that, a case belonging to him was confiscated from the automatic left-luggage lockers at Odessa airport. Goncharov has apparently been charged under article 194 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian S S R (‘Forgery, production or sale of forged documents’)...

Barladyanu’s friends are being summoned for interrogation.

* * *

Dnepropetrovsk region. On 15 June at the farm of Izhevka a search was carried out at the home of Aleksei Ivanovich Tikhy. Handwritten material on the history of the Ukrainian language was confiscated. According to unconfirmed reports, after the search Tikhy was detained and given a ‘Warning’ according to the Decree of 25.12.1972. A. I. Tikhy served a term in the past under article 58 of the old code.

* * *

Riga. On 28 June a search was carried out, in connection with a case being investigated by the Moscow Procurator’s Office, at the home of former political prisoner Viktors Kalninš (a co-defendant of Gunnars Rode, he served 10 years under articles corresponding to articles 64 and 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code). Samizdat was confiscated, in particular Solzhenitsyn’s Letter to the Leaders. The next day, Kalninš was summoned for interrogation. He was asked about certain Moscow acquaintances; inquiries were made as to where he obtained the confiscated books and ‘who has more such books?’ Kalninš refused to answer these questions, stating that he knew ‘the difference between a witness and an informer’.

On 15 July another search was carried out at the home of Kalninš. His personal papers were confiscated.

On 30 July there was a search at the home of former political prisoner Valdis Zarins (who served 7 years for ‘anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda’). Manuscript copies of his poems, stories and plays were confiscated, together with his personal archive, notebooks and books published in Latvia before 1940.

On the same day a search was carried out at the home of former political prisoner Gunnars Freimanis (who served a 5 year sentence). Handwritten copies of his poems were confiscated.

At the end of July four people were interrogated about ‘literary evenings in their homes’.

* * *

Kaunas. During a search carried out by the K G B on 4 May at the home of sculptor Rimantas Sultskis, a copy of the Gulag Archipelago was found. When

[*This is the heading of article 196. Article 194 concerns slightly different offences.*]

interrogated, Sulskis said he had found the book on the street. Investigator Marko Blas warned Sulskis that if he wanted to exhibit his work and indeed to have the opportunity to continue working, then the search that had taken place must not be publicized abroad.

* * *

Leningrad. On the night of 24-25 May at the police station of Leningrad’s ‘Pulkovo’ airport, Ernst Orlovsky, the Leningrad mathematician and specialist on patents, and a member of the Soviet group of Amnesty International, was subjected to a search on his arrival from Moscow. Various samizdat documents were confiscated, also a short summary of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, a handwritten list of leading members of the All-Soviet Communist Party (Bolsheviks), and a detective novel in English. All the confiscated material was described as anti-Soviet in the search record.

The search was carried out without a warrant being shown and without any spoken explanations whatever. The man conducting the search showed an identity card in the name of police Major I. A. Ivanov; however his name did not appear on the search record. On 28 May Orlovsky sent a declaration to the Leningrad Transport Procurator, protesting against the actions of those who had searched him, and asked for criminal charges to be brought against I. A. Ivanov.

* * *

Moscow. On 26 June 1976 a man in civilian clothes came up to Zviad Gamsakhurdia in the metro, and after showing him a document told him to accompany him to police station 11. There two officials told Gamsakhurdia that he had been detained because he had ‘hit an old lady in the metro’; they took his brief-case away from him and confiscated the third volume of Solzhenitsyn’s Gulag Archipelago, The Adventures of Private Ivan Chonkin by Voinovich, five issues of Kontinent and other items; also articles and declarations by Gamsakhurdia himself.

A few hours later T A S S reported Gamsakhurdia’s ‘act of hooliganism’ to foreign news agencies.

On 30 June Gamsakhurdia went to police station 11, as he had been promised that some of the confiscated material would be returned to him. However, nothing was returned, and in an ‘explanatory talk’ he was advised to leave Moscow as soon as possible.

Gamsakhurdia has been subjected before to similar searches in Moscow (Chronicle 37).
On 25 May 1976 the Supreme Court of the RSFSR considered the appeal in the case of Mustafa Dzhemilev (Chronicle 40) and upheld the sentence passed by the Omsk regional court.

On 25 June Dzhemilev was sent from Omsk prison to a camp in Khabarovsk territory.

* * *

On 18 June an expert commission from the Serbsky Institute declared V. Ya. Moroz mentally healthy (see Chronicle 40).

On 1 July Moroz arrived at Camp 1 in the Mordovian complex (the special-regime camp).

Vladimir Prison

In May Yakov Suslensky was again put on the hospital regime. His state of health is very bad — he suffers from a vascular heart condition and has a duodenal ulcer. During a visit from his wife Suslensky told her that he had no hope of living to see his release (his term of imprisonment ends in January of next year) and asked her to write a plea for a pardon on health grounds.

On 26 June Suslensky's wife sent a declaration to the Main Medical Department of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, describing her husband's state of health and asking for his release.

* * *

Gabriel Superfin was transferred to the strict regime for three months at the end of May. His health seems to have got worse.

* * *

N. Budulak-Sharygin's health is very bad. He has frequent heart attacks. Letters to his wife in England complaining about his health have failed to reach her. Last summer Budulak-Sharygin wrote a declaration addressed to Kosygin. As he is a British subject, he asked that English doctors should be allowed to see him.

Budulak-Sharygin was deprived of his status as an invalid of the second group (Chronicle 39) immediately after this declaration. At the same time he was quickly discharged from the prison hospital.

The prison governor told Budulak-Sharygin: 'Our doctors weren't allowed into Chile and we won't allow yours in here.'

* * *

Chronicle 40 reported the conversation between the mother of Alexander Sergienko, Oksana Meshko, and a tubercular specialist in the medical department of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, concerning the health of her son. At that time she was told that A. Sergienko was receiving treatment with medicines.

It has become known that in April 1976 a special session of the Work Fitness Medical Commission removed Sergienko, who suffers from focal tuberculosis, from the dispensary list.

On 20 June, during a routine visit to Sergienko by his mother, his wife and four-year-old son, a man in M V D uniform, who knew Ukrainian, was present in addition to the woman supervisor: apparently he had come specially for the visit. The two supervisors often interfered in the conversation.

Sergienko's prison term is due to end in December 1976. He wants to request that he should not be sent back to camp 36 but to some other camp. The administration at camp 36, particularly Lyapunov, had acted in a hostile manner towards him.

After the visit to her son O. Ya. Meshko again had a talk in Moscow with Popov [deputy-] head of the medical department at the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and chief tubercular specialist Starikov. She demanded that they review the decision to take her son off the dispensary list, suggesting that they ask for his medical history from the Kiev K G B (Sergienko's medical history was removed from the tuberculosis clinic after his arrest — Chronicle 38).

On 25 June O. Ya. Meshko appealed in a letter to Amnesty International and the Committee in Defence of Human Rights in Frankfurt-on-Main. She asked for intervention, support and help.

* * *

There is evidence that Vasily Fedorenko is in a dangerous state of health. He is on hunger-strike, demanding the repeal of his sentence.

* * *

On 24 February Nikolai Bondar began a campaign of civil disobedience in solitary. He announced his renunciation of Soviet citizenship and his intended boycott of the Soviet government, including the prison administration. On the same day Bondar went on hunger-strike.

* * *

G. Davydov was in the cooler for 30 days, from 14 April to 13 May. B. Shakirov spent 25 days in the cooler (11 April-6 May). A. Safronov spent 15 days there (14-29 April). V. Abankin, after spending 15 days in the cooler (26 March-11 April, Chronicle 40), ended up there again on 14 April. This time he came out on 14 May.

* * *

From May this year it has been allowed, in Vladimir Prison, to wear a cross round the neck.
The Mordovian Camps

Camp 19
At the beginning of February 1976 Vladimir Osipov was summoned for a talk with KGB officials. Osipov said then that it was the first and last time he would talk to secret policemen. On 9 April he was again summoned for a talk. Osipov refused to go. He was asked for a note of explanation. Osipov wrote a declaration to the commander of camp 19, N. S. Pikulin, in which he explained that he refused to meet the KGB because he had described incorrectly a number of incidents in his case.

On 2 March the camp commandant Shorin announced that 150 works by Shabatura, which had earlier been confiscated during a search, had been burnt. On 16 March Shabatura went on a hunger-strike which lasted for 12 days.

Camp 19
At the beginning of April the 50-year-old prisoner R. Konchur stumbled over a bolt sticking up from the workshop floor, fell and hit his head on a machine. The doctor, Seksyasov, refused to go into the work-zone. Konchur was carried out to the medical post. Two hours after his fall Konchur died.

In the winter of 1976 Povilas Stonkus died at work. Stonkus was born in 1906 in Lithuania. He took part in the post-war Resistance movement. In 1967 Stonkus was arrested and sentenced to 15 years in camp.

Cheremukhin, who had cancer of the liver, was recommended for release by a commission, but they did not release him quickly enough — he died in camp.

Irina Senik was put in the cooler on 14 March. The reason for this was her conflict with the camp authorities, who refused to pass on to her the journal Foreign Literature.

On the day that I. Senik was taken to the cooler she had an attack of high blood pressure.

Irina Stasiv-Kalynets has appealed to the United Nations in a number of declarations, asking to be taken under UN protection. The declarations have been held back by the camp administration.

Nadezhda Usoyeva (Chronicle 38) has been transferred back to the camp from a woman's prison in Belarus.

Since October 1975 Nijole Sadunaite (Chronicle 37) has been ill. She spent December 1975 and February 1976 in the hospital.

Camp 1 (special regime)
Trofim Shinkaruk was sent to Vladimir Prison from the camp in June.

In July 1976 Bogdan Rebrik was beaten up. He did not obey an order to transfer to another cell (with criminals) and asked that the order be officially confirmed. The guards threatened to put him in solitary, then called officer Kolesichenko and began to beat him up. Kolesichenko held Rebrik by the throat while senior warder Glinov beat him. Afterwards Rebrik was put in solitary for 15 days.

A number of political prisoners declared a hunger-strike in protest, demanding Glinov's removal and asking that Kolesichenko be punished.

At the end of May 1976 Ivan Gel [in Ukrainian — Hell] went on hunger-
strike. His hunger-strike is known to have been still continuing at the beginning of August. Forced feeding takes place twice a week.

His main demands are: to allow representatives of the independent press and the International Committee of the Red Cross into the camp, and to grant a special statute for political prisoners. He also asks that prisoners should be given food of good quality (many prisoners suffer from diarrhoea and other illnesses of the stomach and intestine because of the low standard of food products). Gel is protesting against the endless humiliating searches, during which even letters which have already been censored are confiscated. He asks that he be given qualified medical assistance. (In the spring of 1976 Gel was put in the camp hospital, where the doctors came to the conclusion that his headaches were due to insufficient nourishment of the brain cells. However, they did not render Gel any medical aid. A parcel of medicines sent by Gel's wife was returned to her.)

Ivan Andreyevich Gel was born in 1937 in the Lvov area. In August 1965, while he was an evening student at Lvov University, in his sixth year in the faculty of history, he was arrested. Under articles 62 and 64 of the Ukrainian SSR Criminal Code (equals articles 70 and 72 of the RSFSR Code) he got 3 years in a strict-regime labour camp, which he spent in Mordovia. On 12 January 1972 he was arrested for the second time and got 10 years in special-regime camps,
5 Pavel Bashkirov of Yakutsk, imprisoned for 11 years after being found with samizdat on his way to visit Tvardokhlebov in exile (p 142). 6 Mikhail Neritsa, an artist and writer of Jelgava, Latvia, arrested for samizdat activity, but eventually released and not charged (pp 108-9). 7 Nikolai Ivanov, a Russian nationalist imprisoned 1967-73 and briefly again in 1976 (p 204). 8 Crowd at the funeral in Peredelkino of dissenting writer Konstantin Bogatyryev, murdered in circumstances suggesting official instigation (pp 274-5). 9 Writer Andrei Arnolik and his artist wife Gyuzel Makudinova in Moscow, later forced by constant harassment into emigration (pp 185-7). 10 Historian and dissenter Alexander Nekrich, also driven into emigration (p 186) in America. 11 Lev Rudkevich, Leningrad dissident harassed for samizdat activity and driven abroad (p 208 and Chronicle 45). 12 Ilya Levin, Leningrad linguist and dissenter briefly imprisoned (pp 198-200). 13 George Krimsky, American journalist harassed by the authorities (p 255 and Chronicle 45) and in 1977 expelled. 14 Efrem Yankelevich and his wife Tatyana Semyonova, forced by persecution (pp 181, 255 and Chronicle 44) into emigrating in 1977.
16-17 Views of Mordovian camp no. 19 in the settlement of Umorsky (also called Lesnoi). At top can be seen the two widely separated wooden fences and a construct project; centre a watch-tower and outer fence; below outer fence and camp buildings. 18 Another view of camp 19. 19 Kuzma Matviyuk, Ukrainian nationalist who served a 4-year term in camp 19 and was then released in unusual fashion (p 237). 20 Three Ukrainian national democrats, Kiev, c 1970: Vasily Stus, centre, transferred in 1976 to some camp (p 148); Ivan Svetlichny, right, held in Perm camp 35 (pp 73-4); and Ivan Gel, serving a 15-year term in Mordovian camp 1 (pp 149-50). 21 During Gel’s long hunger-strike in 1976 his wife Maria, seen here with their daughter, was interrogated intensively about how documents left the camp (pp 214-15).
Three political prisoners held in 1976 in Perm camp 35, and active in the camp resistance (pp 222, 233-4); 22 Evgeny Prishlyak (on right, with N. Gorbal); 23 Ivan Shovkovoi; 24 Yury Mashkov, who was twice sentenced for trying to leave the USSR (p 227). 25 Stepan Sapelyak, b 1952, Ukrainian nationalist who resisted intense pressure to recant (p 227). 26 Dmitry Demidov, b 1948, member with Shovkovoi of 'Union of Ukrainian Youth of Galicia'; sentenced 5 years (Chronicle 33). Held in Perm camp 36 (pp 73-4).

27 Vitaly Kalinichenko, Ukrainian given 10 years for attempt to escape abroad, released in 1976 after a psychiatric internment (p 166).

28 Ma-Khun, a Chinese arrested in 1972 and given 15 years for 'espionage'; case reviewed in 1976, sentence reduced to 3 years (pp 68-9).

29 Vasily Fedorenko, b 1928, a Ukrainian given 15 years for trying to escape abroad, on almost continuous hunger-strike in Vladimir Prison (pp 67-8, 214).

30 Alexander Argentov, member of unofficial Christian seminar, photographed in grounds of Moscow's mental hospital just after his forcible internment (pp 129-30).

31 Mass meeting Paris's Mutualité hall on 23 October 1975, which demanded freedom for Gluzman, Plyushch, and Bukovsky (Chronicle 38, p 105); after release, Plyushch expressed gratitude (pp 115-19).
32 A wing of the Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry, Moscow, where dissenters are often subjected to in-patient examinations lasting 1-2 months. 33 Another wing of the Institute, October 1973. On right is Dr Yury Novikov, head of the Information Section, who defected in 1977 (Chronicle 46).

34 2nd and 4th from left: Serbsky Institute director, Prof Georgy Morozov, and a senior psychiatrist, Dr Nikolai Zherikov, who ruled Yury Shikhanovich not responsible (Chronicle 30), with Finnish psychiatrist K. Achté and T. Pikhanen, 1973. 35 Raisa Moroz, who spearheaded the campaign to prevent the Serbsky from ruling her husband Valentin insane (pp 62-3), with their son. 36 Vyacheslav Ignunov, in Odessa, economist ruled not responsible by Morozov and others at the Serbsky (Chronicle 38) and interned (pp 42-56). 37 The special psychiatric hospital in Smolensk, opened in 1972 (p 160).
Front of Moscow city psychiatric hospital No. 5, known as Troitskoye and situated at Stolbovaya Station, 60 kilometres from Moscow. Section 7 of the hospital, for patients undergoing compulsory treatment. General Grigorenko, Pyotr Starchik and other dissenters have been held here.

Jewish procession led by Colonels Efim Davidovich right and Lev Ovsishcher to the ghetto area in Minsk on 9 May 1975, the 30th anniversary of the German defeat. Despite official opposition, a meeting was held to commemorate the 200,000 Minsk Jews murdered under the Nazis. Davidovich made a stirring speech (Chronicle 39). In April 1976, after constant official harassment, Davidovich died, aged 52. His body was viewed by many mourners (pp. 59-61).

The Crimean Tatar Tokhlu couple, with nine of their 12 children. In 1972 they moved to the Crimea, but met severe persecution (Chronicle 31). In 1976 Mrs Saria Tokhlu tried to protect some neighbours, but was knocked off her feet (p. 84).
49 One of the houses belonging to Crimean Tatars which were destroyed by the authorities in the Crimea in May-June 1976 (pp 83, 165-8). 50 Azat Arshakyan, b 1950, sentenced to 10 years in 1974 for his role in the National United Party of Armenia; in 1976 under pressure to recant (p 72). Released in 1977. 51 Antanas Terleckas, b 1929, defiant Lithuanian intellectual imprisoned 1956-60 and 1973-4 and barred from professional work (p 77-8), with his family.

52 A demonstration by Germans from Estonia outside the West German embassy in Moscow, 30 January 1974 (on similar demonstrations see Chronicle 32). The banners read: 'We Germans want to go to Germany', 'Freedom of Emigration', 'Help us to Leave the U S S R'. 53 Egard (Erhard) Abel, German welder from Karaganda given 3 years for his role in emigration movement, released in 1976 (p 241). 54 Fridrikh Shnarr (Friedrich Schnarr), German driver in Kazakhstan given 2 years in similar case, active again after release (p 172). 55 Pyotr Serebrennikov, b 1900, presbyter of a Baptist community in Azerbaidzhan, sentenced for fourth time — to 5 years and confiscation of his property (p 244). 56 Ekaterina Barina, Baptist from the Ukraine charged with organizing a Sunday school and sentenced to 24 years (p 244).
off to the woods (to join the nationalist partisans). He was one of the last to leave the forest life; in 1956 the authorities began to suggest that he should collaborate with them, but he refused and went to work on a collective farm. In 1968 Grabans was arrested and tried for treason. He was sentenced to 15 years. After he gets out, Grabans wants to go to Denmark, as he thinks that he will not be given a residence permit in Latvia.

* * *

Chronicle 40 reported that Gluzman and Kalynets had been sent to Perm for prophylactic talks. It has become known that they have been sent back to the camp.

* * *

Valery Marchenko's private meeting with his mother was interrupted eight hours after it began, for a search. In a bag belonging to Marchenko's mother they found the money for her return fare. Declaring that she had wanted to hand this over illegally to Marchenko, they ended the visit.

* * *

Camp 36

In March 1976 Sergei Kovalyov spent 17 consecutive days in the cooler. He got the first 10 days for 'drinking tea in a different section of the camp' (it was his birthday). He refused to go out to work from the cooler and was fed on the lowest ration norm — once every other day. Immediately after his release Kovalyov was given another 7 days in the cooler. He went on hunger-strike — 'because of this inhuman behaviour and infringement of legality'. During the hunger-strike Kovalyov began to go out to work, and after five days he ended the hunger-strike.

In May there was an attempt to persuade Kovalyov to write a plea for pardon. At the end of May, after being harassed over a number of small faults, Kovalyov was put in the cooler again.

* * *

Since 18 February (the anniversary of the uprising of the Dashnaktsutyun party in Armenia in 1921) Ashot Navasardyan has refused to go out to work or to obey the orders of the authorities. He is demanding that a referendum be carried out in Armenia on the question of legalizing the National United Party, of which he has declared himself a member. In addition, he demands that Armenian political prisoners should be held within the borders of their own republic.

In the spring Navasardyan was shut up in the cooler a number of times. A. Navasardyan's demands are those put forward by all the political prisoners who declare themselves to be members of the National United Party. In support of their demands they hold a one-day hunger-strike on the fourth of every month (the fifth in December).
In July Navasardyan was taken to Erevan. There he was allowed a meeting with his sister and taken to visit his home.

Letters and statements by political prisoners

From Igor Ogurtsov to the head of camp 35. Ogurtsov gives information in his statement about two false reports made against him and asks that these reports be removed from his file.

Bagrat Shakhverdyan: Statement to the supervisory commission of the Executive Committee of the Chusovoi Soviet of deputies.
Shakhverdyan writes about the tense relations which have developed between himself and the administration, and asks the supervisory commission to arrange a transfer to Vladimir Prison. Shakhverdyan argues his request in the words: "My nerves will not stand "re-education" as practised in camp 35."

Lyubarsky reports that Mikhail Makarenko is threatened with psychiatric internment because of his numerous complaints. Captain Doinikov, who is "in charge" of the political prisoners in Vladimir Prison, has said this openly and rudely more than once.
Lyubarsky recalls that Rogov, the prison psychiatrist, has several times discovered signs of psychiatric illness in political prisoners, usually not long before the end of their prison term. This happened to I. Ogurtsov, V. Merkushev, V. Berezin, L. Lukyanenko, V. Moroz and others. Threats of psychiatric treatment are the usual reaction to prisoners’ attempts to make complaints against the administration.

The author of the letter, who for many months shared a prison cell with M. Makarenko, considers him to be mentally healthy. He hopes that the support of his comrades in prison and the intervention of the Soviet and world democratic public will prevent the authorities from sending Makarenko to a psychiatric hospital.

On 10 December 1975 Kronid Lyubarsky sent the Swiss Fund for Freedom and Human Rights a letter of thanks for awarding him the fund’s prize for 1975 (Chronicle 39 [and Neue Zürcher Zeitung, Zürich, 25.11.1975]). Galina Salova, Lyubarsky’s wife, also thanked the society in writing.

In the Prisons and Camps

The Soviet political prisoners ask that a new form of strike be introduced in addition to the seven forms of strike described by the I.C.T.U.: ‘A hunger-strike is a strike.’ If a refusal to work is usually punished by administrative or judicial measures, the authors suggest that the following procedure should be established:
The striker should declare a hunger-strike. For the first three days he should continue to go to work, and then, while continuing the hunger-strike, he would be isolated in punishment cells and in this way released from work.
The authors recommend this method for people in a situation analogous to theirs. The authors of the suggestion are Gluzman, Kirend, Svetlichny and Shakhverdyan.

A telegram to the American people on Independence Day from political prisoners in the USSR.

Two hundred years ago the people of the English colonies in America proclaimed for mankind two fundamental principles of modern civilization — the right of every man to freedom, and the right of every nation to independence.
Neither barbed wire, nor sub-machine guns on sentry towers, nor guard-dogs, nothing can prevent us, political prisoners in the USSR, from being with you in spirit at this great moment in world history.
We wish for the American people the fulfillment of the aim set by the Founding Fathers — the creation of a brotherhood of free nations, a family of free peoples. P. Airikyan, A. Arshakyan, I. Gel, A. Navasardyan, V. Ovsienko, Z. Popadyuk, P. Paulaitis, E. Pashnin, G. Roote, S. Soldatov, V. Stus, M. Kheifets, V. Chornovil, D. Shamuk.

In Defence of Political Prisoners

Mikhail Bernshtam: Open Letter to Savinkin, the director of the Department of Administrative Organs of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee (10 March 1976).
Having described the situation in prison of Vladimir Bukovsky, the author comes to the conclusion that they want to destroy Bukovsky, but are not resolute enough to kill him openly and are acting according to the method ‘We won’t let him die, but we won’t let him live either.’ Therefore for fifteen months of the last two years they have been keeping the seriously ill Bukovsky under strict regime, on the edge of dystrophy.
‘Who acts like this? A powerful state? No! Neighbours in a communal flat, overflowing with spite but both helpless and powerless!’
Bernstam advises: 'If there is no longer the full resolve to commit evil dispassionately, it is time to retreat from killing people and simply imprison them.'

---

**Tatyana Velikanova, Malva Landia and Tatyana Khodorovich (25 May 1976):**

Appeal to public opinion about the situation of Soviet political prisoners.

The appeal contains abundant information about the punishments to which various prisoners in the camps of the Urals and Mordovia and in Vladimir Prison were subjected between May 1975 and April 1976. They name 19 political prisoners from Vladimir who were thrown into punishment cells during that time; 22 prisoners held under strict regime in Vladimir; 14 camp inmates who have been imprisoned in punishment cells; and 15 people who have been placed in camp coolers.

The authors want the Soviet camps and the prison in Vladimir to be inspected by an international commission.

---

**N. I. Bukovskaya, V. I. Isakova and G. I. Salova:**

Complaint to the Central Committee of the CPSU.

The mother of Vladimir Bukovsky, the wife of Georgy Davydov and the wife of Kronid Lyubarsky have sent a complaint about infringement of the right of correspondence to the Central Committee of the CPSU. A reply sent from the Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutes [MACL1] of the MVD reported that 'the overwhelming majority of letters addressed to Bukovsky, Lyubarsky and Davydov are handed over'. According to the figures of the MVD, during 'recent months', if one counts only registered and insured letters, the following numbers have been handed over: more than 70 to Lyubarsky, 30 to Bukovsky and 27 to Davydov.

'At the same time, during checking, certain cases came to light when letters arriving for the prisoners were, without sufficient foundation, not handed over, in connection with which appropriate instructions have been given to the administration of the prison.'

On the other hand, confiscated letters from the prisoners themselves 'contained inadmissible expressions'.

According to F. T. Kuznetsov, the deputy head of the MVD's [MACL1], who signed the letter, Bukovsky's state of health is satisfactory.

---

Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR: Their Treatment and Conditions.


This report, issued in London by Amnesty International, was prepared in the course of a dialogue between that organization and the Association of Soviet Jurists, which began in 1973 and continued during the World Congress of Peace-loving Forces [in October 1973 and a visit by a delegation from Amnesty's International Executive Committee] in July 1974 in Moscow. The theme of the report is not only the conditions of detention of political prisoners but also Soviet corrective labour legislation. The compilers also refer to the relationship between basic human rights and the international obligations of the USSR on the one hand, and the theory and practice of Soviet legal proceedings in 'political cases' on the other. A special section examines the subject of compulsory treatment in psychiatric hospitals.

These are the titles of the sections of the report:

1. Soviet criminal law and prisoners of conscience
2. Soviet corrective labour legislation
3. Maintenance of prisoners
4. Reform of prisoners
5. Relationship between prisoners and administration
6. Prisoners' states of mind
7. Compulsory detention in psychiatric hospitals

The report is packed with facts whose reliability is supported by numerous references (including many to the Chronicle of Current Events). Dozens of political prisoners are mentioned by name in the report, and as a rule there are quite detailed accounts of their 'cases' and their situation. In the introduction Martin Ennals, the Secretary-General of Amnesty International, writes:

Representatives of the Association of Soviet Lawyers were shown an advance copy of this report at an international conference of lawyers in Algiers in April 1975. The draft typescript was then mailed to the chairman of the association, Lev Smirnov, in Moscow on 15 April. Mr Smirnov is also chairman of the Soviet Supreme Court. In a covering letter, Amnesty International indicated that it would welcome comments on the accuracy or interpretation of the facts in the report.

The Chronicle publishes in full Smirnov's reply (translated from English):

Association of Soviet Jurists
Moskva K-9
Prospekt Kalinina 14
27.8.1975

Dear Sir,

In connection with your letter dated April, 15th and so-called 'Report of Conditions of Detention of Prisoners of Conscience' We would like to acknowledge you that at we not eager to discuss about what you call a book.
and that is vulgar falsification and defamation on Soviet reality and socialist legitimacy.

Sincerely,

L. Smirnov, President of the Soviet Lawyers’ Association [*]

Releases

In March 1976 Vitaly Kalichenko (b. 1944) was released at the end of his sentence. He had served 10 years’ imprisonment under article 64 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR (‘betrayal of the motherland’) for attempting to cross the frontier. He was assigned to the town of Fastov, near Kiev.

In summer 1975 he was taken from the camp and moved around various hospitals: a month in a psychiatric block in Mordovia, a month in the Serbsky Institute, three months in the Sychyovka psychiatric hospital.

Kalichenko returned to the camp a month before his release. Until the end of February he was in quarantine, after which he was sent to the camp hospital. He was released straight out of the hospital.

In May 1976 Nadezhda Svetlichnaya (Chronicles 25-29) was released at the end of her sentence. A month before her release she was taken from the Mordovian camps and brought by aeroplane to her home region in Voroshilovgrad region, where she was held until the day of her release. They tried to persuade Svetlichnaya to remain there to live, but she is trying to obtain a residence permit for Kiev, where she lived until her arrest. Reports in previous issues of the Chronicle that Svetlichnaya’s sentence included 2 years’ exile are mistaken.

In the Psychiatric Hospitals

Chernyakhovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital

Kubyshkin is a worker from near Moscow, just over 50 years old. Previously he was charged under article 70 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR for ‘conversations’, was declared non-responsible and sent to the Leningrad Special Psychiatric Hospital. Now he has once again been ‘excused punishment’, and has been sent to Chernyakhovsk. This time he has been charged under article 70 for abusing the Soviet system during a quarrel with a neighbour in his house. Kubyshkin refuses to attend the commissions which review the possible discharge of patients.

Veniarnin Mikhailovich Moiseyev is a teacher from central Russia, aged about 50. In 1966 he went to the district committee of the party to ask for a flat. Receiving a rude refusal, he got excited and told them exactly what he thought of the party and party officials. After this a case was opened against Moiseyev under article 190-1. A commission of experts pronounced him non-responsible. Moiseyev has spent nine years in the special psychiatric hospital. During this time he has almost lost his sight.

Porosenkov has been in the hospital since 1974, also for ‘conversations’. At the beginning of the sixties, also, he spent some time undergoing compulsory treatment in connection with political charges. In the summer of 1975, while working in the hospital workshops, Porosenkov tried to throw himself under a lorry which was taking a load out of the workshop. After this he was put on a special regime and began to undergo intensive treatment.

Shaporenko, a resident of Bryansk, aged about 30. He landed in Chernyakhovsk in 1974 for distributing leaflets (article 70 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR).

Vladimir Shushenkov (born 1949). Former military pilot. In 1972, after a
stay in a psychiatric hospital, he was drafted out of the air force. Approximately six months later Shushenkov was arrested for ‘agitation’, declared non-responsible and sent to Chernyakhovsk.

Heino Jogeuma (born 1937), an electrician from Tallinn. Attempted to cross the border. His stay in the Serbsky Institute was reported in Chronicle 32. He has been in Chernyakhovsk since 1974.

Gleb Alexeyevich Bychkov, taxi-driver from Sochi, 50 years old. Arrested under article 190-1 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR for ‘conversations’. He was taken to Chernyakhovsk in 1972. It is possible that at the present time Bychkov has already been discharged.

* * *

In 1975 the following were discharged from the Chernyakhovsk special hospital:

Agafonov, a resident of Kaliningrad, arrested for circulating texts he had prepared himself, and distributing them in letters or putting them into post-boxes. He had spent more than five years in the hospital.

Vasily Gudilin, about 33 years old, a student at an agricultural technical college. He spent about seven years in Chernyakhovsk for damaging some political posters — he tore them and wrote something on them.

Leonid Krouchenko, an economist from Tallinn, had spent three or four years in Chernyakhovsk. He was accused of conducting propaganda in favour of war.

Chronicle 8 reported that G. Forpostov was held in Chernyakhovsk. Forpostov is a Pole who worked in Minsk as a lecturer. He was convicted of ‘betraying the motherland’ — attempting to flee to Poland. After spending eight years in a camp he was declared mentally ill and sent to Chernyakhovsk. He spent another seven years there, and was then released.

Sychyovka Special Psychiatric Hospital

(Corrections and additions to Chronicle 39)

On the list of people accused under political articles appears the name of A. Andreyev. After an unsuccessful attempt to cross the border he spent about six years in the Blagoveshchensk special hospital, ran away from it, was caught and transferred to Sychyovka. However, Andreyev was discharged from Sychyovka several years ago.

Boss is mentioned on the same list. His full name is David Yakovlevich Boss. He is a Volga German. In 1950 he was sent to the camps under article 58-10 and he has not been free since. Boss has been in hospitals for about ten years now, first in Kazan, then in Sychyovka. He refuses to attend commissions.

Nikolai Ivanovich Breslavsky (previously mentioned as Bzheslavsky or Broslavsky). During the war he served in Iran, and not on the Turkish border, as stated in Chronicle 39. Having crossed the border, Breslavsky lived in Turkey until the end of the war. The Americans handed him over to the Soviet authorities on the basis of the Yalta agreement. He was released from camp in 1956 and immediately went to the Turkish Embassy, hoping to receive an exit visa for Turkey. Breslavsky was arrested at the entrance to the embassy and after a short investigation was sent to a special psychiatric hospital. Breslavsky is now over seventy, and has a rupture and other somatic diseases.

Vitaly Kuzmich Bublik (his initials were given wrongly in Chronicle 39), born 1924, Ukrainian. During the war he found himself in occupied territory, and worked on road repairing and construction. After the war Bublik was convicted of ‘collaborating with the Germans’. He spent the years from 1944 to 1956 in imprisonment. Then he lived in Batumi. In 1959, at the first American exhibition in Moscow, he told an American correspondent about his fate. At the exit from the exhibition KGB officials detained Bublik and questioned him, and when he returned home to Batumi he was arrested and declared non-responsible.

