A Chronicle of Current Events

Journal of the Human Rights Movement in the USSR

Numbers 32-33

ГОД ПРАВ ЧЕЛОВЕКА В СОВЕТСКОМ СОЮЗЕ

П Р О Д О Л Ж А Е Т С Я

Хроника текущих событий

Каждый человек имеет право на свободу убеждений и на свободное выражение их; это право включает свободу беспрепятственно придерживаться своих убеждений и свободу искать, получать и распространять информацию и идеи любыми средствами и независимо от государственных границ.

Всеобщая Декларация
Прав Человека, статья 19

Выпуск I /6/, 28 февраля 1969 года

Содержание : Суд над Ириной БЕЛОГОРОДСКОЙ. - Дело Бориса КОЧУБИЕВСКОГО. - Дело Ивана ДЕНИСОВИЧА. - Ультиматум политзаключенных. - Внесудебные политические репрессии 1968-1969 г.г. - Лисенковцы поднимают голову. - Раз"яснение национальной политики. - Новости самиздата. - Краткие сообщения. - Поправка к 4 выпуску .

Amnesty International Publications

English translation copyright © Amnesty International, 1976
All rights reserved
Published 1976 by Amnesty International Publications
Printed by Villiers Publications Ltd, London NW5, England
ISBN 0-900058 20 X

Copyright of photographs: requests for permission to reproduce any of the photographs in this book should be directed to Amnesty International Publications, 53 Theobald's Road, London WC1X 8SP England, which will pass such requests on to the copyright-holders.

Cover: Title page of one of the original *samizdat* versions of *Chronicle 6*

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is a worldwide human rights movement which is independent of any government, political faction, ideology or religious creed. It works for the release of men and women imprisoned anywhere for their beliefs, colour, language, ethnic origin or religion, provided they have not used or advocated violence. These are termed "prisoners of conscience".
AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL opposes the use of torture and the death penalty in all cases and without reservation. It is now conducting an international Campaign for the Abolition of Torture.
AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL advocates fair and early trials for all political prisoners and works on behalf of persons detained without charge or without trial and those detained after expiry of their sentences.
AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL seeks observance throughout the world of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.
AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL has consultative status with the United Nations (ESOSOC), UNESCO and the Council of Europe, has cooperative relations with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States and has observer status with the Organization of African Unity (Bureau for the Placement and Education of African Refugees).
AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is financed by its members throughout the world, by individual subscription and by donations.

A Chronicle of Current Events

Numbers 32 & 33

Amnesty International Publications
53 Theobald's Road London WC1X 8SP England
1976

List of Illustrations

(between pages 32 and 33)

I 1. Tatyana Zhitnikova and Victor Nekrasov.
2. Pyotr Grigorenko and his wife in 1974.
3. Vladimir Bukovsky in 1960.
4. The prison mental hospital in Oryol.

II 5. Solzhenitsyn with Tvardovsky's widow.
6. Sakharov with his wife, Elena Bonner.
7. Irina Zholkovskaya, wife of A. Ginzburg.
8. Alexander Ginzburg with his children.

III 9. Arie-Leib Khnokh.
10. Alexander Galich.
11. Tatyana Bayeva with her child.
12. Vitaly and Inessa Rubin with Nadezhda Ulanovskaya.
13. Petras Paulaitis, drawn by a fellow inmate.

IV 14. Father Dmitry Dudko.
15. Valentin Turchin and Yury Orlov.
16. A group of Volga Germans.
17. Anatoly Marchenko with his son Pavel.

V 18.–25.
Lydia Chukovskaya, Vladimir Dremlyuga, Ivan Gel, Vladimir Voinovich, Andrei Tverdokhlebov, Alexander Feldman, Mustafa Dzhemilev, Simas Kudirka.

VI 26.–32.
Yakov Suslensky, Iosif Mishener, Vladimir Osipov, Isaak Shkolnik, Valentin Moroz, Igor Ogurtsov, Gabriel Superfin.

VII 33.–41.
Efim Etkind, Edward Kuznetsov, Silva Zalmanson, Boris Penson, Mikhail Kheifets, Anatoly Goldfeld, Israil Zalmanson, Lev Yagman, Boris Azernikov.

VIII 42.–44.
Evgeny Bresenden, Grigory Vashchenko, and a double wedding in a Pentecostal community.

A drawing of Alexander Petrov-Agatov by Boris Penson appears on p. 106.

Contents

Preface 4
Abbreviations 5
Chronicle No. 32
The Deportation of Solzhenitsyn 8
The Trials of Khaustov, Superfin, Nekipelov, Pirogov 12
Case No. 15 in Leningrad 26
Pentecostalists intend to leave the U S S R 28
Soviet Germans want to leave for West Germany 31
The Persecution of Crimean Tatars 31
Events in Lithuania 40
The Case of Pailodze 46
In the Prisons and Camps 48
In the Psychiatric Hospitals 58
An Unpublished Decree 64
The Unofficial International Scientific Seminar in Moscow 67
About the Journal *Veche* 68
In the Moscow Writers' Organization 70
Extra-Judicial Persecution 77
From the Soviet Press 79
News in Brief 83
Samizdat News 92
V. Nekrasov, 'Who Needs This?' 93
Letters and Statements 95
Addenda and Corrigenda 105
Chronicle No. 33
Political Prisoners' Day in the U S S R 108
Food Norms 114
Order Number 020 115
In the Mordovian Camps 116
In the Perm Camps 126
A List of Prisoners in the Perm Camps 143
V. Moroz's Hunger Strike 166
Letters and Statements 169
News in Brief 172
Trials of Recent Years 173
Errata 178
Endnotes 179
RSFSR Criminal Code Articles 70 and 190-1 185
Index of Names 186
Bibliographical Note 192

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 of *A Chronicle of Current Events* 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, and 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 almost entirely of accounts of such violations.

Although the constitution of the U S S R (Article 125) guarantees 'freedom of the press', the Soviet state officially reserves for itself and for officially-approved organizations the right to decide what may or may not appear in print. In the past decade and a half many Soviet citizens whose writings have not been published through official channels have reproduced their work in *samizdat* form. These *samizdat* ('self-published') writings circulate from hand to hand, often being retyped, on the chain-letter principle.

In an early issue it was stated that 'the *Chronicle* does, and will do, its utmost to ensure that its strictly factual style is maintained to the greatest degree possible . . .'. The *Chronicle* has consistently maintained a high standard of accuracy. As a regular practice the editors openly acknowledge when a piece of information has not been thoroughly verified. When mistakes in reporting occur, these mistakes are retrospectively drawn to the attention of the readers. Furthermore the *Chronicle* frequently reproduces without any editorial comment official documents such as governmental edicts, bills of indictment, protocols of searches, investigation officials' reports, etc.

In February 1971, starting with number 16, Amnesty International began publishing English translations of the *Chronicles* as they appeared. Publication of the *Chronicles* ceased temporarily after issue number 27, dated 15 October 1972, as a result of a K G B operation known as Case 24 which was aimed at the journal's suppression. The *Chronicle* reappeared in the spring of 1974 when numbers 28-31, covering the period from October 1972 to May 1974, were distributed in Moscow. These numbers were published in English by Amnesty International in May 1975.

This latest volume, comprising *Chronicles* 32 and 33, 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, extracts of the R S F S R criminal code, illustrations, names index, bibliographical note and material on the outside and inside of the cover have been added to help the general reader. None of this material appeared in the original texts.

The endnotes have been kept to a minimum, partly because the Russian text already refers readers to earlier issues, and partly because the names index gathers together all references to a particular person. Unlike in earlier translations, Ukrainian names are here given in transliteration from the Russian, not 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
January 1976

ABBREVIATIONS

ASSR	Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. Subordinate to an SSR (see below) and based on the minority nationality whose home is on the territory. The Mordovian ASSR, for example, is subordinate to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and so named because it is the home of the Mordovian national minority.
KGB	Committee for State Security.
MOOP	Ministry for the Preservation of Public Order. Renamed MVD in 1966.
MVD	Ministry of Internal Affairs.
RSFSR	Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.
SSR	Soviet Socialist Republic, of which there are 15 in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR).
UVD	Administration for Internal Affairs.

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.

Number 32 **17 July 1974**

Contents:

The deportation of Solzhenitsyn. The trials of Khaustov, Superfin, Nekipelov, Pirogov. Case No. 15 in Leningrad. Pentecostalists intend to leave the U S S R. Soviet Germans want to leave for the Federal German Republic. The persecution of Crimean Tatars. Events in Lithuania. The case of Pailodze. In the prisons and camps. In the psychiatric hospitals. An unpublished Decree of the Praesidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet. The unofficial international scientific seminar in Moscow. About the journal *Veche*. In the Moscow writers' organization. Extra-judicial persecution. From the Soviet press. News in brief. Samizdat news. Letters and statements. Addenda and Corrigenda.

Seventh Year of Publication

The Deportation of Solzhenitsyn

On 13 February, after a prolonged and large-scale persecution campaign in the press, Alexander Isayevich Solzhenitsyn was deported from the Soviet Union.

The immediate cause of this was the publication of his *GULag Archipelago* by the Y M C A Press (see *Chronicle* 30).

The circumstances surrounding the publication of this book, as well as the events following it, are described in detail in the *samizdat* collection *Live not by the Lie.* The collection has been in fairly wide circulation, and so the *Chronicle* will confine itself to presenting the main course of events.

* * *

At the end of August 1973, after five days of interrogation in the Leningrad offices of the K G B, the 70-year-old E. D. Voronyanskaya revealed the place where a copy of A. I. Solzhenitsyn's *GULag Archipelago* was being kept.

If the K G B report on the case of Professor Etkind is to be believed (see this issue), Voronyanskaya also disclosed that Solzhenitsyn had transmitted two copies of the *GULag* manuscript to her through Etkind.

Shortly after, E. D. Voronyanskaya committed suicide.

* * *

'With a feeling of inner frustration I refrained for years from releasing this completed book: my duty to those still living outweighed my duty to those who had perished. But now that the State Security has, notwithstanding, got hold of the book, I have no alternative but to publish it immediately.

September 1973 A. Solzhenitsyn.'

* * *

In December 1973 the Y M C A Press published the book in Paris.*

The first articles about the publication in Soviet newspapers appeared at the beginning of January. Initially these were extracts from the foreign press and T A S S statements.

The T A S S threats perturbed many people. On 5 January V. Voinovich, A. Galich, V. Maximov, A. Sakharov, and I. Shafarevich issued an appeal for the defence of Solzhenitsyn.

On 13 January the newspaper *Pravda* published an article by Solovyov, 'The Path of Treachery'. It became a guiding document: practically all the central and local newspapers reprinted the article. Subsequently the newspapers printed comments in response to Solovyov's article.

*In an interview given to American television on 25 June 1974 A. I. Solzhenitsyn spoke, among other things, about a deal proposed to him by the authorities. They had promised Solzhenitsyn that they would print *Cancer Ward* in the U S S R in exchange for his undertaking not to publish *GULag* for a period of 20 years [*Chronicle's* note].

On 18 January 1974 Solzhenitsyn made a statement in which, with characteristic passion, he pointed out that the Soviet press had distorted the facts and presented false interpretations. Amongst other things, Solzhenitsyn wrote: 'To *which* pages can they point, from *which* volume? For the *Literary Gazette* has been caught red-handed: it quotes from the *seized copy,* from the fourth and fifth parts of *GULag,* which have not yet been published. So it was in State Security that the suspect "Litterateur" copied his extracts!'

Meanwhile the first reactions to the work and the first statements of indignation regarding the press persecution had appeared in *samizdat.*

An article by H. Böll about the work's publication, 'It is Necessary to Go Further and Further', appeared.

A wide-ranging review by Roy Medvedev appeared . . .

The following made written protests, individually and collectively: B. Mikhailov, E. Barabanov, V. Borisov, B. Shragin, L. Chukovskaya, V. Dolgy, Gusyakova, V. Zaitsev, I. Ovchinnikov, V. Osipov, V. Repnikov, V. Rodionov, M. Agursky.

* * *

On 8 February an attempt was made to deliver a summons to Solzhenitsyn's wife Natalya Svetlova, summoning her husband to the U S S R Procuracy, but Svetlova refused to accept it.

On 11 February the summons was repeated.

* * *

'TO THE U S S R PROCURACY, in reply to its repeated summons.

Given the unending and general lawlessness which has reigned for many years in our country (and has affected me personally in the form of an eight-year campaign of slander and persecution), I refuse to recognize the legality of your summons and will not appear for interrogation at any state institution.

Before demanding that citizens obey the law, learn to execute it yourselves. Free the innocent from imprisonment. Punish the perpetrators of the mass exterminations and the authors of the false denunciations. Punish the administrators and the special detachments which carried out genocide (the deportation of *whole peoples*). Deprive *today* the local and departmental satraps of their limitless power over citizens, of their controlling sway over lawcourts and psychiatrists. Satisfy the *millions* of lawful, yet suppressed statements of complaint.

11 February A. Solzhenitsyn.'

* * *

At five o'clock in the evening on 12 February eight men burst into Solzhenitsyn's flat, led by a senior counsellor of justice, Zverev.

A resolution empowering them to take Solzhenitsyn to the Procuracy was

shown to him. One of the participants in the operation assured his wife that Alexander Isayevich would soon return.

Solzhenitsyn was led away, but two 'guests' stayed in the flat, took up posts by the door and the telephone, and remained there for about half an hour.

It is no more than ten minutes' walk from Solzhenitsyn's home to the U S S R Procuracy, so already at this point the writer's family suspected that he had not been taken to the Procuracy.

* * *

Statement of A. Solzhenitsyn,

written by him beforehand, for use in the event of arrest

'In advance I declare as incompetent any criminal trial of Russian literature, of a single book of it, of any Russian author. If such a trial is prescribed for myself, I shall not go there on my own two feet — they will deliver me there in a Black Maria, with my arms twisted behind me. I shall not answer a single question at such a trial. Sentenced to imprisonment, I shall not submit to the sentence except in handcuffs. In imprisonment itself, having already lost my best eight years to forced labour for the state, and contracted cancer in the process, I shall not work for the oppressors even half an hour more.

'In this way I leave open for them the straightforward option of overt tyrants: to bump me off quickly for writing the truth about Russian history.'

* * *

At nine o'clock in the evening it became known that Alexander Solzhenitsyn had been arrested.

* * *

'. . . The fifth act of the drama has begun.

Shame on the country that allows its greatness and its glory to be abused.

Wretchedness on the country whose tongue they tear out with tongs.

Misery on the nation which is deceived.

Blessing and support to the man who now, rudely separated from family and friends, slandered before his people, is — yes now, at this very minute! — conducting his silent duel with the lawless violence.

12 February 1974. 12.00 hours. Moscow. Lydia Chukovskaya.'

* * *

On the evening of 12 February in Lefortovo prison Solzhenitsyn was charged with treason (article 64 of the R S F S R Criminal Code). The charge was signed by the senior counsellor of justice Zverev; Deputy Procurator-general of the U S S R Malyarov was present when the charge was presented.

* * *

On the day after the arrest, 13 February, the 'Moscow Appeal' appeared.[1] Its authors, A. Sakharov, E. Bonner, V. Maximov, M. Agursky, B. Shragin, P. Litvinov, Yu. Orlov, Rev. S. Zheludkov, A. Marchenko and L. Bogoraz, demanded:

1. That *GULag Archipelago* be published in the U S S R and made available to every compatriot;
2. That archive and other materials be published which would give a full picture of the activity of the Cheka, N K V D and M G B;*
3. That an international public tribunal be set up to investigate the crimes perpetrated;
4. That Solzhenitsyn be protected from persecution and allowed to work in his homeland.

The authors of the 'Moscow Appeal' called for national committees to be set up in various countries to collect signatures in support of the appeal.

* * *

At 13.00 on 13 February, in a solitary-confinement cell of Lefortovo prison, Malyarov read Solzhenitsyn a Decree depriving him of his Soviet citizenship.

On the same day he was forcibly deported from the Soviet Union to the Federal Republic of Germany.

After the deportation the campaign flared up in the Soviet press with new vigour and lasted another week.

* * *

On 14 February M. Landa published [in *samizdat*] her support for the 'Moscow Appeal'. On 17 February a letter supporting the 'Moscow Appeal' was published by E. Barabanov, T. Velikanova, S. Kovalyov, T. Khodorovich, and V. Borisov. Pointing to the attempts of Soviet newspapers to represent Western commentators and certain celebrities in the West as supporters of Solzhenitsyn's deportation, the authors write: '. . . Will the free world really reconcile itself to the presentation of another falsification of its views to a deceived and confused people? . . . What is described in Solzhenitsyn's book . . . involves a portion of blame for the West too. . . . Is it not time to recognize with full responsibility that by exploiting the separateness of our worlds and exploiting our mutual lack of information they are turning *you* into accomplices? . . . The solidarity of people cannot be limited to words. It must be effective. In this lies our hope.'

Later the following people associated themselves with the 'Moscow Appeal': E. S. Andronova, L. Aptekar, V. Bakhmin, N.Ya. Iofe, O. Iofe, I. Kaplun, A. Lavut, A. Levitin (Krasnov), G. Podyapolsky, S. Khodorovich, and L. Tymchuk.

According to the writer Vladimir Maximov, 50,000 people in the Federal German Republic and West Berlin have associated themselves with the 'Moscow Appeal'.

* * *

*Previous names of the organization now called the K G B.

On 30 March Solzhenitsyn's family left the U S S R. A letter by his wife was made public. In bidding farewell to her friends in this letter, she said with confidence that Alexander Isayevich, she herself and their children would return.

The Trial of Victor Khaustov

The trial in the case of Victor Aleksandrovich Khaustov took place from 4 to 6 March in the Oryol city court. The judge was Novikov, the prosecutor was Ponomaryov, and counsel for the defence was Nimirinskaya, a lawyer from Voroshilovgrad.

Khaustov was charged with: transmitting information to the *Chronicle* about the underground group of Kuzin and others in Oryol (see *Chronicle* 29); taking part in the duplication and sending to the West of the *Diaries* of Edward Kuznetsov; signing letters in defence of Bukovsky and Yakir; the possession and circulation of 'anti-Soviet' literature: issues of the *Chronicle*, the collection *In Memory of A. E. Kosterin*, two leaflets in defence of P. G. Grigorenko, the journal *Novyi grad*, and [David] Shub's book *Political figures in Russia, 1850-1920*; and orally 'slandering' the Soviet system and Soviet electoral procedures. The indictment charged that, after serving three years of imprisonment and being freed in 1970,[2] Khaustov 'retained his anti-Soviet position' and 'maintained criminal links with Yakir, Krasin, Belogorodskaya, Bonner, Kuzin, and Superfin'.

Khaustov pleaded guilty, although in the course of the judicial examination he disputed several points of the indictment. He said that after his release he had retained his former anti-Soviet convictions but regarded anti-Soviet activity as useless, pointless and causing nothing but harm to the people who engaged in it. He continued to be interested in philosophy, especially works of religious philosophy, and in the process of acquiring the literature that interested him became acquainted with Kuzin. After receiving Kuzin's *Program* from him, Khaustov transmitted it to Telnikov but categorically opposed the inclusion of any note about the *Program* in the *Chronicle* and also any mention of the underground group which had been formed in Oryol. Khaustov did not attach to this isolated episode the significance suggested by the term anti-Soviet activity.

Speaking at the trial as a witness, Kuzin testified that Khaustov would bring to him in Oryol anti-Soviet literature from Telnikov: the *Chronicle*, Shub's book, the collection *In Memory of Kosterin*, and other items. Since he was interested in Kuzin's political views, Khaustov had taken the program from him in order to read it. Kuzin said that Khaustov gave him the impression of a man who had been drawn into this activity against his will.

Khaustov said in evidence that he had received the manuscript of Kuznetsov's *Diaries* from Bonner in a packet inscribed 'For Victor only'. Khaustov had asked Yakir to duplicate the manuscript, for although he had wanted to duplicate it himself, he had been unable to. He had then turned for help to Superfin.

Superfin had typed the manuscript in three copies and undertaken to transmit it to the West. Khaustov had given the second copy of the type-script to Bonner and kept the third for himself, intending to circulate it in *samizdat*. As he had learnt during the investigation from Superfin's testimony, the latter had transmitted his type-written copy and the manuscript to the West. From the same testimony Khaustov had discovered that Bonner had sent her copy to Italy.

Summoned to the court as a witness, Superfin made a statement repudiating the evidence he had given during the investigation and refused to give evidence in court (for further details see this issue of the *Chronicle*: 'The case of Gabriel Superfin'). The judge ruled that in that case the evidence given by Superfin during the pre-trial investigation would be read out. Khaustov's defence counsel, the lawyer Nimirinskaya, objected, regarding such a ruling as illegal: the Code of Criminal Procedure made provision for testimony to be read out in the event of a witness failing to appear in court or in the event of a clear disparity between the evidence given during the investigation and in court, but not in the event of a refusal to testify. The court adjourned; during this time Nimirinskaya, with the judge's permission, talked to Superfin. After the recess Superfin agreed to reply to certain questions that did not involve third persons. He gave evidence regarding the typing and transmission of the *Diaries* and noted the insignificant role played by Khaustov. After this evidence Khaustov spoke again, in turn taking on himself the main share of involvement.

Khaustov testified that he did not consider the letters in defence of arrested people to be anti-Soviet: he had put his signature to these letters out of personal motives of friendship. He said, in particular, that the sudden changes in the lot of Bukovsky had amazed him: now he would be pronounced schizophrenic, now of sound mind. In the reply to this the judge asked why Khaustov had not written that a sick man should not be tried. Khaustov answered that he did not consider Bukovsky to be sick.

Besides the two main witnesses who were brought to the courtroom from custody, there were also a few others from the vacuum-cleaner factory where Khaustov had worked up till his arrest, and from a polling-station. They testified that Khaustov had refused to take part in elections, would not go on [official] demonstrations, and would talk about his earlier imprisonment; however, he had not held anti-Soviet conversations and on his own initiative had not taken part in conversations on political topics.

To the court's question as to whether he felt remorse, Khaustov said that he had no remorse but did feel regret: that he retained and, evidently, would continue to retain an anti-Soviet position. Nevertheless, said Khaustov, he did not intend to continue any anti-Soviet activity.

The procurator demanded five years in camps and three years of exile for Khaustov.

Defence counsel completely denied Khaustov's guilt on some of the charges (anti-Soviet statements, signing the letters) and made various amendments in relation to the others. Counsel drew the court's attention to the tragic nature of Khaustov's fate, to his urge for justice, which expressed itself, for example,

in the fact that, while disputing insignificant points of the indictment, he admitted far more serious ones. She asked for the minimal sentence to be applied to Khaustov.

In his final speech Khaustov said that the prosecution and the defence had given a complete and comprehensive description of his activity and personality. He said that he expected from the court not mercy or indulgence, only justice.

The court sentenced Khaustov to four years of camps and two years of exile.

At an appeal hearing on 16 April the R S F S R Supreme Court upheld the sentence of the Oryol city court as fully legitimate and substantiated.

On 27 May Victor Khaustov was dispatched from Oryol prison; he arrived at the Perm camps, after transport by stages, on 4 July. His address is: Permskaya oblast, Chusovskoi raion, pos. Kuchino, uchrezhdenie VS-389/36.

The Case of Gabriel Superfin

Gabriel Superfin, born in 1943, the author of a number of articles and works prepared for publication on the history of Russian literature and culture,[3] was arrested in Moscow on 3 July 1973 (see *Chronicle* 30) and taken to Oryol, as one of the charges against him — transmission to the West of Edward Kuznetsov's *Diaries* — provided a basis for joining his case to that of Victor Khaustov (see *Chronicle* 29). Subsequently, however, Superfin's case was separated.

At several interrogations in the autumn of 1973 and at many interrogations carried out in January and February 1974 in Moscow, Leningrad, Tallinn, Tartu and Riga, witnesses were shown testimony by Superfin about the participation of various people in the transmission of the *Diaries*, in the publication of the *Chronicle of Current Events*, and so on. As became clear later, Superfin did indeed give this testimony, but as early as 5 November 1973 he stated to the investigators that all the evidence given by him between 22 July and 5 November was false. Superfin defined the motives which led him to give false evidence as base and self-centred. Superfin repeated this statement in public on 5 March 1974 at the trial of Victor Khaustov, to which he was taken as a witness (see this issue). He refused to testify as a witness at this trial, regarding his refusal as the only form of protest available to him against the expulsion from the country of A. I. Solzhenitsyn.

The case of Superfin (article 70, part I, of the R S F S R Criminal Code) was examined from 12 to 14 May by the Oryol city court, presided over by Novikov (he had also presided at the trial of Khaustov). The prosecutor was Shteiman, deputy procurator of Oryol Region. The accused's defence counsel was the Leningrad lawyer Gurevich (the Moscow Collegium of Barristers would not allow Superfin's relatives to engage the Moscow lawyer chosen by them, L. A. Yudovich).

The main charges brought against Superfin at the trial were: typing and sending to the West the *Diaries* of Edward Kuznetsov; preparing material for the *Chronicle* and editing issues of it; transmitting material for the journal *Vestnik RSKhD*[4] (including his review of the three-volume edition of Mandelshtam's poems); making editorial comments on Peter Reddaway's book *Uncensored Russia* (notes made on a copy of the book); circulating an article by Leszek Kolakowski. 'Theses on Hope and Hopefulness'; signing a letter in defence of Galanskov and Ginzburg in 1968; and uttering 'slanders' about Gorky and Sholokhov.

It is known that in 1973 Krasin testified that Superfin had made editorial comments on Reddaway's book, and also that Belogorodskaya testified that he had edited the *Chronicle*.

Superfin pleaded not guilty. He confirmed the factual side of most of the charges brought against him but rejected the interpretation of his actions as anti-Soviet. He described the *Diaries* of Kuznetsov — the notes of a man sentenced to the supreme penalty — as a remarkable human document and a work of great artistic significance, and their author as a courageous man who had sacrificed himself for the sake of the right of Jews to emigrate to Israel. Referring to the *Chronicle* materials, for example the notes prepared by him on banned films and on the censorship (see *Chronicles* 14 and 19), Superfin insisted that the aim and content of the *Chronicle* was truthful, authentic information and not 'anti-Soviet libel'. In Superfin's opinion the *Chronicle*, by giving information on the punishment imposed on certain people for their actions (for example, the information in *Chronicle* 1 on the case of the All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Liberation of the People), played a cautionary role for many readers, and might restrain them from acting rashly. Superfin also denied the 'anti-Soviet' character of the *Vestnik RSKhD*, and said that it was an independent journal on religious, literary and socio-political themes, that it was published through the labours of only one man, and not with the money of the C I A, the N T S, etc. . . . He noted that references to this journal had appeared in the Soviet press.

The opinions which Superfin had expressed about these publications at the pre-trial investigation before 5 November were read out at the trial: at that time he had acknowledged their 'anti-Soviet' character. Superfin attributed these opinions, as well as a number of statements of the same period which he later repudiated (also read out at the trial), to fear and a desire to transfer his own responsibility onto other people. Superfin declared that he was prepared to answer for his behaviour during the investigation, and not only according to the Criminal Code.

Three witnesses spoke at the trial. Victor Khaustov repeated the evidence given by him during his pre-trial investigation, before Superfin's arrest, and also that given at his own trial, presenting his version of the duplication of Kuznetsov's *Diaries* and the sending of the manuscript to the West (see this issue). This evidence coincided in the main with the evidence of Superfin. Lev Ladyzhensky from Riga (see this issue), who was under investigation and also, like Khaustov, brought to the court from custody, confirmed that he had translated Kolakowski's article at the request of Superfin. Szandor Fodo, a final-year

student from Tartu University, after expressing his high opinion of Superfin as a man and a scholar, confirmed that he had recounted to him in detail about his dismissal from work. Fodo stated that in conversations with Superfin it was he, Fodo, who would bring up the theme of the national question, as this had always troubled him in its application both to his own native people, the Hungarians of Transcarpathia (see *Chronicle* 22), and to other national minorities.

Witnesses whose evidence was referred to in the indictment as corroborating certain points which were subsequently included in the verdict, were not summoned to court. Thus, the evidence of I. Zholkovskaya was mentioned as one of the proofs of Superfin's participation in the collection of information for the *Chronicle*, whereas it is known that at the pre-trial investigation I. Zholkovskaya had stated only that she had read her husband Ginzburg's letters from camp to many acquaintances, 'and Superfin might have been amongst them'.

'Taking into consideration the poor health of the accused', the procurator Shteiman asked for six years in camps and three years of exile.

The court sentenced Superfin to five years of strict-regime camps and two years of exile.

On 9 July the appeal hearing took place in the R S F S R Supreme Court. The court was presided over by Shestnov; Zverev was the prosecutor. Superfin was defended by the Moscow lawyer L. A. Yudovich, who had been chosen by Superfin's relatives from the very beginning but was allowed to defend him only at the appeal stage. Yudovich had had difficulty in obtaining a meeting with his client, as the Praesidium of the Moscow Collegium of Barristers (chairman — Apraksin) for a long time refused to let him make a trip to Oryol.

Defence counsel asked for the sentence to be revoked and the case sent for a re-trial. The main argument of the defence was the personal interest of judge Novikov. In its verdict in Khaustov's case, i.e. before the beginning of the examination of this case, a court presided over by Novikov had determined the degree of Superfin's involvement in the transmission of Kuznetsov's *Diaries*. This argument was not even mentioned in either the prosecutor's reply or the judge's decision. The court also rejected the arguments of the appeal on particular points of the charge, accepting as proof of Superfin's guilt the evidence of witnesses Grebenshchikov and Ellingson, who did not appear in court. Even the 'evidence at the pre-trial investigation of witnesses Barabanov and Bonner' (also not summoned to the court) was not excluded from the verdict, although the evidence of Barabanov completely contradicted the conclusions of the investigation and the court, while Bonner had refused to give evidence altogether.

The R S F S R Supreme Court ruled that the sentence of the Oryol city court was lawful and fully substantiated.

Many people had earlier spoken out in defence of Superfin in the U S S R and abroad.

On 12 July 1973 V. N. Chalidze appealed to A. I. Mikoyan to help Superfin and, in particular, to stand bail for him.[6] Superfin had edited the memoirs of

Mikoyan which were published in *Novyi Mir*.

On 23 August 1973 in an interview with Western correspondents[0] A. I. Solzhenitsyn announced that Superfin had given him much assistance in his archival research. In the opinion of Solzhenitsyn, this might aggravate Superfin's fate.

In December 1973 a Committee for the Defence of Gabriel Superfin was formed in the U S A. The statement about the formation of the Committee was signed by Lipman Bers, Robert Bernstein, Victor Erlich, Donald Fanger, Peter Gay, Jack H. Heckster, Octavio Paz, Meyer Shapiro, Vincent Scully and Robert Penn Warren.

According to *A Chronicle of Human Rights in the U S S R* (Number 8), a telegram was sent to N. Podgorny on 25 April on behalf of the Committee for the Defence of Superfin, signed by Professor Lipman Bers, Victor Erlich and Vincent Scully.

It also reports that the American Publishers Association sent a telegram to Podgorny in defence of Superfin at the end of March.

On 17 March A. Tverdokhlebov appealed to Podgorny to pardon Superfin.

On 18 March A. Tverdokhlebov and Maria Slonim sent a letter to the International Commission of Jurists. The letter gives details of the investigation of Superfin's case.[7]

For the letter of 44 friends and acquaintances of Superfin see this issue, section 'Letters and Statements'.

The Trial of Nekipelov

In May 1974 the Vladimir regional court examined the case of V. A. Nekipelov, charged under article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code (for searches and interrogations of Nekipelov in the Myuge case, and for his arrest, see *Chronicle* 29).

Victor Aleksandrovich Nekipelov was born in 1928; he has a higher education in pharmaceutics, and at the end of the 1960s completed the Gorky Literary Institute's correspondence course. He has published his verse and translations in several newspapers and journals. In the mid-1960s a collection of Nekipelov's poetry *Between Mars and Venus* was published. From 1970 Nekipelov worked in the town of Solnechnogorsk (Moscow region), where he had a temporary residential permit. In the autumn of 1971, when he had already received permission to live there permanently and had an authorization for a flat, both the former and the latter were suddenly withdrawn, without any reasons being given, and he was forced to leave. From the spring of 1972 Nekipelov lived in the town of Kameshkovo (Vladimir region), where he worked as the manager of a chemist's shop. Nekipelov has two children, born in 1967 and 1972.

Nekipelov was arrested on 11 July 1973. The investigation was conducted by a senior investigator of the Vladimir regional Procuracy, junior counsellor of justice E. N. Dmitrievsky.

Nekipelov was subjected to a psychiatric examination in the Serbsky Institute and declared accountable for his actions.

Interventions in defence of Nekipelov have been published.

In a statement to [K G B chairman] Yu.V. Andropov of 9 October 1973 S. Myuge (see *Chronicle* 30), shortly after he had left the U S S R, reminded Andropov that he, K. M. Velikanova and Nekipelov had been suspects in the same criminal case, in which the main burden of the charges had lain on Myuge. Now Myuge had been allowed to leave whilst Nekipelov had been arrested. Myuge hoped that 'the leaders of the K G B will find it possible to free Nekipelov from prison so that he can subsequently go abroad'. The text of the statement was published in *A Chronicle of Human Rights,* number 4.[8]

In January 1974 the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the U S S R published a statement signed by T. Velikanova, S. Kovalyov, A. Krasnov-Levitin, G. Podyapolsky and T. Khodorovich. It said, in particular: '. . . his own fate, his persecution, his soul, and the face of the world in which he lived was reflected by Victor Nekipelov in his verse, and his verse was found at his home when it was searched. It is hardly necessary to search long for the real reason behind Victor Nekipelov's arrest: certain worlds cannot bear their own reflections.

'But as poetry is not included in the crimes specified by our criminal code, it is natural to ask: of what is Victor Nekipelov formally guilty? And to this question there is, evidently, only one possible answer, strange though it may be: of nothing — not even of what people are normally tried for in our country.'

The authors express the fear that Nekipelov '. . . is threatened by the most terrible of the possible punishments — a psychiatric hospital'. The statement is published in *A Chronicle of Human Rights,* number 7.

The trial was held on 16, 17 and 21 May. The prosecutor was Obraztsov, and defence counsel was Nimirinskaya; the names of the judge and assessors are not known to the *Chronicle.*

Nekipelov's friends were not allowed into the courtroom, and when on 16 May they entered the room during the recess and occupied some free places, they were rudely removed by the policemen. They were not allowed in even to hear the verdict.

In the indictment Nekipelov was charged with the following: 1. he had 'circulated' the 19th issue of the *Chronicle of Current Events* by giving it to witness Dvortsin for perusal (this assertion was proved by the evidence of Dvortsin); 2. he wrote, and had the intention of circulating, a 'letter of appeal' with the title 'They want to try us — for what?' (intent was proved by the fact that the letter was typed and that the text contained an appeal to his relatives and friends); 3. he wrote and circulated eight poems (the assertion about circulation was proved first by the fact that some of the poems were type-written; secondly by the evidence of his wife that she was familiar with the poems; and thirdly by the evidence of witness Afanasev that Nekipelov had sent him three poems — with two of which Nekipelov was now charged); 4. he had made manuscript drafts on the basis of which he was intending to write a 'Book of Anger' and an article about special psychiatric hospitals 'with the aim of future *samizdat* publication and distribution'; 5. he had circulated orally 'deliberately false fabrications which defamed the Soviet political and social system' (proved by the evidence of witness Voropayev and by witnesses Serkov and Ulanov, who occupied the same cell as Nekipelov during his pre-trial detention).

Nekipelov pleaded not guilty, on the grounds that he had expressed his own thoughts and convictions, and, therefore, his works were not deliberately false. Nekipelov denied giving the *Chronicle* to Dvortsin. He stated that he had not even read the 19th issue of the *Chronicle* before his arrest. Nekipelov also denied any intention of circulating his article 'They want to try us — for what?' At the same time he expressed regret concerning the last lines of the article. Regarding his eight poems, Nekipelov stated that seven of them were not criminal; he had even sent two of the poems to a reviewer of his published book of poems, Afanasev, in order to obtain his critical comments. Only in regard to the poem 'A not quite canonical ode' did Nekipelov express regret that he had written it, but he noted that he had typed only one copy of it. Of his manuscript drafts Nekipelov stated that in the first of them there were ten lines in all, which contained various phrases, not the plan of a book, and that the indictment had conferred a title on a non-existent book; the second draft had only eight lines, written, he thought, in connection with P. G. Grigorenko's internment in a psychiatric hospital and not containing any slander. Finally, regarding the 'oral circulation' Nekipelov stated that his conversations with Voropayev, Serkov and Ulanov did not contain any slander. The statements of Ulanov to the pre-trial investigation, alleging that he had praised *GULag Archipelago* could easily be refuted since he had been in the same cell as Ulanov long before *GULag* had come out. Nekipelov protested against the use of his cell-mates as witnesses, as it was easy to exert pressure on people under investigation. Nekipelov said that investigator Dmitrievsky had exerted pressure on him by threatening to reclassify the charges under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code.

Three of the witnesses summoned to the courtroom — N. M. Komarova (wife of Nekipelov), K. M. Velikanova and M. N. Landa — refused to testify. The motives for their refusal were: for Komarova — the fact that her husband had not committed any crime; for K. Velikanova — the vagueness of the charges; and for Landa — the illegality of criminal persecution for literature. Witness Serkov stated that his interrogation at the investigation had lasted 15 minutes, yet very lengthy statements had been written into the interrogation record, and that he had signed the record without reading it, as he did not have his spectacles. The witness Monakhov, Nekipelov's deputy in the chemist's shop, described how one day he had discovered the 'Open letter to Stalin' by F. Raskolnikov in the drawer of Nekipelov's table and immediately telephoned the town soviet.

Witness Afanasev testified that Nekipelov had regularly consulted him on questions of poetry. Of those sent to him, he regarded the two poems with which

Nekipelov was subjected to a psychiatric examination in the Serbsky Institute and declared accountable for his actions.

Interventions in defence of Nekipelov have been published.

In a statement to [K G B chairman] Yu.V. Andropov of 9 October 1973 S. Myuge (see *Chronicle* 30), shortly after he had left the U S S R, reminded Andropov that he, K. M. Velikanova and Nekipelov had been suspects in the same criminal case, in which the main burden of the charges had lain on Myuge. Now Myuge had been allowed to leave whilst Nekipelov had been arrested. Myuge hoped that 'the leaders of the K G B will find it possible to free Nekipelov from prison so that he can subsequently go abroad'. The text of the statement was published in *A Chronicle of Human Rights*, number 4.[8]

In January 1974 the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the U S S R published a statement signed by T. Velikanova, S. Kovalyov, A. Krasnov-Levitin, G. Podyapolsky and T. Khodorovich. It said, in particular: '. . . his own fate, his persecution, his soul, and the face of the world in which he lived was reflected by Victor Nekipelov in his verse, and his verse was found at his home when it was searched. It is hardly necessary to search long for the real reason behind Victor Nekipelov's arrest: certain worlds cannot bear their own reflections.

'But as poetry is not included in the crimes specified by our criminal code, it is natural to ask: of what is Victor Nekipelov formally guilty? And to this question there is, evidently, only one possible answer, strange though it may be: of nothing — not even of what people are normally tried for in our country.'

The authors express the fear that Nekipelov '. . . is threatened by the most terrible of the possible punishments — a psychiatric hospital'. The statement is published in *A Chronicle of Human Rights*, number 7.

The trial was held on 16, 17 and 21 May. The prosecutor was Obraztsov, and defence counsel was Nimirinskaya; the names of the judge and assessors are not known to the *Chronicle*.

Nekipelov's friends were not allowed into the courtroom, and when on 16 May they entered the room during the recess and occupied some free places, they were rudely removed by the policemen. They were not allowed in even to hear the verdict.

In the indictment Nekipelov was charged with the following: 1. he had 'circulated' the 19th issue of the *Chronicle of Current Events* by giving it to witness Dvortsin for perusal (this assertion was proved by the evidence of Dvortsin); 2. he wrote, and had the intention of circulating, a 'letter of appeal' with the title 'They want to try us — for what?' (intent was proved by the fact that the letter was typed and that the text contained an appeal to his relatives and friends); 3. he wrote and circulated eight poems (the assertion about circulation was proved first by the fact that some of the poems were type-written; secondly by the evidence of his wife that she was familiar with the poems; and thirdly by the evidence of witness Afanasev that Nekipelov had sent him three poems — with two of which Nekipelov was now charged); 4. he had made manuscript drafts on the basis of which he was intending to write a 'Book of Anger' and an article about special psychiatric hospitals 'with the aim of future *samizdat* publication and distribution'; 5. he had circulated orally 'deliberately false fabrications which defamed the Soviet political and social system' (proved by the evidence of witness Voropayev and by witnesses Serkov and Ulanov, who occupied the same cell as Nekipelov during his pre-trial detention).

Nekipelov pleaded not guilty, on the grounds that he had expressed his own thoughts and convictions, and, therefore, his works were not deliberately false. Nekipelov denied giving the *Chronicle* to Dvortsin. He stated that he had not even read the 19th issue of the *Chronicle* before his arrest. Nekipelov also denied any intention of circulating his article 'They want to try us — for what?' At the same time he expressed regret concerning the last lines of the article. Regarding his eight poems, Nekipelov stated that seven of them were not criminal; he had even sent two of the poems to a reviewer of his published book of poems, Afanasev, in order to obtain his critical comments. Only in regard to the poem 'A not quite canonical ode' did Nekipelov express regret that he had written it, but he noted that he had typed only one copy of it. Of his manuscript drafts Nekipelov stated that in the first of them there were ten lines in all, which contained various phrases, not the plan of a book, and that the indictment had conferred a title on a non-existent book; the second draft had only eight lines, written, he thought, in connection with P. G. Grigorenko's internment in a psychiatric hospital and not containing any slander. Finally, regarding the 'oral circulation' Nekipelov stated that his conversations with Voropayev, Serkov and Ulanov did not contain any slander. The statements of Ulanov to the pre-trial investigation, alleging that he had praised *GULag Archipelago* could easily be refuted since he had been in the same cell as Ulanov long before *GULag* had come out. Nekipelov protested against the use of his cell-mates as witnesses, as it was easy to exert pressure on people under investigation. Nekipelov said that investigator Dmitrievsky had exerted pressure on him by threatening to reclassify the charges under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code.

Three of the witnesses summoned to the courtroom — N. M. Komarova (wife of Nekipelov), K. M. Velikanova and M. N. Landa — refused to testify. The motives for their refusal were: for Komarova — the fact that her husband had not committed any crime; for K. Velikanova — the vagueness of the charges; and for Landa — the illegality of criminal persecution for literature. Witness Serkov stated that his interrogation at the investigation had lasted 15 minutes, yet very lengthy statements had been written into the interrogation record, and that he had signed the record without reading it, as he did not have his spectacles. The witness Monakhov, Nekipelov's deputy in the chemist's shop, described how one day he had discovered the 'Open letter to Stalin' by F. Raskolnikov in the drawer of Nekipelov's table and immediately telephoned the town soviet.

Witness Afanasev testified that Nekipelov had regularly consulted him on questions of poetry. Of those sent to him, he regarded the two poems with which

Nekipelov was now charged as good; he could not perceive any libel in them and at one time had advised Nekipelov to publish them as part of a historical cycle, as they described the times of Ivan the Terrible.

The state prosecutor, a senior assistant of the Vladimir region procurator, senior counsellor of justice Obraztsov, declared in his speech that Nekipelov's claims to freedom of speech and freedom of the press were unsubstantiated and slanderous, as in reality article 125 of the Constitution guaranteed these freedoms only in those cases when they were used in the interests of working people. Of the charges enumerated above, the procurator withdrew the 'oral circulation' as it had not been corroborated by the evidence of witnesses in court. In conclusion the procurator said that since Nekipelov had partially repented and expressed regret that he had written some of the poems, his punishment could be limited to two years' imprisonment.

Defence counsel N.Ya. Nimirinskaya, referring to the official commentary on article 190-1 (*Commentary on the R S F S R Criminal Code,* Moscow, published by 'Juridicial Literature', 1971), to which, in her opinion, even jurists often did not attach due significance, noted that statements expressing a critical or even negative attitude to one or another aspect of our system were not a crime; only deliberately false information was a crime. Convictions, whatever they were, did not constitute a crime. Convictions, uttered aloud or set down on paper, continued to be convictions. Therefore Nimirinskaya regarded as a slip of the tongue the procurator's remark that convictions of a certain sort, when expressed orally or in writing, became slander. However, an examination of Nekipelov's case, she said, permitted the assertion that it was precisely with the utterance of his views and convictions — mistaken though they might be in a number of cases — that Nekipelov was being charged, as thereby slandering the Soviet political and social system. The defence lawyer declared that the charge had been formulated too generally and abstractly: the indictment simply enumerated the titles of 'slanderous' works; it was not known which particular information and circumstances expounded in these works the prosecution regarded as slander. Because of the abstract nature of the charge, said the lawyer, she had had to make assumptions as to which phrases might be interpreted by the charge as slanderous.

Having reviewed possible hypotheses regarding the criminality of the article 'They want to try us — for what?' and the seven poems, the lawyer came to the conclusion that the charges of slander were unfounded. As for the poem 'A not quite canonical ode', Nimirinskaya said that it should not have been written. But even in this poem there was no crime as envisaged by article 190-1. It only contained derogatory remarks about Brezhnev and Husak. But the 'fabrications' specified in article 190-1 had to concern the political and social system, not individual political leaders. The prosecution was stretching too much the interpretation of a crime under article 190-1. The lawyer cited an episode from a play by A. Zorin, *The Bolsheviks,* in which a girl is arrested for writing an insulting inscription on a portrait of Lenin; Lenin insisted that she be freed.

Besides which, Nekipelov had not acquainted anyone with his 'Ode'.

Nimirinskaya declared that it was legally inadmissible to build a case exclusively on hypotheses, ascribing to Nekipelov, on the basis of two small manuscript drafts, the intention to write a book and an article of slanderous character.

The lawyer considered unproven the episode of the giving of the *Chronicle* to Dvortsin, since it was confirmed only by the evidence of Dvortsin himself, who could easily slander Nekipelov in order, for example, to cover up for those from whom he had really received it.

Nimirinskaya came to the conclusion that Nekipelov was not guilty of the crimes with which he was charged.

As his final speech, Nekipelov read out a poem which said, among other things, that in his works he 'never called unfreedom freedom' and he hoped that he was one of the tiny guiding stars of Russia.

In the verdict the court repeated all the charges enumerated except for the oral circulation, found Nekipelov guilty, and sentenced him to two years imprisonment in ordinary-regime corrective-labour colony. In addition, the court imposed court costs on Nekipelov to the sum of 199 roubles. The verdict also mentioned procedural violations committed during the pre-trial investigation as regards the interrogation of the witnesses of 'oral circulation'.

On 10 July the R S F S R Supreme Court considered an appeal and left the sentence unchanged.

The Case of S. K. Pirogov

The case of S. K. Pirogov, whose arrest was reported in *Chronicle* No. 30, was heard in Arkhangelsk [Archangel] in May 1974.

More precise information about Pirogov and certain circumstances of the pre-trial investigation have become known.

After Lanskaya, an investigator of the Arkhangelsk Procuracy, had examined the body and personal effects of Vadim Nikolayevich Sokolov (mistakenly called Vladimir in *Chronicle* 30) who had committed suicide on 16 February 1973, certain belongings of the deceased (a jacket and a notebook) turned up on a rubbish-dump. The notebook was picked up by V. K. Kostochka, a driver from the special vehicle servicing section of the city cleansing department. In April he handed over the notebook (in which he had discovered a letter written by Sokolov just before his death to his son and a request to transmit the notebook to the boy) to Pirogov, who had undertaken to find Sokolov's son. Pirogov struck up a correspondence with the sister of the deceased; this correspondence became known to the Arkhangelsk Procuracy.

During searches conducted by Lanskaya in the course of her investigation into Sokolov's suicide, the following were confiscated from Pirogov, in addition to the effects and literature mentioned before (*Chronicle* 30): Sokolov's notebook; several issues of the *Chronicle of Current Events; Social Problems;*[9] the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights;* publications of the Committee for Human Rights; poems by Akhmatova; and songs by Galich.

Pirogov was arrested on 11 July 1973, and on 12 July criminal proceedings

were instituted against him under article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code (however, at a search on 3 July at the flat of Pirogov's mother, she was told that her son had been arrested for taking part in a murder). On 14 July it was decided that the measure of restraint to be applied would be his detention in custody. On 21 July charges were brought against him.

Sergei Kuzmich Pirogov was born in 1931 and has a higher education in economics. He has two daughters, aged five and seven. Before his arrest he worked as an engineer of a construction office. On 12 February 1958 the Arkhangelsk regional court sentenced Pirogov under articles 58-10 and 58-11 of the R S F S R Criminal Code to eight years' imprisonment. On 7 July 1965 (and not in 1964, as reported in *Chronicle* 30) he was freed after a pardon.

The investigation was conducted by local K G B investigators G. G. Romashenko, N. N. Belyayev (see *Chronicle* 30) and B. I. Korotorev. More than 120 people were interrogated in Arkhangelsk, Moscow, Leningrad, Novosibirsk, Ashkhabad, Omsk, Kiev, Vilnius, Kaunas and elsewhere. At the interrogations several witnesses were told that the case might perhaps be reclassified under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code; they were also told of the existence of some 'organization' led by Pirogov, and it was suggested to the witnesses that they should admit that they had participated in it.

From 11 November 1973 Pirogov was subjected to a forensic-psychiatric examination in the Serbsky Institute. In January 1974 a Commission composed of the director of the institute, G. V. Morozov, a Doctor of Medical Science, M. F. Taltse, and a Master of Medical Science, S. M. Gerasimova, ruled that he was accountable for his actions.

In the winter of 1974 the mother of the accused, N. G. Pirogova, twice sent statements to N. V. Podgorny which, amongst other things, complained about the methods being used during the investigation: the pressure being exerted on witnesses and the lies to which the investigators were resorting. N. G. Pirogova stated, for example, that a witness, V. Skvortsov, who had once been a guest in her son's home, had, after being summoned to the K G B, not been allowed to go on a sea voyage abroad, and had been forced to resign his job 'voluntarily'; that his wife gave birth prematurely after twice being summoned to interrogations; and that efforts were being made to force witnesses 'to admit the existence of an organization which the K G B knew did not exist', recourse being made to the demagogic formula 'an organization without an organization' . . . The Arkhangelsk regional Procuracy, to which N. G. Pirogova's statements were readdressed, notified her of the 'groundlessness' of her complaints.

On 24 March 1974 Pirogov sent a letter to N. V. Podgorny in which, in particular, he wrote: '. . . in the name of humanity towards dissent and its manifestations, save me, by granting me a pardon, from a verdict which, through the mechanical working of the machine, could find me guilty of what I cannot be guilty of because of my character and beliefs . . . If, though, my way of life and my honourable actions are ruled to be harmful to those around me, then it would be more honourable, humanitarian and just to deprive me of my citizenship and allow me quietly to leave the country . . . Any punishment involving imprisonment or exile would be a senseless repression of the natural and logical manifestations of dissent which a long time ago developed in me into honest and progressive convictions in the spirit of Yugoslavian Marxism, the official ideology of Yugoslav communists (of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia).'

On 15 April the measure of restraint was changed to a signed undertaking not to abscond (this was done because, in accordance with article 97 of the R S F S R Code of Criminal Procedure, the maximum period of custody as a measure of restraint during an investigation is nine months. However, in practice the investigatory organs always, when they want, receive permission from the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet to extend the period of custody). On 17 April Yu. Lebedev, a senior investigator of the Arkangelsk regional Procuracy and a junior counsellor of justice, signed and sent to the court the indictment in which Pirogov was charged under article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code with 'circulating' Sokolov's notebook and the *Chronicle of Current Events.*

The bill of indictment said, in particular:

'. . . Pirogov in person and through his acquaintance Gofman (who has left the U S S R) received from Telnikov (who has also left the U S S R, see *Chronicle* 22) 13 copies of various issues of the *Chronicle of Current Events* produced by Yakir and Krasin, who were convicted in September 1973 . . . By verdict of the Moscow city court which became law on 1 September 1973 the *Chronicle of Current Events* has been ruled to be literature containing deliberately false fabrications which defame the Soviet political and social system. The slanderous orientation of the *Chronicle of Current Events* is confirmed by the record of an examination of the relevant issues, dated 22 November 1973. Specifically, the issues present matters concerning the domestic policy of the Soviet state in a slanderous way, give distorted information about the arrests and criminal trials of people who have committed particularly dangerous state and other crimes, describe in a slanderous vein the conditions in which prisoners are held in places of imprisonment, and the mentally sick in psychiatric hospitals, and also propagandize anti-Soviet literature and other material of a libellous character, received from abroad and illegally produced in the U S S R. The notebook which formerly belonged to citizen Sokolov contains libellous fabrications about the absence in the U S S R of the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, the absence of a democratic electoral system, and so on . . .'

When he signed article 201 of the R S F S R Criminal Procedural Code [i.e. at the end of the investigation], Pirogov submitted a series of petitions. In particular he asked that those materials confiscated from him which were not mentioned in the charges (for example, the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*), and of which more than one copy had been confiscated, be returned. All his petitions were rejected.

On 10 May 1974 Pirogov wrote a letter to L. I. Brezhnev in which, among other things, he said: '. . . The law gives the head of state the right to amnesty

a citizen before his case has been examined in court. Such a magnanimous gesture would be an act of good will towards the natural and logical manifestations of my dissent. At least it would be better to deprive me of my citizenship than to try me for "deliberate lies", of which I cannot be found guilty by the nature of my beliefs and my character. Life in the U S S R has become impossible for me for moral and ethical reasons . . .' A reply to this letter arrived only after Pirogov's trial. In a letter dated 24 May 1974 and addressed to the head of the remand prison, the chairman of the Arkhangelsk regional court, Yashkin, wrote: 'Inform the convicted prisoner Pirogov that departure from the U S S R is devoid of any practical meaning, as he has been convicted by law to serve a sentence and must by law serve the term of imprisonment.'

From 15 to 22 May 1974 the judicial collegium of the Arkhangelsk regional court, composed of I. I. Semyonov as chairman and the people's assessors I. N. Borisov and L. F. Kuleshov, examined Pirogov's case. Procurator V. M. Bogdanov presented the prosecution's case. Barrister O. V. Lesko acted as counsel for the defence. Pirogov's petition, submitted earlier, for non-party members to be appointed as people's assessors for the hearing of his case, was granted. The trial was genuinely open.

Pirogov completely repudiated the charges brought against him as false and not proven, and pleaded not guilty. He expressed his firm belief in the accuracy of the information contained in the *Chronicle of Current Events*, and also in the value of this publication as a provider of publicity. At the same time he noted the possibility of unintentional 'factual mistakes' appearing in the *Chronicle*, as in any other publication, but pointed out that this circumstance did not provide adequate grounds for ruling that the information contained in the *Chronicle* was libellous. Pirogov expressed the hypothesis that he was being tried 'not for the literature confiscated from me, but as a recidivist: that is easier. I see this at first hand. Kostochka is not being tried for passing on the notebook. Lanskaya is not being tried . . .'

Witnesses V. P. Risling, A. A. Tsizman and L. A. Krechkova, who were called to corroborate the fact that Pirogov had 'circulated' the *Chronicle*, had never acquired a *Chronicle* from Pirogov, nor seen him hand it to other persons.

A. A. Tsizman, a sister of V. A. Gofman who had emigrated to the Federal German Republic, had heard from Gofman's wife that Gofman sometimes brought literature from Moscow at Pirogov's request; she had seen these 'papers' at Gofman's house, and thought they were 'bad' as she had been questioned about them at the investigation and now at the court.

V. P. Risling, Tsizman's husband, testified that at one time Gofman used to bring him *samizdat* materials, saying that he had acquired them from Pirogov. The same Gofman had said to him that Pirogov obtained the material from members of 'Sakharov's Committee'.

L. A. Krechkova denied that she was familiar with the *Chronicle;* as regards her fingerprints being found on the reverse side of one sheet of a copy of the *Chronicle* confiscated from Pirogov, Krechkova supposed that she might have touched this sheet by chance if the *Chronicle* was lying amongst Pirogov's

books, which she sometimes borrowed.

Of the five witnesses called to corroborate the fact that Pirogov had 'circulated' Sokolov's notebook, two (Yu.M. Kublanovsky and L. I. Myshakin) denied that Pirogov had given it to them to read. Three (V. V. Patsyukov, S. A. Furman and A. A. Bachurina) confirmed that they had read it; Patsyukov and Furman testified that they had become interested on their own initiative in the 'psychology of suicide' and had asked Pirogov if they could read it, whilst Bachurina testified that Pirogov had passed it to her through Myshakin so that she could say whether the notes in it really were made by Sokolov (Bachurina had worked with Sokolov and knew his handwriting).

At the trial, amongst other documents, a summary record of the criminal case No. 63 of Yakir and Krasin was read out. It contained, among other things, an expression of their bitter repentance, a promise to influence their accomplices and to cooperate directly with the K G B in the future. (The last assertion is not at all customary in a legal document; it is possible that it was wrongly interpreted: it could be a matter for example, of promising to assist the investigators in the future as well. — *Chronicle.*)

Before the final speeches, Pirogov, supported by his lawyer, addressed a written request to the court to return to him that part of the literature confiscated from him which was not mentioned in the indictment and of which there was more than one copy in the case materials.

'Taking into consideration the personality of the accused' and 'the social danger of the crime committed by him', the prosecutor asked for Pirogov to be given three years of imprisonment in a strict-regime camp. Worthy of note was the prosecutor's assertion that the 'subjective aspect, i.e. the aim with which Pirogov acquainted others with Sokolov's notebook, has no significance in law'.

Defence counsel stated, among other things, in his speech: '. . . Insufficient material has been assembled to charge Pirogov under article 190-1 of the Criminal Code . . . I consider that the charges have not been proven during the judicial investigation and that the accused Pirogov should be acquitted'.

During an exchange the prosecutor said: 'I object to the opinion of defence counsel that only a direct intention constitutes a crime under article 190-1. Indirect intention, such as the creation of possibilities for literature to circulate, also constitutes a crime.' In reply defence counsel referred to the official commentary to article 190-1 in the fourth volume of the text-book *Criminal Law.*

Pirogov concluded his final speech with the words: 'I ask to be acquitted of the charges in the name of justice. I am different from the majority, but I have not commited any crime.'

In the verdict the court repeated everything in the indictment. Taking into consideration, on the one hand, that 'Pirogov was convicted in the past of a particularly dangerous state crime', and, on the other, that 'Pirogov has two minors to support, has a positive reference from work and is a conscientious worker', the court sentenced Pirogov to two years' imprisonment in a strict-regime camp.

The court ordered Pirogov to pay costs to the sum of 270 roubles and 95 kopecks. In addition, the court passed a resolution on Pirogov's request that some of the literature confiscated from him be returned: '. . . the court has found no grounds to grant this request, as the documents confiscated from Pirogov are of significance to the case. Petition refused.' This decision was not announced during the trial, and a copy of it was not presented to the accused. In accordance with the verdict, after it was read out, Pirogov was taken into custody in the courtroom.

On 24 May 1974 Pirogov sent a letter to the President of the Association of Soviet Jurists, L. N. Smirnov, asking him to acquaint the Association with his case 'for the purpose of examining the sufficiency of the evidence and procedural aspects of the sentence'.

On 29 May 1974 Pirogov sent an appeal to the R S F S R Supreme Court. A supplement to this appeal ends with the words: 'If the assumption that I am innocent is not disproved by the facts (of which I am sure), then I ask you to pass a resolution revoking the verdict of guilty, on the grounds of a failure to prove a charge (as regards the *Chronicles*) and of the lack of a *corpus delicti* (as regards the notebook).'

Case No. 15 in Leningrad

On 1 April 1974 a number of searches were carried out in Leningrad in connection with case No. 15. This case was initiated by Leningrad K G B 'owing to the fact that anti-Soviet literature is circulating in Leningrad'. As an example of such literature the investigators have been naming Marchenko's *My Testimony*, Solzhenitsyn's *GULag Archipelago*, a book by Kolakowski, and the *Chronicle of Current Events*. Searches have been carried out, in particular, at the homes of the writers Mikhail Kheifets and Vladimir Maramzin, and of a doctor, Vladimir Zagreba. These people belong to the circle of acquaintances of Joseph Brodsky, who left the U S S R two years ago.

* * *

In the search of Mikhail Kheifets's flat three copies of his introductory article to a *samizdat* collection of Brodsky's verse were confiscated. Also confiscated was Kheifets's letter to the historian Yakovlev, author of an article 'The Prostitute and the Simpleton' (about Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov), published in one of the Soviet publications for foreign countries[10] (the part of this article concerning Solzhenitsyn was re-printed under the title 'The Prostitute' in the *Literary Gazette*, 20 February 1974).

