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Odessa. Here a trial, which was held off and on from 4 to 19 May, has now come to an end. The defendants, Oleksa Prityka, Oleksa Riznykiv and Nina Strokata (see Chronicles 22 and 23) were charged under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (equivalent to article 70 of the Russian Code). In court there figured, in particular, the following: L Ventsov's work, Think!, the letter from Zheludkov to Sakharov, two issues of the Ukrainian Herald, the transcript of the trial of Pohruzhalsky, and a leaflet which had been distributed by a certain Dutch citizen in Moscow.

The prosecution relied, in the main, on the statements made by Prityka, who pleaded guilty. At the trial Prityka declared that he had long ago realized the anti-Soviet nature of his activity, and the essential criminality of his friends, but did not give himself up to the KGB only because of his extreme cowardice, even although he was convinced that the security organs did splendid work, and well knew that retribution was inevitable.

While he was already under investigation in prison, Prityka sent his wife a note requesting her to take to the KGB the files of samizdat which remained after the search, and which during the search were supposedly lying on the window-sill. His wife gave the required help to the investigators.

As well as Prityka, there appeared in court, as witnesses for the prosecution, friends of Prityka, two of whom had previously been sentenced under criminal articles, but regarding the third man, Prityka himself declared in court that this scoundrel and villain had more than once been caught stealing by him, Prityka.

It is known that a fellow-worker of Strokata confirmed Prityka's evidence concerning the distribution by Strokata of the leaflet and the letter from Zheludkov. However Prityka himself had never seen any incriminating docu-
Ashurov. The prosecution case was argued by Procurator Varshavskaya. The counsel for the defence was Korenev.

On the first day of the trial, Nazarov's relatives (parents and brother) did not even know that the trial had begun. On the second day, his mother in spite of her request was not allowed into the court-room. And it was only from the third day of the trial that his parents and brother were present in the court-room.

In the indictment Nazarov was charged with having made statements (orally and in letters) about the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia, and with having sent by post Sakharov's essay (see Chronicle 5) to a friend of his. In the indictment and the Procurator's speech, this essay was directly mentioned, but in the verdict only the sending of "slanderous material".

Nazarov pleaded not guilty.

His petition for Sakharov to be summoned to the court as a witness was refused. The witness Irma, a history teacher at the night school, was threatened with dismissal because she could not remember any criminal statements made by Nazarov. Former fellow-students of Nazarov from the night school appeared as witnesses and said that Nazarov had asked his teachers too many questions, in particular about freedom of speech and of the press.

The speech for the defence was given by Nazarov himself instead of by his lawyer. In it, and also in his final speech, Nazarov did not renounce his views, and declared that the prosecution had not proved any "deliberate falsity" in his statements.

The court sentenced Nazarov to 3 years' deprivation of freedom in hard-regime corrective-labour camps. At present Nazarov is in a camp at the following address: Tadzhikskaya SSR, Dushanbe, p/ya Ya S 3/7.

Dushanbe [Central Asia]. On 24 April 1971, in the town of Dushanbe, the arrest took place of a first-year external student of the History Faculty of the Tadzhik University, Anatoly Sergeyevich Nazarov. Nazarov was born in 1946, did his national service in the army, got qualifications at night school, and was working as a chauffeur.

At first a charge was brought against Nazarov under articles 67 and 69 of the Tadzhik Criminal Code (equivalent to articles 70 and 72 of the Russian Code), the order initiating the criminal case being signed by the Procurator of Tadzhikistan. Later the charge was changed to article 203-1 of the Tadzhik Criminal Code (equivalent to article 190-1 of the Russian Code).

The trial was supposed to be held in December 1971, but at the last minute was postponed. Relations were told that the case materials were at the USSR Procurator's Office.

From 28 January 1972 until 6 February the Supreme Court of Tadzhikistan (in the capacity of a court of first instance) examined the case of Nazarov. The chairman was
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of a defence lawyer, examined the appeal and left the sentence unchanged.

Anatoly Ilich Reshetnik was born in 1937 into a working-class family. After finishing secondary school he became a worker and then served in the army. In 1946 he graduated from the Faculty of History and Philology at the Lenin Pedagogical Institute in Moscow and was assigned to work in Sverdlovsk. There he taught history and social science in a school, then, in an Institute, political economy. Reshetnik was also a lecturer on international themes for the society Knowledge.

In 1964 A. I. Reshetnik joined the Party. In Sverdlovsk he was a Party organizer and chairman of the city teachers' trade-union committee.

In March 1971 Reshetnik was expelled from the Party and dismissed from his job, for writing an open letter to Dean Rodd, and for his favourable attitude to Solzhenitsyn.

Kharkov [E. Ukraine]. In the middle of March the worker Yuly Brind, born in 1930, was arrested. At first Brind spent a month in a psychiatric hospital, for examination; he was then declared sane and transferred to an investigation prison. An assizes session of the Kharkov City Court was held at the factory where Brind worked. He was charged under article 187-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (equivalent to article 190-1 of the Russian Code). Evidence brought against him consisted of a letter to Pravda, written in 1967 on the eve of the Six-day War, and tape-recordings of Israeli radio broadcasts. The procurator declared in court: "Although you did not distribute these tapes, you were in a position to do so." The verdict [pronounced on 1 June]: 2.1 years of ordinary-regime camps.8

Moscow. On 20 April 1972 the arrest took place of the store-keeper of the Institute of Psychology of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Pyotr Petrovich Starshik, born in 1937. He has two children—the elder is 6, the younger 10 months. The investigation into his case is being carried out by the head of the KGB investigation department for Moscow and the Moscow region, Major Bardin. Starshik has been charged under article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code.

In April a search was carried out in connection with case No. 24 (see Chronicle 24) at the home of Vyacheslav and Olga Velikanov (see Chronicle 21).

On 6 May 1972 a series of searches was carried out: in connection with case No. 24 at the homes of P. Yakir, A. Yakobson, G. Podyapolsky (all three are members of the Action Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR), and at the home of I. Kaplun and O. Iofe (see Chronicle 16), I. Kruti, V. Gershovitch, V. Gusarov, E. Armand (the grand-niece of [Lenin's friend] I. Armand), A[nr]Dubrov, V. Beshev, V[ladimir] Albrekht, N. P. Lisovskaya, V. M. Makatinskaya and L. E. Pinsky (a literary critic and member of the Union of Soviet Writers).3 Searches were carried out in connection with case No. 370 (probably the case of K. Lyubarsky, see Chronicle 24) at the home of Yu. Shikhanovich.

From this American singer's letter against—Solzhenitsyn in Literaturnaya gazeta, 27 January 1971, and an article about him in Newsweek, 20 March 1972.

[3 For more details on this case see New Bulletin on Soviet Jewry, (NBJS), P.O. Box 23062, Tel-Aviv, Nos. 215-217. Brind's appeal was turned down on June 27.]
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Starchik, see above) at the homes of K. K. Draffen and Lakhov. There is evidence that in connection with case No. 374 yet another series of searches has been carried out. First and foremost, samizdat material, typewriters and notebooks have been seized. However it is interesting to note also, among the things seized, the report of N. S. Khrushchev to the closed session of the 20th congress of the Soviet Communist Party (Gospolitizdat, 1959, the booklet had no serial number), the newspaper Pravda of 7 November 1952 (with a speech by Beria), a collection of poetry by Akhmatova (printed in Russian in Munich by a neutral publishing house), the cover of Berdyayev's book The Sources and Meaning of Russian Communism, a pension card by which P. Yakir received a personal pension in his student years in recognition of his father, I. E. Yakir, the Army commander who was executed [in 1937]. In the search of Iofe's home, they removed only exercise-books of poetry by her father, Yu. M. Iofe, who already had an exit visa to Israel.

On 13 May V. Chalidze sent to the Chairman of the KGB, Andropov, a letter protesting about the confiscation of his work Reflections on Man during the searches. The letter ends with the following words: "If the copies which have been confiscated are not returned soon, I will yet again have the impression that your institution is trying to defend the official philosophy by seizing non-Marxist (although completely legal) works. I urge you to use more academic methods of defending the official philosophy."


Novosibirsk. A search was carried out on 14 January 1972, in connection with case No. 24, at the home of Alexander Rybakov, a technician at the Institute of Physical and Chemical Bases of Mineral Processing. In the search of his home a hectograph was confiscated along with much samizdat literature. On 20 March A. Rybakov was arrested.


Leiningrad. In May a search was carried out in connection with the case of Yu. Melnik (see Chronicle 24), at the home of Letinsky.


Sverdlovsk. At the end of April Vladimir Markman was arrested. At first he was charged under article 206 of the Russian Criminal Code. In the middle of May article 206 was changed to article 190-1 of the Russian Criminal Code. Markman is an engineer; recently he had been working as a loader.


Kiev. In the middle of March the poet Mykola Khokholya was arrested. On 18 April the writer Ivan Svitlychny was arrested (see Chronicle 24). His flat had been searched three times since the middle of January (the last time on the day of his arrest). He has tuberculosis in an advanced state, and cirrhosis of the lungs.

In April Nadiya Svitlychna, the sister of Ivan Svitlychny (see Chronicle 24) was arrested. Her two-year-old son, in spite of requests and protests from relatives, was put into a children's home.

On 11 May a psychiatric doctor, Samuil Gluzman, born 1946, was arrested. Prior to his arrest he worked for a First Aid unit. Apparently he was arrested in connection with the same case as L. Serednyak (see Chronicle 24). A Czech student, Anna Kocurova, has been arrested [see No. 24, note 20].

Oles Serhiyenko has been arrested.

In the middle of April a search was carried out at the home of the [actor and] science-fiction writer, Berdnyk, a member of the Union of Writers of the Ukraine and a

[16. On Markman and his case see Times, 13 June 1972, Chronicle 21, and NBSJ, Nos. 215-217.]
[17. Born in 1940, he has published in the Ukrainian-language journals Zhivoten and Duireo since 1962. In 1963 he was expelled from Kiev University for heterodoxy. See the Ukrainian Herald No. 3, and his poems in Suchasnist 12, 1968.]
[18. Oles (affectionate form of Oleksandr) Serhiyenko is a young teacher. See his speech in Ukrainian Herald 4, also M. Browne, Ferment in the Ukraine.]
former prisoner in the Stalinist camps. In the search some article by I. Dzyuba and two typewriters were removed. On 28 April Berdnyk announced a hunger-strike and sent a letter to the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Shelest, in which he wrote that the KGB had again broken away from the control of the Party, and that he feared another period of lawlessness would ensue. In the same letter he announced that he would not stop his hunger-strike until Shelest or somebody from the KGB received him, and until everything that had been seized was returned to him. On 3 May one of Shelest's deputies received him. He was presented with all kinds of excuses, but was told that they were unable to intervene in KGB matters. In the middle of May he was summoned to the KGB and all that had been removed during the search was returned to him. His hunger-strike had lasted 16 days. On 15 May a search was carried out at the home of the teacher Vladimir Evgenievich Yuvchenko in connection with the case of his former pupil, I. Serednyak (see Chronique 24). The following things were confiscated: the book by S. Freud, *The Psychology of the Muses*, the book by S. Bulgakov, *Christian Ethics*, which had been copied by hand, a note-book, four exercise books and 14 separate sheets with various notes, two colour films and a sheaf of blank paper. On 16 and 17 May Yuvchenko was questioned about the case of L. Serednyak and on 22 May he was questioned about the case of L. Plyushch (see Chronique 24). * * *

Lvov. The artist Stefaniya Shabatura and [the poet Hryhoriy] Chubay have been arrested. On 14 January 1972, in a village in Volynia, Danylo Lavrentievich Shumuk was arrested. During a search his memoirs about the time he spent in a camp were confiscated. Before the war Shumuk was a member of the Communist Party of the Western Ukraine. He was first arrested by the Poles at the beginning of the thirties and spent 8 years in Polish prisons. He took part in the Patriotic War. In 1943 he joined the [Stepan] Bandera [nationalist] movement. In 1945 he was arrested and served a 10-year sentence. In 1958 he was arrested again on the same grounds, and given another 10 years.

At the beginning of March Vasyl Romanuk was arrested in Ivano-Frankovsk. * * *

Rovno. I. Konchinsky has been arrested. * * *

In mid-April in one of the Ukrainian villages, a search was carried out at the home of Natalya Karaziya, a class-2 invalid (tuberculosis of the bone) (see Reddaway, op. cit.). Her personal correspondence with L. Dzyuba was seized. After the search her invalid status was taken away, with the result that N. Karaziya has been left without any means of subsistence. In the village in which she lives the rumour has been circulated that a bag of dollars and a portable radio were found at her home.

Nalchik [N. Caucasus]. In March the arrest took place of Yury Shukhevych, the son of the head of the UPA (Ukrainian Insurrectionist Army). According to information which has not yet been fully

* * *
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checked, the number of arrests in the Ukraine in the period January—May is more than 100.