Alexei Nikiforovich Kotov (mistakenly called Kitov in Chronicles 30 and 39) is an Orthodox believer. In all he has probably served more than 40 years of imprisonment for propagating religion, the last ten of them in psychiatric hospitals. In 1971 Kotov was discharged from the Vladimir regional hospital into the guardianship of Faina Nikiforovna Komarova, a cleaner in the hospital and also a believer. About a year later guardian and ward were arrested and both were declared non-responsible. (Komarova had not previously been on the psychiatric register.) Kotov was sent to Sychyovka and Komarova to Kazan.


Iosif Terelya. Chronicle 39 stated that he was first of all sentenced for Ukrainian nationalist propaganda. In fact Terelya was a common criminal, and was prosecuted on a ‘political’ charge only in 1969, for distributing leaflets. In 1975 Terelya was transferred to an ordinary hospital in Chelyabinsk.

Vladimir Grigorevich Titov, born 1937, from Kaluga region, arrived in Sychyovka hospital in 1973. He graduated from a KGB training school and held the rank of first lieutenant. He was arrested in 1969 and sentenced to 5 years under article 70 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR. At first he served his time in the Mordovian camps and in Vladimir Prison. In 1975 Titov was transferred to an ordinary psychiatric hospital in Kaluga (see Chronicles 30, 39).

Chronicle 39 gave an incorrect date for the transfer of Mikhail Kukobaka from Sychyovka to an ordinary hospital. This took place in 1974. In the Sychyovka special psychiatric hospital (not in Kazan, as was stated in Chronicle 39) is Andrei Matko, born 1950, a worker from near Moscow. He was arrested in spring 1975 as a member of a group intending to wage a struggle against the dominance of ‘Zionists’ in the country. In their opinion, Jews held all the responsible posts in the government and were firmly ensconced
in the government and the K.G.B. According to rumours, this group intended first of all to destroy the Moscow synagogue. Matko had been on the psychiatric register earlier. He was declared non-responsible by an expert commission in the Serbsky Institute.

It is possible that one of Matko's co-defendants was Alexander Yurevich Chernogorov, arrested on 28 April 1975 in the town of Murom. He was also declared non-responsible by an expert commission in the Serbsky Institute in spring 1975. The Chronicle does not know where Chernogorov was sent after the expert commission.

In Chronicle 39 Timokhin was mentioned among the prisoners in Vladimir Prison. His story was recounted inaccurately. Valiakhmed Khaidarovich Timokhin, a 28-year-old artist and restorer from Vladimir region, was arrested on 6 November 1975 in the town of Strunino. He was accused under article 70 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR with distributing leaflets in Zagorsk, Alexandrov and Strunino. In the name of a non-existent 'Society of Friends of Solzhenitsyn', these leaflets prescribed the creation of underground cells to overthrow the 'Brezhnev clique' and re-organize the life of the country on traditional Russian and Orthodox foundations. These cells were to orientate themselves simultaneously on Solzhenitsyn, the journal Veche and the NTS [People's Labour Alliance]. Timokhin's case was conducted by Major Pleshkov, a senior investigator of the Vladimir region K.G.B. Timokhin refused to give evidence. During the investigation he was held in Vladimir Prison. A local expert commission in December 1975, and then an expert commission at the Serbsky Institute in January-February 1976, declared Timokhin non-responsible. Recently he was transferred to the Sychyovka special hospital.

* Chronicle 39 named Bodanin and Uletsky among the prisoners of the Sychyovka Special Psychiatric Hospital [S P H] supposedly accused under political articles. Bodanin was in fact imprisoned for rape and murder, and in 1974 was transferred to an ordinary hospital. Uletsky was accused of enticing minors to drink. He himself considers that he was arrested for expressing his views on abuses of power by the authorities.

Zinovy Mikhailovich Krasivsky (Chronicles 27, 39) appeared on the list of prisoners in the Sychyovka S P H through a misunderstanding. He is in the special psychiatric hospital in Smolensk. He was transferred there in 1972 after being declared non-responsible.

Viktor Tselykh, a programme engineer from Krasnoyarsk, arrested, apparently in 1971, was in the same Smolensk S P H in 1974. He was incarcerated with duplicating samizdat literature. He refused to give evidence at his investigation and was declared non-responsible. It is not known at the present time whether or not Tselykh has been discharged.

Yury Belov (Chronicle 39) was recently transferred from the Sychyovka S P H to the Smolensk one.

* * *

About the medical personnel of the Sychyovka S P H
Department 4 of the hospital is renowned for the greatest cruelty towards patients. Recently it has been headed by Albert Lvovich Zelenyev. The former head of department 4, Major (Leonid) Lymants (in Chronicle 30 he was called Lyanin), has become the head of the hospital. It is said that he used to beat patients in his department with his own hands.

Doctors Viktor Ellimovich Tsuriev and Yuzef Kazimirovich But are also distinguished for their exceptional cruelty.

Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital
Pyotr Trotsyuk-Kozlyuk is about 50 years old, and was in the Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army. After the war he was sentenced under article 58 of the old Criminal Code to 25 years. Having served about half his sentence, he escaped from his camp. He spent about six years at liberty, worked, and got married. He has a child. One day an acquaintance of his recognized him in the street and informed on him. Trotsyuk-Kozlyuk was arrested once more and in 1962 sent to serve the rest of his sentence. Five years ago a case was brought against him under article 102 of the Criminal Code — 'premeditated murder with aggravating circumstances', as his [wartime] participation in terrorist activities of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists had been revealed. In 1972, at an expert commission in the Serbsky Institute, Trotsyuk-Kozlyuk was declared non-responsible and sent to Dnepropetrovsk.

Kazan Special Psychiatric Hospital
Lev Kindyev, a resident of Sakhalin, has been held here since 1972. He was arrested for attempting to cross the Turkish border.

As far as the Chronicle knows, in recent years there have not been trials at which people have been found guilty of terrorist activity. However, it is known that several people accused of terrorist activity have been declared non-responsible. Three such terrorists are held in the Kazan S P H. The Chronicle is naturally in no position to estimate the degree of their mental health, but considers it possible to report the facts known to it.

Nikolai Demyanov, born 1918, is an engineer from Moscow. He was arrested in connection with the fact that he had rented or bought a house on the Vnukovo highway and carried out earthworks from his house in the direction of the road. During a search of his Moscow flat a partly-made bomb was discovered. Demyanov was accused of preparing an explosion on a government route.

Amatoly Ilia, a Leningrader born in 1947, made an attempt on Brezhnev's life on 22 January 1969. For this Ilia came to Moscow, and after changing into a police officer's uniform, stood near the Borovitsky Gate of the Kremlin. When a cortège of the cars of state leaders returned from a ceremonial meet-
ing with cosmonauts and went past him. Il'in fired a revolver at the leading car. He slightly wounded a motor-cyclist and fatally wounded the chauffeur of one of the cars. Il'in was arrested on the spot.

A year or so later a report appeared in Izvestia [21 March 1970] to the effect that Il'in had been declared non-responsible. A. Snezhevoy, V. Morozov and G. Morozov took part in the psychiatric examination. In Kazan Il'in is held alone all the time, in complete isolation. He is being given large doses of neuroleptic drugs.

Pavel Kuznetsov, born in 1956, was at school in Moscow. Arrested in 1971, Kuznetsov and two of his friends had formed a 'terrorist group'. They got hold of a pistol and set fire to a propaganda centre — there were no casualties. They needed more weapons for further actions, 'in order to return fire if necessary'. Kuznetsov went to his teacher for military affairs and asked him to give him the weapon which he had in his study. The teacher, despite threats, refused, and was killed. Kuznetsov and both his friends were arrested under article 66 (terrorism) and declared non-responsible. One of them died in hospital and the other was discharged. Kuznetsov received and is still receiving large doses of neuroleptic drugs. Kuznetsov's group did not pursue any social or political aims; their 'activity' was apparently a means of self-assertion. Kuznetsov's case has been reported in the Soviet press.

The [Helsinki] Monitoring Group

The Group to Assist the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements in the U S S R, formed in May 1976 (Chronicle 40) by 11 participants in the movement for human rights in the U S S R, has in the two and a half months of its existence passed to the public and to heads of the governments which signed the Final Act of the European Conference five documents of information about violations by the Soviet authorities of its humanitarian articles:

1. On the persecution of Mustafa Dzhemilev (18 May 1976);
2. On infringements of contacts between people in the sphere of international postal and telephonic communications (27 May 1976);
3. On the conditions of imprisonment of prisoners of conscience (17 June 1976);
4. On separated families trying to be reunited (17 June 1976);
5. On repressions against religious families (17 June 1976).

In addition, members of the group have issued several appeals requesting the

---

formation of international commissions (in connection with items 1 and 3, and also in connection with Valentin Moroz being sent to the Serbsky Institute for a psychiatric examination). Each of the documents was signed by several members of the Group.

Before 1 August 1976, the anniversary of the signing of the Final Act, the group issued a document — 'An appraisal of the influence of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in regard to human rights in the U S S R' — signed by 9 of its members (L. Alexeyeva, A. Ginzburg, P. Grigorenko, A. Korchak, M. Landa, A. Marchenko, Yu. Orlov, V. Slepak, A. Shcharansky).

The general appraisal of the compilers of the report is:

The Soviet Government does not intend to fulfill its international obligations on human rights. As before, many hundreds of political prisoners are languishing in the prisons and camps.... The regime under which they are held has in some respects grown markedly more cruel in this year. The practice of psychiatric repression has not been condemned or curtailed. There have been no changes for the better, either on the issue of freedom to emigrate, or on the more private issue of reunification of families.... All independent sources of information are persecuted. All attempts to create associations independent of the leadership of the CPSU are persecuted.

The report notes that recently the reaction of the Soviet authorities to accusations of violating human rights has noticeably increased. This is explained by the coincidental effect of a series of internal and international factors: (1) the Soviet government undertook the obligations on human rights contained in the Final Act 'in exchange' for important political concessions by Western governments; this led to admittedly very tentative but nonetheless unprecedented attempts by the latter to insist that the Soviet government should implement the obligations it had accepted; (2) information persistently forwarded to the world public by members of the movement for civil rights in the U S S R had apparently 'begun to reach the consciousness of wide circles of Western society and even to exert an influence on the tactics of Western communist parties'. The compilers of the report write:

Further extrapolation on the basis of the experience of the last year seems to show that:
---
if the movement for civil rights in the U S S R could expand its work of informing people within the country and informing the West,
--- if at the same time the Western public... actively supported the move for human rights in the U S S R, then —
--- the Soviet authorities would be forced to moderate their repressive policy, and this would facilitate the implementation of democratic rights by citizens prepared simply to assert them. The small likelihood of such a
development should not check our efforts, since it is precisely these efforts which will increase the chances.

Official reaction to the European Conference evolved from energetic condemnation of the demand for 'the free exchange of people and ideas' before the Conference to completely ignoring the humanitarian articles of the Final Act immediately after it was signed. The cruel sentences against Osipov, Kovalyov and the members of the democratic movement in Estonia, the trials of Tverdokhlebov, Dzhemilev, Roitburd, Vinarov and Malkin, and of Igrunov were a 'demonstration of firmness'.

It was a blow against the human rights movement, an action to eliminate those sympathetic to it, and a testing of the state of Western public opinion after the Conference. In the case of a sluggish reaction from the West, the demonstration of firmness would have finally consolidated the Soviet interpretation of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act and the two-handed interpretation of the principle of non-interference in internal affairs which had already become habitual.

However, the growing attention paid by Western governments and public opinion to violations of human rights in the Soviet Union forced the authorities to make individual demonstrative concessions (the release of Plyushch and Naritsa, declaring Moroz sane, giving certain well-known activists in the Jewish movement permission to emigrate, and so on). At the same time repression continued, but the people rounded up were for one reason or another little known to the public. The report names eight people who have been arrested or subjected to psychiatric repression since the signing of the Final Act. It is emphasized that the Group does not have complete information and that this is probably only a small proportion of those who have lost their freedom in this time.

On the issue of emigration the maneuvering of the authorities followed approximately the same pattern: first of all the authorities simply ignored references to the humanitarian articles of the Final Act on the pretext that Israel had not signed it. Then the idea was put forward that the reunification of families would be resolved in accordance with the Helsinki Agreements, but proceeding from the fact that 'the interests of the state are above human rights'. Finally, in June, the head of the All-Union O V I R, Orlin, stated that permission to leave the USSR would be given strictly in accordance with the clause on the reunion of families in the Final Act, but that inasmuch as Soviet law considers families to be married couples and their unmarried children, permission to emigrate would be given only to those related in this way. Since then refusals because of 'insufficiently close relationship' have become as common a phenomenon as 'for security reasons' was earlier. In this way the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference has become a help in restricting emigration. Permis-

sion to emigrate for a few well-known activists and long-standing 'refuseniks' is merely a cover for the growing number of refusals.

A crude violation of the letter and spirit of the Final Act is a complex of measures undertaken by the Soviet authorities to make the circulation of information more difficult. In the first place this has affected political prisoners: a mass offensive was waged on their right of correspondence, under various pretexts their meetings with their relatives, already rare, were reduced in number, and searches and inspections during which all handwritten materials, including copies of complaints to official bodies, were taken away, became common occurrences.

One of the sources of scepticism regarding the future of human rights in the USSR is the absence of any kind of move to bring Soviet legislation into formal correspondence with international conventions on human rights', the authors of the report write. They cite as examples the following inconsistencies: (1) article 126 of the Constitution of the USSR, which requires that the guiding nucleus of all organizations of workers, both social and state organizations, should be formed by the C P S U; (2) article 52 of the Code on Marriage and the Family, which obliges parents to bring up their children in the spirit of the moral code of the builders of communism; (3) articles 70 and 190-1 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR, and the corresponding articles of the codes of the other union republics.

The basic difficulties of the Group's work, in the opinion of its members, are connected not only with receiving information on violations of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act, but also with passing on the Group's documents to the heads of the governments which signed the Final Act. No notifications have been received of the delivery of documents sent to the ambassadors of these countries in Moscow.

**Persecution of the Crimean Tatars**

Evictions

Chronicle 40 published a letter from R. Yunusova about the destruction of her family's home on 13 May. After this, Resmiye Yunusova, her husband Memet Seitveliyev and their paralysed child lived in a tent in their yard. On 3 June a group of policemen and vigilantes headed by Telny, the chairman of the village soviet and Sidorov, the secretary of the party organization of the collective farm, pushed the people by force into a bus, threw their belongings, now without owners, into two lorries (many things were broken or plundered), and drove them out to the steppe. The Seitveliyev family were able to return to their yard only two days later. On 15 June, with the help of others, they restored part
of their house. The next day the same Sidorov, with Plekhanov, the chairman of the collective farm, and Ruban, a Komsomol organizer, drove up a bulldozer and knocked the house down again. The Seitveliyev family is continuing to live in a tent.

* * *

On 4 June, in the village of Mazanka, Simferopol district, Shkvores (Chronicle 34), the chairman of the village soviet, Garanin, the chairman of the collective farm, and Sayarkin, a police officer, headed an operation to evict the family of Dilyaver Muradasilov (four people). They broke down the doors and dragged the people outside. Garanin ordered the bulldozer drivers to knock down the house, and promised them a reward, but they refused. The house was sealed. The family’s belongings were taken to the station, and Muradasilov was asked to dispatch them beyond the borders of the Crimea, but again the answer was no.

* * *

On 16 May Reshat Refatov and his wife Zekiye Mustafayeva and their two children (aged 2 and 5 years) moved into a house they had bought in the village of Pionerskoye, Simferopol district, and immediately applied to the village soviet and the police for official registration of their purchase and for residence permits. Denisov, the head of the district police, shouted at them: ‘You were thieves in Uzbekistan and now you come here to buy houses. This isn’t 1942, you know.’ On 18 May the Refatovs were summoned to the administrative commission of the district soviet executive committee, from where they were escorted to the village soviet, handed the money for the house, received from its former owner, and taken to the house, where police cars, lorries and a bus were already standing. Despite their request to allow the children to sleep in the house that night, Denisov ordered that the family be taken to the station immediately. Here they tried to make both Refatov and Muradasilov dispatch their belongings. On 20 May Refatov bought a partly-built house in the village of Khan-Dzham in Belogorsk district. On 17 June Refatov and his wife were summoned to the police, and while they were there a bulldozer and cars were driven up to the house and vigilantes were brought in. The operation was led by Piskalov, the deputy head of the district police, and Lieutenant Sinyagovsky, the head of the identity papers office. However, the people who had gathered did not let them pull down the houses and evict the Refatovs. Piskalov threatened: ‘We’ll make it worse for you than in 1944.’

* * *

On 18 June in Belogorsk district several raids were made at once on the houses of Crimean Tatars. In the village of Vishennoye, Muntyayev, the chairman of the village soviet, and a police officer, Samoilov, appeared together with vigilantes to evict Servet Mustafayev (a family of five). Mustafayev was able to break away and inform the Crimean Tatars in Belogorsk. A crowd gathered, and the operation fell through. In the village of Chernopole Russians, Ukrainians and Tatars jointly defended the family of Refat Kurtmezrov.

* * *

In the village of Podgornoye, Yakubovskaya, the deputy chairman of the village soviet, and a police officer, Prikhodko, deported the family of Dervish Asanov, with three young children, out to the steppe by night. The Asanovs did not find their belongings until the morning. They had been thrown down beside the road several kilometres from the place where they themselves were dumped. 1,800 roubles left in a cupboard were missing. The chairman of the collective farm on whose land the Asanovs had been dumped gave them two cars, and they returned home. D. Asanov’s eldest son is serving in the army in East Germany. He complained to the military authorities, and the political officer of his unit sent a letter to the district. It appears that this intervention had its effect.

* * *

On the same night of 18 June the police, with the help of Ponomarenko, the chairman of the village soviet, and Vorotilov, the party organizer of the collective farm, deported the family of Veis Faizullayev from the village of Divnoye to the steppe. A few days before the eviction, during the night of 12 June, shots had been fired at the windows of his house. Bullets struck the bed of Veis’s 70-year-old mother-in-law. The police chief, to whom Faizullayev took cartridge cases he had gathered from under the windows, refused to investigate the attack. 27 Tatars, inhabitants of the village, appealed in Faizullayev’s defence to the central and local authorities. Their letter said that Veis Faizullayev took part in the defence of Sevastopol, and was wounded, and that eight of his brothers were killed in action. Those who signed the letter are themselves living without residence permits and work, and are demanding that a commission be set up to investigate their situation.

* * *

The facts given above are set out in an ‘Appeal to all people of good will and to the progressive public’ signed at the end of June by 717 Crimean Tatars, and in numerous letters, complaints and declarations.

* * *

Similar actions continued in July. A document entitled ‘Information No. 237’ reports on events in the village of Voinka, Krasnoperekopsk district, where about 70 Crimean Tatar families are living, 31 of them without residence permits.

On 19 July a detachment of 12 policemen attempted to evict the family of
70-year-old Muradasll Akmollayev (his wife is 60 years old, and one of his two sons is an invalid), but neighbours obstructed the eviction. Women and children, with their belongings sat down in front of the lorries. Some people were observing the operation from a car standing some distance away. When the inhabitants of the village began to photograph them (and also the attempted evictions), the car disappeared.

On 21 July 80 policemen arrived in the village, and with them several ‘short-term offenders’ (all drunk) from the Krasnoperekopsk police detention cells — as a labour force. At every Crimean Tatar house a sentry was posted, and no one was allowed out into the street. In this way they succeeded in evicting the Akmollayevs. What happened to them subsequently is not yet known.

The village has been patrolled by police since 21 July. Four men who took part in the eviction of the residents on 19 July were gaoled for 15 days. They are: G. Ametov, S. Ametchik, A. Memetov and I. Karayev. They are also threatened with criminal prosecution. A few Tatars from among those with residence permits have been dismissed from work.

The district authorities have spread the rumour that in the Tatars’ houses, especially in the Akmollayevs’ house, they found weapons, and that the Tatars are connected with foreign intelligence services.

* * *

According to the ‘Information’ document, the chairman of the Krasnoperekopsk Town Soviet Executive Committee, I. A. Zadula, has said: ‘The Tatars will have some walking to do this year ... we won’t let them trade, we’ll cut off their water and electricity, we’ll knock their houses down, we’ll take their driving licences away.’ To the Crimean Tatars themselves he declared: ‘You’ve got the republic of Uzbekistan. Live there or go to Tartaria.’

In the market the Crimean Tatars’ fruit is confiscated, and for attempting to sell tomatoes in the market without having a residence permit, Amsaa Khalilova was arrested on 15 July for 7 days.

No Residence Permit — no Work

Many Crimean Tatars who have bought houses in the villages of the Crimean steppe (many houses are for sale here, there are not enough workers) write about this fact in their statements. In a letter to Brezhnev, Elmira Zinodinova describes the oppressions endured by her family for three years now. In September 1973 she was sentenced to 2 years’ deportation. In May 1974 the police took her out into the steppe. Her daughter, born on 5 September 1975, was given a birth certificate only eight months later. During elections for people’s representatives, she was arrested on 15 July for 7 days. When the inhabitants of the village began to photograph them (and also the attempted evictions), the car disappeared.

On 21 July 80 policemen arrived in the village, and with them several ‘short-term offenders’ (all drunk) from the Krasnoperekopsk police detention cells — as a labour force. At every Crimean Tatar house a sentry was posted, and no one was allowed out into the street. In this way they succeeded in evicting the Akmollayevs. What happened to them subsequently is not yet known.

The village has been patrolled by police since 21 July. Four men who took part in the eviction of the residents on 19 July were gaoled for 15 days. They are: G. Ametov, S. Ametchik, A. Memetov and I. Karayev. They are also threatened with criminal prosecution. A few Tatars from among those with residence permits have been dismissed from work.
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Trials

As before, administrative-judicial cases are being brought against Crimean Tatar families who have bought houses, and they end in a conviction under article 196 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian S.S.R. ('violation of residence regulations'). This type of case is described in detail in Chronicle 34 (the case of the Osmanovs and of the Abdureshitovs). However, in 1974-75 sentences of 'banishment' prevailed, whereas now it is imprisonment. On 13 May the Simferopol district court sentenced Musa Mamut to 2 years' imprisonment in a camp of ordinary regime, and his wife Zekie Abdulayeva to a suspended sentence of 2 years' imprisonment. Mamut and Abdulayeva have been living in the village of Donskoye since April 1975, and have three children. As soon as they moved into the house they had bought, the police took possession of the house's registration book and refused to deregister the previous owners. The charge at the trial concerned a serious violation of health regulations: seven people (five residents, plus two registered people) were listed in a house with a floor-space of 17 square metres. It was noted in the sentence as a circumstance aggravating guilt, that M. Mamut was not engaged in socially useful work (not having residence permits, Musa and Zekie could sometimes obtain only seasonal work). The regional court upheld the sentence. In her complaints Abdulayeva wrote that her father was wounded liberating the Crimea as a member of the 19th armoured corps, and that her husband has labour awards. In spring 1976 their 16-year-old daughter Dilyara Mamut was not given a passport. Major Denisov, the head of the District Department of Internal Affairs, replied to Dilyara's complaint on 28 June: 'In connection with the fact that your parents are not registered as residents in Simferopol district, documentation of you by means of a passport has been refused.' At the end of July, after repeated applications by Dilyara, she was given a passport, but without a residence permit. At the beginning of June Yakub Usmanov from the village of Shcherbakovo was sentenced to 1½ years' banishment. After the trial 40 Crimean Tatars, inhabitants of the neighbouring village of Nekrasovo, wrote a letter of protest to the first secretary of the Krasnogvardeisky District Party Committee, Kolesnikov. They wrote that 22-year-old Yakub Usmanov, having done military service, finished a lathe-operators' and fitters' course in Simferopol in 1975 and began to work in this line, but after a month he was refused a residence permit and sacked from his job. Having bought a house in Shcherbakovo, he

had, after the authorities had refused to register the purchase, fixed up a contract signed by witnesses. On 11 May Yakub was arrested. They offered to release him if he would sign a commitment to leave the Crimea, but he refused. The letter says that 'no one wanted to get to the heart of the matter, to understand the situation which had forced him to lose both his residence permit and his work.' The authors refer to an article in Izvestia describing an incident in England: the owner of a house who displayed a sign 'For Sale to an English family only' spent 45 days in prison. They go on:

We are full of pride for our socialist homeland. But seeing what lawlessness is being committed against Yakub Usmanov, we want to ask you, respected comrade Kolesnikov — surely in the Crimea it is not forbidden to sell houses to Tatars? But then why, at Usmanov's trial, did the judge put the following question to the former owner of the house: 'Why did you sell your house to a Tatar?' Why did the chairman of the Maryanovo village soviet tell Usmanov that Tatars here may not buy houses? Why are those people, who are grossly violating socialist legality, not subjected to any punishment? Why is Usmanov undergoing persecution and humiliation solely because he is a Tatar?

The district authorities promised to reply to the letter and arranged a meeting in Nekrasovo on 12 July. In their next statement, addressed to the Procurator-General of the U.S.S.R, to the party's regional committee and district committee, the inhabitants of the village write: 'Since it became clear that Yakub Usmanov would receive at the meeting no concrete explanation about the decision on his residence permit and the official registration of his house, we were compelled to leave the hall. We demand a cessation to the persecution of Yakub Usmanov's family because of his national affiliation.'

On 15 July Seit-Asan, Yakub Usmanov's father, was tried. He was sentenced to a 25-rouble fine. In the court-room they refused to hand him a copy of the verdict.

On 9 June a family from the village of Mazanka was tried, Lenura and Gulnar Bekirov and their 23-year-old daughter Shefika. Procurator Zubarev suggested the court should confine itself to fining them and give them work, but the judge, Roditeleva, gave the women suspended sentences of 2 years' imprisonment, and sentenced the head of the family to 2 years' imprisonment, commuted to forced labour on a construction site, an assignment by the Ministry of Internal Affairs. On 13 July the regional court upheld the sentence.

In the Bekirov family there are four more children, aged from 1 to 9 years, and elderly parents. Before the trial a local policeman threatened the Bekirovs: 'The elderly ones will go to an old people's home, the children to a children's home, and the adults to prison.'
On 9 July Enver Reshitov, born 1949, who had lived on the state farm Batalny since September 1975, was arrested and sentenced the same day to 14 years' imprisonment. His wife and 4-month-old baby were left at home.

* * *

Neighbours have defended Adzhimelek Mustafayeva, an inhabitant of Simferopol sentenced in autumn 1975 (one and a half months after her arrest) to banishment from the Crimea (Chronicles 37, 38). Twelve people (Russians and Ukrainians, judging by their surnames) wrote statements to the police in which, speaking very highly of Mustafayeva, they asked that she be given a residence permit. One woman wrote that she had known Adzhimelek’s family since pre-war times.

* * *

Novorossiisk. In school number 2 the geography teacher Ivanova (who is about 40 years old) asked about the national composition of Uzbekistan in a lesson in the 8th class. The pupils listed several nationalities. The teacher added: ‘The Crimean Tatars live there too. They did many bad things during the war, and in 1944 they were deported there. Now they are travelling to the Northern Caucasus, but the government will take measures to see that they are not admitted there.’ During break the children began to tease one pupil in the class, a Crimean Tatar girl, and reproach her for her nationality. She returned home in tears. The girl’s mother complained to the school’s party organization. She refused to talk to the teacher, as the party organization suggested: ‘That is beneath my dignity.’ The day after this conversation the teacher apologized when she came into the class.

In nearby towns and villages and in Novorossiisk itself live several tens of thousands of Crimean Tatars. Recently admission to Novorossiisk for Crimean Tatars has in practice been forbidden. Citizens who wish to sell their houses are called in and warned not to sell them to Crimean Tatars.

* * *

Taman. On 18 May, the anniversary of the deportation of the Crimean Tatars, a funeral banner was hung out on the highest chimney in the town — on the bakery. On that day many Crimean Tatars wore black arm-bands.

* * *

Samarkand. In December 1974 Aishe Seitmuratova wrote an application for reinstatement as a graduate student. A year later she received the following reply:

To the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Special Education of the Uzbek S.S.R., comrade G. A. Abdurakhmanov
Copy to Aishe Seitmuratova, living at Samarkand, Superfosfatny poselok, ul. Teatralnaya 8, kv. 1

Aishe Seitmuratova, a graduate student at the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek S.S.R., was dismissed from her postgraduate course on 18 June 1971 in connection with her arrest and sentencing to a term of 3 years, which was connected with her unstable moral and political behaviour. No more than three months remained until the end of her course of study.

At the present time Aishe Seitmuratova cannot be reinstated as a graduate student, since according to the new regulation ‘On the procedure for conferring academic degrees and academic titles’, confirmed by the USSR Council of Ministers on 29 December 1975 (number 1067), point 24 of section III states: ‘Academic titles may be conferred upon persons who have profound professional knowledge and scholarly achievements in a particular branch of knowledge, and a broad scientific and cultural outlook, and who are masters of Marxist-Leninist theory, have shown their worth positively in scientific, productive and social work, observe the norms of communist morality and are guided in their actions by the principles of patriotism and proletarian internationalism.’

Sh. Sh. Shaabdurakhmanov, Academic secretary of the Department of History, Linguistics and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek S.S.R.

The Emigration Movement of the Germans

In April and May 1976 about 600 Germans living in Kazakhstan and Kirgizia declared in writing their renunciation of Soviet citizenship and appealed for support in the matter of their repatriation to Chancellor Schmidt of the Federal Republic of Germany. After this about 200 people handed in their passports to local police stations. In the town of Issyk, Fridrikh Shnarr (Chronicle 32) and V. A. Klink (Chronicle 34), who had recently been released from camp, and the latter’s father, Artur Klink, did this. The Klinks were called to the Town Soviet Executive Committee with the aim of persuading them to take their passports back. Among those taking part in the conversation on the side of the authorities there were also Germans. An argument flared up, and during it the Klinks called one of them a ‘Judas’ and a ‘fool’. The Klinks were sentenced to 10 days’ detention ‘for petty hooliganism’.

* * *
In 1975 in Chuisky district, Dzhambul region, two families received permission to emigrate; about 30 families had applied for it.

On 1 June 1976 a search was conducted in the flat of Genrikh Davidovich Reimer in the town of Issyk, Alma-Ata region. After the search he was arrested and a charge was brought against him under article 170-1 of the Criminal Code of the Kazakh SSR (equals article 190-1 of the RSFSR Code). Officially the search was carried out in connection with a case brought in autumn 1975: Reimer, working as a superintendent, had at the request of a neighbour brought him some mortar from a building-site. In view of the insignificant amount of the loss (about 30 roubles) they had decided to close the case.

Reimer was suspected of organizing around him the Germans who wish to emigrate. He himself has already applied many times to emigrate to his relatives in West Germany. [See also Chronicles 42, 43.]

Konstantin Fridrikhovich Vukkert, who lives in the village of Novotroitskoye in Dzhambul region, has appealed in a letter to Brezhnev, Honecker and Schmidt, 'It is my deep conviction', he writes, 'that history has laid obligation and responsibility regarding the Germans of the USSR on the governments of three countries — the USSR, the GDR and the FRG.' Vukkert disputes the official Soviet view that the problem of the Soviet Germans is an internal matter of the USSR. He refers to precedents of states displaying concern for citizens of their nationality living in another country, and, in particular, to the Yugoslav past.

Appealing to Brezhnev, Vukkert writes: 'I am convinced that not a single honest, thinking Soviet German can consider as a genuine homeland a country which for more than three decades has so stubbornly refused to notice the problems of its German citizens, refused to defend them against insults and humiliation, refused to help them preserve their national distinctiveness.'

Vukkert thinks that, having refused to restore the Germans' autonomous republic, the Soviet government should extend them the right of emigration to the GDR or the FRG. This would also improve in a fundamental way the position of those Germans who wished to remain: it would lessen hostility and prejudice towards them among the population, and it would force the authorities to treat the Germans more sensitively; now they are regarded only as a reliable work force. Vukkert quotes the words of Mikoyan at a reception for a German delegation in 1965: 'Without the Germans it would be impossible to practise agriculture in the virgin lands.'

It turns out that the positive qualities of the Germans' national character have turned into a curse for them. If the government of the USSR considers that the Germans must work in reparation for the last war, why must they do so for ever? The Decree of 26 November 1948 states that the Germans are deported in perpetuity — in other words, only the Soviet Germans, who, as the Decree of 29 August 1964 admits, bear no responsibility for the last war, must endure this punishment. If payment must be made for the costs of the war, then it is you, Comrade Erich Honecker and Mr Schmidt, who must pay.

Appealing to Brezhnev, K. Vukkert expresses the assumption that his addressee will not want this letter to become the cause of its author perishing 'from the excessive efforts of agents of state security', who have already threatened him with criminal prosecution.

The Struggle of the Meskhetians to Return to Georgia

In 1944 300,000 Turks, or Meskhetians, were forcibly deported from Meskhetia (southern Georgia). Up to the present they are forbidden not only to return to their homeland, but also to register their names in their passports as either Turks or Georgians (they are registered as, for example, Azerbaidzhanis).