On 22 April Kheifets was arrested. He was charged under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. The investigation is being conducted by two investigators, First Lieutenant V. P. Egerev and Major V. N. Ryabchuk.

Kheifets's wife, Raisa Glagoleva, Maramzin and Zagreba have been summoned to interrogations. The literary critic E. Etkind (see this issue) has also been interrogated. The investigation has been most interested in Kheifets's above-mentioned article about Brodsky. In addition to this, the K G B has been interested in some folder which was supposedly in Kheifets's flat before the search and which contained an article by Amalrik. Kheifets's wife confirmed the existence of a folder, but what it contained and where it had disappeared to she did not know. Zagreba, in particular, was shown a photograph of Amalrik's article lying on his writing desk.

In May a search was conducted under case No 15 at the home of Yakov Vinkovetsky, a Master of Geological Science.

Igor Burakhin, a graduate student of Etkind, has also been interrogated under case No. 15. *A Chronicle of Human Rights in the U S S R* (number 8) also reports searches at the flats of Burakhin (he is called Brukhin) and of his wife, Elena Vargaftik.

Valery Voskoboinikov testified at an interrogation that he had read Kheifets's introductory article to the Brodsky collection and also read Amalrik's work at Kheifets's flat. Subsequently Voskoboinikov confessed to Kheifets's wife that he had not in fact read Amalrik at Kheifets's flat. Also interrogated have been Karl Levitin from Moscow and the writers Maiya Danini and Boris Strugatsky (at an interrogation investigator Ryabchuk asked Strugatsky for his autograph on a book he had ready in advance). Levitin and Strugatsky denied they had read Kheifets's article on Brodsky. Confrontations were organized for them with Kheifets, at which the latter testified the reverse; however, Levitin and Strugatsky denied as before that they had read the article.

* * *

Two statements by Vladimir Maramzin in connection with case No. 15 have been made public.[11] In the first one, dated 3 April 1974, Maramzin reports on the search that was carried out at his home. During the search more than 10,000 sheets of his manuscripts and all Brodsky's verse were confiscated; a typewriter was also taken away. At an interrogation Ryabchuk warned Maramzin that he might be 'turned [from a witness] into an accused'.

In the second statement (dated 30 May) Maramzin writes that Kheifets was not involved in assembling Brodsky's verse and that for a period of three years he, Maramzin, had been collecting Brodsky's poetry. He states: 'It was I too who undertook another step to preserve the texts which had been collected together with such difficulty: I sent them abroad, where their author now lives . . . I was moved only by a concern for Russian culture.'

Maramzin also reports that after the search on 1 April he again collected remaining copies of his own confiscated manuscripts and sent them abroad as well. 'If any publishing-houses or journals are interested in my stories or tales, let them know this: my agreement to their publication is now completely decided . . .' — says the statement.

Maramzin calls for help to be given to Kheifets's family (for a biographical note on Kheifets and the address of his family see below).

* * *

Mikhail Ruvimovich Kheifets was born in 1934. In 1955 he graduated from the Herzen Pedagogical Institute in Leningrad with special training in 'Russian language and literature'. He worked as a school-teacher. In 1965 he received official thanks for his achievements in the teaching and educational field and for his participation in the social life of the school. Kheifets is the author of several film scenarios. In 1973 he received the prize of the Lenin Komsomol for his film on the 'People's Will' [19th century revolutionaries]. Besides this, Kheifets is the winner of a competition for educational films. In 1967 Kheifets's book *The Secretary of the Secret Police* was published by the Molodaya Gvardiya publishing-house. Subsequently this book was translated into German and Czech. Kheifets was an active contributor to the journals *Avrora, Zvezda* and *Znanie-sila.* Now Kheifets's family (his wife, Raisa Vladimirovna Glagoleva, and two daughters — Olya, who is five, and Natasha, who is seven) have been left without means of subsistence. Their address is: Leningrad, Novorossiiskaya ul., d. 22, korp. I, kv. 45.

Pentecostalists intend to leave the USSR

The sect called 'Christians of the Evangelical Faith', better known by the name 'Pentecostalists', was considered officially forbidden in the USSR until 1963. The ban on the sect's activity was lifted in that year (the Pentecostalists are formally amalgamated with the Baptists).[12] Communities of Pentecostalists are found in several towns in Siberia and the Far East (Kansk, Chernogorsk, Barnaul, Nakhodka and others), and also in the Crimea and North Caucasus. Since the spring of last year many members of the communities in the towns of Nakhodka and Chernogorsk have been trying to obtain permission to leave the USSR.

It may be presumed that their reason for wishing to leave the country is not only the constant persecution of the authorities but also their conviction that on the Day of Judgment all genuine believers should be near the Tomb of the Lord.

The authorities have refused up till now to consider the Pentecostalists' application to leave, on the grounds that they have no invitations from relatives or the governments of the countries to which they wish to go. Thus, the head of the passport office in Nakhodka, Major Morozkin, declared: 'Present us with an invitation from your relatives and then we will draw up your exit papers.' Morozkin also said that he had instructions from the authorities not to give a written answer to the visa application.

On 5 February 1974 20 members of the sect from the towns of Nakhodka and Chernogorsk appealed to the UN and the UN Committee on Human Rights to help them to leave for Israel or Australia (many members of their sect live in Australia).[13]

On 18 February a Pentecostalist, Evgeny Bresenden, was received by an official of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, Colonel Danilov, who confirmed that the visa office could not draw up exit documents for them as

they had neither official nor private invitations.

Colonel Danilov did not object to Bresenden's intention of writing a letter to the UN Committee on Human Rights, asking it to help them come to an agreement with the government of Israel or another country. Colonel Danilov assured Bresenden that such a letter would reach the addressee.

A statement dated 25 February 1974, written by Bresenden and senior presbyter Grigory Vashchenko on behalf of 80 Pentecostalists and addressed to the UN Committee on Human Rights, says, in particular: 'Our ministers have been freed from imprisonment and the official ban on the activity of our sect has been lifted, but an unofficial ban has still remained in force. We are forbidden as before to hold peaceful prayer meetings, and we are fined and threatened with imprisonment, while the representatives of the Council on Religious Affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers, comrade Shlandakov in Nakhodka, Primorsky territory, and the official representatives in Chernogorsk, Krasnoyarsk territory, know all about it.'

According to the authors of the statement, the deputy head of the Soviet executive committee in the city of Nakhodka called those who wished to leave the USSR traitors and betrayers of the Motherland, and threatened to try them and deprive them of their parental rights. 'When we started to say that . . . the Soviet government had ratified the Covenants on human rights, the Procurator of Nakhodka, Bokhan, said in this regard: "We spit at international laws . . . We have instructions from the ministry and we follow them . . ." The fact that we are unable to obtain permission to emigrate because of our religious convictions proves that the Procurator of Nakhodka, Bokhan, is right.'

On 5 May G. Vashchenko and E. Bresenden appealed to Christians throughout the world on behalf of the Pentecostalists of the USSR. The appeal calls on foreign Christians of all orientations to petition their governments to agree to admit the Pentecostalists for residence in their countries. The reason for their emigration, says the appeal, is 'religious intolerance in the USSR'. The authors believe that all Christian services were forbidden in the USSR from 1938 to 1945 and all churches closed.[14] It says of the present situation of the Christians of the Evangelical Faith: 'Ministers do not have the right to visit their flocks and to meet together to resolve religious questions. If this is done, it is done underground, at great risk, and not infrequently ends in arrest. Thus, for example, in the town of Chernogorsk alone in recent years about 30 men and women have been convicted for their religious beliefs and sentenced to various terms (from three to ten years) of imprisonment, camps and exile . . . We do not have, in our country, the rights and opportunities to be true believers, to educate our children in religious belief, and to preach the Gospel to others. We have no religious literature, as during recent years it has been confiscated from us almost everywhere: Bibles, Gospels and hymn books.'

On 7 May 188 Pentecostalists sent an open letter to the President of the USA. The letter said: 'Since 16 April 1973 right up to the present time we have been applying to emigrate without any results. Every official says in reply that he cannot give us permission to leave as we have no invitation from

relatives or from a government.

'We have no relatives abroad and so we are appealing directly to you, Mr President, to accept our families for permanent residence in your country.'

On the same day, 7 May, G. L. Vashchenko and E. A. Bresenden met foreign newspaper correspondents and answered their questions.[15] Vashchenko and Bresenden talked about the intervention of the authorities in the affairs of their community and about the threats and persecution to which believers were subjected. For example, a K G B captain in Chernogorsk, Ikonnikov, and the supervisory procurator in Krasnoyarsk had said to them: 'There will soon be none of you left; we will grind you to dust or deport you to the Far North to join the polar bears. They're building camps for you up there, and they'll test the atom bomb on you.' Fines of 30 to 50 roubles were being imposed on those who took part in the holding of services, and the leaders of the communities were often arrested.

Pentecostalist believers had practically no chance to receive higher education. The deputy chief of corrective labour colony ITK-27 in the Primorsky territory, Bogdanovich, said to Evgeny Bresenden: 'A foreman or an engineer is primarily an educator. Educators with religious convictions, educators who are Pentecostalists, are of no use to us.'

Vashchenko and Bresenden refuted the charge that the rites of their sect were harmful to health. They reported that three charges were made in accusing the Pentecostalists of fanaticism: 1. Their prayer houses were cramped, dark and stuffy. Their reply: they were not allowed to rent or build prayer houses of the appropriate size.

2. In the opinion of the accusers, the Pentecostalists' custom of kissing each other as a form of greeting was harmful to health. This notion was encountered even in court indictments.

3. According to the assertions of physicians, the rites of the sect overtaxed the human psyche, their prayers led to neuroses, and their religious experiences caused hypertension.

Regarding these points, Bresenden and Vashchenko declared: 'The physicians whose medical conclusions serve as grounds for suppressing our communities and for imprisoning us are either carrying out orders or, because of their materialism, are convinced in advance that all sincere belief in God is a psychic illness.

'Instead of physicians who are militant atheists carrying out the instructions of state organs, let them send us a commission from the International Red Cross, and then the whole world will learn what is overtaxing our health — our prayer meetings or the incessant, exhausting persecution and the years of imprisonment in camps and prisons with their cruel and inhuman regime.'

Soviet Germans want to leave for the Federal German Republic

Many Germans living in the U S S R are trying to obtain permission to leave for the Federal German Republic. It is believed that about 40,000 Soviet Germans are asking to leave. A collection entitled *Re Patria*[16] has come out and states that its goal is the elucidation of the problems of the emigration movement. An association has been formed to unite the Germans of Estonia who wish to emigrate.

On 11 February 1974 a demonstration of Germans who are trying to obtain exit visas took place in Moscow outside the building of the party's Central Committee. Lyudmila Oldenburger, with her young sons, chained herself to the traffic-lights near the Central Committee building.

On 17 February a similar demonstration took place in Tallinn.

In connection with these demonstrations criminal proceedings were instituted against the president of the Association of Estonian Germans, Pyotr Bergman, and members of the association's praesidium: Voldemar Shults, Gerhard Fast and Lyudmila Oldenburger. They were charged under the articles corresponding to articles 190-1, 190-3 and 210 ('Involving minors in criminal activity') of the R S F S R Criminal Code.

The publishers of the collection *Re Patria,* Vitautas Grigas, Lili Bauer and Friedrich Ruppel, were allowed to leave the U S S R in May and June 1974.

A court in the town of Dzhambul (Kazakhstan) has sentenced Friedrich Shnarr to two years of imprisonment under the article corresponding to article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code.

Shnarr was brought to his interrogations in handcuffs. His cellmates in the remand prison tormented and beat him mercilessly every day for three months. The investigator knew about this but instead of supressing the outrages threatened Shnarr with death.

The address of Shnarr's family is: Dzhambulskaya obl., Sverdlovskii raion, s. Mikhailovka, Dzhambulskaya ul., d. 15.

The members of the family are: his wife Amalia Shnarr and three children (born in 1962, 1964 and 1972).

The Persecution of Crimean Tatars

The Arrest and Hunger-Strike of Mustafa Dzhemilev

On 22 June Mustafa Dzhemilev was arrested in the town of Gulistan (Uzbekistan).

On 6 July the Initiative Group of the Crimean Tatar national movement in the Syrdarinskaya region of Uzbekistan sent a statement to N. V. Podgorny, K. Waldheim, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, and world public opinion, entitled 'The Life of Mustafa Dzhemilev is in Danger'.

As is evident from this statement, on 13 May, a few days before the 30th anniversary of the deportation of the Crimean Tatars, an attempt was made to

provoke M. Dzhemilev into a fight. Despite his self-restraint, confirmed by four written testimonies, he was sentenced to 15 days 'for hooliganism'. Dzhemilev declared a hunger strike and was released on the ninth day, in a serious condition.

A month later, when Dzhemilev had not yet fully recovered, he was summoned for military service; a medical commission ruled him fit, although, according to the information of the Initiative Group, pressure had to be put on one of the doctors — a therapeutist — to obtain this. Dzhemilev was not allowed to undergo a second examination in Tashkent or to present certificates from the Tashkent polyclinic where he was receiving treatment. He was ordered to appear with his things in two hours. He did not comply with this order and was arrested the following day for evading military service.

On the same day Dzhemilev started another hunger strike.

The statement says:

'The life of Mustafa is in danger! It has become known to us that on 27 June the prison in Khavasta refused to admit M. Dzhemilev, who had been taken there, because of the serious condition of his health, and that he has again been put in a preliminary detention cell in Gulistan. Evidently fearing the consequences in the event of his death, the K G B has attempted to influence him through his parents, trying to persuade him to end his hunger strike. But Mustafa has categorically refused to do this, stating that he would rather accept death than suffer daily humiliation . . . On 30 June, he was transported to the remand prison in Tashkent, where he is being subjected to force-feeding.'

The Initiative Group calls for the immediate intervention of N. V. Podgorny in order that M. Dzhemilev's life may be saved, and supports the request of his parents to let him leave the U S S R.

On 3 July M. Dzhemilev's mother sent a letter to N. V. Podgorny, also addressed 'to mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, governments and parliaments throughout the world'.

When her family was deported from the Crimea in inhuman conditions in 1944, Mustafa was not even a year old, she writes. Yet in his early youth he said he would not reconcile himself to the persecuted condition of his people. Mustafa had twice expressed a desire to leave for another country. She had opposed this, but now, especially after his unjustified arrests in May and June and the hunger strike that was endangering his life, she and her husband had decided to give their blessing to his departure. 'We beg you to let our son go abroad and to let us die in peace. We do not have the strength to bear our son's torments.' Addressing the governments of other countries, M. Dzhemilev's mother asks them to send an invitation to her son and give him refuge.

The address of M. Dzhemilev's parents is: Abdudzhemil and Makhfire Mustafayev, g. Gulistan, Oktyabrskaya ul., 16. His father is 77 and his mother 64.

Mustafa Dzhemilev has actively participated in the national movement since 1966. That year he was convicted and sentenced to 1½ years. In May 1969 he joined the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the U S S R.

1

2

3

1 Tatyana Zhitnikova, wife of Leonid Plyushch, with the writer Victor Nekrasov, Kiev 1974
2 Pyotr Grigorenko with his wife Zinaida, after his release from a mental hospital in 1974
3 Vladimir Bukovsky, Moscow activist, 1970
4 The prison mental hospital in Oryol



4

5

6

5 Solzhenitsyn at the funeral of Alexander Tvardovsky with his widow, Moscow December 1971
6 Sakharov with his wife, Elena Bonner, Moscow 1974

7

8

7 Irina Zholkovskaya, wife of Alexander Ginzburg
8 Alexander Ginzburg with his children, living under administrative surveillance in Tarusa, 1975

9

10

9 Arie-Lieb Khnokh (on right)
10 Alexander Galich, Moscow bard
11 Tatyana Bayeva (right) with her child, Moscow 1973
12 Vitaly and Inessa Rubin (back) with Nadezhda Ulanovskaya (front) and other friends, Moscow 1974
13 Petras Paulaitis, Lithuanian teacher, drawn by a fellow inmate in Mordovia, early 1970s

11



13

12

14

15

16

14 Father Dudko, Moscow Orthodox priest
15 Valentin Turchin (left) and Yury Orlov, physicists and members of the Soviet group of Amnesty International, Moscow 1975
16 A group of Volga Germans who came to Moscow in 1965 to lobby for an end to their people's exile
17 Anatoly Marchenko and son Pavel, Tarusa 1974

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

18 Lydia Chukovskaya, Moscow writer
19 Vladimir Dremlyuga, prior to arrest in 1968 for demonstrating in Red Square
20 Ivan Gel, Ukrainian locksmith
21 Vladimir Voinovich, Moscow writer
22 Andrei Tverdokhlebov, member of Soviet group of Amnesty International
23 Alexander Feldman, a Kiev Jew and activist
24 Mustafa Dzhemilev, a leader of the Crimean Tatars
25 Simas Kudirka, Lithuanian sailor, before trying to defect to the USA in 1970

26

27

28

29

26 Yakov Suslensky, teacher from Bendery in Moldavia
27 Iosif Meshener, fellow teacher of Suslensky's from Bendery
28 Vladimir Osipov, editor of *samizdat* journal *Veche*
29 Isaak Shkolnik, Jew from Vinnitsa in the Ukraine
30 Valentin Moroz, Ukrainian historian
31 Igor Ogurtsov, Leningrad orientalist and leader of underground group
32 Gabriel Superfin, Moscow literary scholar

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

39

37

38

41

40

33 Efim Etkind
34 Edward Kuznetsov†
35 Silva Zalmanson†
36 Boris Penson†
37 Mikhail Kheifets*
38 Anatoly Goldfeld*
39 Izrail Zalmanson†
40 Lev Yagman*
41 Boris Azernikov*
†sentenced in the Leningrad 'aeroplane case'
*sentenced for activities related to the 'aeroplane case'

42

43

42 Evgeny Bresenden, Pentecostal leader

43 Grigory Vashchenko, Pentecostal leader

44 (below) A double wedding in the Pentecostal community of Chernogorsk in East Siberia

44

In the summer he was arrested. In January 1970 he was sentenced in Tashkent to three years, together with the Moscow poet and teacher Ilya Gabai (see *Chronicle* 12).

A. D. Sakharov and the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights (T. Velikanova, S. Kovalyov, A. Krasnov-Levitin, G. Podyapolsky and T. Khodorovich) have sent the two above-mentioned documents about M. Dzhemilev to the International League for the Rights of Man, the International Red Cross, and K. Waldheim, and also called on them to intervene on his behalf as quickly as possible.

In the middle of July M. Dzhemilev's trial took place, and he was sentenced to one year's imprisonment.

More about the trial of Kurtumerov, Khalikov* and Ramazanov

It has already been reported in *Chronicle* 31 that on 28 November 1973 the Zaporozhe regional court (chairman — N. P. Selivanov, people's assessors — V. A. Yarun and I. I. Kapustina, prosecutor — V. S. Demyanenko, defence lawyers — N. A. Dolzhenko, N. L. Kravtsova and V. D. Koshelnaya) sentenced E. Kurtumerov to two years, and E. Khalikov* and R. Ramazanov to 2½ years of ordinary-regime camps (as well as exacting 35 roubles from each of them for legal advice). The verdict (with the exception of the episode concerning Khalikov's speech on 18 March 1973, for which there was deemed to be insufficient evidence) repeats the wording of the indictment, and its text is quoted here almost in full:

APPROVED

Procurator of Zaporozhe region, senior counsellor of justice
p.p. V. SVETLICHNY

19 October 1973

Bill of Indictment
in the criminal case brought against:
Eskender Kurtumerov, Ebazer Khalikov and Regat[17] Ramazanov under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code.

The investigation has established that:

The accused, E. Kurtumerov, E. Khalikov and R. Ramazanov, after warnings from organs of state authority about circulating deliberately false fabrications which defame the Soviet political and social system, failed to draw the proper conclusions and systematically continued their criminal actions.**

Thus on 4 March 1973 in house No. 29 on Tsiolkovsky street in the town of Melitopol they took an active part in a meeting of young people, and in the

*In other documents this man is called Khalilov (see *Chronicle* 31). The correct spelling on his surname is not known to the *Chronicle*. [*Chronicle's* note.]

**It is clear from the text of the verdict in this criminal case that the defendants were cautioned by unnamed organs of authority in 1968 and 1971, i.e. before the unpublished Decree of the Praesidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet came into force on 25 December 1972 (see this issue). [*Chronicle*'s note.]

presence of 25 people distorted the national policy of the U S S R and circulated deliberately false fabrications which defamed the Soviet political and social system.

On 18 March 1973 at a second meeting of young people in house No. 36 on Tsyurupa street in the town of Melitopol, at which 20 people were present, E. Kurtumerov, Khalikov and Ramazanov made speeches which also slandered Soviet reality.

In addition to this, the accused Kurtumerov produced written works, 'History', 'The Crimea' and others, which contain false fabrications defaming the Soviet political and social system, and also made patently libellous inscriptions on the pamphlets *The Marxist-Leninist Concept of Freedom* by T. I. Oizerman and *Generations of Optimists* by A. Kulagin, and on the journal *Problems of History*.

The accused Khalikov prepared the manuscripts 'A Note to the Chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the U S S R Supreme Soviet', 'A Protest', 'The Criminals are Triumphing', and others, which libel the Soviet political and social system.

The accused Ramazanov also prepared a number of manuscripts: 'To People of Goodwill' and others, addressed to various party and Soviet organs, which libel the policies of the Communist Party and the political and social system.

Charged and interrogated as accused persons, Kurtumerov and Khalikov flatly refused to plead guilty; they explained that they had indeed taken part in meetings of young people but had not slandered Soviet reality.

These assertions of Kurtumerov and Khalikov are refuted and their guilt fully confirmed by the testimonies of witnesses G. R. Mustafayeva*, A. A. Eminova, Sh.A. Katayev, Z. E. Ablyazov, E. Shukurov, V. A. Seitumerov, R. Dzhelyalov and S. D. Khatunsky; by texts confiscated during searches: the poems 'History' and 'The Crimea', the manuscripts'A Protest' and 'The Criminals are Triumphing', and the note addressed to the Chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the U S S R Supreme Soviet; by the notes in the margins of the pamphlet *The Marxist-Leninist Concept of Freedom* by T. I. Oizerman, and on the covers of Kulagin's pamphlet *Generations of Optimists* and the journal *Problems of History*; by other manuscript works in confiscated exercise books; and also by the conclusions of handwriting examinations by experts (vol. I, case sheets 169-173, 223-229).

Charged and interrogated as an accused person, Ramazanov pleaded not guilty and explained that he did not remember being present at the meetings of young people as he often visited Tatar families and held conversations with them on the Tatar question.

Ramazanov's guilt is proved by the statements of witnesses who were present at the meetings on 4 and 18 March 1973 and, in particular, by the evidence of E. Shukurov, Sh.A. Katayev, Z. E. Ablyazov and others, by the manuscript texts of letters to various party and soviet organs ('To People of Goodwill'),

*The numbers of the volumes and the case sheets [of the 'case materials'] are omitted here and subsequently. [*Chronicle*'s note.]

and also by the conclusions of an examination by writing experts.

Thus the culpability of E. Kurtumerov, E. Khalikov and R. Ramazanov in systematically spreading by word of mouth deliberately false fabrications defaming the Soviet political and social system, and also in preparing and circulating in handwritten and typewritten form works of similar content is fully proven by the evidence assembled in the case.

On the basis of these facts

THEY ARE ACCUSED:

Eskender Kurtumerov, born 8 August 1938, native of the hamlet of Koz, Sudaksky district, Crimean region, citizen of the U S S R, a Tatar, non-Party, 11 years of education, married, temporarily employed on various jobs in the 'Ukraina' collective-farm of Melitopol district in the Zaporozhe region, resident in Melitopol on Kotovsky boulevard, house No. 18, flat 35, no previous convictions, is charged with the fact that, having previously been cautioned by organs of state authority to cease the circulation of deliberately false fabrications which defame the Soviet political and social system, he failed to draw the proper conclusions and continued his criminal activity.

Thus, on 4 March 1973 in house No. 29 on Tsiolkovsky street in the town of Melitopol he took an active part in an assembly of youth, where in the presence of 25 people he spread deliberately false fabrications defaming the Soviet political and social system, and organized the taking of a register amongst young people of 15 to 25 years of age.

On 18 March 1973 he spoke at a second meeting in house No. 36 on Tsyurupa street in the town of Melitopol at which 20 people were present. As at the previous assembly, he slandered Soviet reality.

At a search in E. Kurtumerov's flat literature containing libellous notes was confiscated, as well as manuscripts defaming the Soviet political and social system.

In addition, in the town of Nezhin, Chernigov region, at the home of citizen Ibragimov, there were two typed texts containing libellous fabrications regarding Soviet, party and state officials, which had been sent to him by E. Kurtumerov, i.e. the latter had committed a crime envisaged by article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code.

Ebazer Khalikov, born 27 December 1932, native of the hamlet of Otarka, Kuibyshev district, Crimean region, citizen of the U S S R, non-Party, a Tatar, higher education: graduate of Tashkent polytechnic institute, married, employed as a foreman in special mechanized unit No. 557 of 'Melitopol Rural Construction', resident in the town of Melitopol, Grizodubova street, house No. 64, flat 9, no previous convictions, is charged with the fact that he . . . (four paragraphs follow which repeat the text of the charge against Kurtumerov word for word — *Chronicle*) committed a crime envisaged by article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code.

Regat Ramazanov, born 15 March 1936, native of the hamlet of Demerdzhi, Alushta district, Crimean region, citizen of the U S S R, a Tatar, non-Party, 10 years of education, married, employed in No. 9 workshop of the Melitopol

factory of industrial sewing and clothing repair as a cutter, resident in the town of Melitopol, Grizodubova street, No. 55, flat 78, no previous convictions, is charged with the fact that manuscripts confiscated during a search at his flat on 13 September 1968 contained deliberately false fabrications defaming the Soviet political and social system. However, R. Ramazanov, after being cautioned by organs of state authority about the circulation of deliberately false fabrications defaming Soviet reality, did not draw the proper conclusions and continued his criminal activity . . . (two paragraphs follow, the text of which repeats the wordings of the charges against Kurtumerov — *Chronicle*).

On 8 July 1973 R. Ramazanov prepared a manuscript of libellous content which defamed the Soviet political and social system and was typed in several copies and sent to Soviet and party organs.

By his actions he has committed a crime envisaged by article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code.

This indictment was drawn up on 17-19 October 1973 in the city of Zaporozhe.

Senior investigator V. Lomeiko

Statement by Roza Dzhemileva

On 23 April this year, the wife of Reshat Dzhemilev (for his trial see *Chronicle* 31) Roza (Zera) Dzhemileva (address: Tashkent, ul. Besh-Agach, tupik Shark, 15) sent the following statement to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs:

'My husband Reshat Dzhemilev was sentenced on 21 April 1973 by the Tashkent city court to three years of imprisonment in strict-regime camps on charges of violating article 191-4 of the Uzbek Criminal Code and articles 190-1 and 190-3 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. He has been sent to camp p/ya UYa 288/7 in Krasnoyarsk territory to serve his sentence. This creates great difficulties for his family.

'We cannot make use of the right guaranteed by law of three meetings a year with our convicted relative. One visit alone to this distant camp costs two months' salary. I have three children and my monthly wage of 100 roubles is not enough even to feed my family. His 72-year-old mother cannot travel to Krasnoyarsk territory to see him not only for economic reasons, but also because of the condition of her health.

'This is not the first time that citizens convicted for taking part in the national movement of the Crimean Tatar people for return to their Homeland in the Crimea have deliberately been sent to distant camps, as a result of which the right to three meetings with the convicted prisoner turns into a hollow mockery.

'I ask you to transfer my husband for the remainder of his sentence to one of the camps situated within the Uzbek Republic, i.e. the republic on the territory of which he was convicted.

'I ask you to reply to me within the period prescribed by law.'

Statement to K. Waldheim

(*April 1974, 10 pages*)

Recapitulating the continuing repression to which the Crimean Tatar people have been subjected for the past 30 years, the authors of the statement report the existence of more than 200 volumes of 'letters, appeals, statements and petitions addressed to all the authorities of the Soviet state'. Since all these appeals have provoked only more repression, 'our only path of salvation is to appeal to world public opinion and to the United Nations Organization'. The statement describes the mass return of Crimean Tatars to the Crimea after the Decree of 1967 and also (apparently for the first time) the two stages in the official attitude to this on the part of the Soviet authorities: initially instructions were sent out to assist the return in every way, but literally a few days later these were followed by circulars and directives explaining a 'change in the situation' and laying down the guide lines for a struggle against those who wanted to return to the Crimea and those who had already succeeded in doing so.

Then specific examples of persecution and victimization are enumerated.

The statement reports that 150 of the families who [successfully] returned have still not been granted residence permits (a list of 37 families is attached).

In September 1973 a teacher, Shevket Gafarov, received a Simferopol district directive to work in the villaye school in Skvortsovo; when he handed over his documents to receive a residence permit, it was seen that he was a Crimean Tatar; by means of threats, insults and blackmail he was forced to write a statement giving in his notice.

On 4 April 1974 the Zainetdinov couple (from the hamlet of Zavetnoye, Sovetsky district) were summoned to the police, and Elmira Zainetdinova was forcibly deported to Kherson region, whilst her husband and five children were left in the Crimea; Kasym Seidalliyev, the father of two children, was deported in the same vehicle.

Sulbie Muzinova, the mother of four children and a sick woman (from the town of Chernopol, Belogorsk district), was banished from the Crimea for two years, with threats that if she delayed her departure she would be exiled to the Irkutsk region.

The Kadyrov couple (from Belogorsk), whose two children are serving in the army, have been sentenced to banishment.

Mambet Din-Ogly (from the hamlet of Novopavlovka, Krasnoperekopsky district) was twice sentenced to 1½ years of imprisonment: in 1969 and 1971.

The head of the personnel section in Donuzlavsky state poultry farm (Chernomorsky district) declared to Rakhim Ishmatov, an Uzbek, in the autumn of 1973: 'I will not give you a residence permit or a job as you have a Tatar wife.'

The children of Tatars without residence permits are not admitted to schools. Many of them — though by no means all — go to lessons but are not entered in the register.

'The two children of Seit-Ibragim Seit-Osmanov (from the hamlet of Chernopole, Belogorsk district) have not been to school for over six months

now. The headmaster of the Chernopole eight-year school, Lishak, twice dragged Seit-Osman Seit-Osmanov, who is in the sixth year, out of the classroom, kicking him in the process, and then for a week patrolled the sports ground to stop the foot of a single Crimean Tatar child from stepping on this forbidden plot, yelling at them each time: 'Heh, clear off, you Tatars!'

The text of a document is then reproduced:

No. 232

7 October 1973

To the Headmaster of Chernopole Secondary School

It is clear from the report of First Lieutenant Yasko, an inspector of the Belogorsk District Department of Internal Affairs, that you have admitted to your school Dilyara Ibragimova, born 1963, who has no residence permit in the hamlet of Kurskoye. I request you to give a written explanation about this, so that a report may be prepared for the chairman of the district Soviet executive committee, comrade N. L. Krovets.

Inspector of the Belogorsk District Department of Education

(signature)

The statement reports on cases of 'confiscation' (evidently, compulsory purchase — *Chronicle*) by the state of houses which their owners were intending to sell to Crimean Tatars.

Registry offices are refusing to register marriages of Crimean Tatars without police permission, e.g. those of: Mura Eredzhepov and Zeinep Dzhemaletdinova (hamlet of Donskoye, Simferopol district, 1972); Umer Chobanov and Emersaliyeva (Belogorsk town); Niyazi Dagdzhi and Elmira Seferova (village Senokosnoye, Razdolnensky district, 1974).

A detailed description is given of the trial of Dzhemil Kurtseitov, Eivaz Mustafayev and Reitvan Charukhov, who were provoked into a fight with Boldin and Mudry, after the latter had stolen two rams from Kurtseitov during the night (see *Chronicle* 31):

'The judge Shmelev and the state prosecutor Ionova brazenly shielded the provocateurs Boldin and Mudry and dealt with Kurtseitov and his comrades with tyrannical cruelty in order to frighten other Crimean Tatars who want to live in their native land. Shmelev and Ionova disregarded a witness from the same hamlet and did not even summon him to the court, as all his evidence was in favour of Kurtseitov and his comrades. Mustafayev asked for the chairman of the village soviet, Morozenko, who had earlier warned Kurtseitov that a provocation was being prepared, to be summoned to the court. The court refused his request. The judge and the prosecutor completely ignored the fact that the record drawn up at the scene of the incident had disappeared from the court materials. Even the knife of the bandit Boldin had disappeared. Moreover, the provocation was turned into a political trial in which the defendants were also accused, without any grounds whatsoever, of anti-Soviet propaganda and an anti-social way of life.

'Before the trial a search was carried out at the homes of Kurtseitov and Charukhov. Their notebooks and papers were ransacked but nothing was found against the defendants . . .'

Kurtseitov was sentenced to seven years of camps, Mustafayev and Charukhov to five years.

The statement describes the trial of E. Kurtumerov, E. Khalikov and R. Ramazanov (see *Chronicle* 31), and the texts of the indictment and verdict are reproduced (see this issue, above).

The statement concludes with the words:

'We request the U N and the Commission on Human Rights to take our people — who have no rights — under their protection. We realize that the U N is not a world government that dictates its will to states, but the U N can demand that all the states that have ratified its conventions observe them. In relation to the Crimean Tatars, articles 2, 7 and 11 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights have been violated, and continue to be violated, and also article 123 of the U S S R Constitution. We declare with full responsibility that a most terrible form of national discrimination against the Crimean Tatars is rampant in the U S S R; the results of this are no less monstrous than genocide.'

Various Brief Reports

18 Crimean Tatar families were transported [into the Crimea] to the Dzhankoi district on 18 May under the official labour recruitment scheme.

* * *

Chronicle 31 reported that many Crimean Tatars were unable to obtain residence permits not only in the Crimea but also in neighbouring districts of the Ukraine. At the present time all Crimean Tatars residing in Kherson region have obtained residence permits. About 400 families (approximately 2,000 people) are now living in Novo-Alekseyevka, Genichesk district [Kherson region].

* * *

A few days before 18 May (the anniversary of the deportation of the Crimean Tatars from the Crimea) Seidamet Memetov was arrested in Margelan and held for ten days.

* * *

In Novo-Alekseyevka the military registration and enlistment office ordered Enver Ametov (see *Chronicle* 31) to appear before a medical board on 18 May, allegedly in connection with a forthcoming call-up for short-term service.

On the appointed day it turned out that neither the doctors nor the officials at the enlistment office knew anything about a 'board'.

On 25 May the office demanded that Ametov change the place and nature of his work, promising to release him from call-up in exchange. Ametov expressed his indignation at the deceit and the interference in his personal

affairs, and declared that he would refuse to do military service (he was on active service in 1959-62). He repeated this in a conversation with an official of the K G B Directorate for Kherson region, P. P. Popov, who did not conceal that the actions of the authorities had been engendered by Ametov's participation in the national movement. Popov promised to 'intercede' for Ametov at the enlistment office if he ceased his participation.

* * *

On 18 May a flag of mourning was hoisted on a high-voltage line in Bekabad (Uzbek Republic).

Events in Lithuania

In 1974 the ninth and tenth issue of the *Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church* [*Chronicle LCC*] came out. The material in this section is mainly based on the information contained in these issues. For brief summaries of the ninth and tenth issues of the *Chronicle LCC* see the section *Samizdat News*.[18]

The Trial of the Five

As reported by *Chronicle LCC* number 10, from 18 February to 5 March 1974 the Lithuanian Supreme Court tried the case of Š. Žukauskas, A. Sakalauskas, I. Rudaitis, V. Povilonis (all arrested at the end of March 1973 — see *Chronicle* 29) and A. Mackevičius (arrested, it seems, on 23 October 1973). They were charged with anti-Soviet activity, in particular with agitation (article 68 of the Lithuanian Criminal Code); with misappropriation; and with foreign currency transactions. The indictment also mentions the collection of funds to help the family of S. Kudirka (see *Chronicle* 20).

The chairman of the court was Ignatas; the people's assessors were Kavaliauskaite and Tamulionis. The prosecution's case was presented by deputy chief procurator of the republic, Bakučionis. The defence lawyers were Kudaba (for Žukauskas), Barvainis (for Sakalauskas), Gavronskis (Rudaitis), Mrs Matiošaitiene (Povilonis) and Vaicekauskas (Mackevičius).

Besides a specially assembled public, only the closest relatives of the defendants were allowed into the courtroom.

Šarunas Žukauskas, born in 1950, a sixth-year student at the Kaunas Medical Institute, was charged with forming an anti-Soviet underground organization, the members of which took an oath and paid dues, and of leading the organization; with being the author of a proclamation dedicated to Lithuanian independence day (16 February); with duplicating (in two copies) the 15th volume of the *Lithuanian Encyclopedia* (evidently published before 1940); with circulating anti-Soviet literature; with the acquisition of parts for an 'Era' duplicating machine; with trying to enlist Mackevičius in an underground organization; with helping Sakalauskas to steal four typewriters; with complicity (which, seemingly, expressed itself in incitement) in the misappropriation of wooden folk sculpture and church plate undertaken by Mackevičius. It is believed that

the last charges were based entirely on the contradictory evidence of Mackevičius.

During the judicial investigation Š. Žukauskas did not deny that he had been the leader of an organization, the aim of which was the collection of literature and self-education. Acting within a legal framework, he aimed to promote the correction of errors committed by the authorities. He admitted that he had circulated works that had not been officially published, for example *The Trial of S. Kudirka*, but said they did not contain fabrications and were not anti-Soviet. He was convinced that the misappropriation of typewriters with which he was charged had not caused anyone material loss, as they had been written off. Žukauskas categorically denied that he had participated in the theft of church property and folk art works. He did not intend to take responsibility for the crimes of Mackevičius.

Anastas Sakalauskas, born in 1938, a teacher of German at the Kaunas polytechnic institute, sentenced in 1957 to two years of imprisonment for trying to escape abroad in a canoe, was charged with belonging to an underground organization; with possessing anti-Soviet literature (including two numbers of the *Chronicle LCC*, *A Question of Madness* by Zh. and R. Medvedev, Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and other items); with the intention of transmitting a collection of his verse to the West; and with organizing the misappropriation of typewriters.

At the trial Sakalauskas confirmed that he belonged to an organization and paid membership dues. He stressed that the aim of the organization was self-education.

Izidorius Rudaitis, born in 1912, a doctor, was charged with supporting, in particular financially, an underground organization; with facilitating the duplication and circulation of anti-Soviet literature and the proclamation concerning 16 February; with preparing to publish an underground journal (or collection?), *New Bell* [*Naujasis Varpas*], of which he was to become the editor; and with foreign currency speculation.

In the course of the judicial investigation he stated that he knew nothing about any underground organization or alleged underground publication. As for the material which was confiscated from him during a search and which had not been published in the official press, an educated man should be acquainted with different viewpoints, including critical ones. Rudaitis testified that he had acquired the foreign currency by chance.

Vidmantas Povilonis, born in 1947, a technological engineer, was charged with belonging to an underground organization; with possessing and circulating anti-Soviet literature, in particular the proclamation about 16 February; and with participating in the preparation of a publication called *New Bell*.

Povilonis denied that he had been involved in the circulation of any works whatever, and stated that he knew nothing about the plan for the *New Bell* or about an organization. His only connection with Žukauskas was their common interest in local history and folklore.

Aloiz Mackevičius, born in 1949, a former candidate member of the Com-

munist Party, a skilled worker of the Highways Department, was charged with stealing folk art works at the instigation of Žukauskas; with robbing a church in Tirkšliai and taking the stolen goods to Žukauskas; and with joining an underground organization.

Mackevičius pleaded guilty to the thefts and the robbery of the church; his motive was that he liked to dress well. He testified that Žukauskas was his accomplice. However, in the course of the judicial investigation Mackevičius partially changed his evidence and said that he had robbed the church on his own, wanting to prove to Žukauskas that he was capable of independent action.

About 90 witnesses were cross-examined at the trial. However, the court did not examine the substance of the texts with which the defendants were charged in order to check thoroughly whether they contained libellous fabrications.

In his speech, prosecutor Bakučionis singled out Mackevičius, expressing regret that he had found himself the victim of a deception.

In a lengthy final speech Š. Žukauskas said that he was not an enemy of socialism but did not regard Soviet authority in Lithuania as democratic, as it had been forcibly imposed from without, both in 1918 and in 1940. He spoke about the terror, the expropriation of the kulaks, the arrests, the mass banishments and the partisan battles, all of which had cost Lithuania about 300,000 human lives, and about the Russification of Lithuania. Žukauskas stated that he did not consider his actions to be criminal in the eyes of his people, and that he was not asking for a mild sentence, but was demanding acquittal.

The court sentenced Š. Žukauskas to six years of strict-regime camps and confiscation of property; A. Sakulauskas to five years of strict-regime; V. Povilonis to two years of strict-regime; I. Rudaitis to three years of strict-regime and confiscation of property; and A. Mackevičius to two years of ordinary-regime.

Mackevičius is serving his sentence in Praveniškiai (in Lithuania); the rest are in the Perm region (except for Žukauskas, who is being kept in a K G B prison until, it is rumoured, the autumn).

On 17 March 1974 a report about the trial was published in the newspaper *Tiesa* (*Truth*) in an article headed 'In whose name?' The newspaper reports that the defendants published and circulated 'leaflets of an anti-Soviet character'. It also reports that Rudaitis circulated recordings of foreign radio programmes. The article did not specify the sentences.

* * *

On 20 November 1973 [A.] Patrubavičius, a resident of Ežerelis, was arrested after a search. An 'Era' electric photo-copying machine and a typewriter were confiscated from him. At the same time his neighbour Žareckas was subjected to a search.

* * *

At the end of 1973 a Ukrainian Catholic priest, Father Vladimir Prokopiv, born in 1914, a resident of Vilnius, was arrested in Lvov. Prokopiv received his higher theological education in Rome, served as a priest in the Ukraine, and was banished to Kazakhstan. When he returned from exile he settled in Lithuania and worked as a manual labourer. As *Chronicle LCC* No. 9 reports, Father Prokopiv secretly engaged in pastoral activities amongst believers in Lithuania and the Ukraine.

Not long before his arrest Father Prokopiv travelled to Moscow with representatives of the Ukrainian Catholics of Lvov region who have been petitioning for the opening of a Catholic church. A request to open a church was signed by about 1,200 people. When he returned to Vilnius Father Prokopiv discovered traces of a search in his flat. Apparently the flats of the Ukrainians who took the statement to Moscow had also been searched.

* * *

It is reported that at approximately the same time a Ukrainian priest, Mitskevich, who worked in the town of Stryi, was arrested.[10]

* * *

On 9 April 1974 Virgilijus Jaugelis was arrested in Kaunas (see *Chronicle* 30). He was interrogated on 18 January by investigator Lazarevičius. The investigators wanted to learn from whom Jaugelis had obtained the materials for a rotary press. Jaugelis refused to answer, as the Constitution guaranteed freedom of the press and the confiscation of matrices was illegal. During the interrogation the following day samples of his handwriting and his fingerprints were taken.

On the day of his arrest a search was carried out at Jaugelis's flat, led by Captain Pilelis. Jaugelis was charged under article 68 of the Lithuanian Criminal Code (corresponding to article 70 of the R S F S R Code). He is at present being held in the Vilnius K G B prison.

* * *

On 24 April 1974 Juozas Gražys was arrested in Kaunas after a search, in the course of which parts of an 'Era' duplicating machine, paper and several copies of the book *Yet the Holy Scriptures are Right* were found.

* * *

Additional information about the searches at the end of November 1973 (see *Chronicle* 30) is given below. The following were subjected to searches:

On 19 November — Vytautas Vaičiunas (Kaunas), an official of the Kaunas Soviet executive committee. Books and articles of a religious nature and on moral philosophy, prayer books, the *New Testament*, journals, newspaper cuttings, notebooks, plans and technical descriptions of 'Era' printing blocks and other items were confiscated. The search, led by Major Limauskas, lasted two

days. At the beginning of the search Povilas Petronis (see *Chronicle* 30), who was in Vaičiunas's flat at the time, was arrested. Vaičiunas declared that the articles confiscated from him belonged to Petronis. After the search Vaičiunas was interrogated for four days.

On 19 November — Kazimieras Gudas (village of Šlenava, Kaunas district). 2,500 unbound prayer books, an uncompleted home-made 'Era' machine and other items were confiscated. During the search Gudas was beaten up.

On 19 November — Janina Lumbiene (Kaunas). A typewriter, a poem about R. Kalanta and a copy of the memorandum to the U N Secretary-General with 17,000 signatures (see *Chronicle* 25) were confiscated. After the search she was summoned to an interrogation.

On 20 November — Jonas Gudelis (Kaunas). Religious literature, notes and copies of the *Chronicle LCC* were confiscated. After the search he was interrogated in Vilnius and Kaunas.

On 21 November — Marija Vilkute (Kaunas). Books were confiscated.

On 19 and 20 November searches were carried out at two more flats in Kaunas, in the course of which 280 kilograms of print, a home-made printing machine, 1,000 unbound prayer books, a guillotine cutting device and other items were confiscated.

* * *

Information is available on several searches carried out in March and April 1974 in connection with case No. 345 (the case on the publication of the *Chronicle LCC* and religious literature). The following were subjected to searches:

On 20 March — a Ukrainian priest, Father Vladislav Figolis.

On 20 March — Miss Bronja Kazelaite (Kaunas). About 400 copies of a prayer book were confiscated.

On 20 March — a priest, S. Tamkevičius (Simnas). Two issues of the *Chronicle LCC*, religious works and recording tapes were confiscated.

On 4 April — Matulionis (Vilnius). Searches were carried out in Druskininkai, where he was receiving treatment, and in his flat in Vilnius. Religious literature was confiscated. At an interrogation Matulionis confirmed the evidence of employees at the reproduction section of the republican library, Obulskis, Chudakovas and Čiplis, that he had commissioned them to prepare 2,000 catechisms in the Russian language. (The K G B found these books in the library.) Matulionis explained that he had ordered them to use as presents.

On 8 April — Mrs Ona Volskiene (Kaunas). A typewriter was confiscated.

On 9 April and then on 10-11 April — Miss Salomea Mikšyte (Kaunas). A room rented by Miss Mikšyte in Kulautuva was searched and typewriter and religious books were confiscated.

On 24 April — Vilius Semashka (Kaunas). Religious and other valuable pre-war books were confiscated. The people conducting the search contended that someone had formerly been working on an 'Era' in one room of the house. Semashka and the owners of the flat in which he lives were interrogated for three days in Vilnius.

* * *

Many inhabitants of Lithuania were interrogated in connection with case No. 345 between January and April 1974. They were questioned about the people arrested in this case (see *Chronicle* 30), about the *Chronicle LCC*, about home-made publications of religious literature, about an underground seminary, about the priest J. Zdebskis (see *Chronicles* 21-24, 27, 29), whom, it is believed, the K G B regard as one of the leaders of independent Lithuanian Catholics, and others. J. Zdebskis was interrogated for two days.

According to rumours, several investigators believe that the investigation of case No. 345 will last about a year.

* * *

In Lithuania there are, as before, frequent cases of extra-judicial persecution of believers. Some of these are listed below.

The education department in Vilnius forced a day-nursery worker, Miss Aldona Matusevičiute, to resign 'at her own request', as she was suspected of belonging to a Catholic order of nuns. She was dismissed on 13 October 1973.

For the same reason Miss Monika Gavenaite was dismissed from the publishing house 'Šviesa' ('Light') in Kaunas, also 'at her own request'.

Miss Marite Medauskaite, a typist in a finance department in Panevežys, was dismissed from her job in April 1974 on suspicion of being a nun.

The manageress of a chemist's shop in Ignalina, Miss Albina Meškenaite, and a doctor, Miss Vitalija Juzenaite, attended the funeral of a priest, Vincentas Miškinis, the pastor of Melagenai parish, on 30 October 1973. After an investigation of the matter in the district Soviet executive committee (at which the chairwoman of the committee, Mrs Gudukiene, said that people with a non-communist ideology could not be the heads of institutions and referred to the inadequacy of the political work in the chemist's shop), A. Meškenaite was dismissed on 13 November by the chief pharmaceutical board. She was told that she would not get a job in her profession in Ignalina district. Doctor V. Juzenaite received a reprimand.

Miss Laima Atkočiunaite (now Mrs Štarkiene), the director of a house of culture in Jakutiškiai, was dismissed from work in the summer of 1973 after she got married in a church. On 10 January 1974 the Ukmerge district paper *Native Land* reproached her with betraying the Komsomol.

Zenonas Mištautas, a student at the polytechnic in Šiauliai, was forced to postpone the defence of his graduation dissertation for a year and was deprived of his grant. In January 1974 his marks were downgraded on the order of the polytechnic's director, Zumer, 'for non-fulfilment of social obligations he had accepted and for failure to give a lecture on atheism'. Mištautas had refused to give a lecture on atheism at a building site where he was doing his pre-diploma practical work. The minister of higher and secondary special education in

Lithuania, Zabulis, to whom Mištautas addressed a request to be allowed to defend his diploma, confirmed the decision of the pedagogical council. It is assumed that such harsh educational measures as those taken by the teachers and the minister himself are connected with the fact that Mištautas was subjected to interrogations regarding a cross that was carried up Meškuičiai Hill by young people from Šiauliai on 19 May 1973 (see *Chronicle* 30).

The Case of Pailodze

A criminal case against Pailodze was set in motion, as indicated in the indictment, on 23 March 1974, '. . . on the basis of materials received from the Committee for State Security of the Council of Ministers of the Georgian Republic'. On 23 March 1974 Pailodze was summoned to the local police 'on a matter concerning accommodation' and taken from there to remand prison Number 1 in Tbilisi, even though she was ill and had a temperature of 38°.

She was charged under article 206 part 1 of the Georgian Criminal Code (corresponding to article 190-1 of the R S F S R Code) and article 233 part 2 of the Georgian Code (corresponding to article 227 part 2 of the R S F S R Code).

Valentina Serapionovna Paildoze was choir director of the churches of Svetitskhoveli (in Mtskheta) and St Dodo (in Sagaredzho) and at the Church of the Trinity (in Tbilisi).

The indictment, signed by the procurator of the Zavodsky district in Tbilisi, counsellor of justice O. Dzhaparidze, asserts that between 1970 and 1974 Pailodze wrote and 'circulated' 136 anonymous letters to various organizations in Georgia (the Central Committee, the Council of Ministers, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Academy of Sciences, the Union of Writers, courts, military enlistment offices, district party committees, district soviets, educational institutions, the television) and to a number of cultural figures in which she 'insults' the founder of the Soviet communist party and the state; also insults leading party and Soviet officials; urges party and Komsomol members to tear up their party and Komsomol cards; urges top officials to resign from their jobs, threatening them otherwise with destruction (another passage in the indictment says: '. . . otherwise she threatened them with perdition in God's name . . .' — *Chronicle*); proposes to teachers that they give up educating students, give up their studies, refuse to take part in demonstrations on 7 November and to carry portraits of V. I. Lenin and other leaders at the victory parade. . . .' The same anonymous letters '. . . libelled the Soviet social system and people, urged society to adopt passive resistance, and urged young people not to serve in the Red Army . . .' It is also asserted that '. . . she urged leading scientists to abandon their creative work . . .'

In addition, '. . . V. S. Pailodze systematically infringed the personal freedom and rights of citizens (article 233 of the Georgian Criminal Code — *Chronicle*), in that: she systematically conducted religious propaganda for the performance of religious rites . . .'

There is only one reference in the text of the indictment to the evidence of witnesses. It is asserted that '. . . Pailodze circulated two anonymous letters on 5 and 6 November 1973 . . .' in the Tbilisi polytechnic institute. These letters were discovered by students Gulnara Kharbedia (5 November) and Omar Beriashvili (6 November).

In asserting that Pailodze was the author of the incriminating letters, the indictment refers only to the results of an examination by handwriting experts.

A document signed by procurator Dzhaparidze and attached to the indictment says: '. . . There is no material evidence.'

The judge at the trial was G. Kukhaleishvili.

The trial was twice postponed — on 12 and 18 June: the first time in connection with a protest by Pailodze concerning procedural violations (in particular, the pressure exerted on her by O. Dzhaparidze), the inhuman conditions in which she was being kept in prison, and the fact that the lawyer she had chosen, D. Bakradze, was not being admitted to see her; the second time in connection with Pailodze's illness (she fainted in court). The trial eventually took place on 26 June.

V. S. Pailodze pleaded not guilty. Just as she had at the pre-trial investigation, she denied that she had written any anonymous letters or circulated false information.

The witnesses mentioned above were students who did not know Pailodze and had never seen her; they merely testified that they had found the letter in the institute.

Not one handwriting expert was summoned to court and the conclusions of the examination could not be verified by the judicial investigation.

Despite the document attached to the indictment, the state prosecutor presented one piece of material evidence to the court — a letter which he alleged had been signed by Pailodze and confiscated from her during a search. Pailodze did not agree that the signature was genuine. It should be noted that the letter is not listed in the search record.

Pailodze declared to the court that illegal methods of interrogation had been employed: she had repeatedly been placed in a punishment cell and threatened with beatings, and attempts had been made to use denunciations by her cell-mates, who were 'plants'.

Pailodze also stated that the real reason for her arrest was the K G B's desire to discredit her, as she was a dangerous witness. She regarded her trial as a consequence of the fact that she had often denounced the K G B employees and churchmen in their pay who had taken part in the robbery at the Patriarchate in 1972 and in other violations of the law. (Many people name Pailodze as a possible witness in the investigation being conducted by the Procuracy into the state of affairs in the Georgian Patriarchate.)

The lawyer, Bakradze, was simply not allowed to appear in court; the defence was conducted by Kikvidze.

The court sentenced V. S. Pailodze to 1½ years in ordinary-regime camps.

★ ★ ★

Several texts about the condition of the Orthodox Church in Georgia — its evolution and decline, the specific forms of pressure exerted on it by the local authorities and the organs of state security, and the crimes committed in the Georgian Patriarchate — have circulated in *samizdat*. V. S. Pailodze is named among the witnesses who exposed these events.[20]

In the Prisons and Camps[21]

Mordovia

Lesnoye (institution ZhKh 385/19). In August 1973 a large group of political prisoners in camp 19 tried to convey to the outside world a letter to the Committee for Human Rights. The attempt ended in failure as the letter was confiscated from Ivar Žukovskis on his release.[22] After this the following prisoners were put in cell-type premises for six months:

Kronid Lyubarsky (see *Chronicles* 24-28);

Aleksas Pašilis (arrested in Klaipeda in 1970 for leaflets, sentenced to four years);

Nikolai Budulak-Sharygin (during the war at the age of 14 he found himself abroad, adopted English citizenship, arrested in 1968 during a business trip to the U S S R for his firm, 10 years for 'failure to return');[23]

B. Shakirov.

In the autumn Budulak-Sharygin and Shakirov were sent to Vladimir prison for three years.

* * *

On the anniversary of Yury Galanskov's death [*Chronicle* 28] many prisoners sent letters of protest to official bodies. This is the reply of the procurator responsible for institution ZhKh 385 [the Mordovian complex], Ganichev, to one such letter:

'Inform A. I. Romanov that Galanskov's death has no causal connection with any unlawful administrative actions in the places of imprisonment. Romanov's protest is unfounded.'

* * *

On 10 December 1973, on the anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the traditional one-day hunger strikes took place in the camps. Ten people took part in the hunger strike in camp 19. Protests were also sent to various official bodies. The replies were clichés: 'Soviet people enjoy complete freedom and democracy. There are no grounds for protest.'

* * *

On 12 January Ukrainian political prisoners staged a one-day hunger strike in connection with the second anniversary of the mass arrests in the Ukraine (see *Chronicle* 24). Jewish political prisoners Boris Azernikov and Anatoly Goldfeld

supported the Ukrainians by sending statements on this subject to the Praesidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet.

* * *

In camp 19 Boris Azernikov, Kronid Lyubarsky and Boris Penson ('aeroplane' trial, sentenced to 10 years, see *Chronicle* 17) staged a hunger strike from 17 to 24 June. The hunger strikers were protesting against the irregularity with which their mail was delivered and dispatched, and the arbitrary confiscation and 'disappearance' of letters, particularly those from abroad. After the hunger strike they received many letters of different dates of writing and posting, all together.

* * *

Ozerny (institution ZhKh 385/17). Alexander Bolonkin, sentenced in Moscow to four years of camps and two years of exile (see *Chronicle* 30), has arrived here. Bolonkin was beaten up on the journey and in consequence developed a severe pain in his side. However they refused to give him an X-ray as he requested. Bolonkin wrote a complaint about his escorts to the Procuracy. If the reply is to be believed, the case of his beating has been passed to the Sokolniki district court in Moscow.

* * *

Barashevo (institution ZhKh 385/3-4, women's political zone). For about seven months N. A. Strokata (sentenced to four years, see *Chronicles* 25, 28) has been asking to be sent for a medical examination regarding the swelling of her pectoral gland. In 1973 she was finally sent to a special M V D hospital in Rostov-on-Don. Now Strokata has been placed on a cancer register and periodically — once every six months — undergoes an examination in the same hospital. She recently returned from Rostov for the second time; her condition is good.

* * *

Silva Zalmanson ('aeroplane' trial, sentenced to 10 years, see *Chronicle* 17) has returned to the zone from the hospital. The state of her health has improved significantly.

* * *

Irina Stasiv-Kalynets (sentenced to six years plus three years of exile, see *Chronicles* 24, 28) has been transferred to the hospital in a very bad condition. An exact diagnosis has not been established, but the hypothesis is a liver disease.

* * *

Stefaniya Shabatura (sentenced to five years, plus three years of exile, see *Chronicles* 24, 28) was put in cell-type premises from January to April, apparently for staging hunger strikes during the winter.

* * *

Barashevo (institution ZhKh 385/3-2, the hospital). Algirdas Žipre,[24] arrested in April 1958, is being held here.

A. Žipre was born at the end of the twenties (1927-1930?), and took an active part in the partisan movement in Lithuania in the 1940s; believing in the amnesties, he came out of the forest in 1956. He was arrested 1½ years later.

The Lithuanian Supreme Court sentenced him under articles 58-1a, 58-8 and 58-11 to 25 years in camps. Žipre himself believed that he had been sentenced to 15 years, as by that time the maximum term of imprisonment had been reduced to 15 years. However, at that moment the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet had not yet adopted the relevant resolution and in April 1973 Žipre discovered that he still had to serve another ten years in the camps.

He has been transported to the hospital from the Perm camps with the diagnosis 'psychiatric illness'.

The Perm Camps

Kuchino (institution VS 389/36). Seven or eight political prisoners held a one-day hunger strike on 1 May, demanding that order No. 20 of 14 January 1972 be revoked. The text of order No. 20 is unknown to the *Chronicle*; it is known only that the decree imposes on prisoners new restrictions and demands that are not provided for by the R S F S R Corrective Labour Code.

* * *

The following have submitted statements renouncing their Soviet citizenship:

Aleksei Safronov, aged 21, sentenced to 12 years;

Vitold Abankin,[25] aged 25, sentenced to 12 years;

Vitaly Kolomin, aged 29, sentenced to six years;

Vitaly Kalinichenko, aged 28, sentenced to ten years;

Grigory Vabishchevich, aged 43, sentenced to 25 years (ten months left to serve).

They regard their renunciation of Soviet citizenship as a protest against tyranny. They demand that after they have served their sentences they be allowed to leave the confines of the U S S R.

* * *

M. Ya. Makarenko (articles 70, 162 and 173 of the R S F S R Criminal Code, sentenced to eight years, see *Chronicle* 16), imprisoned in Camp number 36, has sent a number of complaints to various Soviet, party and public organizations.

Here are the different types of replies:

The Board of the U S S R Union of Writers and the Moscow writers' organization announce that they are 'not competent to deal with what is going on in the camps' and that in future they will not reply to such appeals. This is the reply to an appeal addressed to A. Barto, M. Sholokhov and K. Simonov.

The practice of transfer to prisons under a simplified legal procedure 'has been examined and found correct' (replies from the Commission on Youth Affairs of the U S S R Supreme Soviet, the Central Committee of the party and the Commission on Legislative Proposals of the U S S R Supreme Soviet).

Makarenko's complaints were examined by the Perm procurator Myakishev and the Chusovoi procurator Boldyrev. Of all the points raised only one was satisfied: in future former members of punitive detachments and policemen under the Nazis would not patrol in red armbands on Soviet holidays. All the rest was ruled to be libel; it was recommended to the camp administration that Makarenko be severely punished for this.