* * *

The Human Rights Committee has received a letter from the Ukraine, addressed also to the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and the Ukraine, and to the editors of the papers Izvestiya and Literary Ukraine. After giving information in this letter about the arrests, searches and interrogations in the Ukraine from January to April 1972 (see Chronicle 24 and the present issue) the authors proceed to give the following warning: "The decades of Stalinist tyranny which afterwards were given the modest designation of "personality cult", are a phenomenon which is far from being understood. It is much more complex than the personality cult of one man, and in its after-effects comparable, for the USSR, to the disasters brought by the World War. It was a terrible social plague, giving rise to terror, suspicion and denunciations, to a whole country of concentration camps for millions of innocent people. It brought the people to the depths of moral corruption, to psychological shocks as agonizing as a severe mental illness. In the thirties this illness began with the excessive growth of the role played by the organs of State Security, the exceeding by them of their powers, and their escape from control by the state. The NKVD became a 'state within a state', creating a whole industry of murder, and, in principle, it could discredit and destroy any person in the country . . . The change in the climate of social life in the USSR in this direction is a very serious symptom. There has been a whole series of developments: the sending of Soviet troops into Czechoslovakia, the secret veto placed on works which expose the Stalinist tyranny and even on the materials of the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, the persecution of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the ceaseless harping on the sharpening of the ideological struggle—all this arouses a deep feeling of unease, in that it is a tendency capable of leading to another 1937 . . . The suppression of national consciousness, the numerous arrests of prominent representatives of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, the threats, blackmail, persecutions and ceaseless mass searches—all this is a threaten-

ing reminder that 1937 began in 1933, began with the repression of leading figures of the national cultures. This is our warning . . ."

At the end of the letter the authors write: "We make a point of noting the considerations which have forced us to divulge our names only to the Human Rights Committee of the USSR . . . We answer for the authenticity of the information divulged in the present appeal. We are sick of anonymity. But the situation is such that at any manifestation of social activity the KGB organs reply with immediate repressions. At the present time we do not think it advisable to have anything to do with the faceless and irresponsible Committee of State Security, which is steadily becoming a real danger to society. We would have been prepared to give our names and to take part in a public examination of the essence of our letter, had there been even the slightest hope of the text being published in full.


An Interview with A. I. Solzhenitsyn

On 30 March 1972 A. I. Solzhenitsyn gave an interview to Western journalists.9 Here are extracts from the interview:

— What are you working on now?
— October 1916, the second volume of the same book.
— Will it be finished soon?
— No. In the course of the work it has turned out to be more complex than I had foreseen. I have to cover the history of social and spiritual currents from the end of the nineteenth century, because these are expressed in the characters. Without knowing the preceding events one cannot understand people.
— Are you not afraid that as you go deeper into a detailed history of Russia, you are getting further away from general and timeless themes?
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— On the contrary, I think. Here there is much that is general and even timeless.
— Do you have to study much material?
— A great deal. And this work on the one hand is unfamiliar to me, because until recently I was concerned only with contemporary events, and wrote from the experience of my own life. And on the other hand there are so many hostile external circumstances that it was much easier for a completely unknown student in provincial Rostov in 1937-38 to gather material on Samsonov’s catastrophe (not yet knowing that I would be destined to pass the same places as he, not when we were surrounded, however, but just the opposite). And although the hut where I lived with Mother was destroyed by a bomb in 1942, and all our possessions, books and papers were burnt, by a miracle these two notebooks survived, and when I returned from exile I was given them. Now I have used them. Yes, then there were no special obstacles in my way. But now... you Westerners cannot imagine my situation. I am living in my own country, I am writing a novel about Russia, but it is as hard for me to gather material as if I were writing about Polynesia. For the present volume I should spend some time in certain historical buildings, but they are now occupied by government institutions and the authorities will not give me a pass. I am barred from access to central and regional archives. I should travel round the places where events took place, talk with old people—the last surviving witnesses, but this requires approval and help from the local authorities, which I cannot get. And without this, everyone shuts up, out of suspicion, nobody will tell me a thing, and I myself, without authorization, could be detained at any step along the way.
— Couldn’t you get other people to help you with this—assistants, a secretary?
— No. In the first place, as a non-member of the Union of Writers, I am not entitled to a secretary or an assistant. In the second place, such a secretary, representing my interests, would be just as restricted and hemmed in as I am. Thirdly, I simply would not be able to pay a secretary. For you see, since the royalties for Ivan Denisovich I have had no significant income, except for the money left to me by the late K. I. Chukovsky, and now even that is coming to an end. The royalties lasted me for six years, and Chukovsky’s money for three. I was able to make them last as long by keeping my expenditure at the level of my teaching days. I never spend more on myself than I would have to pay a secretary.
— Could you not use the money earned in the West?
— I have drawn up a will and when it becomes possible, my lawyer will send these royalties so that they can be spent for the benefit of society in my native country. That pure-hearted newspaper, the Literary Gazette, which never tells a lie, in fact said as much: “He has given detailed instructions on how these royalties should be disposed of”, but the bit about the benefit of society in my native country was lost through innocent editing. I personally will make use only of the Nobel Prize. However the problem of getting even this money has been made degrading, difficult and uncertain for me. The Ministry of Foreign Trade has informed me that every transaction requires a special decision of the Ministry’s board—whether to pay me at all, in what form, and what percentage of the sum received.
— But how do you nevertheless manage to collect material?
— Here again you have a feature of our life that a Westerner probably finds hard to understand. As I understand it, and I may be wrong, it is customary in the West to be paid for all kinds of work, and it is unusual for work to be done for nothing. But take our samizdat—that certainly goes on without any money changing hands. People expend their labour, their free time; they sit up at night doing work for which the most they can get is persecution. And that happens to be true in my case. The subject I am working on is well known throughout society, even outside Moscow. And well-wishers, often unknown to me, send me—of course not by post, or I wouldn’t get them—all kinds of books, even some of the rarest, their own memoirs, and so on. Sometimes these materials are exactly what I need and sometimes they are not so useful. But the fact that these materials are sent to me always touches me and strengthens the real feeling I have that I am working for Russia and Russia is helping me.
which is at times complex, or I ask them to select some material for me. All this requires time and effort; however, not only does no-one ever ask for remuneration, but everyone is glad to be able to help. And yet all this can be quite dangerous. A kind of forbidden, contaminated zone has been created around my family, and to this day there are people in Ryazan who were dismissed from their jobs for having visited my house a few years ago. A corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, T. T. Timofeyev, director of a Moscow Institute [—of the International Working Class], became so scared when he found out that a mathematician working under him was my wife, that he dismissed her with unseemly haste, although this occurred just after she had given birth and was contrary to all laws. My family made a fully legal change of flats while it was unknown that the family was mine. But no sooner did this become known than several officials in the Moscow Soviet were punished: how could they allow Solzhenitsyn, if not himself, but still his young son, to be registered in the centre of Moscow? It happens that a consultant may meet with me. We work for an hour or two and as soon as he leaves my house he'll be closely followed, as if he were a state criminal; they'll investigate his background and then go on to find out who this man meets. Of course they can't do this with everyone. The State Security people have their schedule and their own profound reasoning. On some days there is no surveillance at all, or only superficial surveillance. On other days, they hang around everywhere, for example just before Heinrich Boll came to see me. They put a car in front of the two entrances, with three men in each car—and they don't work only one shift. Then off they go after my visitors, or they trail people who leave on foot. And if you consider that they listen round the clock to my telephone conversations and conversations in my home, that they analyze the tape-recordings and all correspondence, and then collect and compare all these data in some vast premises—and these people are not underlings—you cannot but be amazed that so many idlers in the prime of life and strength, who could be better occupied with productive work for the benefit of the fatherland, are busy with my friends and me, and keep inventing enemies. And still others are trying to dig up things in my background, or are being sent abroad to cause confusion with the publication of my books. And some individual draws up and manages this programme for my suffocation. The programme has not been successful so far, and therefore it has had to be altered several times along the way. But its evolution over the years can be traced by stages . . . They decided to suffocate me in 1965, when they confiscated my archives and were horrified at my writings about the labour camp years—as if they could fail to carry the mark of the eternally condemned! If these had been the Stalinist years nothing could have been simpler. I would have disappeared and that would have been that—no-one would have asked any questions. But after the 20th and 22nd Congresses, things were more complicated.

First they decided to KEEP ME QUIET. Not a line was to be written about me, no-one was ever to mention my name, even to curse it, and after a few years I would be forgotten. And then take me away. But this was already the era of samizdat, and my books were spreading through the country and then making their way abroad. There was no way to keep me quiet. At that point they started (and they continue to this day) to SLANDER ME BEHIND CLOSED DOORS. It is almost impossible for a Westerner to imagine how this works. We have throughout this country an established network of party and public propaganda, and a lecture network. There is no institution or military unit, no regional centre or state farm where lecturers and propagandists do not give speeches according to a schedule, and all of them, everywhere at the same time, say one and the same thing based on instructions from a single headquarters. These instructions may come in different versions—for the capitals, for provincial centres, for the army, for academic institutions, and so on. Since these lectures are attended only by the staff members of the institution or people living in a particular area, they may be effectively closed, or they are completely closed. Since 1966 the orders have gone out to talk about me. First that I was imprisoned under Stalin for SOMETHING SERIOUS, that I was unjustifiably rehabilitated, that my literary works are criminal, and so on. As it happens, the lecturers themselves have never in their lives read these
works, because the authorities have been afraid to let even them have them. The lecturers were simply ordered to talk like that. The system is that the lectures are attended only by insiders. The system is that the lectures are attended only by insiders. On the surface it is a peaceful paradise, with no defamation, while in reality unimaginable slander is being poured over the country. You can’t travel to all the cities, you’re not admitted to closed lecture halls, and there are thousands of these lecturers. There is nobody to complain to, and the slander takes hold of people’s minds. But we live in a new era, a different era. In these times all these lectures, even the most closed, are attended by my well-wishers, and then in various ways they let me know that on a certain date in a certain auditorium, lecturer so-and-so told such-and-such a lie and vilification about me. I jot down the most striking; perhaps I might confront one of the lecturers with it. Perhaps the time will even come in our country when they will personally answer for this before a court.

Why do these listeners not object when they spot a distortion? That is still impossible in our country. No-one dares to stand up and object to a Party propagandist, because if he does the next day he may lose his job and even his freedom. There have been even cases when my name was used as a litmus paper to check the loyalty of applicants for graduate studentships or some privileged position: “Have you ever read Solzhenitsyn? What do you think of him?” The fate of the applicant would depend on the reply. There was a time when they liked to play around with my patronymic, “Isayevich”. They used to say, in passing, “Incidentally his real name is SolzhenitsSER or SolzhenitsKER, but of course that doesn’t make any difference in our country.” But there was one serious charge that easily gets the attention of the listeners: TRAITOR TO THE MOTHERLAND. In general in our country we seem to bait people not with arguments, but with the most primitive labels, the coarsest names, and the simplest, designed, as they say, to arouse the “fury of the masses”. In the twenties it was “a counter-revolutionary”; in the thirties, “an enemy of the people”; since the forties, “a traitor to the motherland”. You should have seen how they leafed through my military record, how they tried to establish that I might have been a prisoner of war for at least a day or two, like Ivan Denisovich—that would have been a real find! Actually, behind closed doors you can make a gullible public believe any lie, and for years, yes YEARS, in lecture halls far and wide, throughout the country, they would say, “Solzhenitsyn voluntarily gave himself up to the Germans—No, he surrendered a whole battery! And then he served as a policeman in the occupied territory—no, he fought for Vlasov. No, he worked right in the Gestapo!” On the surface everything is quiet, no defamation, but under the crust is the cancer of slander.

On one occasion when Novy mir held a readers’ conference in Novosibirsk, someone sent a note up to [its editor] Tvardovsky: “How could you let a member of the Gestapo be published in your magazine?” Public opinion throughout the country was thus being fully prepared for any action against me. And yet times have changed; they can’t abuse people without it becoming known. As it happened, the Soviet press had to acknowledge that I was an officer, and that my military record was unblemished. The fog was hanging there without rain, and it started to clear away.

At that point began a new campaign of accusations that I myself sent Cancer Ward to the West. Behind closed doors, the lies started again: somewhere along the border (no-one said where) a friend of mine had been detained (again no names) and a suitcase with a false bottom had been seized from him containing my writings (again no titles). This nonsense was seriously proclaimed throughout the land, and people were horrified at the thought of what a villain I was. Again, a traitor to the motherland. Then after I had been expelled from the Union of Writers, there were open hints that I should get clear of the country, and thus justify the charge of “traitor to the motherland”. Then the fuss began around the Nobel Prize. Now the word from all the speakers’ platforms was: “The Nobel Prize is a Judas payment for betrayal of his country”.

— But you sent August 1914 abroad yourself—and they aren’t prosecuting you for it?

— They apparently have enough sense at present not to prosecute for this. But here the honest Literary Gazette does some editing, innocent, like all its editing, by saying “Solzhenitsyn promptly sent the manuscript of his novel...”
still very much alive in our country. It would take very little to kindle that fire again at any time. And quite recently Tvardovsky’s enemies publicly reproached him for his so-called “kulak” origin. And in case— if “betrayal of the motherland” didn’t work with the invention of my capture by the Germans, then maybe it will stick through the use of “CLASS ORIGIN”? For this reason the latest articles in the Literary Gazette, for all their illiteracy and stupidity, are by no means simple, aimless mocking. By the way, you observe that the Literary Gazette never even argues against my writings and views IN ESSENCE, never dares to print one genuine critical analysis about Inc, even the most hostile, because it would half-open a part of the intolerable truth. In its judgments about me it is as if it has lost its voice altogether, as if it has been deprived of its own critics and authors. In its attacks on me it hides behind re-printing, behind a yellow-press magazine, foreign journalists,” and even variety singers,” and jugglers...

— What is the plan?