Chronicles 7, 9, 19-21 and 34 wrote about the struggle of the Meskhetians for their rights. In spring 1976 L. Abashidze (Ayubov) and A. Abassammedi (Iskanderov), representatives of the deported Meskhetians, arrived in Tbilisi and tried to be received by E. Shevardnadze, the First Secretary of the Party Central Committee of Georgia. Iskanderi, in charge of appointments, told them: 'Shevardnadze does not receive anyone to discuss matters concerning the national question. What does it matter where you live within the USSR? Does it make any difference where you are registered as in your passport? The national question in the USSR was settled long ago.'

On 26 June 1976 delegates from the Meskhetians arrived in Tbilisi once more. V. Alpenidze, E. Shevardnadze's assistant, said in a conversation with them on 28 June that Shevardnadze was unable even to pose such a question to Moscow, and advised them to try in Moscow to achieve their return to their homeland. (In Moscow, in the Central Committee of the CPSU and in the Supreme Soviet, they had regularly been told: 'Georgia must settle this matter itself.') On 2 July a Meskhetian representative was called in to the KGB, where Colonel Zardalishvili, the head of the ideological department, promised to give him a permit for a trip to Meskhetia. On the evening of the same day Georgian intellectuals arranged a large reception for the representatives of the deported Meskhetians — a dinner in the flat of the historian V. Rtskhiladze.

Early in the morning of 3 July the delegates who had arrived were detained 'on suspicion of speculating in carpets' and taken to a police station. At 4 p.m. they were all released, each having been ordered beforehand to write down
autobiographical details and to indicate his reason for coming to Tbilisi.

V. Alpenidze did not receive the delegates again, and the promised permits for Meskhetia were not given to them.

On 7 July representatives of the deported Meskhetians appealed to E. Shevardnadze in a letter, in which they asked him to provide a very swift solution to the question of the return of the Meskhetians to Georgia, and meanwhile: to allow the start of a mass acceptance of their children into Georgian boarding-schools and the acceptance of 10-15 Meskhetian school-leavers into Georgia's higher educational institutions; to invite lecturers on the history and culture of Georgia into the districts where the deported Meskhetians were living; and to send them documentary films about Georgia.

Simultaneously with this letter, Meskhetians deported to Central Asia, Azerbaijan and Kabardino-Balkaria sent a letter to the Group to Assist the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR. On the same subject the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in Georgia sent a letter to L. I. Brezhnev. Moreover, a member of the group, M. Kostava, in whose flat Meskhetian delegates had been detained, sent a letter to L. I. Brezhnev. He wrote:

I register a determined protest against the arbitrary action of the KGB, who have violated the sacred custom of hospitality, and I demand the return of my brothers — 300,000 Georgians — to their homeland, and that the nationality taken from them forcibly in 1944 be returned to them. I demand that the government of Georgia be accorded competence to resolve independently her own problems in the bosom of her people.

M. Kostava has also written a historical note, 'Meskhetian Turks or Meskhetian Georgians', in which he reports that 'Meskhetians are the oldest Georgian tribe' and that 'the linked use of the words “Meskhetians” and “Turks” is pure nonsense.' Kostava notes reproachfully that issues of the Chronicle of Current Events, and A. D. Sakharov in his book My Country and the World have made this mistake. The Chronicle is not competent in this historico-ethnographic problem, but it is known to the Chronicle that many representatives of this nationality call themselves (at least when speaking Russian) Turks (Turkish Meskhetians or Meskhetian Turks). This has served as the reason for the use of this name in the present issue.

In Pushkin House

Ilya Zakharovich Serman, doctor of philology, a senior research officer at the Institute of Russian Literature of the USSR Academy of Sciences (Pushkin House) has been dismissed.

At the end of 1975 Serman's daughter left the USSR. Soon Serman was excluded from the collective volumes of the Institute by a decision of the director's staff. Serman appealed on this issue in a letter to L. I. Brezhnev, and after a while an instructor of the District Party Committee explained to Serman that the actions of the directors' office had been correct.

On 29 March 1976 (two years before the prescribed time) Serman's reappointment was considered.

At a session of the academic council the acting director, F. Ya. Priima, stated that, in the opinion of the party group of the academic council, Serman could not occupy his post, as his daughter had emigrated to Israel. Priima added on his own initiative: 'Although his daughter's emigration was legal, it is incompatible with Serman's continuing with his ideological work (Serman is a historian of Russian literature of the 18th century — Chronicle). In a secret ballot Serman was not reappointed by a majority of 15 to 7.

Serman is 62 years old; in 1949 he was sentenced under article 58 of the old Criminal Code to 25 years, and in 1954 he was released and exculpated.

Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachev is an outstanding Soviet literary historian, the Director of the Department of Ancient Russian Literature in Pushkin House. 'Certain Western circles wanted to turn him into a dissident,' a KGB official stated to the Secretary of the Party Committee in Pushkin House, Khvatov.

In autumn 1975, on the landing of a staircase near his flat, a young man attacked Likhachev and beat him up viciously (he broke a rib). During the night of 1-2 May 1976 unknown people attempted to set fire to Likhachev's flat. When the local look-out system began to operate and neighbours appeared, the unknown people vanished, leaving on the landing a canister containing a gas mixture and a hose which they had been trying to push underneath the door. Moreover, the cracks around the door had all been filled with plasticine. A detachment of police, which arrived at the summons of a neighbour, began first of all, for some reason, to scrape off the plasticine.

After a month the investigating organs announced (as they had in the beating-up case) that the case was closed for lack of any evidence.

D. S. Likhachev is 70 years old. At the end of the twenties and the beginning of the thirties he spent several years [in captivity] on the Solovki islands and on the Belomor Canal. It is known that he refused to sign the academicians' letter against A. D. Sakharov.* Likhachev has spoken out many times in defence of monuments of Russian culture which are going to ruin.

* * *

Dmitry Sergeyevich
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Yakov Solomonovich Lure, a doctor of philology and a senior research officer at Pushkin House, was invited to go from his work to the KGB on 2 June, and from there was taken to his home, where a search was carried out. They were looking for anti-Soviet literature, but did not find any.

**Unofficial Entertainment**

On the wave of 'unofficial variety' of the sixties a club for unofficial singing was organized in Moscow in 1967 from a group of authors, singers and musicians (who often combined these roles).

Now, the Unofficial Song Club (USC) numbers about 200 group members (song clubs in higher educational institutions, schools, factories and even housing offices) and holds gatherings and contests near Moscow which attract thousands of participants.

The USC now has an artistic committee which operates under the aegis of the Moscow City Komsomol Committee and the Moscow City Trade Union Council, but at first, for several years, the Club was 'nobody's', although its board of its own accord suggested to the Komsomol that it should take it under its wing and give the club a more official character. This does not mean that in this period no attention was paid to the club by party and state bodies. Members of the USC were 'summoned', expelled from institutes (I. Boikov, chairman of the song club in Stankino), from the Komsomol (V. Abramkin, also a chairman in the Moscow Chemical-Technological Institute), and from time to time the activities of the USC in several institutes of higher education were forbidden.

The Moscow City Komsomol Committee 'legalized' the club in 1973. It is thought that the stimulus for this was the report on the activities of the USC given by a KGB representative at a plenary session of the Moscow City Party Committee.

In 1975, soon after the establishment of the above-mentioned artistic committee, disagreements and dissatisfaction arose in the board of the USC. One of the critics, V. Abramkin, left the board. In the autumn of 1975 he was called into the party committee of the institute where he worked and accused of frustrating the Komsomol's initiatives and permitting antisocial attacks on its Moscow City Committee. Also put to Abramkin at the party committee were such questions as: 'What is your attitude to Solzhenitsyn? To the policy of the party? Because of the disagreements in the USC board, in 1976 people began to hold 'mini-meetings', involving only some of the groups of the Club, and some groups decided to gather quite independently of the USC. These meetings, fixed on non-working days in some open space, were called by their participants simply 'Sundays'.

The day before the first 'Sunday', fixed for 1 May, V. Abramkin was summoned at work to the management, where two people from the KGB were waiting for him. They said that a statement had reached their organization from a number of comrades, and that these comrades had asked it to investigate Abramkin's 'anti-social activity'. The statement allegedly said that Abramkin was the chief organizer of an 'anti-social gathering' which was to take place on 1 May. The KGB officials refused to name these comrades or to show them the statements. They reminded Abramkin that he 'had already had a friendly talk with him' the previous autumn, and said that even then the KGB could have opened a criminal case against him, but had relied on his common sense. The KGB officers further demanded, threatening Abramkin with immediate dismissal, that he should promise not to participate personally in the 'Mayevka' and, also, to do everything he could to prevent it taking place.

Nonetheless, the Mayevka took place on 1 May. Several dozen people gathered in the forest near Pionerskaya station (on the Belorussian line). Among other things, a composition was performed which included fragments from Campanella's work *City of the Sun*, Korolenko's letters to Lunacharsky, the speeches of procurator Krylenko, and the songs of Galich. They also sang songs of their own composition.

At the end of May several people underwent investigation for this 'Sunday' in their party committees at work.

On 28 May Alexander Mirzayan, a research officer at the Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, was interrogated by the party organizer and another member of the party committee. They asked him where the 'anti-Soviet meeting' had taken place, and whether he had taken part in it. They asserted that, according to reports which had reached the party committee, Mirzayan was one of the organizers. Mirzayan replied that he had been invited to sing his songs, and that he was not an organizer of the meeting. The conversation lasted about half an hour.

Conversations about his songs had already been held with Mirzayan in the party committee of the Institute and in the Moscow City Party Committee.

On 29 May Valery Zhulikov was called in to the party committee of the Kommunar engineering works. They asked him where the 'anti-Soviet meeting' had taken place, and whether he had any proclamations been read out, and whether the 'Sundays' had anything to do with religion.

On 31 May a conversation was held with Ekaterina Goldanshak, who works at the Moscow electro-mechanical factory. They suggested that she occupy herself with unofficial artistic performances in the factory and join the party.

[*A Mayevka was a pre-revolutionary illegal May-day meeting.*]
Reports had reached the party committee about the 1 May meeting, they told her, saying that she was one of the organizers.

During April-May 1976, KGB officials talked more than once with Vitaly Akelkin, a participant in the mini-meeting. (Akelkin is the leader of the ‘Altruists’ group and one of the active organizers of the USC.) They proposed that Akelkin tell them about Abramkin’s activity, about the reasons for Abramkin’s leaving the USC, and about his, Akelkin’s, personal disagreements with him. They also asked whether Abramkin had given him anything to read. They asked him to answer the questions in writing.

The following ‘Sundays’ were held on 23 May and 20 June 1976. About 200 people gathered at each. Before the concert on 20 June, those who had gathered were informed about the conversations mentioned above. After this a document called ‘Information about the “Sundays”’ was read out. The necessity for the ‘Information’, in the words of those who read it out, arose because the Sunday meetings had evoked a number of wrong interpretations. It was said that the ‘Information’ was a sort of summary opinion of some of those who had gathered in no way bound together the other participants in the meeting.

The contents of the ‘Information’:
— The ‘Sundays’ are intended for informal creative contacts which are fully independent.
— They are not an obstacle, despite the accusations already brought, to the initiatives of the Moscow City Komsomol Committee: the ‘Sundays’ are not held on the same days as large meetings.
— In view of the fact that the ‘Sundays’ have already been called ‘anti-Soviet demonstrations’ and ‘antisocial gatherings’, it is essential to state that the Sunday meetings do not have a political character, in no way contradict existing laws, and do not obstruct the work of official organizations.
— The ‘Sundays’ are not an organization (there are no leaders, regulations or permanent membership).
— Anyone who wishes to can perform any artistic item at the ‘Sundays’, and the degree of participation of each person in the ‘Sundays’ is defined exclusively by his personal actions; thus he cannot be seen as a co-participant in anything at all and cannot bear responsibility for another people’s actions.
— All participants in the ‘Sundays’ are reminded of the necessity of a considerate attitude to nature.
— In view of all these things, in the event of any actions subsequent to the above-mentioned conversations which have the aim of bringing the ‘Sundays’ to an end, it will be difficult to consider such actions as anything other than illegal persecution.

The concert began at 12 o’clock and continued until six o’clock in the evening.
Ginzburg saw for the first time testified that he had spent the night in the cottage.

The same day, A. D. Sakharov sent the Barvikhin police station a protest against the two 'illegal and unfounded detentions' of A. I. Ginzburg.

The statement ends: 'These actions are a form of persecution not only of Ginzburg, but of me personally.'

Leningrad. On the morning of 6 April, the day when Tverdokhlebov's trial should have taken place but did not (Chronicle 40), an inscription appeared on the conservatory building, 'Freedom for Andrei Tverdokhlebov!' By evening the inscription had been painted over. The same day a train drove around Leningrad bearing the inscription 'Freedom for Andrei Tverdokhlebov and all political prisoners!'

Klaipeda. On 14 June, the anniversary of the self-immolation of R. Kalanta (Chronicle 29), slogans demanding freedom for Lithuania appeared on the streets of the town, on the pavements and on the walls of houses. Under the slogans was the signature: 'Kalanta'.

Tbilisi. For the third year in a row now, Komsomol officials have appeared in the Church of St George on Easter night (Chronicles 29, 34). This time the Young Communists stopped young people leaving the church and took them to the headquarters of the volunteer police, wrote down their names and their place of work, photographed them and threatened them with expulsion from the Komsomol and administrative punishment at their workplace.

In a conversation with M. Kostava, a member of the Group for the Defence of Human Rights in Georgia, I. Chelidze, the First Secretary of the Kallnin District Komsomol Committee stated: 'This is not the result of orders from higher organs, but only the personal initiative of the Young Communists. We are taking church attenders to our headquarters in order to ascertain the psychological and ideological mood of the masses.'

The Italian newspaper Corriere della Sera [4 May 1976] published an interview with A. Chakovsky, who was in Rome on an unofficial visit. The Polish weekly Polityka (number 22, 29.5.76) published some of Chakovsky's replies in an article entitled 'On Translations, Dissidents and the Historic Compromise'.

On being asked on the basis of what principles the selection of Italian literature for translation was made in the U S S R, the editor-in-chief of Literaturnaya gazeta, remarking that his reply was valid for all foreign literature, replied:

The chief principle is the artistic value of the work. However, this is not a complete answer. It would be silly to hide the fact that we willingly publish the works of writers who are close to us; but at the same time we also publish the works of writers who do not share our views, but who honestly and objectively reflect the life and problems of their peoples. Everyone knows how far from communism Alberto Moravia is, at least from our point of view, but we translate him, just as we have translated Mauriac, Graham Greene and even Albert Camus and Heinrich Boll, whose novel Group Portrait with a Lady we published, although in the West they write that we have not translated it. This does not mean, however, that we translate everything that turns up. For us the most important role is played by issues concerning the ideological aspect and artistic worth.

The Italian journalist asked Chakovsky what he thought of so-called dissident writers. Chakovsky suggested that first of all they should agree on the meaning of the term 'dissident'.

If it is a question of writers who, from a socialist position, criticize the imperfection of our society, we call that criticism and self-criticism. There is not an issue of Literaturnaya gazeta which does not contain a sharp criticism of negative features and point out the people responsible for them, even ministers. Works directed against the socialist system, which we call anti-Soviet, are a different matter. The most obvious example here is Solzhenitsyn. Solzhenitsyn's works are imbued with a spirit of anarchy and contempt for socialist society. Such ideas are not in fact dissident, but counter-revolutionary. We will not publish these works. They say that our censorship will not allow them to be printed. The reality is that our society is striving towards the clearly outlined aim of the creation of the New World and the New Man. Our people have suffered during the transformation of the country and have made the sacrifice of 20 million dead during the war. In such a situation there can be no room for such works.

Speaking of criticism provoked in the West by several judicial prosecutions and internments in psychiatric hospitals, Chakovsky said that this 'testified to the lack of information concerning a series of attendant circumstances'.

Moscow. On 16 June an exhibition of the pictures of Sarnuil Yakovkvich Rubashkin (1906-75) opened in the Moscow City House of Amateur Art (6 Bronnaya St.). S. Ya. Rubashkin was born in Vitebsk, and in 1931 he graduated from the Film Operators' Faculty of the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography. He worked in the country's leading film studios, filmed more than 20 feature films, and was on many occasions a prizewinner at all-union or international film
contests, for his mastery as a cameraman. He took up painting in 1960. A personal exhibition of his work took place in May-June 1975 in a Leningrad cinema. His pictures were shown at an exhibition in the House of Culture at the Exhibition of Economic Achievements in September 1975 (Chronicle 37).

The first day of the exhibition in the House of Amateur Art passed off peacefully. The next day, before the exhibition opened, people from the K G B came to the director of the House of Amateur Art and forbade the showing of the pictures, giving as their reason the fact that on some of the pictures Jewish inscriptions were portrayed (the series ‘Recollections of Childhood’ and ‘Jewish Festivals’). They said that this was ‘Zionist propaganda’. These pictures were taken into the director’s office, but even after this the exhibition was not permitted. The organizers of the exhibition (Tatiana Kolodzey, a methodologist of the Fine Arts Department, V. Volpina, the head of the department of Fine Arts, and I. Rubashkina, the artist’s widow) appealed to officials of the propaganda department of the party central committee, insisting on the information of a competent commission to evaluate the political and artistic worth of the pictures on exhibition. A commission was formed, including representatives of the People’s University, the House of the People’s Art, and the Ministries of Culture of the R S F S R and the U S S R. The commission looked at the pictures remaining on the walls and came to the conclusion that the exhibition had the right to take place in view of the national colour, directness and artistic worth of the pictures represented in it. However, immediately after the commission had left, firemen appeared and drew up a statement about the insufficient fire precautions on the premises, and the exhibition was closed. All the pictures were returned to I. Rubashkina, including those which had been taken from the walls after the K G B officials had visited the exhibition.

**Minsk.** On 19 December 1975 the newspaper Sovetskaya Belarusia published an article by B. Zdozhnikov, ‘Baseness’, which described a drama in the family of F. B. Chernyavsky, a prominent Minsk engineer. In April 1975 he and his student son Ilya informed the remaining members of the family of their intention of moving to Israel. Over several months F. B. Chernyavsky’s wife and daughter tried to persuade them to forget about this ‘wild venture’. But this turned out to be impossible, since F. B. Chernyavsky, as the newspaper reported in his wife’s words, ‘has yielded to persuasion and is acting in accordance with a scenario worked out by the ardent Zionist Ovsishcher, who carries on agitation for emigration to Israel among the residents of Minsk’. The newspaper goes on to describe in detail all the subterfuge of this ‘terrible man’ and other ‘recruiting agents’ who have broken up a united family which had lived in peace and concord for 22 years, but which had now split up (F. B. Chernyavsky has filed a petition for divorce) under the impact of ‘Zionist intoxication’. Included in their arsenal of methods were flattery, promises of a wonderful life in Israel, blackmail, intimidation and ‘straight bribery’ — in the form of parcels from Israel.

F. B. Chernyavsky wrote a letter to Sovetskaya Belarusia. In it the 47-year-old engineer pointed out that he was capable of taking serious decisions in life himself, and repudiated the insinuations of the author of the article with regard to the role of Ovsishcher in his family drama.

By that time Ilya Chernyavsky had already been expelled from the fourth year of the Belorussian Technical Institute (within nine days of applying to the administration of the institute for a character reference for O V I R) and, still not having received a reply to his appeal to emigrate, he had received a call-up summons from the Military Commission. Considering it amoral to serve in the Soviet Army and give an oath of loyalty to the Soviet state after renouncing Soviet citizenship, and not wishing to study military affairs and thus gain access to the secrets of a country which he intended to leave, Ilya Chernyavsky refused to appear at the call-up point and on 16 June was arrested ‘for evading military service’. From the first day of his arrest he declared a total hunger-strike in protest. After a while they tried to force-feed him, but this turned out to be impossible, since, because of a nasopharynxal illness, he began to suffocate immediately the tube for artificial feeding was put down his throat. After an 8-day hunger-strike Chernyavsky was released from detention and almost immediately received permission to emigrate to Israel.

F. B. Chernyavsky, who on 11 November 1975 asked for a character reference from the Minsk Experimental Design Office Myakolomnath, where he headed a department, was immediately demoted, and in January 1976 dismissed. His documents were not accepted by O V I R because they did not include a certificate of divorce.

**Minsk.** On 9 July 1976 Irina McClellan appealed to the Group to Assist the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements in the U S S R with a request to help her in reuniting her family.

In 1974 she married the American historian W. McClellan, and since then she has been trying unsuccessfully to obtain permission to emigrate to the U S A. Since his marriage the Soviet authorities have been refusing W. McClellan entry visas.

**Erevan.** Shagin Artyunyan, a former political prisoner — he served 3 years from 1968-71 under articles 65 and 67 of the Criminal Code of the Armenian S S R (equivalent to articles 70 and 72 of the R S F S R Code) — appealed to Podgorny with a request to assist him in emigrating: ‘...my moral and political convictions differ from the official ideology, and I feel myself to be alien and irrelevant in this country.’
On 6 April a biologist,* Lyudmila Alexandrovna Martemyanova (born 1942), stepped on to an English shore (from a Soviet steamship) and asked for political asylum.

In Kaliningrad, where she lived, a case was brought against her on a charge of treason against her country. In Kaliningrad and Leningrad her co-workers and acquaintances were questioned, and searches were made in Martemyanova's flat and at the home of her friend in Leningrad.

At the end of May Sergei Pirogov, a former political prisoner (Chronicle 32), emigrated from the U S S R.

In June Vitaly Rubin, a long-standing 'refusenik', an activist in the Jewish emigration movement (Chronicle 40), and a member of the Group to Assist the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements in the U S S R, left the U S S R with his wife, Inessa Axelrod.

On 15 July 1976 Andrei Amalrik (Chronicles 17, 29, 30, 36) and his wife Gyuzel Makudinova left the U S S R.

In spring 1976, not long before the end of his term of exile in Magadan, it was suggested to Amalrik that he emigrate to Israel, without any invitation. He refused (Chronicle 36).

After his return to Moscow, Amalrik received an invitation to the University of Utrecht (Holland) and to an American university. He made an application to the O V I R in Kaluga (the place where he was registered — Chronicle 37), requesting to be allowed out for two years: a year in Holland and a year in America. His wife made a similar application to the Moscow O V I R. She was refused. Then Amalrik withdrew his application.

In spring 1976 a K G B official in charge of Amalrik's case said to him: 'Andrei Alexeievich! You must believe me — you can leave only via Israel.' After this the Dutch consul, who represents the interests of Israel in the U S S R (after the breaking-off of diplomatic relations with Israel in 1967), gave Amalrik and his wife a paper in which it was stated that the Israeli government was granting them permission to live in Israel. Then O V I R gave permission for Amalrik and his wife to leave for permanent residence in Israel (Amalrik is a Russian, his wife a Tatar and a Moslem) and gave them exit visas from the U S S R. In the Dutch Embassy the Amalriks were granted entry visas to Holland.

At the Customs the day before their departure, officials suddenly demanded that Amalrik pay 4,000 roubles duty for the 25 pictures of modern artists belonging to him (first of all the pictures had been valued at 2 roubles 50 kopecks each). Amalrik refused to pay this sum, stating that if they insisted he would not go anywhere. The Customs officers reduced the duty to 1,500 roubles. Then, finally, the Customs agreed to the original sum.

On 15 July Amalrik and his wife flew to Amsterdam.

Addenda and Corrigenda

In 'News in Brief' M. S. Myslobodsky, a former research officer at the Institute of Higher Nervous Activity, was erroneously called Mstalodsky.

The student expelled from the Bashkir University ('News in Brief') is called Viktor Timanov.

The surname of Margarita Felixovna, the doctor who talked to Moroz's wife in the Serbsky Institute, is well known. M. F. Taltse has worked at the Institute for many years (since the 1940s). She is mentioned in the same issue of the Chronicle in the section 'The Trial of Vyacheslav Igrunov'. M. F. Taltse is the deputy of D. R. Lunts, who is head of department 4 of the institute.

Retired Lieutenant-Colonel Kh. K. Chalbash ('Persecution in the Crimea') was not an airman but a tank man, he lives in Tashkent, not Simferopol.

See 'Sychovka Special Psychiatric Hospital' in this issue's section 'In the Psychiatric Hospitals'.

[An oceanographer according to a Reuter dispatch of 11 April 1976.]
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Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

*Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19.*
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Sent to Hospital for his Songs

On 14 February 1975, after one and a half years of forcible treatment in Kazan Special Psychiatric Hospital, Pyotr Starchik returned home to Moscow; he had been arrested in April 1972 (Chronicles 28, 35).

Soon afterwards Pyotr Starchik began to hold weekly concerts in his flat. Accompanying himself on the piano, guitar or zither, he sang his own songs, taken from verses by poets of many lands. Chief among these were Russian poets: his favourite, Marina Tsvetayeva, Khomyakov, Mandelshtam, Tretyakov and Khodasevich. As the father of two small children, he also sang children’s songs.

Fridays were declared ‘open days’. Any decent person knew that he would on that day find a warm welcome at Starchik’s flat and a whole evening of songs.

The authorities did not like these unlicensed evenings, the repertoire of which was not sent to them for approval; the members of the audience were partly unknown to them, partly people they hated.

They began to ‘warn’ Starchik to stop singing. Warnings were issued at a police station. He was warned by Dr Sapozhnikova, head doctor at the psychiatric clinic attached to the Solovyov psychiatric hospital: stop singing or you’ll only have yourself to blame.

Pyotr Starchik, while fully taking into account the unpleasant consequences threatening him, went on singing.

On 31 August [1975], the anniversary of Marina Tsvetayeva’s death, Starchik’s flat was full of guests, two policemen entered and began to write down the names of those present; however, the concert continued.

In the psychiatric report-card made out on Starchik at hospital number 15, it was stated that the reason for his hospitalization was his composition of anti-Soviet songs and his organization of assemblies of shady characters. The card was marked ‘socially dangerous’.

On 18 September Starchik was transferred further away from his friends — to the Moscow Regional Psychiatric Hospital number 5 (Stolbovaya Station on the Kursk line). Only his wife — Saida Starchik — is allowed to visit him. The doctor in charge of his treatment is Boris Vasilevich Novikov, head of section 7.

On 21 September Starchik’s friends and acquaintances, the many people who admired his talents, drew up a protest against his forcible hospitalization on non-medical grounds. 112 people signed the protest.

On 27 September T. Velikanova, A. Ginzburg, T. Khodorovich and G. Yakunin wrote a letter to the USSR Minister of Health, B. Petrovsky, demanding the release of Starchik and declaring their intention to set up a committee which would aim at obtaining this.

Although Starchik had still not been seen by the commission required according to the 'Directives on urgent hospitalization' (Chronicle 28), on 6 October his ‘treatment’ with haloperidol commenced.

G. Pomerants has written an article, ‘The Songs of Pyotr Starchik’, which has been combined with a recording of the songs themselves and widely distributed in ‘tape-recorded samizdat’. Pomerants analyses the essential characteristics of Starchik’s creative work and personality, which have attracted many listeners to him, and describes the latest twist in his fate.

Starchik’s basic emphasis is on spiritual themes which have no clear answers, not on political argument... However, certain authorities have decided to cut off Starchik’s songs — why, we do not know... It is difficult to understand what this is: vulgar bungling, like the destruction of pictures by bulldozers? Or a step backwards, to the last years of Stalin’s reign? He reacted to the hospitalization with his usual meekness. ‘You have to accept it, like the climate,’ he said, comforting his relatives. ‘And whoever can’t stand it can emigrate.’

The Case of Bashkirov

Pavel Evgenevich Bashkirov was arrested on 23 June (Chronicle 41 gave 22 June) on his arrival in Nyurbachan to visit A. Tverdokhlebov. Prior to this, he had been searched at Nyurba airport on the pretext that his rucksack was ‘similar to a stolen one’. The rucksack contained: a tape-recorder, tapes (including a recording of the voices of Tverdokhlebov’s relatives on the telephone), a radio, a camera and samizdat (including two Chronicles). All this was confiscated.

Bashkirov was charged under article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and, a few days later, he was sent to the special investigation prison in Yakutsk. On 24 June K G B officials carried out a search at Bashkirov’s flat (attached to the museum where he had recently been working). The following were confiscated: 17 tape-recordings, photographs of Solzhenitsyn and Grigorenko, samizdat (material on the Sinyavsky-Daniel case, poems by Mandelshtam and so on), and Bashkirov’s own notes. Searches also took place at Bashkirov’s old flat and at his mother’s flat and her place of work.

Among the witnesses interrogated during the investigation, Bashkirov’s former colleague Shavlov stood out particularly. He wrote six pages of testimony, in which he not only confirmed all that he was asked to say about ‘dissemination’ but also showed personal initiative by adding a few people to the list of ‘readers’ known to the investigators.
On 1 July Bashkirov handed in a complaint addressed to the Procurator of the Yakut ASSR, concerning the circumstances of his arrest: on his arrival at the investigation prison, in spite of the fact that he was behaving peacefully, his hands were clamped into handcuffs behind his back, so tightly that the skin broke; he was locked up in the tiniest cell [stakanchik], and threats were made to put him in a strait-jacket. At the end of July Bashkirov handed in a complaint to the prison administration. Its contents were as follows: writing implements and paper had been confiscated from him on a number of occasions; personal letters, notes and documents to do with his case had been taken away from him; his requests for legal consultation on procedure and the rules on detention had been ignored; the disorder in the cell; and the fact that he had not been allowed to shave or have a bath for 20 days.

At the beginning of August, in a declaration addressed to the head of the special investigation prison, Bashkirov again demanded the return of his letters, notes and documents. He also stated: 'Adding my voice to the protests against violence in the world and persecution of people for their convictions, and for political reasons, I shall express this in the only way open to me, by going on a complete hunger-strike from 7 to 11 August.'

On 24 August the investigation came to an end.

Finding a lawyer involved the usual difficulties. After unsuccessful attempts to get permission to engage a lawyer from Moscow, Bashkirov's relatives came to an agreement with the Yakutsk lawyer Medvedev. He went through the case with Bashkirov and was due to appear at his trial.

On 23 September 17 Muscovites made a statement, 'In defence of Pavel Bashkirov':

... The approaching trial is 'legal' in form but is the outcome of wholly unlawful persecution: the shadowing, trickery and secret searches which P. E. Bashkirov was subjected to over some years. He had aroused the suspicions and anger of the Yakutsk K GB by his friendship with those whom the authorities call 'anti-Soviet' and 'renegades', and by reading what the state considers unfit for the eyes of Soviet citizens...

Pavel Bashkirov is not known to society at large, but his trial should, in our opinion, attract no less attention than the trials of well-known activists defending human rights in the USSR. This trial is a reprisal for an inconvenient kind of thinking, for a natural inability to accept tyranny, it is a reprisal against a good and courageous man.

On 27 September the Supreme Court of the Yakutsk ASSR began to hear the case, starting with an incident unprecedented even in 'political' trials. On 23 September Bashkirov's wife, Asya Gabysheva, was told at the law office that Medvedev had gone away on an assignment, that he would not be able to appear at the trial, and she was offered a new lawyer. However, it turned out that Medvedev had not gone anywhere — he came to the hearing. In spite of this, the court did not allow him to take charge of the defence, as a new lawyer had been appointed. Bashkirov categorically refused the services of the defence lawyer forced on him and declared that he insisted on a Moscow lawyer being summoned, chosen by his relatives. The court hearing was suspended until 7 October.

Acting on the instructions of Bashkirov's relatives, Yu. B. Zaks came to an agreement with the Moscow lawyer Yu. B. Peredeyev. On 29 September Apraksin, the chairman of the Moscow City Bar, gave him permission to make the trip, but revoked this permission the next day.

T. Velikanova and T. Khodorovich, members of the Initiative Group, and L. Alekseyeva, A. Ginzburg, M. Landa, Yu. Orlov, V. Slepak and A. Shcharansky, members of the Helsinki Group, have appealed to the RSFSR Ministry of Justice. In their letter, they say:

On 30 September K. N. Apraksin stated, in a personal telephone conversation with persons representing Bashkirov's mother, that he would not 'allow' any Moscow lawyers to go to Yakutsk to defend Bashkirov. Apraksin at first based this on the fact that 'all the lawyers are busy', then on the alleged fact that there had been 'a decision' to allow members of the Moscow Bar to conduct the defence in trials in other towns only if the accused was charged with theft, murder and other such crimes and there was a danger of local feeling influencing the local lawyers. Who made this decision, when and in what way it was taken, K. Apraksin did not inform them.

We do not know if there was such a 'decision', but if so, it is clearly unlawful and gravely infringes the right of accused persons freely to choose their lawyers. Neither the Fundamental Principles of Criminal Procedure in the USSR and the union republics, nor the Criminal Code of the RSFSR, nor the Statutes on the Bar confirmed by the RSFSR Council of Ministers, lay down any territorial restrictions in the choice of a lawyer.

It is typical that only in political cases are obstacles put in the way of choosing a lawyer (the Palatnik and Igunov cases in Odessa, the Kovalyov case in Lithuania, and others).

The complaints and arguments of Yu. B. Zaks at the Bar department of the Ministry of Justice led at least to the restoration of the Yakutsk lawyer Medvedev as the defence counsel in the case.