* * *

On 15 February, a search was carried out with the aim of confiscating 'spare' warm clothing, footwear and so on from the prisoners. All the prisoners were driven into the canteen and told that it was 'not allowed' to have more than one pair of warm underwear; that (under their 'regime') felt boots, warm trousers, and an extra pair of overshoes or high boots were prohibited; and that overalls were banned: they must work in the same clothes that they wore every day . . . Several hundred articles were taken away without receipts, chits or anything being given. Food items preserved by the prisoners were trampled underfoot, books and journals were destroyed. The guards even searched in the snow, feeling about for hidden felt boots and other things, which they then dug up out of the snow. The search was conducted at night. It was directed by the camp commandant, Major Kotov, and by Major Fyodorov and Captain Zhuravkov, in the presence of officials of the special section of the Perm Directorate for Internal Affairs — head of the section, Lieutenant-Colonel Mikov and head of the K G B group, Major Afanasov.

* * *

Vsesvyatskoye (institution VS 389/35). *Chronicle* 30 reported that after the death of prisoner Kurkis two commissions visited the hospital, but these changed nothing. This is not quite correct. After the inspection by the first commission (more specifically it was a commission to sign the death certificate), the prisoners repeatedly protested; there were even short hunger strikes. The second commission removed the head of the camp's medical section from his post; prisoners had their invalid category restored, and many received treatment which they had previously been refused.

* * *

On 21 February[26] Vladimir Bukovsky was put in the cell-type premises for three months. There he was kept on the regime (hot food every other day) prescribed for the camp punishment prison — an innovation introduced by the administration of camp 35. The confinement of Bukovsky in a cell, and his regime there, provoked numerous protests among the prisoners. After these protests V. Pavlenkov and I. Svetlichny were deprived of visits from their relatives.

The following non-prisoners spoke out in defence of Bukovsky: his mother N. I. Bukovskaya; A. Tverdokhlebov; and A. Naidenovich; also A. Levitin (Krasnov), A. Sakharov, T. Khodorovich, T. Velikanova, S. Kovalyov, P. Litvinov, Father S. Zheludkov, G. Podyapolsky, and V. Fainberg. The latter, having received the news (it has not yet been possible to check its accuracy) that Bukovsky and his friends in the camp had declared a hunger strike, started a hunger strike of his own in Moscow in support of them.

On 9 May, 11 days before his term was up, Bukovsky was released from the cell 'in connection with building repairs'.

* * *

On 12 May political prisoner Pronyuk (see *Chronicle* 30) was deprived of a meeting with his wife. On 13 May a mass hunger strike (of about 30 people) broke out in the camp. It lasted a month. The details are not yet known [see *Chronicle* 33], but it is clear that it was one of the most powerful demonstrations by political prisoners in the last decade. The hunger strike ended after the administration agreed to meet certain of the strikers' demands; in particular, it was specified that punishments such as deprivation of a visit or parcel were effective for [only] a month from the time of their imposition, i.e. after a month the prisoner could have the meeting or parcel that had been taken away.

On 27 May Vladimir Bukovsky, who had been taking part in the hunger strike, was sent to Vladimir Prison for three years.

A protest about this by M. Landa and A. Levitin (Krasnov) was made public.

* * *

Five political prisoners refused to participate in the building of a camp punishment prison. Two of them — Arie-Leib Khnokh ('aeroplane' case, sentenced to ten years, see *Chronicle* 17) and Gilya Butman (Leningrad 'aeroplane-related' case, sentenced to ten years, see *Chronicle* 20) — have been put in the cell-type premises because of this.

Vladimir Prison (institution OD-I/ST-2)

Valentin Moroz, the Ukrainian historian and essayist, has now been held in Vladimir Prison for about four years, having received a second conviction under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (corresponds to article 70 of the R S F S R Code), this time for four of his articles: 'Report from the Beria Reserve' (written during his first imprisonment in the Mordovian camps), 'Amongst the Shadows', 'A Chronicle of Resistance', and a literary-critical analysis of the verse of Evdokiya Los, a Belorussian poet.[27]

Moroz was sentenced to six years of prison, three years in camps and five years of exile. Before this he was imprisoned for four years — from 1965 to 1969 (see *Chronicles* 7, 14, 17, 27).

In Vladimir prison Moroz's cell-mates turned out to be common criminals who tormented him and prevented him from sleeping at night. One of them cut his stomach open with the handle of a spoon that was sharpened like a knife, and Moroz had to be sent to the hospital for stitches. After this incident, at the request of Moroz himself and his wife, he was placed in a solitary-confinement cell, where he has now been for two years.

Under the legislation now in force, after half the sentence prescribed by a court has been served a camp regime can be substituted for prison if the prisoner has observed the regulations of the prison regime (see article 33 of the Fundamentals of Corrective Labour Legislation and article 51 of the R S F S R Corrective Labour Code). V. Moroz has infringed these only once: during a visit from his wife he spoke to her in Ukrainian and refused to switch over to Russian; because of this he was deprived of the visit. True, after his wife had complained to the highest authorities V. Moroz's conduct was ruled to be within the law and he was allowed the visit, but this episode is still listed in his prison file as a violation of the regime. And this is the grounds on which he is being refused a transfer from prison to a camp. More important though, evidently, is the fact that in 1972, when he was taken to Kiev from Vladimir as a witness in a case of 'Ukrainian nationalists', Moroz refused to participate in the investigation. But the administration cannot present this circumstance as a formal reason for prolonging his stay in prison.

Valentin Moroz is suffering badly as a result of being kept in solitary confinement, and is close to a nervous illness. He has told his wife that he intends to declare a hunger strike from 1 July and to keep it up until he is transferred to a camp, or until death.

In early July Raisa Moroz travelled to Vladimir and talked to the prison governor, Colonel Zavyalkin. The latter refused to reply to the question whether V. Moroz was on hunger strike; however, he persistently repeated that a hunger strike was a violation of the regime. The head of the medical unit, a woman (presumably Butova), who was present, said in reply to questions about Moroz's health: 'His health is in perfect condition. When I examined him this morning his heart was working normally.' Then she added: 'We examine all the prisoners every morning!'

'I no longer hold out any hope for my complaints and statements,' said Raisa Moroz in an interview with foreign correspondents on 4 July. 'I have only one course left to me — to appeal to all the kind and humane people on earth: help my husband Valentin Moroz! Don't let him die.'

Later Raisa Moroz passed an open letter to the chairman of the P E N club. In it she recalls, in particular, the role of H. Böll in saving the life of Andrei Amalrik.

According to the information available as of 15 July, Valentin Moroz is not intending to end his hunger strike.

Kirov Region

During the second investigation of him in Kirov prison Yakov Khantsis (see *Chronicle* 28) was kept in a basement on a punishment regime. When the period sanctioned by the procurator had expired and Khantsis began to demand his release by knocking on the door, six warders, with an officer in charge, beat him up in his cell until he lost consciousness. They beat his head against the door repeating: 'That's how you should knock, you dirty yid.' As a result of the beating his skull and spine were damaged and his legs were partially paralyzed. Khantsis was carried in to the courtroom (September 1972).[28] The court sentenced him to two years of strict-regime. (For the documents in Khantsis's case see *A Chronicle of Human Rights*, number 1).

In institution OR 216/16, to which Khantsis was sent for a psychiatric examination, he was tied up in a wet towel and efforts were made forcibly to straighten his half-bent paralyzed legs, as it was, apparently, thought that he was shamming. In the course of this, ligaments in the region of his knees were broken.

Khantsis served his new term in institution OR 216/10. At first he was held in the camp prison. When he was being taken to the bath-house, he turned to go into the main zone (on his crutches). An officer snatched the crutches away from him. Khantsis fell and crawled into the main zone. The officer then stood on his legs, but prisoners gathered round and cries of indignation rang out. After this incident Khantsis was transferred from the camp prison to the main zone, and later to another camp — OR 216/1.

Yakov Leibovich Khantsis was released at the end of his sentence, on 6 March 1972, received an exit visa, and emigrated to Israel.

The Ukraine

In the middle of January Alexander Feldman (Kiev, the so-called 'story of the cake', article 206, part 2, sentenced to 3½ years, see *Chronicle* 30) was transported to a camp of intensified regime. His address is: Ukrainskaya S S R, Khmelnitskaya obl., Shepetovskii r-n, selo Klimentovichi, uchr. MKh 324/98.

On 19 January he was allowed an hour's visit from his fiancée and his brother.

During the first few days of Feldman's stay in the camp the production manager Movchan and the head of the workshop for ferro-concrete products, Drachuk, treated him contemptuously because he was a Jew ('You work like a yid,' etc.). At the beginning of February, as a sign of protest, Feldman refused to go to work. For this, on 9 February he received 15 days in the punishment prison. Two days after Feldman came out of the prison the camp administration (camp commandant Kutsak, deputy in charge of regime, Captain Polishchuk) put him in the prison again. On this occasion Feldman served a double term — from 26 February to 29 March. At the end of this period he was beaten up by his cell-mate, a common criminal.

T. P. Tretyakova, a Moscow lawyer with whom Feldman's relatives had signed a contract that she would submit an appeal to the supervisory section of the procuracy (the previous defence counsel, Kiev lawyer Ezhov, who had demanded an acquittal at the trial, had been compulsorily pensioned off soon after it),[29] was not allowed even to study the materials of the prisoner's case. On 24 March Tretyakova arrived at the camp for a meeting with her client. The camp administration refused to allow the meeting on the grounds that Feldman was in the camp prison. Later, the Moscow Collegium of Barristers refused to allow Tretyakova a business trip to Kiev.

On 24 April Feldman was put in the prison for the fourth time, for a term of 15 days. Immediately after this, on 14 May, he was transferred to the cell-type premises for six months.

The same day, 14 May, Alexander Feldman declared a hunger strike in protest against the tyranny of the administration. According to available information, the hunger strike lasted until 25 May.

Transfers

At the beginning of 1973 **Yury Vudka** (Saratov-Ryazan case, sentenced to seven years, see *Chronicles* 12, 14) was transferred from the Perm camps (number 36) to Vladimir prison for three years.

Later, in the summer and autumn of 1973 other prisoners were sent to Vladimir prison from the same camp: **Yury Fyodorov** (the case of the 'Union of Communists' in Leningrad in 1969, sentenced to six years, see *Chronicle* 12) — until the end of his sentence; **Sergei Malchevsky** (case of Malchevsky and Braun, sentenced to seven years and three years of exile, see *Chronicle* 9) — until the end of his sentence; and **Yakov Suslensky** (case of Suslensky and Meshener* in Bendery, sentenced to seven years, see *Chronicle* 27) — for three years.

Sent to Vladimir prison from the same camp on 15 July 1974, 'for violating the camp regime', were: **David Chernoglaz** (Kishinyov 'aeroplane-related' case, sentenced to five years, see *Chronicle* 20) — until the end of his sentence; and two more prisoners, as yet completely unknown to the *Chronicle*.

Berezin (attempt to desert abroad from the army in 1959-60, sentenced to 15 years) has been transferred to Vladimir prison until the end of his sentence; this is not his first spell in Vladimir prison.

For the transfer to Vladimir prison of **N. Budulak-Sharygin, B. Shakirov** and **V. Bukovsky,** see above.

The condition of the Ukrainian political prisoner **Alexander Sergiyenko,** who is ill with tuberculosis and was transferred to Vladimir prison from the Perm camps on 28 December 1973 (*Chronicle* 30), has not changed for the better.

In December 1973 **A. A. Petrov-Agatov** arrived at camp 19 of Dubrovlag from Vladimir prison. Petrov-Agatov was sent to Vladimir prison in 1970 soon after the publication in the West of his book *Encounters with Convicts* [see *Chronicle* 27].

*Incorrectly spelt Mishener in *Chronicle* 27 and elsewhere.

In September 1973 **Alexander Romanov** (Saratov-Ryazan case, sentenced to six years, see *Chronicles* 12, 17; sent to undergo prison regime in 1971) arrived in camp 19 from Vladimir prison. Evidently two years of Vladimir had had their effect, for on 19 May Romanov jumped naked into the forbidden zone crying out 'Satan!' On 21 May he was taken away to the medical zone in Barashevo.

* * *

By the spring of this year **Igor Ogurtsov**, the leader of the All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Liberation of the People, sentenced to 15 years of imprisonment and five years of exile, had served the first seven years of imprisonment, which, according to the verdict, he had to serve in a prison. At the beginning of March Ogurtsov was transported from Vladimir prison to the Perm camps, to camp 35. However, he spent less than three weeks in the camp. On 4 April Ogurtsov was transferred to the Perm prison for a psychiatric examination — 'on Dr Rogov's recommendation of 8 February 1974'.

In fact a psychiatrist called Rogov (who on the occasion in question used a different surname) had, under the guise of being a throat specialist, examined Ogurtsov as early as May 1973. Rogov announced then to Ogurtsov that he had studied his case and correspondence, and that Ogurtsov was suffering from rheumatism of the brain. Ogurtsov wrote a protest at the time to the head of the medical unit, Butova, who was present at the examination. Soon afterwards Rogov was appointed resident psychoneurologist of Vladimir prison and in this capacity summoned Ogurtsov to an examination on 8 February 1974. Ogurtsov refused to be examined, as he had no complaints, and nor had the administration ordered anything.

In June Ogurtsov was transferred to the hospital zone in Mordovia (institution ZhKh 385/3) with the diagnosis 'rheumatism of the brain'.

* * *

On 7 December **Vladimir Sokolov**, born 1914, was transported from camp 19 to the hospital zone in Dubrovlag. He died three days after arrival. According to Sokolov, he had been a naval intelligence officer of the U S A.[30] It seems that he was arrested in 1951-52.

In June **V. Belokhov** was transferred from camp 19 to camp 3. Earlier, prisoners had obtained a confession from Belokhov that he was co-operating with the K G B.

* * *

The following have been transferred from camp 1 in Dubrovlag (Sosnovka settlement, especially strict [or 'special'] regime) to the strict-regime in camp 19:

[1] **Liudvikas Simutis**, born 1935 (see *Chronicles* 18, 25), arrested in 1954 for having participated in the partisan movement in Lithuania in the 1940s. He was sentenced to death, commuted to 25 years. He is seriously ill (tuberculosis of the spine); as early as 1958 a medical commission raised the question of certifying him as a permanent invalid.

[2] **Petras Paulaitis**, born 1904, due for release in 1983 (see *Chronicle* 27). A mistake was made in the report on Paulaitis in *Chronicle* No. 27: it was presumed that after 25-year sentences had been abolished Paulaitis's sentence was commuted to 15 years. In actual fact, Paulaitis's sentence, like those of the majority of other prisoners serving 25 years, was not altered. Paulaitis was transferred to the special-regime camp in 1961 for a period of six months 'for harmful contacts with young people'. But he was kept there for more than 12 years. In 1963 Major Svyatkin of the Ministry of Internal Affairs invited Paulaitis to write an article for a Lithuanian newspaper, to be called 'A Rebuff to Slanderers from the West', promising to mitigate his lot in return for this. Paulaitis refused, and then Svyatkin declared: 'You will rot here. You will never see freedom again, you can believe me.'

[3] **Sergei Babich**, born 1939, second sentence. He served his first term — three years of strict-regime under a political article — in Mordovia and Vladimir in 1960-63. Released 13 April 1963. Arrested 27 September of the same year for the circulation of leaflets criticizing Khrushchev. Sentenced on 19 February 1964 in the city of Rovno to ten years in special-regime camps. Three attempted escapes. His sentence was increased by six years in all for the escapes and he was transferred to Vladimir prison, where he stayed till 1968.

* * *

The following have arrived at camp 19 [in Mordovia]:

Zoryan Popadyuk, born 1953, student of the philological faculty at Lvov University. Arrested, it seems, in 1973 for possession of Ukrainian *samizdat*. Sentenced to seven years in camps and five years of exile. His co-defendant, Mikitko, was sentenced to five years.

V. Ovsiyenko, born 1949, teacher of literature. Arrested in the same case as Lisovoi and Pronyuk (see *Chronicle* 30). Sentenced to four years.

Lyubomir Staroselsky, born 1955, arrested at his school bench, a few days before his final exams. Case and sentence unknown to the *Chronicle*.[31]

Rimas Čekelis, born 1955, pupil at the Vilnius musical school. Arrested 26 April 1973, sentenced to three years. When he was already in the camp, it was suggested to Čekelis by an official of the Vilnius K G B, Trakimas, that he make a speech in front of the pupils at his school, who, it seems, did not wish to censure their former fellow-pupil. Čekelis refused.

Releases

Mordovia. Anatoly Goldfeld (Kishinyov 'aeroplane-related" case, sentenced to four years, see *Chronicle* 20) has been released from camp 19.

Vladimir Mogilever (Leningrad 'aeroplane-related' case, sentenced to four years, see *Chronicle* 20) has been released from camp 3.

Vyacheslav Platonov (case of the 'All-Russian Social-Christian Union',

sentenced to seven years, see *Chronicle* 1) has been released from camp 17.

Perm camps. Antanas Jastrauskas (case and sentence unknown to the *Chronicle*, mentioned in numbers 23, 28)[32] completed his sentence in April.

Ovik Vasilyan (case of Babayan and others, sentenced to six years, see *Chronicle* 16) completed his sentence on 4 July. He was in camp 36.

Sergei Ponomaryov (Gorky case, sentenced to five years, see *Chronicles* 13 and 15) was released from camp 36 on 3 July.

Valery Pestov, one of those convicted in Sverdlovsk in November 1971 (see *Chronicle* 24),* was released from camp 36 in May. His brother Victor Pestov is due for release in a year's time.

On 2 June Gennady Gavrilov (camp 35, case of the Baltic fleet officers, sentenced to six years, see *Chronicle* 15) was told that his wife had appealed to the Praesidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet to give him a pardon and that her request had been granted. Gavrilov was released 11 months before the end of his sentence.

Kirov region. On 25 January Boris Shilkrot (see *Chronicles* 29 and 30) was set free. A few months later he left the U S S R [for Israel].

In the Psychiatric Hospitals

The Release of P. G. Grigorenko

In January 1974, after a routine examination, a commission of doctors at Moscow regional psychiatric hospital No. 5 (Stolbovaya Station) again failed to recommend the cessation of compulsory treatment for P. G. Grigorenko. The doctors let slip by accident that the reason for this decision was that there was no guarantee that P. G. Grigorenko would not return to his former activities. In a conversation with Grigorenko's son the deputy chief doctor of the hospital, Kozhemyakina, stated that the death of P. G. Grigorenko would be the solution that would suit 'everyone'.

In March 1974 the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the U S S R (T. Velikanova, S. Kovalyov, A. Krasnov-Levitin, G. Podyapolsky and T. Khodorovich) published an open letter in defence of Grigorenko. The letter said: '. . . For the last five years the authorities have used every means to break P. Grigorenko — to force him to renounce his convictions, to admit they are the product of an illness . . . All forms of pressure have been fruitless. P. Grigorenko has not accepted their hints, and when they have made direct invitations that he renounce his convictions, he has rejected them.'

The authors affirm that 'by exploiting the illusion of his impending release . . ., the authorities are aiming . . . to reduce people to silence'. Expressing the fear that '. . . life-long imprisonment in a mad-house has been prepared for Pyotr Grigorevich Grigorenko', the Initiative Group calls on international public opinion to help P. Grigorenko.

*An error in *Chronicle* 25 is repeated here. See correction in *Chronicle* 33. The Pestovs were tried in November 1970. On the 1971 Sverdlovsk trial see *Chronicle* 24 and the information on G. M. Davidenko in *Chronicle* 33.

In the spring of 1974 Grigorenko's health took a definite turn for the worse: he began to suffer frequent heart attacks.

In a press statement issued on 2 May 1974, Z. M. and A. P. Grigorenko report that after a serious heart attack on 2 April the chief doctor of the hospital, Kozyrev, and the doctors of the section in which P. G. Grigorenko was being held informed the city psychiatrist Orlov and the Serbsky Institute in writing of the necessity of discharging Grigorenko as a physically seriously ill man, as his treatment could not be carried out in a proper way in a psychiatric hospital. In the same statement Z. M. and A. P. Grigorenko briefly reiterate the circumstances of Pyotr Grigorenko's conviction and the deprivations, threats and slander to which he has been subjected for the entire five years of his imprisonment.

On the same day, 2 May, Z. M. Grigorenko answered the questions of Western correspondents (see the section 'Letters and Statements').

At the beginning of May serious heart attacks recurred.

On 12 May 1974 a commission was convened which recommended the cessation of compulsory treatment for P. Grigorenko.

On 24 June 1974 the Moscow city court passed a resolution terminating compulsory treatment for P. Grigorenko. Grigorenko's relatives knew nothing about this court hearing. On 25 June the court's decision was conveyed to the hospital. According to information available, the person entrusted with this task informed the administration that Grigorenko should be sent home not later than 10 o'clock on the morning of 26 June.

At 17.00 on 25 June P. Grigorenko's wife received a phone call at home in which she was told to come for her husband the following morning. Only at that moment did she learn that the court had sat.

At 10 o'clock on the morning of 25 June P. G. Grigorenko was driven home. (It would not be uninteresting to learn what were the sources of information of those Western radio stations which as early as seven o'clock that morning reported that Grigorenko had left the hospital.) The same day Grigorenko's flat was visited by Western correspondents. P. Grigorenko said to them: 'During five years and two months of severe ordeals I have become very tired, especially as my health has collapsed, my heart in particular. I want to rest and to recover. I ask you to convey my profound thanks to the public, to absolutely all those people who have helped me to return to my family and thereby prolong my life.'

P. G. Grigorenko's wife, Zinaida Mikhailovna Grigorenko, said: 'I am glad, but not completely happy, as I cannot but feel the pain of Vladimir Bukovsky's mother and Leonid Plyushch's wife, of all the mothers and wives whose dear ones are behind bars. I want to convey thanks to all the people who have supported me during these terrible years.'

A few days later Z. M. Grigorenko was summoned to a police station, where a K G B official strongly advised her to take her husband away to the countryside to rest.

L. I. Plyushch still in the Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital

It is now a year (since 15 July 1973) that the Kiev mathematician Leonid Plyushch has been held in the Dnepropetrovsk special psychiatric hospital (see *Chronicles* 29 and 30).

From August 1973 to January 1974 L. Plyushch was receiving large doses of haloperidol in tablet form, as a curative prescribed by doctors.

On 4 January, L. I. Plyushch had his next meeting with his wife. His condition was as before: almost all the time he sleeps; he cannot read or write; he does not go out for exercise as he would freeze. During the meeting he spoke slowly and little, but as previously he listened carefully and with interest; he answered questions briefly.

In February and March the haloperidol treatment was replaced by insulin injections in increasing doses. The team of psychiatrists which examined him at about this time considered it essential to continue Plyushch's treatment. The members of the commission did not speak to Plyushch.

L. A. Chasovskikh, Plyushch's doctor, in response to a question from his wife about which precise symptoms of illness indicated the need to prolong her husband's treatment, answered: 'His views and beliefs.' To further questions about diagnosis and treatment she refused to answer.

At a meeting on 4 March 1974, Plyushch was unrecognizable. Great dropsical swelling had occurred, he moved with difficulty, and his eyes had lost their usual liveliness.

Plyushch said that the doctors were insisting that he renounce his views and beliefs, and definitely in written form. This he had refused to do.

A commission in April again recommended prolonging Plyushch's stay in the Dnepropetrovsk hospital. The doctors asked Plyushch to write a detailed autobiography which would show clearly how his views had formed, and how he had developed his 'delusional ideas'. Plyushch refused to write such an autobiography.

At a meeting on 12 May it was learnt that since April they had stopped giving Plyushch any drugs at all. Plyushch explained this by the fact that pains had developed in his abdominal cavity and the doctors had become scared. With the stopping of the drugs his condition improved: his swellings began to subside, his pains disappeared. Plyushch was transferred to a different ward, where there were fewer patients and it was quieter. He began to read again — true, now only belles-lettres, not scientific literature — and to write letters.

At a meeting on 29 May his wife learned that since 13 May her husband had begun again to be given insulin injections, again in increasing doses. Itching and an allergic rash developed, but the injections were not stopped. After each injection Plyushch was tied down to his bed, and it appeared as though by these injections they wanted to achieve an insulin shock.

On the same day (29 May) the commandant of the Dnepropetrovsk hospital, Pruss, spoke with Plyushch's wife. He said Plyushch still needed treatment and his wife must help the doctors in this regard. 'Your husband reads too much, you must not send him so many books: his sick brain must be spared. You must not forget this.'

In the course of the conversation it became clear that the reading of books in the hospital is strictly controlled and that Plyushch was being given very little to read. Letters from his close ones were being taken away as soon as he had read them, and he was not allowed to keep by him even a photograph of his wife and children.

Questions about what drugs Plyushch was being treated with, and in what doses, and whether they were trying to induce in him an insulin shock, were avoided by Pruss and his doctor, who referred to some directives or other, according to which they were not allowed to answer such questions.

At a meeting on 3 July 1974 Plyushch reported that in late June he had not been given insulin for seven or eight days, as he had had a cold. However, since 30 June they had recommenced the injections and after three or four days had again begun giving him a whole syringeful.

Plyushch reported that he had been examined by some commission of local doctors. The members of the commission had put three questions to him: 'How do you feel?' 'All right.' 'How does the insulin affect you?' 'It provokes an allergy.' 'How do you regard your former activity?' 'I regret that I got involved in it.'

The commission decided to prolong his treatment.

* * *

It has become known that an International Committee of Mathematicians in Defence of Yu. Shikhanovich and L. Plyushch has been founded.[33] The French subcommittee of this Committee publishes a bulletin. Bulletin No. 2 (Paris, 2 June 1974) lists, in particular, some of the members of the Committee, namely 54 scholars from the U S A, Canada, England, France, Italy, Jerusalem, Switzerland and Japan. Amongst them are Berger, Cartan, Claude Chevalier, Claude Picard, Laurent Schwartz and A. Weil.

On 8 February 1974 a delegation from the French subcommittee visited the Soviet embassy in Paris in order to hand over a petition signed by 550 French mathematicians who are alarmed by the trial of Yu. Shikhanovich and the fact that he has been interned in a psychiatric hospital. The scholars conversed with an embassy counsellor, Valentin Dvinin, and a secretary from the cultural section, Valery Matisov. The embassy had heard of Shikhanovich but not of Plyushch. One of the embassy officials explained to the mathematicians that a special psychiatric hospital was a high-class hospital, rather like those for Academicians. The mathematicians handed over for transmission to Shikhanovich some books by 'the Bourbaki', signed by some of the contributors to this famous publication.

On 25 March counsellor Dvinin sent a letter to Professor Henri Cartan which says, in particular, that the U S S R Academy of Sciences, in response to an enquiry from the embassy about the fate of mathematicians Shikhanovich and Plyushch, had replied that '. . . these persons are not listed, and never have

been, among the members of any Academy Institutes'. However, '. . . the appropriate bodies . . .', in reply to another embassy enquiry, had reported that '. . . Plyushch was dismissed from a scientific-research institute in Kiev in 1968 for negligence in his work and for losing official documents. He made no attempts to find himself a new job and, living off his wife's earnings, engaged in writing and systematically duplicating manuscripts containing anti-Soviet material'. Then the official version of the criminal actions of Shikhanovich and Plyushch, the discovery of their mental illness, and their treatment is recounted in detail.

Dvinin reports that some of the participants in a symposium of the World Psychiatric Association which took place in the USSR, including Howard Rome, Ramon de la Fuente and Freedman, had on 15 October 1973 '. . . listened to a report on the history of Plyushch's and Shikhanovich's illnesses . . .' and '. . . did not express any doubts about the mental illness and consequential madness . . .' of both of them.[34]

Dvinin wished to draw the attention of Cartan and his colleagues to the fact that '. . . sometimes serious scientists, on the basis of inaccurate information, allow themselves to become involved in a political campaign being waged by certain groups with the aim of impeding mutual understanding and cordial relations between the peoples of our countries'.

In connection with Dvinin's reference to Doctors Freedman and Rome, bulletin No. 2 of the French subcommittee quotes extracts from a declaration regarding Shikhanovich signed by a number of American psychiatrists and lawyers in November 1973:

'We are deeply disturbed by the fact that, on the basis of a previous psychiatric decision, he can be ruled mentally unbalanced and insane, whilst the available facts of witnesses tell of his complete mental sanity. We are deeply concerned that, as a consequence of this, fundamental principles both of psychiatric practice and of criminal law could be violated. We, who are familiar with Soviet specialists and have worked with them in the realm of psychiatry and law, call on you to dispel our anxiety by conducting an open trial of Shikhanovich and allowing foreign observers to be present.' The declaration was signed by, amongst others: Dr Alfred Freedman, Chairman of the Department of Psychiatry of New York Medical College, and Dr Howard Rome, director of the Psychiatric Department of the Mayo Clinic. A. Freedman is also president of the American Psychiatric Association, and H. Rome is president of the World Psychiatric Association.

Bulletin No. 2 gives biographical information about Plyushch, quoting the 1972 letter about Plyushch from the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR. It reports on the condition of Plyushch in Dnepropetrovsk hospital and prints the text of the appeal by Bonner, Velikanova, Kovalyov, Sakharov, Khodorovich and Tverdokhlebov of 12 February 1974.[35] The bulletin comments: 'All the concern (about the health and life of Plyushch — *Chronicle*) expressed in this appeal is only too well grounded.'

The bulletin reports on the declaration of 17 mathematicians from the University of Provence in defence of Plyushch and on the fact that the initiative for a campaign in support of Plyushch has been assumed by psychiatrists Dr Gentis and Dr Torrubia.[36]

The bulletin recommends a series of actions in defence of Plyushch, including: widespread circulation of information about him; collection of signatures under declarations in his defence (it recommends that declarations be sent to Soviet embassies and to the Dnepropetrovsk hospital); and mathematicians are advised to state their intention of going to the USSR for a meeting with Plyushch and to press hard for a visa.

* * *

At the beginning of March Vladimir Borisov (see *Chronicles* 11, 19, 24, 30) was released from Psychiatric Hospital No. 2 in Leningrad.

* * *

Nikolai Plakhotnyuk from Kiev, who is in the Dnepropetrovsk special psychiatric hospital (see *Chronicle* 28), was examined by a psychiatric commission in April. The results are as yet unknown.

* * *

Vladimir Gershuni was transferred in April from the Oryol special psychiatric hospital to an ordinary psychiatric hospital in Moscow (Psychiatric Hospital No. 13). A psychiatric commission which met at the end of December 1973 decided that it was possible for him to be transferred to an ordinary hospital in March 1974; a court ruled that the transfer be made (on Gershuni see *Chronicles* 11, 13, 19).

* * *

On 15 April Victor Fainberg (see *Chronicles* 4, 19, 30) began a hunger strike in solidarity with V. Bukovsky and other political prisoners in the Perm camps.[37]

On 30 April Fainberg was forcibly interned in a psychiatric hospital.

On 8 May Fainberg ended his hunger strike.

On 18 May he was released from the hospital.

Fainberg left the Soviet Union in June of this year.

* * *

At the beginning of July Yury Shikhanovich (see *Chronicles* 27 and 30) was released from psychiatric hospital No. 9 (in Yakhroma, Moscow region). The decision to terminate his compulsory treatment was taken by a psychiatric commission on 25 March 1974; the court hearing took place in June.

* * *

The following were under psychiatric examination in the Serbsky Institute in January 1974:

Heino Jogesma, born 1937 in Tallinn; crossed the border into Finland and was returned by the Finnish authorities. Ruled mentally ill.

Vasily Trish, born 1911, a collective farmer from Ternopol region, article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (corresponding to article 190-1 of the R S F S R Code). An in-patient psychiatric examination in Vinnitsa ruled that he was mentally ill; after this he was sent to the Serbsky Institute for examination.

Nikolai Kopeiko from Grozny, article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code; underwent in-patient examination in Dnepropetrovsk, then transferred to the Serbsky Institute. Ruled to be mentally ill.

Artur Oganesyan from Leninakan. Escaped from the U S S R and lived for a year and a half in Turkey and the U S A. Gave an interview in Turkey. The circumstances and date of his return, as well as the date of his arrest, are not known to the *Chronicle*.[38] Charged under article 64 of the R S F S R Criminal Code [i.e. with treason]. Possible that he was transferred to the Serbsky Institute from a place of imprisonment. Ruled to be a malingerer.

Grachev, born 1939, from Simferopol, worked as a foreman on a building site. Article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. Ruled to be non-accountable.

Ivan Kuzmin from Lipetsk, about 40 years old, article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. Ruled to be non-accountable.

An Unpublished Decree

of the Praesidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet, No. 3707-VIII, 25 December 1972

Chronicle 30 reported that this decree had been applied to several citizens. During the period January-June 1974 a number of other citizens were issued with a caution on the basis of the decree: Anatoly Marchenko (Tarusa), Irina Kristi, Leonard Ternovsky, Nina Lisovskaya, Vladimir Rokityansky, Lyudmila Alekseyeva, Tatyana Velikanova, Tatyana Bayeva, Alexander Voronel, Anatoly Krasnov-Levitin and Leonid Tymchuk (Odessa). According to rumours, R. Pimenov (Komi Autonomous Republic) was also cautioned; and Vitaly Rubin received a caution in a peculiar oral form.

It has become known that Decree No. 3707-VIII, 'On Issuing a Caution as a Preventative Measure', is stamped 'Not for publication'. Several citizens subjected to its application have not even been shown the decree's text: T. Bayeva was told that it would take a long time to find; A. Voronel, on the other hand, was invited, if he wished, to read the text in any legal advice office, but was not shown the decree when issued with his caution; I. Kristi and T. Velikanova were informed [falsely] that the Decree had been published in the *Gazette of the Supreme Soviet*.

The text of each caution lists the anti-social activities of the person being cautioned. Sometimes these are specific acts: in the case of Bayeva — a journey

to the trial of G. Superfin; in the case of A. Marchenko — writing the book *My Testimony* and a number of letters and statements; in the case of I. Kristi — possessing several documents ruled to be criminal, and causing a breach of the peace near the building where K. Lyubarsky was being tried; in the case of V. Rokityansky — transmitting a copy (or copies) of the *Chronicle of Current Events* to Italian acquaintances (information gleaned from the evidence of V. Krasin); in the case of A. Voronel — organizing an international scientific seminar called 'The Application of Physics and Mathematics to other Branches of Knowledge'. Sometimes anti-social activity is defined in a sweeping formula: I. Kristi, 'was an active member of the anti-Soviet group "the Democratic Movement"'; the same was said about N. Lisovskaya and L. Ternovsky; L. Alekseyeva was cautioned for 'the systematic preparation and circulation of anti-Soviet works' — a formulation from article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code.

In the caution issued to A. Voronel the precise article of the Criminal Code which he was on the point of breaking was designated: article 74, 'Violation of national and racial equality'.

A man calling himself an official of 'state organizations' warned V. Rubin orally (without showing him the decree or a caution), and informed him that he would be called to account under article 64 — 'High treason' (V. Rubin was a member of the programme committee of the international scientific seminar, as was A. Voronel).

The procedure preceding the issuing of a caution varies: some people are summoned to K G B headquarters (A. Marchenko was summoned from Tarusa to Moscow); others are driven there by K G B personnel straight from work (L. Alekseyeva) or from home (T. Bayeva); still others are cautioned in local K G B district offices (L. Ternovsky, N. Lisovskaya, T. Velikanova, I. Kristi) or at a police station (A. Voronel). In every case (except for the mysterious warning given to V. Rubin), a K G B official reads out the caution.

The decree says that in the event of failure to answer a summons, citizens can be subjected to attendance under escort. In effect, L. Alekseyeva, T. Bayeva and others, who were taken to the K G B from work or from home, were subjected to compulsion, even though they had not been in a position to evade a summons, as they had not received one. A. Voronel received a summons inviting him to the Procurator's office, but before the appointed date he was seized on the street, pushed into a car by force (in the course of this the car drove into a crowd at a trolleybus stop), taken first to the Lubyanka and from there to police station No. 46. Here a record was drawn up saying that he had resisted the police (although the men who arrested him were not in uniform, did not produce any documents and had in fact been told by their superiors at the Lubyanka to take him to a police station). After he had been cautioned, the officials of the police or the K G B who had detained him started to shadow him, and in the evening they surrounded him and his wife at the entrance to their house, threatening him with a beating-up; the tailing was not stopped for several days. This is what 'attendance under escort in the event of failure to

appear' means in practice.

It is important to note that in many cases the issuing of a caution is accompanied by educative measures at the place of work. A conversation is conducted by a chief administrator, the party organizer and the trade-union organizer, as a rule in the presence of a K G B official. Material for the conversation is provided by the 'case file', sent to the place of employment from the K G B and containing: the testimony of other persons (often already convicted) against the given person; copies of documents written or signed by him — protests, open letters, statements, etc.; search records; and a character profile compiled by the K G B. The materials are assembled tendentiously: evidence in favour of the person, also his own explanations, are not included in the 'case file'. Naturally the materials from the K G B seem to the officials of non-judicial institutions to be authoritative and not in need of proof, and in this way an attitude of suspicion and mistrust towards the person develops on the part of his employers. Educational conversations have been conducted with T. Velikanova, L. Alekseyeva, L. Ternovsky, N. Lisovskaya, and others.

Citizens subjected to a caution have protested orally and in writing against the application of this measure to them. The grounds for the protests have been as follows: a) they did not commit the acts ascribed to them (N. Lisovskaya and I. Kristi had not heard of the existence of a group called 'The Democratic Movement'); b) disagreement with the description of their actions (L. Ternovsky: 'I do not regard my activity as anti-Soviet or harmful'; A. Voronel: 'The international seminar is a scientific, not a political undertaking; a *fortiori*, it is not anti-Soviet and not nationalistic: scientists of various nationalities will take part in it'); c) the caution is issued on the basis of an unpublished decree, consequently it is illegal (A. Marchenko: 'This decree is a document of your *samizdat*').

The content of the decree and the cautions is causing bewilderment: on the one hand, actions formulated in the terminology used for crimes are, nevertheless, defined as being anti-social but not involving criminal accountability; on the other hand, citizens are warned that if they continue their activity which is not subject to criminal prosecution they will be considered to be breaking the law (A. Voronel, for example, was warned precisely of this).

It may be surmised that the aim of those who drew up the decree was to surmount the inconvenient and inflexible formulations of articles 70 and 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. Article 70 regards as criminal only an action that is consciously directed against the Soviet system; article 190-1 corrected article 70 by removing the question of an action's aims, but it regards as criminal that sort of information which is libellous, or knowingly false, i.e. it once again makes things turn on the motives of an action. This is extremely inconvenient for the investigators, the court and the prosecutor. If, though, there has been a caution, the investigators and the court have the chance to restrict their investigations to the involvement of the accused in the action itself, the harmfulness of which he has been informed about earlier. In devising this, however, the legislators have not allowed for the fact that every

person has the right to retain his own subjective opinions, irrespective of the prescriptions of higher bodies.

The following K G B officials are known to have issued 'cautions': Lieutenant-Colonel Anfisov, Knyazev, Major I. D. Eremeyev, Zhernov, I. S. Romanov.

The Unofficial International Scientific Seminar in Moscow

A group of Jewish scientists who wish to emigrate to Israel and have for long been deprived of work and scholarly contacts with their colleagues in the U S S R, invited the international scientific community to attend an international seminar in Moscow devoted to the application of physics and mathematics to other branches of knowledge. The originality of this seminar lay not only in its theme, which aroused the interest of wide scientific circles in the West, but also in the fact that the seminar was not supported in the U S S R by any scientific institutions and was thus completely unofficial. The following were members of the seminar's Moscow Programme Committee: M. Azbel, V. and I. Brailovsky, A. Voronel, A. Lunts, V. Levich, A. Lerner, V. Rubin, D. Ram, G. Rosenshtein, V. Fain, E. Finkelshtein and B. Gurfel.

More than 30 papers were sent to the Programme Committee from scientists living in the U S S R (including A. D. Sakharov, Yu. I. Orlov and others), and more than 120 papers from scientists in the U S A (including G. Wald, Saint-Dierdi, M. Katz, T. Kuhn, and others), England (J. Ziman, N. Chigier, and others), France (L. Schwartz, S. Mandelbröjt, and others), Israel, and several other countries. Meetings of the seminar were scheduled for 1 to 5 July 1974 at A. Voronel's flat (Moscow, ul. Narodnogo Opolcheniya, d. 45, kv. 103, near the metro-station 'Oktyabrskoye Pole').

From the beginning of May the authorities took a number of repressive measures against the participants and organizers of the seminar. Many members of the Programme Committee were summoned under various pretexts to police stations and the Procurator's office, where K G B officials spoke with them (see this issue, 'An Unpublished Decree'). Participants in the seminar had their telephones cut off and their postal communication with foreign countries suddenly stopped. International phone conversations during which matters connected with the seminar were being discussed were immediately cut off. Mail addressed to the Programme Committee did not reach it.

From the middle of May arrests of members of the Programme Committee and participants in the seminar got under way.[30] It is known that A. Lunts, D. Ram, V. Brailovsky, M. Azbel, A. Voronel, V. Rubin, as well as many others, were arrested. Two days before the arrest of Voronel a K G B official suggested that he make a statement refusing to participate in the anti-Soviet seminar. The nature of the arrests was preventive (although such arrests are excluded by Soviet legislation and have been frequently denounced in the Soviet press when it has been a question of preventive arrests in South Africa

appear' means in practice.

It is important to note that in many cases the issuing of a caution is accompanied by educative measures at the place of work. A conversation is conducted by a chief administrator, the party organizer and the trade-union organizer, as a rule in the presence of a K G B official. Material for the conversation is provided by the 'case file', sent to the place of employment from the K G B and containing: the testimony of other persons (often already convicted) against the given person; copies of documents written or signed by him — protests, open letters, statements, etc.; search records; and a character profile compiled by the K G B. The materials are assembled tendentiously: evidence in favour of the person, also his own explanations, are not included in the 'case file'. Naturally the materials from the K G B seem to the officials of non-judicial institutions to be authoritative and not in need of proof, and in this way an attitude of suspicion and mistrust towards the person develops on the part of his employers. Educational conversations have been conducted with T. Velikanova, L. Alekseyeva, L. Ternovsky, N. Lisovskaya, and others.

Citizens subjected to a caution have protested orally and in writing against the application of this measure to them. The grounds for the protests have been as follows: a) they did not commit the acts ascribed to them (N. Lisovskaya and I. Kristi had not heard of the existence of a group called 'The Democratic Movement'); b) disagreement with the description of their actions (L. Ternovsky: 'I do not regard my activity as anti-Soviet or harmful'; A. Voronel: 'The international seminar is a scientific, not a political undertaking; a *fortiori*, it is not anti-Soviet and not nationalistic: scientists of various nationalities will take part in it'); c) the caution is issued on the basis of an unpublished decree, consequently it is illegal (A. Marchenko: 'This decree is a document of your *samizdat*').

The content of the decree and the cautions is causing bewilderment: on the one hand, actions formulated in the terminology used for crimes are, nevertheless, defined as being anti-social but not involving criminal accountability; on the other hand, citizens are warned that if they continue their activity which is not subject to criminal prosecution they will be considered to be breaking the law (A. Voronel, for example, was warned precisely of this).

It may be surmised that the aim of those who drew up the decree was to surmount the inconvenient and inflexible formulations of articles 70 and 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. Article 70 regards as criminal only an action that is consciously directed against the Soviet system; article 190-1 corrected article 70 by removing the question of an action's aims, but it regards as criminal that sort of information which is libellous, or knowingly false, i.e. it once again makes things turn on the motives of an action. This is extremely inconvenient for the investigators, the court and the prosecutor. If, though, there has been a caution, the investigators and the court have the chance to restrict their investigations to the involvement of the accused in the action itself, the harmfulness of which he has been informed about earlier. In devising this, however, the legislators have not allowed for the fact that every

person has the right to retain his own subjective opinions, irrespective of the prescriptions of higher bodies.

The following K G B officials are known to have issued 'cautions': Lieutenant-Colonel Anfisov, Knyazev, Major I. D. Eremeyev, Zhernov, I. S. Romanov.

The Unofficial International Scientific Seminar in Moscow

A group of Jewish scientists who wish to emigrate to Israel and have for long been deprived of work and scholarly contacts with their colleagues in the U S S R, invited the international scientific community to attend an international seminar in Moscow devoted to the application of physics and mathematics to other branches of knowledge. The originality of this seminar lay not only in its theme, which aroused the interest of wide scientific circles in the West, but also in the fact that the seminar was not supported in the U S S R by any scientific institutions and was thus completely unofficial. The following were members of the seminar's Moscow Programme Committee: M. Azbel, V. and I. Brailovsky, A. Voronel, A. Lunts, V. Levich, A. Lerner, V. Rubin, D. Ram, G. Rosenshtein, V. Fain, E. Finkelshtein and B. Gurfel.

More than 30 papers were sent to the Programme Committee from scientists living in the U S S R (including A. D. Sakharov, Yu. I. Orlov and others), and more than 120 papers from scientists in the U S A (including G. Wald, Saint-Dierdi, M. Katz, T. Kuhn, and others), England (J. Ziman, N. Chigier, and others), France (L. Schwartz, S. Mandelbröjt, and others), Israel, and several other countries. Meetings of the seminar were scheduled for 1 to 5 July 1974 at A. Voronel's flat (Moscow, ul. Narodnogo Opolcheniya, d. 45, kv. 103, near the metro-station 'Oktyabrskoye Pole').

From the beginning of May the authorities took a number of repressive measures against the participants and organizers of the seminar. Many members of the Programme Committee were summoned under various pretexts to police stations and the Procurator's office, where K G B officials spoke with them (see this issue, 'An Unpublished Decree'). Participants in the seminar had their telephones cut off and their postal communication with foreign countries suddenly stopped. International phone conversations during which matters connected with the seminar were being discussed were immediately cut off. Mail addressed to the Programme Committee did not reach it.

From the middle of May arrests of members of the Programme Committee and participants in the seminar got under way.[39] It is known that A. Lunts, D. Ram, V. Brailovsky, M. Azbel, A. Voronel, V. Rubin, as well as many others, were arrested. Two days before the arrest of Voronel a K G B official suggested that he make a statement refusing to participate in the anti-Soviet seminar. The nature of the arrests was preventive (although such arrests are excluded by Soviet legislation and have been frequently denounced in the Soviet press when it has been a question of preventive arrests in South Africa

and other states): those arrested were dispersed throughout prisons in Moscow and its environs without any legal basis to what was happening, and kept there, to use the expression of an official of the prison in Serpukhov, 'like birds in a cage'. The wives of the arrested scientists were kept under house arrest: policemen were posted at the entrances to their houses, and subsequently at the doors of their flats as well, and women were not allowed out of the house.

A. Voronel's wife was arrested on the street when she was on her way home, driven to a friend's flat, and told to live there until the date when the seminar was due to end, and not to try to go to her own flat. During all this they tried to intimidate her by talking of 'the wrath of Soviet citizens' who might, it was alleged, assault her in her home, and also warned that her flat might be burgled, as A. Voronel had given away several keys to his friends. A few days later N. Voronel learnt that a policeman had been posted by her flat on the pretext that a burglary had taken place and the lock had been broken; but she could not verify whether this was so, as she was under house arrest at her friend's flat.

F. Yasinovskaya, who came to visit her friends the Rubins, was stopped at their door and taken off to a police station, where she was ordered to show her documents. B. Sarnov and his wife came to visit their friends the Voronels without knowing anything about either the seminar or the arrests. They were detained at the entrance and taken off to a police station, where they were advised to forget the Voronels for the next few days.

After a visit to N. Voronel a tail was put on L. Bogoraz.

The foreign scientists who wished to participate in the seminar were refused entry visas.

On the day when the seminar was due to start work — 1 July — several people who had set off for A. Voronel's flat were detained.

In this way, the international scientific seminar was brought to nought by the authorities.

From 4 July the arrested members of the Programme Committee started to be released from imprisonment.

About the Journal **Veche**

On 19 April 1974 number 10 of the journal *Veche* came out. Listed as chief editor is not V. N. Osipov, under whose signature the previous nine issues appeared, but I. V. Ovchinnikov. As far as one can judge from the series of statements made by the journal's editor (some of which are presented in issue 10),[40] the reason for the change in the editorial board was insuperable disagreements between its members. The *Chronicle* is not able and does not see the need to enter into an analysis of the mutual accusations with which these statements, not all of them published, abound (amongst them are: 'Urgent Statement for the Press' by V. N. Osipov, dated 7 March, in which he reports his decision to close the journal, and the statements of the new editorial board published in No. 10, concerning their intention to continue the publication, preserving its orientation).

On 1 April the Leningrad K G B conducted searches at the homes of G. N. Bochevarov and P. M. Goryachev, collaborators in *Veche*, and also of V. E. Konkin. The searches were carried out in connection with case No. 15 (for details of this case, see this issue). As the 10th number of *Veche* reports in its chronicle section, all issues of *Veche*, Goryachev's typewriter and *A Memorial to the Victims of Stalin's Personality Cult*, compiled by Bochevarov, were confiscated. The *Memorial* is a list of 1,500 top Soviet party workers, statesmen, and men of science, letters and the arts, who perished as a result of Stalin's tyranny or put an end to their lives by suicide; the surname of each one who died is accompanied by brief biographical data and a photograph. Literary appendices to the *Memorial*, compiled by Goryachev, were also confiscated.

The following day all three were summoned to an interrogation at the Leningrad K G B. Interrogations were conducted principally about *Veche*. The investigator stated to one of the men being interrogated that they (meaning, apparently, the K G B) received hundreds of letters demanding the rehabilitation of Stalin.

G. N. Bochevarov was sentenced in the case of the 'All-Russian Social-Christian Union' (see *Chronicle* 1) in 1968. P. M. Goryachev also served a sentence under a political article.[41]

* * *

In June it became known that the Vladimir K G B is conducting a case connected with the journal *Veche*. Major P. I. Pleshkov, who is in charge of the case, announced this at an interrogation of Yu. A. Gastev on 8 July. The case number is 38.

* * *

On about 10 July searches were carried out in the *Veche* case in Vladimir region, at the homes of I. V. Ovchinnikov (in Aleksandrov) and V. A. Repnikov (in Strunino).

* * *

Among those interrogated in the *Veche* case in July were: M. P. Rogachev, V. A. Repnikov, A. M. Ivanov, G. N. Bochevarov, P. M. Goryachev and V. E. Konkin. On each occasion the investigation showed interest in the person of V. Osipov; however, there is no information about any attempts to interrogate or charge him personally in the case.

* * *

The 'new editorial board' of *Veche* responded to case No. 38 by announcing on 14 July that the journal had been closed down. S. Melnikova and I. Ovchinnikov also stated orally (the latter to P. Pleshkov, who carried out a search at his home) that the publication of *Veche* had been terminated.

In the Moscow Writers' Organization

The Expulsion of Lydia Chukovskaya from the U S S R Writers' Union

In March 1974 the *Information Bulletin of the Board Secretariat of the U S S R Writers' Union* (an internal publication of the Secretariat) contained the following announcement:

In the Secretariat of the Board of the Moscow Writers' Organization

'At a meeting of the Secretariat of the Board of the Moscow Writers' Organization the disciplinary case of L. K. Chukovskaya was discussed. In the course of the discussion it was established that for a number of years L. K. Chukovskaya had flagrantly violated the basic principles of the Statutes of the U S S R Writers' Union, and had engaged in the fabrication of articles and other materials which had been published in various organs of the press hostile to the Soviet Union. In accordance with the Statutes of the U S S R Writers' Union, a unanimous decision to expel L. K. Chukovskaya from membership of the U S S R Writers' Union was adopted.'

Lydia Korneyevna Chukovskaya is the author of the book *In an Editor's Laboratory* and of numerous historical and literary studies on Herzen, the Decembrists and others. Her critical articles have been published in the Soviet press. Her stories *The Deserted House* (about the year 1937) and *Going Under* have been published abroad and circulate in *samizdat*. Many publicistic *samizdat* essays have been penned by her: 'Letter to Mikhail Sholokhov' (1966), 'Not Punishment, But Thought and the Word' (1969), 'The People's Wrath' (1973), and others.[42]

The Secretariat meeting was preceded by an examination of her case at a meeting of the Bureau of the Union's children's section. A resolution was adopted to request the Secretariat to expel her. At the meeting it was said, in particular, that Chukovskaya had contributed nothing to literature and had been kept in the Union only out of respect for the memory of her father and her brother (Nikolai Chukovsky).

At a preliminary talk with Strekhnin and Mednikov, Lydia Chukovskaya, on her own initiative, without being asked, recounted how she had personally handed a copy of 'The People's Wrath' to an American correspondent after inviting him to her flat; her other writings had made their way abroad spontaneously, through *samizdat*.

The meeting of the Secretariat took place on 9 January 1974. Chukovskaya's case was discussed for about two hours. Narovchatov was in the chair. Yu. Strekhnin delivered the main report. About 20 people were present. Amongst those who spoke were: Lesyuchevsky, Rekemchuk, Yu. Yakovlev, Yu. Zhukov, A. Barto, V. Katayev, N. Gribachev, M. Alekseyev, and A. Mednikov.

As it turned out, nothing was said about 'transmitting materials to the West' during the meeting. The only document read out was L. K. Chukovskaya's written authorization to Zhores Medvedev to receive her royalties; Chukovskaya explained that she needed Western royalties to buy optical aids (Lydia Chukovskaya has very poor sight) and medicines.

As far as is known, no disagreements arose between those who spoke.

Lydia Chukovskaya was given the floor. Her speech is widely known in *samizdat*.[43] She said, in particular: 'Expulsion from the Union finally condemns one to the fate of an unperson. I did not and do not exist. . . .

'But *will* I exist? In performing acts of this kind you have always forgotten, and are forgetting now, that only the present and part of the past is in your hands.

'. . . You cannot rule . . . by virtue of the word; . . . with the word you can captivate, cure, bring happiness, expose, cause anxiety, but not rule. You can rule only by obstructing the word, impeding the word, damming up the word: by withdrawing a book from the publishing plan, from a library, by breaking up the type, by not printing an author, expelling him from the Union, by transferring a book from the 1974 plan to 1976 and appropriating the paper for yourselves, or printing the prose of Filev in a million copies. Those are the sort of actions you rule by.

'. . . What will the expelled people do? Write books. For even prisoners have written and do write books. What will *you* do? Write resolutions.

'Write them.'

The resolution read: 'Expel L. K. Chukovskaya from the Union of Writers with full-scale coverage in the press.'

On 12 January the newspaper *Literary Russia* carried a report of the meeting, enumerating all the agenda items, but with no mention of the discussion of Chukovskaya's case.

On 18 January the newspaper *Soviet Russia* published a satirical article by Yu. Yurchenko called '"Misha Skameikin" from London'* which mentions L. Chukovskaya but not her expulsion from the Writers' Union.

It is known that letters in defence of Chukovskaya were sent to the Writers' Union by I. Varlamova, D. Dar, L. Kopelev, V. Kornilov, V. Maximov, L. Panteleyev, A. Sakharov and A. Solzhenitsyn.

We reproduce the letter from the poet Vladimir Kornilov:

'I have learned that the Moscow Secretariat is intending to expel Lydia Korneyevna Chukovskaya from the Writers' Union — a woman who has always been noted for her honesty, talent and courage. Lydia Korneyevna Chukovskaya suffers severely from a dangerous heart disease and her sight is

*The hero of the article, 'Misha Skameikin', is Michael Scammell, an English journalist and editor of the journal *Index*, which publishes uncensored literature from countries where censorship exists (Greece, Yugoslavia, U S S R, etc.). The *Chronicle* thinks it should comment also on some other names mentioned in this article:

L. Kopelev is a member of the Writers' Union, a member of the P E N Club, and an old friend of A. I. Solzhenitsyn.

V. Sidur is a Moscow sculptor and artist. His portrait of Solzhenitsyn is featured in a New York edition of Solzhenitsyn's works.

Itkind is, in all probability, meant by the author to be the Leningrad literary critic E. Etkind. Concerning Etkind see this issue.

almost gone. And you, who are men, are persecuting a woman whose only defence is her personal fearlessness.

Is this humane? Is it manly?

6 January 1974 **Vladimir Kornilov**

At the end of January V. Kornilov was issued with a reprimand for his defence of Chukovskaya.

Lydia Korneyevna has received about 30 personal letters of sympathy.

The Expulsion of Vladimir Voinovich from the U S S R Writers' Union

A meeting of the bureau of the prose section was arranged several times and cancelled for lack of a quorum: the majority of bureau members failed to appear 'because of illness'. The meeting eventually took place on 30 January 1974. Georgy Radov is in the chair. He makes a brief report:

'In 1968 Voinovich signed a letter in defence of the anti-Sovietists Ginzburg and Galanskov. The Secretariat issued him a reprimand for this.

'In 1969 *The Life and Extraordinary Adventures of Ivan Chonkin* was published [abroad] in *Grani*. He received a severe reprimand and a warning.'

Paderin then asks whether Voinovich has read *GULag Archipelago*.

Voinovich refuses to answer.

Brovman: 'How did the letter to Pankin [see this issue, 'Samizdat News'—*Chronicle*][44] get into *Possev* [an emigré journal]?'

Voinovich: 'The letter was open, so anyone could publish it.'

Radov: 'But didn't you try to publish it in our press?'

Voinovich: 'I sent it to *Komsomolskaya Pravda*. They could have published it.'

The floor is given to Voinovich.

'My letter may seem fantastic but there is no fantasy in it; it decodes what Pankin said in his interview: now the All-Union Agency for Authors' Rights will decide for an author where and what he may publish. As regards my words about Lefortovo or Butyrka prison, Pankin said that authors who publish without going through his Agency can expect "certain consequences"; what that means is well known.

'They want to deprive writers of their last right — the right to dispose of their own manuscripts; perhaps *you* don't need this right, but I do.'

Krasilshchikov says that the nature of his work makes it necessary for him to read all anti-Soviet publications. After mentioning the pretenders to the Tsarist throne, including the false Anastasia, and the computers that forecast the impending demise of the Soviet system, Krasilshchikov moves on to Voinovich: 'Voinovich hedges and twists.' Krasilshchikov prefers the conduct of V. Maximov. He challenges Voinovich: 'Stop hedging and say outright that you're an opponent of our system.'

Voinovich: 'You people do not amount to a system.'

Voinov believes that Voinovich handed over his letter to a foreign correspondent and this was how it got into *Possev*.

Lydia Fomenko asks why Voinovich is so bothered about his rights. She, Fomenko, doesn't bother about her rights . . . 'Dostoyevskyitis . . . An underground man. . . .'

Lesnevsky keeps on calling Voinovich by his first name, 'Volodya'. There is no ready-made decision about his expulsion; Volodya still has time to think about it. Lesnevsky is amazed by Volodya's words that he is not being published. The main thing for a writer is not to be published but to write. The Agency for Authors' Rights is a wonderful organization which will help us to wage a struggle with the West and win. Win with subtlety.

Berezko talks about *Chonkin*. Not one writer has ever portrayed the people satirically.

Voinovich: 'What about Shchedrin?'

Berezko: 'Shchedrin didn't portray the people.'

Voinovich: 'Who are the inhabitants of Foolstown, then?'*

Radov: 'The Foolstown people are bureaucrats.'

Berezko: 'And it's a completely different period now. *Chonkin* is literary hooliganism. . . .'

Korolkov says that the nature of his work makes it necessary for him to have dealings with N T S** . . . He is sure that the letter was written to help Solzhenitsyn.

Brovman: 'Voinovich is addressing his comrades from N T S. . . .' He proposes that Voinovich be expelled from the Writers' Union.

Irina Guro: '. . . The putrid smell of a provocation.'

Voinovich says that he had not himself transmitted his letter directly to the West, but he had been quite sure that it would appear there and had nothing against this.

Amlinsky says that he has always felt respect for Voinovich's creative work . . . If Voinovich now dissociated himself from the letter, it might still be possible to do something . . . nothing has been decided yet.

A. Starikov: '. . . Why does he attack the Agency for Authors' Rights? . . . I don't know what to do. . . .'

Radov (summing up): '. . . Nothing has been decided in advance. . . . We are now giving you the floor. . . . You can still change the situation.'

Voinovich says that he will adhere to his former position. . . . He recalls the trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel, the case of Solzhenitsyn . . . 'I shall now answer Paderin's question. I have not yet read *GULag Archipelago*, but I know Solzhenitsyn, I know his previous works and I trust him, whereas I don't trust you. He is a wonderful writer, he fought in the war, he is a courageous man and a citizen. . . . Think things out, your consciences will sooner or later torment you. Maybe you think you don't have any, but you do, and sooner or later they will torment you.'