— The plan is to drive Inc Cit her out of society or out of the country, to throw me in a ditch, or to send me to Siberia, or to have me dissolve “in an alien fog”, as they write. What self-confidence, that those whom the censors cherish have more rights to the Russian land than others born in the same place. In general in all this defamation we see only the stupidity and shortsightedness of those who direct it. They refuse to acknowledge the complexity and richness of history in all its diversity. All they are concerned with is to silence all the voices that they find unpleasant to their ear, or that deprive them of their tranquility. And they don’t worry about the future. By senselessly silencing Novy mir and Tvardovsky they themselves were made poorer, they were made blind, and they refuse to understand their loss. By the way, two weeks ago in The New York Times a letter was printed from a Soviet poet, Smelyakov, in which he criticizes my speech in abroad.”! Oh no, that’s not a lie. They just omit a very small point—that he sent it abroad after he had offered the manuscript to SEVEN SOVIET PUBLISHERS—to “Artistic Literature”, to “Soviet Writer”, to “Young Guard”, and to various journals. Not one of them wanted even to take the manuscript in its hands, let alone read it through or even leaf through it. That’s how things were arranged. No-one answered my letter. No-one asked to see the manuscript.

However the appearance of August suggested a new path to my persecutors. The point is that in this novel I have recounted in detail my maternal and paternal lines. Although there are many friends and acquaintances, alive today who knew my relations, funny as it may seem, the omniscient State Security only found it out from this novel. Then they rushed on to the trail, with the aim of compromising me—by a Soviet yardstick. Their efforts in this were divided into two: at first the RACIAL line was resurrected—more exactly the Jewish one. A special major of the State Security by the name of Blagovidov got going on checking the personal affairs of all Isaikys in the archives of Moscow University in 1914, in the hope of proving that I was a Jew. That would have supplied a tempting way of explaining my literary position. For, you see, with the appearance of a historical novel, the task of those who persecute me is made more complex: it’s not enough to discredit the author himself, it’s necessary, in addition, to shake any faith in his views on Russian history—those he’s already stated and possible future ones. Alas, their racial investigations came to nothing. I turned out to be Russian. Then they changed the racial line for a CLASS one, for which they went to my old aunt and composed an article from her tales, which they printed in the yellow-press magazine Stern;—

— Is one really blamed for one’s origin now?

— Of course they don’t make an uproar as they did in the twenties and thirties, but this “judgment according to social origin” is very firmly instilled in the consciousness and is still very much alive in our country. It would take very little to kindle that fire again at any time. And quite recently Tvardovsky’s enemies publicly reproached him for his so-called “kulak” origin. And in case—if “betrayal of the motherland” didn’t work with the invention of my capture by the Germans, then maybe it will stick through the use of “CLASS ORIGIN”? For this reason the latest articles in the Literary Gazette, for all their illiteracy and stupidity, are by no means simple, aimless mocking. By the way, you observe that the Literary Gazette never even argues against my writings and views IN ESSENCE, never dares to print one genuine critical analysis about Inc, even the most hostile, because it would half-open a part of the intolerable truth. In its judgments about me it is as if it has lost its voice altogether, as if it has been deprived of its own critics and authors. In its attacks on me it hides behind re-printing, behind a yellow-press magazine, foreign journalists,” and even variety singers,” and jugglers...

— What is the plan?

— The plan is to drive Inc Cit her out of society or out of the country, to throw me in a ditch, or to send me to Siberia, or to have me dissolve “in an alien fog”, as they write. What self-confidence, that those whom the censors cherish have more rights to the Russian land than others born in the same place. In general in all this defamation we see only the stupidity and shortsightedness of those who direct it. They refuse to acknowledge the complexity and richness of history in all its diversity. All they are concerned with is to silence all the voices that they find unpleasant to their ear, or that deprive them of their tranquility. And they don’t worry about the future. By senselessly silencing Novy mir and Tvardovsky they themselves were made poorer, they were made blind, and they refuse to understand their loss. By the way, two weeks ago in The New York Times a letter was printed from a Soviet poet, Smelyakov, in which he criticizes my speech in
memory of Tvardovsky." The form of this new attack on me is startling: it would seem that the entire press is in their hands, but can't they answer me anywhere nearer than in the New York Times? This must really mean that they are afraid of the truth. If they answered me in the Soviet press, they would have to quote me, even just a little—and that would be impossible.

**On the presentation of the Nobel Prize to A. I. Solzhenitsyn**

In accordance with the suggestion made by Solzhenitsyn in his letter to the Secretary of the Swedish Academy, K. R. Gierow (see Chronicle 23), the ceremony for the presentation of the Nobel Prize was due to take place in a private flat in Moscow.

A. I. Solzhenitsyn sent off the invitations. In the interview of 30 March (see above) his answer to the question about whom he had invited, was: "I do not know whom Karl Gierow will wish to invite. As far as I am concerned, my close friends apart, I am inviting the most eminent representatives of the intelligentsia in the arts and sciences: some writers, the chief producers of leading theatres, outstanding musicians, a few academicians. For the time being I shall not name them because I do not know whether they will all consider it possible and want to come, and what obstacles they will meet. In any case I am inviting those whom I know and whose work I respect, and we'll see who comes. I would also have liked to invite my [Swiss] lawyer Mr. [Fritz] Heeb to the ceremony, but as a private individual I do not have the official right to invite people from abroad. In addition, I'm inviting the USSR Minister of Culture and journalists from Rural Life and Labour—the two central newspapers which have not yet slandered me. (Since then, the paper Labour has managed to "reform": on 7 April, on one and the same day in both Labour and Literary Russia, a review by Jerzy Romanowski of August 1914 was printed re-printed from the Polish Catholic Weekly, WTK).

In answer to the question: "Could obstacles not be put in the way of the ceremony?" Solzhenitsyn said: "In theory this cannot be ruled out. In practice it could be very easily done—it requires neither a lot of energy nor a lot of intelligence. But I do not expect this to happen—it would be a shameful outrage."

Finally, to the question "And what if Mr. Gierow is refused a visa?", Solzhenitsyn replied: "In that case the ceremony will not take place and my insignia will remain in Stockholm for another ten or twelve years."

And that is what happened. On 5 [in fact 4] April, the Soviet Embassy in Stockholm refused to grant Mr. Gierow an entry visa. After this the Swedish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Wickman, made the suggestion that the Nobel insignia should be handed to Solzhenitsyn through the Swedish Embassy in Moscow, on condition that the appropriate ceremony could not be interpreted as a political demonstration. In reply to this Solzhenitsyn made the following statement:

"Mr. Gierow and I have given way in everything that was possible; his trip was planned as a PRIVATE one, to a PRIVATE flat, for carrying out a ceremony, almost according to a PRIVATE rite. The ban on a ceremony even in this form is an irrevocable and final ban on any kind of presentation of the Nobel Prize on the territory of my country. For this reason the belated concession by the Swedish Minister of Foreign Affairs is already an unrealistic one.

"But it is also an insult: the Swedish Minister persists in regarding the presentation of the Nobel Prize to me, not as a manifestation of cultural life, but as a political event, and is therefore laying down a condition which would lead either, again, to a 'closed' version of the ceremony, or to a special selection of those to be present at it and a ban on their expressing, in any way, their attitude to what was happening, because all this might be interpreted as a 'political demonstration'.

"Besides, after Mr. Gierow was refused a visa, I would consider it a humiliation for him and for me to accept the Nobel insignia from hands other than those of the
Permanent Secretary of the Swedish Academy. Finally, all the difficult preparation had already been done by our humble forces—invitations had been sent out, not only in Moscow, to some 20 writers whom I see as the life and soul of our present-day literature, and to about the same number of artists, musicians and academicians. Because of this appointment many of these people had either cancelled their journeys or rehearsals or other obligations. This refusal has now come as an insult to all these 40 guests. And they, as I myself, are too busy to get involved in a procedure such as this for a second time.

According to the rules of the Swedish Academy, as explained to me, the Nobel insignia can be kept by the Academy for an unlimited length of time. Should I not live long enough to receive them, I bequeath the acceptance of them to my son.”

Solzhenitsyn's letter to Pimen, Patriarch of All Russia, and the reply from Sergei Zheludkov

In March 1972 A. I. Solzhenitsyn sent a letter to Pimen, Patriarch of All Russia. In answer to the appeal in the Patriarch’s Christmas message to all Orthodox believers living abroad—“that they should instil in their children a love for the Church and strengthen this love by their own good example, Solzhenitsyn writes: “Why do you call only these children to be brought up in the Christian faith, why is it only your distant flock that you warn about recognizing slander and lies and growing stronger in justice and truth? But we—should we not recognize these? And should we instil in our children love for the Church,

or not?” Solzhenitsyn goes on to write about the difficult position of the church, of faith and of believers in our country. “For every church which functions there are 20 which have been demolished and destroyed irrevocably and 20 which are neglected and defiled—is there a sight more heart-rending than these skeletons, the property of birds and store-keepers? A church dictatorially directed by atheists is a sight not seen for two thousand years. Do not make us think, do not force us to think that for the bishops of the Russian Church earthly power is higher than heavenly power, that earthly responsibility is more terrible than responsibility to God.”

Solzhenitsyn indicates the path along which lies the re-birth of the Russian Church: sacrifice—in the traditions of early Christianity (“but then they were thrown to the lions, today one can lose only one’s prosperity.”).

The priest Sergei Zheludkov, in his answer to this letter written in April, 1972, wrote to Solzhenitsyn: “I must say that in this case your moral sensitivity has, in a positive sense, betrayed you. You have written an indictment which has reached the whole world, and which accuses a man who is known to be deprived of any opportunity of answering you. And you . . . you have not told the whole truth, just a half-truth. The FULL TRUTH is that the legal church organization is unable to be an ISLAND OF FREEDOM in our strictly uniform and organized society, ruled from the one Centre . . . We have this system of ours, ruled with strict uniformity, and in it is preserved a remarkable form of alien body—the Russian Church organization. It exists under very rigidly defined conditions. We are not allowed to work for the education of children in the Church, or of adults for that matter, just as we are not allowed to do many other things that are essential for the realization of a life which is genuinely of the Church. But what can we do in such a situation? Say ‘either everything or nothing’? Try and go underground, which under the present system is unthinkable? Or somehow join the system and use, in the meantime, all the opportunities which are allowed? The Russian hierarchy has taken the second decision. And it is from this that there stems all the evil which you justly describe, and all the evil about which you were silent. But there was no
other choice . . . That is the FULL TRUTH . . . One of the consequences of your accusatory letter will be the even greater discredit of the Church hierarchy in the eyes of those who do not know the whole truth . . . today you . . . offend the defenceless Patriarch and us—not by slander, but by a well-written half-truth, which can prove, for many, to be more harmful than a downright lie . . . It is easy and safe, Alexander bayevich, to criticise the bishops; but the real work of Our Lord is genuinely difficult . . ."

In reply to Solzhenitsyn’s appeal for the path of sacrifice Zheludkov answers: “There ought to be no compulsion to sacrifice and martyrdom in the Christian Church. We have enough voluntary martyrs as it is—both church ones and non-church ones (the distinction is fairly relative) . . .”

Political Prisoners in the Mordovian Camps

Dmytro Kuzmich Verkholyak, born in 1928. From 1947 he was in the Ukrainian Insurrectionist Army. Arrested in 1955. On 14 February 1956 a court in Ivanofrankov sentenced him to be shot, but this was changed to 25 years of camps. In camp he is working as a doctor’s assistant. In June 1971 he was transferred from camp 17 to camp 19. His natural-law wife (since 1955), Kateryna Ivanovna Yatskiv, was sentenced on 14 February 1956 by the same court to ten years’ deprivation of freedom. Until 1969 she was allowed conjugal visits to see Verkholyak; from 1969 on she has only been allowed general [i.e. short] visits.

Vladimir Yurkiv is in Mordovian camp No. 17; he has been a prisoner for 22 years.

Nikolai Yakovlevich Kurchik is in camp No. 3; he has already been a prisoner for about 26 years, but still has seven years left to serve.

The brothers Pestov have arrived in Camp No. 3. They are two of those sentenced in Sverdlovsk in November 1971 (see Chronicle 24).

The Persecution of Believers in Lithuania

Amongst cases of the infringement of believers’ rights mentioned in the Memorandum of the Catholics of Lithuania (see Chronicle No. 24) is the dismissal of O. Briliene, a schoolmistress and believer, by the Vilkaviskis District Department of Public Education.

In October 1969 the headmaster of a high school in Vilkaviskis saw a photograph of ten pupils of O. Briliene, taken during their first communion. On the headmaster’s orders O. Briliene confirmed in writing that her pupils

were going to church. After this the authorities began blackmailing and persecuting O. Briliene, who is the mother of five children. A teachers' aktiv discussed her. They suggested to Briliene that she resign from her job. Then she was discussed in the department of education and at an open party meeting. Briliene lodged a complaint with the Ministry of Education of the USSR, as a result of which the photograph of the children was returned to her, but the persecution did not cease. At a district conference of teachers the head of the propaganda department called the schoolmistress a hardened obscurantist, while the deputy chairman of the District Soviet Executive Committee, Rogov, suggested that the teachers create an atmosphere which would be so intolerable to Briliene that she would resign from her job of her own accord. Once again O. Briliene appealed to the USSR Ministry of Education, but it refused to investigate her complaint. In September 1970 Briliene was dismissed without having requested it. She appealed to the Vilnius people's court. During the trial the Procurator Vikskevicius jeered at the schoolmistress and called her a person of low morals. On 14 October 1970 the court ruled her dismissal legal. Briliene appealed to the Lithuanian Supreme Court. The Court decreed that schoolmistress Briliene be reinstated in her job. At the same time the parents of the Vilnius high-school pupils had sent a statement to the USSR Prosecutor-General; it was sent on to the Vilnius District Procurator, who made an announcement to the parents that O. Briliene had been reinstated in her job. In reality, however, Briliene was not reinstated in her job, but was threatened that she would not obtain work anywhere. She was not taken on as a cleaner at a bakery, nor admitted to a course for senior specialists in land-reclamation.