The trial was resumed on 7 October. The Chronicle knows only a little about the course of the hearing. The trial was in open court. Ten witnesses were questioned, three of them Bashkirov's cell-mates from the special investigation prison, who gave evidence about his 'dissemination' by word of mouth. Two or three non-prisoner witnesses said that Bashkirov had given them reading matter. The court brought up Bashkirov's visit to Tverdokhlебов (Chronicle 41). The prosecutor said that Bashkirov had carried on anti-Soviet conversations on the
Slogans in Leningrad

On 6 April, the day when Tverdokhlebov's trial should have taken place but did not (see Chronicle 40), three trams came out of the tram depot bearing the following inscriptions on their sides: 'Freedom for political prisoners!', 'Freedom for Andrei Tverdokhlebov!' On 7 April similar slogans appeared on the walls of the Conservatory and the Lesgaft Institute of Physical Training, also on the river-wall of Vasilevsky Island.

On 4 August a huge inscription measuring 40 metres by 1 metre appeared on the wall of the Peter and Paul Fortress: 'You are Trying to Suffocate Freedom, but the Spirit of Man Knows No Chains.' The inscription was soon covered with whitewash and sand-blasted, leaving a noticeable white streak.

On the night of 5-6 August slogans appeared on the walls of the Tavrichesky Palace, the pedestrian underpass at the corner of Nevsky Prospect and Sadovaya Street, the Admiralty and the Tavrichesky Palace; article 98 because of the inscriptions on trams and buses.

On 13 September a series of searches was carried out in Leningrad. The search warrants mentioned only 'the case of the anti-Soviet inscriptions' or 'case 62.' Searches were carried out at the homes of the artists Yuly Andreyevich Rybakov and Oleg Nikolayevich Volkov, the poetess Yulia Okulova (her literary pseudonym is Yulia Vonesenskaya), her friend Natalya Lesnichenko and two other people (see below). Nothing relating to the slogans was found at anybody's home. After the searches Rybakov, Volkov, Okulova and N. Lesnichenko were arrested.

Okulova was visited in her cell by a man who introduced himself as the deputy head of the Leningrad KGB. He suggested that she should take the responsibility for the slogans and state that she had written them herself. He promised her that in that case a show-trial would be arranged, like the trial of Maramzin (Chronicle 35), after which she would be freed and allowed to go abroad.

Okulova refused. At one of the interrogations the deputy procurator of Leningrad, Katukova (in 1970 she was the prosecutor at the trial of the 'aeroplane people'), asked her 'When did you discuss how to write the slogans and which ones? Was Vladimir Borisov (see below) present?' Okulova replied that she knew nothing whatever about any such discussion. No evidence was given by Yulia Okulova. Three days later she was released, after signing a promise not to leave town. She also had to sign a promise not to disclose the secrets of the investigation. Yulia Okulova is the mother of two children. She is a member of the recently organized Initiative Group of Leningrad's Unorthodox Poets and Artists. This group has produced a collection of poetry and drawings which was offered to some Soviet publishing houses, but they have received no reply.

At one of the interrogations Natalya Lesnichenko was shown a note from Rybakov, which said he had written the inscriptions. After this she testified that she had been present when Rybakov wrote the slogans. Like Okulova, three days after her arrest she was released in exchange for a promise not to leave town. She also had to sign a promise not to divulge secrets.

Rybakov and Volkov were told during interrogation that if they confessed Okulova and N. Lesnichenko would be released. Rybakov testified that he himself had written all the slogans, with N. Lesnichenko watching, but that Okulova had known he was going to do it. He described where they had got rid of the paint pots.

Volkov also said he had written all the slogans himself. He did not give any evidence about accomplices or witnesses.

All four were charged under article 230 of the USSR Criminal Code ('Premeditated destruction, demolition or damage of cultural monuments'); and article 98 ('Premeditated destruction or damage of state or public property'). All of them except N. Lesnichenko were also charged under article 17 ('Complicity'). Rybakov and Volkov were also charged under article 190-1 ('Dissemination of knowingly false fabrications'...).

Article 230 was used because of the inscriptions on the Peter and Paul Fortress, the Admiralty and the Tavrichesky Palace; article 98 because of the inscriptions on trams and buses.

Yu. Rybakov (born 1946) has participated in many exhibitions by independent...
Declaration by Vladimir Borisov

On the same day, 13 September, searches 'in connection with case 62' were also carried out at the home of Vladimir Borisov (in Leningrad — at his own flat and at the flat of his mother) and that of his wife Irina Kaplun (in Moscow).


The witness L. D. Evloshina took part in the search almost on an equal footing with the KGB officials.

I. Kaplun was born in 1950. When she was in the ninth class at school, she and some of her friends were caught distributing pamphlets against the revival of Stalinism. They only received a lecture at the time, 'because of their youth'. In 1969, when I. Kaplun was a student in the third year of the Philosophy Faculty at Moscow State University, she was arrested. In 1970, after the end of the pre-trial investigation, but before trial, she was unexpectedly pardoned (Chronicles 11-16). She was not re-instated at Moscow University, and was not accepted at a number of other Moscow institutes of higher education after she had successfully passed the entrance examinations (for example, in 1972 she passed all the examinations for a teachers' training college with marks of 'excellent').

During the search at Borisov's flat the following were confiscated: a micro...
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artists, in particular the exhibition which was held ten years ago at the Kostel building: some artists set up their easels right on the street and began to draw. The police dispersed them. Yuly's father is the actor and poet Andrei Nikolayevich Rybakov, who landed in a camp in the 1940s — Yuly was born in a camp. Now he teaches at the Academy of Arts. He has a wife and two children (one 7 years old, the other one and a half). Rybakov's family is petitioning for his detention to be replaced by a less severe form of restriction.

O. Volkov (born 1940) was earlier tried for attempted rape and spent 4 years in camps. He has also taken part in exhibitions by avant-garde artists. He is separated from his wife. He has a seven-year-old son.

Arrests, Searches and Interrogations

film copy of Solzhenitsyn's Gulag Archipelago, volume 3; seven photocopies of A. D. Sakharov's collection of articles; a piece of paper containing some of the slogans mentioned above (not in Borisov's handwriting); and a hand-made 'printing mechanism'.

On 21 September at a press conference in Moscow V. Borisov issued a 'Statement to the Press':

For over half a century there has been a famine of information in our country ... In searches 'the instruments of crime' are confiscated together with literature: tape-recorders, typewriters, amateur photo-enlarging equipment, and so on — everything that could be used to reproduce texts, or is thought to be capable of doing so by those in charge of the search.

In these circumstances, the problem of the independent publication of uncensored literature is extremely acute. The price paid for solving that problem is either prison, or a special psychiatric hospital, or an attack by thugs from behind a corner.

I have worked out the technology for a simple, cheap printing mechanism, which is easy to assemble in domestic surroundings. One of the experimental models was confiscated from me during the recent search. I am sure there is nothing unlawful in my actions. I consider it my right and my duty to assist the free exchange and circulation of information.

At the same press conference, Lyubmila Aleksyeva, Tat'yana Velikanova, Irina Kaplun and Malva Landa issued the following declaration:

... In this country information is harshly rationed. The authorities do not grudge national power or resources to keep the ration from increasing.

We acknowledge the extremely limited possibilities open to us, but consider it our duty to assist in the circulation of thought and literary works ... We consider it desirable, towards this end, to use not only typewriters but also printing mechanisms with larger circulation possibilities.

We remind you that Vladimir Borisov is in danger of being imprisoned again. For five years, from 1968 to 1974, he was imprisoned in psychiatric hospitals and in a psychiatric prison — for participating in the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the U.S.S.R, and for circulating uncensored literature. Any of the objects confiscated from V. Borisov could be used as an excuse for new persecution: the printing mechanism, the Gulag Archipelago, Sakharov and the Fight for Peace ...

We appeal to all those who value humanity, freedom, freedom of thought and freedom to create — speak out in defence of those who are threatened with persecution for spreading independent information; speak out today in defence of Vladimir Borisov.
The Chronicle has written about Vladimir Borisov more than once (Chronicles 8, 11, 19, 24-28, 30, 32).

The Persecution of Ilya Levin

Chronicle 39 reported the search which was carried out at the home of the Leningrad philologist Ilya Levin on 26 December 1975. On 27 January 1976 Levin was refused permission to emigrate to Israel. The reason given was his army service in 1972-3 (Chronicle 39 was inaccurate about this point).

On 18 February two KGB officials came to his home (one of these was Konstantinov) and demanded that he should let them in 'for a chat'. Levin refused. When some time later he went out of the flat, a policeman came up to him and asked him for his passport, gave it to the KGB officials who had now appeared, and ordered Levin to return home; he himself accompanied him. For over an hour the policeman did not allow Levin to leave the house or to go to the telephone... Then the same KGB officials came to the flat, returned his passport and went away with the policeman.

On 22 February Kudrov, head of the Smolny district section of the Leningrad KGB, summoned Levin and suggested that he sign a document stating that he, Levin, was in possession of Soviet state secrets. Levin refused, saying this was a lie. During the conversation Kudrov threatened Levin, saying he would publish an article which 'would compromise him both here and abroad'; he also threatened him with criminal prosecution for 'an especially dangerous crime against the state' (he did not specify what crime) and with prosecution under article 190-1 'for disseminating tendentious information'. Kudrov inquired after Levin's mental health.

On 26 February the police detained Levin on the street 'for an identification check' (he was told that he was 'very like a certain criminal'); he was taken to Smolny District UVD and subjected to a body search. A few hours later he was released.

On 9 March Levin was again approached by a policeman 'for identification purposes', and, despite the fact that he showed his passport, was taken to the police station. There he was searched once more and books and journals in English were confiscated from him. When Levin demanded that this unlawful behaviour should cease, the man in charge of the search, Lieutenant-Colonel of Police Borozdin, replied: 'You can give orders when you get to Israel.' After frequent complaints by Levin some of the confiscated books and journals were returned to him.

At the end of March some Leningrad intellectuals sent a petition to the City Department of Culture, asking to be allotted a hall for an evening in memory of Gumilev. Levin was one of this group. On 15 April the police took him from his home to the Dzerzhinsky District UVD. There Lieutenant-Colonel of Police Uzheikin, deputy head of the UVD, asked him to sign the following statement:

I, Ilya Davidovich Levin, have been cautioned by the Administration for Internal Affairs of the Dzerzhinsky District Soviet Executive Committee about my incorrect behaviour in participating in antisocial activities in December 1975, on the anniversary of the execution of Decembrists (see Chronicle 38), and about the impermissibility of antisocial actions in future.

Article 190-3 of the RSFSR Criminal Code has been explained to me, concerning responsibility for the organization or active participation in group activities which infringe social order or show clear disobedience to the legal demands of representatives of authority.

I have been cautioned that, if I take part in the independently organized celebration of the 90th anniversary of the poet Gumilev's birth, or in other antisocial activities, I will be made to answer for them in accordance with the law.

Levin refused to sign this document.

On 29 May Levin was taken to the Smolny District UVD. There he was asked to sign the following document:

WARNING
Suspicious activities connected with the organization of an exhibition which has not received the official approval of the Chief Department of Culture, and attendance at such an exhibition, constitute clear disobedience to the representatives of authority and are an infringement of social order. Any actions by you which disregard this warning will be defined in accordance with the corresponding laws in the criminal code.

Officials explained to Levin that this referred to the art exhibition in the Peter and Paul Fortress fixed for 30 May, and that they had 'a list of persons who had to be warned'.

On 30 May at about 8 o'clock in the morning a group of five (one of them in police uniform) came to Levin's home. The visitors refused to give their names. Levin was told that he 'would do better to sit at home' that day. When he left the house, Levin noticed he was being followed. Some time later, one of those following him showed his police card and asked Levin for his passport. Then he declared that 'this passport seems suspicious to me' and asked Levin to follow him to the police station. At the Smolny District UVD Levin was shown a document alleging that he had refused to show his papers to a police man when asked to do so; he had then allegedly refused to follow him to the police station and, when detained by force, he had resisted. Levin refused to sign the false statement and asked to write down what had happened himself. He was not allowed to do this. Levin was searched and his case, his watch, spectacles, passport and shoe-laces were confiscated. He was released and everything except the passport was returned to him at about 7 o'clock in the
Gennady Nikolayevich Trifonov was born in 1945 in Leningrad. In 1965 he
entered the army, he agreed to become a KGB informer. In an 'Open letter to Heinrich
Boll' on 14 May 1976 he writes:

'Gennady Trifonov was born in 1945 in Leningrad. In 1965 he
entered the army, he agreed to become a KGB informer. I
was saved by doctors, and, following a report from a neuro-pathologist,
I was dismissed from the KGB with a diagnosis of 'reactive neurosis'. At the
same time I was dismissed from my job at the film studio.

Assuming that I had freed myself completely from the State Security
forces, I threw myself into literary activity ... From the first day of my employ-
ment by the KGB I had informed all my closest friends of it ...

While he was working at 'Lenfilm', Trifonov kept in contact with the KGB
through the already mentioned deputy personnel manager, KGB Lieutenant-
Colonel Lavrenty Vasilevich Sokolovsky, and through one of the film direct-
ors, KGB officer Yury Nikolayevich Gubanov. His activities were supervised
by the deputy head of the KGB Department of Culture, KGB Captain
Vyacheslav Stefanovich Novikov. On leaving the KGB, Trifonov signed a
document promising to keep secret all information known to him. This 'pro-
mise' also contained a warning that if he gave away secrets he would be charged
with 'treason to the motherland'.

At the end of 1974, Trifonov was forcibly placed in a psychiatric hospital
for a month. There he was visited by KGB officials, who tried to persuade
him to work for them again. After discharge from hospital Trifonov was
warned at his local psycho-neurological clinic that if he revealed the circum-
stances of his hospitalization he would be put in hospital again.

From the beginning of 1975 Trifonov actively participated in the activities
carried out by unofficial writers and artists in Leningrad.

In 1976 Trifonov decided to emigrate and live permanently abroad with his
relatives in the U.S.A. In his letter to Boll he writes:

On 28 April 1976 I was summoned for a lengthy interrogation, during which
I was asked to give written evidence libelling my friends — the unofficial
artists and poets of Leningrad. I categorically refused to give such evidence ...

During the interrogation of 28 April an MVD official told me that if I did
not stop my anti-Soviet activities, if I went on bothering the authorities for
permission to emigrate from the USSR, and if I offered my work for pub-
lication abroad, more severe measures would be taken against me. On 1 May
1976 in the evening I was savagely beaten up by three men unknown to me,

Army, he agreed to become a KGB informer. In an 'Open letter to Heinrich
Boll' on 14 May 1976 he writes:

What happened to Leningrad's leading unofficial writers and poets during
the Stalin era is well known — is not only subject to criminal prosecution in the USSR, but
is also widely made use of to discredit persons disapproved of by the regime.

During my army service pressure was exerted on me to enter the ranks of
informers for the KGB. This was done by means of open intimidation,
various threats going as far as accusations of homosexuality, which — as is
well known — is not only subject to criminal prosecution in the USSR, but
is also widely made use of to discredit persons disapproved of by the regime.

Trifonov was born in 1945 in Leningrad. In 1965 he
entered the army, he agreed to become a KGB informer. In an 'Open letter to Heinrich
Boll' on 14 May 1976 he writes:

While he was under arrest in a special reception prison, Levin went on hunger-
strike as a sign of protest. On 3 June the doctor at the prison told Levin that
his hunger-strike 'aroused doubts about his mental health' in her.

On 9 June Levin was released.

On 29 June Levin appealed to the Procurator-General of the USSR, compla-
ing about the continuous illegibilities committed by the Leningrad police.

On 13 September a search was carried out at Levin's home in connection with the slogans (see above). Nothing relating to this case was found. Photo-
graphs of artists, private notes and verses were confiscated.

Arrest of Gennady Trifonov

Gennady Nikolayevich Trifonov was born in 1945 in Leningrad. In 1965 he
became Olga Berggolts's literary secretary. In 1967, when Trifonov was in the
army, he agreed to become a KGB informer. In an 'Open letter to Heinrich
Boll' on 14 May 1976 he writes:

'When I entered the army in 1965 I was asked to inform for the KGB.
My duty was to gain the confidence of lesser informers and maintain ties with
the KGB authorities through the deputy personnel manager of the studio,
who was also a Colonel of the USSR State Security.

In spite of the fact that my work for State Security was forced on me by

extreme circumstances, all these years I was tormented by my involvement
with the KGB. I tried to give information of the most general character, which
I knew the KGB already possessed from other sources of the same
kind. I knew for certain that no one had ever suffered because of what I had
done. But the very fact of my involvement in KGB activities, even if it
was purely formal, I felt to be a disgrace to myself as a human being and
a Russian literary intellectual.

In August 1973 I appealed to a highly placed official of the Leningrad
KGB, asking to be allowed to resign. This request was not granted. In
September 1973 I tried to kill myself by taking a heavy dose of nembutal.
I was saved by doctors, and, following a report from a neuro-pathologist,
I was dismissed from the KGB with a diagnosis of 'reactive neurosis'. At the
same time I was dismissed from my job at the film studio.

Assuming that I had freed myself completely from the State Security
forces, I threw myself into literary activity ... From the first day of my employ-
ment by the KGB I had informed all my closest friends of it ...

While he was working at 'Lenfilm', Trifonov kept in contact with the KGB
through the already mentioned deputy personnel manager, KGB Lieutenant-
Colonel Lavrenty Vasilevich Sokolovsky, and through one of the film direct-
ors, KGB officer Yury Nikolayevich Gubanov. His activities were supervised
by the deputy head of the KGB Department of Culture, KGB Captain
Vyacheslav Stefanovich Novikov. On leaving the KGB, Trifonov signed a
document promising to keep secret all information known to him. This 'pro-
mise' also contained a warning that if he gave away secrets he would be charged
with 'treason to the motherland'.

At the end of 1974, Trifonov was forcibly placed in a psychiatric hospital
for a month. There he was visited by KGB officials, who tried to persuade
him to work for them again. After discharge from hospital Trifonov was
warned at his local psycho-neurological clinic that if he revealed the circum-
stances of his hospitalization he would be put in hospital again.

From the beginning of 1975 Trifonov actively participated in the activities
carried out by unofficial writers and artists in Leningrad.

In 1976 Trifonov decided to emigrate and live permanently abroad with his
relatives in the U.S.A. In his letter to Boll he writes:

On 28 April 1976 I was summoned for a lengthy interrogation, during which
I was asked to give written evidence libelling my friends — the unofficial
artists and poets of Leningrad. I categorically refused to give such evidence ...

During the interrogation of 28 April an MVD official told me that if I did
not stop my anti-Soviet activities, if I went on bothering the authorities for
permission to emigrate from the USSR, and if I offered my work for pub-
lication abroad, more severe measures would be taken against me. On 1 May
1976 in the evening I was savagely beaten up by three men unknown to me,
The letter ends as follows:

I appeal to you, Mr Boll, and urgently request you ... to help me to leave my country ... I fully realize that the very act of writing this letter to you and its subsequent publication in the West will threaten my personal safety. But I have no other choice than to appeal to my colleagues — the writers of Europe — for help. To go on living in my own country, in the circumstances I have been placed in by the authorities, now seems impossible to me.

On 15 June Trifonov was sacked from his job. In July the U.S. embassy informed Trifonov that the American authorities were prepared to allow him in as an immigrant, but the Leningrad O V I R refused to accept Trifonov's documents. On 19 July M V D investigator Podgaisky told Trifonov that 'instead of going to America' he would land himself in 'jail or in a psychiatric hospital for a long time', and that he was 'a traitor to the motherland' and 'an enemy of the people'.

On 22 July Trifonov appealed to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the M V D, the K G B and the U S S R Procurator's Office, and also to the editors of the newspaper Izvestia:

On the basis of my manuscripts confiscated from my friends and of personal correspondence, all of which is at the disposal of the K G B, and by eavesdropping on my telephone conversations and keeping a watch on my personal life with the aid of neighbours in my flat ... interested circles are trying, by libellously and tendentiously interpreting the facts of my biography, to make out a criminal case against me under articles 120 and 121 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. ... With this letter I inform the Presidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet ... that I regard my persecution under all the provisions of articles 120 and 121 of the R S F S R Criminal Code as a repressive measure by the responsible Soviet authorities aimed at infringing my right to emigrate freely from the U S S R. (Article 120 concerns 'Indecent behaviour', article 121 'Sodomy').

On 22 July Trifonov was arrested in Kiev. The investigation has not yet come to an end. According to rumour, he is accused of bribery, as was the Vinnytsia doctor, Mikhail Shtern (Chronicle 34). The real reason for Kovtunenko's arrest is revealed in an open letter, 'If you don't want to be a scoundrel, you'll end up in prison!' (dated October 1976), from the writer Mykola Rudenko, a member of the Soviet Amnesty International group (Chronicle 36):

... An important K G B official had a great idea: Listen, mates, why don't we make use of the local doctor, Kovtunenko? He visits Chapayevka, Koncha Zaspa and Mrigi all in one day. Who could be a better choice to fulfill the duties of a secret informant? ... They tried to persuade him for about three months. They promised him great things. I had the honour of figuring in these secret plans. When it became clear that Kovtunenko could not be persuaded, they began to threaten him with arrest. What for? Well, for example, for 'illegally' giving out sickness certificates. Somehow Mikhail Spiridonovich, tortured by moral scruples, came to see me and openly asked me for advice. I did not believe that the case looked so hopeless ... Nothing like it had been seen even in the most cruel police states. But Mikhail Spiridonovich smiled sadly: 'If it hasn't been seen yet, it will be. They won't forgive me if I refuse.'

On 6 August M. S. Kovtunenko wrote a memorandum: 'I, Mikhail S. Kovtunenko, have been asked to work as a K G B official, in order to watch, spy on and inform on M. D. Rudenko, because he is a member of Sakharov's group. I fully share the opinions held by M. D. Rudenko and will defend them while I can. I consider that we have no freedom, not even of the most ordinary kind. I believe in the Ukraine.' A month later he was arrested.

**The Arrest of Mart Niklus**

On 4 or 5 October Mart Niklus, a resident of Tartu, was summoned from the school where he teaches English and taken to his home for a search. As it turned out that there was no warrant, Niklus did not open his flat, but set off for the procurator's office to collect the objects confiscated and was arrested on a charge of 'resisting the police'.

In 1958-66, Mart Niklus served a term of imprisonment in the Mordovian camps under article 58-10 of the old Criminal Code. He is mentioned in Marchenko's book My Testimony.43 Niklus is a zoologist, but after his release he could not obtain work in his
specialized field (Chronicle 35), although he had applied to various departments about this more than once.

**Verification of Identity**

Nikolai Ivanov, who served a term as a member of the All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Liberation of the People (Chronicle 1), settled after his release in 1973 in the village of Bryksoy Gory, not far from Alexandrov in Vladimir region; he started to work as a stoker in the Alexandrov church. As this work was seasonal, in May every year he was paid off, and in September he was taken on again at his former workplace. This summer Ivanov had agreed to help in restoring a church in the village of Godenovo, Rostov district Yaroslavl region.

On 21 August a car drove up to the church which was being repaired; in it sat two policemen and Kuznetsov, the head of Rostov District Criminal Investigation Department. They asked Ivanov to accompany them to Rostov, as ‘the chiefs want to talk to him’, and promised to bring him back in the same car. When they reached Rostov, Ivanov was put in a Preliminary Detention Cell for ‘an identity check’: although he had his army card with him, he did not have his passport and it was clear from what he said that he had not been registered for work for three months. On 22 August he was transferred to the special reception prison at Yaroslavl.

Ivanov was released only 19 days later, after the Alexandrov district police station sent a reply to a written enquiry as to whether he was really registered in that district. During this whole period of time he was not allowed to receive letters or parcels; only once was he allowed to receive some cigarettes (Ivanov does not smoke).

* * *

Chronicle 36 reported that former M V D investigator Yury Ivanovich Fyodorov, after serving a 6-year sentence in the case of the ‘Union of Communists’ organization, was released at the beginning of 1975; he went to the town of Lugn near Leningrad and was there placed under surveillance.

In May 1976 he was tried for infringing the surveillance regulations and sentenced to a term of exile.

* * *

Jelgava (Latvia). On 27 August Pyotr Mikhailovich Naritsa was arrested. On that day he had driven out of town with his wife and children and one of his acquaintances. In a wood a minibus drove up to them. Five men rudely demanded that Naritsa show them his documents, and when Naritsa asked who they were and why they were shouting, they assaulted him, beat him to the point of unconsciousness, and dragged him into a police car that had driven up.

P. Naritsa was charged with beating up vigilantes and sent to the Riga investigation prison. The case is being investigated by the Jelgava procurator’s office.

On 6 October P. Naritsa was put in the cooler.

Pyotr Naritsa is the son of M. A. Naritsa (Chronicles 16, 38, 40 and 41). Since the arrest of his father in 1961 (the arrest before last), Pyotr Naritsa has been beaten up many times on imaginary or staged pretexts (in 1971, for ‘stealing a fur coat’, he was beaten up in a police station in front of his wife and father). In 1972 he was arrested for 15 days for talking to a foreigner on the street. In 1975 P. M. Naritsa was arrested for hanging a slogan out of the window of his flat on the day of his father’s arrest (Chronicle 38). A month later the case was discontinued.

* * *

Chronicle 41 has already written about the renunciation of citizenship by Soviet Germans. According to detailed reports, in the spring of 1976 160 Germans living in Kazakhstan and about the same number in Kirgizia paid a tax of 500 roubles each into a bank in return for renouncing their citizenship and sent a declaration announcing their renunciation to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet in their republic, together with the receipts for the tax paid, invitations from West Germany, applications for permission to emigrate, and passports.

The reaction of the authorities was to stop pensions being paid to some old age pensioners and to stop some workers’ wages. Fines began to be imposed on those who had sent in their passports. The authorities are threatening to bring criminal charges against all those who ‘have no passports’.

On 1 June searches were carried out at the homes of David Reimer, Anton Bleile, Kaspar Nikolai and [Ivan] Vitmaier, as well as at Gennrik Reimer’s (Chronicle 41). On the same day Anton Bleile was arrested. It seems he was charged under article 178-1 of the Kazakh S S R Criminal Code (equivalent to article 190-1 of the R S F S R Code).

On 20 July Lilia Andreyevna Furman (born 1951) was arrested for active participation in the German emigration movement. She was charged under article 178-1 of the Kazakh S S R Criminal Code. She was one of those who had ‘sent in’ their passports.*

A Search at Viktor Nekipelov’s

On 22 June Viktor Nekipelov (Chronicle 32), who lives in the town of Kameshkovo, Vladimir region, sent a letter to the regional procurator protesting against the unending efforts of the local police to supervise his life (Chronicle 40), particularly against the continuous summonses for ‘talks’. Nekipelov asked the procurator to explain how long the police could legally interfere in the private life of a man released from imprisonment. On 23 July the Vladimir

*For details of the sentences on her and other arrested Germans see Chronicle 44.*
regional procurator's office replied:

The Statutes on the Soviet Police lay down that the police forces must carry out educational and prophylactic work with persons who have been sentenced for premeditated crimes. This work is not limited by any concrete time limits.

Nina Mikhailovna Komarova, wife of Viktor Nekipelov, is continuously subjected to discrimination and harassment at work. At chemist's shop 45 in Kameshkovo, where she works as an analytic chemist, she has often been asked to 'look for other work' or 'go to another town'. The administration was particularly annoyed by Komarova's lack of participation in the collective life of the shop and in staff meetings, and her refusal to sign socialist undertakings or the Stockholm Appeal. The shop management examined Komarova's work (in her absence) and issued a severe reprimand, full of minor fault-finding. Komarova was punished for failing to come to work, although she had taken time off at her own expense because her child was ill. On 13 September, at a meeting in the regional Chemist's Shop Administration, Komarova's work was declared unsatisfactory and she was rebuked severely. The main accusation against her in examining her record was 'sticking to her own personal opinion about everything' and refusal to carry out 'her socialist duties'.

On 23 September a search was carried out at the Nekipelovs' home, on the authority of Procurator Tikhonov of the Moscow city procurator's office — 'in connection with case 46012/18-76'. When asked 'what case is that?', it was explained that it concerned the Chronicle and anything connected with it.

There were 57 entries in the search record. The following were confiscated:

**Doctor Zhivago** by B. Pasternak, *Live not by Lies* by Solzhenitsyn, *R. Medvedev's Political Diary*, poems by Natalya Gorbanevskaya, Boris Chichibabin and Nekipelov himself (including those for which he had already served 2 years), the Paris address of Leonid Plyushch, and receipts for letters sent abroad.

At the end of the search Nekipelov and his wife protested against the illegal confiscation of books, letters, articles and declarations. They refused to sign the search record.

* * *

Riga Chronicle 41 reported on searches carried out in Riga in June and July. One more search has become known — at the home of Aldis Cerinš.

Viktors Kalning, Valdis Zaring, Guitar Freimanis and Aldis Cerinš, together with their wives, were summoned for interrogation.

In addition, the former political prisoner Karl Grinert and his wife were summoned for interrogation. Karl Grinert was considered to be the organizer of a literary evening at his home, at which Zarinš and Freimanis had read their verses. Those present at this evening were also summoned for interrogations or 'talks'.

Viktor Kalning, his wife Irene Celming, Karl Grinert and his wife Irene Grinert were given a 'warning' according to the Decree of 25 December 1972 (Chronicles 30, 32). The text of the 'warning' referred to the organization of literary evenings and the harbouring of literature.

Valdis Zaring (born 1917) got a 7-year sentence in 1965 under article 65 of the Latvian SSR Criminal Code (equivalent to article 70 of the RSFSR Code), for an attempt to send his verses to the West.

Karl Grinert (about 50 years old) was arrested in 1946 for taking part in the partisan movement. He was originally sentenced to be shot. He spent a few months in the death cell, but at this point the decree abolishing the death penalty was issued. Grinert was released in 1971.

Gunars Freimanis (born 1929) has been in prison twice (Chronicle 41 was inaccurate in this respect). He got his first sentence — 10 years — at the end of the war, on a charge of participation in the partisan movement, while he was still a minor. In 1954 or 1955 he was released 'for lack of evidence of a crime'. In 1964 he got a 3-year sentence under article 65 of the Latvian SSR Criminal Code.

Viktor Kalning (born 1937) was arrested at the beginning of 1962. He was tried as one of a large group under article 59 of the Latvian SSR Criminal Code (equivalent to article 64 of the RSFSR Code). They were charged with 'attempting forcibly to separate Latvia from the USSR'. Viktor Kalning got a 10-year sentence. He came out in 1972. His co-defendant Gunars Rode was sentenced to 15 years. At present Rode is in Vladimir (Chronicle 40). (In 1962 Procurator-General of the USSR Rudenko objected to the leniency of the sentence passed on the members of the group, but the Supreme Court of the Latvian SSR left the sentence as it was.)

Tuapse. On 10 September, on the bank of Blue Creek, a patrol of border guards in search of radio sets searched a hut in which Valery Abrantkin (Chronicle 41) was living. An armed soldier was set to guard Abrantkin, while friends living with him (including a three-year-old girl) were forbidden to go away anywhere. The border guards took away a typewriter, a tape-recorder and cassettes, books, manuscripts and personal papers, and gave it all to the deputy KGB chief in Tuapse, Bortsov, who was present during the search.

On 13 September V. Abrantkin sent a declaration to the procurator of Tuapse, protesting against the actions of the border guards and KGB officials, particularly against the fact that he had been asked to sign a warning about his 'anti-Soviet activities'. Abrantkin writes:

In spite of my protests, the manuscripts and books belonging to me were called (without preliminary investigation) 'politically harmful' in the record of confiscation. After such a clearly unlawful definition of my books and manuscripts, I was glad to sign another document stating that I had been warned about committing 'anti-Soviet actions'. It should be noted that
Abramkin also demanded the return of the objects confiscated. Three days later, the tape-recorder was returned to him (without the cassettes), together with his typewriter.

Three hours later, in the same place, Rudkevich's friend Alexander Georgievich Abramov (Chronicle 35) was detained by police as he was about to board a train from Leningrad to Moscow; he was taken to a police station and searched, without any warrant. Nothing was found on him. He was released and departed safely.

Odesa. The circumstances of Viktor Goncharov's arrest (Chronicle 41) were as follows: he was arrested on 15 June at Odessa Airport while trying to buy a ticket to Yakutia on a false student card. However, Goncharov's case has aspects which are relevant to the interests of the Chronicle.

The suitcase which was mentioned in Chronicle 41 disappeared in the first days of May — not from Odessa, but from an automatic left-luggage locker in the Kiev Station in Moscow. Perhaps the explanation lies in the fact that, the day before, Goncharov had put the suitcase there under the eyes of a policeman who had come to expel him from Moscow as an unregistered resident. Besides religious literature, the suitcase contained a few typewritten copies of Solzhenitsyn's article 'Live Not by Lies' and Goncharov's (real) library ticket.

The suitcase and its contents do not figure in the case evidence, but are constantly brought up in conversations during the investigation. As far as is known, Goncharov has expressed regret at having possessed Solzhenitsyn's civic writings.