Radov reads out some sheets of paper typed in advance. The content is standard, ending with: '. . . recommend expulsion to the Secretariat.'

*A reference to the novel *A History of One Town* by the 19th century writer Saltykov-Shchedrin.

**An anti-Soviet emigré organization based in Paris and Frankfurt.

During the voting it turned out that not only members of the Prose Section's Bureau but also of its so-called 'active group' had been present and voted. Also, two writers who had wanted to come and speak in Voinovich's defence had not been allowed into the meeting.

The expulsion from the Union of Writers was confirmed on 20 February at a meeting of the Secretariat of the Moscow section of the R S F S R Writers' Union. Voinovich did not go to the meeting but sent an open letter to the Secretariat.

The letter discloses the reasons why Voinovich did not attend the Secretariat meeting; these relate both to the circumstances of the meeting, which was announced as being a closed one, and also to the Secretariat itself, its composition and activity.

'We have nothing to say to each other, nothing to argue about,' writes Voinovich, 'because I say what I think, while you say what you are ordered to.'

The Dismissal of E. G. Etkind[45]

Efim Grigorevich Etkind — the well-known Soviet scholar — is a literary critic, a doctor of philology and a professor. He is a secretary of the Leningrad section of the Writers' Union. He is author of the following books: *Poetry and Translation* (1963), *On the Art of Being a Reader* (1964), *A Seminar on French Stylistics* (1965), *French Verse in the Translations of Russian Poets* (1969 and 1973), *A Conversation about Poetry* (1970), *Bertold Brecht* (1971), and *Russian Poet-Translators from Trediakovsky to Pushkin* (1973).

We reproduce extracts from a summary of a document entitled:

Memorandum from the K G B

Etkind came to the notice of the K G B in 1969; he has known Solzhenitsyn for over ten years, met him frequently, given him practical help, and kept libellous works at his own home, including *GULag Archipelago*. He knew Voronyanskaya through Solzhenitsyn. . . . Voronyanskaya testified at an interrogation: 'Solzhenitsyn came to Leningrad in 1971; he handed two copies of *GULag Archipelago* to Etkind, and later Etkind personally brought them to me at my home' . . . In the summer of 1970 Voronyanskaya stayed at Etkind's country cottage. . . .

. . . At the beginning of April this year the K G B initiated a criminal case concerning the circulation of anti-Soviet libellous documents (see this issue, 'Case No. 15' — *Chronicle*). Searches took place at the home of Maramzin and Kheifets, who had published a five-volume edition of Brodsky's verse in *samizdat*; a preface for it written by Kheifets was discovered at his home . . . Etkind's review of the preface, which was also confiscated, contains an approving response to the political aspect of the preface. When interrogated, Etkind testified that he was the author of the review and that he had never concealed his attitude to the events in Czechoslovakia. Kheifets testified that Etkind maintained close relations with J. Brodsky . . .

In March 1964 Etkind's conduct at Brodsky's trial was discussed at a meeting of the secretariat of the Writers' Union, but Etkind would not recognize the harmfulness of his views then either.

Etkind's 'Letter to Young Jews Seeking to Emigrate' also testifies to his harmful activity; it contains appeals to Jews not to leave for another country but to fight for their freedom and civil rights here.

. . . It has been established that Etkind uses his professional position in society to get views that are alien to the Soviet system published in his works. . . . This is how prominent Soviet scholars appraise them.

Doctor of Philology, Professor P. S. Vykhodtsev: 'Etkind's views on poetry . . . in no way coincide with Marxist-Leninist principles.'

Author E. Serebrovskaya, a Master of Letters (on his book *A Conversation About Poetry*): 'In Etkind's work there is no class consciousness, there are no words like 'Motherland' and 'patriotism', no ideological evaluation of poetry.'

Writer A. N. Chepurov writes about the political harmfulness . . . of the article 'Paul Wiens as a Translator of Soviet Poetry' . . . and of the book about Brecht . . .

. . . In 1949 Etkind was dismissed from the Leningrad Institute of Foreign Languages for methodological mistakes in his master's degree dissertation . . .

. . . In 1973-4 various measures were implemented regarding Solzhenitsyn and his circle. However, Etkind did not draw any conclusions for himself. Over a long period Etkind has consciously conducted ideologically harmful and hostile activity. He has operated as a political double-dealer.

* * *

This 'Memorandum' was read aloud at a meeting of the Academic Council on 25 April 1974 by the rector of the Herzen Pedagogical Institute in Leningrad, A. D. Boborykin.

He noted that this was not the first time the Academic Council was engaging in a discussion about Professor Etkind. In 1968 the Academic Council had cautioned Etkind in connection with a political error he had committed: in an introductory article to the two-volume *Masters of Russian Verse Translation* Etkind had written: 'Deprived of the possibility of complete self-expression in their original creative work, Russian poets — especially between the 17th and 20th party congresses — conversed with the reader in the words of Goethe, Shakespeare, Orbeliani and Hugo.'

Etkind did not attend the meeting, as he was ill. But his letter to the Academic Council was read out. In the letter Etkind recalls that he has been at the Institute for 23 years, engaging in teaching and working as hard as possible. Etkind writes that he has handed in his resignation, but asks it to be taken into consideration that the 'main line of my conduct cannot be illustrated by two or three tactless phrases written in private letters and on private matters — yet it is precisely from documents of this type that the incriminating expressions have been extracted.'

Then the question of Etkind's removal from the post of professor was discussed:

'Etkind is an anti-Soviet renegade and double-dealer . . . He has not left for Israel but conducted his politics more subtly . . . He should be expelled from the Institute and deprived of his academic title and degree' (Prof. A. I. Domashnev, dean of the faculty of foreign languages, head of the department of German philology).

'. . . What we have heard today is an expression of Jewish nationalism turned inside out . . .' (A. Merzon, a woman philosophy teacher).

'. . . an ideological saboteur . . . an inner Solzhenitsyn . . . Etkind doesn't have two different stools: he sits in a single chair — Solzhenitsyn's chair . . .' (P. L. Ivanov, professor, philosophy department).

'. . . Etkind should be advised to take himself off after Solzhenitsyn . . .' (Prof. Kulba, head of the department of inorganic chemistry).

'. . . He has become the spiritual father of young anti-Sovietists, the distributors of *samizdat* . . . there is no place for him among Soviet pedagogues . . .' (Prof. I. S. Eventov, department of Soviet literature, member of the Union of Writers).

'. . . There is no place for the ideological saboteur Etkind in our ranks . . . Etkind has been giving a course on French literature . . ., the question of whether to give this course at all must be discussed . . .' (Prof. R. G. Piotrovsky, head of the department of French language).

'. . . These are the tactics of an enemy. He has held firmly to his position for a long time, beginning in 1949 and ending in the '70s when evolution inevitably united him with scum like Solzhenitsyn, Kheifets, Brodsky and others . . . On the basis of the new directives of the Higher Degrees Commission we have the right to deprive Etkind of the academic title of professor . . .[40]

'As for his academic degree, that is a matter for the Academic Council which awarded the degree to decide . . .' (Prof. Yu.V. Kozhukhov, corresponding member of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, pro-rector for research work, department of U S S R history).

Rector Boborykin, in summing up the debate, noted that an accurate evaluation had been given and that emphasis had been put in the right places.

The proposal to dismiss Etkind from the post of professor at the Leningrad Pedagogical Institute was put to the vote. There were 57 for, not a single one against, and no abstentions.

The proposal to urge the Higher Degrees Commission to deprive Etkind of the title of professor was put to the vote. There were 57 for, not a single one against, and no abstentions.

On the same day Etkind was expelled from the Writers' Union.

On 3 May Etkind wrote a 'Statement for the Press'. He says:

'. . . Yes, I know Solzhenitsyn. Yes, I did speak as a witness at the trial of Joseph Brodsky and to the best of my ability helped the young poet to publish the translations which supplied him with a crust of bread. Yes, I did write books and articles in which I tried to express my views on French literature, Russian poetry and German drama. I did all this in the firm conviction that I was promoting the growth of my country's culture, for which I live. In devoting myself to the theory and history of artistic translation I was quite sure that I was promoting friendship between the peoples who speak the Russian, French and German languages . . .

'. . . My generation remembers well the meetings of the year 1949; at that time the best professors, our teachers, were driven out of the universities, and the best writers out of literature. I am not comparing myself with them. But my generation will not forget till their dying day the blood-thirsty unanimity with which orators at such meetings branded Zhirmunsky, Eikhenbaum, Azadovsky and Gukovsky and demanded their immediate removal from Leningrad University . . .

'. . . A revival of the year 1949 might seem impossible.

'Alas, it is not only possible but as easy as anything! Professors, writers and poets have known their colleague for many years, but they are told that their colleague is a political criminal and they hasten to believe it . . . They are told that he committed "methodological errors" in 1949 and they don't ponder what an absurdity they have been told: they don't hear the date "1949", only the habitually frightening words about errors, and they agree to his civil execution . . . And they perform the execution unanimously. Unanimity was a necessary condition of the proceedings in that distant age as well.

'But, one would think, a quarter of a century later a new public consciousness should have developed, a civic self-awareness should have been cultivated in people. Is it possible that we can be thrown back 25 years so easily?

'Is it possible that people don't accumulate historical experience? That they have been taught nothing by, at least, *Novy mir*, if by nothing else? That they have forgotten the poetry by Tvardovsky, the repentant articles of Simonov, the suicide of Fadeyev, the rebirth from the ashes of Bulgakov, Babel, Mandelshtam, Akhmatova and many others? Is it possible today, in 1974, to utilize the arguments used then, and provoke general approval by making references to the year 1949?

'No, I believe in progress, in a new public consciousness, in the growth of civic self-awareness. I believe that no one will succeed in throwing our country back 25 years. And also, I still believe in the democratic forces of the contemporary world.'

Extra-Judicial Persecution

Volkov and Golubev, students of the Latvian State University (physics and maths faculty) listened to and recorded on tape some excerpts from Solzhenitsyn's book *GULag Archipelago*, broadcast by a foreign radio station. They then reproduced the recording for their colleagues.

They have been expelled from the Komsomol and the university.

* * *

V. Kanarsky, O. Bugai and A. Lenkin, students of the Leningrad Polytechnic Institute (engineering and cybernetics faculty, 5th year) have been expelled from the institute for irreverent utterances about the physical appearance of

L. I. Brezhnev during a television programme.

A teacher of social sciences, Kozhan, denounced them. The Komsomol committee censured them for 'political hooliganism'. Although a general student meeting did not support the censure, the students were expelled at the request of the Komsomol committee (order No. 88 of 16 April this year).

* * *

At the end of May 1974 two 15-year-olds, Tomas Čepaitis and Ramunas Abukevičius from the S. Neris secondary school in Vilnius, were expelled for inscribing on a brief-case: 'Russians, go home!' Some poems about the self-immolation of R. Kalanta [see *Chronicles* 26, 27] also contributed to their expulsion.

The boys were advised to 'repent', but they refused.

The reasons given for their expulsion were 'drunkenness', 'smoking', etc.

Abukevičius's father was dismissed from work.

* * *

A teacher at the Moscow Institute of Engineering Technology and a Master of Physical-Mathematical Science, the mathematician M. I. Grabar [see *Chronicle* 2], has been compelled to leave his job 'at his own request'. At the beginning of April this year the deputy rector of the Institute warned Grabar that his appointment would not be renewed and advised him not to try and find a new teaching post.

The previous summer Grabar had been summoned to an interrogation in the case of Bolonkin (see *Chronicles* 29 and 30). Bolonkin testified that he had taken some book published by *Possev* from a book-shelf in Grabar's house without his knowledge. Grabar stated that he was not familiar with any books published by *Possev* and that if such a book really had been in his house he knew nothing about it.

Grabar was allowed to teach his students through till the end of the term.

In May of this year an assistant lecturer, Makarevsky, was dismissed from the Bauman Higher Technical College in Moscow. At the departmental meeting at which the question of his dismissal was discussed, the basic pretexts voiced concerned Makarevsky's involvement in the case of Bolonkin. Materials from the Bolonkin case referring to Makarevsky had been sent to the Institute from the court or the K G B. (To judge by these materials, Bolonkin testified that he kept his *samizdat* at Makarevsky's. Makarevsky denied this during the investigation.)

Other reasons for Makarevsky's dismissal are of a professional nature.

Konovaltsev, who was also interrogated in the Bolonkin case, has been dismissed from the Moscow Institute of Aeronautical Engineering.

It is known that at his trial Bolonkin retracted all the evidence he had given during the investigation (see *Chronicle* 30).

* * *

In April 1974 Alexander Ginzburg, and in May Anatoly Marchenko, who both live in Tarusa, Kaluga region, were placed under police surveillance — the former for six months and the latter for a year. The conditions of the surveillance are: they are forbidden to go beyond the boundaries of their district (and the district boundary passes a few hundred metres from where they live), to visit the Palace of Culture (which houses the only cinema in the town), and to go out of the house after eight o'clock at night; they are obliged to register with the police weekly; etc.

In the event of any infringement of the surveillance rules they face the threat of imprisonment under article 198-2 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. As early as May Ginzburg was summoned to court for the imposition of a fine for failing to register. A penalty was not imposed, as it turned out that he had been ill and this was confirmed by documents.

Ginzburg's family and Marchenko's family live in Moscow; Ginzburg and Marchenko are not able to live in Moscow under the regulations of the residence permit system, and now that surveillance has been imposed they are deprived of the opportunity of visiting their families.

Ginzburg is a friend of Solzhenitsyn's family and has his power of attorney. He is authorized by Solzhenitsyn to give material assistance to prisoners and their families on behalf of the writer and using his funds (see *A Chronicle of Human Rights*, No. 8).

Marchenko is the author of several open letters and statements, and he signed the 'Moscow Appeal' (see this issue).

The 'Surveillance Regulations' allow either, 'in essential cases', for the term of surveillance prescribed to be *extended* for six months at a time until the expiry of the period that the original conviction remains 'on the record' [i.e. the same period as the original sentence]; or for surveillance to be instituted not later than three years after release (see the Decree of the Praesidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet dated 26 July 1966, *Gazette of the Supreme Soviet*, 1966, No. 30).

The reimposition of surveillance after a break is not provided for by law, yet Ginzburg and Marchenko had already been under surveillance after their release from imprisonment, and this had been terminated in accordance with the law.

Ginzburg protested against the new period of surveillance, in the manner prescribed by law, but no reply had come from the procurator of Kaluga region after more than two months.[47]

Marchenko wrote a statement for the press regarding the surveillance (see this issue).

From the Soviet Press

On 15 April 1974 the newspaper *Tbilisi* published an article by the third secretary of the Tbilisi Komsomol City Committee, N. Lekishvili, and a correspondent of the newspaper, A. Shengeliya, 'Lighted Candles and a Forgotten Debt'. It says that although the Soviet Constitution proclaims freedom of conscience,

it is impossible to reconcile oneself to the fact that young people, and Komsomol members in particular, take part in the religious festival of Easter. The article mentions the names of about 30 young people who visited churches in Tbilisi during Easter 1974.

The article does not say, however, that the Easter ceremony was also visited by officials from the staff of the Tbilisi city party committee and from district Komsomol committees. Amongst these officials were N. Lekishvili, secretaries of Komsomol district committees, N. Bichiashvili, Tsiuri Korshiya and B. Kadagidze, and the head of the sports section of the city Komsomol committee, O. Baratashvili. The Komsomol officials themselves lit candles and 'prayed'. N. Lekishvili, for example, conducted himself in this way. Other Komsomol officials stood in the street, lying in wait for when young people left the church, at which point the latter were asked to go along to a people's volunteer police office, where a police official would take down their particulars.

The following episode is also known:

A young woman came out of the Zion Church with a year-old baby in her arms. Beside the volunteer police office her path was barred by Ts. Korshiya [a woman], who asked her to come into the office. The woman refused. Then the child was snatched out of her arms and she was forcibly dragged into the office. She began to shout and one of the passers-by intervened on her behalf. After that the child was brought back and the woman went away.

In a private conversation Komsomol officials admitted that they themselves were unhappy about their actions, but believed that they had no alternative.

The Case of Victor Mikhailovich Ilinov

On 21 March 1974 the newspaper *Youth of Georgia* (the organ of the central committee of the Komsomol of Georgia) printed an article, 'A Man with a Split Personality', about Victor Mikhailovich Ilinov, a resident of the town of Ochamchire in Georgia. Ilinov is a joiner, stove-maker and roofer; he is also the presbyter of a local community of schismatic Baptists,[48] and during a search at his flat theological literature was confiscated. The article calls Ilinov an 'enemy of the people'; he was charged with the fact that services conducted by him were attended by adults and children, who listened to the sermons and sang psalms; also with the fact that he had advised his son and other children not to join the Pioneers. At an interrogation Ilinov's son answered that he would not serve in the army because he did not want to kill people.

Ilinov was sentenced to four years' imprisonment.

To Start Life Anew

Vladimir Dremlyuga (see *Chronicles* 3, 4, 17), one of the participants in the demonstration on Red Square on 25 August 1968 against the sending of troops into Czechoslovakia, was sentenced to three years of ordinary-regime camps under articles 190-1 and 190-3 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. He served his sentence in Yakutia. In the summer of 1971 Dremlyuga was sentenced to a second term (see *Chronicles* 20, 21); he was given another three years for 'deliberately false, slanderous utterances that defame the Soviet political and social system' (article 190-1) and transferred to a strict-regime camp. About 30 witnesses who were prisoners in the camp with Dremlyuga were interrogated in the case. They testified that Dremlyuga had conducted 'anti-Soviet conversations' with them. There are grounds to suppose that Dremlyuga did in fact share his ideas with one of the witnesses, but he was not even acquainted with many of the other so-called 'witnesses'. Soon afterwards, many of the witnesses were released before their sentences were up.

In June 1974 Dremlyuga was freed on parole, 1½ months before the end of his sentence.

The newspaper *Socialist Yakutia* of 9 June 1974 featured an article about V. Dremlyuga by I. Voronov, 'To Start Life Anew'. This article is reproduced in full below.

To Start Life Anew

His biographical particulars are as follows: Vladimir Aleksandrovich Dremlyuga, born in 1940. Place of birth — Saratov. Family status — married. No children. Serving a sentence on a second conviction. He has been in places of imprisonment since 1968.

We received this information later on, from his case file and other documents, but at first it was not without surprise and, it must be confessed, a certain mistrust that we read a letter from prisoner Vladimir Dremlyuga, permeated with pain about his past, which begins:

'Dear Editor,

'Whilst in imprisonment I have subjected my past life and activity to an extremely thorough analysis and have tried to gain an understanding and make an objective appraisal of my actions, for which I have twice been tried as a criminal.

'I should like to share my thoughts on the pages of your newspaper.

'I am 34. It is difficult to start life anew at such an age, and even more difficult to change one's views and habits and to renounce the aberrations which until recently I thought to be my beliefs. Nevertheless, I have found within myself the strength to admit and state openly that I have profoundly realized and fully recognized the mistakenness of the position which I adopted earlier, the incorrectness of the actions I performed, their harm to the Soviet people and their incompatibility with its ideas, views and policies. Hard as it may be, I want to admit openly the justice of the legal judgments pronounced on me . . .'

Over and over again we leaf through the official documents of the corrective-labour institutions — the references, reports and petitions — and try to discover the first obstacle against which the author of the letter stumbled.

Perhaps it was in 1964 when, as a student at Leningrad University, he was expelled during his second year for unworthy conduct, or later, in 1968. It was about this time that Vladimir Dremlyuga — stoker, driver and, lastly, mechanic in charge of a gas boiler-room — came to the attention of P. Yakir and V. Krasin. It was not difficult for them to mould out of a failed student a figure like themselves, someone who was willing to oblige in executing their will.

Yet, Vladimir Dremlyuga made a good start to his life in Melitopol. The workers' collective in the Vorovsky factory cordially welcomed yesterday's schoolboy into its midst, and helped him to master the subtleties of the profession of pattern-cutter. His comrades envied him in a kindly way when the factory apprentice went from his machine to university.

'. . . In condemning my past, I state with full responsibility that if it were possible to start life anew, then never, under any circumstances, would I again be amongst those who took part in the escapade which happened in 1968. This assertion has been provoked not by a passing pang of regret and not by the fear of any new punishment but because I have fully realized and recognized the harmfulness of such activity to the Soviet people, its incompatibility with the interests and opinions of society . . . Nor would I repeat the second mistake, when, without having comprehended what had happened, without having appraised it dispassionately and objectively, and at the same time believing myself to have been undeservedly wronged by the organs of Soviet authority, I continued to permit myself to express politically unhealthy and harmful opinions in imprisonment, for which I was sentenced a second time under article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code.

'The sincerity of my letter should not be doubted, as the writing of it is a purely voluntary act. I should like to add to this statement that what mainly influenced the change in my views and the formation of new convictions . . . were the materials from the trial of Krasin and Yakir, who adhered in the past to positions similar to mine . . .

'In conclusion, I wish to assure the Soviet people and its organs of authority that henceforth I shall not devote myself to anti-social activity and shall never find myself on the side of the enemies of the socialist state. By my honest labour and exemplary conduct I shall attempt to prove that I am no longer a man lost to society and that I can be a useful and needed member of it.

Vladimir Dremlyuga.'

We have chatted with the administration of the corrective-labour institution and with people who have observed Dremlyuga's behaviour for a number of years and done everything to return him to honest creative labour. No, it was not fear of the future that brought Vladimir Dremlyuga to the conclusion that he had to admit his guilt and repent of his crimes, but rather his awareness of the harmfulness of the actions he had committed, an awareness that came to him after deep reflection and a reinterpretation of the past. And the petition handed over to the judicial organs by the administration of the corrective-labour institutions, requesting the premature release of Vladimir Dremlyuga, was fully justified.

I. Voronov, our correspondent.

* * *

A facsimile of the last paragraph of Dremlyuga's letter to the editors was printed alongside the article.

The background to Dremlyuga's release and the article in *Socialist Yakutia* is as follows.

As early as November last year Dremlyuga discovered that his camp mates were again being summoned to interrogations concerning him. At that time, in November and December, a representative of the Procuracy arrived at the camp and informed Dremlyuga that another criminal case under article 190-1 for 'oral agitation in the camp' had been instituted against him. This man, or another representative of authority, suggested to Dremlyuga that he write a statement of repentance for his actions. Dremlyuga did this. After a time he was told that the text he had composed was unsatisfactory and it was suggested that he sign another text. Dremlyuga did this also.

During the winter and spring of 1974 many visitors came to see Dremlyuga in the camp, from the chairman of the K G B for the Yakut Autonomous Republic down to journalists from *Socialist Yakutia*. It was at that time that Dremlyuga's letter to the editors was composed.

After his release Dremlyuga was given a residence permit for Melitopol, where his mother lives. He was advised, on his way there, to call in on a K G B official, whose name is not known to the *Chronicle*, in Moscow.

Having arrived in Moscow, Dremlyuga did not go anywhere. Then, at the beginning of July, they came to fetch him from the flat of N. P. Lisovskaya, where he was staying, and invited him to go and see the above-mentioned figure. Chatting with Dremlyuga, this K G B official advised him to leave for Melitopol as quickly as possible and even assisted him in buying tickets for the train. During this conversation he advised Dremlyuga not to call in on Academician Sakharov, as the latter was 'not quite right in the head'. On 11 July Dremlyuga left for Melitopol.

It has become known that Vladimir Dremlyuga intends to leave the U S S R [see *Chronicle* 34].

News in Brief

Reports of the arrest of [Vladimir] **Vylegzhanin,** [Alexander] **Zaritsky** and [Yury] **Lifshits** in Kiev in November 1973 have been confirmed. They have been charged under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (corresponding to article 70 of the R S F S R Code).[49] Evidently case number 62 was initiated specifically in connection with their arrest.

A number of searches have been carried out in connection with case 62.

* * *

At eight o'clock in the morning on 17 January 1974 a search was started in the flat of **Tatyana Zhitnikova** in connection with case 62, 'with the aim of confiscating anti-Soviet libellous literature'. The search warrant was issued on the instructions of the deputy chairman of the Ukrainian K G B, Major-General Troyak. The search was conducted by investigator Berestovsky, who had earlier interrogated T. Zhitnikova in the case of P. Yakir.

Confiscated were:[50] 1) a film of the letters of T. Zhitnikova's husband L. Plyushch from a special psychiatric hospital; 2) L. Plyushch"s article 'The Ethical Approach'; 3) A. Tverdokhlebov's statement about Plyushch; 4) V. Nekrasov's book *Pages of a Life* (published in the U S S R); 5) a tape of songs by Yu. Kim.

Zhitnikova signed the search record but protested against the confiscation of Nekrasov's book and the film of Plyushch's letters on the grounds that they were documents with no relation to any 'case'.

The search lasted until 14.00 hours.

* * *

The same day a search was started in Kiev, in the same case, at the home of the writer **V. Nekrasov.** The search began at eight o'clock in the morning and ended at two o'clock at night on 19 January, i.e. it lasted 42 hours.

The whole of Nekrasov's archive was confiscated from him, including all the writer's manuscripts of uncompleted (or completed but unpublished) works. The search record is 60 pages long.

Friends of Nekrasov who came to see him during the search — **Zhitnikova** and **Raigorodetsky,**[51] for example — were subjected to body searches. Nothing was found on Zhitnikova, but a book was confiscated from Raigorodetsky; in both cases a search record was drawn up. (Subsequently a search was carried out at Raigorodetsky's flat.)

Two other friends of Nekrasov who called on him during the search were invited to get into a car and go for a 'chat'. During one of these 'chats' it was stated that Nekrasov's fate lay entirely in his hands — let him choose for himself 'on which side of the barricades he is to be found'.

After the search V. Nekrasov was repeatedly summoned to interrogations.

* * *

Yury Lekhtgolts has been subjected to a search under case No. 62.

* * *

Searches have been carried out in Moscow under case 62, in particular at the home of **Nikolai Bokov** on 25 January. The first volume of the American edition of Mandelshtam's poems was confiscated. Major Korkach, who was leading the search, declared: 'I'd gladly flog people for reading Mandelshtam.'

After the search N. K. Bokov was interrogated several times in connection with case 62.[52]

* * *

On 22 March the writer **V. Nekrasov,** who was visiting Moscow, was forced to leave for Kiev under police compulsion.

* * *

On 10 July 1974 **Mark Isaakovich Raigorodetsky,** a teacher of Russian language and literature, who had been arrested on 28 May, was sentenced in Kiev to two years of camps under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (corresponding to article 190-1 of the R S F S R Code). Details of the trial are not known.

* * *

Vladimir Kislyak, a Master of Chemical Science, has been dismissed from his job after applying for an exit visa. He is working as a watchman at a boat station in Kiev. His wife and child have received permission to emigrate and left; Kislyak has been refused permission 'for policy reasons'.

In June Kislyak was in Moscow for several days on business; he returned to Kiev on 17 June. At two o'clock on the night of 18 to 19 June he was beaten up by four strangers armed with truncheons. As they beat him they said: 'Don't go to Moscow, you bastard, don't dare go to Moscow.'

* * *

The fiancée [Tatyana Chernysheva] **of Alexander Feldman** (see *Chronicle* 30 and this issue) was summoned to a police-station on 21 June 1974 and asked: did she really want to register her marriage with Feldman? What nationality was Feldman? What nationality was she herself? Was she intending to leave the U S S R together with Feldman?

In conclusion they got her to sign a statement that she would not go out of Kiev before the end of June.

* * *

In Riga the investigation is continuing into the case of **L. A. Ladyzhensky,** charged under article 65 of the Latvian Criminal Code (corresponding to article 70 of the R S F S R Code) (see *Chronicle* 30).

L. A. Ladyzhensky is a mathematician who before his arrest was in charge of an A S U [?] laboratory of the Baltic Scientific Research Institute for the Fishing Industry; earlier he taught at Riga University. He has published many works on mathematics.

On 6 December 1973 a search which lasted all night was carried out at his home (Ladyzhensky has a large library with a unique collection of material on Pasternak). About 50 titles were confiscated during the search, including the *Chronicle of Current Events*. On the same day about ten other searches were carried out in Riga with the aim of confiscating literature.

On 7 December Ladyzhensky was arrested.

F.Ya. Korovin, summoned to an interrogation as a witness in Ladyzhensky's case, was arrested a few days later.

Ladyzhensky was called as a witness at the trial of G. Superfin (see this issue). He testified that he had translated a work by Kolakowski (Kolakowski

is an independent-minded Polish Marxist). It may be supposed that in addition to this translation Ladyzhensky is charged with circulating *samizdat*, in particular the *Chronicle of Current Events*. The Moscow mathematicians V. A. Borovikov, F. A. Kabakov and Margulis were interrogated in the case of Ladyzhensky.

At several interrogations witnesses were shown a statement by Ladyzhensky which said that he wanted them to confirm his evidence and that disavowal by witnesses would not mitigate his lot; he also spoke about this at a confrontation with one of the witnesses.

* * *

On 16 May a search was carried out at the home of **Leonid Tymchuk** in Odessa. The formal grounds were that L. Tymchuk was suspected of harbouring a television set that had been stolen in Zaporozhe. They looked for the television amongst his books and papers. The 'Moscow Appeal' (see this issue, 'Deportation of Solzhenitsyn') was confiscated.

After the search Tymchuk was summoned to an interrogation; he was read out a 'Caution' (see this issue — 'An Unpublished Decree').

L. Tymchuk, a sailor, supported the appeal of 1968, 'To World Public Opinion', by L. Bogoraz and P. Litvinov [see *Chronicle* 1]. At present he is the legally authorized representative of Nina Antonovna Strokata, a political prisoner (see *Chronicles* 25, 28, 30 and this issue — 'In the Prisons and Camps').

Leonid Tymchuk has informed the authors of the 'Moscow Appeal' that, when the police found a copy of the text at his home, he put his signature on it.

* * *

On 3 May 1974 A. I. Solzhenitsyn stated to a correspondent of *Time* magazine that there was information that the K G B had carried out a search at the home of his friend **Natalya Radugina** in Ryazan shortly after his deportation. The purpose of the search, in Solzhenitsyn's opinion, was the confiscation of *samizdat* copies of his works.

* * *

The priest of the Church of St Nicholas in Moscow, **Father Dmitry Dudko,** has been dismissed.[53] This was preceded by a directive from Patriarch Pimen that Father Dmitry be transferred to a church well removed from the capital and under the authority of Metropolitan Serafim of Krutitsy and Kolomenskoye (Serafim was the *only* hierarch of the Russian Orthodox Church to approve publicly the expulsion of Solzhenitsyn — *Chronicle*). In a sharply-worded letter to Patriarch Pimen, Father Dmitry refused to comply with the proposed transfer. Subsequently Father Dmitry expressed his apologies in writing for what, according to Church rules, was his inadmissible tone in addressing the Patriarch. However, in the middle of May an order for his dismissal followed.

Some people believe that the real reason for Father Dudko's removal was the dialogues he had been holding with his parishioners on Saturdays since the autumn of 1973 — something in the nature of 'question and answer evenings'. Many young people, including students, had been coming to these dialogues, and this had provoked the displeasure of the Soviet authorities.

Father Dudko was a prisoner in the Stalinist camps.

* * *

On 28 June, during the visit to Moscow of President Nixon, the Moscow litterateur **Pyotr Oreshkin** was arrested on the street and forcibly interned in a psychiatric hospital.

At the police station where he was at first taken, the district psychiatrist (evidently specially summoned to the police-station for this purpose) asked Oreshkin some questions: Was he interested in politics? Was he dissatisfied with any Soviet policies? Did he not expect that there would be some changes as a result of Nixon's visit? Did he read the journal *Abroad* and how did he interpret the material printed in this journal? After this, Oreshkin was sent to Psychiatric Hospital No. 15 in Moscow.

Oreshkin graduated from the Moscow Literary Institute in 1962; after this he worked on the staff of the journal *Technology for the Young* and as an assistant director of the Mosfilm studios.

* * *

Yavas, Mordovian Autonomous Republic. The director of the administration of the Dubrovlag complex (institution ZhKh 385), **Colonel Osipov,** has been promoted: he has been appointed deputy minister in the Mordovian Ministry of Internal Affairs. The name of the new director of the camp complex is not yet known to the *Chronicle.*

* * *

Barashevo, Mordovian Autonomous Republic. According to unverified information, **Mikhail Vasilevich Ershov** has died here in institution ZhKh 385/3 (evidently in the medical zone).

Ershov belonged to the so-called 'True Orthodox Church'.[54] The following is reported about him: he had served about 40 (forty) years, had four convictions, the last one under articles 58-8 and 58-11, for which he had been sentenced to 25 years. He had been in camps 1, 10 and 3 in Dubrovlag. He died on 4 June 1974. Age unknown.

Ershov refused to repent and to recognize the official church.

* * *

In March 1974 the orientalist **Vyacheslav Platonov** (case of the All-Russian Social-Christian Union, articles 70 and 72 of the R S F S R Criminal Code, sentenced to seven years, see *Chronicle* 1) was released from the Perm camps upon completion of his sentence.

V. Platonov has settled in Tartu.

* * *

In April 1974 the Leningrad mathematician **R. Pimenov** completed his term of exile. He was arrested and convicted under article 190-1 in 1970 together with B. Vail (see *Chronicles* 16, 17, 22, 25, 30).

* * *

In May 1974 **Ivan Filaretovich Danilyuk** [a Baptist] was arrested in Ryazan. He was charged under article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code.

Danilyuk's address: Ryazan, ul. Gogolya, d. 3, kv. 34.

* * *

Three pupils from the ninth year in Tbilisi secondary school No. 24 — **Ustiashvili, Vashakidze** and **Ugrekhelidze** — were arrested in early March 1974. They were suspected of having pasted 'anti-Soviet' posters on a building of the district party committee. (According to certain information, the posters said something about Solzhenitsyn.) In addition, they were charged with writing a letter to the editorial board of the newspaper *Kommunist* demanding an explanation as to why there was no freedom of thought and expression in our country.

The boys were released during the second half of March; they are continuing to study at school.

There is information that the director of school No. 12, and also one of the parents of the schoolboys named, have been removed from their jobs.

* * *

Literary critic **Leri Alimonaki** (works in the Bureau of Translators at the Georgian Union of Writers) was summoned to the K G B in Tbilisi in early April 1974. He was interrogated by investigator Giorgobiani. The investigator said that he had information against Alimonaki from his former place of work (the Film Hire Agency, director Ch. Amiredzhibi), according to which Alimonaki often sought in conversations to justify Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn, was indignant about the Russification of Georgia, etc.

The investigator threatened Alimonaki with arrest and a charge under article 206-1 of the Georgian Criminal Code (corresponding to article 190-1 of the R S F S R Code) if such incidents recurred.

* * *

On the night of 4 to 5 July the Moscow mathematician and logician **Yu. A. Gastev** was subjected to a search in his room in the Tbilisi hotel 'Sakartvelo'. Gastev had arrived in Tbilisi the day before to take part in a symposium on cybernetics. The search was conducted by a senior investigator for especially important cases, Major I. V. Tsintsadze, and other officials of the Georgian K G B (five men in all) in connection with 'the investigation of case No. 18, initiated by the K G B administration for Vladimir region'. They were looking for 'anti-Soviet literature'. *Samizdat* (in part *tamizdat**) and personal papers were confiscated. While they were searching they tried to engage Gastev in 'conversation' ('Where did you put the rest? We know this isn't everything!'; 'Where were you last night?'; 'Whom do you know in Tbilisi?'; 'Why aren't you a sincere man? It makes no difference, you'll tell us everything tomorrow, like they all do!', and so on). The deputy chief of the operations squad of the Tbilisi K G B, L. V. Shanidze (not mentioned in the search record), was particularly energetic.

After the search Gastev was not allowed out of the hotel until two o'clock in the afternoon. All who came to see him were detained; two were questioned on the spot and two were driven to the K G B for interrogation.

The same night another search was carried out in Tbilisi, without result. In the morning the owner of the searched flat was taken to the K G B for interrogation; Shanidze conducted the interrogation.

On 5 July at three o'clock in the afternoon a search got under way at Gastev's Moscow flat; it was conducted by 'officials of a department of the K G B attached to the U S S R Council of Ministers' B. B. Karatayev, V. I. Ryazanov and A. M. Smirnov, in the presence of two witnesses who lived at the other end of Moscow. The search warrant had been issued by the Vladimir K G B; the head of the investigations group is Lieutenant-Colonel P. F. Evseyev. Personal papers, letters and *samizdat* were confiscated. The search lasted until 12 o'clock at night.

On 8 July Gastev was interrogated in the Vladimir K G B offices by senior investigator Major P. I. Pleshkov, who is in charge of 'investigation case No. 38 on the publication and circulation of the illegal journal *Veche* and other anti-Soviet literature' (according to Pleshkov, the case — formerly case No. 18 — 'is being conducted under article 70'). The investigator was interested in whether Gastev was familiar and 'maintained a link' with V. N. Osipov, G. N. Bochevarov, P. M. Goryachev and V. E. Konkin (see this issue), and also in the source of the papers confiscated from him (described by Pleshkov as 'anti-Soviet' and 'ideologically harmful'). Gastev declared that he had nothing to do with either the publication or the circulation of *Veche*, and that he regarded neither *Veche* nor the confiscated papers as criminal; he refused to answer questions about where he had obtained them [see also *Chronicles* 34, 35].

*I.e. *samizdat* literature which has been published over there, '*tam*', in the West, and then brought back into the U S S R.

* * *

On 5 July 1974 the musicologist **Merab Ivanovich Kostava,** a member of the Tbilisi Initiative Group for Human Rights, was detained in the hotel 'Sakartvelo' in Tbilisi and taken to the K G B (the *Chronicle* had no previous knowledge of an Initiative Group in Tbilisi).

Kostava was interrogated by the head of the operations department, Major Otar Tskaroveli, and the deputy chairman of the Georgian K G B, Colonel Zardalishvili. They were interested in whether Kostava was acquainted with Yury Gastev, Valentina Pailodze (see this issue) and Zviad Gamsakhurdiya. Kostava confirmed his acquaintance with the last two. He refused to answer several other questions. During the conversation the K G B officials conducted themselves politely and correctly.

* * *

On 18 March **P. Litvinov** and his wife **M. Rusakovskaya** left the U S S R.

On 25 August 1968 P. Litvinov, together with L. Bogoraz, N. Gorbanevskaya, V. Fainberg, K. Babitsky, V. Dremlyuga and V. Delone, took part in a demonstration on Red Square against the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet troops.

P. Litvinov had signed numerous letters of protest against the violation of human rights in the U S S R.

He is one of the authors of the 'Moscow Appeal' (see this issue).

* * *

On 28 March **B. Shragin** and his wife **N. Sadomskaya** left the U S S R. B. Shragin is the author of many petitions in defence of human rights in the U S S R and also one of the authors of the 'Moscow Appeal'.

* * *

On 11 April **Galina Gabai,** the widow of I. Gabai, left the U S S R.

* * *

After long ordeals (see *Chronicle* 26, *A Chronicle of Human Rights* 1-5, 7, 9) husband and wife **V. Panov** and **G. Rogozina,** artists of the Kirov theatre of opera and ballet in Leningrad, obtained exit visas for Israel.

* * *

The son and parents of physicist **A. Voronel** (see this issue) left for Israel in December 1973 and March 1974 respectively.

* * *

On 25 June 1974 the well-known dramatist and songwriter **Alexander Galich** left the U S S R. His songs were the reason why he was expelled from the U S S R Writers' Union in 1971 (see *Chronicles* 23, 24). In addition to this, Galich is known as the author of a letter in defence of V. Bukovsky and other letters of protest.[55]

* * *

On 15 March 1974 the writer **V. Maximov** left the U S S R for a protracted period. *Chronicle* No. 29 wrote about his expulsion from the Union of Writers. Several collections of Maximov's tales and stories have appeared in the U S S R. His novels *The Seven Days of Creation* and *Quarantine* are well known in *samizdat.*[56]

* * *

At the end of May the famous cellist, professor of the Moscow Conservatoire, Lenin prize winner and People's Artist of the U S S R, **Mstislav Rostropovich,** left the U S S R for extended tours abroad. Later his wife, the singer and People's Artist of the U S S R, **Galina Vishnevskaya,** also left. His friendship with A. Solzhenitsyn and interventions in his defence were at one time the cause of serious unpleasantness for Rostropovich.

* * *

Alexander Uchitel (Ryazan), who served a four-year term of imprisonment (Saratov-Ryazan case, 1970, see *Chronicle* 12), has handed in documents for an exit visa to Israel and received a refusal. The reasons for the refusal are that he has a conviction, that his period of police surveillance has not yet expired, and also that he is registered in his passport as a Russian.

A. Uchitel reports that he declared a hunger strike on 4 May 1974, demanding permission to leave.

* * *

The fifth and sixth issues of the unofficially published almanac *Jews in the U S S R* have appeared in Moscow.[57]

* * *

The Khronika Press publishing-house has issued the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth numbers of the *A Chronicle of Human Rights in the U S S R.*

Pavel Litvinov is named amongst the editors of the eighth number.

* * *

On 17 May 1974, after examining the appropriate documents, the Consular Section of the U S Embassy in Moscow recognized that the **mother of Simas Kudirka,** Marija Jono Šulskiene, was a U S citizen from birth, and

presented her with an American passport.

It is reported that competent authorities in Washington are examining the possibility of recognizing S. Kudirka as an American citizen.

* * *

On 6 April 1974 an officer of the Institute of the Biology of Development, U S S R Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Biology **I. M. Shapiro,** who was in Italy as a member of a group for academic tourists, asked for political asylum.

In connection with this, the 'situation' in the Institute was repeatedly discussed by party and academic-administrative bodies during April and May this year. A decision was taken to review the membership of the Academic Council. Besides Shapiro it was decided to exclude four more people — all of whom were Jews. The group directed by Shapiro was liquidated. The well-known embryologist **A. A. Neifakh** was removed from the directorship of a laboratory. Academician N. P. Dubinin played a very active role in the organization of this administrative persecution.

On 21 June the director of the Institute of the Biology of Development, Academician **B. L. Astaurov** [see *Chronicle* 14], passed away.

Samizdat News

In March 1974 **A. I. Solzhenitsyn** published his 'Letter to the Soviet Leaders', which he had written earlier, on 5 September 1973. The letter aroused a great number of responses of the most varied nature. The first of these responses was by **A. D. Sakharov** — *On Alexander Solzhenitsyn's Letter To The Soviet Leaders.* In view of the undoubted interest of the developing discussion for the most varied circles of readers, the *Chronicle* proposes to deal with it in detail in one of its forthcoming issues [see number 34].

* * *

Live Not by the Lie (collection dedicated to the **'Solzhenitsyn** affair', Moscow, 1974.

The collection covers the period from August 1973 to the end of February 1974. It presents critical reviews, publicistic statements, newspaper articles, and open letters and appeals about the publication of *GULag Archipelago* and the events connected with it. The material is copiously illustrated with extracts from *GULag.*

A short review of the collection has been circulated; extracts from it are quoted below.

'The book is in the traditional *samizdat* genre sometimes known as that of the "White Book". The collection *Live Not by the Lie* can be compared with A. Ginzburg's *The Case of Sinyavsky and Daniel* (1966), N. Gorbanevskaya's *Red Square at Noon* (1969), and to some extent with P. Litvinov's *The Trial of the Four.* As often happens in books of this type, the breadth and contradictoriness of the opinions presented in fact results in the reader feeling that a case has been proved, whilst the terseness of the author's text, his marked preference for documents, and the heterogeneity of the material, give the work significance as an art form. The collection is, without a doubt, as much a literary event as it is a civic and socio-political act and a documentary record. The well-known formula "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth" is realized here not only in its moral and ethical sense, but in an aesthetic way too . . .'

* * *

I. R. Shafarevich, 'On Certain Tendencies in the Development of Mathematics'. (A lecture for the occasion of the official presentation of the Heinemann prize of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences.)

The eminent Soviet scholar, a corresponding member of the U S S R Academy of Sciences, believes that the development of mathematics, because of its lack of a single good, is resulting in an unlimited accumulation of ideas which in principle are equally profound. However, mathematics '. . . is unable to work out, in addition, a concept of its own form; it is left with the ideal of totally unregulated growth, or, more accurately, expansion in all directions.' 'Isn't mathematics being transformed into a strikingly beautiful variant of Hegel's "bad infinity"?' asks Shafarevich. 'It is clear that such a development of knowledge rules out any sense of integrality or beauty.' The author believes that the problem can be solved in two ways. The first — 'to extract the purpose of mathematics from its practical applications' — he decisively rejects. In his opinion, the practical value of many brilliant discoveries of science is nil. Only one possibility remains: 'The purpose of mathematics can be supplied not by a sphere of human activity that is lower in comparison to it, but by a higher sphere — religion.' Shafarevich illustrates the possibility of such a solution from the history of the origins of mathematics in the Pythagorean school.

Shafarevich contends that at the present time a similar problem has arisen in many branches of human culture. He hopes that a solution of the problem for mathematics 'might serve as a model for the solution of the basic problem of our epoch: to find the higher religious purpose and meaning of the cultural activity of mankind.'

V. Nekrasov, 'Who Needs This?'

The writer Victor Nekrasov recounts the various persecutions to which he has been subjected for the last 11 years: a party investigation into his personal activities and a strict reprimand in 1963 for his essays on America, 'On Both Sides of the Ocean'; an investigation into his personal activities and a strict reprimand in 1969 for a letter in defence of the Ukrainian writer Chornovil and for his speech on the 25th anniversary of the massacre of Jews in Baby

Yar; expulsion from the party in 1972 'for allowing himself to have a personal opinion that does not coincide with the party line'; each time, in addition to conversations, explanations, and a 'working-over', the investigation resulted in a halt to publication of his works.[58]

In 1974 — a humiliating search, the confiscation of his archives, including his draft manuscripts, then interrogations. Nekrasov talks about the vagueness and changeability of the concept 'anti-Soviet', about the right of an author to keep his own inviolable archive, about an author's right to the confidence of his country. The trampling of these rights and the impossibility of writing and publishing one's works lead eventually to emigration: Nekrasov gives the names of his friends who have left the country. If the authorities want to get rid of the independent-minded intelligentsia in this way, says Nekrasov, it will lead to irreplaceable losses for the country and the people: 'For K G B investigators can't write books for us, can't paint pictures or compose symphonies.' If the authorities really want to force people to betray their conscience in this manner . . . 'No, it is far better for the reader to do without my books . . . He, the reader, will wait. But not for lampoons and slander — he waits for the truth. I will never degrade my reader by lying to him.'

* * *

Veche, number 10, 19 April 1974 (153 typed pages).

Contents: report of the editorial board*; statement by the editorial board dated 14 March 1974;* Easter message from Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia; 'To Serve Russia Means to Bear its Cross', by I. V. Ovchinnikov (editor-in-chief of No. 10); 'On the 100th Anniversary of the Birth of N. A. Berdyayev' (extracts from a collection of articles by Berdyayev, *The Fate of Russia,* Moscow, 1918); 'In Optina', by V. Kapitanchuk (the author's reflections on a trip to the Optina monastery); five poems by N. S. Gumilyov; 'Regarding the Polemics between Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn', by A. Skuratov [see *Chronicle* 34]; 'On Russia's "Colonialist" Policy', anonymous; 'On Certain Tendencies in the Development of Mathematics', by I. R. Shafarevich (reprinted without the author's knowledge);* two chapters from A. Skuratov's book *The Triumph of the Suicide Men*; the ending of A. Gavrilov's short novel *Bratsk-54*; two poems by Oleg Okhapkin (it is before these poems that a puzzling statement by the editorial board has been inserted: '. . . the journal *Veche* reserves copyright; a special mention will be made when literary works are published with the author's consent'); 'A Retort', a reply to the commentary 'The Russian National Opposition in the Soviet Union' transmitted by the radio station 'German Wave' ('Deutsche Welle') on 17 April 1974; 'Something about the Metamorphoses of Tastes and Opinions', by V. Filatov (a polemic with B. Bursov's article 'Something about Tastes and Opinions', *Literary Gazette,* number 9, 1974); letter to the editorial board of *Veche* from V. Veresov and the board's reply; letter to the editorial board of *Veche* from

*See this issue ('About the Journal *Veche*') [*Chronicle*'s note].

M. Agursky and the board's reply; Chronicle.*

The materials of this (evidently the last)** issue of the journal *Veche,* listed above, will not be presented in any detail for the moment. As a significant part of them are connected with preceding issues of *Veche,* which have been only partially reflected in past issues of the *Chronicle,*[59] it would, clearly, be advisable to return to certain materials and to number 10 in a special review of the publication as a whole (numbers 1-10).

Letters and Statements

In this section those statements from the many available to the *Chronicle* which have not been sufficiently reflected in other sections of this issue are summarized and quoted in extracts or in full.

* * *

General Secretary of the Central Committee of the
Communist Party, L. I. Brezhnev!
President of the United States, R. Nixon!

You are meeting in order to discuss many political matters of importance to two mighty countries and to the whole world. I call on you to consider during your meetings problems of humanity and of basic human rights as well. These problems are not political ones, but their solution would promote international confidence and détente to a huge degree.

Facilitate the mutual exchange of knowledge between the citizens of our countries, and promote publicity and freedom of religion and thought in the spirit of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights,* in particular its 19th article. Facilitate the release of political prisoners, and the ending of persecution for religious convictions and for trying to leave the country. Facilitate the immediate release of such inspiring and courageous people as Bukovsky (you have no doubt received the disturbing letter from the mother of this noble man, who is being subjected to cruel injustices), Grigorenko, Plyushch, Moroz, Gluzman, K. Lyubarsky, Kudirka, Ubozhko, R. Dzhemilev, Akimov, Bolonkin, Khaustov, Shumuk, Shukhevich, Feldman, Gavrilov, Ponomaryov, Nadezhda and Ivan Svetlichny, husband and wife Karavansky and Strokata, husband and wife E. Kuznetsov and Silva Zalmanson, husband and wife Kalynets and Irina Kalynets-Stasiv, Stefaniya Shabatura, Irina Senik, Daria Gusyak, brothers Vulf and Izrail Zalmanson, the priest Romanyuk, the priest Zalivako, Chinnov, Krasivsky, Lupynos, Chornovil, Dremlyuga, Makarov, Žukauskas, Simutis, Rudaitis, Povilonis, Sakalauskas, Shakhverdyan, A. Romanov, Abankin, Meshener, Khantsis, Babich, Suslensky, Sado, Ogurtsov, Frolov, Popadyuk, Sverstyuk, Markman, Mogilever, Shkolnik, Altman, Fyodorov [Yu.P.], Murzhenko, Mendelevich, Dymshits, Khnokh, Butman, Komarov,

*See summary in this issue [*Chronicle*'s note].
**See this issue ('About the Journal *Veche*') [*Chronicle*'s note].

Azernikov, Melnichuk, Makarenko, Shnarr, Ladyzhensky, Penson, Pirogov, Nekipelov, Superfin, Starchik, Dandaron, Montlevich, Butkus, Lavrov,[60] Vail, Amalrik and Kheifets.

This list is far from complete because there are many whom I do not know. Each name here involves an arduous and heroic fate. These people were not engaged in political activity and were not undermining the foundations of the state. They are fully entitled to be called prisoners of conscience, and victims of injustice and tragic circumstances.

The fact that I enumerate Soviet prisoners here does not mean that I believe that injustices happen only in our country; I am simply writing what I am best informed about.

Do what is in your power, if only for some of them — the women, the old and the sick, those who have been sentenced more than once — for the courts inflict particularly unjust penalties on them. Facilitate the immediate release of all those who have been imprisoned for more than the 15-year term prescribed by law.

Facilitate international inspection of places of imprisonment in all countries, for it is there that human rights and the principles of humanity are most often violated.

Nothing is so dangerous for mankind as hushed-up, concealed evil and violence.

Facilitate in a democratic spirit a cardinal and definitive solution of the problem of freedom of movement and freedom of emigration and return, as dictated by the 13th article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The full implementation of this right is most essential for international confidence and understanding, for the development of more uniform economic, social and legal standards.

If you avoid humanitarian problems, you will deprive your nascent cooperation of any vital moral force, doom it to sterility and fail to achieve the high aims of peace and security. I want to believe that this is not what you desire.

Yours sincerely,
Andrei Sakharov, Academician.
25 June 1974.

* * *

A. D. Sakharov commented on his letter to L. I. Brezhnev and R. Nixon in a statement to American television, which ended with the words: 'I am for détente, but détente by collusion, détente by capitulation would be a catastrophe, a betrayal of people throughout the world. Genuine détente and a genuine guarantee of security mean not just talks between statesmen, but in the first instance contacts, mutual trust and mutual understanding between ordinary citizens.'

* * *

'I, Andrei Dmitriyevich Sakharov, am declaring a hunger strike from midnight on 28 June in protest against the unlawful and cruel repression of political prisoners. I demand an immediate alleviation of the lot of Vladimir Bukovsky, a review of his case, and his release.

'The name of Bukovsky has become a symbol in the sacrificial struggle for human rights and humanity in our country. The repression to which he is being subjected is a challenge to the conscience of mankind. I ask that my hunger strike be regarded as support for the appeal which I have sent to the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and to the President of the U S A, and for all the pleas contained in that appeal.'

* * *

To the International Red Cross
Express Telegram

'Believing that human mercy stands *outside* all politics and *above* all politics, I call on you, who have voluntarily assumed the Cross of the active manifestation of mercy — of help to all who suffer — to render *immediate* support to the prisoners of conscience in Soviet concentration camps, prisons and psychiatric hospital, who are in a *desperate* situation.

'Those who particularly need your help at present are: Vladimir Bukovsky, Valentin Moroz, Leonid Plyushch, Alexander Sergiyenko, Alexander Feldman, and Igor Ogurtsov.

'I am hoping that your active intervention in their defence will perform another good deed: it will enable his relatives and friends to persuade Academician Andrei Sakharov, who is filled with a moving love for people and is ready to suffer with them, to terminate the hunger strike he has begun. A continuation of this hunger strike could have a serious effect on Sakharov's state of health.

1 July 1974

Tatyana Khodorovich.'

* * *

'I support the protest of Andrei Dmitriyevich Sakharov against the inhuman conditions in which Soviet political prisoners are kept, and I associate myself with his demand for a political amnesty.

'In solidarity with A. D. Sakharov, I am declaring a hunger strike as from 2 July.

Anatoly Marchenko,
g. Tarusa Kaluzhskoi oblasti,
ul. Lunacharskoyo, d. 39.'

* * *

On 4 July 1974 A. D. Sakharov made a statement which ended with the words: '. . . My appeal and hunger strike have been supported by many people in the U S S R and abroad, and have attracted a great deal of public attention.

'I have been forced for medical reasons to take the decision to confine the length of my hunger strike to six days. I am ending my fast this morning.

'But it must not be forgotten that Vladimir Bukovsky is swollen from hunger, on a punishment starvation diet in Vladimir prison, that Leonid Plyushch is being tortured in Dnepropetrovsk psychiatric prison, and that Igor Ogurtsov is languishing in Perm prison after seven years of confinement in [Vladimir] jail and is now threatened with the tyranny of psychiatric internment. I implore world public opinion, all honourable people, not to relax their efforts in their defence and in defence of all the others who are suffering so unjustly.

'I hope that the leaders of my country will manifest good will and start to satisfy your and my aspirations, proceeding from the simplest of motives — mercy for the suffering.

'I am deeply convinced that not only the spiritual well-being of mankind but also its actual physical preservation depends on the observance of fundamental human rights and the principles of humanity.'

* * *

T. Khodorovich, 'The Dictates of Conscience'.

The author states that she feels an affinity not to a party or an organization but to people who are united 'by a natural feeling of sympathy for the unjustly persecuted and by respect for the human personality, its free spirit, and for truth'. These people are now called 'dissidents' or 'dissenters', says T. Khodorovich, and she contends that these terms do not reflect Soviet reality but merely obscure the truth: in the Soviet Union there is no opposition or juxtaposition between people who think correctly and those who dissent, there are only 'people on the one hand, and on the other a faceless, organized and trained system of violence with a single well-developed instinct — that *every* thought must be stifled . . ., providing only that the thought derives from an individual personality.'

Regarding unofficially transmitted proposals [from the authorities], such as 'Keep quiet and, in exchange, the lot of your imprisoned friends will be mitigated', Khodorovich says that she sees her duty in preserving her creative and spiritual freedom, 'even at the cost of losing normal freedom'. She rejects the proposal made to her of trading her own conscience. She defines the essence of her position as moral resistance to violence and injustice.

* * *

In January 1974 **T. Velikanova, S. Kovalyov** and **T. Khodorovich** published a statement in which they say:[61]

'. . . Of late we, members of the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the U S S R, as well as certain other people who do not wish to keep silent, have been receiving proposals from people who do not name themselves: "Vouch for such-and-such a friend of yours who is imprisoned and his lot will be alleviated . . ." The substance of the guarantee is straightforward: both the prisoner and the guarantor must in future keep silent . . .

'We are presented with an intolerably difficult choice; the blackmail has been accurately and cruelly calculated. We know that anyone who agrees to this sort of bargain should not be censured, for such a step is dictated by pity and love. But to sacrifice one's own soul is suicide, and someone else's — murder. Spiritual murder.

'We cannot agree to this.

'And to those who put us in such a position we can say only one thing: No.

'*Your* deeds, *your* conscience and *your* sins are *your* responsibility.

'You want to use hostages?

'We shall not assist you.'

* * *

On 12 February 1974, in connection with the news that L. Plyushch's condition had taken a severe turn for the worse, Elena Bonner, Tatyana Velikanova, Sergei Kovalyov, Andrei Sakharov, Tatyana Khodorovich and Andrei Tverdokhlebov sent an appeal to international organizations[62] which ends with the words: '. . . Leonid Plyushch is on the verge of death. We are appealing to you to press urgently for an international inspection of the Dnepropetrovsk special psychiatric hospital, as well as of other hospitals of this type; and for an international examination of the state of Leonid Plyushch's health and his transfer to a foreign hospital to recover his shattered health. This appeal to you, and in your person to international public opinion, is the only path left open to us for saving the life of Leonid Plyushch.'

This statement was circulated by the International League for the Rights of Man and was sent, in particular, to Secretary-General Waldheim of the U N.

* * *

On 6 March 1974 T. Velikanova, S. Kovalyov, A. E. Levitin (Krasnov), G. Podyapolsky, A. Sakharov and T. Khodorovich appealed to the International Committee for the Defence of Human Rights, the International League for the Rights of Man, Amnesty International, and to workers and trade-union organizations throughout the world to speak out in defence of V. Khaustov and not to allow further reprisals against him.[63] The authors write: '. . . The charges against Khaustov were, specifically, that he had taken several *samizdat* documents to Oryol at the request of his friends and had taken part in the sending abroad of E. Kuznetsov's prison diary. It was these actions, which were perfectly normal acts of exchanging information, that provided the grounds for a charge of anti-Soviet activity and a harsh sentence. Khaustov's case is yet another link in the long chain of persecution of people for their beliefs . . .'

On 7 March M. Landa associated herself with the appeal.

* * *

On 16 March a statement in defence of Superfin was published.[64] The statement says, in particular:

'. . . Concealment of a crime inevitably gives birth to new crimes. This is how it will be until the public conscience is purged, until truth is given full voice. Until that time, all who dare to make secret things public will turn out to be "guilty". For the logical crime there must not be *witnesses*. So they are tried for "slander", put in camps, left to rot in prisons and mad-houses, or thrown out of the country.

'But the main thing is this: the authorities want to force them into stating that their *bearing of witness* was a criminal offence. The whole mechanism of the investigation is subordinated to this end. . . . And to us, who live in freedom, it is not given to know how they break a human soul *there*, inside. If the mechanism succeeds, the spectacle is put on show. But if not? . . .' Going on to mention that it is already four months since Superfin repudiated the evidence he had given earlier, as became evident at Khaustov's trial, the authors write: '. . . But a voice which has miraculously broken through to us from the silent depths of an investigation prison-cell, the voice of a man who found within himself the strength to resist baseness and lies and thereby brought upon himself a new danger, calls on us to make a choice: will we be the habitually silent accomplices of yet another crime, or will we try to avert it?

'On the basis of this extorted and then renounced testimony dozens of people have been recently interrogated in Moscow, Leningrad, Riga, Tallinn and Tartu . . . And each one was told a barefaced lie: "Confirm it . . . he has confessed everything."

'This is the essence of their *methods* — the lie. It unfailingly guides the whole course of the investigatory machine, which serves neither the state nor its security, but, for the sake of self-preservation, keeps demanding more and more victims. And until its immorality and illegal essence are revealed, the shadow of the *GULag Archipelago* will relentlessly pursue us.