On 24 December 1971 47 priests of the archdiocese of Vilnius addressed a statement to the Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and to the USSR Council of Ministers, concerning the abnormal position of the Catholic Church in Lithuania. The statement makes six basic demands:

1. That the Kaunas Theological Seminary be given complete freedom, including the right to admit all suitable candidates.
2. That the freedom of the religious press guaranteed by the Constitution of the USSR be implemented in practice, that is, that the opportunity be given to print prayer-books, catechisms, hymn-books, the Holy Scriptures and other books of religious content, of which there are not enough, and which the believing populace demands.
3. That Bishops J. Steponavicius and V. Sladkevicius be allowed to return to their duties, and all priests living in Lithuania (including Ukrainians) be allowed to carry out their pastoral work freely and publicly.
4. That the additional clause in article 143 of the Lithuanian Criminal Code, concerning the "Organization and systematic conducting of religious studies among minors in violation of the regulations stipulated by law", which is abused by Lithuanian courts, be revoked, as it does not conform with the International Convention of 15.11.61* or with the Constitution of the USSR.
5. That all unknown and secret instructions concerning religious life be annulled.
6. That the cases of persons convicted on religious grounds be reviewed again and these persons released.

* * *

In March 1972, in a letter addressed to L. Brezhnev, believers of the town of Klaipeda requested permission to use a church built at their own expense and then turned into a philharmonic hall. The petition carries 3,023 signatures.

* * *

In April 1972, 190 believers from the parish of Stirniai in the Moletai District of Lithuania sent a statement to the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers asking that the constraints on religious practice should cease.

1. The priest A. Seskevicius should be allow to work in

(2) Uncertain which convention is meant. Possibly the "Convention against Discrimination in Education", which was adopted by UNESCO on 14 December 1960, and entered into force on 22 May 1962. Article 2 (b) of this convention fits the context. See I Brownlie, Basic Documents on Human Rights, Oxford, 1971, p. 331.)
his parish Seskevicius, priest of the parish of Dubingiai in the Molėtai District, was convicted in September 1970—see Chronicle Nos. 17, 21—and since the expiry of his term of punishment he has not been allowed to work in his parish.

2. Convicted priests should be released.

3. Priests should not be hindered from teaching children in church.

4. All who so desire should be permitted to enter a Theological Seminary.

* * *

In May 1972 believers of Lithuania appealed to all people of good will to assist them in their struggle for freedom of conscience. The letter asserts that on 11 April 1972 a representative of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, accompanied by an official from the Council for Religious Affairs attached to the USSR Council of Ministers, J. Rugenis [see Chronicle 23], travelled from Moscow and, in the building of the Curia of the Kaunas arch-diocese, forced the bishops and persons in charge of the dioceses of Lithuania to publish a "Pastoral Epistle" aimed against the believers who had signed complaints and statements sent to various state organs of the USSR.

The "Pastoral Epistle" states that in certain parishes, of late, signatures have been collected by irresponsible persons on behalf of priests and believers, on blank sheets of paper, or paper with texts for which different ones were later substituted.

Priests were ordered to read out this "Epistle" on 30 April 1972 in all the churches of Lithuania. Some priests did not submit to this demand.

As the letter says: "the falsity of the epistle lies in the fact that there were no examples of forgery mentioned. As for the Memorandum signed by 17,000 believers, all these signatures were written on sheets of paper on each of which an identical text had already been printed. This same text of the Memorandum was published in the Lithuanian press abroad. The Memorandum, with the signatures, was sent to the Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, Brezhnev, via UNO."

The letter also says that the "Pastoral Epistle" granted the organs of the KGB the moral right to persecute participants in the movement for freedom of conscience.

Outside the Moscow Synagogue, 29 March 1972

On 29 March 1972 Jews who had gathered outside the Moscow synagogue were dispersed by police and druzhinka. That evening, the eve of Passover, there were several bus- and car-loads of policemen in the vicinity of the synagogue building. For half a day a fence was erected opposite the synagogue, and passages to the street between houses were closed. Persons who gathered were either herded off the road and on to the pavement, or forbidden to walk on the pavements. Towards seven o'clock that evening the police began clearing the pavements and driving everyone on to the steps of the synagogue. Some individuals were dragged out of the crowd and taken away by the police. The assembled persons sang in chorus: "Chevenu shalom aleichem"—"we have brought you peace". Then the druzhinka started elbowing their way up the steps through the crowd and chased everybody down off the steps. Linking arms, they split the crowd into two parts, formed a barrier across the entire street, and forming two chains, in this way began to clear the Jews out of Arkhipov Street, one chain moving up the street, the other down. A large group of young Jewish people (about 200) had assembled in the square near the memorial to the heroes of Plevna. They were singing Jewish songs and dancing. At about 9 o'clock in the evening large numbers of policemen and plain-clothes men appeared there and began to disperse the young people. Someone in plain clothes shouted: "Damned Yids, at last we've shown you what's what!" Someone was grabbed and dragged into a bus. One girl had her face battered, and as they dragged another into the bus they shouted: "Take this Jewish girl!" Then all the persons detained (about 20) were driven off to police station No. 26 where they were kept until midnight. They were told that if they were ever detained again at the synagogue criminal proceedings would be instituted against them.
The names of some of those who took part in the pogrom are: police Major Sergei Petrovich Sokolov, who declared that his name was already well known in Israel; a KGB employee by the codename of "Kuzmich"; Yury Nikolayevich Bannikov, an instructor from the department of military-patriotic training of Moscow's Kalinin District Komsomol Committee; Boris Semyonovich Konstantinov, a captain in the operations and investigation department of Moscow's Kalinin District Department for Internal Affairs.29

Extra-Judicial Persecutions

A group of Crimean Tatars has sent a letter to the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, the USSR Council of Ministers and the USSR Supreme Soviet, citing numerous facts relating to the local authorities' oppression of Crimean Tatars returning to the Crimea, refusal to register them, the ban on residents selling their houses to Crimean Tatars, etc. The letter ends with a demand for an urgent solution of the nationalities' problem with respect to the Crimean Tatar people, and the immediate release of General P. G. Grigorenko, a champion of the Crimean Tatar cause. The letter carries 743 signatures.

* * *

In July 1967 Professor R. I. Muzafarov, a Doctor of Philological Sciences and a Crimean Tatar by nationality,30 was a member of a delegation of Crimean Tatars received by comrades Andropov, Shchelokov, Rudenko and Georgadze. This fact was the cause of his subsequent trials and tribulations. He was dismissed on one pretext or another from almost a dozen pedagogical institutes in the country two or three months after commencing work at them. Books and articles written by him—and he is the only specialist on Crimean Tatar philology in the country with a high degree—are not printed. One of his books had already been typeset for the Kazan University Press, but did not appear because it was based on Crimean Tatar materials. Another book which had been included in the 1969 prospectus of the Gafur Gulyam publishing house of artistic literature subsequently turned out to be "outside the scope" of the publisher and was returned to the author. For over three years now the manuscript of his third book, "Crimean Tatar Proverbs", favourably reviewed, has been lying unopened in the Chief Editorial Office for Oriental Literature of the "Nauka" publishing house. In 1969 his review of Essays on Crimean History31 was held back by Glazov even after it had been set up for the journal Novy mir. Finally the central press has joined in the hounding of Professor Muzafarov. On 12 April 1972 the paper Labour published an article by Yu. Baranov entitled "The Professor gets a fail", in which Professor Muzafarov was depicted as a "rolling stone" with a "colourful biography" and an "ignoramus" who had not written "a single article" for several years.

On 17 April Professor Muzafarov sent a letter to Brezhnev. Describing the story of his persecution, Muzafarov ended with the words: "I would like to hope, respected Leonid Ilich, that the Central Committee will not only share my indignation at the whole of this shameful story—a story of the unprecedented victimization of a Soviet scholar for his public activities, which were aimed at the realization of the Leninist principles of [our] nationalities policy, but will also take certain practical steps. I beg to be guaranteed the opportunity to pursue without let or hindrance my scientific and pedagogical work in my chief speciality—Crimean Tatar philology—and I request that the conditions necessary for this be created. I absolutely insist that the persecution cease and its organizers and perpetrators be severely punished. I expect the Central Committee to oblige the editor of Labour [A. M. Subbotin] to allow me the opportunity publicly to refute Yu. Baranov's slanderous article.

The only concrete reaction to this letter was the entirely unprovoked dismissal of Professor Muzafarov from the

[29] See more detail on this episode in NSB 215, pp. 16-17.
[31] Probably the volume edited by I. S. Chirva, Simferopol, 1967, is meant.]
Kishinyov Institute of Art, where he was working at the
time, and where he had spent only two months.

On 17 May, having received no reply to his first letter,
Professor Muzalarov wrote a second letter to Brezhnev.
In this letter he writes, amongst other things: "Such a
protracted silence, combined with fresh instances of per-
suasion . . . compels me to think that the Central Com-
mittee is conniving at the victimization of a Soviet scholar
for his public activities, aimed at the logical realization of
the Leninist principles of [our] nationalities policy. In
this connexion I would like to remind you a second time
that I still expect a prompt and satisfactory reply to my
letter. I have to inform you that if I do not receive such
a reply within the next few days—a reply not only in
word, but in deed—I shall have no alternative but to make
our one-sided 'correspondence' public."

Moscow. For many years now Valentin Prussakov and
his wife [Lyudmila] have been seeking permission to
emigrate to Israel. On 3 April 1971 they were detained
on the street by employees of the state security police.
They were told that they were suspected of robbery. At
the police-station, however, they were presented with a
warrant for their 'Detention while committing acts of
hooliganism'. They were subjected to a search and all the
papers they had on them were confiscated, including an
appeal addressed to the 24th Party Congress requesting
permission to leave for Israel.

The state security employees promised to return all the
papers to them, but to this day they have not done so.
On 12 May 1972 V. Prussakov was summoned to the
district police station, where an employee informed him
that he was regularly causing a breach of the peace while
in an intoxicated condition, Prussakov objected, saying
that nobody had ever rebuked him for causing a breach
of the peace, and so this did not tally with the accusation
of "regular breaches", and secondly that he was someone
who never touched alcohol. The police employee declared
that there had in all probability been a mistake, and they
had confused Prussakov with someone else, but never-
theless he warned him of his responsibility, should he
commit any "anti-social acts" in the future.

Voronezh [central Russia]. Three second-year history
students at Voronezh University (two of whom are
Vysotsky and Semyonov) were expelled from the Kom-
somol and the University in March 1972. They were
accused of putting out a manuscript journal, "Sexual-
Democrat" [a pun on Social-Democrat], with a leaflet
entitled "Pacifist" enclosed. The journal discussed prob-
lems of social ethics applied to sexual life. The authors
were fighting for a more serious and open discussion of
problems of sex. The articles in the journal related to
questions of the special role of the intelligentsia in the
life of society in the USSR and in the shaping of the
nation, to questions of censorship and of the need for
democratic reforms. In connexion with the activities of
the student journalists a strict reprimand was given to the
departmental head, Professor A. Nemirovsky.

The Voronezh Regional Party Committee keeps a sharp
eye on the spiritual life of the region. Not long ago a
puppet theatre was forbidden to stage the play "Three
Little Piggies" on the eve of the fiftieth anniversary of the
USSR. This spring the Regional Party Committee banned
the dust-jacket of a book by Professor Nemirovsky, "The
Thread of Ariadne", which had already been printed and
distributed to shops. The author had devoted his book
to a study of Roman and Greek antiquities. The dust-
cover depicted the labyrinth of King Minos at Knossos.
The regional party committee saw a fascist symbol in the
lines of the labyrinth, and the dust-jacket, by then in the
shops, was withdrawn and destroyed.

[33. Described as "a well-known historian and teacher" in a
review in Novy mir 3, 1970, p. 282, of his book The
Etruscan Mirror, Moscow, 1969. His text-book The History
of the Ancient World has now been published in six
editions.]
News in Brief

As Chronicle No. 24 reported, in March 16 prisoners in Leningrad Region's corrective-labour colony No. 24 (at Obikhovo Leningradskoi obl.) refused to take food and sewed up their mouths in protest at the conditions of their confinement. As a result of an investigation the commandant of the colony was removed from his post, and the deputy head of the Department for the Administration of Places of Imprisonment in the Internal Affairs Directorate of the Leningrad City Soviet Executive Committee received a reprimand. The inmates of the colony were subjected to a torrent of repressions. The solitary confinement cells and cell-type premises are packed with the prisoners who supported the protest. Some, driven to despair, are inflicting serious injuries upon themselves. There have been instances of warders being assaulted in the camp. In connection with this, almost half the prisoners in the solitary confinement cells have been chained with handcuffs whose construction prevents any movement of the hands: the wrist-slips tighten more and more with every move, and cause severe pain. Many prisoners are now threatened with a camp trial for violation of the camp-rules.