Sergei Kozilo (Chronicle 29, 30), at whose home Goncharov stayed while in Moscow, has been dismissed — under KGB pressure — from his job with the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate.

The trial of Goncharov, appointed for 7 September, has been put off, first to 17 September, then to 5 October.

On 15 September an acquaintance of V. Goncharov's, Irina Nikanorova, a 28-year-old student at Odessa Art College, was subjected to an uninterrupted 16-hour interrogation on the 'conveyor-belt' method: four interrogators questioned her in shifts. At the same time Nikanorova was threatened with expulsion from her college and told her parents would lose their jobs, and so on. In the end, Nikanorova wrote the following statement at the dictation of the investigator:

— She, Nikanorova, was a religious believer;
— there was a 'group of believers': she herself, V. Goncharov, P. Reidman and S. Rodentsev;
— Goncharov did not produce only religious literature; for example, he had personally given her the Gulag Archipelago to read;
— she admitted the antisocial nature of this relationship and of her own actions, promising not to continue them.

The whole text of the statement was headed 'Repentance'.

On the third day after the interrogation Irina Nikanorova renounced all her evidence in writing, declaring that the interrogation had reduced her to a state in which she would have written anything dictated by the interrogator.

At the beginning of September Anna Vasilevna Mikhailenko, librarian at School Number 1 in Odessa, had a long talk with officials of the Odessa and Ivanovo-Frankovsk KGB administrations. The conversation took place in a room at the 'Black Sea' Hotel.

Anna Vasilevna Mikhailenko gave her interlocutors details of the activities at the educational seminar on the history of Ukrainian art, organized by Vasily Barladyanu (Chronicle 41), details of where and by whom the classes were organized, of the theme which came up at the seminar (basically an analysis of the work of Ukrainian writer Yury Zhuk, who died in the 1960s). She also gave information about those who took part in the seminar, mentioning Viktor Goncharov,
Anna Viktorovna Golumbievskaya (Chronicle 34), Leonid Tymchuk (Chronicle 38) and the married couple Leonid and Valentina Sery, and explained the various relationships between them and their attitude to Barladyanu. The conversation also covered A. V. Mikhailenko's acquaintances in Western Ukraine.

A. Mikhailenko later explained that 'firstly, there are good people in the KGB as well, who are looking for contacts with dissidents', secondly, that she in her turn had been able to obtain 'valuable information' from them, namely: (1) she had been warned that a microphone had been placed in Golumbievskaya's flat, (2) she had been told to advise Barladyanu to 'get married quickly to a Jewess and emigrate'. And thirdly, A. Mikhailenko said her stories were not written down.

A day later, she was summoned again and made to write everything down on paper and sign it.

In the Prisons and Camps

A Visit to Dzhemilev

Mustafa Dzhemilev has been sent to serve out his term of punishment in the Far East (Chronicle 40). His address is: 692710, Primorsky Krai, Khasansky raion, stantsia Primorsk, p/ya 267/26.

This district is part of the border zone, so that it can only be visited with a pass issued by the police of the area where the traveller is registered as a resident, and if one has an invitation.

In the middle of September Mustafa's relatives received a letter from him, asking them to come and visit him soon, as his health was very bad. Soon an invitation from the administration arrived. However, at the Tashkent city police station they would not make out a permit for the journey, stating that some point in the invitation was wrongly formulated.

On 29 September this telegram was sent to Moscow:

Moscow K-9, Ogarev St. 9, Shchelokov, Minister of Internal Affairs.

The Tashkent police are not allowing Mustafa Dzhemilev's relatives to travel to visit him; they have refused them a pass for Primorsky Krai in spite of an invitation from the administration of the corrective labour colony. Mustafa's state of health desperate. Perhaps this will be their last meeting. We ask for your help in obtaining quick permission for the journey.

Bonner, Velikanova, Lavut, Sakharov.

On the next day, Mustafa's relatives received an assurance from Imanov, an official of the Uzbek SSR MVD, that they would soon get the pass. Immediately after this conversation they were received by the city's police chief Malynushko. Forgetting any irregularities in the documents, he said that the pass would not be issued and that Imanov was not fully informed — 'he doesn't know everything'. 'Anyway, Dzhemilev has no need of a visit,' Malynushko said.

On 30 September A. Sakharov issued a declaration addressed to Amnesty International, the UN, government leaders and political parties, also to all those fighting for human rights.

Recalling Dzhemilev's ten-month hunger-strike and his conviction on fabricated charges, Sakharov appealed: 'Demand that the Soviet authorities release Dzhemilev immediately for medical treatment in conditions of freedom; only this can save him.'

At the beginning of October Mustafa nevertheless received a visit from his brother and sister. They found that his condition had improved.

Vladimir Prison

On 2 May, as a sign of solidarity with those taking part in the 'Freedom March' in the USA, the political prisoners held a one-day hunger-strike.

Similar action was taken by political prisoners in the camps of Mordovia and Perm (see below, also 'In the Perm Camps' in Chronicle 40).

The prisoners learned of the forthcoming 'Freedom March' ahead of time from the newspaper Pravda.

On 26 August the prison was visited by Drozdov, the deputy procurator of Vladimir region, and Obraztsov, the procurator in charge of ensuring legality [in places of imprisonment]. The political prisoners in one of the cells began to talk to him about observing legalities. Drozdov said that this would be too much of an imposition, and would cost the state too much money.

At the end of the summer the political prisoners started to be transferred to Block 4 (until then they had been held in all four blocks).

The prison radio has announced a new procedure for dealing with complaints. From now on, complaints about prison situations will be sent only to the Vladimir Procurator's Office and the departments to which it is subordinate; complaints concerning investigation, trial and sentence will be sent only to the procurator's office in the place where the trial was held and the relevant higher organs; other complaints will go only to those organizations which the prison administration considers competent to deal with the questions brought up in the complaints.
Since April they have started to hand out bowls of hot soup on the mornings of the 'hungry days' in the cooler.†

Prisoners on strict regime have swollen fingers from undernourishment, as well as swellings and red rashes on their bodies.

On 18 August Vladimir Bukovsky ended a six-month term on strict regime. He ended his term in the cooler. On 19 August he received a visit from his mother. In a press release Nina Ivanovna Bukovskaya wrote:

...His appearance was awful — he was so dreadfully, inhumanly thin. I have only seen such faces, with the skin literally stretched over the bones of the skull, and hands and neck resembling those of a five-year-old child, on newspaper photographs of prisoners in Auschwitz... From this same 'educator' Doinikov I got to know that my son was put in the cooler for trying 'by illegal means' to send me a letter. As is well known, by 'legal' means (i.e. through the prison censors) he has not been allowed to do this for ten months... He told me that he was allowed to inform me only that he was not at present on hunger-strike and that he was not in solitary. My son also told me that recently he had been completely cut off from the outside world: all his complaints to the supervisory authorities had unfailingly been confiscated (in one month alone, 15 complaints were confiscated). He was not even allowed to write to his lawyer, Vladimir Shveisky. During my visit I was, however, astonished by my son's cheerfulness, his amazing calm, the liveliness of his eyes... How long are they going to torment my sick son merely for openly expressing his personal opinions and defending other people?

Nina Ivanovna told her son during the visit that the parliaments of three countries and the Pope had spoken out in his defence. Bukovsky's prison term is due to end in May 1977, his camp term in March 1978. After that he still faces 5 years of exile. For some complaint of his he has been deprived of his next visit, which was due to take place in six months — in February 1977.

From the end of April Nikolai Bondar (Chronicle 33) spent a month in hospital. After his stay in hospital, he was put in the most crowded cell (eight persons). Bondar asked to be transferred to solitary because of his weak state of health. At the end of May he went on hunger-strike. On 7 July, after a 40-day hunger-strike, he was transferred to a cell with one other prisoner in it.

On 26 August Superlin ended a three-month term on strict regime. In the evenings his legs swell up, he has stomach and liver trouble and is in constant pain.

In August a large group of political prisoners who had refused to work were transferred to strict regime for two months, after first spending 10 to 15 days in the cooler. They were Abankin, Safronov, Davydov, Shakirov, Rode, Afanasiev and Lyubarsky.

Konokh was transferred to strict regime, but it was soon necessary to remove him to the hospital.

Suslensky's state of health remains very serious (Chronicle 41). At the beginning of September he was taken to hospital. He was taken straight from there to the cooler. His 7-year sentence ends on 29 January 1977; nevertheless, he feels so ill that he is asking for support in obtaining a premature release.

In July and August, Makarenko was deprived of access to the prison shop. In the middle of August, after spending ten or fifteen days in the cooler, he was transferred to strict regime. His term is due to end in May 1977. He is being constantly threatened with prolongation of his sentence.

In June Konstantinovsky (Chronicle 40) was on hunger-strike for 20 days.

In the middle of September Pashnin went on hunger-strike [in the cooler].

†Both statements incorrect: he was in fact given 7 days in the cooler. See Chronicle 43.
Among his demands were: the removal of Captain Doinikov, as being a provocateur and tormentor, and the normalization of the question of correspondence.

* * *

Fedorenko is continuing the hunger-strike he began on 10 December 1975 (Chronicles 38-40). He is being forcibly fed.

In the summer of 1976 he interrupted his hunger-strike for ten days, during medical treatment, but he gave a warning beforehand that the interruption would be temporary.

* * *

Budulak-Sharygin has very high blood pressure, up to 220. The saltless diet he needs is not given to him.

Sergienko has a constantly high temperature. Chronicle 41 reported that he has been taken off the register of those suffering from tuberculosis.

* * *

After Georgy Davydov had been forced to rewrite a letter to his wife several times (Chronicle 40), he wrote her a short letter on 1 April. The letter was merely a list of the letters he had received. He also enclosed in his letter some pictures cut out of journals for his little daughter and a letter from his wife that had been checked by the censors. However, his letter was once more not allowed through. Then Davydov refused to continue the correspondence further.

* * *

Bagrat Shakhverdyan (camp 35) and Stepan Sapelyak (camp 36) have been transferred from the Perm camps to Vladimir Prison. Shakhverdyan has been given 4 months on strict regime.

The Mordovian Camps

Camp I (special regime)
Chronicle 41 reported that at the end of May Ivan Gel went on hunger-strike. He continued the hunger-strike until September. It was carried out in very difficult circumstances: he was not sent to hospital but put in solitary; he was forcibly fed once a week, from August on — twice a week.

By means of his hunger-strike Gel was trying to obtain an improvement in living conditions for his family: his wife Maria with her daughter and her brother Taras are living in one semi-basement room, with no conveniences and no kitchen.

At the beginning of September, Maria Gel was summoned to the Lvov KGB headquarters, where she was told that they had a photocopy of a declaration by her husband, written by him in the camp and copied out in her handwriting. Because of this Maria and Taras were subjected daily to interrogations lasting many hours, accompanied by threats and trickery. In particular, Taras was threatened with revocation of his newly-acquired university diploma and dismissal from his job, if he did not reveal his sister's role in getting information out of the camp. As a result, Taras began to have a heart attack during interrogation and was taken to hospital, where he was diagnosed as having had a 'minor coronary attack'.

Maria was warned not to say anything about her interrogations, but she refused to keep them secret and reported all the developments to the Group to Assist the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R.

Yu. Orlov, the leader of the Group, organized a press conference for foreign journalists at which he reported I. Gel's hunger-strike and the persecution of his family, and it was stated that group members A. Ginzburg and V. Turchin would go to Lvov to visit Maria Gel on the group's behalf. From the time of their arrival the KGB summonses to Maria ended, and a few days later it became known that Ivan Gel had ended his hunger-strike. Soon he was transferred from Mordovia to Lvov, where his wife and relatives were promised their next ordinary visit to him.

* * *

Chronicle 41 reported that Bogdan Rebrik had been beaten up and put in solitary for refusing to transfer to a cell of common criminals. When he came out of solitary, he was put in a cell with Ukrainian political prisoners.

It is known that camp commandant Kropotov had ordered the solitary cell to be prepared before Rebrik was asked to transfer to the criminals' cell.

* * *

On 7 August Nina Antonovna Strokata had a meeting with her husband Svyatoslav Iosifovich Karavansky. As she is under administrative surveillance (Chronicle 39), she had to obtain permission for the journey to visit him. She received permission only from the USSR MVD, after two refusals by lesser authorities.

Before the visit, Strokata had a conversation with First Lieutenant Tirin of the KGB, the KGB representative in the camp. Tirin told Strokata: 'Your husband mustn't say anything about the situation in the camp. If he talks about it, stop him.' Tirin also declared: 'We are ready to compromise in any way that will suit both you and us.'

Karavansky has been excused work because of his health (he has very high blood pressure), as any loud noise is bad for him. His prison term according to his last sentence will end in 1979.
Nikolai Andreyevich Evgrafov (born 1930, Ukrainian, three years of education) is serving his term in camp 1.

In 1966-73 he served a 7-year sentence under article 62, part 1, of the Ukrainian S S R Criminal Code (equivalent to article 70 of the RSFSR Code). After his release he lived in Slavyansk (Donetsk region), working as a stevedore.

On 29 April 1975 the Donetsk Regional Court, headed by chairman Zinchenko, sentenced Evgrafov to 10 years in special-regime camps under article 62, part 2, of the Ukrainian Code. The prosecutor was Procurator Yu. P. Noskov; the defence was conducted by Yu. P. Aleksebin. The trial was officially conducted in closed court (the reason is unknown to the Chronicle).

The indictment finds Evgrafov guilty of writing the work The Truth about Injustice, of disseminating it (he gave it to three acquaintances to read) and of conversations expressing 'anti-Soviet', 'slanderous' views.

The above-mentioned work is described thus in the indictment:

The accused, making use of notes he had brought with him from places of imprisonment which contained anti-Soviet statements by foreign reactionary sociologists, philosophers and economists, wrote an anti-Soviet lampoon in 1974 ... In it he falsifies the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, libels the Soviet economy, the nationalities policy of the Soviet state, and the world Communist movement.

The indictment says about the 'anti-Soviet statements', among other things: '... he praised the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists and also praised the structure and system of capitalist countries ...

The date of Evgrafov's arrest (and thus also the date when his sentence is due to end) is unknown to the Chronicle.

---

Camp 3 (men's zone)
Paruir Arakryan has been transferred here from camp 17.

Camp 3 (women's zone)
Chronicle 41 reported that in the middle of March Irina Senik was put in the cooler despite the fact that she was at that time suffering an attack of high blood pressure.

In protest at the detention of the sick I. Senik in the cooler the women political prisoners began a hunger-strike. After four days in the cooler (instead of the prescribed 15) I. Senik was sent back to the camp zone.

---

In April Stefania Shabatura was put in the punishment cells for six months.

---

S. Shabatura's camp term ends in January 1977. She still has 3 years' exile after that.

---
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S. Shabatura's camp term ends in January 1977. She still has 3 years' exile after that.

---

Since July 1975 Irina Stasiv-Kulyk has been working as an orderly. This work is paid at half rate — 15 roubles a month. After deductions for 'maintaining the prison staff', food and clothing, she had no money left to spend at the camp shop. Irina's complaints to the Procurator's Office and other Soviet authorities have yielded no results. Her complaints to international organizations are not allowed through by the administration.

Camp 17
On 2 May Vasily Stus, Mikhail Kheifets and Azat Arshakyan participated in a one-day hunger-strike in solidarity with those taking part in the 'Freedom March' in the U.S.A.

---

In May and June Stus, who was still feeling ill after an operation (Chronicle 39), was offered a bed in hospital for a prolonged period of invalid status, but conditions were attached: he was not to be allowed books and was not to send verses home. Stus refused. Then he was sent to the hospital in handcuffs. Stus wrote a complaint about the rough treatment he received.

In the summer Stus had over 300 of his poems confiscated, which he had written in the camp. When the political zone was abolished (see below), 300 of his translations from Goethe, Rilke, Kipling and other poets were also confiscated.

From June to August three of Stus's letters in a row were confiscated, for containing 'hidden meanings'. In the first of these letters 'hidden meanings' were discovered in Stus's own poetry, in the second — in Stus's translation of a poem by Baudelaire, in the third — in verses by Shevchenko.

---

In August the 'political' zone in camp 17 was abolished. The political prisoners were transferred to camps 3 and 19.

Camp 19
Stus was transferred from the hospital to camp 19. Here he was handed a document informing him that the 600 poems confiscated from him had been destroyed — this meant everything he had written in the camp. He was now searched every day; he was stripped and made to squat. Stus made a protest and refused to get up and stand in line for roll-call. He was put in the cooler and kept there for 14 days.

Some political prisoners wrote a declaration to the Procurator's Office and the KGB about the cruel treatment of Stus; they also went to the camp autho-
Highlights:

- Yury Khramtsov was punished for refusing to work, despite being an invalid.
- Vladimir Osipov, Alexander Bolonkin, Sergei Soldatov, and Razmik Markosyan held a one-day hunger-strike in solidarity with participants in the 'Freedom March' in the USA.
- For refusing to attend political lectures, Osipov, Bolonkin, Soklatov, Markosyan and Vasily Dolishny were punished.
- There was a request for a transfer to camp 35 (continuation—see Diary 39).
- Yury Khramtsov, Izrail Zalmanson, and others were deprived of privileges.
- The prisoner Shakhverdyan was transferred to the cooler for 7 days for refusal to work.
- Igor Kalynets returned to the camp from Lvov.

**The Pam Camps**

- Camp 35
- Diary of camp 35 (continuation—see Chronicles 33, 36, 38, 39, 41).

20 May: After being reported by Chaika, Izrail Zalmanson was deprived of access to the camp shop and of a parcel. Because of a report by Nikolayev, Savchuk and Verkholyak were deprived of parcels and of access to the camp shop. A punishment formerly imposed on Verkholyak was cancelled by camp commandant Pimenov for being 'too mild'.

In the evening Zograbyan was released from the punishment cells. For the last month he had been receiving only 450 grammes of bread a day, without any hot meals.

20 May: In the morning Zograbyan was sent out to work — at his former job of mechanic (see Chronicle 39 for an account of his fight for a transfer to this job). At 2.30 pm he became ill (physical and nervous exhaustion, gastritis, weak heart-beat). The prisoners asked the officer on duty, Siddaykov, for a medical assistant. It was only at 5 pm that Zograbyan was seen by a medical assistant.

21 May: By a decision of the district court, the Nazi collaborator Khimushkin was released because of a cancerous illness.

22 May: Pronyuk returned to the camp zone from the cooler in camp 36. In May he was informed by the Main Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions that his declaration to the 25th Congress of the CPSU had not been sent to the addressers.

23 May: Gimpu was transferred from camp 37 and put in the cooler for 10 days.

24 May: Lieutenant Kuznetsov told the former torturer Vasily Khokhlov that he could not have a car, because of the poor work done by the prisoners.

25 May: After being reported by Nikolayev, Shakhverdyan was deprived of a parcel and of access to the camp shop (because of his hernia he had refused to work as a lathe-operator). After Kuznetsov made out a report about Butman's 'insolence', he was also deprived of a parcel and of access to the camp shop. Zakharchenko was punished for 'refusal to work'.

27 May: Igor Kalynets returned to the camp from Lvov. On the way he had been robbed, first by criminal convicts with whom he was being transported, then by convoy guards.

28 May: V. Ya. Kuverden, head doctor at the hospital in the town of Skalny, examined Shakhverdyan and Nikolai Marusin. Confirming that Shakhverdyan had a hernia and stating that an operation was necessary, he nevertheless refused to release him from heavy work, saying: 'In our country many miners who have hernias still work and are none the worse — they set records.' Admitting that Marmus had varicose veins in his legs, he also refused to release him from work at a lathe and advised him to 'work sitting down'. It became known that the administration of camp 35 and the KGB in Skalny had asked Kuverden not to release the prisoners from work, as the camp was not fulfilling its work plan. Immediately after this 'medical examination' Pimenov put Shakhverdyan in the cooler for 7 days, for 'refusal to work'. Before he was shut up Shakhverdyan handed in a declaration to the International Red Cross asking for help. This declaration was not sent by the administration.

21 May: The prisoners Altman, Anselbaums, Butman, Verkholyak, Ghzman, Grabans, Zalmanson, Zakharchenko, Kalyntsev, Kivilo, Kirend, Zograbyan, Marchenko, Mikita, Motryuk, Pronyuk, Savchuk, Svetlichny, Soroka and Shovkon held a one-day hunger-strike. Each of them sent the following declaration to the Administrative Department of the Central Committee of the CPSU:

The deliberate infringement of Soviet laws by the camp administration, which has recently become systematic and is aimed directly at injuring the health of prisoners, as in the cases of the repressive measures taken against B. Shakhverdyan, R. Zograbyan and others, together with the failure of all previous attempts by the prisoners to obtain supervision of the situation by the
supervisory authorities and the K G B, which openly ignore or draw back from these problems; the chronic undernourishment caused by the laws on corrective labour; the lack of necessary medicines — all this forces me to appeal to the Soviet authorities to allow a visit to Corrective Labour Institution V S 389/35 by representatives of the International Red Cross, who have been trying in vain for many years to fulfil their duties towards Soviet political prisoners.

In support of this demand I declare myself on hunger-strike for today, 31 May 1976.

A declaration containing similar demands was sent by these prisoners who did not take part in the hunger-strike for health reasons — Basurah, Maschur, Cherkavsky [Chronicle 39] and Pidgorodetsky.

In his declaration Basurah said:

1. A prisoner of war, an ordinary soldier of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, have spent 23 years in prison camps, losing my health and being reduced to a state of complete collapse (he has already suffered two heart attacks), add my voice to these demands ... The excesses committed by the local administration have reached the limit: merely for writing a declaration which was not even sent to its addressee, I was given 10 days in the cooler ...

Pidgorodetsky said in his declaration:

Having signed the Helsinki Agreement and proclaimed the ideals of peace, peaceful coexistence and humanism to the whole world, the Soviet Union must back this up by its actions. First of all, a commission from the International Red Cross must be allowed to come here ... In the 24 years I have spent in Soviet camps and prisons, I have never seen a representative of this organization, while in other countries, even in Chile, they have free access ...

June: Captain Polyakov began to carry out the functions of commandant at camp 35 in place of Major Pimenov.

Food standards went down sharply. In addition to the usual soup made from frozen cabbage and fish, the green colour and peculiar smell of which do not fade even after prolonged boiling, the quality of the bread got worse: it acquired the colour and consistency of clay.

Ivan Svetlichny is ill; he has cerebral hypertension (stages IA and IB) together with angina. He suffers from constant severe headaches. There is reason to suppose that he has internal pressure on the brain. The doctor has prescribed magnesium injections for him, but the nurse said there had not been any magnesium available for a long time. Instead of magnesium, they gave Svetlichny injections of platyphyllin, but there was only enough of that for three injections. His memory fails him badly. Often he cannot concentrate. Svetlichny asks for a qualified medical opinion, which would take into account his condition in which he finds himself.

Pronyuk's condition has worsened significantly. During an X-ray examination he was found to be bringing up blood from the left lung. In spite of this the camp administration is still demanding that he fulfil the norm, as before.

2 June: Ginzburg came out of the cooler.

3 June: Shakhverdyan was visited in the cooler by members of a district supervising committee. They told him that because of his non-fulfilment of the work norm and his infringement of regime regulations, the commission would recommend that he be transferred to prison. Shakhverdyan expressed his gratitude to the commission for their humanitarian attitude to him, as a longer stay in camp 35 would mean new repressive measures against him and could end in his becoming an invalid. The visitors called Shakhverdyan 'Butman' a number of times and ascribed some episodes from the latter's life to him.

5 June: Polyakov deprived Zakharchenko of a visit for the third time running, for breach of discipline at work.

7 June: Butman's mother arrived for her prescribed long visit. The visit took place in the visitors' room at camp 37, seven kilometres from camp 35. The official explanation was that the visitors' room at camp 35 was full up and there were no more places. It is obvious that in reality the reason was a breakdown of the listening devices. The visit was allowed to last only 24 hours.

For refusing to work at a lathe, Marmus was deprived three times and deprived simultaneously of a visit, a parcel and access to the camp shop.

8 June: After being reported by Shilin (for 'stopping work early') Kalynets was deprived of a parcel and of access to the camp shop. Zakharchenko was punished for reading in working hours. Captain Syagy of the medical corps, from the Medical Section of the Penitentiary V O D, spoke to the prisoners who went on hunger-strike on 31 May. He agreed that their claims about the living conditions and medical services had some basis and admitted that the punishment of Marmus and Shakhverdyan was illegal.

9 June: Marmus and Shakhverdyan were transferred to work in the sewing workshop, but the punishments handed out to them earlier were not cancelled.

The censor Kolesnichenko informed Valery Marchenko that his declaration to the Institute of Nephrology had been confiscated because it was libellous. (From his youth Marchenko has suffered from chronic nephritis. Before his arrest he had spent a number of periods in hospital because of it. Since his arrest in June 1973, and especially in the last two years, his health has significantly worsened.)

11 June: Shmidt and Savchenko were transferred to camp 37.

12 June: A visit to Gluzman from his relatives was transferred to camp 37. The official explanation was that the drains were in a bad state of repair.

15 June: A visit to Zograbyan was transferred to camp 37.

16 June: After being reported by Gubarev, Zograbyan was punished by Kytmanov for 'a breach of discipline at work' (on 12 June he had washed his
socks in work time).

19 June: KGB official Shukin asked Shakhverdyan if he had not changed his opinions. Shakhverdyan answered in the negative.

20 June: The prisoner Yakov Kryuchkov began a conversation with Asselbaum, in which he said that Milberg, who had served 25 years for his wish to emigrate from the USSR, had been put in a psychiatric hospital after his release. Evidently this conversation was an attempt to scare Asselbaum, who has expressed his desire to emigrate from the USSR.

21 June: After Pronyuk was reported by Chaika, Kytmanov deprived him of access to the camp shop, for refusing to carry out an order from the officer on duty. Gimpu handed in a petition, asking for permission to receive some gastric lemonade from home (it contains no acid: he is an invalid of the second group, and there is no lemonade in the camp). Varunin, the head of the medical section in the Perm camps, supported his request, but Poljakov refused it, writing on the petition: ‘The central hospital is supplied with all medical requirements.’

22 June: An assizes session of the Chusovoi town court transferred Shakhverdyan to Vladimir Prison. Kirovchenko was transferred from the camp. The soup was completely inedible; as it had been made from a stock of rotten animal entrails.

26 June: Gimpu declared that the food had worsened because ‘the young people protest a lot, and that’s what we’ve got for their letters’. A cook, prisoner Dzenis, particularly hostile vein.

28 June: Gurny was transferred from the camp.

1 July: Svetlichny had an attack of high blood pressure, with vomiting and other brain symptoms.

2 July: At the insistence of the consultant doctor Utyro, and in spite of opposition from Dr Solomina, Pronyuk was sent to hospital.

4 July: A meeting of political prisoners took place on the bi-centenary of the United States of America. Some prisoners gave brief talks on the history and politics of the USA and the American political system.

* * *

Not counting Altman, Butman and Zaluzhnou, who carry on a regular correspondence with Israel, letters from abroad have been received by the following political prisoners: Svetlichny (in 1975 — from Anna-Halya Horbatsch in West Germany; in 1976 — from the Hevryk family in Philadelphia and from Vera Selyantskaya in Rio de Janeiro), Chuman (in 1975 — from Eva Butman in Israel; in 1976 — from Eva Kurz in West Germany and from Iosif Meshener in Vienna), Kalyuts (in 1975 — two letters from Anna-Halya Horbatsch in West Germany; in 1976 — also two letters from her), Ogurtsov (in 1976 — from Poland), Evgeny Prishlyak (from his brother Yaroslav in Montreal: three letters in 1963, one letter in 1964, one in 1965, one in 1966, one in 1967, two in 1968.

---
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one in 1969, one in 1974, one in 1976) and Kurtinovsly (during his whole sentence — three letters from his sister in France).

On 5 July Miroslav Simchich's wife and her two children (aged 4 and 8 years) came for a long visit with him. Simchich has been imprisoned since 1949 (see his letter below). They were at first given a three-day visit, but later this was unexpectedly cut to two days.

It is very difficult to reach the settlement of Vsesvyatskoye, where camp 35 is located, from the railway station at Chusovoi. A car driver going in that direction who gave Simchich's wife and her children a lift told her that people are punished for giving help to the relatives of political prisoners.

* * *

Chronicle 41 has already mentioned Valery Marchenko's meeting with his mother. We now report more precise details.

On 6 July Valery's mother, who had made her way with difficulty to Vsesvyatskoye from Chusovoi station, heard from the administrative authorities at camp 35 that her visit would take place in camp 36, which is in the settlement of Kuchino, about 100 kilometres from Vsesvyatskoye.

The administration at camp 36 tried to find out from Valery's mother how she had got to Kuchino from Vsesvyatskoye and who had transported her.

Valery Marchenko was taken to Kuchino in a prison van. The compartment where he sat filled up with gas from the exhaust. As the guards had closed the little window of his compartment, he was choking. In answer to Valery's plea for the window to be opened, the guards said ‘You should be rattled about for a bit and then thrown out.’ Only after Valery kept knocking to attract the attention of the officer riding in the driver's cab was the window opened. When they arrived, Valery could not get his breath back for several hours. When Marchenko's mother told officer Mikunov, after the visit, how her son had been brought there, he replied that Marchenko was lying; the guards were Young Communists and could not have behaved like that.

Valery had been allotted a two-day visit from his mother. People kept coming into the room where they met, asking if everything was in order, if the water pipes were working, and so on. 18 hours after the visit began, eight people suddenly rushed into the room. The visit was terminated. Marchenko was taken away. A search began: they looked for something in the soup bowl, in the box of sweets, they even unscrewed the water pipes ... In his mother's suitcase they found 129 roubles, which she had saved for her return journey. She was told that she had wanted to pass them illegally to her son. The money was confiscated, without any record being made of the confiscation. On this, the visit came to an end.
Valery Marchenko was born in Kiev in 1947. His uncle was a well-known Ukrainian historian, Professor Mikhail Marchenko of Kiev University. His parents were teachers of Ukrainian language and literature. In 1970 Valery graduated from the Ukrainian section of the Department of Philology at Kiev State University. From September 1970 to June 1973 Marchenko worked as a literary journalist on the newspaper "Literaturnaya Ukraina." At the same time he taught Ukrainian language and literature in a school, did translations from Azerbaijani to Ukrainian and engaged in academic work.

On 25 June 1973 Valery Marchenko was arrested by the KGB. On 29 December 1973 the Kiev Regional Court under Judge Zavgorodny sentenced him to 6 years in strict-regime labour camps and 2 years' exile, for 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'. The prosecution was conducted by Procurator Silenko.

The charges against Marchenko in the indictment were that:

- under the influence of nationalist ideas, which he had acquired as a result of reading illegal anti-Soviet literature and listening to hostile broadcasts by foreign radio stations, and having an incorrect understanding of certain aspects of the Soviet government's nationalities policy, he systematically involved himself — from 1963 to 1973 — in activities hostile to Soviet society, with the aim of subverting and weakening Soviet power: he spread slanderous fabrications by word of mouth, discrediting the Soviet political and social system; he produced, stored and disseminated documents of an anti-Soviet, nationalist character, containing malicious attacks on Soviet reality and on the nationalities policy of the CPSU, together with calls to struggle against Soviet power. He tried more than once to send abroad the hostile documents of which he was the author, so that they could be published in the anti-Soviet nationalist press.

Apart from Valery Marchenko's 'slanderous by word of mouth', the evidence against him consisted of three of his own works and Dzyuba's work "Internationalism or Russification?" which he had distributed (he gave it to three friends to read).

In the camp Marchenko, in spite of the difficult conditions and his weak state of health, translates from English to Ukrainian and writes articles on current affairs.

Marchenko's illness (chronic nephritis) is getting worse. In the camp he has become an invalid. There is no medicine for him in the camp, while the medicines sent by his mother are sent back.

He is made to sew sacks from 9 am to 6 pm six days a week. He is deprived of access to the camp shop if he does not fulfill the norm. As a result, Marchenko makes use of the camp shop only four or five months in a year. When Marchenko's mother told the camp administration that her son was catastrophically thin, she received the reply: 'What do you expect? He doesn't fulfil the norm.'

In the summer of 1976 Ivan Svetlichny was in the prison hospital for an examination. After leaving the hospital, he was removed from his post as a librarian (he was replaced by 'a free worker') and sent to work on a machine-press — work quite unsuited to his state of health (see above).

On 1 August the anniversary of the conclusion of the Helsinki Agreement, 27 prisoners — Asselbaums, Altman, Batara, Butman, Verkholyak, Gimpu, Gluzman, Grabans, Zakharchenko, Zograbyan, Kalynets, Kivilo, Kirend, Kovalenko, Marchenko, Mashkov, Minko, Motryuk, Ogurtsov, Pidgorodetsky, Prishlyak, Pronyuk, Svetlichny, Soroka, Shakhverdyan and Shokovoy — held a hunger-strike (see also 'camp 37').

Camp 36
The camp is located in a swamp. So the water, especially at work, is unsuitable not only for drinking but even for washing. In the bath-house the water is quite rusty in colour. This water leaves dirty stains on the sinks. When clothing is washed in it, it turns rusty in colour. Commissions which have come here because of complaints by the prisoners have admitted, as has Major Yarunin, the head of the medical service of camp complex V S-389, that the water is bad, but they have said there is nothing to be done — the camp is in a swamp.