'How long will such "cases" be fabricated? How long will innocent people, deprived of contact with the outside world, defenceless against any fraud and blackmail, be pulverized in investigation prisons?

'WE DEMAND:

'1. That Gabriel Superfin's isolation be ended immediately and that his relatives and the defence lawyer chosen by them be allowed in to see him.

'2. That a commission from the International Commission of Jurists be allowed in immediately to find out all the circumstances of the investigation of Superfin's case and the methods used by the K G B.

'3. That Superfin be released and a decision taken to terminate the investigation of his case.'

The statement was signed by: Evgeny Barabanov, Valentina Berdichevskaya, Vadim Borisov, Tatyana Borisova, Tatyana Velikanova, Oktyabrina Volkova, Vladimir Vigilyansky, Alexander Galich, Yury Gastev, Sergei Genkin, Alexander Ginzburg, Lyudmila Ginzburg, Galina Gladkova, Vladimir Glotser, Natalya Gorbanevskaya, Alexander Gribanov, Irina Zholkovskaya, Olga Iofe, Lyudmila Kardasevich, Sergei Kovalyov, Vadim Kozovoi, Natalya Komarova, Ilya Korneyev, Alexander Lavut, Boris Landa, Vladimir Lapin, Vera Lashkova, Yury Levin, Pavel Litvinov, Boris Mikhailov, Galina Narinskaya, Grigory Podyapolsky, Olga Rozhanskaya, Ivan Rudakov, Maria Slonim, Andrei Tverdokhlebov, Viktor Timachev, Tatyana Khodorovich, Natalya Chervinskaya, Lydia Chukovskaya, Nadezhda Shatunovskaya, Sergei Khodorovich, Alexander Shuster and Boris Shragin.

* * *

A. Sakharov, 'Open Letter to Academician V. A. Engelgardt'.

Academician V. A. Engelgardt, the famous biochemist, held private talks with Western scientists during a visit to Europe and the U S A in which he tried to convince them not to speak out in defence of Sakharov and his views. One of the main reasons given by Engelgardt was concern for Sakharov's safety. (It is not known whether Engelgardt advised anyone in the West to speak out *against* Sakharov. However, it is worth recalling that he himself censured Sakharov very severely in the autumn of 1973 when, together with other Academicians, he published a widely-known letter that gave the signal for other such statements in the U S S R[65] — *Chronicle*.)

In a letter to Engelgardt Sakharov says: 'I myself have consciously chosen the course of my life and the course of my conduct, and it is not for you to correct them. I am convinced that my position, my rights, and the safety of the members of my family . . . can be effectively protected only by open and decisive interventions.' Sakharov again emphasizes the necessity of publicity in all matters that are of social significance.

The letter is dated 29 March 1974.

* * *

On 4 April 1974 A. Sakharov, referring to information from Amnesty International on the condition of political prisoners in Indonesia, appealed to the President of the Republic of Indonesia, General Suharto.

A. D. Sakharov writes, among other things: '. . . I appeal to you . . . to proclaim a general political amnesty. I consider myself entitled to address this request to you also because in my own country, together with like-minded people, I am regularly speaking out in favour of an amnesty for all political prisoners and the political detainees in psychiatric hospitals.

'A humane and broad amnesty never threatens the political stability of the country which proclaims it. On the contrary, such an act must without fail promote the easing of social and racial conflicts both in the country which has proclaimed it and also far beyond its boundaries.

'I am convinced of the enormous moral and political significance which a decision to grant an amnesty would have not only for Indonesia but for the whole of mankind as well.'

* * *

T. Khodorovich, 'I can stand it no longer'.[66]
M. Landa, 'Justice and Mercy for Valentin Moroz'.
'I can stand it no longer,' said V. Moroz to his wife at their last meeting.

These two appeals describe the extremely serious condition of the Ukrainian historian and publicist Valentin Moroz. It is now four years since he was put in Vladimir prison, and for about the last two of them he has been in solitary confinement. 'He is close to death,' — says T. Khodorovich.

The authors of the appeals call on all honourable people to speak out in defence of Valentin Moroz's life.

The appeals were written at the beginning of April 1974.

* * *

To Amnesty International

To the International Committee for the Defence of Human Rights
To the International League for the Rights of Man

A court in Oryol has sentenced **Gabriel Superfin,** a literary scholar and translator, to five years of imprisonment and two years of exile. The charges which led to such a harsh sentence were his involvement in sending to the West Edward Kuznetsov's prison diary and the circulation of the *Chronicle of Current Events.* Both these charges are the fruit of a prejudice which identifies the circulation of information undesirable to the authorities with criminal libel. Are the facts and personal opinions recorded in the prison diary of Edward Kuznetsov, who was sentenced to 15 years of imprisonment, really so secret that for alleged involvement in their publication people should be sentenced to imprisonment in prisons and camps — first Victor Khaustov (March 1974) and then Superfin (May 1974)? In a democratic society vices are not concealed, efforts are made to correct them; in any case publicity about them is not a cause for persecution. All this is true also about the *Chronicle of Current Events.* The real reason for Superfin's harsh sentence — or so we assume — was his renunciation of the evidence given by him in the first half of the investigation. We do not know what he was fated to experience, this man of very poor health, who fell into hands capable of a very great deal for the sake of bureaucratic success. But Superfin found within himself the strength to resist the pressures, and it was for this that he was not forgiven. We call on international organizations and progressive and honourable people throughout the world to demand the release of Gabriel Superfin — in the name of justice and humanity.

A. Sakharov
A. Tverdokhlebov

* * *

A. Marchenko, 'Statement for the press'.
The author reports that the police have instituted official surveillance of him without any grounds. Marchenko expresses the hypothesis that the real purpose of this measure, as of a number of preceding ones (search, interrogation, caution — all for invented, formal reasons), is to force him either to keep quiet or to emigrate. Marchenko stresses that his statement is not a request for help: 'Let my report be yet another particle of information about a country which today aspires to rule the destinies not of one man, but of the whole world.'

The statement is dated 15 May 1974.

* * *

Yu. Orlov, 'Statement regarding the International Scientific Seminar'.
Yu. Orlov, a physicist and [corresponding] member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, rejects the charge of kindling national discord which the authorities have brought against A. Voronel, one of the organizers of the international scientific seminar. He states that the seminar is strictly scientific but is being persecuted by the authorities on political grounds: its participants are 'those scientists who have been deprived of work as a result of the authorities' arbitrariness'.

Orlov thanks the organizers of the seminar for helping people not to become professionally unqualified.

The statement is dated 18 June 1974.

* * *

'Statement in Connection with the 35th Anniversary of the Birthday of **Yu.T. Galanskov.**'
On 19 June 1974 Yury Timofeyevich Galanskov, a martyr of the struggle for human rights in the USSR, would have been 35 years old. Yury Galanskov perished in a camp hospital 1½ years ago. His death was a cruel outcome of the inhuman regime in the prisons and political camps of the USSR.

We, former prisoners and friends of Yury Galanskov, remind all who are alive to compassion that the present regime for political prisoners in the USSR is a well thought-out system for the destruction of their health and for the mockery of human dignity. The cynical tormenting of General Grigorenko, the continuing torture of Bukovsky, Ogurtsov and hundreds of other 'incorrigibles' — this is the 'practical contribution' of the Soviet Union to the cause of international détente. Quite recently a political prisoner, Alexander Romanov, a history student before his arrest, was driven to a desperate protest by the tyranny of the administration and threw himself into the forbidden zone. It was mere chance that saved him from an inevitable death.

On the 35th birthday of Yury Galanskov, a man and a citizen, a martyr and a humanist, we once against protest against the barbarous regime in the political camps and prisons of the USSR.

We call on world public opinion, the International Red Cross and Amnesty International to put the maximum effort into achieving the quickest possible investigation of the conditions in which political prisoners are kept in the USSR.

Leonid Borodin, Nikolai Ivanov, Vladislav Ilyakov, Valentina Mashkova, Vladimir Osipov, Vyacheslav Rodionov, Stanislav Sery.

Moscow, 19 June 1974.

* * *

Mikhail Agursky, Vitaly Rubin and **Inessa Akselrod**, 'An Appeal to American Congressmen'.

A new wave of illegal arrests of Jewish activists heralds the arrival of President Nixon in the U S S R. These arrests have nothing in common with security measures, for they are being carried out in many cities and applied to people who have never participated in demonstrations.

Arrests of Jewish activists constitute a shameless blackmail of American public opinion. Both the Soviet and the American governments bear an equal degree of responsibility for this blackmail.

We call on American congressmen not to give in to any blackmail. Jewish activists know what they are embarking on when they stand up for their rights and for the rights of the Jewish population in the U S S R.

22 June 1974.

* * *

To the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev

Arrested for the second time four years ago, now after two years in a solitary cell in Vladimir prison, **Valentin Moroz** is demanding a transfer to a camp and is declaring a hunger strike.

Valentin Moroz, who earlier served a four-year term of imprisonment, was sentenced to six years of prison, three years of camp and five years of exile for writing an account of the horrors of his first imprisonment only: the desire of the authorities to conceal the shameful truth can explain their second act of cruelty. In prison Moroz suffered from assaults on him by criminals deliberately put in his cell, and was transferred to solitary confinement at his own request. The only violation of the regime in his record is the fact that he talked in Ukrainian at a meeting with his wife.

I ask you to intervene and save an honourable and courageous man.

Yours sincerely,
Andrei Sakharov, Academician.

25 June 1974.

* * *

Yury Orlov, a physicist and corresponding member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, issued a statement to the press on 11 July 1974, in which he recounts the persecution to which he has been subjected on political grounds.

In 1956, after speaking at a meeting at which Khrushchev's report to the 20th

Party Congres was read out, he was forced to leave Moscow; in 1973 he was dismissed from the Institute of Terrestrial Magnetism of the U S S R Academy of Sciences for speaking out in defence of Sakharov; at the same time the Armenian Academy of Sciences refused to give him work. Left without employment, he took part in A. Voronel's seminar, and then presented a paper for the international scientific seminar which was due to commence on 1 July. Beginning on 27 June, Orlov was subjected to house arrest for a period of ten days, whilst his wife was openly shadowed. Their telephone was cut off.

Yu. Orlov writes: '. . . I categorically protest against the persecution to which I am being subjected for my convictions. I demand immediate restoration of employment in accordance with my qualifications. I appeal to international scientific opinion to speak out in defence of Soviet scientists who are being subjected to persecution on political grounds.'[67]

* * *

On 7 May 1974 **T. Velikanova, S. Kovalyov** and **T. Khodorovich** handed numbers 28, 29 and 30 of the *Chronicle of Current Events* to a group of Western correspondents. At the same time they published the following statement:

'As we do not consider, despite the repeated assertions of the K G B and U S S R court instances, that the *Chronicle of Current Events* is an illegal or libellous publication, we regard it as our duty to facilitate as wide a circulation for it as possible.

'We believe 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.'

In June **M. Landa** supported this statement. She writes: '. . . I consider it my duty as a human being to facilitate the duplication and circulation of the *Chronicle of Current Events*, as well as of other valuable, uncensored literature which cannot be officially published in the Soviet Union. . . .'

Corrigenda and Addenda

From the information given in *Chronicle* 15 about the case of Revolt Pimenov it might have been thought that the doctor who was treating him, Dr Goland, took part in the psychiatric commission which at one time ruled him to be 'schizophrenic'. This impression is not correct: according to R. Pimenov himself, Dr Goland fulfilled her medical duty properly at all times.

* * *

In December 1973 the delegate of the Crimean Tatars arrested at Samarkand airport before flying to Moscow was Shevki Mukhteremov, not Memetov, as erroneously reported in *Chronicle* 31.

Vadim Nikolayevich Sokolov (case of Pirogov) was mistakenly called Vladimir in issue 30.

Alexander Petrov-Agatov, writer, drawn in a Mordovian camp in 1974 by fellow prisoner Boris Penson

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.

Number 33 **10 December 1974**

Contents:

Political prisoners' day in the USSR. Food norms. Order Number 020. In the Mordovian camps. In the Perm camps. A list of prisoners in the Perm camps. V. Moroz's hunger strike. Letters and statements. News in brief. Trials of recent years.

Seventh Year of Publication

Political Prisoners' Day in the USSR

According to advance information received from the labour camps of Mordovia and Perm, a decision was taken there to designate 30 October as 'Political Prisoners' Day in the USSR'.

On that day the prisoners intended to declare hunger strikes, which were to last for one or two days. Certain demands which the hunger-strikers intended to put forward on 30 October are known to us. These demands included: recognition of 'political prisoner' status; separation of political prisoners from criminal convicts and war criminals; abolition of forced labour and compulsory norm-fulfilment; abolition of restrictions on correspondence, including correspondence with other countries; abolition of restrictions on parcels and gifts; removal of MVD authority over the medical staff in places of imprisonment; provision of full medical services for the prisoners, with allowance for visits by specialist doctors, including doctors from abroad; an increase in the number of permitted visits by relatives and permission for visits by friends; provision of opportunities for creative work for writers, scholars and artists; permission to register marriages; and permission for prisoners to talk in their mother-tongue in the camp and during meetings with relatives.

The *Chronicle* does not yet know what actually took place 30 October [see numbers 34, 35].

* * *

On the evening of 30 October a press conference was organized by A. D. Sakharov and the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR, at which information about 'Political Prisoners' Day' was given to Western journalists. The Chairman of the Moscow group of Amnesty International,[68] V. F. Turchin, was present at the press conference as an observer.

'The organizers of this press conference look upon it as an expression of their solidarity with Soviet political prisoners. We are also counting on widespread support from world public opinion,' said a statement given to the journalists. The statement outlined the main difficulties of the life led by political prisoners: excessively long terms of imprisonment; bad and severely insufficient food, which cannot be supplemented from parcels, as these are strictly limited as to both their weight and numbers; widespread and unsupervised punitive measures; oppressive work conditions; bad medical services, and so on. The statement emphasizes that the political prisoners 'have been convicted for actions, opinions and intentions which would not be regarded as grounds for prosecution in a democratic country'.

'We do not yet know,' the statement says, 'what happened today there, behind the barbed wire. But we are certain that today, as always, the political prisoners will reassert their dignity as human beings and their feeling of inner justification.'

* * *

The journalists were handed copies of open letters by prisoners and other material received from labour camps.

These documents are presented in brief extracts below. The majority were written during October, specially for Political Prisoners' Day. An open letter to the Women's International Democratic Federation — signed by **K. Lyubarsky, S. Babich, I. Zalmanson, Z. Popadyuk, A. Petrov-Agatov, B. Azernikov** and **B. Penson** — appeals to the Federation to demand the following from the Soviet Government: the release of women political prisoners, the open publication of the materials of their cases, and the opportunity for members of the Federation to see for themselves the conditions under which women prisoners are held. (See also 'In the Mordovian Camps'.)

* * *

In an open letter to the World Postal Union,[69] **Azernikov, Lyubarsky** and **Penson** speak of systematic 'breaches of the obligations which the USSR Ministry of Communications assumed when the Soviet Union joined the WPU'. They emphasize that they are not referring to the important matter of Soviet legislation concerning restrictions on prisoners' correspondence and the censorship of their letters, as this is outside the competence of the WPU.

'Scores, even hundreds of letters . . . disappear without trace . . . with no explanation given, and with complaints remaining unanswered,' the letter states. Some political prisoners fail to receive 20 to 50 per cent of all their mail; and there have been individual cases of prisoners being completely deprived of letters over long periods. Letters are frequently delayed for months, telegrams for many days, sometimes for weeks.

Correspondence which, unlike that which 'disappears', is officially withheld by the censors, is usually not returned to the senders, and the latter receive no compensation. Incidentally, the confiscation of letters in such cases is against the law.

The letter goes on: 'We ask you to take into account the extreme limitations on our own means of protest. We need the help of organizations with authority, which are directly concerned with the problems we have raised.'

B. P. Azernikov, an oral surgeon, describes in an open letter[70] the dangerously unhealthy conditions under which prisoners are held in the 'strict-regime' labour camps of Mordovia, and the extremely low standard of the medical services in these camps.

The prisoners live in a state of 'disguised starvation'. 'Even the maximum calory count of the food is about 2,000 calories less than the amount necessary for the hard labour in which the prisoners are engaged. The food contains practically no animal protein or vitamins. Cases of food poisoning are not infrequent.

'The air in the workshops is thick with sawdust powder and abrasive dust, acetone and acid fumes. . . .' This is conducive to the development of silicosis and other lung diseases.

'Medical treatment is begun only when an illness has reached a critical stage, and even then it is continued only until the symptoms disappear. Chronic illnesses such as gastro-enteric, cardio-vascular and eye diseases, rheumatism, mycosis and periodontosis are not treated at all, although they exist on a massive scale in the camps. A sick man is permitted exemption from work only if his temperature is above 37.4° centigrade. Exemption due to illness, without a high temperature, is extremely rare. The doctor cannot exceed the limit of the so-called "exemption norm" — 1.7 per cent of all prisoners — even during influenza epidemics.'

There are no doctors in some camps; their place is taken by doctors' assistants or nurses. Specialist doctors visit the camps once or twice a year or even less. Prisoners who are doctors may not help their sick comrades. They are expressly forbidden to do so, by order.

Camp doctors have only the simplest medicines at their disposal, and some of these have far exceeded their period of validity. The camp chemists lack effective modern drugs, for example many anti-biotics. But 'the sending of drugs into the camp from outside is forbidden'.

The dirt road between the camp and the hospital is so bad, 'and the camp vehicles so unsuitable for transporting the sick, that the journey may cost a sick man his life. There have been cases of broken limbs and of spinal injury resulting from these journeys. For heart patients a journey over this road is simply unbearable'.

'Often . . . people who are completely healthy in mind when they arrive in the camp . . . become mentally ill towards the end of a long term. Such sick people receive no treatment whatsoever; often, prison cells and punishment cells are used to isolate them. There have been no instances when even the very seriously ill have been released.'

Azernikov asks for help for those suffering inhuman treatment. And he concludes: 'This should not, and cannot, be delayed by transient political considerations.'

* * *

The astro-physicist **K. A. Lyubarsky**, appealing in a letter to the Executive Council of the World Federation of Scientific Workers and to the Executive Committee of the Congress for Cultural Freedom,[71] describes the effect of the camp routine and conditions on the professional future of prisoners who are scholars.

'We are not merely temporarily deprived of freedom. We are deprived forever of our profession, of the work we love,' writes Lyubarsky.

In a labour camp, it is strictly forbidden to receive any scientific literature, even highly specialized, published abroad. Literature published in the U S S R can be obtained from mail-order shops, but only recently published books in little demand are actually available from these. Private individuals are categorically forbidden to send any literature. Private letters from colleagues — especially from those abroad — containing scientific information, are delayed by the censors for many months, and often withheld altogether.

Academics, mostly no longer young, are subjected to hard physical labour in the camps, which they are not used to, and which leaves them neither the strength nor the time for intellectual work.

Lyubarsky considers that the impossibility of following scientific developments, and the exhaustion and the systematic malnutrition eventually lead to scientists serving long terms of imprisonment becoming completely unqualified to continue in their professions.

Lyubarsky calls on the Federation and the Congress, and on scientists all over the world, to obtain for Soviet political prisoners the right of free access to academic literature, the right to academic contacts; he calls on scholars to send scientific material to their political prisoner colleagues.

* * *

B. P. Azernikov, in an open letter,[72] speaks of the reasons which first made him decide to leave the U S S R, and thus brought him to a labour camp.

'Why am I here? Why could I not be elsewhere?'

'I realized that I had been robbed. I had been robbed of my history, my forbears, my language . . . so that I would not even think of resisting the attempts to herd me into the faceless "new historic community" — the "Soviet people". And this realization has determined the whole subsequent course of my life.'

'I did not try to shake the might of the Soviet Union . . . I wanted only to leave it, for a country which, whatever it may be like, good or bad, has for me the unquestionable advantage of being the land of my people. However, in the eyes of the Soviet Government — which once [under Lenin] published 'A Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia' — this wish of mine alone almost automatically made me a criminal; and so here I am, in a labour camp.'

'. . . Today, on "Political Prisoners' Day in the U S S R", remember those who, before they can step on the soil of their Homeland, are still fated to spend long years in Soviet labour camps. Today, they cry out: "Deliver me, o my God, out of the hand of the wicked, out of the hand of the unrighteous and cruel man." (Psalm 71, verse 4[73]).

'We shall not forget them! We shall say today with hope and also with them: "Next year in Jerusalem!" '

* * *

The Western journalists were also handed copies of an interview given by some of the prisoners in Perm camp VS-389/35, namely: **Ivan Svetlichny, Igor Kalynets, Ivan Kandyba, Lev Yagman, Semyon** (Slava) **Gluzman, Zinovy Antonyuk, Arie Khnokh, Iosif Meshener, Evgeny Prishlyak, Vladimir Balakhonov** and **Bagrat Shakhverdyan.** The interview deals with such matters as the legal position of political prisoners, the harshness of the labour camp regime, the prisoners' relations with the administration, the many instances in which

political prisoners have acted in defence of their rights, etc.

The prisoners say that the authorities, by imposing on them the strictest isolation, are trying to hide the truth about the kind of life led in the camps by people who have been convicted in the face of the declaration on civil freedoms in the Constitution. The rules of censorship are such that they effectively allow for any letter to be withheld, and thus encourage the tyranny of the censors. The destruction of such letters rules out any possibility of checking on the reasons for which they were withheld.

Although the declared aim of the authorities is to win the prisoners over by force of argument, they are powerless and in fact make no attempt to do so; their real aim is to break a prisoner, to force him to renounce his views. The administration tries to achieve this aim by constant fault-finding and punishment, by illegally subjecting the prisoners to mental and physical suffering — humiliation, hunger, cold, etc. Heavy, sometimes pointless labour has become an instrument of punishment. 'Reformed' prisoners do not even disguise the fact that the incentive in their 're-education' was a desire for the relative well-being and the small privileges provided to those on good terms with the authorities.

The supervisory bodies cover up the cruelties of the regime and the tyranny in the camps, always supporting the administration. So complaints by the prisoners are ineffective, unless the illegalities can be given wider publicity. In fact, the publicity which directs world attention to the evidence of tyranny is the corner-stone of the defence of human rights in the U S S R. The efforts of the Soviet authorities and certain circles in the West to regard this kind of repression as the internal affair of the Soviet Union are dictated by unworthy considerations of political manoeuvring.

At the end of the interview I. A. Svetlichny says: — 'Please give our warm greetings to Solzhenitsyn, whose courage we all deeply respect.'

The full text of the interview is published in the first issue of the *Archive of the Chronicle.*[74]

* * *

The journalists were also given the following: 1. a statement by prisoners addressed to the Praesidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet in connection with the resolution of 5 September 1918 on the establishment of concentration camps (see 'In the Perm Camps', below); 2. a letter to the Moscow Human Rights Committee, from K. A. Lyubarsky, A. M. Goldfeld, B. P. Azernikov, Z. V. Popadyuk, B. Penson and S. A. Babich (see 'In the Mordovian Camps', below) — the full text of the letter is reproduced in a *samizdat* collection, *On the Conditions in Which Prisoners are Held,* published by A. N. Tverdokhlebov;[75] 3. a statement by Lyubarsky to the Praesidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet in connection with the release of S. Zalmanson and S. Kudirka (see 'Letters and Statements', below); 4. the document 'A Chronicle of the GULag Archipelago' (see 'In the Perm Camps', below).

* * *

A letter from **A. D. Sakharov** to L. I. Brezhnev — dated 24 October 1974 — was read out at the conference and handed to the journalists.[76]

'The continuation of senseless and cruel repression of human rights and dignity cannot be tolerated on this earth, even in that part of it which is divided from you by barbed wire and prison walls. Brave and honest people cannot be allowed to die,' Sakharov writes.

The letter contains detailed information on hunger strikes by V. Moroz, G. Abel, K. Lyubarsky and I. Gel; it tells of lengthy collective hunger strikes by political prisoners, and mentions hunger strikes by the Baptists G. Vins and Zdorovets.[77] Sakharov maintains that these facts 'bear witness irrefutably to the acuteness of the position regarding political prisoners and their conditions'. He asks for immediate action, so as to avoid a tragic outcome in the hunger strikes at present taking place.

'Political prisoners in the U S S R are the victims of ideological intolerance, partly anti-religious in character, of political prejudices, and of the cruel traditions of the system. . . . A special position amongst political prisoners is held by people who have consciously devoted themselves to the defence of others.' Among these, Sakharov recalls the names of V. Bukovsky, L. Plyushch, S. Gluzman, Reshat and Mustafa Dzhemilev, I. Ogurtsov, the late Yu. Galanskov — all of whom have become 'symbols of the battle for human rights and against oppression and lawlessness'.

The letter ends with these words: 'I ask you to consider again the granting of a full amnesty for political prisoners, including those in psychiatric hospitals, the easing of their conditions of imprisonment, and the shortening of the sentences of prisoners in all categories.

'Such decisions would have great humanitarian value, would greatly enhance international confidence and the spirit of détente, and would cleanse our country of the shameful stains of cruelty, intolerance and lawlessness.'

* * *

The statement issued by the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the U S S R, headed '30 October' and signed by **T. Velikanova, S. Kovalyov, G. Podyapolsky** and **T. Khodorovich,**[78] speaks of the meaning of the term 'political prisoner' and of the different categories of political prisoners in the U S S R; of the punishment in Soviet camps through hunger and cold, which contravenes corrective labour legislation but is provided for by various regulations and directives; and it lists the demands put forward on 'Political Prisoners' Day in the U S S R'.

The statement adds: 'In giving journalists information about the camps, and, most important, the documents sent out of the camps by the prisoners at enormous risk and with great difficulty, we ask you to remember that the writers are risking the revenge and punitive measures of the authorities. Our friends are consciously accepting those risks. It is their wish that these statements and letters be published; it is the duty of those of us who are free to try to protect them from cruel punishment — that is our responsibility, and yours.'

The Initiative Group also gave the journalists a statement about the transfer of K. Lyubarsky from a labour camp to Vladimir prison [see this issue].

The organizers of the press conference answered a number of questions put to them by the journalists.

* * *

The texts of the documents mentioned above, except for those printed in full in this issue, or in other publications, are published in *Archive of the Chronicle*, number 1.

Food Norms[79]

The food norms in strict-regime corrective labour colonies are: hospital norm (norm 5b) — 3,100 calories; high calory norm for heavy physical work (norm 2) — 2,800 calories; special dietary norm for working prisoners (norm 5a) — 2,500; the standard 'guaranteed' norm (norm 1) — 2,450; in cell-type premises [C-T P] and camp punishment prisons for prisoners being taken out to work (norm 9a) — 2,050; and in camp prisons for prisoners not being taken out to work (norm 9b) — 1,350.

The food norms in Vladimir prison are: ordinary regime — 2,050 calories; strict-regime — 1,950; for the first month on strict regime — 1,350; in punishment cells — 1,350 and 850, every other day (hot food is given on alternate days; on days when cold food only is given, the diet is hot water, salt and 450 grams of bread).

For comparison, the following are the average energy-consumption needs of a 30-year-old man, weighing 70 kilograms [154 lbs], at various levels of activity. If, after 12 hours without food, this man lies down in a comfortable room-temperature of 20° to 22° centigrade, he expends between 1,700 and 1,800 calories per day. This loss of energy (the so-called 'basal metabolism') is used up mainly by the continuous functions of the organism which are needed to maintain life — the working of the heart and lung muscles, the maintenance of a constant body-temperature, and so on. This energy loss also helps keep the weight steady.

If, at the same temperature, the man gets up, eats regularly, but does not work, then, owing to the activity of the digestive tract and muscles, his energy requirements rise to between 2,100 and 2,400 calories per day. In a cold environment they are naturally much greater.

Examples of daily energy loss, given an eight-hour working day, are: 2,770 calories for a shoemaker, 3,190 for a joiner, 4,480 for a brick-layer, 5,200 for a wood-cutter or lumberjack, and up to 7,000 for a porter or stevedore.

Order Number 020

This Order, dated 14 January 1972, combines a number of earlier directives.

The *Chronicle* does not have at its disposal the precise text of the Order, but its main contents are well known.

1. Prisoners are allowed to move about their camp-zone only in columns.
2. Visits to huts other than their own are forbidden.
3. Prisoners must have, sewn onto their clothing, patches giving their surname and the number of their unit.
4. Prisoners are forbidden to wear beards.
5. During the warm months of the year, prisoners must remove their headgear in the presence of administration personnel.
6. The duties of an orderly include the reporting of any infringement of the regulations to the head of the unit.
7. Tobacco is looked upon as equivalent to food products (so that when a prisoner is deprived of access to the prison shop, he is also deprived of tobacco).
8. This is the list of personal effects which a prisoner is permitted to keep with him:
   (a) Not more than five books;
   (b) Two changes of underwear;
   (c) Toilet articles;
   (d) Clothing and footwear of the approved pattern 'according to the prescribed norms'.
   Other effects must be kept in the camp storage room.
9. This is the list of food products allowed to be sent in packages and parcels:
   In small packages: dry confectionery, apart from chocolate and any products containing it. (This, in practice, was the same before the Order was promulgated.)
   In parcels: bread and buns of various kinds; salted herring; tinned food — meat with vegetables, lard, pulses, fish, vegetables; onions and garlic; cheese, lard, butter and margarine. (Previously, tea, coffee and pure meat products were also allowed.)
10. Letters may be confiscated on the following grounds:
    (a) Obscene expressions;
    (b) Libellous statements about the administration or conditions in the camps;
    (c) Distortion of the U S S R's foreign or internal policies;
    (d) Suspicion of 'phrases in prearranged code';
    (e) Illicit enclosures;
    (f) Divulging of information which may not be made public.
11. Confiscated letters and statements are to be destroyed. (Previously, confiscated letters were kept with the prisoner's personal records.)
12. Only statements addressed to the Procurator's Office are exempt from

camp censorship. (Previously statements addressed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party and to the Praesidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet were also exempt.)

13. As before, a prisoner can be kept in a camp punishment prison for up to 15 days. But now the administration has the right to extend this punishment for an unlimited period, through a series of successive rulings (also for up to 15 days each, but not including any compulsion on the prisoner to work). The total length of time a prisoner may be kept in a prison is limited only by the state of his health.

It is also known that paint and paintbrushes are categorically forbidden. Order number 020 was brought into operation by stages. Thus in the Perm camps it was first put into practice in 1973. It was then, for example, that the identification patches sewn onto clothing were introduced.

In the Mordovian Camps[80]

On the Moscow-Ryazan-Ruzayevka railway line lies the station of Zubova Polyana (441 kilometres from Moscow); the next station is Potma (455 kilometres from Moscow). From Potma, a narrow-gauge line runs north, used by wagons bearing the inscription 'Property of ZhKh-385'. There is, north of Potma, the corrective colony called 'Institution ZhKh-385', or 'Dubrovlag'. In this colony, and also in 'Institution VS-389' (see 'In the Perm Camps', below), political prisoners are held (except for those sentenced under articles 190-1, 190-2 and 190-3 of the R S F S R Criminal Code, or under the corresponding articles of the other Soviet republics) and also people accused of 'especially dangerous crimes against the state'. The prisoners in these colonies come not only from the Russian Federative Republic but also from all over the Soviet Union. The *Chronicle* does not know whether such types of prisoner are also held in other camps. The political prisoners are held in camps 1, 3, 17 and 19 of institution ZhKh-385, and their addresses are, correspondingly, 'institution ZhKh-385/3', etc. Camps 1, 17 and 19 are situated in the Zubovo-Polyana district of the Mordovian A S S R, while camp 3 is in the Tengushevsky district; camp 1 is in the settlement of Sosnovka, Sosnovka being the first station after Potma. The headquarters of institution ZhKh-385 are in the settlement of Yavas — roughly halfway along the narrow-gauge branch-line. Camp 17 is in the settlement of Ozerny. Ozerny lies 18 kilometres from Yavas. The road from Yavas to Ozerny is in such a state that the prisoners call it 'the road of death': there have been instances when prisoners travelling over this road in Black Marias (they are divided into tiny single compartments with nothing for the person inside to hold on to) have suffered broken bones, concussion, etc. Camp 19 is in the settlement of Lesnoi. Lesnoi is six kilometres from the station of Shala. Transport from Shala to Lesnoi is by rail trolley. Camp 3 is situated in the settlement of Barashevo; Barashevo is the terminal station on the narrow-gauge line. Women political prisoners are kept in camp 3 (zone 4). The hospital of institution ZhKh-385 is also in camp 3 (zone 2).

* * *

Camp 1 (Special Regime)[81]

The prisoners in camp 1 are kept under special-regime conditions. (Up to about 1971, the special regime camp was camp 10, near the station of Leplei.) The camp building consists of 12 cells for prisoners, four punishment cells, a workshop, and rooms for the guards and administration offices. Three small exercise courtyards, with latrines, adjoin the building. Each prison cell (15 square metres [i.e. three by five] is for eight persons; it has two-tier bunks, a table, a bench, a hanging cupboard and a latrine bucket. The prisoners' cells are dark and damp (about two mattresses per year per prisoner rot because of this). The workshop (14m x 12m x 3.2m) is also damp — the ceiling steams up, and moisture trickles down the walls.

The work is hard and extremely unhealthy — grinding glass with abrasive cast-iron wheels. Abrasive silicose dust hangs in the air, and there is no ventilation. Nor is any special clothing provided. A medical commission ruled that the work was unhealthy, but, nonetheless, refused to grant extra milk rations for the prisoners. The working day lasts eight hours. The prisoners include many criminal offenders who have been sentenced under political articles while in the camps.

* * *

Ivan Andreyevich Gel (see *Chronicles* 24, 27, 28) is in camp 1. On 16 October he started a hunger strike, declaring it was 'to the death' (i.e. with no time limit), demanding the granting of special status to political prisoners; permission for the International Red Cross to have access to political prisoners; the removal of M V D authority over medical services in labour camps (he himself has suffered from severe headaches for a long time but is not given the necessary medical aid); and the registration of his marriage with the woman who is his natural-law wife (they have a child, which is usually considered sufficient grounds for the registration of a marriage, but they have been trying to get registration for nearly three years, without success).

* * *

Camp 17

At the beginning of 1974 a group of political prisoners in camp 17 protested to the highest authorities against being held with war criminals.

* * *

In 1974, in camp 17, **Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Chornovil** (see *Chronicles* 7, 24, 29) went on hunger strike. In this way Chornovil hoped to obtain permission for a visit by his natural-law wife, A. Pashko. After the hunger strike, the

visit was allowed. Chornovil stated that if further visits were forbidden he would go on an indefinite hunger strike. Chornovil and his wife cannot obtain permission for their marriage to be registered.

Later Chornovil was transferred from camp 17 to camp 19.

* * *

Ilya Glezer (see *Chronicles* 24, 25, 27) is also in camp 17.

Camp 19

Chronicle 32 has already reported the unsuccessful attempt by a group of political prisoners in camp 19 to send out a letter addressed to the Committee for Human Rights. A subsequent attempt succeeded. The letter is dated March-April 1974, and has six signatories: **K. A. Lyubarsky, B. P. Azernikov, B. S. Penson, A. M. Goldfeld, Z. V. Popadyuk** and **S. A. Babich.** The writers of the letter describe in detail the prison regime under which political prisoners in the camps are kept: the administration's tyranny, the continuous illegalities it practices with the aid of all kinds of supplementary orders and directives (see, for example, 'Order Number 020', above). They ask the Committee 'to examine the question of the conditions in which political prisoners are held in Soviet labour camps', and 'to study not only the existing laws controlling the life of political prisoners, but also how these laws are in actual fact being implemented'. The writers of the letter also regret that the term 'political prisoner' is not used in Soviet laws, and that the existence of political prisoners in the Soviet Union is denied.

What happened subsequently to those who wrote this letter?

On 20 September **K. A. Lyubarsky** (see *Chronicles* 24-28, 32) was transferred from camp 19 to camp 17. On 7 October Lyubarsky went on hunger strike 'to the death' over the question of his books. According to camp regulations a prisoner has the right, first, to keep in his zone (in his barrack or in the store — the 'kaptyorka') up to 50 kilograms of personal effects (any surplus has to be kept in an outer store, i.e. outside his zone); second, the prisoner has the right to keep with him up to five books. Until now, prisoners (including Lyubarsky himself when in camp 19) have always been allowed to decide for themselves what the 50 kilograms to be kept in the zone should consist of. Lyubarsky had selected books as the greater part of his 50 kilograms; but the administration of camp 17 suddenly announced that he would be allowed to keep only five books inside the zone, whether with him or in the store.

It was then that Lyubarsky went on hunger strike 'to the death', demanding that the administration observe its own rules. On 15 October the administration admitted they had been wrong and promised to return the books. On 16 October, however, Lyubarsky was taken to Yavas, for trial. And it was only when he entered the courtroom that he realized he was going to be tried. This was an administrative trial, held at the request of the authorities of camp 17, in spite of the fact that in that camp Lyubarsky had only been penalized once — he was given a reprimand for talking to other prisoners during work.

(It is known to the *Chronicle* that he had the permission of the foreman to do so, as he was still a 'learner' and had to familiarize himself with a new type of job.) At the trial Lyubarsky was accused of breaking the regulations on 15 occasions (he had earlier appealed against these charges, but the Procurator had replied only once). The administration declared that Lyubarsky had not embarked on the path of reform and that he was exerting a harmful influence on younger people. The Procurator, too, declared that Lyubarsky had not embarked on the path of reform; in addition, he said, Lyubarsky had not changed his beliefs. The court ordered Lyubarsky to be transferred to a prison for the remainder of his sentence.

Lyubarsky was taken at once from Yavas to Potma. On 17 October he was dispatched under convoy. On 20 October he was already in Vladimir prison. For the first two months there he was kept on the strict regime (as allowed by law), but for the first month he was on punishment rations (this is not provided for by law, but is applied to nearly every prisoner). Towards the end of October, M. Landa and the Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the U S S R lodged protests against the transfer of Lyubarsky to Vladimir prison.

In the spring of 1974, **B. P. Azernikov** and **B. S. Penson** were transferred from camp 19 to camp 3.

Before transfer, Penson, one of those sentenced in the trial of the 'aeroplane people' (see *Chronicle* 17), was put in the camp prison for 15 days for 'infringement of the regulations on clothing'.

Boris Azernikov is an oral surgeon. In accordance with article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code he was sentenced to 3½ years for 'participation in a Zionist organization' [see *Chronicle* 23]. His sentence ended in February 1975.

A. M. Goldfeld, whose release was reported in *Chronicle* 32, has already left for Israel.

* * *

Chronicle 32 reported the transfer of Shakirov to Vladimir prison. As far as is known, **B. A. Shakirov** was sentenced to eight(?) years' imprisonment under articles corresponding to articles 64 and 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code; he was charged with Uzbek nationalism and attempting to cross the border.

* * *

Antanas Sakalauskas, one of those sentenced in the Lithuanian 'trial of the five' (see *Chronicle* 32), has been delivered to camp 19.

* * *

Roman Semenyuk (see *Chronicle* 27) has been transferred from Vladimir prison to camp 19.

* * *

Chronicle 32 reported the arrival in camp 19 of **Lyubomir Staroselsky,** arrested 'at his school bench'. Additional details have now become known, which show that issue 32 was inaccurate in one respect. Staroselsky was born on 8 May 1955, and his co-defendant, **Roman Kolopach,** on 12 November 1954. Staroselsky finished school after the ninth year and started working. On the night of 8-9 May 1972 Staroselsky and Kolopach put out two yellow-and-blue Ukrainian nationalist flags in the village of Stebnik (in Lvov region). On that date neither of them had reached the age of 18. On 19 February 1973 the Lvov regional court found them guilty of actions under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (equivalent to article 70 of the R S F S R Code) and article 187-2 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (article 190-2 of the R S F S R Code). They were charged under article 62 for putting out Ukrainian nationalist flags, and under article 187-2 ('defiling the State emblem or flag') because the flags incorporated some blue cloth torn by Kolopach from the red-and-blue flag of the Soviet Ukraine. The court sentenced Kolopach to three years, and L. Z. Staroselsky to two years' imprisonment. Both youths were taken into custody only after sentence had been passed, so their term of imprisonment began on 19 February 1973.[82]

* * *

Two of the four leaders of the All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Liberation of the People — A S C U L P — (see *Chronicles* 1, 19), are in camp 19: **Evgeny Aleksandrovich Vagin** ('head of the ideological section' of A S C U L P, by profession a literary scholar) and **Boris Anatolevich Averichkin** (a lawyer, 'in charge of the organization's documents'). Their sentences began in March 1967.

* * *

Anatoly Ivanovich Ivanov[83] is a prisoner in the Mordovian camps (seemingly in camp 19). A. I. Ivanov was born in 1939, in the town of Vyazma. Up to the time of his arrest he was working in Moscow as a taxi driver. He lived in Odintsovo (a suburb of Moscow). He is married and has one son. In February 1971 the Moscow regional court sentenced him to five years in labour camps under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. The charge against him was that, from 1969 onwards, he had been writing poems and other material in which he had 'crudely distorted the life and history of the Soviet people, the activity of the party and the government, had poured scorn on Soviet democracy and had exaggerated isolated shortcomings'. In addition, he was charged with: the text of an appeal to the Praesidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet, in which he requested permission to emigrate to the U S A; describing the sending of troops into Czechoslovakia as an occupation; expressing dissatisfaction that citizens' constitutional rights cannot be exercised in practice; and conversations with workmates in which 'he declared that the policy of the party creates disorder and is against the people, and that it was

essential for an opposition party to be formed'. During the pre-trial investigation A. I. Ivanov expressed his regret for 'having acted wrongly when making such statements'. At his trial, he pleaded not guilty.

* * *

In December 1973 **Alexander Aleksandrovich Petrov-Agatov** (Agatov is a literary pseudonym) arrived from Vladimir prison in camp 19. Petrov-Agatov was in the past a communist, a leading member of the Stavropol party territorial committee. He is the author of the words of the well-known song 'Dark Night' (from the film 'Two Warriors').

In 1947 Petrov-Agatov was accused of anti-Soviet propaganda because of some critical remarks about Stalin, and in June 1948, he was sentenced to imprisonment by the Special Board. He escaped from camps on five occasions. Each escape was declared to have been counter-revolutionary sabotage and for each he was sentenced to an additional term of imprisonmnt. In 1956 Petrov-Agatov was released and legally exculpated.

Following his release Petrov-Agatov worked as an assistant to the Minister of Culture of the Checheno-Ingush Autonomous Republic. His works were widely published. His song 'My Checheno-Ingushetia' became almost a national anthem in the Republic.

In 1960 Petrov-Agatov was again arrested. He was released in 1967. The circumstances of this case are not known.

After his second release Petrov-Agatov continued writing and translating. He did many translations of poems by Yandiev, Raisa Akhmatova, Akhmet Vedzizhev and Mutalibov. He has translated works by almost all the Chechen and Ingushi poets. In 1967 a cycle of his own verse lyrics was published in the journal *Prostor,* and another selection of his poems was published in 1968, in the journal *Neva,* number three. His short novel *The Secret of the Old Church* was also published in *Neva* in issue eight, 1968.

On 26 July 1968 Petrov-Agatov was arrested once more. The indictment in his case[84] reads: 'On 26 July 1968, by order of the Directorate for Moscow and Moscow Region of the K G B attached to the U S S R Council of Ministers, A. A. Petrov was arrested for conducting anti-Soviet agitation. The investigation carried out in connection with this case has established that, starting in 1943, Petrov wrote, kept and distributed various poems of an anti-Soviet nature. . . . Later, A. A. Petrov copied into note-books the anti-Soviet verses he had written between 1943 and 1953 and kept them with the intention of distributing them at some future date. In 1968 Petrov produced a handwritten book of poems which he called *Songs of Hope and Faith.* In this handwritten collection Petrov included anti-Soviet poems which he had written in 1943-1953, . . . and which contain libellous fabrications defaming the Soviet political and social system, while, in addition, the poems "To God", "The United States of America" and "To President Johnson" contain calls for the overthrow of Soviet authority. . . . In July 1968, moreover, he wrote an anti-Soviet text called "Epilogue".'

The sentence was seven years (under article 70 of the R S F S R Criminal Code).

In camp Petrov-Agatov wrote a documentary work of an autobiographical nature — *Encounters with Convicts*. This work, and a number of poems from the collection *Songs of Hope and Faith* ('Kolyma Track', 'To God', 'Twenty-Six', 'The Sword of Gumilyov') have been published in the West. In November 1970 Petrov-Agatov was sent to Vladimir Prison for three years. He arrived in camp 19 in December 1973.

* * *

During 1973 Z. V. Popadyuk, S. G. Dreizner, K. A. Lyubarsky, P. A. Airikyan, B. A. Shakirov, N. Budulak-Sharygin, A. Pašilis, A. I. Ivanov, V. O. Mogilever, I. Zalmanson and R. Z. Semenyuk each spent six months in the C-TP (cell-type premises — a form of camp prison) in camp 19.

B. P. Azernikov spent three months in the C-TP during 1973.

* * *

In 1973 **Solomon Girshevich Dreizner** (see *Chronicle* 20) and **Paruir Airikyan** (*Chronicle* 16 [and 34]) were released at the end of their terms from camp 19.

* * *

In 1974 **Vladimir Mogilever** (see *Chronicle* 20) and **Alexis Pašilis** were released at the end of their terms of imprisonment.

A. Pašilis was sentenced in 1970, in the town of Klaipeda, to four years' imprisonment for distributing pamphlets and for hanging out Lithuanian national flags. He was charged under article 68 of the Lithuanian Criminal Code (which corresponds to article 70 of the R S F S R Code). His co-defendants were Šilinskas and Balkaitis. In the winter of 1973-74 Pašilis was taken to Vilnius, 'to be educated'. On 16 February he was taken back to Mordovia but to a different camp. At the end of August Pašilis was returned to Vilnius and there set free. The local police have placed him under administrative surveillance for six months.[85]

* * *

Near the office-block in camp 19 a notice is posted headed: 'THEY HAVE EARNED THE HIGHEST TRUST OF THE LAW', which says that at the request of the administration, and by order of the supervisory commission, the following persons have been granted a remission of the remainder of their terms by being given pardons or by commutation of their sentences, because of their conscientious work, exemplary behaviour and active participation in community affairs: M. V. Elin, M. R. Potseluiko, A. N. Vashchenko, A. V. Stapchinsky, V. A. Pupelis, J. J. Rubenis, F. F. Klimenko and P. A. Kalva.

Who, in fact, are these people?

Elin is a former soldier who defected to West Germany, returned voluntarily, and received a ten-year sentence in accordance with article 64 of the R S F S R Criminal Code; in camp he worked as senior electrician. **Potseluiko** took part in mass murders during the German occupation; he personally hanged a number of people; his sentence was 25 years, and in camp he worked as senior foreman. **Vashchenko** worked as a chief of police under the Germans during the occupation and took part in mass murders; his sentence was 25 years, and in camp he was in charge of the stores. **Stapchinsky** worked as a Gestapo interrogator; he was first sentenced to 25 years and later received another 25-year sentence for participating in the Vorkuta uprising; in camp he was a senior foreman. **Pupelis** and **Rubenis** served in the German army, both of them got 25 years; in camp Pupelis was in charge of the seed-beds, and Rubenis was his assistant. **Klimenko** was arrested in March 1969 on account of a manuscript (evidently of an autobiographic nature) and during his pre-trial investigation gave false evidence against P. Litvinov and L. Bogoraz [see *Chronicle* 8]; his sentence was five years; the handwritten texts of Klimenko's denunciations have been found. **Kalva** got a ten-year sentence for participating in the Latvian partisan movement; in camp he worked as a construction engineer; he was pardoned three months before his sentence expired.

* * *

Camp 3

There are, at present, 22 women in the fourth (female) zone of camp 3:

(1) **Darya Yurevna Gusyak,** Ukrainian, born 1924, member of O U N [Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists]. Sentence — 25 years, imprisoned since 1950, from 1950 to 1969 in Vladimir prison. At present almost blind, suffers from dermatitis.

(2) **Mariya Ivanovna Palchak,** Ukrainian, born 1922 or 1927, member of O U N. Arrested in 1960 or 1961, sentenced to be shot but sentence commuted to 15 years.

(3) **Nina Antonovna Strokata,** Ukrainian, born 1925, microbiologist. Arrested December 1971 under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (Corresponding to article 70 of the R S F S R Code), sentenced to four years. Strokata is suffering from an oncological illness. Once every six months she is taken to a cancer clinic in Rostov-on-Don for examination. In 1974 Strokata was elected an honorary member by the American Association of Microbiologists. Her husband S. Karavansky (*Chronicles* 13, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 32) is now serving his 25th year of imprisonment. He is now in camp 1. His term ends in 1979.

(4) **Irina Mikhailovna Senik,** Ukrainian, born 1925. Was imprisoned from 1944 to 1954. In October 1972 she was arrested again (see *Chronicles* 28, 29, 32). Her sentence was six years of camps and three years in exile. Irina Senik is an invalid of the second degree (she has either tuberculosis or a fractured spine).

(5) **Stefania Mikhailovna Shabatura,** Ukrainian, born 1938, is a commercial artist. Arrested January 1972 under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code, sentenced to five years in camps and three years' exile (*Chronicles* 28, 32).

(6) **Irina Onufrievna Stasiv-Kalynets,** Ukrainian, born 1940, a poetess. Arrested January 1972 under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code, sentenced to six years in camps and three years' exile (*Chronicles* 28, 29, 32). In the spring of 1974 Irina Stasiv began feeling the first acute symptoms of a renal disease (the preliminary diagnosis was nephritis); after a period in hospital her condition became more stable. Her husband Igor Kalynets (*Chronicles* 28, 32) was arrested shortly after his wife's trial. He received the same sentence and is now in camp 35 in the Perm complex. Their 12-year-old daughter lives with her grandmother in Lvov.

(7) **Nadezhda Alekseyevna Svetlichnaya,** Ukrainian, born 1936. Arrested in April 1972 under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code; sentenced to four years in labour camps, to be followed by exile (*Chronicles* 29, 32). Svetlichnaya is a sick woman (she has arachnitis, hepatitis and latent tuberculosis). Her brother Ivan Alekseyevich Svetlichny (*Chronicle* 29) is in camp No. 35 in the Perm complex. Her four-year-old son lives with relatives in Kiev.

(8) **Galina Vladimirovna Selivonchik,** born 1937. In 1969 she herself, her husband and brother tried to hi-jack a plane (her husband being killed in the attempt); she was sentenced to 13 years in camps and five years' exile (see *Chronicles* 15, 16).

(9) **Anna Moiseyevna Kogan,** born 1920, worked for the K G B, was a member of the party. Arrested in 1969, sentenced to seven years. She was tried together with her son. Her son Boris Sokolov, born 1941, a worker, was sentenced to four years and is now in camp 35 in the Perm complex [see below]. Details of their case are not known.

(10) **Alexandra Khvotkova,** convicted for the second time for her membership of the T O C ('Truly Orthodox Church').[86]

(11) **Irina Andreyevna Kireyeva,** second conviction for being a member of the T O C.

(12) **Anastasia Andreyevna Volkova,** sister of I. A. Kireyeva; second conviction for being a member of the T O C.

(13) **Klavdia Volkova,** second conviction for membership of T O C.

(14) **Mariya Pavlovna Semyonova,** born 1925; third conviction for membership of the T O C. She finished her second term of imprisonment in, it appears, 1971 (see *Chronicle* 15).

(15) **Nadezhda Usoyeva,** born 1942. Convicted for T O C membership.

(16) **Tatyana Sokolova,** born 1934. Convicted for T O C membership.

(17) **Glafira Kuldysheva,** born 1929. Convicted for T O C membership.

(18) **Raisa Ivanova,** born 1929. Convicted for T O C membership. Ivanova refused to work in the camp and was sent away for psychiatric examination, from which she never returned. It is assumed that she was sent to a special psychiatric hospital. The prisoners consider Ivanova mentally healthy.[87]

(19) **Natalya Frantsevna Gryunvald,** born 1912. Sentenced to 25 years (*Chronicle* 15). Her son, sentenced with her at the same trial, is now in camp 35 in the Perm camp complex.

(20) **Vera Iosifovna Kiudene,** Lithuanian, born 1919, a peasant. Arrested in 1967 for her participation in the post-war Lithuanian resistance movement. *Chronicle* 15 stated that Kiudene was mentally ill. No information is available on her present state of health.

(21) **Ekaterina Aleshina** (?), apparently Mordovian. Sentenced for membership of the T O C.

(22) **Tatyana Pavlovna Krasayeva,** born 1904. Sentenced to seven years. Her case is not known about.

* * *

In September 1974, in answer to an appeal published in the journal *New Times* number 13, 1974, **Svetlichnaya, Stasiv-Kalynets, Strokata** and **Shabatura** handed a statement to the administration, asking to be allowed to contribute to the fund for victims of the Chilean junta with money they had earned in the camp. Their request was refused.

They also asked for permission to send delegates from among the women political prisoners to a congress of the Women's International Democratic Federation. This request was also refused.

* * *

Lyubarsky, Azernikov, Penson, Popadyuk, Babich, I. Zalmanson and **Petrov-Agatov** addressed an open letter to the Women's International Democratic Federation. They wrote: 'There are not many of these women, altogether only 20 to 30. We do not wish to discuss here the question of whether or not their conviction was just or lawful. Political disagreements are long-drawn-out affairs, while these women are suffering now. We only want to ask whether the power of a mighty state would really be undermined, whether the power which disposes of a gigantic apparatus would be weakened, by the release of two dozen women? Waging war on women cannot be a sign of strength. They must be freed! What better opportunity could there be for a State which proclaims itself the most humane in the world to prove the sincerity of its declarations? We appeal to you, women democrats: demand that the Soviet government release its women political prisoners . . . They are your sisters. Help them. That would be not an act of politics, but an act of humanity.'

* * *

At the end of August 1974, six years before her sentence was due to end, **Silva Zalmanson** (see *Chronicles* 17, 32) was unexpectedly pardoned. She left for Israel at the beginning of September. Silva's husband Edward Kuznetsov,

and her brother Izrail, are in the Mordovian camps (Kuznetsov in camp 1, I. Zalmanson in camp 3); her other brother, Vulf Zalmanson, is in camp 36 in the Perm complex.

In the Perm Camps

Spread out over the Chusovoi district of the Perm region is 'Institution VS-389', a camp complex in which political prisoners are held in two camps (numbers 35 and 36).

Camp 35 is in the settlement of Vsesvyatskoye; camp 36 in the settlement of Kuchino.

At Kuchino a new camp (apparently number 37) to house 200 to 250 people is being built by prisoners from camps 35 and 36.

Camp 35

Camp Commandant — Major Pimenov
Political Officer — Major Kitmanov
Head of the medical section — Captain Yarunin
The camp is designed to house 240 people.

The camp is situated in a small valley, and as a result the atmosphere is always damp and there are sudden changes in atmospheric pressure. It is at a height of about one kilometre above sea level. The winter temperature can be as low as 50°C below zero.

Issue 10 of the *A Chronicle of Human Rights in the U S S R* published 'A Diary of a Month-Long Hunger Strike', which describes events in camp 35 between 12 May and 4 July of this year. The 'Diary' is part of an extensive collection of texts and documents compiled by prisoners in camp 35. Those who compiled it have called this collection *The Chronicle of the GULag Archipelago.*

The information on camp 35 included in this issue is largely based on material from the *Chronicle of the GULag Archipelago.* (The full text of the *Chronicle of the G A* exists in *samizdat.*)

* * *

On 6 February 1974 Lieutenant Nikolayev, the officer on duty, struck a prisoner, Vladimir Bobrov, while putting handcuffs on him. Following a demand by the prisoners, Bobrov was examined by a doctor, Captain Yarunin, head of the medical section, who estimated and recorded in his register the degree of force used to inflict the wounds.

Demanding an investigation, the prisoners Afanasev, Bukovsky, Litvinenko, Meshener, Yatsishin and Bobrov himself went on hunger strike.

On 7 February Lieutenant-Colonel Mikov, head of the Special Section of the Perm Directorate of Internal Affairs (see *Chronicle* 30), together with the new head of the K G B section, tried, during an investigation, to justify Nikolayev's actions. Only after the hunger-strikers had addressed an appeal to the

U S S R Procurator's Office and to the administrative organs department of the Communist Party Central Committee did Mirodyan arrive, the Chusovoi procurator responsible for supervision of the corrective labour colonies. He promised to carry out an objective investigation.

The results of this investigation were given by the R S F S R Procuracy in its answer [by V. Bolysov] of 9 August 1974 to the prisoners' written complaints (see below).

The Hunger Strike of 12 May to 12 June

In the opinion of the prisoners in camp 35 the administrators of that camp have, over the past one-and-a-half years, been 'tightening the screws'.

For example, in the winter of 1973-74, Gluzman and Svetlichny were deprived of visits because 'they were sitting on their beds in the daytime'. In April 1974 Svetlichny was again deprived of a visit because of some 'ideologically harmful poems' which had been confiscated from him. In February Bukovsky was put in the cell-type premises for three months (see *Chronicle* 32, also below). In April Pavlenkov was deprived of a visit from his wife (see *Chronicle* 32). The prisoners consider that, in recent months, they have been picked on over trifles much more often ('Why haven't you shaved?', 'Why are you walking so slowly?', 'Why aren't you wearing socks?').

On 12 May, Pronyuk (see *Chronicle* 30) was deprived of a visit because, having fallen ill, he had stayed away from work without first informing the administration (Pronyuk had only recently arrived in the camp and did not yet know the rules). This was the last straw, which drove the prisoners to declare a hunger strike.

On the evening of 12 May more than 40 prisoners went to the officer on duty, Sidyakov, and asked him to send for Pimenov. The latter promised to come to the zone, but did not do so. When the evening bell was sounded the prisoners refused to go to bed unless Pimenov came. The garrison was alerted and the outer guard posts of the camp were reinforced.

The following morning many prisoners refused to turn out for roll-call; 25 of them declared that they were going on hunger strike. (According to other sources, the hunger strike was started only after Major Pimenov had finally appeared and had ordered Svetlichny and Antonyuk to be put in the camp prison for having 'organized a disturbance' — Svetlichny for three days and Antonyuk for seven days.)

Those who went on hunger strike were: Altman, Antonyuk, Afanasev, Balakhonov, Budagyan, Bukovsky, Butman, Valdman, Gluzman, Gorbal, Danne, Zakharchenko, Kalynets, Kandyba, Lychak, Marchenko, Meshener, Nemazilov, Pavlenkov, Svetlichny, Khnokh, Chanturishvili, Chekalin, Shakhverdyan and Yagman. All of them refused to go out to work.

A few other people staged a one-day hunger strike in support of the protest, and prisoner Gladko refused to go to work. The hunger-strikers called for an end to the repressive measures against political prisoners, and, in particular, asked that Pronyuk be allowed his visit from his family.

The prisoners would not let Pronyuk himself take part in the hunger strike, so that it would be possible for him to have a visit.

The Deputy-Head of Corrective Labour Institution VS-389, Major V. F. Kotov, asked Pronyuk to send a telegram to his wife to tell her the visit had been cancelled. Pronyuk refused. On the following day the camp administration itself sent such a telegram, in Pronyuk's name. (On the 22nd day of the hunger strike, during a conversation with prisoner Davidenko, Pimenov said: 'If Pronyuk, now, were to fill in an official request form for a visit and backdate it to 10 May, I would refuse to grant it, but, on the reverse side of the same form I would give him permission for a prolonged visit.')

The hunger strike lasted until 12 June, though it was not maintained continuously by the same prisoners: as some stopped hunger-striking, others began. Some stopped their hunger strike because friends asked them to, as it was affecting their health: Antonyuk and Shakhverdyan ended their strike on 16 May; Gorbal ended his on 17 May; Yagman and Chanturishvili on 21 May; Meshener on 22 May; Danne on 2 June; and Svetlichny on 3 June.

On 14 May nine prisoners started a ten-day hunger strike, protesting against the camp administration's violations of the law.

On 20 May 15 prisoners declared a one-day protest hunger strike: they demanded that the hunger-strikers be given separate quarters, and that artificial feeding be started.

On 24 May Davidenko — who had left hospital on the previous day — joined the hunger strike. Gavrilov was on hunger strike from 3 to 7 June. On 10 June nine prisoners joined in the hunger strike, among them some who had earlier given it up.

At first the administration adopted towards the hunger-strikers a policy of persuasion mixed with threats, with the threats clearly predominating. Then they resorted to repression. Almost up to the end of the hunger strike the camp authorities refused to consider the prisoners' demands seriously.

As early as 13 May the Political Officer, Major Kitmanov, threatened to call in troops.