In November 1971 the following persons took part in a hunger strike in Vladimir Prison: Vyacheslav Aidov, Yakov Berg, Leonid Borodin, Oleg Vorobyov, Alexander Ginzburg, Stepan Zatikyan, Zymovy Kravitsky, Vasyl Kulyin, Yaroslav Lesiv, Gunar Rode, and others. They were protesting at the state security police employees' practice of recruiting informers from among political prisoners, at blackmail, and at the classification of state documents sent by prisoners to state organs as anti-Soviet documents.

In the prisons and camps, instances are not infrequent of persons with grave mental disorders being kept under an ordinary regime along with healthy people. The sick men Vasilii Kondrat'ev, Jurij Zelenkevich and Tarasov are in Vladimir Prison. Prisoner Trekubov, transferred to that prison from camp 11 of Dubrovlag, used to call himself "president of all Russia" [vsey Rossi, as in Patriarch of all Russia] and after the expiry of his term in 1969 was immediately sent to a psychiatric hospital.

On 10 December 1971 Ludvikas Simutis (born 1935), sentenced to 25 years of special-regime as an active participant in the underground organization "Movement for the Freedom of Lithuania" (see Chronicle No. 18, section "Political Prisoners in the Mordovian Camps"), appealed a second time to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, requesting that he be released, and stressing the deterioration in his health, the severe conditions of his confinement, his exemplary conduct and the absence of any penalties in his 16 years of imprisonment.

Vatslav Sevruk, arrested in Vilnius in January (see Chronicle No. 24) is under psychiatric examination in the Serbsky Institute.

In April a diagnostic commission in the Serbsky Institute found V. Borisov and V. Fainberg (see Chronicle No. 24) sound of mind. At the end of April they were transferred back to the Leningrad Special Psychiatric Hospital to await a court hearing.

At the beginning of May the poet Vasyi Stus (see Chronicle No. 24) was confined in the Pavlov Psychiatric Hospital in Kiev.

Anatoly Lupinos (see Chronicle No. 23) is in the

[34. On all except Zatikyan, Kulymin, Lesiv and Rode see Reddaway, op. cit. On Zatikyan see Chronicle 23, note 89, on Rode No. 22, and on Kravitsky, Kulymin and Lesiv No. 17.]
Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital [in SE Ukraine].

In the same hospital is [the artist] Leonid Beloborodov. In 1969 L. Beloborodov and G. I. Bendersky were arrested as they attempted to sail a boat across the Black Sea to Turkey. At first Beloborodov was sentenced to two years' imprisonment for "illegal frontier-crossing". At the beginning of 1971 he was released, but then new proceedings were brought against him under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (equivalent to article 70 of the Russian Code). A psychiatric commission found him of unsound mind, and the court sent him to Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital [see Chronicle No. 21]. Beloborodov is about 20. The fate of Bendersky is not known. 

In the summer of 1971, Hryhoriy Mykhaylovych Pryshlyak, [former] head of counter-espionage for the Ukrainian Insurrectionist Army, completed his 25-year sentence and was released from the Mordovian camps.

In July 1971 Vladimir Leouyuk, one of the five members of the organization "OUN-North" [Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists] was released from the Mordovian camps. This organization consisted of five Ukrainians who were former inmates of Stalin's camps. Four of them remained living in the north after their release from the camps—hence the title of the organization.

On 12 January 1972 Yaroslav Hasyuk, another member of the same organization, was released from the Mordovian camps after the expiry of his 12-year sentence.

In November 1971 Mykhaylo Zelenchuk, convicted by Ivan-Frankivsk Regional Court on 14 February 1956, was released early from the Mordovian camps.

On 22 November 1971 Vyacheslav Alexandrovich Aidov [see Reddaway, op. cit.] was released from Vladimir Prison. In May 1970 he had taken part in a hunger strike (see Chronicle No. 15 [and 18]) and been transferred to Vladimir. Aidov, an engineer born in 1938, was sentenced in March 1967 by Moscow City Court to five years in a strict-regime labour camp for forming a "Union to Struggle for Freedom" (the incriminating documents were: a programme, statutes, and the text of a leaflet which was supposed to be duplicated on a printing-press). Since his release Aidov has been living under administrative surveillance in Kishinyov [Moldavia].

Yakov Berg, who was sentenced to seven years in the same case as Aidov, is in Vladimir Prison.

On 31 December 1971 Ivan Zhukalak died in Dubrovlag camp 3. He was about 60. He had spent 15 years in the camp, and was a blacksmith by trade.

On 31 March 1972 political prisoner Rostislav Serbenchuk from Odessa, who had served eight years and five months for attempting to form an "anti-Soviet organization", was released from Mordovian camp 385/19 [see his name in V. Osipov's essay, Grani No. 80, p. 136.]

On 19 May 1972, after serving a three-year sentence of imprisonment, Ilya Gabai [see Chronicle No. 12 [and Reddaway, ch. 6] was released.

[37. Born 1912. See M. Browne, op. cit.]
[38. Born 1912. See M. Browne, op. cit.]
[40. Born 1925. See his portrait in ibid., p. 11]
The artist Yury Ivanov (see Chronicle Nos. 10, 22) has been released early. He tried to get a job in Saransk, but as he could not obtain a residence permit there he has gone to Smolensk.

Moscow: Kim Davletov, who was arrested in December 1971 (see Chronicle No. 24), was expelled from the Communist Party on 30 December by the Moscow City Party Committee (until his arrest he had been a member of the Party Committee at the Academy of Sciences' Institute of Philosophy). It is thought that he has been charged, under article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code, with publishing his works in the Western press under a pseudonym. According to some reports, K. Davletov has been ruled to be of unsound mind.

It has become known that the investigation of the case of Ilya Glezer (see Chronicle No. 24) is proceeding under article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code.

The Moscow KGB have completed their investigation of the case of A. Dronov (see Chronicle No. 25). A charge has been brought under article 88 of the Russian Criminal Code (violation of the foreign currency transactions regulations). Apparently the sum that was confiscated during a search, and the interrogation of witnesses, did not provide [enough] material for a charge under article 70, although many witnesses were questioned about the circulation of literature and about statements by Dronov on political topics.

Due to an unfortunate misunderstanding, the name of Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Platonov, a specialist in Byzantine history sentenced in 1968 to seven years' imprisonment by the Leningrad City Court (see Chronicle No. 1), was omitted from a report on the fate of members of the "All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Liberation of the People" [ASCULP] (see Chronicle No. 19). He is in Dubrovlag camp 3, and was one of ten [in fact nine] prisoners who appealed to the International Red Cross in a letter of December 1971 (see Chronicle No. 23).

In March-April 1972 Yury Shleim and Yuriy Glazov (see Chronicle No. 24) left the USSR.

In March [1972] Revolt Pimenov (see Chronicle No. 22) was unanimously elected to the post of Junior Research Officer in the Komi branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He has been entrusted with forming first a group and then a department specializing in his own mathematical field.

42. He has published widely since at least 1959. His most substantial work is Folklore as an Art-Form, Moscow, 1966.]
On 11 April 1972 the Kiev authorities, thanks to a telephone call from the Mayor of New York [J. Lindsay, permitted wreathes to be laid at Baby Yar in memory of the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto. A meeting, however, was banned. About 200 people were present. Four wreathes were laid bearing the inscription: "We shall not forget! We shall not forgive!" Towards eight o'clock in the evening the crowd was dispersed, and those who expressed their indignation at the prohibition of the meeting were detained. Six people of advanced years were jailed for fifteen days.

After the publication of her penitential letter [see Chronicle No. 24] Zinoviya Franko was reinstated in her job; she was given a new, four-roomed flat and granted two weeks' leave for moving in.


mittee, A. D. Sukharov, V. N. Chalidze, A. N. Pervodokhlebov, I. R. Shafarevich,* and a consultant to the Committee, A. S. Volpin, sent to the President of the USSR Supreme Soviet a memorandum on the restoration of the rights of forcibly deported peoples and ethnic groups. They call upon the President of the Supreme Soviet to facilitate the restoration of the rights of the Crimean Tatar and Meskhetian peoples (and other nationalities and groups) to live on the territories from which they were forcibly and unconstitutionally deported."

Samizdat News

Social Problems, issue No. 15 (January-February 1972). The collection consists of three sections. The first("Law") contains a translation of an article entitled "Collective Rights and Collective Action under English Law" and a letter from V. Chalidze to the Chairman of the International League for the Rights of Man [John Carey] concerning the problem of the defence of the rights of servicemen who became such not of their own free will, or as mercenaries, but because it is their legally stipulated obligation in many countries." The second section ("Documents on Legal Practice") contains the replies by the Uzbek Supreme Court and the Uzbek Procuracy to V. Chalidze's complaints requesting a review of the case of the priest Adelgeim (see Chronicle No. 24). In both instances the complaints "were rejected". The third section ("Documents of the Human Rights Committee") includes a Note by V. Chalidze on the use of primary sources of information in articles about Service personnel.

On 4 May 1972, gives further details, e.g. that the exiled Dr. Pimenov previously had to work in a boat repair factory. See also his remarkable scholarly essay of 1968. "How I have tried to Discover the Identity of the Spy Reyly, in Rumka, no. 8 June 1972. Here Pimenov apparently proves that after 1917 Sidney Reilly spied consistently for the USSR. This goes against the conventional view that he was always a British spy, as expounded most fully in Robin Bruce Lockhart, Ace of Spies, London, 1967. Pimenov did not have access to this book.

The Times, 4 May 1972, gives further details, e.g. that the exiled Dr. Pimenov previously had to work in a boat repair factory. See also his remarkable scholarly essay of 1968. "How I have tried to Discover the Identity of the Spy Reilly, in Rumka, no. 8 June 1972. Here Pimenov apparently proves that after 1917 Sidney Reilly spied consistently for the USSR. This goes against the conventional view that he was always a British spy, as expounded most fully in Robin Bruce Lockhart, Ace of Spies, London, 1967. Pimenov did not have access to this book.

[40] Possev: 7th, 1972, and \(27\) April. The second appeal is from the Ukrainian lawyer I. A. Kandyba to the UN Human Rights Commission. Dated 31 October 1969, it was written in Vladimir prison and describes the appalling conditions there. It was published in Russian in Possev, 9th tarts, October 1971, pp. 60-63, and also in Ukrainian.

[46] The Times, 4 May 1972, gives further details, e.g. that the exiled Dr. Pimenov previously had to work in a boat repair factory. See also his remarkable scholarly essay of 1968. "How I have tried to Discover the Identity of the Spy Reilly, in Rumka, no. 8 June 1972. Here Pimenov apparently proves that after 1917 Sidney Reilly spied consistently for the USSR. This goes against the conventional view that he was always a British spy, as expounded most fully in Robin Bruce Lockhart, Ace of Spies, London, 1967. Pimenov did not have access to this book.

[47] NBSJ No. 215 names some of these as Isak Margolin, Sem- yon Nivelt and Lazar Zingerman.]


[49] Se Reddaway, chap. 12 and 13, also a UPI dispatch dated 16 August, which summarizes the latest Tatar appeals to the Soviet authorities, signed by 18,010 and 20,000 people.


[51] A well-known case in the USSR is that of the Zionist Jonah Kalchinsky, with which Chalidze has been directly con-
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At the beginning of the collection, in a "Compiler's Note", V. Chalidze writes: "With this issue a new bringing to a close the regular publichion of the collection "Social Problems". The position at present is such that, apart from articles in translation and UNO documents, which are difficult to procure, we would find ourselves basically publishing only Documents of the Human Rights Committee. These documents can be published separately, which will improve their circulation, while translated articles and UNO Documents can be conveniently distributed from time to time amongst a narrow circle of persons interested in irregular publications on particular issues. I would point out that the collection has nevertheless apparently contributed to the propagation of the idea that even when the situation forces people into an enormous concern to discuss immediate concrete developments in public life, the regular and constructive study of social problems is an important activity".

* * *

Democrat, No. 5, 1971. Written also on the cover is: "Organ of Democratic Forces". The last page concludes with the words: "Publisher—the Democratic Movement of the Soviet Union".

1. A statement "On Russo-Chinese Relations", commencing with the words: "The journal Democrat has been authorized by the Democratic Movement of the Soviet Union to publish a statement concerning the Sino-Soviet conflict". The statement consists of five points. The final point begins with the words: "The Democrats have their own plan for the peaceful settlement of territorial disputes between the USSR and China".

2. An article "On the Question of Illegal Forms of Struggle", beginning as follows: "October 1969 saw the publication of the Programme of the Democratic Move-
In reply to Democrat's rebuke of inconsistency, the Chronicle states: the necessary precautions involved in the publication of an information bulletin such as the Chronicle in the conditions of our country are one thing: an underground organization (see Chronicle No. 14 on "The Tactical Principles of the Democratic Movement of the Soviet Union") is another.

Review, No. 3, April 1972

1. "The Hounding of A. Solzhenitsyn". An account of the interview given by Solzhenitsyn to Western correspondents (see this issue of Chronicle).