The toilets are about a hundred metres from the living quarters. In winter this distance makes itself felt, especially for invalids. The toilets are not heated. In the punishment cells and the cooler the drains and water-pipes are fitted out in each cell in the following manner: instead of a water closet, there is a hole with a cover; above it is a sink with a hole stopped by a plug; above the sink is a water-pipe, which has a tap in the corner. In the mornings and evenings the guard turns on the tap for a short time. The rest of the time he has to be specially asked to do so.

The work (assembling the parts for irons) takes place in two workshops. Workshop I is hot and officially 'dangerous': this is where the assembly takes place. Workshop 2 has three noisy machine-presses and semi-automatic lathes. The work is very dirty. No one has any spirit left after work is over. Baths are once a week, on Saturdays. On Sundays clothes are washed individually. Ordinary soap is given out in the bathhouse. Toilet soap is sold in the camp shop within permitted limits.

Chronicle 41 has already reported that in May Kovalyov was put in the cooler again. In the middle of May Kovalyov was faced by a pile of documents...
accusing him of infringing the regime regulations. One of them stated that on 30 April, in the morning, he had been ten minutes late for his shift. In actual fact, on the morning of 30 April Kovalyov had felt unwell on arrival at work and had asked the officer in charge, Lyapunov, for permission to go to see the doctor. The latter made no objection, Kovalyov, not finding the doctor at work, at once returned to the shift detail and went back to work.

Later the same day, the doctor excused him from work. His other infringements of the rules were of the same kind.

After his 7 days in the cooler Kovalyov was immediately given another 3 days for the following infringements of rules: he had not got ready for the cooler quickly enough, he had been late at the work cell (he was finishing a declaration, with the permission of the guard); while his cell was being searched he tried to break through into the cell, using force against Ensign Titov (actually, Kovalyov had said, on being taken out into the corridor during the search, that a search should take place in his presence).

In protest at this, Kovalyov began a total hunger-strike. Fyodorov, the deputy commandant for regime, came into his cell and threatened to put him in the punishment cells or send him to a prison. Kovalyov wrote a number of declarations. In a declaration addressed to Major Istomin (his former interrogator, an official of the Perm KGB) Kovalyov described these unjustified punishments and threats and stated that he would be forced to adopt the most resolute forms of protest. Many prisoners expressed protests at the prolongation of Kovalyov’s term in the cooler. Bogus Sveristyuk went on hunger-strike.

In June [investigator] Istomin visited camp 36 and talked to Kovalyov. After this visit the tormenting of Kovalyov almost ceased.

Kovalyov appealed to the camp doctors to send him to a Leningrad hospital for prisoners, so that he could have an operation. (He has a severe form of haemorrhoids, with much loss of blood. Before his arrest he already had an operation arranged.) The doctors, including Major Yarunin, replied that they could not remember any case of a prisoner being taken there, and nor would this happen. Petrov, the head of the medical section in camp 36, told Kovalyov: ‘We’ll give you treatment if you behave well.’

On 4 October Kovalyov had a two-hour visit from his wife, L. Yu. Boitsova. A. P. Lavut, who had accompanied her, was not allowed to participate in the visit. During the meeting Kovalyov said that representatives of the camp administration had asked him if he wanted to see A. D. Sakharov. Boitsova said that Andrei Dmitrievich was preparing to visit him. The guard supervising the visit, Captain Rak, interrupted: ‘You mustn’t speak about Andrei Dmitrievich.’

After the visit Boitsova and Lavut were received by Major Zhuravkov, the camp commandant, and other representatives of the administration. Boitsova was allowed to hand over some medicine and photographs of her children for Kovalyov. Zhuravkov said that Kovalyov was ‘getting used to the camp regime with difficulty’ and that he was trying ‘to instruct the administration in the law’ and ‘to start a lawsuit against them’. Zhuravkov advised Boitsova to influence her husband. ‘If his views really don’t change, after he’s released he’ll find himself in other places like this one, or somewhere even more remote.’

Zhuravkov explained his refusal to allow Lavut to visit by saying that ‘some people’ were allowed visits, if the administration was convinced that they would have a positive influence on the prisoner. For example, if a prisoner’s former work-place requested it, or on the recommendation of competent bodies.

About Kovalyov’s coming visit from a lawyer who was preparing to seek a review of his case (Chronicle 40, in September the lawyer eventually managed to study the case), Zhuravkov said permission would have to be obtained from the KGB.

* * *

In the spring and summer of 1975 Stepan Sapelyak was transported several times to the Ukraine — to Kiev and Ternopol. There he was subjected to all kinds of attempts to get him to recant: he was taken on a trip to the beach; he was taken to his home village, the car stopped on the road leading to the village and he was told ‘Go home, we feel you’ve repented, you can write a declaration to that effect tomorrow’. Stepan refused; they threatened to beat him, showing him their rubber truncheons. At this time there was a tourist from Canada, of Ukrainian nationality, under arrest in Ternopol. Sapelyak was asked to tell this Ukrainian woman that he was not a political prisoner but just a hooligan, that he had never been in the Urals but had been in a camp near Lvov, that the story of his being beaten up (Chronicle 33) had been an invention. Sapelyak refused.

On his return to camp 36 he was constantly searched, being stripped naked for the purpose, and he was often put in the cooler; in May 1976 he was put in the punishment cells for a month. In May 1976 KGB official Major Chernyak shouted at Sapelyak: ‘I’ll reduce you to skin and bones, so that when you emerge you’ll have to put stones in your pockets to stop the wind blowing you away!’

In the last year Sapelyak’s high blood pressure has worsened. In June 1976 it was between 180 and 120. In the summer of 1976 Sapelyak was transferred to Vladimir Prison.

Sapelyak is about 25 years old. He is from the village of Rossokhocha in Cherkivsky district, Ternopol region (Western Ukraine). In 1973 a group of young men from this village, led by Sapelyak, took down the red flags celebrating the 55th anniversary of the Ukrainian Republic and put up yellow and blue (nationalist) flags instead. He was sentenced to 5 years in camps and 3 years’ exile.

* * *

In the summer two men came to see Evgeny Sveristyuk; one of them was a
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KGB official. They spoke to Sverstyuk in Ukrainian; he answered them in Russian.

But you, it seems, fought for the right to speak in Ukrainian?' said the KGB man.

'I talk to the secret police in Russian.'

'If you consider me a secret policeman — well, my colleague is a philosopher.'

'A secret policeman with a philosophic deviation,' said Sverstyuk, and put an end to the conversation.

* * *

Certain details have become known about Askot Navasardyan's stay in the KGB investigation prison in Erevan. When in August 1974 he went on hunger-strike, forcible feeding was carried out with the intention of causing him pain: although he did not resist, his jaws were forced open and his tongue was pulled out of the way with iron pliers, squeezing it severely. On 27 October 1974, when he was about to be dispatched from Erevan station, his escort (Russians and Turkmen led by a single Armenian, Ruzvelt Sagatyan) entered the 'cage' where Navasardyan was and beat him up severely (with their fists and feet). When Navasardyan asked 'What's this for?', Sagatyan said 'So you'll know what a Soviet escort's like!'

When Navasardyan was being taken to Erevan (Chronicle 41) attempts were made to get him to write a plea for pardon.

* * *

Ladyzhensky (Chronicle 34) is being kept in special conditions in the camp: he gets extra visits, extra parcels, a special food diet, and freedom from work. Ladyzhensky's minor infringements of the regime regulations are overlooked, while other people are punished for the same thing.

In April 1976 Ladyzhensky was a witness at the trial of Andrei Tverdokhlebov ( Chronicle 40). In June Izvestia published an article, 'A Well of Foul Water', which said:

The regime there (in the camps — Chronicle) is organized strictly according to the law. This has been confirmed by, among others, prisoners serving terms of punishment in labour colonies — Dudenas, Paulauskas, Dzhaburia and Ladyzhensky. According to them, no illegal pressures have been brought to bear on them. They are asked only to observe the rules laid down and to work, besides which they receive an appropriate wage for their labour, as provided for in Soviet law.

Trying to justify himself to the other prisoners, Ladyzhensky said that Izvestia had deliberately presented his situation as typical for the camp as a whole; after all, in his testimony he had talked only about himself. (In fact Izvestia gives this part of Ladyzhensky's testimony accurately — see Chronicle 40).

In the Prisons and Camps

According to him, the conditions created specially for him were a premeditated provocation; he himself had not asked for privileges.

* * *

In 1975 Iosif Mendelevich appealed to the Helsinki Conference in a letter, stating that there was no freedom of religion in the camp. He got a reply to this letter from Syroiyatov of the Perm Corrective Labour Department. The reply stated, in particular, that the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference was declaratory in character; it did not have the force of law and there was no obligation to observe it.

On 31 July 1976, the anniversary of the Helsinki Conference, Mendelevich was put in the cooler for two days for refusing to work on a Saturday.

On 1 August Kovalyov and Sverstyuk went on hunger-strike in protest at the punishment of Mendelevich.

* * *

In February 1976 the prisoner Taratukhin declared at a 'press conference' that he had worked with KGB representatives and that he was now ceasing this collaboration. He sent a corresponding declaration to the administration.

Taratukhin told the prisoners how he had 'informed' and on whom. He said he had become an informer to discover who the other informers were. However, he had not succeeded in this, because they were not made known to each other.

Taratukhin said that Major Chernyak of the KGB was in charge of the informers, but that they rarely met him. They passed their information on to Drs Petrov and Titov, who 'paid' them in chocolate (six bars a month). In addition, the doctors prescribed them a special diet and gave them time in hospital.

Informers received extra parcels and packages. Besides reporting on conversations and the mood in the 'camp zone', the informers inflamed national prejudices (especially against the Jews) and spread slanderous rumours about the more respected prisoners.

Taratukhin also revealed the text of his 'oath':

I, Sergei Mikhailovich Taratukhin, agree to work with the Committee for State Security. I promise to keep secret any state secrets which may become known to me in the course of this co-operation. For reasons of security I will use the pseudonym 'Andrei'.

Taratukhin (born 1956) landed in the political camp from a common criminals' camp.

* * *

(Pvt) Lychak has been transferred to camp 36 from camp 37 and put in the punishment cells for two months.

* * *
On 4 July Mukhametshin (Chronicle 37) went on strike for the day, in honour of American Independence Day. The next day he was put in the punishment cells.

Camp 37
On 24 February eight people went on a hunger-strike in honour of the 25th Congress of the CPSU.

In March [Izrail] Zalmanson and Mikitko were transferred to camp 35.

On 2 May Vinnichuk, Vorobyov, Gimpu, Vladimir Marmus, Pronyuk and Sinkov held a one-day hunger-strike in solidarity with those who took part in the ‘Freedom March’ in the USA.

At the end of May the following incident occurred.

In the prisoners’ barracks the bunks are of the prison type: a few long thin strips of cloth stretched over an iron frame. They are very uncomfortable to sleep on. Sometimes the prisoners manage to acquire some planks or a second mattress. One day the guards took away all these ‘illegal’ improvements. Then 17 people demanded that the ‘net-bunks’ laid down by Decree 020 should be given out and, throwing their bunks out of the barracks, they started to sleep on the floor. The administration asked them for several days to put the bunks back, then offered a compromise: while their complaints (to the Procurator’s Office and the Administration for Corrective Labour Institutions) were being examined, planks would be welded to the bottoms of the frames. The prisoners agreed. Gimpu, who was suspected of being the instigator, was put in the cooler on 23 May, ‘for another reason’. He was transferred to camp 35 and sat out his 10 days in the cooler there.

The Procurator’s Office replied that the present bunks in the labour colony are in fact ‘net-bunks’. (There was a similar incident in camp 35 — see Chronicle 39).

On 1 August, the anniversary of the end of the Helsinki Conference, seven prisoners — Avakov [Chronicle 39], Vinnichuk, Vorobyov, Kvetsko, Vladimir Marmus, Reznikov and Sinkov — held a hunger-strike.

Reports that ‘the living conditions in camp 37 are something unprecedented’ (Chronicle 38) have unfortunately turned out to be exaggerated.

In Camps for Common Criminals

Vladimir Arkhangelsky (Chronicles 38, 39) is serving a term in the Buryat ASSR (institution 94/4).

His state of health is bad: he has severe pain in his lungs, he vomits every day and is very weak. He has become very thin and weighs about 50 kilograms. He is given valerian as a form of medicine.

A letter from the Medical Services Administration of the USSR MVD dated 27 September 1976, sent in answer to a complaint, reads:

‘At present the prisoner Arkhangelsky is healthy and capable of working. The medical officials who failed to give timely aid have been reprimanded.’

Bobyrev, Deputy head of department,
Medical Services Administration, USSR MVD.

Letters and Declarations from Political Prisoners

M. Simchich to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

In 1949 Miroslav Vasilevich Simchich (born 1923) was sentenced to 25 years’ imprisonment by a military tribunal in Ivano-Frankovsk, for being a member of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army.

The aim of Simchich’s declaration is to obtain cancellation of the supplementary sentence (10 years) which he got in the Magadan camps in 1953.

Simchich describes the appalling conditions of the prisoner transports and camps, which he survived by a miracle. The authorities in his camp ruled with the help of a gang of criminals. In defence of his life, Simchich had dared to get into a fight with thieves, and was helped by his friends, but the official Vorontsov, who had himself provoked the fight, initiated a criminal charge against the ‘nationalist group’. All eight of them got 10 year sentences. Further on, Simchich writes:

In 1956 a commission from the USSR Supreme Soviet commuted my term of imprisonment to 10 years. But after four years outside the camps somebody felt I had not been inside for long enough and I was arrested again (on so-called newly discovered evidence) …

I therefore consider unjust the addition of another camp sentence to my first sentence, so that my term of imprisonment was increased to 30 years. The commission exculpated all seven of my co-defendants in the camp trial … And after all, a 30-year sentence does not exist on the statutes.

I ask you to inform me … if my sentence will come to an end after the 30 years I have now been condemned to, or if there will be a Special Board session, as in the 30s, which will give me another supplementary sentence.
D. Vorholyak to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet (June 1976).
For many years I have been earnestly trying to obtain registration of my
marriage to my wife, to whom I have been married de facto since 1953.
Article 10 of the Basic Law on Marriage and the Family in the USSR and
the Union Republics does not forbid the registration of a prisoner's marriage...
In connection with this, I ask you to clarify whether the administrative
regulation forbidding prisoners to register their marriages — an order of the
Ministry of Internal Affairs — is legal.

* * *

V. Marehenko to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet (July 1976).
Taking into account the principle in article 16 of the International Covenant
on Civil and Political Rights ('Each person, wherever he lives, has the right to
be regarded as a person before the law'), which came into effect on 23 March
1976, I ask you to pronounce on the legality of the continued use of article
8 of the Basic Principles of the Corrective Labour Law of the USSR and
the Union republics, which limit by law the right of prisoners to be regarded
as persons before the law in the USSR.

* * *

V. Marechenko: Open letter to Walter Heinowski and Gerhard Scheumann,
journalists from the German Democratic Republic (June 1976).

I am writing to you for the second time, hoping that this time fate will look
kindly on me and my letter will reach its addressee ... I know that you have
devoiced not only your pen, but also your movie camera, to depicting the
many sufferings of Chile. You describe ... the torments of prisoners in con-
centration camps with fiery emotion, skilfully. It was this that really moved
me to sit down and write you a letter ... But why don't you see for yourself
how the present torturer, Ensign Ali Atayev, takes honey (which I am for-
bidden) to the former torturer Grigory Sinyatsinsky ... or what price is paid by
the spiritually degraded Usatyuk for his unlimited number of visits (while
others are constantly being deprived of visits). I ... can tell you how the
philosopher Pronyuk, eaten up by tuberculosis, is deprived of the miserable
five roubles he should have (for the 'camp shop' — Chronicle) once a
month ...

* * *

S. Mamchur: to Canon Raymond Goor, a [Belgian] member of the secre-
tariat of the International Committee on European Security and Co-operation.

Respected Father! Having been in Soviet concentration camps since 1957,
I have not yet been able to avail myself of the right our Lord has given every-
one — the right to read the Word of God. For all this time I have had the
Bible taken away from me, as well as sections I had copied out from it, which
were burned ... I beg you, Father Canon, to influence the authorities of the
Soviet Union to allow me to have a Bible with me in the camp. This natural
longing of mine is a sacred human right, sanctified by God.

* * *

V. Romanyuk: to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet (see also his
letters in Chronicles 37, 39).

In his letter the priest Vasily Romanyuk renounces his Soviet citizenship:
... for I consider that it is an offence before God and man to bear the title
of a citizen of the country where so many crimes have been committed
against peace and humanity, where now — in the last quarter of the 20th
century — a man is shut up for years in concentration camps and psychiatric
hospitals merely for expressing his opinions and thoughts to someone else.

V. Romanyuk writes that he is appealing to the American people and government to make him a citizen of the U S A, and asks for the help of the World Council of Churches in obtaining this.

I am a native of Western Ukraine and until I was 19 years old I had not lived under your protection, or studied in your schools or served in your army.

In 1944, when Soviet forces took over our region and mobilization was proclaimed, I went to the Military Commissariat together with my father. There, because of slanderous denunciations by the local communists, I was arrested and sentenced to 10 years, so that the first Soviet 'passport' which officially included me among the citizens of the Soviet Union, was the sentence passed by the Stanislav military tribunal.

In 1972 you declared me to be an especially dangerous recidivist, a state criminal, and gave me, in my old age, another 'passport' of the same kind I received in my youth, but this time the sentence may be indefinite, as my health will hardly be able to endure your 'special-regime colonies'.

* * *

V. Romanyuk: to the National Council of Christian Churches of the U S A.
A letter similar to the preceding one.

* * *


The first anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe has shown that the Soviet government signed it out of demagogic motives ... It is not difficult to understand that a country with a totalitarian regime, hidden away behind an iron curtain, could not be a peaceful neighbour to the free countries of Western Europe. As a protest against the non-fulfilment of the democratic requirements of the Final Act by the Soviet government ... I declare myself on hunger-strike on 1 August 1976 ...

* * *

N. Motryuk: a letter to his son.
I am now serving a term of punishment as a 'state criminal', because my friend and I met together and discussed the present situation in Ukraine, the reasons for the cultural and spiritual depression there, as well as the low standard of living. (Nikolai Motryuk is a member of the Union of Ukrainian Youth in Galicia — see Chronicle 33. He was arrested on 15 March 1973. His sentence comes to an end on 15 March 1977.) What awaits me in my homeland? Constant surveillance, all kinds of provocation, persecution, and, in the end, a prison or concentration camp again. There will be no life for me here. So I have renounced Soviet citizenship and have asked the French ambassador to grant me French citizenship. If I manage to emigrate, it will be by God's grace ...

* * *

Abankin describes in detail the circumstances of his life, which led him to try to leave the U S S R in 1966 (on 4 August 1966 he was detained by East German border guards; in October 1968 he got a 12-year sentence). He describes how the investigator tried to force him to give the confession necessary to the investigation and how the trial was conducted. Abankin confirms his renunciation of his citizenship (Chronicle 32). In conclusion he writes:

I did not admit during the investigation or the trial that I was a traitor to the Motherland, as I have not betrayed the Motherland, but the authorities. The authorities are not the Motherland. Authorities change. The Motherland remains for ever. They did not pay any attention to this, but I declare once more: I am a Russian and will remain a Russian, whatever happens, and my Motherland is Russia.

* * *

S. Kovalyov, E. Sverstyuk.
To the Don Quixotes who cannot come to terms with the incarnation of the evil of the world, with violence and lies, to those who constantly hear the voice of the earth and the voice of conscience, those who are upheld by their active love of the truth, those who knock at locked doors, who write letters which never arrive, who help those dear to us, who shelter the hunted and persecuted, those people, with names and without, to whom we owe a debt — our thanks and a brotherly shake of the hand!

In Defence of Political Prisoners


For some years now the political prisoners in the camps of the Urals and Mordovia and in Vladimir Prison have observed 5 September as the Day of Remembrance for the Victims of the Red Terror. Political prisoners of various opinions, faiths and nationalities gather together on that day, reflect on our
history and remember those who perished without trace, their persecuted relations and friends ... Upholding the initiative and traditions of political prisoners in the Soviet Union ... we repeat again: freedom for the political prisoners of the Soviet Union! End the Terror!

* * *


The artist Stefanía Shabatura has been officially informed that all her creative works — book-marks and drawings — are to be burnt.

Stefanía Shabatura is a well-known Ukrainian artist; her tapestries have been shown more than once at regional, republican, all-Union and international exhibitions.

Until 1974 Stefanía Shabatura was given practically no opportunity to draw, to do what was most important and valuable to her.

In 1974 she was given a sketching book, paints, brushes, crayons and paper.

All this was brought to S. Shabatura by Shumeiko himself, a representative of the Lvov K.G.B. It was precisely because of this that the camp administration did not deprive S. Shabatura of the paints, which are included among objects forbidden in places of imprisonment ...

At the end of 1975 Stefanía Shabatura was taken to Lvov (where she had lived before her arrest) for ‘re-education’. However, even in Lvov prison Stefanía Shabatura remained herself. On Human Rights Day, 10 December 1975, she went on hunger-strike, as she had done in the earlier years of her imprisonment, in protest at the crude violation of human rights in the U.S.S.R. She did not change her mind about the hunger-strike, did not end it even after insistent warnings from Shumeiko, the representative of the Lvov K.G.B. ... Shumeiko threatened Stefanía Shabatura, saying she would ‘come to regret’ her stubbornness.

Immediately after her return to the camp, in the guardhouse itself, a document was read to Stefanía Shabatura: all the drawings confiscated from her before her departure had been assigned to be burnt, because they were ‘abstract’ and depicted the camp ...

Stefanía Shabatura has not committed any crime or offence ‘against the state’. It is a crime to terrorize, persecute and mock her, to cripple her physically and attempt to destroy her spiritually. It is a crime to burn her work. These crimes are committed in the land of victorious socialism, under the cover of socialist legality.

I hope that this will not prevent artists — ‘left-wing’, ‘right-wing’ and others, the creative intelligentsia, and everyone who values man and his highest aspirations, from speaking out in defence of Stefanía Shabatura and her work ...


The linguist Melchuk (Chronicle 41) asks the scientists and academics of the world to remember the fate of the biologist Sergei Kovalyov.

We cannot put the world right immediately — but we can help to save one man. Anyone can do that ...

Write letters of encouragement to Kovalyov.

Write letters of protest to the Soviet authorities ...

Do not forget that letters from well-known and unknown Westerners, addressed to the Minister for Internal Affairs of the U.S.S.R., Shchelokov, and to the administration of camp V S 369/36 can bring this or that repression to an end ...

Releases

On 13 July Kuzma Ivanovich Matviyuk (Chronicle 33) was released. He served his term in Mordovia (camp 19).

The release took place as follows. On 2 July he was unexpectedly put on a prisoner transport and transferred to the prison in the town of Cherkassy (he had been taken from Moscow to Kiev in an ordinary passenger aeroplane, in handcuffs accompanied by three guards). On 12 July K.G.B. officials ‘had a talk’ with Matviyuk.

On the evening of 13 July Matviyuk was put in an official car and taken to the bus station, accompanied by the prison governor and a guard. There he was issued a ticket to the village of Ilyashovka, where his mother is living; he was put on the bus on the right route and told that he was forbidden to get off or change routes.

On his arrival in Ilyashovka, Matviyuk was handed a decree subjecting him to one year’s administrative surveillance, as ‘he had not chosen the way of reform while he was in a place of detention’. According to this decree, Matviyuk does not have the right to go outside the district and must be at home between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m.; every ten days he must go to the district centre and register with the police.

Matviyuk was sent to live in Ilyashovka against his will: in the camp he had
In August Yury Vudka was released from camp 36. (Chronicle 36 mistakenly stated that, in addition to his 7 years imprisonment, he would have a term of exile.)

In April Vudka was transferred to camp 36 from Vladimir Prison. Before the prisoner transport left Vladimir, his personal papers, letters and a copy of his sentence were confiscated from him during a 'check'. At the beginning of September he still had not received back his papers and some money. In answer to the complaints he sent both to Vladimir and to higher authorities, he got the following replies from Vladimir:

1. '...all his personal effects have been given back to him ..., apart from some correspondence and various manuscripts, which were justifiably confiscated ... There is no money in his personal account.'
2. 'Inform the prisoner Vudka that ... his belongings were returned to him when he was transferred.'
3. 'I ask you to inform the prisoner Vudka ... that copies of the legal documents confiscated from him during his transfer have been sent to your address ...'

A month before his release Vudka was transferred to a Dnepropetrovsk prison. He was allowed to write to his parents in Pavlograd, telling them he was in Dnepropetrovsk, only after he went on hunger-strike.  

On 24 September, after serving a 6-year sentence (the first 3 years in prison), Oleg Vorobyov was released (Chronicles 16, 18, 33).

At the beginning of August he was transferred from camp 37 to camp 36 (Perm camps), and two weeks before his release he was transferred to Kaluga prison. On his release from Kaluga prison Vorobyov was allowed to read a character report written about him in the camp: 'He systematically infringed the regulations, took part in unjustified hunger-strikes, is given to stirring things up, and has not reformed.' The report ended with a recommendation that Vorobyov be placed under surveillance.

In September Yury Grodetsky (Chronicle 35) was released. He had previously been transferred from Vladimir to Leningrad.

On 2 October Vladlen Pavlenkov from Gorky (Chronicles 11-13, 33) was released.

At instruction classes for propagandists in Gorky, it was announced that Pavlenkov would soon be returning to Gorky from prison. He had not reformed, he had relatives in America (Solzhenitsyn was named as one of his 'relatives abroad'). Pavlenkov was friendly with dissidents, including Sakharov. (It was stated that the number of dissidents was not large — about 300 people.) His wife, Svetlana Pavlenkova, was said to be receiving money from the CIA and sending it to prisoners.

Before Pavlenkov's release, [Sergei] Ponomaryov and [Vladimir] Zhiltsov — Pavlenkov's co-defendants, who had been released earlier — were summoned to the Gorky KGB headquarters. They were asked why former political prisoners came to see Svetlana Pavlenkova.

Three weeks before his release Pavlenkov was transferred from Vladimir Prison to a Gorky prison. On the morning of 2 October he was told, while still in his prison cell, that he would be subjected to administrative surveillance. Then he was taken home in a prison car.

On 9 August Ma Khun was released.

This is his story. In 1968 he crossed the Chinese-Soviet border and was detained by a border patrol. Ma Khun told the border guards that he had run away from China and wanted to live in the Soviet Union. A criminal case was started against him under article 69 of the Kazakh SSR Criminal Code: 'Illegal immigration into the USSR'. Then the case was abandoned. Ma Khun was given a residence permit and allowed to live in the Soviet Union.

On 11 March 1972 Ma Khun was arrested and charged with espionage. On 30 November 1973 a military tribunal of the Central Asian military region sentenced Ma Khun for 'attempted espionage' to 10 years' imprisonment (the first 5 years in prison, the rest in a strict-regime camp), followed by 5 years' exile, with confiscation of property. The tribunal considered it proved that Ma Khun had crossed the Soviet Union with the intention of spying. The evidence largely consisted of testimony given by three Chinese who had crossed the Chinese-Soviet border at various times. Ma Khun did not admit he was guilty at the trial. He stated categorically that he had never had any training in intelligence and had not been given any mission by Chinese intelligence. He stated that the testimony of the witnesses was untrue.

Ma Khun was sent to start serving his term in Vladimir Prison. Chronicle 39 reported that in October 1975 Ma Khun had been sent to Alma-
Ata, 'apparently to have his case re-examined'. Chronicle 40 reported that in February 1976 Ma Khan had been returned to Vladimir: 'The Chinese who testified against him now say they did so under pressure from the investigator. There was no new trial, but Ma Khan is hoping that his sentence will be cut.'

The Supreme Court of the Kazakh S S R, conducted a special review of Ma Khan's case, revoked the sentence and gave the case over to a fresh examination on the level of a pre-trial investigation. This time the K G B investigators redefined the charges under article 69 of the Kazakh S S R Criminal Code. As the maximum sentence under article 69 is 3 years, and Ma Khan had already served more than four years, he was released.

On 9 August the deputy head of the investigation department of the K G B attached to the Kazakh S S R Council of Ministers apologized to Ma Khan: 'We have made a mistake — you are not a spy. Today you will be released.' Ma Khan now lives in Khabarovsk territory (Khabarovsk district, settlement of Pobeda, hostel 3.) As he is stateless, he cannot leave the district.

In 1961 a group of Ukrainian nationalists was arrested in Lvov. Their case is described in the book *Ferment in the Ukraine*, which was published in England. Four of the group were sentenced by the court to be shot. Five people — Roman Gurny (Chronicle 35), Nikolai Melekh (Chronicle 33), Mikhail Protsiv (Chronicle 33), Gnat Kuzik and Vladimir Gnot — got 15 years each.

In 1976 they were released at the end of their sentences: Gurny and Melekh from camp 35, Gnot, Kuzik and Protsiv from camp 36.

On 26 April, Rimas Cekeliis (Chronicle 32), a student from Vilnius College of Music, was released from camp 36 after serving a 3-year term. He is now 21 years old.

On 4 August Viktor Chesnokov (Chronicle 33), a co-defendant of Vitold Abankin (see above, his 'Declaration'), was released from camp 36 after serving a 10-year term.

On 27 September the Muscovite Semyon Annanyevich Kifyak (Chronicle 33) was released from camp 36 after serving a 5-year term under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code.

Aleks Miranskas has also been released at the end of his sentence from camp 36 (his case is unknown to the Chronicle; he was sentenced to 3 years), so were Nikolai Redko (7 years under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code), Vitas Remeika (Chronicle 33) and Nikolai Teslenko (6 years under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code) (Chronicle 33).

Vitaly Nikolaevich Kolomin, having served a 6-year sentence under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code, has been released from camp 37 (his case is not known to the Chronicle; evidently Chronicle 38 gave an incorrect date for the beginning of his sentence).

A co-defendant of Vladlen Pavlenkov (see above), Mikhail Sergeyevich Kapranov (Chronicles 11-13, 38), has been released from camp 37, after serving a 7-year sentence under article 70.

The following have also been released from camp 37 after completing their sentences: Mikhail Kopolun (6 years under article 70), Anatoly Merkurev (5 years under article 70), Boris Mudrov (5 years under article 64) and Eugenius Juodvirgis (2 years under article 70 for producing leaflets; his two co-defendants got 11 years each).

Ergard Abel (Chronicle 34), sentenced in 1973 under an article corresponding to article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code, has been released.

On 16 June Pavel Fyodorovich Kampov (Chronicle 33) completed the 'camp part' of his sentence.
In December 1970 the Uzhgorod regional court under judge L. A. Girits sentenced him to 6 years' imprisonment and 3 years' exile for 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'. In the indictment he was found guilty of using certain phrases in his letters to Brezhnev, of being the author of the samizdat article '25 Years of Hope and Disillusion' (Kampov categorically denied being the author, and the case-evidence included no proof that he was the author), of disseminating pre-election leaflets and campaigning for his name to be written on to the voting ballots (during interrogation the KGB investigator told Kampov that during the elections 20 per cent of the voters crossed out the official candidate and wrote in his name). The prosecution at the trial was conducted by Procurator Derdyai.

Kampov served his sentence in the Perm camps (camp 36). On about 20 June he was sent into exile. Before joining the prisoner transport, he was deprived of notes he had made during the investigation and the trial, quotations from the indictment and copies of complaints to official bodies.

The journey into exile took 26 days. Kampov's address in exile is: 636842, Tomskaya oblast, Pervomaisky raion, poselok Komsomolsk, Pochtovy pereulok 5.

Kampov is an invalid of the second group. However, he is not being paid his disability pension at present. He cannot find work either. Kampov is a mathematician, a Candidate of Science; before his arrest he was teaching at Uzhgorod University and the Teachers' Training College there. The secretary of the Pervomaisky district party committee has told Kampov that for political reasons he cannot be allowed to teach. Kampov went round all the organizations in the settlement but could not get work.

He was allotted a bunk in a hostel as living space.

'In a word, I'll have to beg my way back into the camp, as I've no other choice. Otherwise I'll die of hunger,' Kampov wrote in a letter.

On 21 September Alexander Bolonkin's 4-year term in a camp came to an end (Chronicle 30). Two months before the end of his sentence he was put in the punishment cells. On 17 September he was transferred to camp 19; from there he was sent to his place of exile in Krasnoyarsk territory. According to a sentence, his exile will last for 2 years.

Tikalas (Chronicle 33) has been sent off from camp 36 at the end of a 7-year term, to spend 3 years in exile.

Andrei Nikolayevich Kravets has completed a 3-year term under article 70 and

has been sent from camp 37 into exile (Chronicle 39 did not mention his period of exile).

In July or August 1976 Anatoly Malkin (Chronicle 37) was transferred from a camp to a 'chemical' construction plant — a building site in Saratov region. He will be released in May 1978.