On 16 May an inspector of the operations section, Lieutenant Rogozov, threatened to bring charges against the hunger-strikers under article 190-3 of the R S F S R Criminal Code. At that time, too, on Kitmanov's initiative, an attempt was made to out-manoeuvre the hunger-strikers through a resolution by the so-called 'Soviet of the Colony Collective' (S C C). (This, in theory, is the colony's self-governing body, composed of persons 'who have recommended themselves by their exemplary behaviour and their conscientious attitude to labour and education', to quote the R S F S R Corrective Labour Code. In camps where there are political prisoners, this body consists almost entirely of former policemen and other people who collaborated with the Germans during 1941-45. The political prisoners themselves boycott the S C C as a rule.)

S C C member Ostrovsky proposed that immediate strong measures should be taken against the hunger-strikers, including criminal charges. S C C member Efimov supported Ostrovsky's proposal, but the other members refused to sign the minutes of the meeting.

During the first days of the hunger strike Meshener, Balakhonov, Yagman, Bukovsky, Pavlenkov, Gladko, Davidenko and Budagyan were put in the camp prison. When all the prison cells were full-up with hunger-strikers there were still about 15 of them left in the zone. On the sixth day Pimenov asked them to move to a new barrack which was still under construction, but they refused as it was very damp there. Pimenov then declared: 'In that case, I don't consider you hunger-strikers; I have unlimited power here, and the Perm Procurator will back me up in any action I take.'

Artificial feeding of the hunger-strikers was begun on the 12th day. The head of the medical section, Yarunin, when questioned by prisoner Pidgorodetsky, said that it had been impossible to begin force-feeding earlier, as the camp commandant had been refusing to isolate the hunger-strikers. It was only on the 11th day that, faced with the threat of the hunger strike spreading, the administration had the hunger-strikers moved into the hospital. However, they were fed for only four days, after which Pimenov ordered that the force-feeding be stopped ('feed them strictly according to the rules — relying entirely on medical assessment'), and it was begun again only after six to eight days.

On 27 May Bukovsky was transferred to Vladimir prison [see *Chronicle* 35]. On 7 June Afanasev was also sent there.

In response to complaints sent by the prisoners (during the month more than 200 statements were sent to various bodies), representatives of the authorities came to the camp. On 14 May, for example, district procurator, Mirodyan, came to the camp, called Pronyuk a liar and refused to examine his complaint seriously. Matsiyevsky, head of the Perm regional procuracy's department for supervision of corrective labour colonies, visited the camp on the 10th day of the hunger strike. He too refused to admit that the administration's actions had been unlawful. On the 18th day two representatives of the medical department of the Perm Directorate for Corrective Labour Colonies visited the camp. They were medical inspector Captain Sadovsky and Lieutenant Nesterenko of the M V D medical service, and they gave the official replies to the protests sent to the medical department. The replies were:

— that the camp prison cells are quite suitable for the accommodation of prisoners;
— that the law does not forbid invalids of the second degree being put in the prison (reference to Svetlichny);
— that the law does not stipulate the examination of prisoners by a doctor before they can be put in the prison.

The hunger-strikers were visited repeatedly by Major Kotov and Captain Utyro, the K G B operations representative for camp 35.

On 4 June the deputy head of the Perm Regional Directorate for Corrective Labour Colonies, Colonel Shabadin, arrived. He was the first to threaten the hunger-strikers with charges under article 77-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code ('actions disrupting the work of a Corrective Labour Colony'), which carries

penalties right up to execution by firing squad.

Seemingly in an attempt to keep contacts between camp 36 and camp 35 to a minimum, when prisoners from camp 36 recovered in the hospital (which is situated in camp 35) they were not discharged. Thus the hospital became overcrowded. As a result, there was a delay in admitting prisoner Sylka (from camp 36) into hospital. By the time he was eventually brought in, on the evening of 5 June, his condition was already very serious, and he died on the morning of 6 June.

On the night of 10 June Opanasenko, from camp 36, hanged himself in the hospital. He left a note [written in Ukrainian]: 'Can't stand it any more—damn you, executioners!' The prisoner Gluzman (see *Chronicle* 28), a psychiatrist by profession, in a letter to the party Central Committee (text in *A Chronicle of Human Rights in the U S S R*, number 10) asserts that there had been no apparent deviations in Opanasenko's psyche prior to his suicide.

On 12 June, having completed the period agreed on, the prisoners ended their hunger strike.

* * *

After the hunger strike had ended, those who had taken part in it were given a special diet for four days. They managed to get the special diet prolonged for one more day by threatening to stop eating again. Many of the hunger-strikers were let off work for the first few days.

Immediately after the hunger strike systematic persecution of its participants began, especially of those whom the administration considered to have been particularly active. Gluzman, Danne, Lychak and Meshener were deprived of access to the camp shop; Gluzman and Meshener were also deprived of a parcel.

On 28 June Pavlenkov was put in the cell-type premises for three months. (He had taken part in the hunger strike from the first to the last day.) On 29 June Chekalin was put in the prison for 13 days. Balakhonov was put in the prison for three days.

* * *

On 4 July **Gluzman** was put in the prison for five days because of his refusal to take part in building a new punishment block. On 9 July Gluzman was released from the prison and again refused to take part in building the new block; he was put back in the prison on 10 July, this time for ten days.

On 20 July, when Gluzman next came out of the prison, he sent a statement to the Politbureau of the party and to the board chairman of the 'Novosti' News Agency (A P N); (the appeal was apparently sent to the latter because Gluzman made use of quotations from the Soviet press, which has more than once expressed its outrage at the use of Chilean political prisoners as a labour force for building a prison on the island of Dosan). In this statement he writes that the administration is using his refusal to work on the prison building as a pretext to send him first to the cell-type premises, then to Vladimir prison. Gluzman emphasizes that he has not refused to work as such; on the contrary, on 10 July and again on 16 July he had written to the commandant, asking to be assigned to any other work — and had not received any reply, either oral or written.

On 26 July, again because of his refusal to work on the prison block, Gluzman was deprived of a visit from his parents. At the time, his parents had already left Kiev for the Urals. They arrived at Vsesvyatskoye on 31 July, and there learned that their visit had been cancelled.

On 3 August Gluzman's father wrote him a letter, in which he appealed to his son to 're-appraise his values', come to his senses, and not violate the camp regime any more. S. Gluzman replied to his parents in an open letter, in which he explained his own understanding of true moral values (for full text see *Archive of the Chronicle*, number 1).[88]

* * *

On 21 July, **Yatsishin** was sentenced to three years in Vladimir prison for systematic refusal to work. It seems that Yatsishin is suffering from a mental disorder: he is mistrustful, withdrawn, and inclined to eat dirt (coprophagy). At the beginning of August he was transferred to the Vladimir prison hospital.

* * *

On 21 July **Yagman** went on a one-day hunger strike, 'as a warning', in connection with the worsening atmosphere in the camp.

* * *

On 29 July **Antonyuk** refused to work in the ploughed-up security strip along the camp fence. Political prisoners in the camp do not regard it as 'good form' to work in the prohibited zone. In an appeal to the Procuracy Antonyuk wrote that working in the security strip was contrary to his moral principles.

On the same day Antonyuk was given a reprimand. On 30 July he was deprived of access to the camp shop. On 1 August he was deprived of a visit, and on 6 August he was sent to the prison for seven days.

On 6 August a reply to his letter came from the Procuracy, signed by Matsiyevsky and saying: '. . . Explain to Antonyuk that . . . the regional Procuracy finds no violation of the law by the administration in the offer made to him to work as a painter.'

* * *

On 10 August Yagman again went on hunger strike — 'to defend myself and my friends against further tyranny'.

* * *

In the middle of June, a commision was investigating, in the camp, complaints by the prisoners; it consisted of a representative of the R S F S R Procuracy, Rytov, and of a representative of the U S S R M V D, Lieutenant-Colonel Anastasov. In a conversation with prisoners, Anastasov insisted that the administration's actions were legal and the hunger strike was against the law.

* * *

[Document]

Procuracy of the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic.
Department for places of imprisonment.
9 August 1974. No. 14/402-72 Received 9 August 1974
To the head of the Special [i.e. K G B] Section in institution VS-389/35.

I ask you to inform the convicts V. K. Pavlenkov, A. N. Chekalin, A. G. Khnokh, G. I. Butman, T. Chanturishvili, L. I. Yagman, D. I. Demidov, V. F. Balakhonov, I.Ya. Meshener, Yu.A. Budagyan, N. A. Gorbal, G. V. Gladko, G. V. Gavrilov, V. I. Zakharchenko, I. M. Kalynets, B. Shakhverdyan, A. A. Altman, S. F. Gluzman, Z. P. Antonyuk, T. Melnichuk, E. Prishlyak, E. Pronyuk, K. N. Nemazilov, V. K. Bogdanov, D. K. Verkholyak and I. Valdman that their complaints, received from the Central Committee of the Communist Party, have been investigated by the R S F S R Procuracy. For refusing to go to work and disrupting the daily routine the convicts Pronyuk, Pavlenkov, Balakhonov, Bukovsky, Butman and Meshener were justly punished by being put in the camp prison for varying periods. The statements that the convicts Pronyuk, Butman and Yagman were deprived of visits after their relatives had already arrived were not substantiated on investigation. Statements in the complaints made by convicts Khnokh, Balakhonov, Gorbal, Gavrilov, Zakharchenko, Kalynets, Gluzman, Antonyuk and Pronyuk, referring to the convicts Bukovsky and Afanasyev having been sent away from the camp while in a weakened state of health due to their refusal to accept nourishment, do not correspond to the facts. The convicts referred to were transferred to a prison in May-June of this year by court order, because of their systematic and wilful disruption of order in the camp, and they were not listed as refusing nourishment at the time they were transferred. Neither has it been confirmed that disciplinary penalties based on false reports were inflicted on Bukovsky. The convicts Sylka and Kurkis died in the hospital of the institution as a result of serious diseases from which they were suffering. It has not been established that any action on the part of the administration of the institution could have been the cause of convict Opanasenko's suicide.

Reports by Kalynets and Chekalin that the convicts were threatened by comrade Shabadin, deputy head of the Directorate for Corrective Labour Colonies, and by unit commander comrade Kuznetsov, as well as reports by Balakhonov and Gluzman that convict Bobrov was beaten up by camp official Nikolayev, have not been confirmed after investigation. Gluzman's report that relatives are subjected to a search before visits does not correspond to the facts. Losses of letters reaching the institution have not been established. The legally

stipulated three-day period, during which the administration must despatch letters written by prisoners and deliver letters sent to them, is sometimes not being observed, in connection with the lack of a translator. The administration has been advised to take the necessary measures to rectify this infringement of the regulations.

Concerning the convicts deprived of visits, no infringements of the law have been established, with the exception of two cases when the convicts Torosyan and Davidenko were deprived of visits; it has been recommended that sanctions be imposed on the officials responsible for the refusal of visits to Torosyan and Davidenko.

The statements made in complaints by convicts Gorbal, Zakharchenko, Kalynets, Bogdanov and Gladko — that during searches, books, notes, exercise-books, copies of their sentences and other belongings, which the convicts are supposedly allowed to keep, have been confiscated and not returned to them — have not been substantiated on investigation. Various notes were taken from convict Svetlichny, which were later returned to him.

No infringements of the law have been established concerning the use of convicts for labour during periods in the camp prison or the cell-type premises.

There is no confirmation for the reports by convict Antonyuk that his hot-water bottle was confiscated, and that tea has been confiscated from some convicts, so as to be sold to other convicts.

It has been established on investigation that there was no reason for convicts Lychak and Bobrov to be put in the cell-type premises. The above-mentioned convicts were released on the orders of an official inspecting the institution at the time. Sanctions against the guilty officials concerned have been recommended.

It was found that convict Bogdanov, and also other convicts, are receiving the appropriate medical aid.

Other reports in the complaints have not been substantiated on investigation.

Head of the Department for Supervision of Places of Imprisonment; senior counsellor of justice **Bolysov**[89]

* * *

On 18 August, in a statement to the administrative organs department of the Central Committee of the party, **Yagman** analyzed the reply from the R S F S R Procuracy. Among other things, Yagman wrote: 'The admission of violations through the non-observance of the three-day period for the sending and receiving of letters is very interesting. It turns out that this has been happening for lack of a translator. But it is still not clear what language letters written in Russian have to be translated into, and yet these are often kept back for ten days or more.' In Yagman's view, the reply of the R S F S R Procuracy was designed 'to encourage the administration in further illegalities'.

* * *

On 19 August a mass protest hunger strike began again in the camps.

* * *

On 19 August the conversion of a block of living quarters into a punishment block began, under the personal direction and control of Polyakov, the deputy camp commandant for regime matters. The conversion was pushed through with unimaginable haste.

* * *

On 22 August **Svetlichny** wrote an appeal to Bolysov. The letter concerns Bolysov's reply to the prisoners' complaints.

Svetlichny refutes the statements like 'the reports have not been substantiated' in Bolysov's reply by citing numerous examples. For instance, about the transfer of Bukovsky and Afanasev during the hunger strike, Svetlichny writes: 'What am I to believe — the evidence of my own eyes, when I myself saw Bukovsky being sent off to Vladimir prison, not merely during "a time when he was refusing nourishment" but half-a-month after the beginning of a hunger strike; or am I to believe you, a person who never saw any of this . . .? And how about the 200 other prisoners in the camp — what if they, too, saw it all and know it to be true? How will they react to your cold "does not correspond to the facts"?' Refuting yet another statement made by Bolysov, Svetlichny writes: 'My wife, who came to visit me in September 1973, was not merely searched, she was stripped naked, made to bend over, squatting down and so on — i.e. she was subjected to extremely degrading treatment which denied all human dignity . . . V. V. Sarnachnaya, Z. Antonyuk's wife, was subjected to the same operations. Even the elderly mother and nine-year-old son of A. Chekalin were searched. Such incidents are, in fact, common occurrences in the camp.'

Svetlichny expresses the opinion that, in the reply, only the signature was by Bolysov himself.

* * *

On 26 August **Kalynets** was deprived of a visit from his relatives. The reason: during the preliminary examination of the foodstuffs which an aunt of Kalynets had brought for him, it was discovered that the jam in one pot had been cooked with alcohol as flavouring.

* * *

Around 27 August, some new prisoners joined the hunger strike. It appears that up to then the following were taking part in the hunger strike: Kalynets, Gorbal, Svetlichny, Balakhonov, Gluzman, Pronyuk, Prishlyak, Antonyuk, Khnokh, Valdman, Chekalin and Yagman.

On 27 August, the ninth day of the hunger strike, the hunger-strikers were examined by a doctor for the first time.

* * *

On 28 August the camp administration sent a telegram to Gluzman's parents, informing them that their son had again been deprived of a visit.

On 29 August Antonyuk, Balakhonov, Valdman, Gluzman, Svetlichny, Khnokh and Chekalin were put in the cell-type premises (Gluzman and Svetlichny for three months each).

Soon after 29 August many of those who had taken part in the May-June hunger strike sent individual statements to the Perm Regional Procuracy which read as follows:

'At the present time, the convicted prisoners Z. P. Antonyuk, V. F. Balakhonov, V. K. Pavlenkov, I. A. Svetlichny and S. F. Gluzman have been put in the cell-type premises of colony VS-389/35.

'Among the reasons given in the order for putting them in the C-T P was that they had allegedly exerted a negative influence on other convicted prisoners — particularly on those who took part in the protest hunger strike of May-June 1974.

'I wish to inform you that I personally took part in that hunger strike, not because of any negative influence having been exerted on me by the persons mentioned above, but exclusively because of the provocative actions of the camp administration. A similar situation has existed in the camp since 28 August — when the prisoner I. M. Kalynets was deprived of a visit for no reason whatsoever, and the law was openly and cynically flouted by the camp administration and by Major Kotov, who is responsible for institution VS-389.

'As a result, without any "negative influence" having been exerted on me, I am compelled once again to declare a hunger strike in protest, as this is the only effective means at my disposal for attracting the attention of the supervisory authorities to unlawful actions.

'In view of the above, I would ask you to clarify:

1. What are the sources which the administration has used for its serious charges against the above-mentioned persons?
2. What facts are these charges based on?
3. Did the persons mentioned, in the opinion of the administration, exert a "negative influence" over me personally.'

* * *

The mass hunger strike ended on 5 September, after which only four people continued to fast: **Svetlichny, Balakhonov, Gluzman** and **Antonyuk.**

* * *

In accordance with new M V D directives concerning hunger strikes, hunger-strikers are now fed 'according to medical evidence', i.e. when the breath starts to smell of acetone.

The K G B representative in the Department of the Perm Directorate of Internal Affairs for Especially Dangerous Crimes against the State, Major

Afanasov, commented: 'No feeding. Let one of them kick the bucket, then the rest will stop their hunger strikes.'

* * *

The Procurator for supervision of the corrective labour colonies of the Perm region, Matsiyevsky, was personally informed about the circumstances of the hunger strike.

* * *

From 19 to 22 September Antonyuk, Balakhonov, Gluzman and Svetlichny went onto a 'dry' hunger strike [i.e. refused water too].

* * *

The camp administration threatened Antonyuk, Svetlichny and Pidgorodetsky wtih court proceedings for 'exerting a negative influence on those around them'. On 5 September Major Kotov threatened to deprive **Svetlichny, Pidgorodetsky** and **Kovalenko** of their status as second degree invalids, so that they 'would have to work and would have no time to think'. And indeed the Medical Commission for Labour Matters, during its work in the camp from 16 to 20 September, proceeded to deprive all three of their invalid status.

* * *

In September **Igor Ogurtsov** (see *Chronicle* 32) returned to camp 35 from the Mordovian camp hospital.[90]

* * *

On 5 September over 30 people sent statements with the following text to the Praesidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet:

'On 5 September 1918, through the decree "On the Red Terror" passed by the Soviet of People's Commissars, concentration camps, later to be called forced-labour camps, were established in the U S S R.[91] That day — 5 September 1918 — has been made symbolic by the millions of victims who resulted from that action.

'On this day of mourning, I protest against the ever-continuing tyranny and I demand that my status as a political prisoner be recognized, and all the logical consequences put into effect.'

* * *

At the end of October **Svetlichny, Balakhonov, Antonyuk** and **Gluzman** sent an appeal to Academician Sakharov:

'We have now been on hunger strike for three months. We are demanding the right to be accorded the status of political prisoners. We have written to all

the highest U S S R authorities — with silence as their only answer. In that way they leave the camp administration free to act as it pleases, and allow it to taunt us. We appeal to you, as an eminent figure in the democratic movement. We ask you to do for us everything you can in the shortest possible time, and to make your actions known to all official bodies.'

* * *

A group of political prisoners has appealed to the International Red Cross. In their appeal they point out that the Soviet Red Cross, while demonstratively providing aid for refugees and political prisoners abroad, has never given any help to Soviet political prisoners, and neither knows nor wants to know anything about their situation, about the fact that 'the conditions of imprisonment in this camp are specially designed to destroy the prisoners' health'. The starvation-level food norms are reinforced by prohibitions and restrictions concerning food parcels; the seriously ill are sometimes deprived of their invalid status and forced to do work they are not fit for; the lack of normal medical services leads to disease and deaths (Mikityuk died in July 1972, Kurkis in August 1973, and Sylka in May 1974); a prison regime has been established in the camp hospitals.

Protest hunger strikes, the only means available to defend one's rights, are punished by isolation in the camp prison; following a recent new directive, force-feeding is carried out only when the body's protein begins to disintegrate. The appeal describes the use of psychiatry for the suppression of dissent as 'the most terrible and monstrous' of all the means used.

The appeal was signed by A. Altman, N. Bondar, N. Gorbal, V. Zakharchenko, A. Zdorovy, I. Kalynets, V. Marchenko, I. Mendelevich, I. Ogurtsov, E. Prishlyak, E. Sverstyuk, B. Shakhverdyan and L. Yagman.

* * *

According to the law, prisoners who 'have a serious illness which precludes further serving of their sentence' can be freed before their sentence expires (for example, under article 100 of the R S F S R Corrective Labour Code). The prisoners call this procedure 'invaliding out' or 'commissioning off'. In actual practice, only those whose days have been numbered have, up to now, been 'invalided out'. According to some reports, prisoner **Kibartas** was 'commissioned off' only after his death. **Solenieks** was 'invalided out' only after the malignant tumour on his lip had become inoperable. In camp 35, at this moment, the following prisoners are suffering from illnesses which make them eligible for 'invaliding out':

Mikhail Dyak (12 years of prison and camps and five years' exile) — lymphogranulomatosis;[92]

Vladimir Dyak (ten years of camps) — a malignant form of hypertension;

Dmitry Basarab (25 years of camps)[93] — common arteriosclerosis, cardiosclerosis, aneurism of the miocardium since suffering a heart attack in 1972,

ischemic heart disease;

Konstantin Lushch (15 years of prison and camps and five years' exile) — a malignant form of hypertension, haemiplegia on the right side after a brain haemorrhage;

Nikolai Melekh (15 years of prison and camps) — Parkinson's disease, hemiparesis on the left side after meningoencephalitis;

Albertas Meškinas (15 years of camps) — severe mitral-aortal heart disease, stomach ulcer, stomach haemorrhage, anaemia;

Evgeny Pronyuk (seven years of camps and five years' exile) — open tuberculosis of the lungs.

Vladimir Bukovsky in the Camp

It was reported in *Chronicle* 32 that Vladimir Bukovsky was kept in the cell-type premises from 20 February (in fact it was from 21 February) to 9 May. Details about his incarceration in the C-T P have now become known, together with some of the earlier circumstances.

Before Bukovsky was transferred from Vladimir prison to the camp in the spring of 1973, he was in Lefortovo prison in Moscow for two months, where Major Aleksandrovsky (see *Chronicle* 29) had some conversations with him.

The Major proposed to Bukovsky that he should write a request for a pardon and added that his advice was based on the opinion of high authorities. In reply, Bukovsky demanded the release of the people who had been interned in psychiatric hospitals for political reasons. At the end of their conversations, Aleksandrovsky noted that the road to a pardon would always be open for Bukovsky, that he would have plenty of time to think it over, and would be helped to do so.

From the very first days of his stay in the camp numerous punishments were inflicted upon Bukovsky. Over a short period of time he received two warnings and two reprimands; he was deprived of access to the camp shop and also deprived of a visit. The reasons given for some of the punishments were that: he went out of the living quarters wearing slippers, he was wearing a cap which was not of the regulation type, he did not salute a representative of the administration, he did not stand up when the head of his unit entered.

On 4 February Bukovsky was put in the camp prison for ten days, because he had not carried out an order given by First Lieutenant Osin, the manager of the workshop. On 14 February Bukovsky was informed that his punishment had been extended by five days because the shift foreman, prisoner Balashov, had reported that Bukovsky had not been at his place of work on 3 February (a Sunday). During a talk with Bukovsky the camp Commandant, Major Pimenov, said that he (Pimenov) had not been in any way responsible for the punishment.

On 19 February Bukovsky was released from the prison, but on 21 February he was put in the cell-type premises 'for continuous, wilful breaches of the regime regulations and for exerting a negative influence on those around him', according to a resolution by a VS-389 Commission in Skalnoye.

In March two officials, who did not give their names, visited Bukovsky. They took offence because he did not stand up when they walked in: 'I am being fed so poorly here,' Bukovsky observed, 'that I simply cannot get up very often.' On the same day he was transferred from the cell-type premises to the prison for seven days. On reading him the order for this, Pimenov again remarked: 'You must understand, this has nothing to do with me.'

According to insufficiently verified reports, Bukovsky was there allotted food norm '9b' (see above).

As Bukovsky lacked the strength necessary to fulfil his work norm (prisoners in the C-T P have to cut threads on bolts by hand), he was deprived of access to the camp shop during April. In this connection political officer Kitmanov said to him: 'That's the basic law of socialism: he who does not work, neither shall he eat.'

A group of prisoners sent appeals on Bukovsky's behalf to the U S S R Procurator-General. They all received identical replies, through the Perm Regional Procuracy:

'You are asked to inform prisoner (name . . .) that his appeal (dated . . .) has been received and examined by the U S S R Procuracy. The regional Procuracy has carried out an investigation, checking-up on the legality of convict Bukovsky's transfer to cell-type premises; it has been established that, for systematic disregard and infringements of the camp regulations, for rudeness, insulting behaviour, non-fulfilment of lawful demands by the administration, and for other breaches of the regulations, he was justifiably put in cell-type premises, and that he is able, from the health point of view, to undergo this form of punishment.

Head of the Department for the Supervision of
Places of Imprisonment, Matsiyevsky'

Camp 36

A list of the **administration personnel** of camp 36 was given in *Chronicle* 30. At the present time the following facts are known:

Captain Zhuravkov — Camp Commandant (the previous Commandant, Major V. F. Kotov, has become deputy head of the VS-389 complex of Corrective Labour Colonies).

Major V. Fyodorov — Deputy in charge of regime matters and the operations section.

Captain Gnedin — Political officer.

Shardin — Production chief.

Captain Milenty — Assistant to the Commandant.

Kotova — Doctor.

Ensign Rotenko — Surveillance service.

The camp is designed to hold 250 people. At present there are about 200 in it.

* * *

The work in the camp consists of:
— manufacture of electric fire bars — in workshop 1 (an unhealthy workshop, because of the dust);
— assembling of electric iron panels — in workshop 2;
— pressing of plastic plates — in workshop 3 (unhealthy, as temperature in it is about 60°C);
— sewing of mittens — in an auxiliary workshop;
— construction work;
— a saw-mill is to be opened soon.

Because of the lack of ventilation in the workshops, the prisoners have to wear respirators while working. Despite the unhealthy conditions they have to work eight hours a day, six days a week. The work-norms are high — only one prisoner, Sado, was able to fulfil the norm on two occasions, through working overtime.

* * *

Living conditions: Two single-storey barracks, each divided into two sections. There are about 30 double-tier bunks in each section. Each room has three or four windows; the ceiling is three to 3½ metres high. The regulations prescribe one locker for each pair of bunks. One pillow, one blanket, three(?) sheets and one towel are allocated for each bunk. During the spring, when the heating has just been turned off, and during the autumn, when the heating has not yet been turned on, the rooms are very cold.

Baths are allowed once a week, to be taken during the first half of the day — the bath-house is badly heated.

* * *

July 1972: A few prisoners went on a six-day hunger strike because of the compulsory shaving of beards (one of the first steps to implement Order 020).

November 1972: Several prisoners protested in writing against compulsory attendance at political meetings.

10 December 1972 (Human Rights Day): One-day hunger strike; the prisoners tried to hang out a U N flag.

December 1972: Bondar staged a month-long hunger strike, on the anniversary of his trial.

24 December 1972: Hunger strike by the 'aeroplane people' (on the second anniversary of the Leningrad trial).

15 July 1973: The customary hunger strike by the 'aeroplane people' (on the third anniversary of their arrest).

9 February 1974: About 40 people went on hunger strike, protesting against the camp regime. They appealed to various authorities and to the press.

1-15 May: Abankin on hunger strike.

* * *

A Month-Long Strike

On the afternoon of 22 June, a Saturday, a number of prisoners were lying in the sun in the area near the living quarters. Among them was **Stepan Sapelyak,** who, though he had been in the camp for only a few months, had already come into conflict with the administration more than once; he had suffered a series of punishments, had been put in the prison, and had managed to provoke an extremely hostile attitude on the part of the administration. On that day the officer on duty as deputy camp commandant was Captain Milenty.

Milenty, together with Ensign Rotenko, was patrolling the zone, and asked the sun-bathing prisoners to get dressed; they obeyed him. However, Sapelyak was then taken to the guard-house, where he was asked to write an explanation regarding 'the infringement of the regulations concerning dress'. He refused to do so. Then Milenty made him stand facing the wall, leaning on it with his hands as for a search, and with the words 'I'll show you the law', Milenty struck Sapelyak a number of blows on the back and sides with his fists. Then the camp commandant, Captain Zhuravkov, appeared at the guard-house and informed Sapelyak that he was being deprived of access to the camp shop for a month because he had 'infringed the regulations concerning dress'. Sapelyak said that he had been beaten up, and demanded an immediate medical examination. Soon after, the doctor, Kotova, arrived at the guard-house; she is the wife of the former camp commandant. A prisoner who happened to be in the guard-house, Safronov, noticed red marks on Sapelyak's body and pointed these out to Kotova, but she alleged that Sapelyak had had these from birth. She said she could find no marks on him made by blows. Sapelyak was then allowed to leave the guard-house for the zone; he was threatened that if he told anyone about a beating, then 'sparks would really fly' for him.

Sapelyak told the other prisoners what had happened. Some time later, a guard detail arrived and tried to take him back to the guard-house, but the other prisoners would not let them take him. The following day they went on strike, demanding an investigation. About 45 people took part in the strike. Major Kotov announced that he would head an investigation.

During the first three days, the administration limited itself to threats of prosecution under article 77-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code and to symbolic punishments (reprimands and warnings).

The investigation was completed by the beginning of the third day of the strike. The evidence of prisoner Žukauskas, a doctor, who had also examined Sapelyak and had found marks on his body caused by a hand, was not taken into consideration.

On the evening of the 25 June Major Kotov announced to the assembled prisoners that Sapelyak was a slanderer and would be punished for his slander. On the same evening Sverstyuk, Zdorovy and Grilius were put in the prison for refusing to work. After this a number of prisoners ended their strike.

Thirty-two people continued to strike: Sapelyak, O. Frolov, Sverstyuk, Grilius, Pokrovsky, Mendelevich, Gulil, Dymshits, Zdorovy, Zalmanson, Grin-

kov, Makarenko, Sinkov, Žukauskas, Berniichuk, Mirauskas, Lukyanenko, Šilinskas, Kalinichenko, Kudirka, Kifyak, Vorobyov, Grigorev, Davydov. Gerchak, Safronov, Chernoglaz, Astra, Puce, Saarte, Lapp and Abankin.

On the next day Pokrovsky was put in the C-T P for five months, Davydov for four months, and Kudirka for two months. Earlier Abankin, too, had been put in. Several prisoners were put in the prison. By the evening of that day the prison cells were full up. Other prisoners were deprived of visits and parcels, and of access to the camp shop.

On 3 July the following prisoners were transferred to Vladimir prison for taking part in the strike: Kudirka (for three years), Lukyanenko (to the end of his sentence, i.e. 1½ years), and Chernoglaz (for 11 months).

On 5 July the following prisoners were transferred from the prison to the C-T P: Makarenko, Zdorovy and Grilius (for two months) and Šilinskas (for four months).

On 13 July O. Frolov and Davydov were transferred to the hospital because of a deterioration in their health.

On 15-16 July the prisoners still in the zone ended their strike. Those imprisoned in the C-T P continued to strike.

The health of Makarenko, Grilius, Zdorovy and Šilinskas deteriorated sharply in the course of just over a month, while they were being given prison food norms. They were told that, due to camp regulations, it was not possible for them to be given the medical treatment required.

The strike ended soon after 20 July.

* * *

On 19 July prisoner **Makarenko** was deprived of access to the camp shop for infringing the regulations on dress; for the same reason he was, on 23 July, deprived of his next visit; on 25 July, again for the same offence, he was put in the prison for 14 days. It would seem that the real reason for these punishments was that Makarenko himself, as well as people interested in his fate, had been constantly writing protests about the systematic confiscation or disappearance of letters addressed to him or written by him. These protests had been addressed to the M V D. On 8 August Makarenko was released from the prison. On 9 August he was transferred to camp 3 in the Mordovian complex. In September Makarenko was transferred to Vladimir prison by court order, for violating 'the regulations'.

* * *

On 9 August Abankin, Astra, Mirauskas, Puce, Safronov and Sinkov renewed the strike; they demanded that their friends held in the C-T P be hospitalized and taken off prison food norms. In answer to this, they were themselves put in the prison.

In the middle of August Abankin and Safronov were transferred to Vladimir prison, each for three years.

The prisoners in the C-T P announced that, because of the tyranny continuously practised by the administration, they would not work again in this camp.

On 25 August a hunger strike in support of the strikers was begun in the zone. This hunger strike lasted, it seems, until 5 September.

On 4-5 September, the customary hunger strike on the anniversary of the Decree of 5 September 1918 took place. It began at eight o'clock on the evening of 4 September. About 40 people took part. They lit a candle on a specially-made mound, resembling a grave; speeches were made, and prayers said in memory of the dead. The hunger-strikers tried to remain silent throughout the following day. The hunger strike ended at eight o'clock on the evening of 5 September.

A List of Prisoners in the Perm Camps known to the 'Chronicle'

Some comments are necessary as a preface to this list:

1. For easier reference, the prisoners in the list below are divided into groups according to the type of their 'case'. This grouping is, however, not in any way meant to be an attempt at a strict 'classification' based on the essential facts of each case concerned: this would be too difficult in many instances because of insufficient information. Each prisoner is classified according to the kind of charge brought against him, though often, when several charges are involved, it is difficult to single out the main one. The division can, therefore, only be relative and largely arbitrary. For instance, many of those in the Ukrainian 'intake' of 1971-73 could be included among those convicted for 'ideological crimes' — *samizdat*, letters and petitions (I. Svetlichny, I. Kalynets, M. Gorbal, A. Reznikov and others); and the same could be said to apply to some of the Lithuanians. Indeed in the great majority of political trials, during recent years at least, it has been ideological motives which have, generally speaking, provided the reason for conviction. However, the authorities have defined all these people, be it the Ukrainians or the Lithuanians, as nationalists.

On the other hand, such 'group' cases as that of D. Grinkov can be seen to be related to 'national' movements; while groups like that of O. Frolov may be regarded as involving 'ideological' activities. Therefore, for the sake of convenience, those persons convicted for 'forming groups' have been classified together in a separate category. In the process this category has incorporated, for example, the 'case' of Lukyanenko, which is widely regarded as having been fabricated by the Lvov K G B. (Concerning this, see V. Chornovil's book, known in *samizdat* as *The Green Book*.)

Another example is that of those convicted in the famous Leningrad 'aeroplane' trial; here below, they are placed in the category of 'Zionists', although, strictly speaking, they ought to have been classified among the people who have tried to leave the U S S R. 'Zionists' is a self-description on the part of the 'aeroplane people'.

2. It should be borne in mind that there may be errors in the dividing of the

prisoners into groups. For example, among the Lithuanians listed under 'National movement' there are some of whom the *Chronicle* knows only their names and terms of imprisonment; among these there may be some persons convicted for collaboration with the Germans during the war.

3. The reader should be warned against the temptation to use the number of prisoners listed in each category to calculate the numerical correlation between various categories of prisoners: the information on the prisoners in the Perm camps is not comprehensive, so it is impossible to indicate how far the numerical correlation in the list corresponds to the real situation. For instance, there is hardly any information on prisoners convicted for religious offences, but this does not mean that there are no such prisoners in the Perm political camps.

4. In cases where articles of the Criminal Codes of the non-Russian Republics are concerned, these have been 'translated' into the corresponding articles of the R S F S R Code. It should be noted, though, that the texts of the corresponding articles are not always identical.

Institution VS-389/35

I. *Prisoners convicted on charges relating to samizdat, letters, petitions and protests:*

(1) *Meshener*, Iosif, 39 years old, history teacher in a school in the town of Bendery. In 1969 he was expelled from the party and dismissed from his job for a letter on the Czechoslovak question sent to the Central Committee. He then wrote to the U N about his letter and the consequences. Arrested in 1970 (*Chronicle* 16). Sentence— six years, article 70.
Co-defendant: Ya. Suslensky.

(2) *Gluzman*, Semyon (Samuel), 27 years old, psychiatrist. Arrested on 11 May 1972, tried for *samizdat* activity under article 70; sentenced to seven years in camps and three years' exile (*Chronicle* 28). Well-known as the author of 'An in Absentia Psychiatric Report on the Case of P. G. Grigorenko'.[95]

(3) *Superfin*, Gabriel Gavrilovich, 30 years old, literary critic and literary historian. (Article 70, sentence — five years in camps and two years' exile.) He was arrested on 3 July 1973. Convicted in May 1974, basically for collecting material for the *Chronicle of Current Events* and for participating in its publication. For Superfin's trial see *Chronicle* 32. He arrived at the camp in September.

(4) *Zhuchkov*, Konstantin Vasilevich, 48 years old, a worker. Wrote anonymous letters to various organizations. Article 70, sentence — three years.

II. *Prisoners convicted for belonging to 'anti-Soviet organizations':*

(5) *Pavlenkov*, Vladlen Konstantinovich, 45 years old, until his arrest taught history at a technical college in Gorky. Arrested in October 1969 on charges of trying to found an anti-Soviet organization (on the 'Gorky case' see *Chronicles* 11-13). Articles 70, 72, sentence — seven years.

(6) *Gavrilov*, Gennady Vladimirovich, born 1939, engineer, Lieutenant-Captain in the Soviet Navy; was a member of the party. In the autumn of 1968, at an officers' meeting, he described the entry of troops into Czechoslovakia as an act of aggression. In February 1969 he was, in a single day, expelled from the party, dismissed from his job and transferred to the naval reserve. In June of the same year he was arrested, and, in 1970, sentenced to six years in camps. He was charged under articles 70 and 72 with founding an illegal organization, the 'Union to Struggle for Political Freedom', with writing theoretical politico-philosophical works and distributing them, and with attempting to organize the underground publication of a newspaper, *The Democrat* (for the case of the Baltic Fleet Officers see *Chronicles* 11, 15). In June 1974 Gavrilov was pardoned (see *Chronicle* 32).
Co-defendants: *Kosyrev* (two years, released in 1971) and Paramonov.
Gennady Paramonov, a re-enlisted petty officer, was an external student in the Faculty of Philosophy and History of Tartu University, and a Komsomol leader in the garrison at Paldiski. Was ruled non-responsible for his actions, and is now in his fifth year of internment in the Chernyakhovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital.

(7) *Ogurtsov*, Igor Vyacheslavovich, born 1937, expert on oriental languages, worked as a translator from Japanese. One of the leaders of the All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Liberation of the People (A S C U L P) (see *Chronicles* 1, 4, 19). Articles 64, 70, 72. Sentence — seven years in prison (which ended this year), eight years in camps and five years' exile.

(8) *Davidenko*, Georgy Mikhailovich, 27 years old, a metal worker from Nizhny Tagil, formerly a member of the party. Sentence — four years. Arrested in March 1971 in connection with the case of the 'Revolutionary Party of Soviet Intellectuals' (R P S I). The case was examined by the Sverdlovsk regional court in the middle of November 1971.[96]

The R P S I was formed as a result of a merger between the so-called 'intellectuals' and an organization called U R C (Urals Regional Committee, founded in April 1970; Secretary — Lavrenteva); at the U R C third regional conference, in August 1970, Davidenko was appointed 'president'. They set up a printing press, held meetings, wrote and distributed articles: 'Trampolism' and 'The Birth of New Classes and the Struggle in the Era of Socialism'. The verdict refers to these articles as 'making assertions about the degradation of socialist society and the degeneration of the Komsomol'. The *Chronicle* has no information on the ideological position of this organization; it is only known

that they called themselves 'anti-trampolists', but what is meant by the term 'trampolism' is not clear.

Davidenko's co-defendants:

Spinenko, Vasily (wrote under the pseudonym Smolin), born in 1945, a graduate of the Faculty of Philosophy at Donetsk University, the 'ideologist of the organization' — declared non-responsible for his actions and interned for 'compulsory psychiatric treatment';

Kiselev, Alexander Ivanovich, born 1951, a metal-worker in a mine in the town of Makeyevka. Sentence — three years; now released;

Belomesov and *Semiletov* (see below for details).

The fate of two workers from Nizhny Tagil is unknown:

Babishcheva, Evgenia Kirillovna, born 1948, and

Lavrenteva, Natalya Dmitrievna, born 1950.

(9) *Kandyba*, Ivan Alekseyevich, Ukrainian. Arrested in 1961 and sentenced to 15 years — apparently under articles 64, 70 and 72 — for participation in the 'case' of Lukyanenko (see V. Chornovil: *The Green Book*).

(10) *Dyak*, Mikhail Dmitrievich, 39 years old, Ukrainian; until his arrest he was a neighbourhood commissioner, with the rank of police-lieutenant, in the Dolinsk district of the Ivano-Frankovsk region. Arrested in March 1967 as one of the leaders of the 'Ukrainian National Front' (on the case of the U N F see *Chronicle* 17). Articles 64, 72, 218 (illegal possession of weapons or explosives). Sentence — five years in prison (which he has served), seven years in camps and five years in exile.

Mikhail Dyak is seriously ill; the authorities proposed to him that he write a plea for a pardon, promising that this would be granted. Dyak refused.

(11) *Demidov*, Dmitry Ilich, 26 years old, Ukrainian, engineer. Arrested on 13 April 1973 in connection with the case of the 'Union of the Ukrainian Youth of Galicia'. The verdict stated that Demidov 'effectively took upon himself the responsibilities of deputy leader for ideological questions concerning the organization's activities'. Articles 70, 72, and an accomplice under article 218-1, Part 2 (stealing firearms, ammunition or explosives). Sentence — five years.

(12) *Melekh*, Nikolai, born 1930, Ukrainian. Arrested in Lvov in 1961. Sentence — 15 years. Melekh's four co-defendants were executed by shooting. It is known that the case is described in the book *Ferment in the Ukraine*, published in England.[97]

III. *Zionists*

(13-15) Three of those convicted in the 'aeroplane case' in Leningrad in 1970 (see *Chronicle* 17):

Khnokh, Arie-Leib, 30 years old, a worker. Sentence — ten years;

Mendelevich, Iosif, 27 years old, up to his arrest a student at the Riga Polytechnic Institute. Sentence — 12 years. Transferred to camp 35 from camp 36.

Altman, Anatoly, 33 years old, worked as a joiner until his arrest. Sentence — ten years.

All charged under articles 64 (via 15), 70, 72 and 93-1 (grand larceny of state property).

(16-17) Two of those convicted at the 'aeroplane-related' trial in Leningrad in 1971 (see *Chronicle* 20):

Yagman, Lev Naumovich, 33 years old, engineer. Sentence — five years. Articles 70, 72, 189 (being an accessory before the fact — article 93-1).

Butman, Gilel Israilevich. 42 years old, engineer. Sentence — ten years. Articles 64 (via 17), 70, 72, 189.

All the above-mentioned count the start of their sentences from June 1970.

(18) *Shkolnik*, Isaac, 37 years old, a metal-worker from Vinnitsa. He was preparing to emigrate from the U S S R. Arrested at the beginning of July 1972. At first he was charged, under article 190-1, with 'anti-Soviet conversations' at work and with friends. Later he was charged with espionage on behalf of Israel (according to information in *A Chronicle of Human Rights*, number 1, on behalf of Britain). A military tribunal in Vinnitsa, having investigated Shkolnik's case from the 29 March to 11 April 1973, sentenced him to ten years in camps. On 3 July the Military Collegium of the U S S R Supreme Court reduced Shkolnik's sentence to seven years.

IV. *Persons who attempted to leave the U S S R*

(19) *Balakhonov*, Vladimir, worked as a translator with the permanent Soviet delegation at the U N's Meteorological Organization in Switzerland. Decided not to return to the U S S R; then changed his mind and returned to Moscow on 1 December 1972. The Soviet Consul had assured Balakhonov that he would not be subjected to any persecution; however, Balakhonov asserts that he had been well aware of the risks involved, but had, nevertheless, decided to return because he could not bear the separation from his family.

In Moscow Balakhonov was summoned to the K G B several times and threatened; he was arrested on 7 January 1973. Article 64 — sentence 12 years.[98]

(20) *Gladko*, Georgy Vladimirovich, an ex-soldier. Escaped abroad from the Potsdam military prison. Sentence — 12 or 13 years, beginning in 1962 [see *Chronicles* 9, 11, 35].

(21) *Valdman*, I., Estonian, a soldier. Crossed the Soviet-Czechoslovak

border. Article 64, sentence — 12 years.

(22) *Lychak*, Ukrainian, perhaps a soldier. Attempted to cross the border; sentence — eight or 12 years; has about two years left to serve.

(23) *Kruglyak*, a sailor. Attempted to escape abroad. Sentence — 12 years; has about four years left to serve.

(24) *Vendysh*, M.,[99] a sailor. Attempted to escape abroad; sentence — 12 years; he was convicted in about 1970.

V. *Ukrainian nationalists and those ruled to be such*

(25) *Antonyuk*, Zinovy, 41 years old, a philologist. Arrested on 14 January 1972. Charged with harbouring and distributing Ukrainian *samizdat*, including the *Ukrainian Herald*. The verdict of the Kiev regional court: seven years in camps and three years' exile (see *Chronicle* 27).

(26) *Svetlichny*, Ivan Alekseyevich, writer and literary critic. Arrested on 14 January 1972. Tried by the Kiev regional court, charged under article 70. Harbouring Ukrainian *samizdat* of a fictional and autobiographical nature; producing articles of literary criticism. Sentence — seven years in camps and five in exile [see *Chronicle* 29]. On 11 February 1972 the newspaper *Evening Kiev* also accused Svetlichny of betraying his motherland to the Belgian citizen Jaroslav Dobosch for 50 roubles, and of trying to send to the West a number of anti-Soviet documents. One of these documents was *A Dictionary of Ukrainian Rhymes*, the criminal nature of which stems from the fact that its author is the political prisoner S. Karavansky; the other documents were also of an academic nature. It is not known whether these accusations were examined at the trial.

At the end of October or beginning of November Svetlichny was transferred from camp 35 to an unknown destination. He was previously arrested by the Kiev K G B in August 1965 and released on 30 April 1966, because of insufficient evidence.

(27) *Kalynets*, Igor, a poet. Arrested in 1972. Some Ukrainian publishers in Canada republished a collection of verse by Kalynets which had been published in the U S S R. But the Canadian edition also included three poems previously unpublished. The Lvov regional court ruled that one of these was criminal in content. Sentence — six years in camps and three years' exile.

A few days before the arrest of Kalynets his wife, the poet Irina Stasiv-Kalynets, had been given an identical sentence.

Igor Kalynets has been written about in *Chronicles* 7, 27 and 28.

(28) *Gorbal*, Nikolai [in Ukrainian: Mykola] Andreyevich, born 1941, lecturer in aesthetics at a technical college, external student at the Ivano-Frankovsk Pedagogical Institute. During 1968-69, according to the verdict in his case, he wrote 'a composition in verse form' called 'A Thought'. He made two copies of this and gave them to several acquaintances to read. He was arrested on 24 November 1970. Sentence — five years in camps and two years in exile, under article 70. According to the sentence, passed by the Ternopol regional court, Gorbal must spend his term of exile in the Komi Autonomous Republic.

(29) *Stus*, Vasily, 36 years old, poet and literary critic. Arrested in January 1972. Charged at first under article 190-1, then under article 70. Sentence — five years in camps and three years in exile. The case against Stus was based on: (1) a critical article on P. Tychina; (2) a letter to the government about the state of literature in the Ukraine; (3) telling two 'anti-Soviet' jokes; (4) the publication in Belgium of a collection of his poems. (See *Chronicle* 27).

(30) *Kovalenko*, Nikolai Ermilovich, 56 years old, a Kiev teacher. Arrested on 14 January 1972. Tried for involvement with Ukrainian *samizdat* and for oral statements about Czechoslovakia. Sentence — five years (see *Chronicle* 27).

(31) *Pronyuk*, Evgeny, about 30 years old, formerly a research fellow at the Philosophy Institute of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Arrested on 8 July 1972 for sending, together with V. Lisovoi, a letter to the party's Central Committee (about the growing number of political trials in the Ukraine in 1971-72). At their trial Lisovoi and Pronyuk were also charged with contributing to two issues of the *Ukrainian Herald* (see *Chronicle* 30). Article 70. Sentence — seven years in camps and five years in exile.

(32) *Zakharchenko*, V. I.,[100] writer. Article 70; sentence — five years. The expulsion of Zakharchenko from the Ukrainian Writers' Union was reported in *Chronicle* 28.

(33) *Melnichuk*, Taras Yurevich, 30 years old, a poet. In July 1972 he was sentenced, in Ivano-Frankovsk, to three years under article 70 (see *A Chronicle of Human Rights*, number 5-6, *Ukrainian Herald* 6).

(34) *Dyak*, Vladimir. Arrested on 1 June 1971 by the Lvov K G B. Charged with distributing leaflets, with protesting against the policy of Russification in the Ukraine, and with having written pamphlets (one of these was 'The Ukrainian Language in a Socialist Society'). A few days after his arrest a criminal charge was brought against him which alleged that he had stolen, and then sold, wood from a timber-yard under his charge in the village of Bilche-Volistsa. Article 84, part 3, of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (corresponding to article 92, part 3, of the R S F S R Code).

The theft charge was dropped for lack of evidence at the end of September 1971.

On 12 October the Lvov regional court sentenced V. Dyak to five years in camps under article 70. But the charge under article 92 was brought up again just as Dyak was on the point of being sent to a camp. The investigation dragged on for about a year; on 17 October 1972 V. Dyak was found guilty of theft and sentenced to ten years in camps, to run concurrently with the earlier sentence. All his property was confiscated.

Dyak himself categorically denies any guilt concerning the criminal charge.

(35) *Soroko*, Stepan Klimentevich, born 1932. Convicted in August 1952. He was sentenced to 25 years by a military tribunal organized by state security troops in Rovno region, for being a member of the O U N and for setting up an O U N cell in the village of Krichilsk.

(36) *Prishlyak*, Evgeny, 62 years old, was once a regional or interregional security officer in the Ukrainian Insurgent Army [U I A]. Up to now he has spent a total of 28 years in Polish, German and Soviet prisons. His 'Soviet' term is 25 years, under article 58-1. Transferred to camp 35 from camp 36. [See *Chronicle* 24].

(37) *Pidgorodetsky*, Vasily, was a district security officer in the U I A. Arrested in 1951, sentenced to 25 years. In 1955[101] he was one of the organizers of an uprising in a camp. For this he was sentenced to 15 years. During the pre-trial investigation he learnt that, after a review, his earlier sentence had been reduced by ten years. He is due to be released in 1981.

(38) *Lushch*, Konstantin, member of the O U N, in which (or in the U I A) he held a leading position; he later went into hiding. Arrested in 1969, sentenced under article 64 to three years in prison and 12 years in camps. His co-defendant was Demchishin.

(39) *Verkholyak*, Dmitry Kuzmich, born 1928, Ukrainian, worked as a doctor's assistant in the U I A. Captured in a forest at the beginning of 1955, he was one of the last to be caught. Tried in February 1956. Sentence — 25 years. [See *Chronicles* 8, 9, 25.]

(42) *Jucis*, Juozas, born 1915. Arrested in 1971. Sentence — 12 years.

(43) *Žilinskas*, Antanas, born 1920. Arrested in 1969. Sentence — six years.

VI. *Lithuanian National Movement*

(44) *Jauga*, Antanas, born 1921. Arrested in 1967. Sentence — 15 years.

(45) *Urnežius*, Zigmas, arrested at the same time as the above, same sentence.

(46-47) *Tamoliunas*, Povilas, born 1926; and
Bružas, Ignas, over 60 years old.
Both arrested in 1966, both sentenced to ten years.

*Nos 40 and 41 are missing from the manuscript for an unknown reason.

(48) *Karpavičius*, Petras, born 1912. Arrested in 1964; sentence — 15 years.

(49) *Mišiunas*, Leonas, born 1907. Arrested in 1963; sentence — 12 years.

(50) *Čiukšis*, Karolius, born 1912. Arrested 1963, sentence — 15 years.

(51-54) Imprisoned since 1962:
Kirdenkis, Vladas, born 1924; *Kaminskas*, Kazis, born 1908; *Dudenas*, Nikolas, born 1910; *Miškinis*, Balys, born 1920. All are serving 15-year sentences.

(55) *Pocius*, Petras, born 1920. Sentence — 15 years, begun in 1961.

(56) *Šmitas*, Edvardas, about 50 years old. Probably arrested in 1955; sentence — 20 years, plus three years for an escape.

(57-65) 'Twenty-fivers': *Sidaris*, Vitas,* born 1928, arrested in 1957; *Bastis*, Vytas, about 40 years old; *Purlis*, Bronius, and *Matuzevičius*, Jonas, born 1930 [see *Chronicle* 24] — all arrested in about 1953.
Slapšinskas, Vytas, over 50 years old, arrested in 1952; *Vyturis*, Placidis, born 1921, arrested in 1950; *Valentinas*, Vladas, and *Pavlinas*, both arrested in 1947-48, both had three years added to their sentence because of an escape; *Tučas*, Robertas — date of arrest unknown.

(66) *Galdikas*, Balys, born 1925. Arrested in 1948, sentence — 25 years (for assisting the partisans). Released in 1956 on K G B recommendation. Six months to a year later he was returned to the camp to serve out his sentence. Given three extra years for attempting an escape from Vorkuta.

(67-70) No further details are known about the following Lithuanians in camp 35:
Meškinas, Albertas, sentence — 15 years; *Slučka*, Antanas, sentence — 15 years; *Kuržinskas*, Jonas, and *Babičas*.

VII. *War criminals*

(71) *Dordzhiev*, E. B. During the war he worked for both Soviet and German intelligence. Arrested in about 1953, sentence — 25 years under article 58-1.

(72) *Strashkov*, Nikolai; before the war he was a miner in the Donbass area; during the occupation he collaborated with the Germans (not, apparently, with military or punitive forces but with civilian organizations); after the war he lived in Central Asia under a pseudonym; in about 1963 he was recognized while visiting the Donbass area, and arrested; article 64, sentence — 15 years.

(73) *Ostrovsky*: was once a minister in the Belorussian government set up by the Germans. Sentence — 25 years. In the camp he is a member of the 'Soviet of the Colony Collective' [S C C].

(74) *Efimov*: served in the police force under the Germans; in the

*Not in fact in camp 35. See number 64 in the list for camp 36, below.

camp he is a member of the S C C.

(75) *Balashov*: served in the German police force. In the camp he is a shift-foreman.

(76) *Shavkunenko.*

VIII. *Other prisoners convicted for especially dangerous crimes against the state*:

(77) *Chanturishvili*, Teimuraz, born 1947, a Georgian poet. In 1969 he was charged under article 70 and also under article 91 (banditry with the aim of stealing state property) for taking part in an attack on a police pay-office; according to a different version he was also charged under article 72 for participating in a nationalist organization, 'The Black Rose'. It is said that Chanturishvili himself describes the pay-office robbery as an "expropriation'. Sentence — 12 years in camps.

(78) *Bondar*, Nikolai Vasilevich, born 1939, formerly taught philosophy at Uzhgorod University. Was arrested on 7 November 1970 during a demonstration on Kreschatik [Kiev's main street]; Bondar there unrolled a placard bearing a slogan criticizing the occupation of Czechoslovakia. Article 70, sentence — seven years (see *Chronicle* 23).

(79) *Chekalin*, Alexander Nikolayevich, born 1938, a fitter in the factory 'Stroimashina' in the town of Lisichansk, Voroshilovgrad region.

On 14 June 1970, during elections for the U S S R Supreme Soviet, 'he concocted anti-Soviet inscriptions on ballot-papers, calling for the overthrow of Soviet power and also adding knowing fabrications which libelled the Soviet social and political system' (quotation from the verdict*).

Arrested on 27 May 1971, article 70. The sentence of the Voroshilovgrad court — 5 years in camps; there are grounds to believe that Chekalin's sentence was reduced to four years on appeal.

(80) *Shakhverdyan*, Bagrat Levonovich, born 1940, Armenian, a cybernetics engineer. Arrested 19 March 1973. Tried in Erevan in November 1973. Articles 70 and 72;[102] sentence — five years in camps and two in exile.

Co-defendant — Arat Tagutavmetyan.

(81) *Budagyan*, Yury, born 1942, Armenian. Articles 70, 72; sentence — three and a half years. Released on 4 October 1974. Co-defendants: V. and S. Melikyan [see *Chronicle* 35].

(82) *Berger*, L. N. (otherwise known as Kolodezh) — transferred from a criminal camp to a political one, and to camp 35 from Mordovia (385/1, special-regime). (See on him the *Diaries* of E. Kuznetsov.)

(83) *Rumyantsev*, Valery. Article 64, sentence — 15 years. Released in August 1974, now living in the village of Tikhoretsk, under

*See full text below, section 'Trials of Recent Years'.

administrative surveillance for one year [see *Chronicle* 34].

(84) *Danne*, Erik, Latvian. According to one source, sentenced to seven years for espionage; according to others, to five or six years under article 70; his term expires in one and a half to two years.*

(85) *Bogdanov*, V. K.: for 'espionage' — removing a machine-part from an ammunitions factory — his sentence was eight years. Is suffering from radiation sickness.

(86) *Sokolov*, Boris, a worker, convicted under article 70 for some actions connected with criticism of Brezhnev. Sokolov's mother, Anna Moiseyevna Kogan, is held in the women's political camp in Mordovia [see above].

(87) *Afanasev*: possibly convicted for an attempt to escape from the U S S R. Transferred to Vladimir prison.

(88) *Yatsishin*:[103] sentenced to six years in 1972 in the Ukraine, for 'nationalism'. Transferred to Vladimir prison.

(89-95) *Nemazilov*, K. N.: a Tatar;
Ismagilov, Ismail, a Tatar or Bashkir;
Marchenko, V.: sentence — seven years plus five years' exile[104];
Gurny, Roman, Ukrainian, convicted in 1961[105];
Bobrov, Vladimir;
Litvinenko, A.;
Smirnov.

Institution VS 389/36

I. *Prisoners convicted on charges relating to* samizdat, *letters, petitions and protests*:

(1) *Vorobyov*, Oleg Ivanovich: 35 years old, a worker. In 1969 he supported the first letter by the Initiative Group (see *Chronicle* 8). Arrested on 24 September 1970 in Perm. He was tried on charges relating to *samizdat*, under article 70; sentence — three years in prison (Vladimir) and three years in camps.

Co-defendant: R. Vedeneyev, sentence — three years (see *Chronicles* 16, 18).

(2) *Davydov*, Georgi Valentinovich: 33 years old, a geological engineer from Leningrad. Reproduced *samizdat*, including the *Chronicle*, with a duplicating machine. Arrested on 22 September 1972. Article 70, sentence — five years in camps and two[106] years in exile.

Co-defendant: V. Petrov, sentence — three years and two in exile (see *Chronicle* 29).

(3) *Khaustov*, Victor Aleksandrovich: born 1938, a worker. His first sentence was for three years (1967-70) under article 190-3 (for taking part in the well-known demonstration on Moscow's Pushkin

*Not accurate: *Chronicle* 35 reports his release in early 1975, and gives more details. See also *Chronicle* 11.

Square on 22 January 1967). He was arrested for the second time on 17 January 1973. Sentenced by the Oryol regional court to four years in camps and two years' exile, under article 70 (see *Chronicle* 32). The main charge was taking part in the sending to the West of the *Diaries* of E. Kuznetsov.

II. *Prisoners convicted in cases concerned with 'anti-Soviet' organizations*:

(4) *Belomesov*, Victor Pavlovich: 26 years old, a fourth-year student at the Donetsk Polytechnic Institute evening courses, worked in a mine storehouse. A member of the R P S I (i.e. the so-called 'anti-trampolists', see note on Davidenko's case in section 'Camp 35', above). Arrested in March 1971. Articles 70, 72; sentence — four years.

(5) *Semiletov*, Victor Alekseyevich[107]: 28 years old, formerly a student at the MVD special school in Donetsk. His co-defendants were: Davidenko, Belomesov, etc. Sentence — four or five years.

(6) *Borozdin-Braun*, Nikolai Nikolayevich: 38 years old. Arrested in May 1969. Articles 70, 72; sentence — seven years in camps and two years in exile. His co-defendants were: S. A. Malchevsky (sentence — seven years and three years) and A. S. Berger (sentence — four and two years).
For the case of Malchevsky and Braun see *Chronicle* 9.

(7) *Petrashko*, Valery Mikhailovich: born 1951, a communications worker. Arrested in 1969 in the town of Krasnoyarsk and sentenced under articles 68 (diversion), 70 and 72 to six or seven years in camps.* The case was concerned with distribution of pamphlets and with arson in administrative buildings in Krasnoyarsk (see *Chronicle* 15). Co-defendants: V. Potemkin (six or seven years),* E. Rogalyova (five years — now released).

(8-9) *Frolov* and *Grilius*:
Frolov, Oleg Ivanovich: born in 1945 or 1946, a fourth-year student at the Ryazan Institute of Radio-Technology. Arrested in 1969. Articles 70, 72, sentence — five years.
Case of the union of the 'Communards', known as the 'Saratov-Ryazan case' (see *Chronicle* 14). To be more exact, the Ryazan branch of the case (Vudka and others).
O. Frolov was released when his sentence expired, in July; his co-defendant, *Grilius*, Shimon Aronovich, born 1945, also a former student, was freed in August of this year.[108]

(10-11) *Shaburov*, Nikolai Artemovich: born 1945, worked as head of a repair workshop in the town of Liepaja in the Latvian S S R; and *Pestov*, Viktor Georgievich: born 1940, a metal-worker from Sverdlovsk. Both sentenced to five years, beginning from May 1970.