2. A report that about half the members of the Czechoslovak Union of Journalists have been expelled, and about one half dismissed from their jobs. A "Czech Union of Writers" is being created, its members totalling seventy (the old Writers' Union had 320 members), and 90 per cent of these are pensioners. Rudolf Kalkí, who in 1941 wrote Twelve Letters to Stalin, has been appointed editor of Literary News [which is due to start appearing in September 1972]. There is an account of the contents of the first issue of Political Monthly... The text is given of a speech by V. Bilak at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, in which he criticizes in particular the Rumanian leadership for its "alliance with China", the Hungarian for its "reckless economic experiments", the Polish for its "spinelessness with regard to anti-socialist elements", and the East German for its "political sclerosis".

3. "From the History of Samizdat". An account of the samizdat journal Political Diary (more than 70 numbers appeared from 1964 to 1970). Its publishers (writers, historians, sociologists, old Bolsheviks) described themselves as "Liberal Communists" to Western correspondents.

4. Evidently a misprint. The copy received in the west reads "On the Unexpectedness of the War with Germany". The article concerns the years 1940-41.

5. Drafted by "campaigners for a moral and political Renaissance".


[56. Evidently a misprint. The copy received in the west reads "On the Unexpectedness of the War with Germany". The article concerns the years 1940-41.]

[57. Drafted by "campaigners for a moral and political Renaissance".]
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Like to point out in a friendly spirit that, since the publication of the "Tactical Principles", circles closely connected with the Chronicle's editors have not been sufficiently active in circulating official documents of the DMSU, in particular the 'Memorandum of the Democrats to the Supreme Soviet'.

3. The first part of an article by S. Radonezhskyl: "Basic Concepts of Society".

4. A report commencing with the words: "In the last year the KGB has begun to carry out on a large scale unofficial searches of dissidents' homes". There is an account of a search of this kind at A. Solzhenitsyn's dacha (see Chronicle 21).

5. An editorial by N. S. Khrushchev: "What the Soviet papers don't write about..."

6. "On the Unexpectedness of the Attack on Berlin".

7. "Why a Relaxation of Tension has Begun in Europe".


10. Verses by M. Benediktow-Sibirisev: "On the Death of Khrushchev" (and on 8 other themes).

11. The editors of Democrat ("on behalf of the DMSU") announce a competition to compose the words and music of an "Anthem of the Democrats". The anthem "must reflect the striving for freedom of the individual, the striving for the abolition of all forms of dictatorship".

It "must consist of three stanzas and a chorus."

The Chronicle repeats its belief that by using such expressions as "Organ of Democratic Forces", "Publisher—the Democratic Movement", or "The journal... has been authorized to state", the publishers of Democrat are indulging in wishful thinking and thereby confusing the reader.

[58. Political Monthly is a Czech samizdat journal. See AFP dispatches dated 18 February 1972 from Prague, and 28 February and 12 May from Vienna. Bilak made this speech on 21 October 1971. See Rude Pravo, 22 October, and Le Monde, 12 February.]
whom they gave eleven numbers of the Diary. The author disapproves of this action, as he does of the fact that the "Diaries" were circulated amongst a very narrow circle of people.

4. "From the History of the USSR." An account of the semi-constitutional conference of a majority of the members of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (bolsheviks), which took place in the apartment of G. I. Petrovsky at the end of 1925 and at which the question of the replacement of Stalin by Dzerzhinsky as Secretary-General was discussed. Voting figures are given for the 17th Party Congress [in 1934], when 270 persons voted against Stalin; thanks to the efforts of Kaganovich it was announced that only three persons had voted against Stalin, the same number as had against Kirov. There is also discussion of the fact that the system of identity-cards abolished in Russia in 1917 was reintroduced in 1932.

5. "Literary Chronicle." Notes are given on: the novel Balance by P. P. Dudochkin (of Kalinin) about the hard life of collective farm-workers in the fifties; an anthology of verse by the Vinnitsa poet Felix Rahurin, who committed suicide at the age of 19, unable to endure the strains of military service; an autobiographical account (about his twelve-year term in a camp) by Roald Mukhamedyarov; a satirical article "Monologue of a Soviet Worker" by Vladimir Gusarov.

6. "Kaleidoscope." Reflections on the remarkable stability in their jobs of top- and medium-level party personnel since October 1964.—A comparison of the average standards of living in the USSR and the USA.—Some details of two recent meetings of the General Committee of the CPSU devoted to discussing measures to intensify the struggle against dissidents [see Chronicle, note 15].

* * *

Programme of the Estonian National Front, 10 August 1971.

The programme proclaims as the aim of the ENF the holding of a referendum on the self-determination and status of Estonia, and formulates principles for an independent Estonian political and social system.

The Chronicle does not know how large is the circle of people who support or make up the ENF.

Estonian Democrat, 1972, No. 1-5 (in Estonian).

1. "Memories of the Days of Independence." Extracts from the memoirs of three leading Estonian nationalists concerning the congress of federalists convened in Kiev in the summer of 1917 on the initiative of the Ukrainian Central Rada. The congress discussed questions of secession from Russia in connection with the chauvinist policy of the Provisional Government.

2. "Programme of the Estonian National Front" (ENE) (see above).


4. "My Thoughts about the Liberators"—(cites instances of the chauvinism of ordinary Russian people, as displayed in their daily life.

5. A letter by 17 [anonymous] Latvian communists to the communist parties of Rumania, Yugoslavia, Austria, France, Switzerland and Spain, and also to Aragon and Garaudy. The letter sharply criticizes the deliberate Russification of Latvia, and cites numerous facts.

[64. This 4000 word letter is dated July-August 1971. See full Russian text in Ruskaya mysl, 17 and 24 February 1972, and a detailed analysis of it in Pravda, 3, 1972, pp. 41-45, and full German translation in Lewsky, op. cit. It appears to have been first published in Unita, Rome, in December 1971, then in Dagens Nyheter, Stockholm, in early January, and also in Yugoslav papers and elsewhere. On 24 February the Soviet Latvian paper Glna called it "a fabrication of the CIA, aided by Bruno Kalnins". On this Latvian emigre' see Chronicle 33; on 27 February the New York Times reported that the US government believed the letter to be authentic. Shortly after this the Latvian First Party Secretary, August Voss, published a long article ...]
A translation from Russian of two of Solzhenitsyn's "Micro-stories": "Lake Segden" and "It's not us who'll Die".

"When emotions and instinct prevail over intellect, then millions perish." The author cites historical instances when the Estonian people might have influenced their own destiny and even the fortunes of the whole world, but, because of the narrow-mindedness of certain politicians, they did not do so. For example, in 1918 Estonian units in Petrograd might have prevented the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly, and wanted to do so, but Estonian diplomats in Petrograd forbade them to interfere in Russian affairs.


A collection of materials on the case of V. Bukovsky, containing, among other things, a short biography of Bukovsky, his interview [with A.P. correspondent Holger Jensen] published in the paper Washington Post [of 17 May 1970] (see Chronicle No. 19), Bukovsky's letter to the editor of the Washington Post (see Chronicle No. 14 [and note 78 to Chronicle 23]), his letter to psychiatrists in the USA, England and elsewhere, enclosing forensic-psychiatric diagnostic materials relating to V. Borisov, L. Gorbanevskaya, P. Grigorenko, V. Kuznetsov, V. Fainberg, I. Yakimovich (see Chronicle No. 19), letters in defence of Bukovsky (see Chronicle Nos. 19, 20, 24), and Bukovsky's final speech at his trial (Chronicle No. 23). The title of attacking "incorrect opinions" and "survivals of bourgeois nationalism in the minds of citizens of our republic" (Political Self-Education, Moscow, No. 6, 1972). On 14 July Soviet Latvia reported the dismissal of the Latvian Minister of Internal Affairs, who has apparently not been given a new governmental appointment.

6. A translation from Russian of two of Solzhenitsyn's "Micro-stories": "Lake Segden" and "It's not us who'll Die".

7. "When emotions and instinct prevail over intellect, then millions perish." The author cites historical instances when the Estonian people might have influenced their own destiny and even the fortunes of the whole world, but, because of the narrow-mindedness of certain politicians, they did not do so. For example, in 1918 Estonian units in Petrograd might have prevented the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly, and wanted to do so, but Estonian diplomats in Petrograd forbade them to interfere in Russian affairs.


A collection of materials on the case of V. Bukovsky, containing, among other things, a short biography of Bukovsky, his interview [with A.P. correspondent Holger Jensen] published in the paper Washington Post [of 17 May 1970] (see Chronicle No. 19), Bukovsky's letter to the editor of the Washington Post (see Chronicle No. 14 [and note 78 to Chronicle 23]), his letter to psychiatrists in the USA, England and elsewhere, enclosing forensic-psychiatric diagnostic materials relating to V. Borisov, L. Gorbanevskaya, P. Grigorenko, V. Kuznetsov, V. Fainberg, I. Yakimovich (see Chronicle No. 19), letters in defence of Bukovsky (see Chronicle Nos. 19, 20, 24), and Bukovsky's final speech at his trial (Chronicle No. 23).

8. See also, for most of these documents, Bukovsky's books and other items listed in the Bibliography appended to Chronicle 22-23. See also the strongly favourable reply published in a samizdat style in the west.


A collection of materials on the case of V. Bukovsky, containing, among other things, a short biography of Bukovsky, his interview [with A.P. correspondent Holger Jensen] published in the paper Washington Post [of 17 May 1970] (see Chronicle No. 19), Bukovsky's letter to the editor of the Washington Post (see Chronicle No. 14 [and note 78 to Chronicle 23]), his letter to psychiatrists in the USA, England and elsewhere, enclosing forensic-psychiatric diagnostic materials relating to V. Borisov, L. Gorbanevskaya, P. Grigorenko, V. Kuznetsov, V. Fainberg, I. Yakimovich (see Chronicle No. 19), letters in defence of Bukovsky (see Chronicle Nos. 19, 20, 24), and Bukovsky's final speech at his trial (Chronicle No. 23).

The title of attacking "incorrect opinions" and "survivals of bourgeois nationalism in the minds of citizens of our republic" (Political Self-Education, Moscow, No. 6, 1972). On 14 July Soviet Latvia reported the dismissal of the Latvian Minister of Internal Affairs, who has apparently not been given a new governmental appointment.

166 A translation from Russian of two of Solzhenitsyn's "Micro-stories": "Lake Segden" and "It's not us who'll Die".

7. "When emotions and instinct prevail over intellect, then millions perish." The author cites historical instances when the Estonian people might have influenced their own destiny and even the fortunes of the whole world, but, because of the narrow-mindedness of certain politicians, they did not do so. For example, in 1918 Estonian units in Petrograd might have prevented the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly, and wanted to do so, but Estonian diplomats in Petrograd forbade them to interfere in Russian affairs.


A collection of materials on the case of V. Bukovsky, containing, among other things, a short biography of Bukovsky, his interview [with A.P. correspondent Holger Jensen] published in the paper Washington Post [of 17 May 1970] (see Chronicle No. 19), Bukovsky's letter to the editor of the Washington Post (see Chronicle No. 14 [and note 78 to Chronicle 23]), his letter to psychiatrists in the USA, England and elsewhere, enclosing forensic-psychiatric diagnostic materials relating to V. Borisov, L. Gorbanevskaya, P. Grigorenko, V. Kuznetsov, V. Fainberg, I. Yakimovich (see Chronicle No. 19), letters in defence of Bukovsky (see Chronicle Nos. 19, 20, 24), and Bukovsky's final speech at his trial (Chronicle No. 23).

8. See also, for most of these documents, Bukovsky's books and other items listed in the Bibliography appended to Chronicle 22-23. See also the strongly favourable reply published in a samizdat style in the west.
Solzhenitsyn's heroes, however, are guided by the feeling of responsibility, the consciousness that if they do not carry out the work that has fallen to their lot, no-one else will do it. . . . Is not Solzhenitsyn himself permeated by this same pathos, the pathos of sober, sensible, but irrevocable personal responsibility? . . . A proud and humble sense of individual responsibility—there we have the kernel of Solzhenitsyn's ethic, both as a writer and as a man".

Lev Ventso: "The poetry of Alexander Galich". An attempted analysis of the social and moral significance of Galich's song-writing. In the opinion of the author (see footnote 11) the poetry of Galich is a most striking expression of the "home-based culture" that has developed in our country over the last few years, conditioned on the one hand by the suppression of any creative initiative, and on the other, by the pressing need for free intellectual intercourse. For this original form of culture Galich has created the song-play, song-drama genre.

A. Solzhenitsyn to M. P. Yakubovich: A response to his third and fourth letters, those about Kamenev and Stalin. While valuing the letters highly, Solzhenitsyn indicates some of their shortcomings.
address this conference. An invitation was sent on three occasions, but not once did it reach the addressee."

Press Review for 1984." A pamphlet. Composed by Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences K. I. Popugayev, this is a futuristic Marxist-Leninist model of the world press for the year 1984, which has already become the canonical end-point for prognostications. A few items from the review: A witty and topical report by Times correspondent S. Blayhead dated 5 January: "They Wrote for Appearances" (see . . .). It is devoted to an analysis of why . . . the toilers of a Scottish district gathered in an unprecedented harvest of cucumbers last year while on the counters of London's greengrocers cucumbers were somewhat scarce". Warsaw Era for 4 February carries a report from Rome: "For You, Youngsters!" . . . Thousands of young boys and girls from the capital went out to the construction site run by the Komsoomol [Italian version of Komsomol, or Communist Youth League]. The erection has begun of a sports complex for young people. Where St. Peter's Cathedral once stood, now bulldozers and scrapers stand. . . .