In the Psychiatric Hospitals

Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital

Evdokimov (Chronicle 39) is in a serious physical condition (he has asthma and aching in his bones) and his morale is low. He has admitted that he faked mental illness, but so far he is being denied a fresh diagnosis.

Plakhnotynyk (Chronicle 39) is feeling ill. He has defective lungs.

At the beginning of 1976 Yury Alexandrovich Yetokhin6 from Leningrad was in the hospital 'for crossing the border'.

Yury Belov (Chronicles 39, 41) was transferred in September from the Smolensk Special Psychiatric Hospital to an ordinary hospital. His address is now: Krasnoyarsk krai, Nizhne-Ingash raion, posyolok Peima-Tiny, Psychoneurological hospital.

Zinovy Mikhailovich Krasivsky (Chronicles 39, 41) has been transferred to an ordinary hospital in Lvov.

In September 1976 a doctors' commission recommended that Vyacheslav Igrunov (Chronicle 40) should be discharged from his psychiatric hospital.

Persecution of Believers

In September Alexander Argentov (Chronicle 41) was released from a psychiatric hospital. As far as is known, this was done on the orders of Moscow's head psychiatrist, V. P. Kotov. It is possible that Argentov's swift release was largely due to the many expressions of support for him here and in the West.

Number 35 of The Bulletin of the Council of Evangelical Christian-Baptist
On 11 July in the village of Ivanovka, Ismailinsky district, in the Azerbaijan SSR, Pyotr Alexandrovich Serebrennikov (76 years old), the presbyter of the Ivanovka E C B congregation, was arrested. On 21 July he was sentenced under an article corresponding to article 227 of the R S F S R Criminal Code ('Encroachment on the personalities and rights of citizens under the guise of performing religious rites') to 5 years' strict-regime, together with confiscation of property. This was his fourth term 'inside'. He left at home a severely ill wife, who cannot rise from her bed. The believers of the Ivanovka congregation sent a complaint to Brezhnev, Podgorny, Rudenko and the Council of E C B Prisoners' Relatives.

On 20-21 July in the same village the following were arrested: Ivan Alexandrovich Serebrennikov (born 1906), Maria Stepanovna Leontieva (born 1912) and Anastasia Pavlovna Ermolova (born 1924), the mother of seven children (some of them still minors). Criminal cases have been initiated against them.

Members of the local congregation are persecuted in other ways as well: their light and water are cut off; they are fined and sacked from their jobs. A complaint to Brezhnev, Podgorny and Rudenko, dated 7 July and signed by ten believers, states that the persecution is directed by N. V. Nikitin, chairman of the collective farm and deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan SSR.

On 3 August in the town of Zdolbunovo, Rovno region, Ukrainian SSR, Ekaterina Nikolayevna Barina (born 1924), the mother of seven old ladies, and her daughter-in-law, was arrested and sentenced to 15 days. The parishioners were told that Shteffen had behaved rudely to representatives of authority. However, after he had served the 15 days, Shteffen was not released. A criminal case was initiated against him. He is charged with breaking the law on religious cults. The town authorities are demanding that the members of the local congregation should register it.

On 20-21 July in the same village the following were arrested: Vladimir Pyotravich Iliev and Maria Nikolayevna Dimova in the village of Vinegradovka, Belgorod district, Odessa region. The following were confiscated: Bibles, tape-recordings, photographs of E C B prisoners, the Bulletin of the Council of E C B Prisoners' Relatives, and notes on religious themes. M. N. Dimova sent a complaint to Rudenko, the E C B Council of Churches and the Council of E C B Prisoners' Relatives.

On 22 April in Pavlograd, when Vladimir Ivanovich Shults was preparing to board a plane to Alma-Ata, the policeman Fedorchenko confiscated a handwritten collection of religious songs from Shults' case during a search of his things.

Because of this, 196 believers from the Slavgorod and Khabary districts of Altai territory sent a complaint to the United Nations and the President of France. They wrote:

While formerly a check was carried out before flights by aeroplanes in order to confiscate explosives, firearms and poisonous substances, it now occurs to us that the check may be carried out more in order to confiscate religious literature than explosives.

When Shults asked Fedorchenko on what grounds he had confiscated the volume, the latter replied: 'No grounds. Complain to whoever you like. Go to the procurator — he'll explain it to you.'
in January-May 1976 it was fined 1,800 roubles. Among those fined in 1976 were:
F. V. Nikitin, a war invalid; pension — 65 roubles; fine — 125 roubles.
G. Z. Rudnichenko, severely ill; pension — 60 roubles; fine — 150 roubles.
G. P. Stolbov, pension — 100 roubles; fine — 250 roubles.
N. P. Pozdnyakov, has seven children to maintain, wages — 180 roubles, fined 250 roubles.
N. I. Polyakov, has 5 dependants, wages — 180 roubles, fined 350 roubles.

In an Open Letter to Brezhnev and the Council of E C B Prisoners' Relatives dated 2 July 1976, members of the Moscow E C B congregation write:
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When we ask 'Why has this happened?' the authorities can only find one reply: 'Your congregation is not registered.' This is said after we have gone to the authorities more than once, applying for registration.

In 1975 we sent an application by post to the Moscow Soviet. A commission on this matter was set up by the soviet executive committee for the Lyublino district of Moscow, whose activities were limited to somewhat vague statements on the difficulties connected with this question. K G B officials who summoned some believers for a talk were more honest, declaring that 'You are not going to be registered unless you resign from the Council of Churches'.

A people's court in Znamenka, Kirovograd region, has decreed that 12-year-old Oleg Korovin should be taken away from his aunt, Natalya Petrovna Korovina, and handed over to the welfare authorities. Oleg's parents are dead. N. P. Korovina looked after Oleg's sick mother for 12 years and brought him up. The Kirovograd Regional Department of Public Education, and the Procurator's Office of Kirovograd region, asking that Oleg's wishes be respected, and protesting against the decision of the people's court.

A general meeting at the Zdolbunovo hospital and polyclinic of stomatology (Rovno region) has decided to ask a court to deprive Alexander and Nina Nazaruk, parents of 11 children, of their parental rights, because they are bringing their children up in a religious way.

In the town of Shepetovka, Khmelnitsky region, the teacher Ekaterina Stepanovna Zhivotyagina was forced to flee from her home with her children, because the local authorities had got to know that she had become a believer and were trying to send her to a psychiatric hospital for forcible treatment and to take her children away from her.

A general meeting at the Zdolbunovo hospital and polyclinic of stomatology (Rovno region) has decided to ask a court to deprive Alexander and Nina Nazaruk, parents of 11 children, of their parental rights, because they are bringing their children up in a religious way.

In the town of Shepetovka, Khmelnitsky region, the teacher Ekaterina Stepanovna Zhivotyagina was forced to flee from her home with her children, because the local authorities had got to know that she had become a believer and were trying to send her to a psychiatric hospital for forcible treatment and to take her children away from her.

Persecution of the Crimean Tatars

Evictions

In August more evictions took place.
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and told that they would not receive any seed from the collective farm.

* * *

Chronicle 41 reported the trial of the Osmanovs, father and son (to be more exact, the Osmanovs, but in Uzbekistan, when Tatars are given passports, officials often write their names in the Uzbek form). On 28 August Seit-Asan Osmanov and his wife were driven with their belongings to the station at Dzhankoi. Here 'fifteen-day convicts' were brought up to unload their things: those who refused were threatened with a supplementary sentence. The Osmanovs did not send their belongings away, but, with the help of a group of Crimean Tatars, returned to the village of Sheberbakovo and settled once more in their own house, in spite of opposition from the police.

* * *

On 25 August Yagya Kenzhmetov, his wife and 12-year-old daughter (his son is serving in the army) were evicted from the village of Zolotoye Pole. His house was demolished by a tractor. Direct instructions had been given by Rublov, first secretary of the Kirov district party committee. The neighbouring residents tried to hinder the eviction. One of them, Umer Dzheinarov from the village of Lgovka, was sentenced to 15 days' imprisonment for this on 27 August.

* * *

Resmiye Yunusova and Memet Seitveliyev, together with their paralysed child, are still living in a tent near their twice-demolished house (Chronicles 40, 41).

Trials

The Chronicle has information about the activity of only one district court — in Kirov district. In three days — 31 August and 1 and 2 September — this court gave out four judgements proclaiming the purchase of houses null and void.

The court also heard five criminal cases under article 196 of the Ukrainian S S R Criminal Code — 'infringement of the residence regulations'.

On about 20 August Abibulla Khalilov from the village of Grushevka was given a suspended sentence of 2 years under this article. In his speech for the prosecution Procurator Zelenov talked about the importance of the passport system: it helped to provide the population with work and sustenance and gave the authorities necessary information about the personalities of citizens.

This was why persons who had been refused a residence permit had to move out immediately. The defence lawyer I. I. Chaiko questioned the accused, asking him why he had earlier not denied his guilt but had refused to plead guilty at the trial. In his closing speech for the defence, the lawyer said that his client had made three mistakes: he had not been well informed about the possibility of

obtaining a residence permit when he had arrived from Tashkent region; he had bought a house without first applying to a notary public; he had not left when he failed to obtain a residence permit. The notary's refusal to make out a contract because a Crimean residence permit was lacking was justified, according to the lawyer. The lawyer called for a mild sentence, because Khalilov, as he put it, had 'got stranded' in the Crimea, simply lacking the money for the return journey.

* * *

On 1 September Shevket Arsatov from the town of Stary Krym was sentenced to 2 years in strict-regime labour camps. He has two children; his wife Susanna Chalvash, who is soon expecting a third child, has been told she is to be used for annulment of the purchase of their house.

* * *

On 2 September three residents of the village of Grushevka were tried. Ridvan Usminov was sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment, replaceable by forced labour at the direction of the M V D. Rebat Shabanov and Ablyakim Yagyayev were sentenced to 2 years' banishment. [Sentences inaccurate — see Chronicle 44.]

* * *

On 2 September in the town of Belogorsk Mukhsim Osmanov, a 45-year-old invalid of the first group (he was blinded when working as a welder) was charged under article 196. In Belogorsk district charges under article 196 have also been brought against Enver Ametov and Murat Voyenny.

* * *

On 26 August several dozen Crimean Tatars met together in order to appeal to the regional soviet executive committee about residence permits and employment. It was a day for the reception of petitioners.

Unlike 18 November 1975, when the police dispersed people who had already gathered at the committee building (Chronicle 39), this time preventive measures were taken. In a number of villages the police went round the homes of Crimean Tatars and told them that no one was to leave — a commission on non-registered persons might arrive. The police removed Crimean Tatars from buses bound for Simferopol. About 30 people managed nevertheless to get into the committee building, but the chairman would not receive them.

* * *

In the town of Stary Krym a police official asked the headmaster of the middle school not to allow children who were unregistered residents to attend the school. The headmaster replied that he had to carry out the law on universal education, while registration for residence was a matter for the police, not the schools.

* * *
On 5 September Aishe Seitmuratova and Enver Ametov were made to get out of a car leaving Belogorsk and were taken to Simferopol, to the regional administration of the M V D. Here Ametov was released after being searched (his notebook was confiscated), but A. Seitmuratova was interrogated (without a record being made). The persons who detained Seitmuratova — Second Police Lieutenant Lyutikov and a man who did not give his name — reproached her for the fact that Western radio stations broadcast reports on the position of Crimean Tatars in the Crimea. Aishe replied that the origin of these reports lay in the illegal actions of the police and other representatives of authority. Seitmuratova was informed that she was 'an undesirable person' in the Crimea, and that she would be put on an aeroplane bound for Moscow (she herself had said she was planning to go to Moscow). At the airport the same two persons took Seitmuratova to the plane when the other passengers had already taken their seats. On discovering in the cabin that the plane was bound for Tashkent, Seitmuratova ran out into the gangway, but her 'escorts' twisted her arms behind her and pushed her back.

In Tashkent a watch was established on the house where Seitmuratova was staying.

On 6 September Aishe Seitmuratova sent a protest to the Procurator-General. She asked for the incident to be investigated and the officials who had committed violent, illegal actions to be punished, and she called on the Procurator-General to 'defend her human and civil rights'.

Events in Georgia

On 30 June 1976 the doctor L. Meladze was sending a telegram from Nikolai Samkharadze, a doctor, to L. I. Brezhnev, from the Central Telegraph Office in Moscow. In the telegram Samkharadze asks — not for the first time — that the decision to deprive his brother Beglyar of his pension (Chronicle 38) should be revoked, and he describes his poverty-stricken state. Two KGB officials, obviously summoned by a telegram girl, took L. Meladze to some room in the telegraph building and asked her why she had sent such a telegram. 'Because that man is in a hopeless situation,' replied L. Meladze. The officials told her that she must not do that, because the contents of the telegram might become known to agents of the U.S.A.

On 22 July Nikolai Samkharadze was detained outside his house in Tbilisi and taken to KGB headquarters, where he had a 'conversation' with section head Tatishvili. Tatishvili demanded that Samkharadze tell him why he sent such telegrams and why he made anti-Soviet speeches at meetings at his place of work. Tatishvili reminded Samkharadze that he had been arrested for such actions in 1959 and had been sent for compulsory psychiatric treatment.

In connection with the above-mentioned incident, the Chronicle considers it appropriate to quote from a declaration by Zviad Gamsakhurdia, dated 25 September 1975:

To Citizen A. Inauri, head of the KGB attached to the Council of Ministers of the Georgian SSR.

Copy: to Citizen Yu. Andropov, Chairman of the USSR KGB.

It has now become clear to me that on 20 September of this year the KGB made an attack on me and my family, using a toxic weapon which, as TASS recently reported, is forbidden by international law. This report stated that there are in existence toxic and biological weapons which can kill and can also put someone out of action temporarily. It was the latter that was used on me, my wife M. Archvadze and her sister, L. Archvadze in our house in Tbilisi (ul. Galskaya 19).

The house is isolated, with a high fence; nobody except us lives round about for some distance, which obviously facilitated the localization of the weapon’s effects.

From morning we had felt somewhat unwell. At around twelve o’clock my wife went into town and became ill on the street. Her pulse beat rapidly, her head swam, she was short of breath and could hardly drag herself home. At the same time I was experiencing the same symptoms in my study, although I had never had palpitations before. A little later, my wife’s sister L. Archvadze had similar symptoms, which even had to be treated by injections.

I must also mention at this point that my father, Konstantin Semyonovich Gamsakhurdia, died on 17 July this year, after being unable to get his breath and after attacks of palpitations.

I must add that the above-mentioned condition — rapid pulse, dizziness, weakness — recalls the condition described by the Moscow writer Voinovich, who was subjected to a toxic attack in the Metropol Hotel in the spring of this year (see Chronicle 36 — Chronicle).
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I should like to warn you that such actions will not bring any honour or glory on the KGB.

A medical report containing a description of the toxic symptoms and the conclusion that they were the result of gas poisoning, was written by Dr N. Samkharadze on 2 October 1975. On 23 October 1975 Z. Gamsakhurdia issued a declaration stating that the diagnosis of poisoning had also been confirmed by a doctor at the writers' polyclinic, who was later talked to by KGB officials. The declaration goes on to say that the symptoms disappeared on 10 October, but reappeared in modified form later, again affecting both his wife and himself at the same time.

On 29 June 1976 research officer G. Gogochuri was taken from the Tbilisi Institute of Philosophy to KGB headquarters. He was accompanied by KGB employee Kopadze, who is specially 'attached' to the institute. At the KGB Gogochuri was interrogated by persons unknown to him. They asked Gogochuri why he had icons at home and if it was true that he organized religious 'Khatoba' festivals in his home. Gogochuri was also told that there were parts of his dissertation which revealed sympathy for religion. Gogochuri was then told that the KGB knew he had spoken out against the new rule which lays down that dissertations in Georgian academic institutions must be defended in the Russian language; these expressions of opinion were called 'nationalism'. He was clearly told that such episodes could have dangerous consequences for him.

On 15 July 1976 the KGB in Tbilisi summoned Medea Buadze and Maria Tushishvili. They were told that the KGB had got hold of copies of a religious book, The Mirror of the Human Heart, reproduced on an 'Era' photocopier. M. Buadze was asked if she had reproduced the book. M. Buadze did not deny that she herself had done so, as she did not see anything criminal in it. M. Tushishvili also declared that it was not a crime and called on the KGB officials not to persecute religion.

On 16 July 1976 KGB official Pirtskhalava visited the Tbilisi Republican Psychiatric Hospital and spoke to hospital employees Professor A. Makaridze, Dr P. Kontridze and book-keeper K. Khazhomia. Pirtskhalava said that the KGB had received an anonymous report that hospital employees V. Naneishvili (deputy director of the Institute of Psychiatry) and Sh. Gamkrelidze (head of the pharmacology section) often carried on anti-Soviet conversations at work. In particular, they repeated to other hospital employees the content of foreign radio broadcasts, which they systematically listened to; they told them the plots of Solzhenitsyn's books, talked about the activities of the Georgian dissident writer Zviad Gamsakhurdia and approved of these activities (the publication of the samizdat journal The Golden Fleece, the compilation of the document-collection On Torture in Georgia, and so on). Pirtskhalava demanded that the above-mentioned persons should confirm all this, but he did not succeed. The 'accused' themselves, V. Naneishvili and Sh. Gamkrelidze, were not questioned. Gamkrelidze had also 'sinned' in that he had driven a Czech guest to his home in a village which is 200 km from Tbilisi, while foreigners are only allowed to go 70 km out of Tbilisi.

Chronicle 38 reported on the article and letters of Zviad Gamsakhurdia in defence of an ancient monument of the 6th to 17th centuries, the David Geredzha cave monasteries' complex, which is being destroyed by artillery practice. Professor Pirashvili, Doctor of Arts, member of the USSR Artists' Union and Honoured Art Worker of the USSR; Professor [Georgy] Tautashvili, Doctor of Philology, member of the presidium of the Georgian SSR Writers' Union; and Doctor of Philology [Igor] Bogomolov, member of the Writers' Union (all three are members of the CPSU), have sent a letter on the same subject to eminent people in authority. The letter quotes the answer given by Major-General Shkadzhanov, deputy commander of the Caucasian Military District, to the Minister of Culture of Georgia. The General called the monument 'the ruin of a former monastery' which 'to our great regret is in the middle of the firing range'. The authors of the letter call for the great cultural value of the monument to be respected, as well as the negative political effect which would be produced on world public opinion.

Viktor Rtskhiladze, chief of the inspectorate on the preservation of monuments attached to the Georgian SSR Ministry of Culture, and Viktor Batutsashvili, director of the David Geredzha museum, ask in a declaration to the Procurator-General of the USSR, dated 20 August 1976, that those who have been destroying the monument should be prosecuted. The declaration reports that the artillerymen 'explode shells in the direct proximity of caves decorated with medieval frescoes ... there have been cases when they scored a direct hit (the Bertubani monastery has been completely destroyed). In addition, the soldiers ... write worldly inscriptions on the frescoes.' On 6 August the artillerymen expelled the curators and the director of the museum from their official buildings, in order to carry out a bombardment nearby.
English poetry. Tymchuk's friends are disturbed by these events — it was by just such methods that the charge of hooliganism was brought against him last year.

Zhukovka (near Moscow). On 28 July Associated Press correspondent George Krinsky came to Sakharov's dacha with his family. Not long before the time of arrival which he had stated on the telephone the day before, a policeman and a picket of the 'socially conscious citizens' (as they were called in the record which was made later) appeared near the dacha. They stopped Mr Krinsky's car and asked him to go away at once, as 'the settlement of Zhukovka is closed to foreigners.' Crimsky and Efrem Yankelevich (Sakharov's son-in-law, who had invited the Krinsky family) insisted on checking this unexpected news with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Krinsky was allowed to telephone, but only in the presence of the policeman and the 'public', who entered the house in spite of Yankelevich's protests. This is the second occasion of unauthorized entrance into Sakharov's dacha — see Chronicle 41. An official of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs confirmed that the settlement of Zhukovka was closed to foreigners. Until now Sakharov's dacha has been freely visited both by foreign journalists and by other foreign guests — for example, by Heinrich Boll and Jeremy Stone, the director of the Federation of American Scientists. Yankelevich issued a declaration about this incident on 14 September: 'On the subject of freedom of movement for foreign journalists and contacts between people.'

Moscow — Nyurbachan. In August E. G. Bonner and A. D. Sakharov went on a visit to A. Tverdokhlebov (Chronicle 41). In the settlement of Mirny, where the planes from Moscow arrive, a note from the head of transport requesting that they be found a place in the night plane from Mirny to Nyurba was lost. Sakharov and his wife had to walk the 15 km from Nyurba to Nyurbachan at night. The drivers of hired cars explained to them that on that day the police had forbidden them to take any passengers to Nyurbachan.

Moscow. On 7 October 1976 the police came to Alexander Ginzburg's Moscow flat and took him to the police station. He was kept there for three-and-a-half hours. The police told Ginzburg to pay a fine for infringing the residence regulations and to leave Moscow within 72 hours. Ginzburg refused to sign the record of an infringement of regulations, declaring that he had not spent more than three consecutive days in Moscow.

Ginzburg's conviction has not yet been 'liquidated'. As he was released from imprisonment in January 1972 after a 5-year sentence (Chronicle 23), his con-
victim, according to article 57 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, will be liquidated in January 1977. Until then, although his wife and two small children live (and are registered) in Moscow, he does not have the right to live in Moscow. 'To live' means, in this case, 'to spend more than three consecutive days there'. The police are constantly harassing Ginzburg (Chronicles 32, 34, 41).

* * *

Leningrad. A few months ago at the Kirov factory (formerly the Putilov factory) about 400 people held an 'Italian-style' strike for three days (appearing to work but only producing 3-4 per cent of the norm), in protest at the administration's bad treatment of the prisoners working at the factory.

* * *

Latvia. At the beginning of 1976 leaflets in the Latvian language were distributed here, calling on Latvians to fight for the democratic rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The leaflets were signed 'Democratic Union of Latvian Youth'. The text had been 'compiled' from letters cut out of newspapers and stuck on pieces of paper. Evidently they had then been photocopied on an 'Era' machine.

In the spring, leaflets in Russian and Latvian calling on the Russians to leave Latvia were distributed. The leaflets were compiled and signed in the same way. In the summer and autumn typewritten leaflets on economic themes appeared. In the summer, typewritten leaflets demanding the liberation of political prisoners in the Soviet Union were distributed, as well as others stating that the Helsinki Agreement 'only serves to strengthen legal recognition of the territorial gains made by the USSR during the Second World War'.

At the end of the academic year leaflets which had 'Freedom for Latvia!' printed on them by hand, appeared in schools. Special written work was carried out in schools, during which pupils had to write in their usual handwriting and in printed letters.

In the summer the slogan 'Free Soviet political prisoners!' was written in large black letters on the wall which blocks the view of the Riga Central Prison from the direction of the railway.

* * *

Moscow. The soviet executive committee of the Sverdlov district in Moscow has made the parish council of St Pimen's Church dismiss three members of the church choir who are under 40 years old. Then the committee ordered that the caretaker should be dismissed from the church after he had refused to inform on the church elder and the treasurer.

* * *

Moscow. On 15 August 1976 a KGB official read a lecture to the employees of the Pushkin Museum. He called on his hearers to be vigilant, warned them against contacts with foreigners, and made them promise to ring the KGB about every group of foreign tourists that visited the museum.

* * *

Berlin-Moscow. Students from East Germany at Soviet educational establishments are warned, before their departure for the USSR, that if they become friendly with students from capitalist countries in the USSR, they will immediately be sent home.

* * *

Moldavia. In August 1976 Ceausescu was to travel through Moldavia. As there are very strong pro-Rumanian sentiments in Moldavia, the authorities, fearing an enthusiastic reception for the Rumanian leader, declared that Ceausescu would be travelling through on 3 August, but his journey took place on 2 August.

* * *

Vilnius. At the beginning of September three pupils from the eleventh class were expelled for their friendship with Viktor Petkus (Chronicles 38, 40). Petkus was sentenced to 25 years under article 58 of the old Criminal Code at the end of the 1940s, but in the 1950s he was amnestied. He received a second sentence of 7 years for 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'. Petkus has been given a message through a third party. 'We'll put you inside, just wait!'

* * *

Latvia. At the beginning of 1976 leaflets in the Latvian language were distributed here, calling on Latvians to fight for the democratic rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The leaflets were signed 'Democratic Union of Latvian Youth'. The text had been 'compiled' from letters cut out of newspapers and stuck on pieces of paper. Evidently they had then been photocopied on an 'Era' machine.

In the spring, leaflets in Russian and Latvian calling on the Russians to leave Latvia were distributed. The leaflets were compiled and signed in the same way. In the summer and autumn typewritten leaflets on economic themes appeared. In the summer, typewritten leaflets demanding the liberation of political prisoners in the Soviet Union were distributed, as well as others stating that the Helsinki Agreement 'only serves to strengthen legal recognition of the territorial gains made by the USSR during the Second World War'.

At the end of the academic year leaflets which had 'Freedom for Latvia!' printed on them by hand, appeared in schools. Special written work was carried out in schools, during which pupils had to write in their usual handwriting and in printed letters.

In the summer the slogan 'Free Soviet political prisoners!' was written in large black letters on the wall which blocks the view of the Riga Central Prison from the direction of the railway.

* * *

Moscow. The soviet executive committee of the Sverdlov district in Moscow has made the parish council of St Pimen's Church dismiss three members of the church choir who are under 40 years old. Then the committee ordered that the caretaker should be dismissed from the church after he had refused to inform on the church elder and the treasurer.

* * *

Moscow. On 25 June 1976 A. A. Zinoviev, Doctor of Philosophy, protested at a press conference which he had called against the refusal of the Soviet authorities to allow him to travel to a meeting of logicians organized by the Finnish Academy of Sciences. Zinoviev is a member of that Academy.

A few years ago Professor Zinoviev was dismissed from his post as head of the department of logic at the Moscow University Faculty of Philosophy, partly for his support of people who 'signed' petitions. He is now a senior researcher in the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Philosophy.

After the press conference Zinoviev was deprived of the opportunity of reading lectures at the university and expelled from the Philosophy Society. An order has been issued to expunge references to his works.

* * *

Kiev. In the volume Problems of General and Clinical Physiology of the Cardiovascular System (Kiev, Naukova Dumka, 1976) the bibliography in one of the articles includes the titles of some articles by a group of authors, one of whom
Moscow. On 26 September a regular 'Sunday concert' (a mini-rally of unofficial songs — see Chronicle 41) took place in the wood near the Firsanovka station.

The first part of the concert was dedicated to the memory of Vera Matveyeva, a member of the Unofficial Song Club, who died in August this year at the age of 30. Many songs that she had composed or performed were sung, as well as songs and poems dedicated to her. As at other 'Sunday concerts', anyone who wanted to could perform.

During the interval between two performances, Valery Abramkin's declaration to the Procurator of Tuapse (see the section 'Arrests, Searches and Interrogations') was read out.

300-400 people came to the concert; 'observers' were also present, some of them with cameras.

Moscow. On 11 August 1976, senior engineer Alexander Rykov of the Timiryazev Agricultural Academy (Chronicle 38) was visited at work by Captain M. G. Devonar, an official of the Moscow KGB. Devonar suggested that Rykov should collaborate with the KGB, tell them about the black market in books, and find out who 'Behemoth' was (this is the nickname of some speculator in books). Rykov refused the offer made to him, in spite of threats made by Devonar.

Moscow. The report published on 2 February 1976 in the American newspaper International Herald Tribune that A. Sokolov, deputy head of section 2 of Glavlit [the Soviet censorship] had obtained emigrant, anti-Soviet and other publications confiscated by the censors and had sold them on the black market (see Chronicle 38) aroused alarm at Glavlit. All issues of the paper were confiscated and locked up in safes. A translation of the article went round the fiscated and locked up in safes. A translation of the article went round the

On 29 September Mikhail Bernshtam (Chronicle 40) left the U.S.S.R.
Letters and Statements


Respected delegates to the Conference of European Communist Parties!

We appeal to you to include in the conference’s programme the question of the human rights problem in states ruled by the communist governments, and to formulate a generally accepted and principled attitude to this problem. It has now become generally recognized that the basic rights proclaimed in the U.N.’s Universal Declaration of Human Rights and partly defined in the covenants on rights must be observed. The leaders of communist parties in the countries of Europe have more than once declared their devotion to the ideal of human rights and democratic forms of government. We can only welcome such statements. It is clear, however, that people judge the theory and practice of communist parties, and will continue to do so, by the situation in those countries where communists are in power, and chiefly by the situation in the Soviet Union. Although in comparison with the Stalin period the situation in our country has basically improved, it is still characterized by massive systematic infringement of the elementary civil and political rights of the individual, by undemocratic forms of government and arbitrary repression by the authorities.

The authors of the letter isolate two aspects of the problem: the policies of the CPSU in relation to social organizations, and the freedom to exchange information and have beliefs and freedom of conscience — and they put a number of concrete questions to the conference. These include:

— Is the existence of independent social organizations possible in a communist state?
— Does the conference consider it justifiable to persecute people for distributing in samizdat informational and other journals, in particular the Chronicle of Current Events?
— What kind of guarantees must there be in communist states to ensure the independence of the judicial and legal system?

A. D. Sakharov: Speech to the meeting of the International League for Human Rights (dated 25 September 1976; the speech was read out to a session of the League on 29 September).

I am very grateful for the honour awarded to me, of being chosen as a vice-president of the International League for Human Rights. Like all those who have gathered together in this hall, I agree with the basic principle underlying the League’s activities — the supreme importance of human rights in the complex of problems facing mankind.

I hope that, in spite of the difficulty of actively defending rights in the USSR, I shall nevertheless be able to work with the League. However, a necessary condition of such co-operation will be the cessation of the blockade set up by the Soviet authorities of my telephone and postal links with other countries, which has been going on (with short interruptions) for two years now.

Here today I will not speak about all the political prisoners in the USSR — who include those condemned for religious activities, for attempting to leave the country, for reading and storing literature which the authorities find undesirable, and on charges of so-called ‘nationalism’, and others. I wish to remind the meeting of the fate of those whose activities were unmistakably in defence of rights, who collected and distributed information on the violation of human rights in the USSR. They are not politicians. They did not expect any changes in the political structure of our country as a result of their activities, they were not seeking any benefits for themselves — on the contrary, their lives and the lives of those dear to them have, as a result of their activities, become unbelievably difficult, often poverty-stricken, but they have regarded the fate of each unjustly condemned person as their own personal sorrow. Such are Sergei Kovalyov, Andrei Tverdokhlebov, Vladimir Bukovsky, Semyon Gluzman, Kronid Lyubarsky, Gabriel Superfin, Viktor Khautov, Anatoly Marchenko and others. It is thanks to their stand and activities that the trend towards the defence of rights in society grew up in our country. The lives and health of many of them are now in danger as a result of cold, hunger, work which is often beyond their strength, and other hardships in the camps and in exile. Detailed information about the position of each of them can be obtained from the publications of Amnesty International, Khronia Press and others.

I am convinced that, in conditions when human rights activities are cruelly persecuted in a number of countries, our duty — the duty of the League — is to defend the freedom and lives of our friends, comrades and fellow fighters in the battle for human rights throughout the world.

A. D. Sakharov was chosen as an honorary vice-president of the International League for Human Rights in June 1976. He is a member of the League’s Council of Directors. The League is a non-governmental organization, which has consultative status at the U.N. and UNESCO and so on. Its headquarters is in New York.

A. D. Sakharov: To G. Ford, President of the USA and presidential candidate of the Republic Party, and to J. Carter, presidential candidate of the Democratic Party of the USA (September 1976).

In this appeal A. D. Sakharov says:

I am convinced that worldwide preservation of political and civil human rights,
of freedom of conviction and conscience, the freedom to exchange information, freedom of movement and freedom to choose one's country of residence, is inseparable from the basic tasks facing humanity — the preservation of international security, of economic and social progress, and the maintenance of the environment. I am convinced that there is no room for isolationism and national egoism in the defence of human rights.

Sakharov emphasizes, among possible international actions, 'the fight for a general worldwide amnesty for political prisoners'. The appeal ends with these words:

I hope that the principles involved in actively defending human rights throughout the world will assume an ever more important place in U S policy, in the spirit of the freedom-loving and humane traditions of the American people.

... ...

Boris Mikhailov: To the chairman of the World Peace Council, Dr R. Chandra (August 1976).

Respected Chairman, Being the father of four children and a sincere supporter of peace, I share the pacifist attitude of the Stockholm declaration. However, in my opinion it is in need of some additions. I feel that it should have indicated precisely the quite large group of states which are not included in the traditional 'imperialist' definition, but whose economy is becoming more and more militarized, whose armed forces are to be found far beyond the borders of their own countries, and who have a widespread practice of providing arms to other states, whatever the motives for this practice may be based on. The absence of a precise addressee for the declaration has prompted me to refrain from signing the present edition of this document.

Unfortunately, in the institution where I work the campaign to collect signatures for the Stockholm declaration has turned into a test of loyalty, a means to discover and mercilessly persecute all dissent. My viewpoint has been distorted, I was declared to be a warmonger, I was slandered and threatened with dismissal from work, which would have deprived my whole family of the means of existence. It is appropriate to point out that the pressure put on me contravenes the peace-loving spirit of the declaration and the principle of willing participation in distributing and signing the document. As far as I know, my case is not the only one, which makes it all the more necessary to condemn such discriminatory practices.