*In fact both got five years. See *Chronicles* 15, 17 (supplement), and 35, which reports Petrashko's release.

Co-defendants: Pestov, Valery Georgievich, born 1948, brother of Viktor Pestov, worked in Sverdlovsk as a metal-worker, sentence — four years, now freed; Uzlov, Vladislav Nikolayevich, born 1948, worked as a freight dispatcher on the Sverdlovsk railway, sentence — three and a half years; Bersenev, Vladimir Evgenevich, born 1948, a metal-worker in the Sverdlovsk Housing Department, sentence — three years.
All five were members of the Komsomol, and the charges were under articles 70 and 72.
In 1968 Viktor Pestov and Shaburov founded the group 'Free Russia'. On 7 November 1969 they distributed pamphlets in Sverdlovsk; they worked out a charter and a program of action, and organized themselves into the 'Russian Workers' Party'. In 1969-70 they distributed leaflets and their program. They were demanding 'the overthrow of party absolutism', wage rises, higher student grants, an increase in house-building, and a broadening of relations with the West.
The case was tried by the Sverdlovsk regional court at the end of November 1970. In *Chronicles* 25 and 32 the Pestov brothers were erroneously linked with another trial in Sverdlovsk, described in *Chronicle* 24. That trial took place in November 1971 and concerned the 'R P S I case' (see above [on G. M. Davidenko]).

(12) *Sado*, Mikhail Yukhanovich: born 1934, orientalist. One of the leaders of the Social-Christian Union; 'the head of the personnel department', and responsible for safeguarding the security of the organization. Arrested in the spring of 1967. Articles 64, 70, 72; sentence — 13 years. Held in Vladimir prison up to 1969 (see *Chronicles* 1, 19).

(13) *Chekhovskoi*, Alexander Konstantinovich: born 1947, a worker, formerly Secretary of the Komsomol organization in the combine 'Voroshilovgrad Construction'; a member of the 'Party to Struggle for the Realization of Lenin's Ideas'. The same case involved G. I. Tolstousov, Polotsky and others. Details of their trial and sentences are not known.*

(14) *Tolstousov*, Gennady Ivanovich:*
Co-defendant of Chekhovskoi.

(15) *Deonisiadi*, German Vasilevich: born 1938, a joiner. Involved in the case of the 'Young Worker' group in Alma-Ata (see *Chronicle* 18). Sentence — five years.
Co-defendants: B. Bykov (sentence — six years, expired in 1973) and V. Mednikov (sentence — three years; released in 1970).

*See details in *Chronicle* 35 and in the document described in *Chronicle* 25, note 45. Chekhovskoi was arrested in 1970 and sentenced in Voroshilovgrad to six years under article 70. Tolstousov's sentence is not known, but his release is reported in *Chronicle* 35.

Deonisiadi himself was released on health grounds (apparently in 1972, or earlier) after spending some time in the psychiatric ward of the camp hospital.

(16) *Chamovskikh,* Viktor Petrovich: born 1940, worked as a lathe operator in a factory in Kerch, contributed to the paper *Kerch Worker.*

He typed out 'The Program of the Working Class', drafted by Yakubenko, which — in the words of the indictment — 'contained lying fabrications which defamed the policy of the Party, and which also regarded the existence of a parallel Communist party as both possible and necessary'. Besides this, Chamovskikh and Yakubenko had written an article which, according to the indictment, 'contained cheap fabrications concerning the position of the working-class in the U S S R, its participation in the directing of production, and called for the working-class to unite in the fight for their rights'. The 'Program' or the article may have been signed 'The Union for the Defence of Workers' Rights', and one or other of these documents may have included a call for a group of this name to be formed.

During a workers' strike in Kerch, Chamovskikh posted up — in Kerch, Zhdanov and Kharkov — a pamphlet headed 'Communards shall not be Slaves'.

At the trial Chamovskikh testified that he had not had any subversive aims, and that Yakubenko had been the author of all the documents.

The sentence of the Crimean regional court was four years in camps and three years in exile.

Yakubenko was sent to a psychiatric hospital.[109]

(17) *Lukyanenko,* Lev Grigorevich: born 1927, a lawyer, formerly a member of the party. Arrested in Lvov in 1961. He was the chief defendant at the trial, where some others were also convicted. He was sentenced to death by shooting, but this was later commuted to 15 years' imprisonment.

The case of Lukyanenko and of his co-defendants has been described in detail in the so-called *Green Book* by V. Chornovil.[110]

Lukyanenko was transferred to Vladimir prison on 3 July (see above in this issue).

(18) *Grinkov,* Dmitry Dmitrievich: born 1948, Ukrainian, motor mechanic in the town of Kolomiya.

Founder and leader of the 'Union of the Ukrainian Youth of Galicia'; his co-defendants were N. N. Motryuk (sentence — four years), I. V. Shovkovoi (five years), D. I. Demidov (five years) and R. V. Chuprei (four years).

The Ivano-Frankovsk regional court gave Grinkov seven years in camps and three years in exile. His sentence began on 15 March 1973. The trial of 'The Union of the Ukrainian Youth of Galicia' was held in August 1973 (see below in this issue).

(19) *Sapelyak,* Stepan: about 24, Ukrainian. Arrested and convicted for distributing Ukrainian nationalist pamphlets and literature, and for being a member of a youth organization; sentence — five years. He has been in the camp since the spring or early summer.

(20) *Sinkov*: co-defendant of Sapelyak.

(21) *Lapp,* Raivo-Tomas Erikovich: born 1947, Estonian, laboratory worker in Tartu University. Arrested in December 1969. Articles 70, 72; sentence — five years (see *Chronicle* 15).

Co-defendants: Vosu, Andres Johanovich: born 1945, taxi-driver; Paulius, Enn Ernstovich: born 1947, a metal-worker; Kyiv, Evald Aksenovich: born 1947, a worker.

The verdict reads: '. . . having already anti-Soviet views, they formed an anti-Soviet group which planned to proselytize others, and to accumulate weapons with the intent of committing especially dangerous crimes against the state. They had in their possession two M K machine-guns, five rifles, one automatic rifle, 3.5 kgs of grenades, eight detonators, 11 metres of fuse-wire, two pistols and four Mausers. They were planning to blow up an electric high-voltage cable, and also to blow up a monument to Soviet soldiers . . . they approved of the crimes of the fascists. They listened to tape-recordings of German martial music and Hitler's speeches; they read nationalist books.'

(22) *Saarte,* Willi Feliksovich: born 1942, Estonian, a worker. In 1967-68 he was serving a term in Corrective Labour Colony number 5, in the city of Tallinn. According to the verdict in his second case, Saarte, while in the camp, took steps to form an armed nationalist organization, and made contact with prisoner Matus of the same camp colony. On regaining his liberty he tried to organize the 'Eesti Rachvuspartem' — an Estonian nationalist party.

Sentence — 4½ years. Due to be released at the end of this year [see *Chronicle* 24].

III. *Zionists*

(23-24) Those convicted in the case of the 'aeroplane people':

Dymshits, Mark Yulevich, born 1927, pilot, until his arrest a member of the party. Sentence — 15 years (see *Chronicle* 17).

Zalmanson, Vulf, born 1939, a soldier. Sentenced to ten years by a Leningrad military tribunal (see *Chronicle* 18).

(25) *Chernoglaz,* David, born 1939; the Kishinyov 'aeroplane-related' trial. Sentence — five years, ending in the summer of 1975 (see *Chronicle* 20). Transferred to Vladimir prison (see above in this issue).

IV. *Persons who attempted to leave the U S S R*

(26) *Abankin*, Vitold, a soldier. Crossed the border. Sentence — 12 years, began in 1966. He has renounced his Soviet citizenship in the camp (see *Chronicle* 32, in which he was erroneously referred to as Viktor).

(27) *Chesnokov*, a soldier. Co-defendant with Abankin. Sentence — ten years.

(28) *Berniichuk*, Apollony Aleksandrovich, soldier. Sentence — 12 years.

(29) *Grigorev*, Victor, 30 years old, a soldier. Sentence — six years.[111] Deserted because of his religious convictions, tried to cross the border.

(30) *Dudin*, Anatoly, a sailor. Sentence — 15 years. He 'jumped ship' while on the island of Malta, and tried to remain there.

(31) *Kudirka*, Simas, born 1930, radio operator on the fishing-vessel 'Soviet Lithuania'. Escaped to an American ship, but was given back by its captain; was taken back to the U S S R, arrested, and tried under article 64. Sentence — ten years (see *Chronicle* 20). He was transferred to Vladimir on 3 July.

In the middle of the summer the U S government recognized S. Kudirka as a citizen of the U S A because his mother, Šulskene, had been an American citizen (see *Chronicle* 32).

At the end of August he was granted an official pardon and released.

At the beginning of November he received permission to leave the country, and emigrated to the U S A with his mother, wife and two children.

(32) *Koptsyukh*, a soldier. Sentence — 12 years.

(33) *Repiev*, Arkady, a soldier. Sentence — ten years, released after serving it to the end.[112]

(34) *Safronov*, Alexei Vitalevich, born 1952 a soldier. Sentence — 12 years [see *Chronicle* 32].

While on guard duty with Lance-Corporal S. A. Kolmakov on the night of 20 November 1970 — when their unit was stationed in East Germany — they deserted together, taking their weapons with them, and went into hiding. They were discovered on the morning of 25 November, and at first resisted capture; seeing how useless this was, Kolmakov shot himself, but Safronov gave himself up. According to the charges, they 'had agreed that if they succeeded in crossing (the West German Border — *Chronicle*) they would ask for political asylum, would make anti-Soviet statements to the press and on television, and would give away military secrets'.

(35) *Zakharov*, Vyacheslav Mikhailovich, a soldier. Sentence — 12 years. Soon due for release.

(36) *Panifidin*, Mikhail Mikhailovich, born 1945, a soldier. Sentence — ten years. His co-defendant was Lichutin (Pyotr Vladimirovich), born 1945. Sentence — 12 years. Articles 64, 89 (stealing state property) and 146 (banditry).

According to the verdict: 'On 26 January 1966, fearing that criminal proceedings would be instituted against them on account of the number of times they had been absent without leave on drunken sprees, they agreed to escape to West Germany together. They took a map from the Lenin reading room, stole ammunition and sub-machine guns, seized a vehicle, wounding an East German citizen in the process, and set off for the border; but realizing that a search for them was in progress, they hid in a hay-stack. They saw the search parties, which included Soviet sub-divisions and German police, but did not renounce their plan, deciding instead to wait till the search was over. They intended, on reaching West Germany, to divulge all the military information in their possession, including details of the unit they were serving in, so as to gain permission to reside in West Germany.'

This case, like other cases of attempted escape from East to West Germany by Soviet servicemen, was tried by a military tribunal in Potsdam.

Panifidin was pardoned and released this year.

V. *Ukrainian nationalists and those ruled to be such*

(37) *Reznikov*, Alexei Sergeyevich, a writer. Arrested on 9 November 1971. Sentence — 5½ years; charged in connection with Ukrainian and Muscovite *samizdat*.

Co-defendants: N. Strokata and A. Prityka (see *Chronicles* 25, 28).

(38) *Sverstyuk*, Evgeny Aleksandrovich, 34 years old, literary specialist. Arrested in January 1972, tried in April 1973 under article 70. The charges concerned works of literary criticism and conversations. Sentence — seven years in camps and five in exile. Apparently transferred to camp 35 last September.*

(39) *Chernomaz*, Bogdan Danilovich, 25 years old, a qualified soil expert, worked as a teacher in the Ternopol region. Trial in November 1972, article 70. Sentence — three or four years.

Co-defendant: Kuzma Ivanovich Matviyuk (now in Dubrovlag camp 19, sentence — four years).

(40) *Zdorovy*, Anatoly Kuzmich, 35 years old, a mathematician from Kharkov. At first sentenced to four years of camps, but later, following a protest by the Procurator, this was increased to seven years [see *Chronicles* 35, 36].

(41) *Cherny*, born 1949. Article 70. Sentence — five or six years.

(42) *Lutsik*, Mikhail, 42 years old. Convicted in 1965 for distributing

*Correction in *Chronicle* 35: No, he only spent some time in the hospital at camp 35. On Sverstyuk see *Chronicles* 7, 24, 27 and 29.

Ukrainian *samizdat.** Sentence — 15 years; has served time in Vladimir (see *Chronicle* 11).

(43) *Turik*, Andrei. Sentence — 15 years.

(44) *Pokrovsky*, Ivan Nikolayevich, member of O U N. Article 58-1. Sentence — 25 years; due to be released at the beginning of December this year [see *Chronicle* 35].

(45) *Kurchik*, Nikolai Yakovlevich, member of O U N. Arrested in about 1946, article 58-1. Sentence — 25 years. In 1954 he was given another 25 years, the two sentences to run concurrently. Due to be released in 1979 [see *Chronicles* 25, 35].
He was transferred at the beginning of August to the special regime camp in Mordovia, where he is to serve out the rest of his time.

(46) *Glyva*, Vladimir. Article 58-1 (O U N). Sentence — 25 years.

(47) *Griniv*, O U N member. Sentence apparently 25 years. He was pardoned this year, after 23½ years in labour camps.

(48) *Girchik* (or *Gerchak*), Grigory Andreyevich, 43 years old, member of O U N. Sentence — 25 years, ending in 1976-77.

(49) *Prindya*, Grigory. Sentence — 25 or 15 years, apparently for being a member of the O U N.

(50) *Protsiv*, Mikhail. Sentence — 15 years, apparently arrested in 1962 in connection with the case of the U N C — the 'Ukrainian National Committee'.[113]

(51) *Pilitsyak*. O U N member.[114]

VI. *Lithuanian national movement*

(52) *Skaržinskas*, Juozas, born 1926. Arrested in 1947. Sentence — 25 years, plus three years for an escape attempt. Due to be released in 1975.

(53) *Jurkštas*, Vladas, born 1923. Arrested 1949. Sentence — 25 years.

(54) *Lešauskas*, Juozas, born 1918. Arrested in 1950. Sentence — 25 years.

(55) *Klimas*, Vaclavas, born 1913. Arrested 1951. Sentence — 25 years.

(56) *Akramavičius*, Petras, born 1930. Arrested 1952. Sentence — 25 years.

(57) *Kadžionis*, Jonas, born 1928. Arrested 1953. Sentence — 25 years.

(58) *Kavoliunas*, Vytas, born 1927. Arrested 1953. Sentence — 25 years.

(59) *Kazakevičius*, Antanas, born apparently in 1926. Arrested 1953. Sentence — 25 years.

(60) *Gricius*, Jonas, born 1910. Arrested 1954. Sentence — 25 years.

(61) *Dubauskas*, Julius, born apparently 1927. Arrested 1955. Sentence — 25 years.

*Erroneous, as are some of the details in *Chronicles* 11 and 24. Lutsik was imprisoned for about ten years prior to 1956, then arrested again in 1960, tried in April 1961 and released in 1972. In autumn 1973 he was sentenced to two years for 'vagrancy'. See *Chronicle* 35, *Ukrainian Herald* 4, and *The Chornovil Papers*, p. 216.

(62) *Mitrikas*, Vladas, born 1910.[115] Arrested 1955. Sentence — 25 years.

(63) *Rekašius*, Benius, born 1927. Arrested in about 1955. Sentence — 25 years.

(64) *Sidaris*, Vytas, born 1928. Sentence — 25 years; transferred from a special regime camp in 1973; later apparently transferred from camp 36 to camp 35.*

(65) *Streikus*, Izidorius, born 1928.[116] Arrested 1962. Sentence — 15 years.

(66) *Paulauskas*, Jonas, born 1915. Arrested 1964. Sentence — 15 years.

(67) *Džaugis*, Antanas, born 1914. Arrested 1965. Sentence — 15 years.

(68) *Morkunas*, Stasis, born 1913. Arrested in about 1965. Sentence — 15 years.

(69) *Žvynis*, Bronius, born 1915. Arrested 1965. Sentence — 15 years.

(70) *Remeika*, Vytas, born 1942. Arrested 1967. Sentence — 10 years, possibly on a criminal charge.

(71) *Šerkšnis*, Jonas, born 1917. Arrested 1968.[117]

(72) *Bakanavičius*, Antanas, born 1917. Arrested 1969. Sentence — 15 years.[118]

(73) *Šilinskas*, Jonas, born 1943. Arrested 1970. Sentence — five years [see *Chronicles* 23, 30]. Co-defendant: Pašilis (Aleksis). Sentence — four years, released in August.

(74) *Baranauskas*, Stasis. Sentence — ten years.

(75) *Žukauskas*, Šarunas, born 1950, a sixth-year student at Kaunas Medical Institute. Apparently arrested at the end of March 1973. Charged with creating an underground organization. Articles 70, 72. Sentence — six years.
Co-defendants: Sakalauskas, Rudaitis, Povilonis, Mackevičius (see *Chronicle* 32 and *Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church*, number 10).

(76) *Murauskas*, Algis, born 1952. Arrested 1973. Sentence — three years. Hung out a national flag.

(77) *Rimkus*, Jonas, born 1916. Sentence — 15 years.

(78) *Randis*, Zigmas, born in about 1920. Sentence — believed to be ten years.

(79) *Petraitis*, over 50 years old. Sentence — 25 years.

VII. *Prisoners sentenced for their religious convictions*

(80-82) 'Jehovah's Witnesses':
Ivanov;
Klymyuk;
Volchansky, Stepan, released in July.

(83) *Tikalas*, a Moldavian, apparently also a 'Jehovah's Witness'.

*Correction in *Chronicle* 35: he only spent some time in camp 35's hospital.

VIII. *War criminals*

(84-100) Prisoners who — according to available evidence — served in the police force under the Germans:
Baranov, Ivan. Sentence — 25 years;
Braga;
Bortnik, Evgeny;
Bortnik, Mikhail;
Voronin, Evgeny;
Vinogradov, a brigade-leader. Sentence — 25 years; member of the S C C [Soviet of the Camp Collective];
Goncharov, recently arrested;
Dubas;
Dzhaburin;
Zagrebayev, a brigadier. Sentence — 15 years;[119] member of the S C C;
Kamuz (?);[120]
Kurtanidze;
Prikhodko, Fyodor (perhaps a Vlasovite) [see *Chronicle* 35];
Stepanov, Evgeny, a brigadier. Sentence — 25 years; member of the S C C;
Stroganov, recently arrested;
Fedyuk;
Zeitunyan, Andronik, over 60 years old. Sentence — 15 years.

(101) *Akhmedov.*

(102) *Veitsvager*, disabled, has lost a leg. Sentence — 15 years; recently arrived at camp 36.

(103) *Petriv.*

(104) *Reshetko.* Sentence — 25 years.

(105) *Strotsen.* Sentence — 25 years.

(106) *Tokarev*, Boris Ivanovich, librarian. Sentence — 25 years; member of the S C C.

(107) *Onishchenko*, a brigadier. Sentence — 25 years; member of S C C.

(108-111) *Best, Sauter, Funk* and *Kost* — Odessa Germans, each sentenced to 25 years. It is not clear what the charges were.[121]

(112-114) *Linra, Khaavastik, Saarts* [see *Chronicle* 35] — each sentenced to 25 years.

(115) *Vetra*, Estonian, S S officer. Sentence — 25 years; member of the S C C.

(116) *Shalomatin*, served in the Wehrmacht. Sentence — 25 years.

(117) *Opanasenko.* Sentence — 25 years. He hanged himself in the hospital, when he still had two years to serve.

(118) *Sylka.* Sentence — 25 years. He died of an ulcer in hospital in June, when he had less than two years left to serve.

IX. *Other prisoners convicted for especially dangerous crimes against the state*

(119) *Makarenko*, Mikhail Yanovich, 43 years old. He founded the well-known club 'Under the Integral' in Akademgorodok, Novosibirsk, and also established the picture gallery at the Scientists' House of the Siberian Branch of the U S S R Academy of Sciences. Arrested on 5 July 1969. Sentenced to eight years in camps by the Moscow City Court under article 70 and articles 88, 162, 173 (currency transactions, engaged in a forbidden craft, and taking bribes). Under article 70 he was convicted for writing a letter to the Budapest conference of communist parties, which he signed 'The Party of Non-Party Workers, Fighting for Socialism' (see *Chronicle* 16).

Makarenko was transferred to Vladimir prison in September this year.

His co-defendant — V. Rodionov — has been released.

(120) *Astra*, Gunnar, worked in Riga as a technician at the State Electrotechnical Factory which manufactures radios. He got to know some Americans, at an American exhibition, who later visited him in Riga; he showed them around the city.

Astra subsequently began to study at the Faculty of Foreign Languages, and, on leaving his factory job, took a photostat plan of the factory with him as a memento. This document, and a valuable collection of photographs, were confiscated during a search. Experts who examined this photostat plan several times admitted that it was not a secret document; upon further expert examination, however, it was eventually decided that, taken in conjunction with his technical knowledge of the factory in question, the photostat plan could have been used for espionage purposes. Among the photographs in the collection (about 10,000 in all) was a picture of a bridge — espionage again — as well as a few pictures of nude women — pornography. In addition, he was charged with anti-Soviet propaganda — on the evidence of witnesses with whom he had had conversations.

Thus Astra was charged under article 64 (espionage), article 70 (anti-Soviet propaganda), and article 228 (pornography), and sentenced to 15 years. His sentence expires in 1976.

(121) *Kampov*, Pavel Fyodorovich, Ukrainian, born 1929, a mathematician with a master's degree; he taught at Uzhgorod University and at an advanced training institute for teachers, and worked in the regional education department.

In 1970 Kampov and some other persons were nominated to stand as deputies to the U S S R Supreme Soviet — though their names had not been included in the official lists of candidates. Kampov was nominated at the Volovets timber combine as a candidate to represent the Uzhgorod constituency in the Supreme Soviet; Ivan Garagonich, 53 years old, chairman of the Trans-Carpathian regional co-operative society and a member of the party, was

nominated as a candidate for the Mukachevo constituency; Maria Kish, 18 years old, Hungarian, a worker, was nominated for the Khust constituency; Ivan Mikhailovich Chendei, 47 years old, a member of the party, and chairman of the Trans-Carpathian section of the Writers' Union, was nominated for the Soviet of Nationalities for the Trans-Carpathian constituency. (The constituencies for elections to the Soviet of Nationalities are substantially larger than those for the Soviet of the Union.) About 100 publicity leaflets were distributed. No other details are known about the nominations.

On 16 June 1970 two days after the elections, Kampov was arrested without a warrant from the Procurator; one was eventually signed on 1 July. Kampov was kept in solitary confinement up to the time of his trial. He was then charged, in closed court, with having distributed the leaflets mentioned above. According to different information Kampov was also charged with having written, under a pseudonym, a pamphlet in Ukrainian called '25 Years of Hope and Disillusion', which had been sent to Ukrainian publishing houses, and also with having written to the party Central Committee requesting permission for a separate communist party of Trans-Carpathia. No relatives were present when sentence was pronounced. Apparently article 70. Sentence — five or six years.*

Garagonich asserted to the regional party committee that he had not been connected with this nomination of candidates. Chendei was expelled from the party. Nothing further is known about Kish.

Kampov's wife was advised to divorce him, and his 73-year-old mother had her allotment-garden in the Mukachevo district confiscated. Kampov himself was threatened by K G B officials that he would be deprived of visits if he talked to anyone about his case. In April 1972 Kampov was visited by K G B Colonel Ruban, who promised him that if he kept quiet he would be freed on 1 September of the same year, and reinstated at work.

The nomination of Chendei was reported in *Chronicle* 18.

(122) *Tachiev*, Yusup, an Ingush, killed[122] the chairman of a collective farm. Convicted under article 66 — 'terrorism'. Sentence — 25 years, plus another five (apparently for an offence committed in the camp).

(123) *Kharlanov*, Victor, 24 years old. Article 66 (?). Sentence — five years; due to be released this year.

(124) *Ziemelis*, Juris, 32 years old. Article 66. Sentence — 15 years, expiring in October 1975.

**Chronicle* 35 confirms article 70, and gives the exact sentence: six years of camps and three of exile.

(125) *Cherepukhin*, 60 years old. Espionage. Sentence — 10 years; released in 1974.

(126) *Vasilev*, Yury Vladimirovich, born 1947. Hi-jacked an aeroplane. Co-defendant: his sister, Galina Vladimirovna Selivonchik (see *Chronicle* 16).[123]

X. *Common and petty criminals transferred to 'political' camps while serving sentences elsewhere*

(127) *Vasin*, about 50 years old; some prisoners consider him to be mentally deranged.[124]

(128) *Fedorchuk*. Sentence — about five years.[125]

(129) *Frolov*, Vasily, has already spent nearly 30 years 'inside' — has eight years still to serve.

(130) *Krasnyak*, a common criminal, now in a psychiatric hospital; was formerly in a special-regime camp.

(131) *Kolomin*, Vitaly Nikolayevich, 29 years old. Sentence — six years.*

(132-133) *Rande*, Karl Karlovich, and
Gulais, G.
When already in a camp, sentenced to four years under article 70; due for release at the end of 1974.

XI. *Prisoners about whose cases little or nothing is known to the* Chronicle

(134) *Armans*.

(135) *Brikulis*.

(136) *Vernik*, Ivan Alekseyevich, born 1943, from near Moscow. Sentence — four years. Has been in Vladimir.

(137) *Gulil*.

(138) *Kalinichenko*, Vitaly Vasilevich. Sentence expires in 1976 [see *Chronicle* 32].

(139) *Kifyak*, Semyon Ananevich, about 33 years old, from Moscow. Article 70. Sentence — five years, due to end in November 1976.

(140) *Marchuk*. Sentence — 25 years.

(141) *Puce*, 22 years old. Article 70. Sentence — five years.

(142) *Potemin*, Alexander Ivanovich, over 60 years old, has a Master's degree in historical science. Sentence — 12 years.

(143) *Nezdiiminoga*, Vladimir, 35 years old. Sentence — four years plus three in exile [see *Chronicle* 22].

(144) *Solodky*, 42 years old. Sentence — 15 years.

(145) *Frolov*, Nikolai.** Article 70.

(146) *Vabishchevich*, a Belorussian, O U N (?). Sentence — 25 years; used to be a member of the S C C. *Chronicle* 32 reported that he had renounced Soviet citizenship.[126]

**Chronicle* 35 adds details, corrects his age (from 25), and points out that, as he was sentenced under article 70 (after being arrested in 1971), he should in fact appear in an earlier section of the list. See on him also *Chronicle* 32.
**An error: *Chronicle* 35 says there is no such prisoner.

(147) *Teslenko.* Article 70. Sentence — about six years; a member of the S C C.
(148) *Potashov,* Vladimir, was first charged under article 70, then under article 190-1, and finally again under article 70. Sentence — four years. Released on 15 June 1974, now living in Omsk.
(149) *Valetov,* from the city of Togliatti. Sentence — three years; released at the end of May.
(150) *Molchanov.* Sentence — 25 years; pardoned and released.
(151) *Kots,* Nik [see *Chronicle* 28].
(152) *Ritinysh.*[127]

V. Moroz Continues his Hunger Strike

V. Moroz is continuing the hunger strike he began on 1 July (see *Chronicle* 32).

Valentin Yakovlevich Moroz was born on 15 April 1936. In 1958 he graduated from the History Faculty of Franko University in Lvov. From 1958 to 1964 V. Moroz taught history at a school. In September 1964 he became a lecturer at the Ivano-Frankovsk Teachers Training College. On 1 September 1965 he was arrested. In January 1966 the Lutsk regional court sentenced him to four years' imprisonment under article 62, section 1, of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (which corresponds to article 70 of the R S F S R Code). On 1 September 1969 Moroz finished his sentence and was set free. On 1 June 1970 he was arrested again.

In November 1970 the Ivano-Frankovsk regional court sentenced him — under article 62, section 2, of the Ukrainian Code — to nine years' imprisonment (of which the first six years were to be spent in prison) and five years' exile.

At the end of August [1974] Moroz's wife, Raisa Vasilevna Moroz (Naberezhnaya ulitsa 14, kv. 1, Ivano-Frankovsk, Ukrainian S S R), not having received any reply to a letter she had addressed to the President of the P E N Club, sent him a second letter. She also wrote to the International Red Cross and to the International Federation of Former Inmates of Fascist Concentration Camps. In all these letters she appealed for support on behalf of her husband, for help in saving his life, and for assistance in bringing about his transfer to a labour camp.

During September Raisa Moroz received, in reply to her inquiries, some information regarding her husband's condition. Deputy governors of Vladimir prison, Vodin and Fedotov, answered: 'Valentin Moroz is alive and well.' A letter dated 13 September from the Vladimir Regional Health Department stated that Moroz had been examined by doctors and was in excellent health; the findings of a medical examination of Moroz, also sent by the Health Department, even showed him as being in better health than before his arrest.

A medical report dated 27 September and signed by Popov, deputy head of the M V D medical department, stated that Moroz had been found to be suffering from a chronic disease of the gall-bladder, for which he was receiving treatment, and that he was being fed artificially.

During September and October Raisa Moroz was summoned four times for talks to the Ivano-Frankovsk K G B; there she was threatened with prosecution under the articles corresponding to article 70 and article 190-1 of the R S F S R Criminal Code; there were hints that she might be dismissed from her job, or she might be beaten up by thugs of some sort. On the day after this conversation a stone was thrown at the window of her room, breaking it and hitting her in the face. Officials of the Ivano-Frankovsk K G B first tried to convince Raisa Moroz to 'stop making a fuss about your husband, and start thinking about yourself'; not succeeding in this, they began pressing her to persuade her husband to stop his hunger strike. During these conversations it became clear that the K G B officials had a wide knowledge of Raisa's private conversations over the telephone, of her conversations with people in person, of her acquaintances, of her personal interests, etc. They brought Raisa's brother in from the country, so that he might 'save his sister from being arrested', and they said they would bring her mother.

Raisa Moroz went to the reception room in the K G B offices attached to the U S S R Council of Ministers. She was interviewed there by K G B official Viktor Ivanovich Petrov. He told Raisa Moroz that he was talking to her on behalf of Yu.V. Andropov, chairman of the K G B, and that the results of the interview would be reported to him. Petrov said that going on hunger strike was the private affair of the prisoner concerned, and the fact that a 'fuss' being made in the West on Moroz's behalf would not help him — 'they'll fuss for a while and then they'll stop'. Petrov gave Raisa Moroz to understand that, whether her husband ended his hunger strike or continued it, there would be no change in the conditions under which he was being detained. In conclusion, Petrov told Raisa Moroz that not all her own actions were guiltless with regard to Soviet law, and he advised her to ponder this.

On 5 November Moroz's wife and father were allowed to visit him. Prior to the visit, the governor of Vladimir prison, Zavyalkin, told Raisa Moroz that, whatever happened, her husband would still have to spend the next two years in prison.

* * *

After this visit Raisa Moroz wrote the following letter:

'To all persons of humanity and goodwill in the world,

'To: the organization "Amnesty International"
the International Red Cross
the P E N Club
the President of the U S A, Mr Ford
the Prime Minister of Canada, M. Trudeau
the Chancellor of West Gemany, Hr Schmidt
the leaders of all States which have diplomatic relations with the U S S R
all newspapers and radio stations in the world —

'On 5 November my husband Valentin Moroz, a political prisoner in Vladimir prison, was allowed a visit from his family. This was on the 128th day of his hunger strike.

'As usual, our conversation with him took place in the presence of warders, who continually interrupted us, forbidding us to talk first about this, then about that. But something else, previously unheard of in Vladimir prison, also occurred: in addition to the warders, a news-photographer from the Novosti press agency was also present at our meeting; and probably because of this, it took place not in an empty, cheerless room, but in a hall containing some furniture and a television set. Not knowing what kind of information Novosti intends to put out concerning Valentin Moroz, I want to do this myself.

'Valentin is terrifyingly thin (he weighs 52 kgms (114 lbs) though he is 175 cm. (5 ft 9 ins) tall. His face is all swollen and he has dropsical swellings under the eyes. He complains of pains in the heart. But his worst sufferings are caused by the tube through which he has been fed artificially since the 20th day of his hunger strike. This tube is injuring the inside of his throat and his oesophagus. When withdrawn, it is covered in blood, and the pain which Moroz has felt from the beginning during the feedings now persists in between the feedings as well. Valentin is now almost constantly in a semi-conscious condition, but he makes himself stand up from time to time, as he fears his legs may otherwise become atrophied. And such is the spiritual strength of the man that he would not let anyone carry him to our meeting, he walked in by himself!

'But however morally strong a man may be, his physical capabilities have their limits. If Moroz's life is to be preserved, he must now be taken to a hospital and given prolonged and attentive medical treatment. Yet the prison governor insists that Valentin must remain in prison, whether he continues his hunger strike or ends it. This is equivalent to a death sentence. My husband is well aware of this, but he has decided to prolong his hunger strike for a further two months, until 1 January 1975. If he does not succeed in getting out of the prison during that period, he will find a way of putting an end to his life:— "The year 1975 in prison does not exist for me," he said. I have no doubt that he will carry out this decision, just as he has already carried out his decision to start an indefinite hunger strike.

'Is it really possible that, in the present-day world, a man whose guilt consists exclusively of four essays which a court has declared to be anti-Soviet, should pay for this with his life?

Raisa Moroz.'

* * *

In addition, Ya.I. Moroz, V. Moroz's father, wrote to L. I. Brezhnev:

'Dear Leonid Ilich!

'The father of the political prisoner V. Moroz, now in Vladimir prison, is writing to you. Moroz is already in his fifth year in that prison. I am an old man

and it is difficult for me to travel there for visits, so I had not seen my son all that time. On 1 July my son went on hunger strike, and has continued it ever since. K G B officials and an editor of the newspaper *Radyanska Volyn* came to my house and persistently urged me to visit my son and persuade him to end his hunger strike. I saw my son yesterday, or rather what is left of him: before me sat a skeleton with swollen face and puffy eyes. Artificial feeding is being used on him, and he says that the tube which they push through his oesophagus has for a long time now been covered in blood when pulled out, as everything inside him has been injured, which makes him suffer terrible pain.

'My son went on hunger strike so that he should be transferred from prison to a labour camp, but when I saw him I realized that he can neither be transferred to a camp nor be left in prison — his life can only be saved by a very good hospital and by highly qualified medical treatment. I cannot try to persuade him to put an end to his hunger strike, because to end it would mean that he would be left in prison, i.e. that he would soon die — for no one has promised that the ending of his hunger strike would better his situation in any way. On the contrary, the prison authorities consider that in spite of his awful state of health he has to serve out the punishment-term he was sentenced to, in the same way as before.

'I know nothing about politics, and it is hard for me to understand why the court condemned my son to be shut up in a prison for a period which he finds unbearable. But however great his guilt may have been, he was not, in fact, condemned to death.

'I beg you, with all my heart, to intervene and save my son's life — after all, you too have children of your own, and ought to understand my feelings. My son must live!

With hope, and with respect,
Yakov Moroz,
collective farmer and pensioner.'

6 November 1974.

* * *

On 22 November V. Moroz ended his hunger strike. In a letter to his wife he informed her that he had been taken out of solitary confinement. His cellmate is, he said, 'a member of the intelligentsia'.

Letters and Statements

Four women from camp 3 in the Mordovian complex have sent letters to the U S S R Procurator-General, R. Rudenko. They are Stefania Shabatura (12 July 1973), Irina Senik (5 December 1973), Nina Strokata (10 December 1973) and Nadezhda Svetlichnaya (10 December 1973). Their letters are published in *Archive of the Chronicle* number 1.[128]

* * *

Press Statement

'The persecution of Alexander Isayevich Solzhenitsyn has ended with his deportation. This was calculated to deprive of moral support those being persecuted for their ideas, for their refusal to lie, for the sacrificial love they feel for their people. There had always been Solzhenitsyn's example — which had made it easier for one to behave like a human being: to defend one's rights and not to lose one's integrity, whether one was in an office, on a work-site, in prison or in a camp.

'To many people, however, Solzhenitsyn has given not only moral support. For many years, as I well know, political prisoners, their relatives and friends have turned to him for material support — and have received it.

'Deporting Solzhenitsyn will not put an end to this aid. Political prisoners, their families and those who help them will be able to depend, as before, on Alexander Isayevich's support. The honour of assisting him in carrying out this task has fallen to me.

'This is the address to apply to:
Alexander Ilich Ginzburg,
Lesnoi pereulok, dom 5,
Tarusa Kaluzhskoi oblasti [Tarusa, Kaluga Region].

'It is not difficult to foresee that new obstacles will arise on this road, especially at first — as is always the case in our country when voices begin to be heard, not in praise of the powers that be, but in bitter witness to the results of their power.

'However, I share Solzhenitsyn's conviction that the righteousness of power must inevitably yield to the power of righteousness.

Alexander Ginzburg.'

21 April 1974

* * *

On 15 September **Kronid Lyubarsky** sent the following statement to the Praesidium of the U S S R Supreme Soviet, in connection with the unexpected pardoning of Silva Zalmanson and Simas Kudirka:

'If the government of the U S S R has decided to curtail politically motivated repression, this ought to be welcomed in every way . . . If the political prisoners in the U S S R were to be freed, and new politically motivated persecution to cease simultaneously, this would be greeted by Soviet society with understanding, and would significantly lessen the tensions which exist between the authorities and dissenting groups, which consist predominantly of the intelligentsia . . .

'Obviously, such a course would signify the transition from a struggle using courts and repression to a genuine struggle of ideas. But this ought not to frighten a state which possesses a really strong ideology. I call on the government of the U S S R not to abandon the conciliatory initiative they have taken without developing it further.'

The full text of this statement is published in *Archive of the Chronicle* number 1.

* * *

On 20 November **A. D. Sakharov** sent a letter to the presidents of national psychiatric associations in nine countries:

'For almost three years **Semyon Gluzman,** a psychiatrist, has been imprisoned, because he dared to challenge a school of psychiatry which uses psychiatry for repressive ends . . .

'In the spring of 1972 Semyon Gluzman was arrested. The court sentenced him to seven years' imprisonment on trumped-up charges of having distributed libellous fabrications about the Soviet system. It has now become known that this was the revenge taken by the authorities against Gluzman for his having written an anonymous but very penetrating article which was published in *samizdat.* It is Gluzman who (in collaboration with others) wrote 'An in Absentia Psychiatric Report on the Case of P. G. Grigorenko', who at that time was incarcerated in the Chernyakhovsk special psychiatric hospital on the basis of a false diagnosis. This report was an exposé by a qualified person of one of the darkest and most carefully-disguised of crimes, and it was precisely for this reason that it drew the revenge of the authorities upon its author. Since his conviction Gluzman has been taking part, in his camp, in the political prisoners' struggle for their rights and against the tyranny and cruelty of the administration and the ever-worsening conditions under which political prisoners are held . . .

'I am appealing to you, counting on your sympathetic understanding and on your sense of professional solidarity: Gluzman is a man of whom his colleagues can be proud. Today he needs your defence. Help him!'

The full text of the above letter is published in issue 1 of the *Archive of the Chronicle.*[120]

* * *

Andrei Grigorenko wrote a letter to A. D. Sakharov, in which he asked him and the Human Rights Committee for their help on behalf of **Mustafa Dzhemilev** (see *Chronicle* 32). **A. D. Sakharov** replied on 20 November in a letter headed 'In support of Mustafa Dzhemilev'. Both letters are published in the *Archive of the Chronicle* number 1.

* * *

In June **A. D. Sakharov** addressed letters to L. I. Brezhnev and the U S President R. Nixon (see *Chronicle* 32). Having received no reply, he wrote again, on 20 November, to L. I. Brezhnev and to U S President G. Ford. This letter is published in the *Archive of the Chronicle* number 1.

* * *

The political prisoner **Nikolai Andreyevich Gorbal** (camp 35 in the Perm complex) sent the following statement to the procurator of the town of Chusovoi:

'I request clarification of the following questions:

(1) If a convict dies while serving a term of punishment, are his relatives entitled to have his body? Which standing regulations make provision for this?
(2) If the standing regulations allow the administration of the place of imprisonment to refuse to hand over the body of the deceased to the relatives for burial, how long a period has to elapse before the body can be re-interred? Which standing regulations make provision for this?
(3) If a convict is buried in the place where he dies, are his relatives informed of the location of the grave? Which standing regulations make provision for this?
(4) Am I entitled to make arrangements for the disposal of my body in the case of my death? Which standing regulations make provision for this?'

S. Gluzman sent a similar set of questions.

Two months later there had still been no reply.

News in Brief

Ivar Žukovskis, a journalist dealing with international affairs, was convicted in 1969 for giving, while in Yugoslavia, an interview to a Yugoslav newspaper about the events in Czechoslovakia. He was released from camp 19 in the Mordovian complex during the summer of 1973 (see *Chronicle* 32).

As Žukovskis relates, the following incident happened to him in June 1974:

One day a woman (a stranger to him) asked him in a shop to try on a coat because, she said, he was of similar build to her son; then the woman asked Žukovskis to put on his own raincoat, over the coat; Žukovskis agreed to this request too; then the woman started shouting that she had caught a thief. A record was drawn up. In August Žukovskis was sentenced to two (or 2½) years, for stealing.

* * *

In the files of case number 109, in which ten Crimean Tatars were tried in Tashkent in July 1969 (see *Chronicle* 9) there is a document, dated March or April 1969 and signed by investigator Berezovsky and Procurator Ruzmetov, to the effect that, due to his death, the accused **Fevzi Seidalliyev** (see *Chronicle* 31) has been eliminated from the case. Not long before this, Mamedi Chobanov (see *Chronicles* 7, 31) had met F. Seidalliyev in a convoy of prisoners between Simferopol and Dnepropetrovsk: Seidalliyev was on hunger strike and was extremely emaciated.

* * *

Alexander Feldman (see *Chronicles* 30, 32) has been transferred from the cell-type premises in camp MKh 324/98 (in the Khmelnitsky region) to the C-T P in another camp (institution YuZ 17/10, selo Darevka, Belozersky raion, Khersonkaya oblast). On 3 October Feldman was released from the C-T P before his time was up (40 days before his term in it was due to end), in view of his state of extreme physical exhaustion. Although recommended for hospital

treatment, by 22 October he still had not been transferred to the hospital. Common criminals among the prisoners beat Feldman up, smashed his spectacles, and robbed him (taking letters, papers and personal effects).

* * *

Andrei Tverdokhlebov has compiled a collection of selected reports, *On Prisoners' Conditions.*[130] The collection has these sections: 'A Strict-regime Corrective Labour Camp', 'On the Food in Vladimir Prison', the 'The Pre-trial Prison of Lefortovo' and 'Concerning Order 020'. Besides these, the collection includes the full text of a letter addressed to the Human Rights Committee by political prisoners in camp 19 in the Mordovian complex. (See 'In the Mordovian Camps', sub-section 'Camp 19', in this issue.)

* * *

In August **Lukyanenko, Kudirka, Chernoglaz, Bukovsky, Yatsishin** and **Afanasev** found themselves all together in the same cell in Vladimir prison.

* * *

A. D. Sakharov has been awarded the 'Cino del Duca' prize. In a letter of thanks A. D. Sakharov stated: 'The award of this prize is evidence of a concern not only for myself personally, but also to an even greater extent for that complex of people, problems and events which fate has often caused to be connected with my name.' A. D. Sakharov's wife, **Elena Bonner,** has made use of the prize money by placing 50,000 francs in a Paris bank so as to establish a fund for assistance to the children of political prisoners in the Soviet Union. In announcing the establishment of this fund, she expressed the hope that 'the provision of the necessities of life for children of political prisoners will not be a matter of indifference to people in many countries, and that they will contribute to the fund'.

Trials of Recent Years

[Trial of A. N. Chekalin:] Verdict

Case No. 6-74 *Secret*

In the name of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, on 15 June 1971 the Voroshilovgrad regional court, consisting of: V. A. Yaresko as chairman and K. A. Baranova and M. F. Drozhzhina as people's assessors; with T. M. Golubnichei as secretary, and with prosecutor V. I. Zimarin and defence counsel N. M. Sokolikova participating, having investigated, in closed session, in the city of Voroshilovgrad, the charges against **Chekalin, Alexander Nikolayevich,** born 19 December 1938, native of Slyud-Rudnik, Udereisk district, Krasnoyarsk territory, a Russian, citizen of the U S S R, not a party member, ten years of education, no previous convictions, married, with a dependant son

born in 1962, resident of the town of Lisichansk, Voroshilovgrad region, K. Marx St, 136/5, worked as a metal-fitter in the Lisichansk factory 'Stroimashina', under arrest since 27 May 1971, brought to trial under article 62, section 1, of the Ukrainian Criminal Code. has established that:

On 14 June 1970, during the elections, the accused A. N. Chekalin wrote anti-Soviet inscriptions on ballot papers used for the elections to the Soviet of the Union and to the Soviet of Nationalities in the Ukrainian S S R Lisichansk electoral district number 38, and the Lisichansk electoral district number 440; in these inscriptions he called for the overthrow of Soviet authority and also made deliberately false and libellous accusations defaming the Soviet social and political system, thus committing the crime specified in article 62, section 1, of the Ukrainian Criminal Code. The accused Chekalin has admitted that he is guilty of the above-mentioned offence, and that, on election day, he went to the polling booths and, on being given the ballot papers, he wrote on them comments of an anti-Soviet nature, libelling the Soviet electoral system; the fact that he was guilty of the above-mentioned offence is supported by the evidence of witness N. I. Veretennikov, who was at the time deputy-chairman of the constituency electoral commission and who, while counting the votes, noticed that there were anti-Soviet inscriptions on two of the ballot papers. He said that he had interpreted these inscriptions as calling for the overthrow of Soviet authority and as libelling our electoral system. The witness E. R. Chekalina, wife of the accused, said that after the elections her husband had mentioned that he had written anti-Soviet comments; she also said that her husband listened to foreign radio broadcasts, particularly to the 'Voice of America'. The witness V. D. Zhitny, foreman of the work-brigade in which the accused worked, told the court that Chekalin was discontented with the existing system in our country and had talked of possibly emigrating. The evidence of witness S. P. Chernikov was that he had heard Chekalin use insulting language about communists. The accused did not deny that he was discontented with the existing system in our country, that he had expressed the desire to emigrate to some other country, that he had regularly listened to foreign radio broadcasts, and that in his inscriptions on the ballot papers he had quoted some words he had heard from these radio broadcasts. (The following half line is indecipherable — *Chronicle*) . . . the material evidence on which the inscriptions, as the criminological examination statement shows, were written by one and the same person — Chekalin. The accused was aware that, in putting these inscriptions on the ballot papers, he was spreading anti-Soviet ideas, because the inscriptions on the ballot papers would be read when the votes were being counted, and it was his intention that they should be read. He acted with the deliberate intent of spreading libellous fabrications concerning our electoral system; he himself does not even deny this; therefore it follows that he committed the above-mentioned crime with the deliberate intent of pursuing anti-Soviet aims, to which the above-mentioned evidence bears witness. The fact that Chekalin had anti-Soviet intentions when propagating his ideas is borne out by the very content of the inscriptions on the ballot papers. His contention that he committed this crime because of a grudge against the administration of his workshop, due to a failure on their part to grant him a summer holiday, is ill-conceived. On 12 March 1970 a workshop union meeting forbade him the right to have a holiday in the summer because of his non-attendance at trade union meetings. He committed the crime on 14 June 1970 (see page 96 of the case file). Furthermore, he had not, at the time, taken any steps to appeal against the union meeting's decision, nor did he refer to the above-mentioned factors during his original explanations of the reasons for his crime. Taking into consideration all the evidence, the regional court finds that the accused Chekalin's guilt concerning anti-Soviet agitation has been fully established, and that his criminal acts have been correctly defined as coming under article 62, section 1.

On coming to a decision as to the degree of the punishment, the regional court has taken into consideration the facts that Chekalin committed an especially dangerous crime against the state, that he was employed in socially-useful work, that he has a dependant child, and that he has admitted his guilt and repented. He must serve a term of imprisonment in a strict-regime corrective-labour colony, but taking into account his character and the way he has conducted himself, the regional court considers that a supplementary punishment in the form of exile is not advisable. In accordance with the law as laid down in articles 323-324 of the Ukrainian Code of Criminal Procedure, the verdict of the regional court is as follows:

A. N. Chekalin has been found guilty of contravening article 62, section 1, of the Ukrainian Criminal Code, and is sentenced to be punished by imprisonment for a term of five years, without exile, the term to be served in a strict-regime corrective-labour colony. The term of imprisonment is to include the time which Chekalin has spent in custody since 27 May 1971. The form of restraint is to remain unchanged: detention in custody.

Court expenses to the sum of 11 roubles, 88 kopecks are to be paid by Chekalin to the state. The material evidence — the ballot papers — is to be kept with the case files. An appeal against the verdict can be addressed to the Ukrainian S S R Supreme Court within seven days of its pronouncement, and by the accused himself, within the same period of time after he has received a copy of the verdict.

Chairman (signature)
People's Assessors (signatures)

* * *

Chekalin is at present in camp 35 of the Perm complex.

* * *

[The Trial of Dr S. I. Korolchuk]

On 1 September 1971 the Lvov regional court (chairman: L. S. Zuber; people's assessors: Rekunenko and Korniyenko), sitting in closed session, investigated the case against Semyon Isidorovich Korolchuk (born 1930, with a higher medi-

cal education), charged with actions designated in article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code.[131] Counsel for the prosecution was Procurator P. I. Balochanin. The defence was conducted by lawyers M. V. Melik and L. I. Fadorishev. The verdict reads in part:

'The court has established that the accused Korolchuk, with the aim of undermining Soviet power, conducted anti-Soviet agitation from 1965 until March 1970, through the distribution of material of anti-Soviet content, in which the Soviet social system was defamed, and that he also spread the slights contained therein by word of mouth. In 1965, Korolchuk established criminal contact with V. Kobylyukh, from whom he obtained an article about the trial of Pogruzhalsky, and then gave it to I. N. Gubka to read . . . In 1965, in the apartment of Guz, Roman Yuskov, a resident of Kiev, gave Korolchuk two issues of the anti-Soviet journal *Suchasnist*, published in Munich (F R G), which he also passed on to Gubka. In 1965 Korolchuk obtained a photocopy of the anti-Soviet publication *Two Ukrainian Encylopaedias* — a book printed abroad. In the summer of the same year, 1965, Gubka gave Korolchuk five copies of the anti-Soviet journal *Liberty and the Fatherland*, which the latter showed to Pastukh at the end of 1965, subsequently hiding them in the village of Glinsk. In 1967 he tried to influence Pastukh, talking to him about Pogruzhalsky and praising the document 'Woe from Wit' by V. Chornovil.[132] While talking to A.Ya. Saly in the town of Turka, in 1965, he spoke of the deliberate burning down of a library in Kiev. In 1970, during a conversation with Yavorsky, he tried to convince the latter that a policy of Russification was allegedly being put into effect in the Ukraine.'

The court sentenced Korolchuk to four years of strict-regime camps 'and to confiscation of his "Spidola" radio set, as being an instrument of his crime'.

The nature of the crime committed with the aid of the 'Spidola' radio set was not specified in the verdict.

The Union of Ukrainian Youth of Galicia

On 9 August 1973 the Ivano-Frankovsk regional court (chairman — G. D. Vasilenko; people's assessors — D. T. Konyukh, V. R. Kostromin), sitting in closed session, investigated the case against five Ukrainians charged with founding an illegal anti-Soviet organization, the 'Union of Ukrainian Youth of Galicia'. The counsel for the prosecution was procurator I. D. Egorov. The counsel for the defence were lawyers V. A. Tokarev, G. M. Kobylsky, L. M. Suslov, V. I. Pospolitak and A. S. Antonets. The accused were: Dmitry Dmitrievich Grinkov (born 1948, secondary education, metal-worker, two small dependant children, home address: flat 28, Pervomaiskaya Street 11, Kolomyya, Ivano-Frankovsk region); Nikolai Nikolayevich Motryuk (born 1949, secondary education, metal-worker, has a dependant infant, lived in the village of Markivka, Kolomyya district, Ivano-Frankovsk region); Ivan Vasilevich Shovkovoi (born 1950, secondary education, joiner, lived in the settlement of Pechenizhin in Kolomyya district); Dmitry Ilich Demidov (born 1948, higher education, mechanical engineer, has a dependant infant, lived in the settlement of Pechenizhin); and Roman Vasilevich Chuprei (born 1948, prior to his arrest a third-year student at the Lvov Polytechnic Institute).

All five accused were charged under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (equivalent to article 70 of the R S F S R Code) and article 64 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ('organized activity aimed at committing especially dangerous crimes against the state, and also participation in an anti-Soviet organization'). Grinkov, Motryuk, Shovkovoi and Demidov were, in addition, charged under article 223 of the Ukrainian Code ('stealing firearms, ammunition and/or explosives'), while Demidov was charged under article 223 via article 19 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code ('complicity'). Grinkov, Motryuk and Shovkovoi were also charged under article 140 of the Code ('larceny'). Grinkov was also charged under article 81 of the Code ('feloniously appropriating state or public property'), and Shovkovoi was further charged under article 222 of the Code ('unlawfully possessing, storing, manufacturing or selling weapons and/or explosives').

Under articles 62 and 64 the accused were charged with having, in the autumn of 1971, agreed 'to found an illegal anti-Soviet organization to fight against Soviet power for the secession of the Ukrainian S S R from the U S S R and for the establishment of a so-called "independent Ukraine", by attracting new members into the above organization, by the ideological preparation and training of its members and of others in a spirit of anti-Soviet nationalism, and by establishing links with other organizations hostile to the Soviet Union, including ones abroad'. Grinkov was the moving force behind the founding of the organization. And he then headed the organization, directed it, and named it 'The Union of Ukrainian Youth of Galicia'. Nine meetings of the organization took place between February 1972 and March 1973. (Grinkov, Shovkovoi and Motryuk were arrested on 15 March 1973; Chuprei on 17 March 1973; and Demidov on 13 April 1973.) At those meetings, speeches were made and books read which were 'of a nationalist, anti-Soviet nature', and 'nationalist songs' were sung.

Under the other articles of the Ukrainian Code, the main charge against the accused was the stealing of firearms and ammunition. In addition, Grinkov had appropriated two builder's pistols and had given them to Shovkovoi to convert into real firearms. The verdict stated that at the beginning of 1973, 'in order to hide his criminal activity', Shovkovoi had 'thrown the pistols down a school toilet drain'. In 1969 Shovkovoi had manufactured a barrel-loading pistol, and in 1972 he had converted it and used it for target practice.

At the trial all the accused 'made full confessions and gave details about the time, place and circumstances' of their criminal acts. Besides which, specific points in the statements made by the accused were supported by evidence given by seven other members of the organization, who appeared as witnesses at the trial, and by the 'nationalistic content of notes confiscated from Grinkov'.

In passing sentence, the court took into consideration 'the sincere repentance shown by the accused Motryuk, Shovkovoi, Demidov and Chuprei, and their

condemnation of their criminal acts'. The sentences were: Grinkov — seven years in strict-regime camps and three years in exile; Shovkovoi and Demidov — five years in strict-regime camps each; Motryuk and Chuprei — four years' strict-regime each. The sentence carries the endorsement: 'secret'.

Chronicle Notes

Henceforth, the *Chronicle* will publish a supplement, *The Archive of the Chronicle*, which will contain texts of *samizdat* documents and possibly of some other documents as well.

* * *

The *Chronicle* wishes to express its gratitude to the 'Khronika Press' publishing house (U S A, editor-in-chief Valery N. Chalidze) for undertaking, in accordance with wishes expressed to it earlier, the work and burden of the publication abroad of the *Chronicle of Current Events*.

The *Chronicle* hereby confirms that the 'Khronika Press' publishing house has been given full authority to represent it with regard to all matters concerning copyright in connection with the publication of the *Chronicle of Current Events*.

The *Chronicle* wishes to have the widest possible distribution of the information contained in its issues, and hopes that opportunities will be found for the attainment of this objective.

Errata in *Chronicles* 28-31

[Regrettably, a considerable number of printing errors appeared in *Chronicles* 28-31. The following list corrects some of them.

P. 9, footnote: not Litinov, but Litvinov. P. 25, line 22: not Vyeselova, but Veselova. P. 30, first footnote, line 4: not November, but 9 November; not 'month-', but 'month-long'. P. 44, 2nd caption: not Shaferevich, but Shafarevich. P. 56, footnote: the second sentence here should in fact be attached to the previous footnote; also, not Rushkin, but Pushkin. P. 62, lines 2 and 3 from bottom: delete '(Maltsev of having bad contacts with Italian correspondents'. P. 72, footnote: not Kudrika, but Kudirka. P. 77, line 5: *omitted. P. 82, footnote omitted: *On Gabai see *Chronicles* 1, 2, 5, 8-15, 19, 25, 29, 31. P. 83, reference in footnote omitted: See text in *A Chronicle of Human Rights*, number 4, 1973, pp. 9-13, also number 5-6, pp. 88-90. P. 85, line 9: not Dzemilev, but Dzhemilev. P. 88, line 23: delete 'Subject'. P. 89, line 3: not Soviet Kogo, but Sovetskogo; and line 11: not arya, but Zarya. P. 93, line 22: not Belyeyev, but Belyayev. P. 97, line 5 from bottom: not Afansov, but Afanasov. P. 118, line 13 from bottom: not Makogov, but Makogonov. P. 121, line 7 from bottom: not Fydorov, but Fyodorov. P. 124, 2nd caption: not Dznemilev, but Dzhemilev; 5th caption: not 1969, but 1966. P. 127, footnote: not *Delo 109*, but *Tashkentskii protsess*. P. 135, line 27: not Mamade, but Mamedi. P. 139, footnote: not 16, but 26. P. 161, caption: not Aldiyev, but Aliyev. P. 162: not Akhmetov, K., but Akhtemov, K. P. 168, omission in line 6 from bottom: 31 Percy St.

In addition, it should be noted that the printer could not, unfortunately, supply the inverted circumflex often required in Lithuanian on the letters c and s.]

End-Notes (Chronicles 32 and 33)

1. See full text in *A Chronicle of Human Rights in the U S S R* (henceforth *C H R*), New York, number 7, 1974.
2. See a transcript of his 1967 trial and related materials in P. Litvinov, ed, *The Demonstration on Pushkin Square*, London, 1969. See also *Chronicles* 2, 5, 12.
3. See details of the published works in *C H R*, 1973, number 3, section 'Bibliography'.
4. *Herald of the Russian Student Christian Movement*, 91 rue Olivier de Serre, 75015 Paris, quarterly.
5. See text in *C H R*, 1973, number 3.
6. Widely published. See full text in, e.g., *The New York Review of Books*, 4 October 1973.
7. For the texts of this and the previous item see *C H R*, 1974, number 8.
8. See also Myuge's article about Nekipelov, and Nekipelov's verse in *Russkaya mysl*, Paris, 3 January 1974 and 11 April 1974 respectively.
9. *Obshchestvennye problemy*, a *samizdat* journal edited in Moscow by V. N. Chalidze, of which 15 issues appeared between 1969 and 1972. The contents of each issue were summarized in the *Chronicle* (see Numbers 10-27, with a few exceptions). Many materials of the Moscow Human Rights Committee were published in later issues of *Social Problems*.
10. The paper *Golos Rodiny* (*Voice of the Motherland*).
11. See texts in *C H R*, 1974, numbers 8 and 9.
12. These two sentences are not fully accurate. In fact, provided that Pentecostalist communities have been prepared to affiliate to the official All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians (i.e., Pentecostalists) and Baptists, formed in 1944, they have been allowed to register with local authorities both before and after 1963, and thus become legal. But many have not been prepared to do this. After 1963 the Chernogorsk community was allowed for a time to function legally without affiliation, but this was a special case. See documents and article by Michael Rowe in *Religion in Communist Lands*, Keston College, Kent, number 1-3, 1975.
13. See the full texts of this appeal, and of the two further appeals summarized below, in *C H R*, 1974, number 10. See also the Vashchenko documents in number 15.
14. An error, presumably caused by mis-typing or faulty knowledge. In fact, the period of greatest persecution for Soviet Christians was between 1929 and 1941, by which date most churches had been forcibly closed. But on Hitler's invasion of the U S S R Stalin sharply reversed this policy.
15. None appear to have reported on this, but later Bresenden gave another interview to Peter Osnos, whose report appeared in the *Washington Post* and the *International Herald Tribune*, 23 April 1975. In the autumn of 1975 Evgeny Bresenden was allowed to emigrate.
16. This varied *samizdat* collection of over 100 pages, resembling the Jewish movement's *Exodus*, has been published in several places in the West. For background see Ann Sheehy, *The Crimean Tatars, Volga Germans* and *Meskhetians* (second, expanded edition), Minority Rights Group, 36 Craven Street, London, WC2, 1973. See also recent documents and materials on the Germans in *Chronicle* 34 and *C H R*, 1974, numbers 7, 10, 12.
17. Regat: Riad according to *Chronicle* 31, though both forms may be correct:

Tatar names are often spelt in a variety of ways.