"At the age of 18": Anonymous. The story of a youth who was in camp and in exile in the 1920's and 1930's. The action takes place in Siberia and Central Asia.

"Vadim Belotserkovsky:" An appeal to the Soviet public

A. Volpin spoke in The Times, 3 July, and The Jewish Chronicle, London, 30 June. Chalithe's paper has reached the west, but not yet been published.
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The Arrest of Pyotr Yakir

On 21 June Pyotr Ionovich Yakir was arrested in Moscow.

P. I. Yakir (born 1923) is the son of General Ion Emanuelovich Yakir, a hero of the civil war, who was executed by Stalin; he served 17 years (from 1937 to 1954) in Stalin's prisons and camps. P. I. Yakir is a member of the Action Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR.

On the afternoon of 21 June, when P. I. Yakir went out-side during his lunch-hour, he was bundled into a car and driven off. Approximately one hour later the same squad of KGB men who had conducted searches of Yakir's flat on 14 January (Chronicle No. 24) and 6 May 1972 (Chronicle No. 25) came to fetch Yakir's wife Valentina Ivanovna Savenkova at her place of work. The squad drove V. I. Savenkova to her home and carried out a search, the third this year. The search warrant indicated article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code. The search lasted four hours. Only V. I. Savenkova was present at the search. Several citizens who wished to be present (in particular P. I. Yakir's son-in-law Yu. Kim [husband of Irina Yakir] and Academician A. D. Sakharov) were not allowed into the flat. On the same day searches were also carried out at the work-places of P. I. Yakir and his wife. None of Yakir's family has seen the records of these searches. The Chronicle too knows nothing about them.

On the evening of 21 June KGB investigator Major Gennady Vasilevich Kislykh telephoned V. I. Savenkova and informed her that P. I. Yakir had been arrested, that he had been charged under article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code, and that he was in the Lefortovo KGB investigation prison. Incidentally, official sources had informed foreign correspondents in Moscow during the day that P. I. Yakir had been arrested for "anti-constitutional activities" and charged under articles 70 and 210 (the inducement of minors to criminal activity) of the Code.

V. I. Savenkova appealed to the USSR Procurator-General to commute the suppressive measure taken against P. I. Yakir to, for instance, a signed statement not to leave the city. On 1 July the Action Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR addressed a similar appeal to the USSR Procurator-General. The Action Group's letter says, amongst other things:

... the public activities of Pyotr Yakir originate entirely in the idea of the de-Stalinization of our society. Yakir's anti-Stalinism is organically linked with his biography, his professional knowledge of our history, and his uncompromising attitude to social evil. The activities of Yakir reflect his convictions and are utterly selfless.

... Yakir's sole aspiration was to further the democratization of our society ...

No reply has yet been received to these letters.

A letter signed by a "Group of Soviet citizens" and dated June 1972 says, amongst other things:

"Pyotr Yakir has been thrown into gaol.

The authorities have resolved to add a new, sombre page to the tragic fate of one of our most remarkable contemporaries, a man of rare civic talent, great fortitude of spirit, indomitable energy and unswerving courage.

This is yet another stage—perhaps the culminating point—in the tactical campaign of creeping but systematic repressions which the regime has been conducting for several years now in an attempt to stifle the democratic movement.

One can and should protest against this action. What is more important, though, is to understand the essence of the new situation, and intensively and without hysteria (whether it be the hysteria of the bayonet-charge or the hysteria of capitulation) to adapt the life and methods of struggle of every democrat, and consequently of the entire movement, to the reality of the present.

The arrest of Yakir, a man who consciously placed himself...

[1. Compromising allegations were made in the detailing of these activities, and were carried in western news reports the next day.]
self at the spearhead of the struggle, does not mean that 
'all is lost', that the authorities have achieved a victory 
with their policy.
... The arrest of Yakir is neither a beginning nor an 
end: it is an important landmark.
To preserve people and to preserve samoustan, to 
preserve and strengthen the movement for democra-
tization—that is the chief aim today, that is the best answer to 
the arrest of Yakir...”

Political Trials

The trial of Yu. Melnik. On 15, 16 and 19 June in 
Leningrad City Court the case was heard of Yuri Melnik 
(Chronicle No. 24), charged under articles 70 and 196 
(forgery, manufacture or sale of forged documents, stamps, 
seals or forms) of the Russian Criminal Code. The chair-
man was Karlov, defence counsel was Kheifets; 
In the courtroom there were about thirty specially invited 
people, whom the court administrators for some reason 
referred to as “students”. At certain times these “students” 
played the role of guards at the doors to the courtroom. 
Contrary to the usual practice, access to the courtroom 
was unrestricted, except at the time when three witnesses 
were being questioned (K. Lyubarsky—see Chronicle No. 
24; V. Smirnov; and the vice-director of a school of radio 
engineering, whose name the Chronicle does not know). 
Yu. Melnik, born in 1945, has a secondary education. 
In the indictment he was charged first with: verbal dis-
semination of his views on the absence of democratic free-
doms in our country, the sending of Soviet troops into 
Czechoslovakia in 1968, the position of the Jews and the 
Crimean Tatars, and the “creation of a Human Rights 
Committee in Moscow, the aim of which is to circulate 
underground anti-Soviet literature and to publish an under-
ground anti-Soviet newspaper”; secondly with: circulation 
of Avtorkhanov’s book The Technology of Power, the book 
For Ever Flowing, “attributed to V. Grossman”,

[1. For other trials involving O. V. Karlov and S. A. Kheifets, 
see Nos. 16 and 17] 

Leningrad

In March 1971 seven people were arrested in Leningrad: 
Vyacheslav Dzhabov (a senior engineer at the Institute of 
Mechanical Processing), Sergei Sergeyev, Andrei Kotlov, 
Mariya Semenovna Musivenko, the brothers Ivan and 
Sergei Purtov; and a seventh person, whose name 
is unknown. All seven were charged under article 70 of the 
Russian Criminal Code. The specific content of the charge 
is not known to the Chronicle. All that is known is that 
the accused professed the following “credo”: our society 
is sick, it must be made healthy, true Leninist policies must 
be restored, and communism built.

[5. Cf. the bulletin Crime and Punishment No. 7. See Reddaway, 
P. 429.]
The trial took place in January 1972. Details are unknown to the Chronicle. All that is known is that four of the accused were ruled by a psychiatric commission to be of unsound mind and were sent to a special psychiatric hospital for compulsory treatment; the remaining three were sentenced to various camp terms.

In the summer of 1971 Evdokimov (born 1923), a journalist, was arrested in Leningrad. He was charged under article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code. The indictment imputed to him in particular the fact that he had written for [the monthly emigre journal] Possev. A psychiatric examination in the Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry found him of unsound mind. The trial of Evdokimov and his wife was held recently in Leningrad. Evdokimov, being of unsound mind, was not present in the courtroom.

At the judicial hearing Evdokimov's wife testified against her husband. In accordance with the ruling of the court, Evdokimov has been sent to the Leningrad Special Psychiatric Hospital. His wife was given a three-year suspended sentence with a five-year probationary term. Evdokimova is the mother of two children.

In the Leningrad Special Hospital Evdokimov has declared a hunger strike in protest at the brutal conditions of confinement.

Kiev

On 5 June the trial was held of Vladimir Rakityansky, charged under article 62 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (equivalent to article 70 of the Russian Code). The sentence was five years. The Chronicle does not know the details.

 Searching, Interrogations, Arrests

Odessa

At the beginning of May, Grigory Berman (aged 26) submitted his documents to OVIR in order to leave for Israel. A week later he was summoned to the KGB, who demanded that he give information about some of his friends, threatening that if he did not, permission to leave would not be granted. Berman refused. Three days later he received his call-up papers. Pleading exemption from military service on health grounds Berman left for Kiev. On 25 May he was arrested in the waiting-room of OVIR and dismissed to Odessa Prison. He has been charged under an article corresponding to article 198-1 of the Russian Criminal Code (evasion of a summons for training or medical examination, or of military registration, by a person liable for military service).

On 21 May Yury Pokh (aged 22) was arrested on similar grounds. The same charge has been brought against him.

Moscow

On 5 June G. Shapiro was arrested, and on 9 June M.
Nashpits, both have been charged under article 198-1 of the Russian Criminal Code.

During a search at the home of typist V. Makatinskaya on 6 May (see Chronicle No. 25) a typewriter with a Russian keyboard was confiscated and one with a Roman keyboard left. In June KGB employees visited Makatinskaya with a warrant for seizure and removed the second typewriter.

It has become known to the Chronicle that the search at Lakhov's house was carried out, not on 6 May under case No. 374, as reported in Chronicle No. 25, but on 20 April (the same day as the search of P. P. Starchik's home, and evidently in connection with this search) under case No. 24. Vasily Ivanovich Lakhov (who is aged about 40) lives near Moscow in the village of Yakovenko (railway station St. Sobibovaya on the Kursk line). He is a member of the communist party and a graduate student at MIKhM [Moscow Institute of Chemical Machine Construction]. Following this search Lakhov was summoned several times for interrogation. He was questioned (by now in connection with the Starchik case) by investigator S. N. Gorshkov.

On 20 April in connection with case No. 24 a search was carried out at the home of Vasily Ivanovich Bayev (aged about 40) a resident of Podolsk [25 m. south of Moscow]. Nothing was found in the search. Bayev is a sociologist at VNIEETO [All-Union Research Institute for Electrothermic Equipment].

In the Spring of 1972 G. P. Shchedrovitsky, a Master of Pedagogical Science, has his flat searched in connection with case No. 24 (see Chronicle No. 24).

Leningrad

On 15 April Mikhail Meilakh, a Master of Philological Science, had his flat searched in connection with the case of Evdokimov's wife (see this issue).

Pre-trial Investigations

In May Leonid Plyushch (see Chronicle No. 24) was sent to Moscow for a psychiatric examination. A number of facts oblige one to suppose that the diagnosis of the commission of experts has been determined in advance. One such fact was adduced in a statement by the Action Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR, in connection with the arrest of Plyushch (see Chronicle No. 24).

Here is another fact: as early as February an employee of the KGB called Sur declared to a witness, F. A. Didenko, that the KGB was in possession of a letter written by Plyushch's mother, in which she spoke of her son's "oddities"; in reality, however, no letter of the kind existed!

On 4 June Plyushch's wife T. I. Zhitnikova sent a statement to the Procurator of the Ukrainian Republic, informing him of the facts of the tendentious, prosecution-like approach of the investigators to her husband's case.

From 6 to 23 May Vasyl Stus (see Chronicle 24 and note 18 to the Amnesty edition) was under examination in the Pavlov Psychiatric Hospital in Kiev. The diagnosis of the commission of experts was: character displays on--

[10. They were both sentenced to one year of corrective labour without imprisonment but with deduction of 20% of their pay, Shapiro on 26 July, Nashpits on 2 August. See HITULI No. 24, 25. On Shapiro see also Chronicles 22 and 23.]

[11. Valentina Mikhailovna Makatinskaya, aged about 60, is a translator from French who spent some seventeen years in the concentration camps up to about 1950. Her husband used to work in the Soviet embassy in Paris. Her initials are given wrongly in the Chronicle as V. E.]

[12. Master of Philosophical Science, according to No. 2 and to P. Litvinov, The Trial of the Four, which both record his expulsion from the party for signing an appeal.]

[13. A literary specialist aged about 30 and son of the well-known literary critic Boris Meilakh.]
tain psychopathic traits, but of sound mind. Stus's case is being conducted by investigator V. I. Lubenchts. A charge was brought initially under article 187.1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code (corresponding to article 190.1 of the Russian Code); then it was reclassified under [the severer] article 62 of the Ukrainian Code (article 70 of the Russian).

In March, Gilyayev, who participated in the hijacking of an aircraft from the Crimea to Turkey, was in the Pavlov Psychiatric Hospital in Kiev. A diagnostic commission found Gilyayev of sound mind. Gilyayev's case is being conducted by the Ukrainian KGB. He has apparently been charged with betrayal of the fatherland and stealing state property.

Yury Shukhevych (see Chronicle Nos. 24, 25) has been charged under article 70 paragraph 2 of the Russian Criminal Code. The investigation is being conducted by the KGB of the Kabardino-Balkarskaya Autonomous Republic [N. Caucasus]. The investigator is Major Kashezhev. After three months of investigation Shukhevych was transferred to Kiev, but soon he was sent back to Nalchik since, to all appearances, no evidence was discovered linking Shukhevych with Ukrainian cases. The address of Shukhevych's wife, Valentina [N. Trotsenko, is: Nalchik, Sovetskaya ul., 83, kv.13. They have two children—Roman (born 1970) and Ira (born 1972).

A diagnostic commission in the Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry has found V. Sevruk (see Chronicle Nos. 24, 25) of unsound mind.

**Political Prisoners in Psychiatric Hospitals**

Vladimir Ilich Trifonov was born in 1938 in the Kalinin Region [NW of Moscow]. In 1966 Trifonov studied in the physics faculty of Kalinin Pedagogical Institute. He frequently argued with teachers in the department of political economy. As a result a psychiatric examination was arranged for him. The examination lasted five minutes. It was carried out by a leading psychiatrist from the Kalinin Medical Institute, Victor Mikhailovich Shpak. On the basis of Shpak's diagnosis Trifonov was expelled from the Institute. In March 1968 he was arrested for making "anti-Soviet statements". Six months later he was sent to the Leningrad Special Psychiatric Hospital, where he remains to this day. His mother's address is: Kalininskaya obl. Ostashkovskii raion. Shirkovskoye p/o, der.Orlinka. Trifonov's wife, Vere Trifonova (see Chronicle Nos. 24, 25) was born in Kalinin in 1941. She is charge of the apartment where Trifonov is held.