In sending you this letter, Mr Chandra, I hope that you will support me and I assure you of my sincere desire to do my part in the fight for peace, without wars or violence, to which the activity of the World Peace Council is dedicated.

... ...

Shagun Arutyunyan: Declaration to the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet (30 July 1976).

Arutyunyan asks Podgorny to deprive him of his Soviet citizenship and allow him and his family to emigrate from the USSR.

Unfortunately, in the institution where I work the campaign to collect signatures for the Stockholm declaration has turned into a test of loyalty, a means to discover and mercilessly persecute all dissent. My viewpoint has been distorted, I was declared to be a warmonger, I was slandered and threatened with dismissal from work, which would have deprived my whole family of the means of existence. It is appropriate to point out that the pressure put on me contravenes the peace-loving spirit of the declaration and the principle of willing participation in distributing and signing the document. As far as I know, my case is not the only one, which makes it all the more necessary to condemn such discriminatory practices.

... ...


K. Jokubynas states for two years he has been receiving refusals in answer to his application to emigrate to join his brother in Canada (and to the appeals of his brother), on the last occasion the reason given was 'because your request cannot be granted'. K. Jokubynas writes:

If anyone started to say that there was a slave-owning system in the Lithuanian SSR, he would be brought to trial for 'slandering Soviet reality'. But what other form of society forbids its citizens to leave their place of residence? I should like to know by what right, on the basis of what law, I have been chained to this particular country?

(K. Jokubynas is a former political prisoner who has served two terms of imprisonment; the second sentence was for an attempt to converse with a foreign sailor in the port of Igarka. [See more details in Chronicle 43.] He now lives in Vilnius and works in the republican library.)

... ...

Nadezhda Svetlichnaya: To L. I. Brezhnev, Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the CPSU (14 August 1976).

For the last four years I have been in a camp for women political prisoners in Mordovia. The only thing I admit being guilty of, then or now, was my insufficient knowledge of the law, particularly article 125 of the USSR Constitution and article 19 of the Declaration of Human Rights.

Relying on the right of each person to any information, something which is guaranteed by these documents, I read samizdat literature, among other...
things, for which I landed in prison ... How could I not have learned to understand Soviet laws? One-and-a-half years ago I became acquainted with the 'Decree on passports' and 'Some rules on the registration of citizens', which were published in the press and contain the relevant article guaranteeing that people returning from imprisonment will be able to renew their former residence permit, regardless of living space, at the homes of their parents, marriage partners or other relatives. However, I and my small son, who is not yet capable of committing any crimes against anyone, have been told for four months that we have no right to live in Kiev, where we had been registered permanently at my brother's flat until my arrest; the reason given was the lack of living space which is up to the standards required by the health norms. (This is now calculated at 9 square metres to each person, but before it was 7 square metres and then the question of lack of living space never arose) ...  
Or it may be that I have again misunderstood the laws, and that the 'former residence permit' which is mentioned in the 'Decree on passports' is a permit to live in the captivity from which I was recently released.

In that case I ask you to send me back to the camp, so that I won't have to say, in the words of Shevchenko: 'I am in freedom now. The freedom of a dog on the end of a chain.'


In May of this year I was released from a woman's political camp in Mordovia, where I spent 4 years. According to the 'Decree on passports' now in force, after my release I should have been registered as a resident in the place where I lived before my arrest, that is, in Kiev. Nevertheless I was refused the right to live in that city, to live anywhere, in fact, except for one place — the village of Polovinkino in Voroshilovgrad region, where I was born, but where I have not lived for 23 years and to which I find it extremely difficult to return for many reasons.

In forcing me to live there and only there, I have in fact been condemned to exile, which was not part of my sentence.

A month ago I sent a letter to the Central Committee of the CPSU and L. I. Brezhnev, asking for permission to register for residence in Kiev in accordance with the law, but I have received no reply. Today I am going to find out why there has been no reply. If the answer is in the negative, my son and I will obviously have no other choice than to emigrate, but even this does not depend, as is well-known, on my wishes alone.

N. Strokata, M. Landa: To the International Federation of Members of the Resistance Movement (October 1976).

A letter in support of Nadezhda Svetlichnaya and her son (see above).

Nina Strokata-Karavanskaya:

1. To the Committee of non-governmental organizations attached to the U NICEF.
2. To the International League for Human Rights.
3. To the organization 'World Goodwill'.

The letters call for action in defence of Pyotr Starchik (see the section 'Sent to Hospital for his Songs').

Open Letter from the Initiative Group for the defence of Human Rights in Georgia to the Russian Section of the B B C.

Our Initiative Group for the defence of Human Rights in Georgia is indignant at the fact that on 27 June 1976, without checking and without any relevant comment, you repeated the false information given out by TASS about the alleged act of hooliganism committed by a member of our Group, the writer Zviad Konstantinovich Gamsakhurdia, who is also a member of Amnesty International (see Chronicle 41 — Chronicle). If you do not issue a correction ... we shall come to the conclusion that you are taking into account the wishes of the Soviet government and closing your eyes to the real situation.

Irakly Kenchoshvili, Merab Kostava, Viktor Rtskhiladze.

Leonid Sery: Appeal to the governments of the U S A, Britain, Canada, Australia, West Germany and France, to the International Committee for Human Rights and the International Red Cross (September 1976).

The Sery family (he himself is 40 years old, his wife is 32) have six children aged from one year to 13 years. He works as a turner in the port, earning about 180 roubles a month (after deductions), which together with allowances brings their monthly income up to about 230 roubles. L. M. Sery gives detailed facts about prices and the choice of goods in the shops and markets, in order to explain why and how they are always hungry and cannot buy many things they need.

L. M. Sery also describes his unsuccessful attempts to increase his income by getting better work or additional employment (he fulfilled his work norm by 140 per cent), or by getting work for his wife which would fit in with the housework. He writes:

If you do not issue a correction ... we shall come to the conclusion that you are taking into account the wishes of the Soviet government and closing your eyes to the real situation.

Irakly Kenchoshvili, Merab Kostava, Viktor Rtskhiladze.
I believe that during working hours people should work and not engage in demagogy, slogan-shouting, drawing up proclamations or calling meetings, and I say this to the faces of the authorities; as a result they persecute me and call me anti-Soviet.

In answer to complaints he sent to Moscow and Kiev, Sery received threats: 'You have unhealthy thoughts and we might have to give you treatment.' At the end of his letter Leonid Mikhailovich writes:

In view of all this and the pressure put on us, we have become convinced that in our country a working man does not have the right to protest; our trade unions have no rights either and make no attempt to secure them. In reply to our letters we have received only threats and mockery. We decided to write a letter to the 25th Congress of the C P S U, asking them to let us emigrate to any capitalist country. And we also wrote to them that we have no money, so the expenses of our journey will have to be borne by them...

Help us, don't let us die here from constant lack of nourishment. Indifference is also a crime in God's sight.

Our leaders should be ashamed that their workers are not in a position to feed their families and it is disgraceful to feed the people with promises and slogans. Please help us to emigrate. We should like to go to America or Canada. There are Ukrainians in Canada, and we would find the language problem easier. We are also Ukrainians.

We'll wait for an answer, if we stay alive! Here's hoping!

L. M. Sery's address is: 270005, Odessa, ul. Frunze 199, kv. 128.

Samizdat News

"Aurė", number 3 (June 1976).

The first two issues of this Lithuanian journal were briefly summarized in Chronicles 39 and 40. The third issue includes eight articles:

1. Kestutis Daugirdas: 'How Lithuania lost its independence', 28 pages. A description of the events of 1939-40. After the secret agreement between Germany and the U S S R dividing Eastern Europe into their respective state spheres of influence, the three Baltic states were invaded in the autumn of 1939 by Red Army units, in accordance with the 'agreements on mutual aid'. An imaginary story about some Red Army men disappearing in Vilnius was the pretext for the ultimatum of 14 June 1940, the entry of larger army units and the formation of the 'People's government' of J. Paleckis. On the night of 11-12 July 1940 mass arrests took place in Lithuania. On 14 July the elections to the Seimas (Parliament) took place, which resulted in the so-called 'Union of Working People' taking power; according to official data, 90 per cent of the votes were in its favour, but in the opinion of the author, based on a number of sources, the votes in favour were 15-16 per cent of the total. On 21 July the Seimas asked the Supreme Soviet of the U S S R to accept Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

2. V. L.: "Polonization or Russification?" (6 pages). The author gives facts about the growing number of Polish schools in Vilnius and its surroundings; he refers to Polonization as an interim stage in the russification of these districts.

3. J. A.: 'Alcoholism — a national disaster' (3 pages). The authorities' attempt (in 1972) to halt this process has come to nothing. The author quotes many statistics; for example: in 1972 the consumption of alcohol in Lithuania came to 116 roubles' worth (per person) and in 1974 to 156 roubles; in 1974 the sum of 17,000,000,000 roubles was spent on buying spirits in the U S S R.

4. Letter to a camp. From Lithuania to Mordovia. 12.12.1975 (3 pages). The author of the letter — Senelis (Grandfather) — writes to the prisoners Nijole and Liudas in the Mordovian camps. He read of their fate in the Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church, and he also found their addresses there. The author himself has spent time in 'that island of the Gulag archipelago'. Senelis swears to do all he can to assist the return of Nijole and Liudas to Lithuania.

5. V. P.: 'How are traditions born?' (6 pages). The author of this article expresses his deep regret at the neglect of ancient church rituals and national traditions, etc. He feels sorry that the celebration of 'socialist festivities' is usually accompanied by plentiful boozing, which assists the excessive trade in alcoholic spirits and snacks from temporary stands.

Speaking of attempts to introduce new rituals, the author of the article refers to the well-known 'Remembrance Day' in Lithuania. Official propaganda prides itself on the idea of commemorating this day, but — as the author reports — we remember and know quite well how 'widely' the anniversary of Romas Kalanta's death is commemorated in our country; on the anniversary of his death no one is usually allowed to approach his grave.

6. A letter to Virgilijus Noreika, director of the Lithuanian Academic Theatre of Opera and Ballet. On 10 April 1976 the newspaper Tiesa published the article 'Whom are the slanderers serving?', largely about Mr and Mrs Juragas, describing their emigration for Lithuania and their activities abroad. The authors of the letter ask the well-known Lithuanian singer who appeared in the above-mentioned article in the role of 'chief accuser' of J. Juragas (formerly chief producer at the Kaunas Drama Theatre), if he is really ignorant of Juragas's motives for leaving his homeland. As is well known, Juragas, who was responsible for many talented productions, could not stand the pressure put on him by the censors and, in August 1972, he sent a letter[17] to the Ministry of Culture and other institutions, declaring that he no longer wanted to mutilate productions at the behest of the censorship and would not compromise. He was immediately sacked from his job, could not find any other work in his field, and finally, in despair, he emigrated. The authors of the letter remind the venerable...
singer that, contrary to his assurances, normal conditions for artistic creation have not been realized in Lithuania, that in the Lithuanian Theatre of Opera directed by Noreika not a single national opera is being performed, and that Noreika himself appears on stage more and more rarely. The authors accuse Noreika of premeditated lying, careerism and cowardice. They sign themselves: 'the Vilnius intelligentsia'.

7. 'How the Soviet authorities are restoring national historical monuments.' The article describes how ancient monuments, especially church buildings, are being destroyed in Soviet Lithuania. The story of the Church of the Resurrection in Kaunas, a Lithuanian national shrine, is given as an example. This building, left empty for a long time, was finally reconstructed at great expense as a radio factory. The article includes information about the fact that immediately after the war the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier was desecrated, the Eternal Flame in the garden by the War Museum was extinguished, and the Liberty Monument was destroyed. The signature is 'Tautonis' (approximate translation — 'man of the people').

8. 'Antanas Pogkus is not an ethnographer!' The article describes how officials of the Vilnius Museum of Atheism obtain exhibits for their stands. They travel round the villages under assumed names and entreat the peasants and priests to give them church valuables, saying that these objects will grace the Museum of Ethnography. A certain Antanas Pogkus distinguished himself by his especial zeal. There are grounds for believing that this is a pseudonym used by the museum's director.

'Memory': An Historical Almanac, issue number 1, Moscow 1976.

In the introductory article the editors announce that the magazine will contain material on the history of our country (largely post-revolutionary history). The editors intend to publish the almanac at least once or twice a year and call on readers to give their active support. Natalya Gorbanevskaya, a member of the editorial board, is named the representative of 'Memory' abroad.

The first issue (about 650 typewritten pages) includes the memoirs of former political prisoners, essays on the 'cases' of the 1940s-1960s, published documents, fragments of evidence, and reviews. Much of the material is accompanied by editorial comment. The section on 'Memoirs' includes the following material:

M. L. Shapiro, 'Kharbin 1945'. Excerpts from the voluminous memoirs of an émigré journalist who was arrested for an article she had written in the 1930s after the invasion of Manchuria by Soviet troops. She died after ten years in the camps, in an invalid home in Mordovia (where she wrote her memoirs).

O. I. Yusovitch, 'From my Memoirs'. Three chapters from the notebooks of a woman prisoner on Solovki at the end of the 1920s, imprisoned on a 'religious' charge.

O. I. Yusovitch, 'From my Memoirs'. Three chapters from the notebooks of a woman prisoner on Solovki at the end of the 1920s, imprisoned on a 'religious' charge.

G. D. Zalmanovskaya, 'Prisoners' Transport to the War'. Record of an oral description of the evacuation of prisoners in the summer of 1941.

M. B. Siluans, 'My Life in Letters and Stories'. The author, who remained a convinced communist after 15 years in the camps, describes his sufferings after rehabilitation.

The section 'Articles and Essays' includes:

— an article on a student 'terrorist' case of 1944, cooked up by the KGB (the case of V. Sulimov, E. Bobnova, V. Frid, Yu. Dunsky, M. Levin, N. Ermasova and others);

— the story of a group of young people arrested in 1945 (N. Vilyams, L. Medvedsky, Yu. Tsalin, L. Malkin and Yu. Gastev, who is the narrator), with many digressions on life in those years and the preceding ones;

— a historical sketch about the so-called 'Union of Communards' in Leningrad (1963-65), better known as the 'Kolokol' [Bell] group;

— the article 'In memory of Anna Petrovna Skripnikova', which tells of the help given by A. P. Skripnikova to her former comrades in the Mordovian camps (Skripnikova's life story is told in the Gulag Archipelago).

The section on 'The History of Culture' includes three letters to the leaders: from M. A. Voloshin to Kameney (1924), from N. Ya. Khazina-Mandelstam to Molotov (1930) and from L. Yu. Brik to Stalin (1935; it was after his decision on this letter, addressed to N. I. Ezhov, then secretary of the Central Committee, that Stalin uttered the phrase about 'our best, most talented poet', which was quoted the next day in Izvestia).

The 'Miscellaneous' section contains:

'Ekaterina Pavlovna Peshkova and her aid to political prisoners', 'V. O. Levitsky's letters from exile', 'An incident from the history of Solovki', 'The camp on Nazino Island', 'The girl in the sailor-suit: commentary on a photograph', 'Victors are not brought to trial', 'Party rehabilitation'.

Three reviews follow:

'Names and Fates', by I. Voznesensky. The fruit of research on the history of the Academy of Sciences (reduced to journal article length), the starting point of discussion being the jubilee edition of the reference-book The USSR Academy of Sciences: Personnel (Moscow, 'Science', 1974).


The 'Documents' section includes A. P. Babich's complaint to an appeal court (1947, see the Gulag Archipelago for Babich's fate), the sentence in the 'Kolokol' case, and some other texts.
The issue ends with a bibliography listing prison literature from 1921 to 1935, accompanied by a wide-ranging article investigating the question of prison publications as a source for study of the GULAG Archipelago. The editors state that they do not intend to limit themselves to 'camp' themes in the future. The whole volume has a markedly non-party character.

---

In the introduction the author writes:
In Autumn 1968 I wrote the pamphlet The Inertia of Fear, which then was quite widely circulated in samizdat. This edition has been rewritten and is thus a new work, although it is based on the same ideas as the first version. I want to list the most important of these ideas: positivism in the realm of philosophy, and socialism (but not Marxism) in the field of social thought; a belief in the leading role of world-views in social movements; basic democratic freedoms and individual rights as the essential condition for a normal development of society; gradualism (step-by-step changes — Chronicle) in politics; my discernment of a strength in the intelligentsia which could, in principle, and therefore should, achieve democratic changes; my extremely critical opinion of the intelligentsia as it at present exists. My call for the Inertia of fear to be overcome; it is rooted in Stalinist times and fetters the initiative of society.

---

Z. Gamsakhurdia — a delegate to the Congress — 'considered it humiliating to ask for permission to speak from persons who, according to the law, should not have had anything to do with controlling the speeches of a writers' congress (that is, from officials of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia). In the author's own words, Georgian official literature is deaf to the suffering of its own nation; none of the delegates said a word about this at the congress, except Revaz Dzhaparidze (he got friendly applause from the auditorium, but it was E. Shevardnadze, secretary of the Central Committee, not the officials on the platform who in his closing address called his speech 'breaking down an open door').

---

The author protests against the fact that the fight for the primacy of the Georgian language, and demands for a reasonably comprehensive and objective teaching of Georgian history are declared to be 'manifestations of nationalism'. In the course of his argument the author quotes in detail the well-known letter of 1922 by Lenin 'On the question of nationalities or autonomization', published after the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U; he also quotes the favourable words of A. Bely, B. Pasternak and other representatives of Russian culture about the Georgian nation and Georgian culture; and he recalls the misfortunes suffered by Georgia in the years of Soviet power.

Gamsakhurdia criticizes the methods used in the present campaign against corruption: the correcting of a serious economic situation is being replaced by repressive measures which are virtually not touching the speculators and bribe-takers from the 'privileged caste', while the press carries on a campaign of libel to convince its readers that nowhere else but Georgia is the centre of the moral corruption now so prevalent. Z. Gamsakhurdia considers that his moral corruption is made worse by the so-called fight against harmful customs and traditions, which is 'a mask for a fight against religion and national identity'. He says: 'In general, we must remember that the fight against religion leads only to the moral degradation of society, an increase in crime, and the reinforcement of anti-cultural tendencies among the people.'

The author concludes: 'The most negative phenomenon in our country must be considered the fact that Russification in Georgia has now become the basis of state policy.'

---

Zviad Gamsakhurdia, Valentina Pailodze (Paliani): Behind the Mask of 'the Fight Against Harmful Customs' the Government is Robbing the Church (9 September 1976).

The authors report that in Svanetia the overwhelming majority of the population are religious believers, but no church services are held in any churches. Patriarch David V. has refused to send the Svanetians a priest; the Abkhazian priest David (Pipiya), who christens children secretly in Svanetia, has heard him say 'I cannot go against the government'.

The article also describes (this is the main theme) the threat posed to icons, which include very old and revered works, and to other church treasures. Many of these have been carried off by the state authorities, some are lying in safes in closed churches, but recently there have been a number of mysterious robberies. The Svanetians are resisting attempts to carry away their icons.

---

Teimuraz Dzhanvelidze: Behind the Mask of 'the Fight Against Harmful Customs', the Government is Forbidding Religious Festivals (10 September 1976, 4 pages).

The author of the article, a teacher, and three other Georgian intellectuals
were present at the festival of St. Kvirkhe on 29 July in the village of Kala in Svanetia. They found it very difficult to get to the festival, as police had closed the roads leading to Kala. The secretary of the district party committee, to whom they appealed for help (they wanted to record folk songs and customs), explained that these measures were part of 'the fight against superstition' and tried to scare them by saying that there were knife-fights and drunkenness at the festival. However, he was ready to excuse the driver, who agreed to take them to Kala.

The author describes the atmosphere at the festival, which went off beautifully in an orderly way, and the custom of general reconciliation which is linked with it. He is annoyed at the campaign against Christianity, as the latter has deeply permeated the worthy sons of Georgia'

Dzhanelidze writes: 'The fight against religion is also a fight against the culture in which it is rooted; it is likewise a fight against the past...''

This concerns the fires and explosions which have occurred recently in Georgia (over 300 incidents in 1975-6, of which about 50 were in Tbilisi). The article describes (giving places, dates, the amount of damage, the nature of the sabotage) 15 cases which occurred in 1976 and mentions a number of the larger fires and explosions in 1975. Some details are given of the government authorities' fight against these diversions.

The author is of the opinion that:

The fires and explosions can be divided into two kinds. The first, most widespread kind are the fires started by employees of one institution or another, to save themselves from the claws of the Department for Combatting the Pillaging of Socialist Property and Speculation.

The second kind are protest fires and explosions, like, for example, the explosion at the aviation factory, the explosion at the government building, the fires at bus stations, factories, and so on.

Viktor Nekipelov: Anaesthesia.
A collection of verses written mostly in 1974-5, while he was in prison (Chronicle 32).

Viktor Nekipelov: The Institute of Fools (Notes on the Serbsky Institute), 194 pages.
The author describes his stay at the Serbsky Institute in January-March 1974, while being diagnosed. He clearly outlines the characters of the medical per-

Sanizdat News

M. S. Bernshtam: What do the events of the past week mean? (21 September 1976, 4 pages).
In his comments on the repressive measures and threats directed against P. Starchik, Vl. Borisov (see the reports on them in this issue), E. Barabanov and L. Regelion (on 15 September he was threatened with arrest), the author comes to the conclusion that these events signify a change in the policy of the authorities, demonstrating their scorn for agreements on human rights. He considers Borisov's position to be especially dangerous, as is that of E. V. Barabanov (Chronicle 30), who 'is being hunted . . . with the aim of forcing him to undergo examination in a psychiatric clinic'.

Bernshtam calls for 'an active and principled attitude to be taken by public opinion in Russia and the world'.

Anna Gerts: The Forbidden Roads to Free Will . . . (Moscow 1972).
This novel 'on dissident life' has circulated quite widely in samizdat, and Roman Gul, the editor of the New York journal Novy Zhurnal, which has published the novel predicts that it will become a best-seller in 1976.

Larisa Bogoraz: Petty Demons. An article on the novel The Forbidden Roads to Free Will (July-August 1976, 14 pages). L. Bogoraz assigns this work to the genre of 'ladies' novels' (as examples of this genre, she refers to the novels of Antonina Kopytseva and Vsevolod Kochetov, and the memoirs of Natalya R申етова). As for the specifically dissident and samizdat background to the novel, L. Bogoraz is of the opinion that it serves to transform 'an ordinary story of immorality' into a case against a group of people charged with 'lack of feeling and lack of responsibility towards society'.

What article does the prosecution use?
Since the time of Dostoevsky, it has been a tradition in Russia to call any social movement 'demon-possession'. In the late 1960s and early 1970s this definition became very fashionable. . . Alas, we are used to arguing by analogy and bowing to authority: petty feelings and lazy thoughts take their toll. The salon critics do not even try to analyse the essential characteristics — good or bad — of the new social movement, which is many-sided and diverse, with an unresearched origin and an unknown structure. Instead, they isolate its

sonnel and of his companions in misfortune. At first he refused to talk to the doctors, but finally he suddenly began to speak. Nekipelov suggests that this

may have been caused by drugs mixed into his food.

...
real and imaginary defects, spitefully bringing the scum and rubbish up to the surface. For these critics Anna Gerts’s novel will be an agreeable present — the more so because the novel contains transparently photographic portraits.

In addition, Anna Gerts does not have the courage to condemn the phenomenon as a whole — ‘this results in mediocrity, pitiful attempts to understand all and forgive all, feeble hatred and contrived reconciliation’.

L. Bogoraz writes very sharply about the literary manners of the novel’s author and the characteristics of the real people she has turned into characters in the book. In the end — no matter what the author intended — ‘these people have been slandered by Anna Gerts, and as she has changed their names they cannot sue her’. The author ‘amazingly contrives to see in people and events all that is empty, superficial, inferior and irrelevant’.

In conclusion, Larisa Bogoraz suggests that the novel should be published by Novosti Press Agency as a work ‘which is as valuable in the ideological duel as, for example, A Quarrel with Time by N. Reshetovskaya, which was recently printed by the same publisher.’

Two Obituaries

In Memory of Konstantin Bogatyrev

Konstantin Bogatyrev had a hard life. As a young man he was condemned to death, but this was commuted to 25 years in the camps, of which he served just over five years. However, even after leaving the camp and right up to the present, he was impatiently awaiting the end of his 25-year sentence. He felt that, while the term had not expired, he could still be sent back to a cell to serve it out to the end. He never had to do so.

Not long ago we, his friends, celebrated the end of the sentence with him. But someone had already decided to carry out the first sentence — which condemned him to death. And that evening, on a dark staircase, a base murderer dealt him a cruel blow.

The judge who pronounced sentence 25 years ago and the man who now carried out the sentence have committed a crime together, and the place for them is beside each other in the dock.

We do not know the murderer’s name, but his mark is known to us. He is one of those who throw cobblestones through the windows of peaceful people, who threaten violence to women and infants, one of those who have a bestial hatred for anyone who thinks differently from themselves, or who thinks at all. The criminal who committed this murder will perhaps never end up behind bars. But there is a Higher Court, and its sentence has already been passed. Before depriving Bogatyrev of his life, this insignificant mongrel had killed the human being in himself. Whoever he is, he is fated to lead a dog’s life and die a dog’s death.

Bogatyrev’s coffin was followed by hundreds of people: relations, friends, acquaintances, and people who had never met him. And I recalled another funeral. A former executioner came to the end of his days despised by everyone, including his own children. He lived in terror of coming retribution, not realizing it had already come. He lived in fear and died of terror. Two coaches came to his funeral. But there was no one to ride in them. There was no one to carry his medals. Passers-by were asked to carry the coffin to the car. The widow decided to have a funeral breakfast and laid the table for 50 people. Only two came. They just wanted to have a good drink.

Kostya [Konstantin] was a talented translator of German poetry. He was a modest, honest, conscientious and brave man. He did not show off his bravery — it was part of his normal behaviour. It was because he was like this that he was killed.

His life was a dramatic one and ended tragically. But his death raised him high above us, and no one can touch him now. Now he cannot be put in prison, or shot, or humiliated. And the more vile his murder was, the more securely he will remain in our memories and in his literary works.

Two Obituaries

Mikhail Dyak

On 17 August in the Ukrainian village of Kalina (Ivano-Frankovsk region) Mikhail Dmitrievich Dyak died at the age of 41.

In March 1967 Mikhail Dyak was arrested as one of the leaders of the ‘Ukrainian National Front’. In the same year he was sentenced to 12 years’ imprisonment (the first 5 years in prison) and 5 years’ exile.

Until his arrest Dyak was a local policeman in the Dolina district of Ivanovo-Frankovsk region. ‘Anti-Sovief’ leaflets had been appearing in that district and neighbouring areas. The worried authorities demanded that Dyak carry out an operational search for the ‘criminals’, but they could not catch them for a long time, perhaps because Dyak himself was among them.

After Vladimir Prison Dyak first landed in Mordovia, then in Perm camp 35. While he was still in Mordovia Dyak got a terrible disease — lymphogranulomatosis (one of the forms of cancer of the blood). Contemporary medicine cannot cure this disease, but treatment begun in time can prolong the sick man’s life for quite a long period.

The camp doctors explained the serious nature of his illness to Dyak, but the camp authorities suggested that he should ask for a pardon — on this condition they promised to release him on grounds of health. ‘But I don’t consider myself guilty of anything,’ answered Dyak. ‘What am I supposed to repent
about, what am I asking pardon for?' This 'bargaining' dragged on for over three years. Finally, in May 1975, Dyak was released without having asked for a pardon, but at that point his days were already numbered. On emerging to freedom, he exchanged the prison walls for the walls of a hospital ward, where he spent almost all his time.

He died, having lived just over a year after his release, suffering dreadfully and knowing that he was dying.

It is clear, even from this short life-story, what a brave, resolute man he was, but his friends — in the camps and at liberty — know that he was an irresistibly charming man, calm, good, patient, as well as an interesting speaker, though not a man of many words. He died in a hospital, not a camp, but his premature death, like the death of Yury Galanskov, leaves an indelible stain on the conscience of his jailers.

Endnotes (Chronicles 40, 41 and 42)

3. These four people are A. D. Sakharov, E. G. Bonner and P. G. and Z. M. Grigorenko.
7. Dr M. F. Talts. See Chronicle 41 and Bloch and Reddaway, op. cit.
8. Also incorrectly called Mo-Khun in Chronicle 39. On Ma-Khun's release and his unusual case see Chronicle 42 and his lengthy document in CHR, 1976, number 23-4, pp. 54-67.
9. On D. M. Airapetov see also Chronicle 44, which reports that he does not consider himself a political prisoner.
11. In this sentence the words 'tank officer' and 'Tashkent' have been inserted in place of the original 'airman' and 'Simferopol', in accord with the correction in Chronicle 41.
12. See reference to full text in note 5 above.
13. This is a paraphrase of the various points in principle VIII.
14. Chronicle 41 reports that his name is Viktor Timanov.
15. Works by M. Bulgakov, A. Tvardovsky and V. Nekrasov respectively.
16. Name corrected from Mislobdsky, as indicated in Chronicle 41.
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19. Corrected here from 'medical assistants' (feldshery) in accord with Plisnash's text — see note 18.
20. There is some confusion here. Chronicle 17 reports on Nikolai Ruban. Vasily Ruban, a poet and journalist born in 1942, is first mentioned in Chronicle 30, but, as here, the reference to Chronicle 17 confuses him with his namesake. See later published details on V. Ruban in Bloch and Reddaway, op. cit. (also on the other inmates mentioned here), and in the Ukrainian Herald, numbers 4, 6, 7-8.
21. For more details see Bloch and Reddaway, op. cit.
22. As note 21.
24. See note 17.
25. Russia's elected national assembly, which existed from 1906 to 1917.
28. The full texts of these and other issues of the Bulletin are on file at Keston College, Kent.
29. See note 26.
30. Full texts available at Keston College, Kent.
31. A book of poems by a poet and critic (b. 1907) who lives in the U.S.A.
32. On Kalinin see Chronicle 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 18, 21.
33. According to Chronicle 28, the sentence was 5 years of special-regime, 5 years of strict-regime, and 5 years' exile. On Gel (Hol) see also Chronicles 7, 18, 24, 27, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40.
34. Chronicle 44 says that this report of his transfer was 'apparently premature'. In any case, in January 1977 he was in the Vladimir regional psychiatric hospital, and was transferred from there to Sychovka in February or March 1977.
35. In 1976 he was transferred to an ordinary mental hospital in Lvov (see Chronicle 43), where he still was in late 1977.
36. See full texts (Russian and English) in the sources given in note 5.
37. The Crimean Tatars were all deported in one night from the Crimea on 18 May 1944.
38. On this meeting see Politicheskii dnevnik, Herzen Foundation, Amsterdam, vol. 1, 1972.
39. In Chronicle 43 the Georgian historian V. Rtskhiladze argues strongly that the Meskhetians are Georgians, not Turks.
40. Corrected from 'birth' — see Chronicle 43.
41. For the campaign which led to Starchik's release on 14 November 1976 see ibid.

Endnotes

42. Chronicle 43 reports Trifonov's sentencing to 4 years on sexual charges, after he had given damaging evidence against several Leningrad dissenters. (It is possible that the Gennady Trifonov whose suicide attempt in Leningrad is reported in Chronicle 14 is the same man, and that his personal details are there mis-reported.)
43. On Niklaus see also Chronicles 13, 15, 27.
44. Pashnin has been removed from this list, as indicated in Chronicle 43.
45. Correction in Chronicle 43: Suslensky was put in the hospital after his cooler term, not before.
46. See more details in Chronicle 43.
47. See extracts from this order in C H R, 1976, number 23-4, p. 34.
49. In December 1976 Vudka emigrated to Israel.
51. See more details, in fact, in Chronicle 33, where one of the two references to him mis-spells him Muranuskas.
52. See in fact some details on his case in Chronicles 33, 35.
53. 3 years according to Chronicle 38.
54. Mervurel, Mudrov and Juodvidis are mentioned in Chronicle 39, which gives the latter's sentence as 24 years.
55. Probably the same person as the 'Vitokhin' who was in the same hospital in 1971. See Chronicle 21.
56. See an article by Kotov on problems of the forensic psychiatric diagnosis of psychoses in elderly people, Zhurnal nevropatologii i psikhiiatrii, 1973, number 9.
57. Chronicle 44 reports his sentencing to 5 years.
58. See the full text in Index on Censorship, London, 1976, number 1.
59. After documentation of this sort began to obtain some publicity in the West, Izvestia reported on a programme to restore the David Garedzha complex.
60. See report on his meeting with Moldavian officials, Pravda, 3 August 1976.
61. See sources for full Russian and English texts in note 5.
62. See the text of Dzhaparidze's speech, protesting about discrimination against the Georgian language, in Index on Censorship, 1976, number 4.
63. See the full text of Dzhaparidze's speech, protesting about discrimination against the Georgian language, in Index on Censorship, 1976, number 4.
64. Published in Russian by Khronia Press, 1977.
67. Published in Kontinent, 1977, number 12.
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