18. These summaries are in fact omitted, presumably by mistake. Sequels to many of the episodes in this section can be found in *Chronicles* 34, 35 and 36. English translations of the Lithuanian *Chronicle* are published as booklets by the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Priests' League of America, 64-14 56th Road, Maspeth, New York 11378.
19. The Soviet paper *Lvovskaya Pravda* later reported on his conviction and trial, but did not give his sentence. See a lengthy account in *The Guardian*, London, 28 August 1974.
20. See an article (with documents) on this complex matter, 'The Georgian Orthodox Church: Corruption and Renewal' by Peter Reddaway, in *Religion in Communist Lands, op cit*, 1975, numbers 4-5 and 6. See also *Chronicles* 34-35 and this issue ('News in Brief'). It is clear from this material that Mrs Pailodze's case played an important role in the emergence and development of human rights activity in Georgia.
21. Additional information on many of the prisoners mentioned in this section can be found in *Chronicle* 33 (this volume), also in *Chronicles* 34-36.
22. *Chronicle* 33 (section 'In the Mordovian Camps') reports that a later attempt succeeded. On Žukovskis see *Chronicles* 11 and 33.
23. In the West he spells his name Scharegin. He was arrested in September 1968 and sentenced in early January 1970. See a Reuter report from Moscow dated 9 January 1970.
24. Corrected from 'Algimantas' in accordance with correction in *Chronicle* 34.
25. Corrected from 'Victor', as indicated in *Chronicle* 33. Kolomin's age, on the line below, has been corrected from 22, as indicated in *Chronicle* 35.
26. Corrected from '20 February', as indicated in *Chronicle* 33.
27. These essays are now available in English in two similar Moroz collections, *Report from the Beria Reserve*, Peter Martin, Toronto, 1974, and *Boomerang*, Smoloskyp, PO Box 6066, Baltimore, Md, U S A, 1974. For appeals in Moroz's defence see this issue (section 'Letters and Statements') and *C H R*, 1974, numbers 8 and 9.
28. Corrected from 'March 1972' on the basis of available documents.
29. See the texts of his carefully argued appeal, and of the verdict on Feldman which the appeal contests, in *C H R*, 1974, number 8, pp 43-51.
30. This is also stated in a letter he wrote to A. Petrov-Agatov shortly before he died, a copy of which recently reached the West.
31. But see details and a correction in *Chronicle* 33.
32. A Lithuanian worker born in 1943.
33. The committee's secretary is Dr M. Broué, 18 rue du Gén Pajol, 77130 Montereau, France. The committee, which seeks broad support, publishes regular bulletins in both English and French.
34. In a subsequent issue of the Committee's bulletin Prof. Freedman published a categoric denial of this statement.
35. See section 'Letters and Statements' in this issue.
36. See the statement by Dr Roger Gentis and Dr Horace Torrubia in *Le Nouvel Observateur*, Paris, 5-11 November 1973.
37. Simultaneously he circulated a long statement of solidarity which was widely published in the West.
38. Returned to the U S S R in 1973.

39. See A. Voronel's open letter of 22 June 1974 in *C H R*, 1974, number 10.
40. These were published in the West in the spring and summer of 1974.
41. See *Chronicles* 11 and 24. Goryachev emigrated in 1975.
42. See *Chronicles* 5, 6, 11, 20, 22 and 30, and *C H R*, 1973, number 4.
43. See full text and related texts in *C H R*, 1974, number 7 (see also 1973, number 4).
44. In fact no summary is given, evidently through inadvertence. Voinovich's letter, dated 2 October 1973 and published widely in the West, was a response to Boris Pankin's interview in the *Literary Gazette* of 26 September 1973. On Pankin's All-Union Agency for Authors' Rights see also *C H R*, 1973, numbers 4 and 5-6, section 13 in each, and 1974, number 7, section 'Persecution of Writers' (also 1973, number 1, section 'Documents of Soviet Law'). The first two parts of Voinovich's five-part novel about Chonkin were published in Russian in book-form by the Y M C A-Press in Paris in 1975, and are due to appear in several other languages. For several Voinovich texts and an interview see *Index*, London, 1975, number 2.
45. The materials of this section appear at their full length (9 pages) in *C H R*, 1974, number 9. See also Etkind's defence of Brodsky at his trial in the condensed transcript in *Encounter*, London, September 1964 (full transcript in Russian in R. N. Grynberg, ed, *Vozdushnye puti — Almanakh IV*, New York, 1965).
46. For details of these directives (of 1972) see *C H R*, 1973, number 5-6, section 3, where the case of the scientist A. P. Fedoseyev is discussed.
47. For a later, detailed statement (5 pp) by Ginzburg see *C H R*, 1975, number 13. See also *Chronicles* 34 and 35 for developments regarding him and Marchenko.
48. On these 'reform Baptists', or '*initsiativnili*', see *Chronicles* 16 and (especially regarding G. Vins) 34 and 35.
49. Vylegzhanin was later sentenced to four years, but the other two may have been freed. See *Chronicles* 34 and 35.
50. The first two of these items feature in a book edited by Tatyana Khodorovich which has appeared in Russian and will appear in early 1976 in English as (provisional title) *The Da Vinci Syndrome: the Case of Leonid Plyushch*, C. Hurst, London. The third item is one of the two Tverdokhlebov documents summarized on pp 116 and 118 of *Chronicle* 30 (English edition), the second of which was published in *The New Scientist*, London, 11 October 1973.
51. Corrected from Raigorodsky, as indicated in *Chronicle* 34.
52. On Bokov, a young philosopher, see *Chronicle* 34. In 1975 Bokov emigrated.
53. For documents in this case see *C H R*, 1974, numbers 9 and 10, and recent issues of *Religion in Communist Lands*, Keston, Kent.
54. On this schismatic Church see W. C. Fletcher, *The Russian Orthodox Church Underground: 1917-1970*, London, 1971.
55. See documents concerning Galich's struggle to emigrate in *C H R*, 1974, number 7.
56. See also his *samizdat* open letters to H. Böll and to the Writers' Union in *ibid*, 1973, number 3, and to Prof. Muzafarov (a Crimean Tatar) and the Medvedev twins in *ibid*, 1973, number 5-6.
57. See *Chronicle* 30, p 112 (English edition). B'nai B'rith in New York has published the first two issues in English, and the Department of Russian

Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem has been publishing the almanach regularly in Russian in its series *Evreiskii Samizdat.*

58. Nekrasov's essays were published in *Novy mir* in late 1962; for the Chornovil letter see Michael Browne, ed, *Ferment in the Ukraine,* London, 1971, document 30. See also P. Litvinov, *The Demonstration in Pushkin Square,* and *Chronicle* 5 for his signing of other protests in 1966 and 1968, and *C H R,* 1974, numbers 7 and 8, for documents on his 1974 search, etc.
59. See various issues from number 18 onwards.
60. In fact, by the end of 1973 Lavrov and the two preceding people, Montlevich and Butkus, as well as their colleague Zheleznov, had all been released from the ordinary mental hospitals in which they had been interned. See *Chronicle* 28 on their case.
61. See full text in *C H R,* 1974, number 7.
62. See full text in *ibid, loc cit.*
63. See full text in *ibid,* 1974, number 8.
64. See full text in *ibid, loc cit.*
65. See *Chronicle* 30. On Engelgardt's more liberal role in the Zh. Medvedev case see *Chronicle* 14.
66. See full text in *C H R,* 1974, number 8.
67. In response to Orlov's statement Sakharov and Shafarevich issued an appeal to world scientific opinion in his defence. See text in *ibid,* 1974, number 10.
68. On the Moscow group see *ibid,* 1974, number 11, and *Chronicle* 34.
69. See full text in *C H R,* 1974, number 12.
70. See full text in *ibid, loc cit.*
71. See full text in *ibid, loc cit,* also *Nature,* London, 4 September 1975. The Congress is now in fact called the International Association for Cultural Freedom. Its headquarters is in Paris.
72. Full text in possession of Khronika Press, but not yet published.
73. Corrected from the faulty reference given in the *Chronicle* (Psalm 90, verse 14). It should also be noted that Psalm 70 in the Anglican Psalter is Psalm 71 in the Russian Psalter.
74. Due to be published in Russian by Khronika Press, New York, in 1975. The full text of the 20-page interview is due to appear in English in *Survey,* London, 1975, number 97.
75. This collection is included in the book *Andrei Tverdokhlebov — v zashchitu prav cheloveka* (*Andrei Tverdokhlebov in Defence of Human Rights*), edited by V. Chalidze, Khronika Press, New York, 1974.
76. See full text in *C H R,* 1974, number 11.
77. On Zdorovets see *Chronicles* 7, 29, 30; on Vins *Chronicles* 5, 34 and 35.
78. See full text in *C H R,* 1974, number 11.
79. For a systematic analysis of food norms and other major aspects of the theory and practice of the Soviet laws and regulations on imprisonment see the Amnesty International Report, *Prisoners of Conscience in the U S S R: their Treatment and Conditions,* London, 1975 (referred to henceforth as *A I Report, 1975*). This very thorough report is essential background reading for *Chronicle* 33 and for the sections of other *Chronicles* which concern prisons, camps and mental hospitals.
80. For a detailed map of this camp complex see P. Reddaway, *Uncensored Russia,* p 204, and for an explanation of various key Russian words concerning camps see *ibid,* p 456, notes 8 and 10.

81. For detailed ground plans of this camp, and of a typical cell in it, see *A I Report, 1975.*
82. *Chronicle* 35 reports that Staroselsky was released in, probably, early 1974, and also points to the illegality of his having been put in a camp for adults after the verdict had specified a juvenile camp for his whole term.
83. A. I. Ivanov: probably the A. Ivanov whose *samizdat* essay on the desirability of a multi-party system is summarized in *Chronicle* 17.
84. This document recently reached the West, with related documents, but has not yet been published. On Petrov-Agatov and his works see also *Chronicles* 10, 17, 27.
85. On the involvement of his mother, B. Pašiliene, in the case of Sergei Kovalyov see *Chronicles* 34 and 35.
86. See note 54 above.
87. *Chronicle* 35 reports that in October 1974 she was ruled to be mentally ill and sent to the hospital in camp 3.
88. See full English text in *C H R,* 1975, number 13. The episode with Gluzman's parents at the camp is described by his friend Victor Nekrasov in an article about Gluzman, Plyushch and their families in *The Observer* Colour Magazine, 20 July 1975.
89. I.e., the V. Bolysov who is the author of the article, 'Utilize All Means of Procuracy Supervision', in *Sotsialisticheskaya Zakonnost* (Socialist Legality), Moscow, March 1975.
90. For an important document describing Ogurtsov's hospitalization, and its background, see *C H R,* 1974, number 10.
91. See A. Solzhenitsyn, *The GULag Archipelago,* vol. 1.
92. *Chronicle* 35 reports that in January 1975 M. Dyak (aged 40) was in a terminal condition, yet was refused release by a court, as he had not 'reformed'. See on him also *Chronicles* 11 and 17.
93. Basarab: omitted, presumably in error, from the list of camp 35 prisoners later in this issue. On him see *Chronicle* 24.
94. This book is apparently not yet available in the West. But lengthy documents on the case, edited by Svetlichny, have been published. In English they appear in Michael Browne, ed, *Ferment in the Ukraine,* London, 1971.
95. See French text in *Cahiers du Samizdat,* Brussels, 1973, May, number 9, and Russian text in *Russkaya mysl,* Paris, 12 April 1973. In July 1975 the Royal College of Psychiatrists sent a telegram of moral support to Gluzman, and protested to the Soviet authorities about his imprisonment. See texts in *The Observer,* London, 20 July 1975.
96. The trial is described in some detail, but without the defendants' names, in *Chronicle* 24, pp 140-41 of the Amnesty International edition.
97. See note 94 above.
98. Two documents written by Balakhonov in 1974, summarized in *Chronicle* 35, have reached the West. One, an appeal to the World Meteorological Organization in Geneva, was given to the addressee by the Swiss section of Amnesty in summer 1975. On 11 July 1975 a demonstration for Balakhonov took place in Geneva.
99. Mikhail Vendysh: corrected from Vyndish, as indicated in *Chronicle* 35. See also *C H R,* 1973, number 5-6, where some details differ: Vendysh is reported

to be a Jew born in 1947 and sentenced to 15 years after trying to escape from a Soviet ship in the Mediterranean in 1967. In 1972 he was in Mordovian camp 19.

100. I.e., Vasily Ivanovich. Zakharchenko was born in 1936.
101. 1956, according to *Ukrainian Herald* 4, which says he was arrested in 1948 (not 1951).
102. Corrected from 12 (a clear slip), as indicated in *Chronicle* 34.
103. According to *C H R*, 1973, number 4, Mikhail Yatsishin is an office-worker from Chervonograd.
104. V. Marchenko: six years in camps and two in exile, according to *Ukrainian Herald* 7-8, which describes him as a writer.
105. Not convicted 'recently', first name not 'Panas': corrected here as indicated in *Chronicle* 35. Also, the one word 'Glana' (a name) has been deleted just below 'Gurny', as indicated in *Chronicle* 35.
106. Tentatively corrected from '3' on the basis of *Chronicle* 29 and another document.
107. Corrected from Vasilevich, as indicated in *Chronicle* 35.
108. Both have since emigrated to Israel.
109. See more details of this case, from the official viewpoint, in *Chronicle* 22, where Yakubenko's initials are given as N.I. No information is available on Yakubenko's subsequent fate. *Chronicle* 35 reports Chamovskikh's release from camp and dispatch into exile.
110. See note 94.
111. Victor Evgenevich Grigorev's sentence was seven years, according to a long appeal he wrote in 1972 to world Christians, which also indicates that he was arrested in 1968 and renounced his Soviet citizenship in 1972. See Russian text in *Novyi zhurnal*, New York, 1975, number 118.
112. Corrected from 'due for release in one and a half years', as indicated in *Chronicle* 35.
113. Confirmed in M. Browne, ed, *Ferment in the Ukraine*, p 100. Protsiv was one of a group of six men from Khodorov who were tried in Lvov.
114. Dmitry Pilitsyak: according to another document, his sentence is 25 years under article 58-1. *Chronicle* 35 reports his release.
115. Corrected from 1920, as indicated in *Chronicle* 35.
116. Corrected from 1918, as indicated in *Chronicle* 35.
117. *Chronicle* 35 adds: 15 year sentence under article 64.
118. Corrected from 10 years, as indicated in *Chronicle* 35, which adds: article 64.
119. Corrected from 25 years, as indicated in *Chronicle* 35, which also gives the article (64) and Zagrebayev's first name, Ivan.
120. Corrected from Kashuz, as indicated in *Chronicle* 35, which adds that his sentence is 15 years under article 64.
121. *Chronicle* 35 reports that they were sentenced in 1957 for taking part in mass shootings of Jews, and corrects *Chronicle* 33's error in calling them Volga Germans.
122. Corrected from 'was', as indicated in *Chronicle* 35.
123. Where her name is, evidently, mis-spelt Silivonchik. On her see also this issue.
124. *Chronicle* 35 adds that Egor Vasin served in the Vlasov army, was given, while in a non-political camp, 25 years under article 58 (of the Stalin-period code), and has had this increased by further sentences imposed for camp offences.

125. According to another document: Kirill Fedorchuk, born 1924.
126. *Chronicle* 35 corrects the spelling of Vabishchevich's name, adds his first name, Grigory, and his age, 43, confirms the O U N charge, and says his sentence is due to end in March 1975.
127. Corrected from Ratinysh, as indicated in *Chronicle* 35, which adds: article 58 (of Stalinist code), sentence — 25 years.
128. See note 74.
129. See full English text in *C H R*, 1974, number 12.
130. Published in the book indicated in note 75.
131. See further details in *Chronicle* 22 and *Ukrainian Herald* 6.
132. Published in the West as *The Chornovil Papers*, McGraw-Hill, 1968. Pogruzhalsky was sentenced in 1964 for arson, after a mysterious fire in a Ukrainian national library in Kiev, which was widely believed to have involved a deliberate destruction of part of the Ukrainian heritage.

RSFSR Criminal Code

Each republic within the Soviet Union has its own criminal code. The *Chronicle* frequently refers to specific articles of Soviet law. The three articles mentioned most often are found in the criminal code of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic—R S F S R for short. These articles read :

Article 70 Anti-Soviet Agitation and Propaganda. Agitation or propaganda (main section) carried on for the purpose of subverting or weakening Soviet authority or of committing particular especially dangerous crimes against the state, or the [verbal] spreading for the same purpose of slanderous fabrications which defame the Soviet political and social system, or the circulation or preparation or keeping, for the same purpose, of literature of such content, shall be punished by deprivation of freedom for a term of 6 months to 7 years, with or without additional exile for a term of 2 to 5 years, or by exile for a term of 2 to 5 years.

Article 190-1 Dissemination of Fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet political and social system. The systematic dissemination by word of mouth of deliberate fabrications which defame the Soviet political and social system, or the manufacture or dissemination in written, printed or other form of works of the same content, shall be punished by deprivation of freedom for a term not exceeding 3 years, or by corrective labour for a term not exceeding one year, or by a fine not exceeding 100 rubles.

Index of Names

Roman numerals in brackets refer to the page on which a photograph appears.

Abankin, V. 50, 95, 140, 142, 158
Abel, G. 113
Ablyazov, Z. E. 34
Abukevicius, R. 78
Afanasev, witness 18-19
Afanasev, Vl. 126-27, 129, 134, 153, 173
Afanasov, Major 51, 136
Agursky, M. 9, 11, 94, 104
Airikyan, P. A. 122
Akhmatova, A. 21, 77
Akhmatova, R. 121
Akhmedov, prisoner 162
Akimov, Dzh. 95
Akramavicius, P. 160
Akselrod, I. 104
Aleksandrovsky, Major 138
Alekseyev, M. 70
Alekseyeva, L. 64-66
Aleshina, E. 125
Alimonaki, L. 88
Altman, A. A. 95, 127, 132, 137, 147
Amalrik, A. 27, 53, 96
Ametov, E. 39-40
Amiredzhibi, Ch. 88
Amlinsky, writer 73
Anastasov, Lieut.-Col. 132
Andronova, E. S. 11
Andropov, Yu. V. 18, 167
Anfisov, Lieut.-Col. 67
Antonets, A. S. 176
Antonyuk, Z. P. 111, 127-28, 131, 132, 133, 134-36, 148
Apraksin, lawyer 16
Aptekar, L. 11
Armans, prisoner 165
Astaurov, B. L. 92
Astra, G. 142, 163
Atkociunaite, L. 45
Averichkin, B. A. 120
Azadovsky 76
Azbel, M. 67
Azernikov, B. P. [VII] 48, 49, 96, 109-111, 112, 118-19, 122, 125

Babayan, A. 58
Babel, I. 77
Babicas, prisoner 151
Babich, S. A. 57, 95, 109, 112, 118, 125
Babischcheva, E. K. 146
Babitsky, K. 90
Bachurina, A. A. 25
Bakanavicius, A. 161
Bakhmin, V. 11
Bakradze, D. 47
Bakucionis, procurator 40, 42
Balakhonov, V. F. 111, 127, 129, 130, 132, 134-36, 147
Balashov, prisoner 138, 152
Balkaitis 122
Balochanin, P. I. 176
Barabanov, E. 9, 11, 16, 100
Baranauskas, S. 161
Baranov, I. 162
Baranova, K. A. 173
Baratashvili, O. 80
Barto, A. 51, 70
Barvainis, lawyer 40
Basarab, D. 137
Bastis, V. 151
Bauer, L. 31
Bayeva, T. [III] 64-65
Belogorodskaya, I. M. 12, 15
Belokhov, V. 56
Belomesov, V. P. 146, 154
Belyayev, N. N. 22
Berdichevskaya, V. 100
Berdyayev, N. A. 94
Berestovsky, KGB investigator 83
Berezin, prisoner 55
Berezko, writer 73
Berezovsky, investigator 172
Berger, mathematician 61
Berger, A. S. 154
Berger, L. N. 152
Bergman, P. 31
Beriashvili, O. 47
Berniichuk, A. A. 142, 158
Bernstein, R. 17
Bers, L. 17
Bersenev, V. E. 155
Best, prisoner 162
Bichiashvili, N. 80
Boborykin, A. D. 75-76
Bobrov, Vl. 126, 132, 133, 153
Bochevarov, G. N. 69, 89
Bogdanov, V. K. 132, 133, 153
Bogdanov, V. M. 24
Bogdanovich, camp official 30
Bogoraz, L. I. 11, 68, 86, 90, 123
Bokhan, procurator 29
Bokov, N. K. 84
Boldin, 38
Boldyrev, procurator 51
Böll, H. 9, 53
Bolonkin, A. A. 49, 78, 95
Bolysov, V. 127, 133, 134
Bondar, N. V. 137, 140, 152
Bonner, E. G. [II] 11, 12-13, 16, 62, 99, 173
Borisov, I. N. 24
Borisov, Vadim 9, 11, 100
Borisov, Vladimir 63
Borisova, T. 100
Borodin, L. 104
Borovikov, V. A. 86
Borozdin-Braun, N. N., *see* Braun
Bortnik, E. 162
Bortnik, M. 162
Braga, prisoner 162
Brailovsky, I. 67
Brailovsky, V. 67
Braun, N. N. 55, 154
Bresenden, E. A. [VIII] 28-30
Brezhnev, L. I. 20, 23, 78, 95, 96, 104, 113, 153, 171
Brikulis, prisoner 165
Brodsky, J. 26-27, 74, 76
Brovman, writer 72-73
Brukhin, *see* I. Burakhin
Bruzas, I. 150
Budagyan, Yu. A. 129, 132, 152
Budulak-Sharygin, N. 48, 55, 122
Bugai, O. 77
Bukovskaya, N. I. 52
Bukovsky, Vl. K. [II] 12-13, 52, 55, 59, 63, 91, 95, 97-98, 103, 113, 126-29, 132, 134, 173
Bulgakov, M. A. 77
Burakhin, I. 27
Bursov, B. 94
Butkus, D. 96
Butman, G. I. 52, 95, 127, 132, 147
Butova, Dr. 53, 56
Bykov, B. 155

Cartan, H. 61-62
Cekelis, R. 57
Cepaitis, T. 78
Chalidze, V. N. 16, 178
Chamovskikh, V. P. 156
Chanturishvili, T. 127-28, 132, 152
Charukhov, R. 38-39
Chasovskikh, L. A. 60
Chekalin, A. N. 127, 130, 132, 134, 135, 152, 173-75
Chekalina, E. R. 174
Chekhovskoi, A. K. 155
Chendei, I. M. 164
Chepurov, A. N. 75

Cherepukhin 165
Chernikov, S. P. 174
Chernoglaz, D. 55, 142, 157, 173
Chernomaz, B. D. 159
Cherny, prisoner 159
Chernysheva, T. 85
Chervinskaya, N. 101
Chesnokov, prisoner 158
Chevalier, C. 61
Chigier, N. 67
Chinnov, A. F. 95
Chobanov, M. 172
Chobanov, U. 38
Chornovil, V. M. 93, 95, 117-18, 143, 146, 156, 176
Chudakovas, 44
Chukovskaya, L. K. [V] 9, 10, 70-72, 101
Chukovsky, N. 70
Chuprei, R. V. 156, 177-78
Ciplis, 44
Ciuksis, K. 151

Dagdzhi, N. 38
Dandaron, B. D. 96
Daniel, Yu. M. 73, 92
Danilov, Col. 28-29
Danilyuk, I. F. 88
Danini, M. 27
Danne, E. 127-28, 130, 153
Dar, D. 71
Davidenko, G. M. 128-29, 133, 145-46, 154, 155
Davydov, G. V. 142, 153
Delone, V. 90
Demidov, D. I. 132, 146, 156, 176-77
Demyanenko, V. S. 33
Deonisiadi, G. V. 155-56
Din-Ogly, M. 37
Dmitrievsky, E. N. 17, 19
Dobosch, J. 148
Dolgy, V. 9
Dolzhenko, N. A. 33
Domashnev, A. I. 76
Dordzhiev, E. B. 151
Drachuk 54
Dreizner, S. G. 122
Dremlyuga, V. A. [V] 80-83, 90, 95
Drozhzhina, M. F. 173
Dubas, prisoner 162
Dubauskas, J. 160
Dubinin, N. P. 92
Dudenas, N. 151
Dudin, A. 158
Dudko, Fr. D. [IV] 86-87
Dvinin, V. 61-62
Dvortsin, witness 18, 21
Dyak, M. D. 137, 146
Dyak, Vl. 137, 149-50
Dymshits, M. Y. 95, 141, 157
Dzaugis, A. 161
Dzhaburin, prisoner 162
Dzhaparidze, O. 46-47
Dzhelyalov, R. 34
Dzhemaletdinova, Z. 38
Dzhemilev, M. [V] 31-33, 113, 171
Dzhemilev, R. 95, 113
Dzhemileva, R. (Zera) 36

Efimov, prisoner 128, 151
Egerev, V. P. 26
Egorov, I. D. 176
Eikhenbaum, Prof. 77
Elin, M. V. 122-23
Ellingson, witness 16
Emersaliyeva 38
Eminova, A. A. 34
Engelgardt, V. A. 101
Eredzhepov, M. 38
Eremeyev, I. D. 67
Erlich, V. 17
Ershov, M. V. 87
Etkind, E. G. [VII] 8, 26-27, 71, 74-75
Eventov, I. S. 76
Evseyev, P. F. 89
Ezhov, I. S. 55

Fadeyev, A. 77
Fadorishev, L. I. 176
Fain, V. 67
Fainberg, V. 52, 63, 90
Fanger, D. 17
Fast, G. 31
Fedorchuk, prisoner 165
Fedotov, prison official 166
Fedyuk, prisoner 162
Feldman, A. [V] 54-55, 85, 95, 97, 172-73
Figolis, Fr. V. 44
Filatov, V. 94
Filev, writer 71
Finkelshtein, E. 67
Fodo, S. 15-16
Fomenko, L. 72
Ford, G. 167, 171
Freedman, A. 62
Frolov, N. 165
Frolov, O. I. 95, 141-42, 143, 154
Frolov, V. 165
de la Fuente, R. 62
Funk, prisoner 162
Furman, S. A. 25
Fyodorov, Major V. 51, 139
Fyodorov, Yu. I. 55
Fyodorov, Yu. P. 95

Gabai, G. 90
Gabai, I. 23, 90
Gafarov, S. 37
Galanskov, Yu. T. 15, 48, 72, 103, 113
Galdikas, B. 151
Galich, A. A. [III] 8, 21, 91, 100
Gamsakhurdiya, Z. 90
Ganichev, procurator 48
Garagonich, I. 163-64
Gastev, Yu. A. 69, 89, 90, 100
Gavenaite, M. 45
Gavrilov, A. V. 94
Gavrilov, G. 58, 95, 128, 132, 145
Gavronskis, lawyer 40
Gay, P. 17
Gel, I. A. [V] 113, 117
Genkin, S. 100
Gentis, Dr. R. 63
Gerasimova, S. M. 22
Gerchak, *see* G. A. Girchik
Gershuni, Vl. 63
Ginzburg, A. [II] 15-16, 72, 79, 92, 100, 170
Ginzburg, L. 100
Giorgobiani, investigator 88
Girchik, G. A. 142, 160
Gladko, G. V. 127, 129, 132-33, 147
Gladkova, G. 100
Glagoleva, R. V. 26, 28
Glezer, I. 118
Glotser, V. 100
Gluzman, S. F. 95, 111, 113, 127, 130-31, 132, 134-36, 144, 171-72
Glyva, Vl. 160
Gnedin, Capt. 139
Gofman, V. A. 23-24
Goland, Dr. 105
Goldfeld, A. M. [VII] 48, 57, 112, 118-19
Golubev, student 77
Golubnichei, T. M. 173
Goncharov, prisoner 162
Gorbal, N. A. 127-28, 132-33, 134, 137, 143, 148-49, 171
Gorbanevskaya, N. 90, 92, 100
Gorky, M. 15
Goryachev, P. M. 69, 89
Grabar, M. I. 78
Grachev, foreman 64
Grazys, J. 43
Grebenshchikov, witness 16
Gribachev, N. 70
Gribanov, A. 100
Gricius, J. 160
Grigas, V. 31
Grigorenko, A. P. 171
Grigorenko, P. G. [I] 12, 19, 58-59, 95, 103, 144, 171
Grigorenko, Z. M. [I] 59
Grigorev, V. 142, 158
Grilius, S. A. 141-42, 154
Griniv, prisoner 160
Grinkov, D. D. 141, 143, 156, 176-78

Gryunvald, N. F. 125
Gubka, I. N. 176
Gudas, K. 44
Gudelis, J. 44
Gudukiene, Mrs. 45
Gukovsky 77
Gulais, G. 165
Gulil, prisoner 141, 165
Gumilyov, N. S. 94
Gurfel, B. 67
Gurevich, lawyer 14
Gurny, R. 153
Guro, I. 73
Gusyak, D. Y. 95, 123
Gusyakova 9
Guz 176

Heckster, J. H. 17
Herzen, A. 70
Hitler, A. 41
Husak, G. 20

Ibragimov, citizen 35
Ibragimova, D. 38
Ignatas, judge 40
Ikonnikov, KGB captain 29
Ilinov, V. M. 80
Ilyakov, V. 104
Iofe, N. Ya. 11
Iofe, O. 11, 100
Ionova, prosecutor 38
Ishmatov, R. 37
Ismagilov, I. 153
Ivanov, prisoner 161
Ivanov, A. I. 120-21, 122
Ivanov, A. M. 69
Ivanov, N. V. 104
Ivanov, P. L. 76
Ivanova, R. 124

Jastrauskas, A. 58
Jauga, A. 150
Jaugelis, V. 43
Jogesma, H. 64
Johnson, L. B. 121
Jucis, J. 150
Jurkstas, V. 160
Juzenaite, V. 45

Kabakov, F. A. 86
Kadagidze, B. 80
Kadyrovs 37
Kadzionis, J. 160
Kalanta, R. 44, 78
Kalinichenko, V. V. 50, 142, 165
Kalva, P. A. 122-23
Kalynets, I. M. 95, 111, 124, 127, 132-35, 137, 143, 148
Kampov, P. F. 163-64
Kamuz, prisoner 162
Kanarsky, V. 77
Kandyba, I. A. 111, 127, 146
Kapitanchuk, V. 94
Kaplun, I. 11
Kapustina, I. I. 33
Karatayev, B. B. 89
Karavansky, S. 95, 123, 148
Kardasevich, L. 101
Karpavicius, P. 151
Katayev, Sh. A. 34
Katayev, V. 70
Katz, M. 67
Kavaliauskaite 40
Kavoliunas, V. 160
Kazakevicius, A. 160
Kazelaite, B. 44
Khaavastik, prisoner 162
Khalikov, E. 33-36
Khantsis, Y. L. 54, 95
Kharbedia, G. 47
Kharlanov, V. 164
Khatunsky, S. D. 34
Khaustov, V. A. 12-16, 95, 99-100, 102, 153
Kheifets, M. R. [VII] 26-28, 74, 76, 96
Khnokh, A-L [III] 52, 95, 111, 127, 132, 135, 147
Khodorovich, S. 11, 101
Khodorovich, T. 11, 18, 33, 52, 58, 62, 97-99, 101, 102, 105, 113
Khrushchev, N. S. 57, 104
Khvotkova, A. 124
Kibartas, prisoner 137
Kifyak, S. A. 142, 165
Kim, Yu. 84
Kirdenkis, V. 151
Kireyeva, I. A. 124
Kis, M. 164
Kiselev, A. I. 146
Kislyak, V. 85
Kitmanov, Major 126, 128, 139
Kiudene, V. I. 125
Klimas, V. 160
Klimenko, F. F. 122-23
Klymyuk, prisoner 161
Knyazev, KGB official 67
Kobylsky, G. M. 176
Kobylyukh, V. 176
Kogan, A. M. 124, 153
Kolakowski, L. 15, 26, 85
Kolmakov, S. A. 158
Kolodezh, *see* L. N. Berger
Kolomin, V. N. 50, 165
Kolopach, R. 120
Komarov, prisoner 95
Komarova, N. M. 19, 101
Konkin, V. E. 69, 89
Konovaltsev 78
Konyukh, D. T. 176
Kopeiko, N. 64
Kopelev, L. 71
Koptsyukh, prisoner 158
Korkach, KGB major 84
Korneyev, I. 101
Kornilov, V. 71-72
Korniyenko, people's assessor 175
Koroichuk, Dr. S. I. 175-76
Korolkov, writer 73
Korotorev, B. I. 22
Korovin, F. Ya. 85
Korshiya, Ts. 80
Koshelnaya, V. D. 33
Kost, prisoner 162
Kostava, M. I. 90
Kosterin, A. E. 12
Kostochka, V. K. 21
Kostromin, V. R. 176
Kosyrev, A. K. 145
Kotov, Major V. F. 51, 128-29, 135, 139, 141
Kotova, camp doctor 139, 141
Kots, N. 166
Kovalenko, N. E. 136, 149
Kovalyov, S. 11, 18, 33, 52, 58, 62, 98-99, 101, 105, 113
Kozhan, teacher 78
Kozhemyakina, doctor 58
Kozhukhov, Yu. V. 76
Kozovoi, V. 101
Kozyrev, doctor 59
Krasayeva, T. P. 125
Krasilshchikov 72
Krasin, V. A. 12, 15, 23, 25, 65, 81-82
Krasivsky, Z. 95
Krasnyak, prisoner 165
Kravtsova, N. L. 33
Krechkova, L. A. 24
Kristi, I. 64-66
Krovets, N. L. 38
Kruglyak, prisoner 148
Kublanovsky, Yu. M. 25
Kudaba, lawyer 40
Kudirka, S. [V] 40-41, 91-92, 95, 112, 142, 158, 170, 173
Kuhn, T. 67
Kukhaleishvili, G. 47
Kulagin, A. 34
Kulba, Prof. 76
Kuldysheva, G. 124
Kuleshov, L. F. 24
Kurchik, N. Y. 160
Kurkis, prisoner 51, 132, 137
Kurtanidze 162
Kurtumerov, E. 33-36
Kurtseitov, D. 38-39
Kurzinskas, J. 151
Kutsak, camp commandant 54
Kuzin, E. 12
Kuzmin, I. 64
Kuznetsov, E. [VII] 12, 14-16, 95, 99-100, 102, 125, 152, 154
Kuznetsov, T. P. 132
Kyiv, E. A. 157

Ladyzhensky, L. A. 15, 85-86
Landa, B. 101

Landa, M. N. 11, 19, 52, 99, 102, 105, 119
Lanskaya, investigator 21
Lapin, V. 101
Lapp, R-T. E. 142, 157
Lashkova, V. 101
Lavrenteva, N. D. 146
Lavrov, Yu. K. 96
Lavut, A. 11, 101
Lazarevicius, investigator 43
Lebedev, Yu. 23
Lekhtgolts, Y. 84
Lekishvili, N. 79-80
Lenin, V. I. 20, 46
Lenkin, A. 77
Lerner, A. 67
Lesauskas, J. 160
Lesko, O. V. 24
Lesnevsky, writer 173
Lesyuchevsky 70
Levich, V. 67
Levin, Yu. 101
Levitin (Krasnov), A. 11, 18, 33, 52, 58, 64, 99
Levitin, K. 27
Lichutin, P. V. 159
Lifshits, Y. 83
Limauskas, Major 43
Linra, prisoner 162
Lishak, headmaster 38
Lisovoi, V. 57, 149
Lisovskaya, N. P. 64-66, 83
Litvinenko, A. 126, 153
Litvinov, P. M. 11, 52, 86, 90, 91, 92, 101, 123
Lomeiko, V. 36
Los, E. 53
Lukyanenko, L. G. 142, 143, 146, 156, 173
Lumbiene, J. 44
Lunts, A. 67
Lupynos, A. 95
Lushch, K. 138, 150
Lutsik, M. 159-60
Lychak, prisoner 127, 130, 133, 148
Lyubarsky, K. 48-49, 65, 95, 109, 110, 112-114, 118, 122, 125, 170

Mackevicius, A. 40-42, 161
Makarenko, M. Ya. 50-51, 96, 142, 162-63
Makarevsky, lecturer 78
Makarov, prisoner 95
Malchevsky, S. A. 55, 154
Malyarov, M. P. 10-11
Mandelbröjt, S. 67
Mandelshtam, O. 15, 77, 84
Maramzin, V. 26-27, 74
Marchenko, A. T. [IV] 11, 26, 64-66, 79, 97, 102-103
Marchenko, V. 127, 137, 153
Marchuk, prisoner 165
Margulis, mathematician 86
Markman, V. 95
Mashkova, V. 104
Matiosaitiene, Mrs. 40
Matisov, V. 61
Matsiyevsky, procuracy official 129, 131, 136, 139
Matulionis 44
Matus, prisoner 157
Matuseviciute, A. 45
Matuzevicius, J. 151
Matviyuk, K. I. 159
Maximov, V. E. 8, 11, 71-72, 91
Medauskaite, M. 45
Mednikov, A. 70
Mednikov, V. 155
Medvedev, R. 9, 41
Medvedev, Z. 41, 70
Melekh, N. 138, 146
Melik, M. V. 176
Melikyan, S. 152
Melikyan, V. 152
Melnichuk, T. Y. 96, 132, 149
Melnikova, S. 69
Memetov, S. 39, 105
Mendelevich, I. 95, 137, 141, 147
Merzon, A. 76
Meshener, I. Ya. [VI] 55, 95, 111, 126-27, 129-30, 132, 144
Meskenaite, A. 45
Meskinas, A. 138, 151
Mikityuk, prisoner 137
Mikhailov, B. 9, 101
Mikitko, prisoner 57
Mikov, Lieut.-Col. 51, 126
Mikoyan, A. I. 16-17
Miksyte, S. 44
Milenty, Capt. 139, 141
Mirauskas, prisoner 142
Mirodyan, procurator 127, 129
Miskinis, Fr. V. 45
Mistautas, Z. 45
Mitrikas, V. 161
Mitsiunas, L. 151
Mitskevich, priest 43
Mogilever, V. O. 57, 95, 122
Molchanov, prisoner 166
Monakhov, witness 19
Montlevich, V. 96
Morkunas, S. 161
Moroz, R. V. 53, 166-68
Moroz, V. Y. [VI] 52-54, 97, 102, 104, 113, 166-69
Moroz, Ya. I. 168-69
Morozenko, 38
Morozkin, Major 28
Morozov, G. V. 22
Motryuk, N. N. 156, 176--78
Movchan 54
Mudry 38
Murauskas, A. 161
Murzhenko, A. 95
Mustafayev, A. 32
Mustafayev, E. 32, 38-39
Mustafayeva, G. R. 34
Mustafayeva, M. 32
Mutalibov, poet 121
Muzinova, S. 37
Myakishev, procurator 51
Myshakin, L. I. 25
Myuge, S. 17-18

Naidenovich, A. 52
Narinskaya, G. 101
Narovchatov, writer 70
Neifakh, A. A. 92
Nekipelov, V. A. 17-21, 96
Nekrasov, V. P. [I] 84, 93-94
Nemazilov, K. N. 127, 132, 153
Nesterenko, Lieut. 129
Nezdiiminoga, V. 165
Nikolayev, Lieut. 126, 132
Nimirinskaya, N. Ya. 12-13, 18, 20-21
Nixon, R. M. 87, 95, 96, 171
Novikov, judge 12, 14, 16

Obraztsov, prosecutor 19
Obulskis, library employee 44
Oganesyan, A. 64
Ogurtsov, I. [VI] 56, 95, 97, 98, 103, 113, 136, 137, 145
Oizerman, T. I. 34
Okhapkin, O. 94
Oldenburger, L. 31
Onishchenko, prisoner 162
Opanasenko, prisoner 130, 132, 162
Oreshkin, P. 87
Orlov, psychiatrist 59
Orlov, Yu. I. [IV] 11, 67, 103, 104-105
Osin, 1st Lieut. 138
Osipov, Col. 87
Osipov, V. N. [VI] 9, 68-69, 89, 104
Ostrovsky, prisoner 128, 151
Ovchinnikov, I. V. 9, 68, 69, 94
Ovsiyenko, V. 57

Paderin, writer 72-73
Pailodze, V. S. 46-48, 90
Palchak, M. I. 123
Panifidin, M. M. 159
Pankin, B. 72
Panov, V. 90
Panteleyev, L. 71
Paramonov, G. 145
Pashko, A. 117
Pasilis, A. 48, 122, 161
Pasternak, B. 85
Pastukh 176
Patrubavicius, A. 42
Patsyukov, V. V. 25

Paulaitis, P. [III] 57
Paulauskas, J. 161
Paulius, E. E. 157
Pavlenkov, V. 52, 127, 129, 130, 132, 135, 144
Pavlinas, prisoner 151
Paz, O. 17
Penn Warren, R. 17
Penson, B. S. [VII] 49, 96, 109, 112, 118-19, 125
Pestov, Valery G. 58, 154
Pestov, Viktor G. 58, 154-55
Petraitis, prisoner 161
Petrashko, V. M. 154
Petriv, prisoner 162
Petronis, P. 44
Petrov, V. I. 167
Petrov, V. V. 153
Petrov-Agatov, A. A. 55, 109, 121-22, 125
Picard, C. 61
Pidgorodetsky, V. 129, 136, 150
Pilelis, Capt. 43
Pilitsyak, prisoner 160
Pimen, Patriarch 86-87, 94
Pimenov, Major 126-29, 138-39
Pimenov, R. I. 64, 88, 105
Piotrovsky, R. G. 76
Pirogov, S. K. 21-26, 96, 105
Pirogova, N. G. 22
Plakhotnyuk, N. G. 63
Platonov, V. 57, 88
Pleshkov, P. I. 69, 89
Plyushch, L. I. 59-63, 84, 95, 97-98, 99, 113
Pocius, P. 151
Podgorny, N. V. 17, 22, 31-32
Podyapolsky, G. 11, 18, 33, 52, 58, 99, 101, 113
Pogruzhalsky 176
Pokrovsky, I. N. 141, 142, 160
Polishchuk, Capt. 54
Polotsky, prisoner 155
Polyakov, camp official 134
Ponomaryov, prosecutor 12
Ponomaryov, S. M. 58, 95
Popadyuk, Z. V. 57, 95, 109, 112, 118, 122, 125
Popov, doctor 166
Popov, P. P. 40
Pospolitak, V. I. 176
Potashov, Vl. 166
Potemin, A. I. 165
Potemkin, V. 154
Potseluiko, M. R. 122-23
Povilonis, V. 40-42, 95, 161
Prikhodko, F. 162
Prindya, G. 160
Prishlyak, E. 111, 132, 137, 150
Prityka, A. 159
Prokopiv, Fr. V. 43
Pronyuk, E. 52, 57, 127-28, 132, 138, 149
Protsiv, M. 160
Pruss, V. K. 60-61
Puce, prisoner 142, 165
Pupelis, V. A. 122-23
Purlis, B. 151

Radov, G. 72-73
Radugina, N. 86
Raigorodetsky, M. I. 84-85
Ram, D. 67
Ramazanov, R. 33-36
Rande, K. K. 165
Randis, Z. 161
Raskolnikov, F. 19
Reddaway, P. B. 15
Rekasius, B. 161
Rekemchuk, writer 70
Rekunenko, people's assessor 175
Remeika, V. 161
Repiev, A. 158
Repnikov, V. A. 9, 69
Reshetko, prisoner 162
Reznikov, A. S. 143, 159
Rimkus, J. 161
Risling, V. P. 24
Ritinysh, prisoner 166
Rodionov, V. 9, 104, 163
Rogachev, M. P. 69
Rogalyova, E. 154
Rogov, V. L. 56
Rogozina, G. 90
Rogozov, Lieut. 128
Rokityansky, V. 64-65
Romanov, A. I. 48, 56, 95, 103
Romanov, I. S. 67
Romanyuk, V. 95
Romashenko, G. G. 22
Rome, H. 62
Rosenshtein, G. 67
Rostropovich, M. 91
Rotenko, camp ensign 139, 141
Rozhanskaya, O. 101
Ruban, KGB colonel 164
Rubenis, J. J. 122-23
Rubin, V. [III] 64-65, 67-68, 104
Rudaitis, I. 40-42, 95, 161
Rudakov, I. 101
Rudenko, R. 169
Rumyantsev, V. 152
Ruppel, F. 31
Rusakovskaya, M. 90
Ruzmetov, procurator 172
Ryabchuk, V. N. 26-27
Ryazanov, V. I. 89
Rytov, official 132

Saarte, W. F. 142, 157
Saarts, prisoner 162
Sado, M. Y. 95, 140, 155
Sadomskaya, N. 90
Sadovsky, Capt. 129
Safronov, A. V. 50, 141-42, 158
Saint-Dierdi, scientist 67
Sakalauskas, A. 40-42, 59, 119, 161
Sakharov, A. D. [II] 8, 24, 26, 33, 52, 62, 67, 71, 83, 88, 92, 94, 96, 97, 99, 101-102, 104-105, 108, 113, 171, 173
Saltykov-Shchedrin, N. 73
Saly, A. Ya. 176
Sapelyak, S. 141, 157
Sarnachnaya, V. V. 134
Sarnov, B. 68
Sauter, prisoner 162
Scammell, M. 71
Schmidt, H. 167
Schwartz, L. 61, 67
Scully, V. 17
Seferova, E. 38
Seidalliyev, F. 172
Seidalliyev, K. 37
Seit-Osmanov, S.-I. 37-38
Seitumerov, V. A. 34
Selivanov, N. P. 33
Selivonchik, G. V. 124, 165
Semashka, V. 44-45
Semenyuk, R. Z. 119, 122
Semiletov, V. A. 146, 154
Semyonov, I. I. 24
Semyonova, M. P. 124
Senik, I. M. 95, 123, 169
Serafim, Metropolitan 86
Serebrovskaya, E. 75
Sergiyenko, A. F. 55, 97
Serkov, witness 18-19
Serksnis, J. 161
Sery, S. 104
Shabadin, Col. 129, 132
Shabatura, S. M. 50, 95, 124, 125, 169
Shaburov, N. A. 154-55
Shafarevich, I. R. 8, 93, 94
Shakhverdyan, B. L. 95, 111, 127-28, 132, 137, 152
Shakirov, B. A. 48, 55, 119, 122
Shalomatin, prisoner 162
Shanidze, L. V. 89
Shapiro, I. M. 92
Shapiro, M. 17
Shardin, camp official 139
Shatunovskaya, N. 101
Shavkunenko, prisoner 152
Shengeliya, A. 79
Shestnov, judge 16
Shikhanovich, Yu. 61-62, 63
Shilkrot, B. 58
Shkolnik, I. [VI] 95, 147
Shlandakov, official 29
Shmelev, judge 38
Shnarr, A. 31
Shnarr, F. 31, 96
Sholokhov, M. 15, 51, 70

Shovkovoi, I. V. 156, 176-78
Shragin, B. 9, 11, 90, 101
Shteiman, prosecutor 14, 16
Shub, D. 12
Shukhevich, Y. 95
Shukurov, E. 34
Shults, V. 31
Shumuk, D. 95
Shuster, A. 101
Sidaris, V. 151, 161
Sidur, V. 71
Sidyakov, camp officer 127
Silinskas, J. 122, 142, 161
Simonov, K. 51, 77
Simutis, L. 56, 95
Sinkov, prisoner 142, 157
Sinyavsky, A. D. 73, 92
Skarzinskas, J. 160
Skuratov, A. 94
Skvortsov, V. 22
Slapsinskas, V. 151
Slonim, M. 17, 101
Slucka, A. 151
Smirnov, prisoner 153
Smirnov, A. M. 89
Smirnov, L. N. 26
Smitas, E. 151
Sokolikova, N. M. 173
Sokolov, B. 124, 153
Sokolov, Vl. 56
Sokolov, V. N. 21, 23, 25, 105
Sokolova, T. 124
Solenieks, prisoner 137
Solodky, prisoner 165
Solovyov, *Pravda* writer 8
Solzhenitsyn, A. I. [II] 8-12, 14, 17, 26, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 79, 86, 88, 91, 92, 94, 112, 170
Soroko, S. K. 150
Spinenko, V. 146
Stalin, J. V. 69, 121
Stapchinsky, A. V. 122-23
Starchik, P. 96
Starikov A. 73
Starkiene, Mrs. (*see* L. Atkociunaite)
Staroselsky, L. 57, 120
Stasiv-Kalynets, I. O. 49, 95, 124, 125, 148
Stepanov, E. 162
Strashkov, N. 151
Streikus, I. 161
Strekhnin, Yu. 70
Stroganov, prisoner 162
Strokata, N. A. 49, 95, 123, 125, 159, 169
Strotsen, prisoner 162
Strugatsky, B. 27
Stus, V. 149
Sulskiene, M. J. 91, 158
Superfin, G. G. [VI] 12-17, 65, 85, 96, 100, 102, 144
Suslensky, Y. [VI] 55, 95, 144
Suslov, L. M. 176
Sverstyuk, E. A. 95, 137, 141, 159
Svetlichnaya, N. A. 95, 124, 125, 169
Svetlichny, I. A. 52, 95, 111-12, 124, 127-28, 133-36, 143, 148
Svetlichny, V. 33
Svetlova, N. 9
Svyatkin, Major 57
Sylka, prisoner 130, 132, 137, 162

Tachiev, Y. 164
Tagutavmetyan, A. 152
Tamkevicius, Fr. S. 44
Tamoliunas, P. 150
Tamulionis 40
Taltse, M. F. 22
Telnikov, V. 12, 23
Ternovsky, L. 64-66
Teslenko, prisoner 165
Tikalas, prisoner 161
Timachev, V. 101
Tokarev, B. I. 162
Tokarev, V. A. 176
Tolstousov, G. I. 155
Torosyan, prisoner 133
Torrubia, psychiatrist 63
Trakimas, KGB official 57
Tretyakova, T. P. 55
Trish, V. 64
Troyak, KGB officer 83
Trudeau, P. 167
Tsintsadze, I. V. 89
Tsizman, A. A. 24
Tskaroveli, O. 90
Tucas, R. 151
Turchin, V. F. [IV] 108
Turik, A. 160
Tvardovsky, A. 77
Tverdokhlebov, A. [V] 17, 52, 62, 84, 99, 101, 102, 112, 173
Tychina, P. 149
Tymchuk, L. 11, 64, 86

Ubozhko, L. 95
Uchitel, A. 91
Ugrekhelidze, pupil 88
Ulanov, witness 18-19
Urnezius, Z. 150
Usoyeva, N. 124
Ustiashvili, pupil 88
Utyro, Capt. 129
Uzlov, V. N. 155

Vabishchevich, G. 50, 165
Vagin, E. A. 120
Vaicekauskas, lawyer 40
Vaiciunas, V. 43-44
Vail, B. 88, 96
Valdman, I. 127, 132, 147
Valentinas, V. 151
Valetov, prisoner 166
Vargaftik, E. 27
Varlamova, I. 71
Vashakidze, pupil 88
Vashchenko, A. N. 122-23
Vashchenko, G. L. [VIII] 29-30
Vasilenko, G. D. 176
Vasilev, Y. V. 165
Vasilyan, O. 58
Vasin, prisoner 165
Vedeneyev, R. 153
Vedzizhev, A. 121
Veltsvager, prisoner 162
Velikanova, K. M. 18-19
Velikanova, T. M. 11, 18, 33, 52, 58, 62, 64, 65, 98-99, 100, 105, 113
Vendysh, M. 148
Veresov, V. 94
Veretennikov, N. I. 174
Verkholyak, D. K. 132, 150
Vernik, I. A. 165
Vetra, prisoner 162
Vigilyansky, V. 100
Vilkute, M. 44
Vinkovetsky, Y. 27
Vinogradov, prisoner 162
Vins, G. P. 113
Vishnevskaya, G. 91
Vodin, prison official 166
Voinov, writer 72
Voinovich, V. N. [V] 8, 72-74
Volchansky, S. 161
Volkov, student 77
Volkova, A. A. 124
Volkova, K. 124
Volkova, O. F. 100
Volskiene, Mrs. O. 44
Vorobyov, O. I. 142, 153
Voronel, A. 64-66, 67-68, 90, 103
Voronel, N. 68
Voronin, E. 162
Voronov, I. 81-82
Voronyanskaya, E. D. 8
Voropayev, witness 18-19
Voskoboinikov, V. 27
Vosu, A. J. 157
Vudka, Yu. 55
Vykhodtsev, P. S. 75
Vylegzhanin, V. 83
Vyturis, P. 151

Wald, G. 67
Waldheim, K. 31, 33, 37, 99
Weil, A. 61

Yagman, L. I. [VII] 111, 127-29, 131, 132, 133, 137, 147
Yakir, P. I. 12, 23, 25, 81-82
Yakovlev, historian 26
Yakovlev, Yu. 70
Yakubenko, N. I. 154
Yandiev, poet 121
Yaresko, V. A. 173

Yarun, V. A. 33
Yarunin, Capt. 126, 129
Yashkin, court chairman 24
Yasinovskaya, F. 68
Yasko, 1st Lieut. 38
Yatsishin, M. 131, 153, 173
Yudovich, L. A. 14, 16
Yurchenko, Yu. 71
Yushkov, R. 176

Zabulis, minister 46
Zagreba, Vl. 26
Zagrebeyev, prisoner 162
Zaitsev, V. 9
Zakharchenko, V. I. 127, 132-33, 137, 149
Zakharov, V. M. 158
Zalivako, B. 95
Zalmanson, I. [VII], 95, 109, 122, 125-26
Zalmanson, S. [VII] 49, 95, 112, 125, 170
Zalmanson, V. 95, 126, 141, 157
Zardalishvili, Col. 90
Zareckas, 42
Zaritsky, A. 83
Zavyalkin, Col. V. 53, 167
Zdebskis, Fr. J. 45
Zdorovets, B. 113
Zdorovy, A. K. 137, 141-42, 159
Zeinetdinov 37
Zeinetdinova, E. 37
Zeitunyan, A. 162
Zheludkov, Fr. S. 11, 52
Zhernov, KGB official 67
Zhirmunsky 77
Zhitnikova, T. [I] 83-84
Zhitny, V. D. 174
Zholkovskaya, I. [II] 16, 100
Zhuchkov, K. V. 144
Zhukov, Yu. 70
Zhuravkov, Capt. 51, 139, 141
Ziemelis, J. 164
Zilinskas, A. 150
Ziman, J. 67
Zimarin, V. I. 173
Zipre, A. 50
Zorin, A. 20
Zukauskas, S. 40-42, 95, 141-42, 161
Zukovskis, I. 48, 172
Zuber, L. S. 175
Zumer 45
Zverev, prosecutor 9-10, 16
Zvynis, B. 161

Bibliographical Note

The original Russian texts of *Chronicles* 32 & 33, of which this book is a translation, appeared as separate booklets without annotations, *Khronika tekushchikh sobytii,* Khronika Press, New York, 1974 and 1975.

Earlier issues of the *Chronicle* are available in English from two main sources. Numbers 16-31 have been published by Amnesty International Publications with annotations and names indexes, all issues except number 16 still being in print (see inside back cover). Numbers 1-11 appeared in full, with annotations and 76 photographs, in Peter Reddaway's *Uncensored Russia: the Human Rights Movement in the Soviet Union,* London and New York, 1972.

Numbers 34-36 of *A Chronicle of Current Events* will be published in English by Amnesty International Publications later in 1976. The Russian texts of these and of number 37 have already reached the West.

Other books and periodicals in which readers can find more details about many of the people mentioned in *Chronicles* 32 & 33 are listed in the annotated bibliographies in the Amnesty International editions of numbers 22-23 and 27.

Many texts referred to briefly in numbers 32 & 33 have appeared in full in *A Chronicle of Human Rights in the USSR,* Khronika Press, 505 Eighth Avenue, New York, NY 10018, bi-monthly (separate Russian and English editions). In French the best source of such texts is *Cahiers du Samizdat,* 105 drève du Duc, 1170 Brussels, Belgium, monthly.

For many religious texts, see *Religion in Communist Lands,* Keston College, Heathfield Road, Keston, Kent, England, bi-monthly. For Jewish texts see *Jews in the Soviet Union,* 31 Percy Street, London W1, England, weekly.

For Lithuanian texts see issues of *The Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church* (published as booklets), 64-14 56th Road, Maspeth, New York 11378, USA. For Ukrainian texts see *The Ukrainian Herald,* so far only available in Ukrainian in five books published jointly by PIUF, 3 rue du Sabot, Paris 6, France, and Smoloskyp, PO Box 6066, Baltimore, Maryland, USA.

Other Amnesty International Publications

A Chronicle of Current Events

Earlier editions of this unique publication are still available. Numbers 17, 18, 21, 24, 27, published singly: 65 pence (US $1.60) each. Double volumes 19-20, 22-23, 25-26: 85 pence (US $2.10). Numbers 28-31 in one volume: 95p (US $2.50).

Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR: Their Treatment and Conditions

An analytical account of conditions in Soviet prisons and labour colonies and of the legal and medical treatment of prisoners of conscience detained in psychiatric institutions. The report shows how political considerations often override criminal law and theory in the Soviet Union. 154 pages: 85 pence (US $2.00). November 1975.

Report of an Amnesty International Mission to Spain

This report, of an AI mission which visited Madrid and the Basque country in July 1975, contains personal and direct evidence of the torture of 43 Basque detainees, a section on torture elsewhere in Spain and a summary of the Spanish legal code on torture and interrogation. 24 pages: 35 pence (US $0.90). September 1975.

Report of an Amnesty International Mission to Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic to Investigate Allegations of Ill-Treatment and Torture

The report of the commission which visited Israel and Syria, 10-24 October 1974 to investigate allegations arising from the October 1973 war. 34 pages: 50 pence (US $1.25). April 1975.

Amnesty International Report on Torture

A survey of torture allegations in more than 60 countries. Issued in conjunction with Amnesty International's worldwide Campaign for the Abolition of Torture. 246 pages. £1.50 (US $3.75). Second (updated) edition. January 1975.

Chile: an Amnesty International Report

A detailed study of the fateful year that followed the bloody military coup that overthrew the Allende government in September 1973. It documents the political imprisonment, executions, disappearances, systematic use of torture and abuse of legal procedures by the junta. 80 pages in English, 88 pages in Spanish, both illustrated. 85 pence (US $2.10). September 1974.

Report on Allegations of Torture in Brazil

The other face of Brazil's much-vaunted 'economic miracle': a report on how torture has become an institutional instrument of terror and repression in the country. 108 pages. £1.20 (US $3.00). First published September 1972. Second edition reset with revised preface and commentary. July 1974.

Report of an Inquiry into Allegations of Ill-Treatment in Northern Ireland

An Amnesty International investigation into 30 cases of alleged brutality by the security forces against detainees. 48 pages. 75 pence (US $1.85). March 1972. Reprinted July 1974.

Please send orders for publications to Amnesty International national sections in your country, or to Amnesty International Publications, 53 Theobald's Road, London WC1X 8SP, England. Please send payment with your order and add 20 per cent for postage and packing (30 per cent if air mail).

A Chronicle of Current Events is the major journal of the movement for the defence of human rights in the USSR. Despite a long and continuing campaign by the KGB to suppress it, it is still produced regularly in typewritten *samizdat* form inside the Soviet Union and circulated on the chain-letter principle.

Set forth in numbers 32 and 33, in humane and moving terms, are details of individual cases of harassment, arrests, trials and imprisonment in penal institutions or psychiatric hospitals in many parts of the USSR. They cover the period from May to December 1974.

Number 33 especially provides a greater volume of up-to-date information on the conditions of political imprisonment in the USSR than any single document to have emerged from that country in recent years. Included are details on the feeding and maintenance of prisoners, their labour requirements, the official regulations governing their daily life and efforts of prisoners themselves to obtain an improvement in the penal conditions.

With its scope, detail and accuracy, *A Chronicle of Current Events* remains the most important source of information on violations of human rights in the Soviet Union today.

'What makes the "Chronicle" so impressive is its utter lack of melodrama.'

The New York Times

'The "Chronicle" itself goes on, courageously and mysteriously, against all probability.'

The Times, London

United Kingdom £1.95
United States $4.95
Canada $4.95

Australia $3.75 (recommended)
New Zealand $3.75
ISBN 0-900058 20 X