Anatoly Dmitriyevich Ponomaryov was born in Leningrad in 1933, and worked as an engineer at the Leningrad branch of the All-Union Research Institute of Medical Instrument Design. In October 1970 he was taken into custody and criminal proceedings were instituted against him. This subject continues (see also note 66 to No. 25) to provoke intense controversy. When on 11 July the French Minister of Interior, R. Marcellin, referred in a speech to the Soviet practice of imprisoning dissenters in mental hospitals, the Soviet ambassador P. Abrasimov made an official protest to the French government—see an AP dispatch from Paris of 14 July and L'Aurore. Paris, 16 July. On 8 May, moreover, Pravda accused Israel of exactly the same practice. Meanwhile the American Psychiatric Association (1780, 18th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20009), had responded to J. F. Stone's articles (see note 67 to Chronicle 23) by setting up a powerful ad hoc committee, consisting of Drs. R. W. Waggoner (chairman), Paul Chodoff, and John Visher, and Judge D. L. Bazelon, to examine the "Bukovsky papers" on which they were based. In its report this committee was...
him under article 190-1 of the Russian Criminal Code for the circulation of satirical verses by himself and the retyping of the letter by Solzhenitsyn to the writers' congress. A psychiatric examination held in Psychiatric Hospital No. 2 on Pryanikha Street found him of unsound mind. On 29 January 1971 the Leningrad City Court sent him to the Leningrad Special Psychiatric Hospital for compulsory treatment. Since 11 March 1971 he has been in this hospital. The address of his family is: Leningrad, Lesnoi prospekt 34/36, kv. 125.

In April 1967 Yuri Sergeyevich Belov was sentenced under paragraph 2 of article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code to five years in special-regime camps. He served his term first in camp No. 10 in Mordovia, then in Vladimir Prison. In the autumn of 1971 new proceedings (the third!) were instituted against him, once again under article 70 (for "agitation inside the prison"). From December 1971 to February 1972 he was under examination in the Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry and was found to be of unsound mind. In May 1972 he was transported from Vladimir Prison to the Special Psychiatric Hospital in the town of Sychyovka in Smolensk Region.

In 1971 Vladimir Shlepnyov was tried in Moscow. He was charged under articles 14 (betrayal of the fatherland) and 15 (responsibility for preparation of a crime, or for an attempted crime) of the Russian Criminal Code. His "attempt" to "betray the fatherland" had consisted in "endeavouring to cross the frontier illegally". The court sent him to the Special Psychiatric Hospital in Kazan for compulsory treatment.
At the beginning of June the Leningrad City Court changed its ruling of compulsory treatment for Evgeny Viktorovich Shashenkov (Chronicle Nos. 5, 18) and Vladimir Vasilevich Popov (Chronicle No. 18) in a Special Psychiatric Hospital, and ordered compulsory treatment in a hospital of ordinary type.

It was reported in Chronicle No. 25 that a diagnostic commission in the Serbsky Institute had found V. Fainberg of sound mind. Later, however, a new court ruling arrived at the Leningrad Special Psychiatric Hospital where Fainberg was awaiting the hearing: "V. Fainberg requires compulsory treatment in a hospital of the ordinary type for a period of four to five months".

On 29 June Pyotr Grigorevich Grigorenko underwent one of the regular [six-monthly] psychiatric examinations. The commission resolved to extend the term of compulsory treatment.

The Expulsion of a Correspondent

On 5 May David Bonavia, Moscow correspondent of the London paper The Times, was ordered to leave the USSR.

On the same day the British government registered a protest. D. Bonavia is the twentieth foreign correspondent to be expelled from the USSR in the last two years. On 6 May the London Times, protesting at the expulsion of its correspondent from Moscow, reprinted word for word its protest at the expulsion of the Times correspondent from Berlin at the end of the thirties, changing only the name of the capital and the name of the correspondent. On 13 May The Times pointed out that throughout the entire history of the paper, apart from the two above-mentioned cases, there had been only one other instance of its correspondent being expelled: in 1903, Nikolai II had the Times correspondent [D. D. Brabant] expelled from Russia for his articles on the Jewish pogroms and the revolutionary movement.

The expulsion of D. Bonavia was preceded by an appropriate campaign in the Literary Gazette. The paper printed, for instance, a letter from an old-age pensioner in the Vitebsk region demanding Bonavia's expulsion [20 April, p. 9]. In connection with this letter a Times reader expressed his surprise that a publication in such short supply in the USSR as The Times was read by pensioners in the town of Vitebsk. The same reader also writes that when he was in the USSR he did not see The Times anywhere, but on his next visit he will certainly take a trip to Vitebsk and there obtain this paper which is so rare in the USSR. Another Times reader writes: "Please allow me to congratulate your correspondent on the well-deserved honour of being expelled from the USSR. Such honours are conferred only upon the most talented and objective correspondents".

The Stockholm paper Svenska Dagbladet writes that the expulsion of Bonavia is the best advertisement for him: it is clear that he is a good journalist and has a good understanding of Soviet affairs.
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“In Honour of Nixon”

The visit of American President Nixon to the USSR (22-30 May) was accompanied by some curious activities on the part of the authorities.

From 11 May onwards the following were summoned to district police-stations in Nilo-cow: I. S. Khodorovich, a member of the Action Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR, A. S. Volpin, a consultant of the Human Rights Committee, and fifteen active participants in the Movement for the Right of Jews to Leave for Israel. They were required to promise that during the visit of Nixon to the USSR they would not commit “anti-social acts”. All those summoned declared that they had not intended and did not intend to commit unlawful actions.

G. S. Podynpolsky, a member of the Action Group, A. S. Volpin, and Yu. A. Shikhmanovich were sent away from Nilo-cow on urgent business trips for the duration of Nixon’s visit.

From 19 May telephones began to be disconnected in people’s flats. In Moscow the telephones of members of the Action Group: P. I. Yakir, members of the Human Rights Committee, Academician A. D. Sakharov and V. N. Chalidze, and also of R. A. Medvedev and thirteen participants in the Jewish Movement to Leave, were disconnected. The telephones of nine of these thirteen persons have still not been re-connected. To V. Chalidze’s enquiry of the telephone repair service came the reply: “There has been some complicated damage to the cable. It will be repaired on 29 May”. During the same period several telephones in Kiev were disconnected. The telephone of Professor Brunauer (of Rigad) was cut off until at least June.

In Moscow at 8 o’clock on the morning of 21 May persons in civilian clothes, accompanied by police officials, presented themselves at the apartments of V. Prussakov (chronicle No. 25), and five activists in the Jewish Movement to Leave: R. Rutman, Doctor of Technical Science, L. Libov and V. Polsky, Masters of Technical Science, V. Slepak, an engineer, and B. Orlov, a historian; and without any legal grounds whatsoever, drove them all to various prisons outside Moscow. On 22 May Master of Technical Science J. Begun, and, on 24 May, the 20-year-olds A. Slepak and L. Tsypin, were jailed in the same manner. All the persons named above were held in prison until 31 May without any charge being brought against them. At the police stations their relatives were informed in verbal communications that the reason for the arrest was “breaches of the peace in the past, and intended breaches in the future”. Their wives were constantly, openly and crudely shadowed: the police agents burst into telephone booths, got into lifts, and sometimes even tried to enter the apartment to which their prey had gone. On 31 May the persons listed above were taken to

which overlooked streets along which Nixon was due to pass were forbidden to get near their windows on the relevant days. In Kiev on 27 May the police ordered T. I. Zhitnikova, the wife of Leonid Plyushch (see Chronicle No. 249) to sign an undertaking that she would not visit the city centre and public places for a period of four days. She was threatened that if she did so proceedings would be taken against her for “breach of the peace”.

In Minsk, Riga, Vilnius and Kishinyov several Jews were required to give written undertakings not to leave their cities for the duration of the visit. Instances are known of the police making persons of Jewish nationality get off trains and aircraft bound for Moscow. There was one case where the husband, a Russian, was allowed to board a plane, but his wife, a Jewess, was stopped. Aeroflot ticket-desks were known to refuse to sell tickets for Moscow to Jews as well known, since 1970 it has been necessary to present one’s identity-card in order to purchase an air ticket.

In Moscow at 8 o’clock on the morning of 21 May persons in civilian clothes, accompanied by police officials, presented themselves at the apartments of V. Prussakov (Chronicle No. 25), and five activists in the Jewish Movement to Leave: R. Rutman, Doctor of Technical Science, L. Libov and V. Polsky, Masters of Technical Science, V. Slepak, an engineer, and B. Orlov, a historian; and without any legal grounds whatsoever, drove them all to various prisons outside Moscow. On 22 May Master of Technical Science J. Begun, and, on 24 May, the 20-year-olds A. Slepak and L. Tsypin, were jailed in the same manner. All the persons named above were held in prison until 31 May without any charge being brought against them. At the police stations, their relatives were informed in verbal communications that the reason for the arrest was “breaches of the peace in the past, and intended breaches in the future”. Their wives were constantly, openly and crudely shadowed: the police agents burst into telephone booths, got into lifts, and sometimes even tried to enter the apartment to which their prey had gone. On 31 May the persons listed above were taken to
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their local police stations, where KGB employees told them that they had isolated them with the aim of preventing any possible breaches of the peace on their part during Nixon's visit. (For reference: Soviet legislation does not provide for preventive detention.) On the morning of Nixon's arrival in Leningrad, engineer L. Lerner* was detained on the street as he was on his way to work; he was taken to a police station and held there until evening with no explanation. In Kiev two people* were likewise held with no explanation for four days.

On 22 May V. Prestin was detained on the street in Moscow. He was charged with "pestering a woman." The woman who had reported this to the police was one of the police spies following Prestin that day. A People's Judge in the Kalinin district of Moscow sentenced Prestin to fifteen days' imprisonment for "petty hooliganism." Before this, on 21 May, Prestin had already declared a hunger strike in protest against the arrest of his friends, and he kept up this hunger strike until the moment of his release from prison. In Leningrad solo ballet-dancer of the Kirov Theatre of Opera and Ballet V. Panov,* who had recently applied to emigrate to Israel, was subjected to a militarized arrest for a fifteen-day period.

On 21 May KGB employees seized A. Tumerman* on a Moscow street and took him to Psychiatric Hospital No. 5. He was held there until 30 May. Throughout this time Tumerman kept up a hunger strike. On 24 May Tumerman wrote a letter to Nixon requesting him to "raise the question of civil rights in the USSR*.

On 20 May, in an interview with an Associated Press correspondent,* P. Yakir said: "As far as I know, summit meetings do not usually concern themselves with problems of internal affairs. However, many problems of this kind (for instance, the question of guaranteeing the rights of the individual) have long since ceased to be the internal affair of a particular country and become international problems. The discussion of these problems by leaders of the major powers is a matter of interest both for those countries and for the whole of mankind." Giving examples of political persecution in our country in recent years, P. Yakir concluded as follows: "One would like to think that after the visit of Nixon the forces of reaction will not be intensified, that people will cease to be arrested and put in lunatic asylums for their beliefs. It is time to put an end to the Middle Ages."

Shevchenko Day in the Ukraine

21 May is the anniversary of the bearing of T. Shevchenko's ashes from St. Petersburg to the Ukraine. For many years now the Ukrainian public has commemorated this day by laying wreaths at the Shevchenko memorial in Kiev, and by singing and dancing round the statue [see Reddaway, p. 288]. In recent years the authorities have attempted to give the entire day's proceedings in the Shevchenko Park an official character: a platform has been erected around the memorial, teams of performers sent, and concerts organized. However, along with the official enterprises there have usually nonetheless been some "amateur" folk festivities. This year the authorities resolved to put a stop to any attempts to honour the poet's memory. The Shevchenko Park was surrounded by cordons of police, *druzhinniki* and "plain-clothes men". The police chased away people who stopped on the streets bordering the park. Without any explanation, policemen, *druzhinniki* and "plain-clothes men" seized persons trying to approach the Shevchenko memorial, those trying to sing Ukrainian songs, and even those dressed in Ukrainian embroidered shirts or wearing Shevchenko badges on their chests. Over
fifty people were detained. Some of them were sentenced the next day to fifteen days' imprisonment for “resistance to authority”.

**The Press-Conference of J. Dobosch**

On 5 June a press-conference by J. Dobosch (Chronicle No. 24 [and note 20 to the Amnesty edition]) was shown on Ukrainian television. At this press-conference J. Dobosch made a statement. We cite extracts from this statement:

"I have been requested . . . to make the following statement. Jarošlav Dobosch, a Belgian citizen, was born in West Germany in 1947. Prior to my arrival in the Soviet Union I was living in Belgium . . . and studying in my fifth year in the faculty of sociology at the Catholic University . . . In 1967 I joined a nationalist organization—the Ukrainian Youth Association (SUM). This organization consists of young people who . . . are fighting . . . for the creation of an independent Ukraine . . . In fact this organization is directed by the OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists) . . . In the autumn of 1971, as an active member of SUM, I was elected chairman of the Belgian section of this organization . . . Carrying out the instructions of SUM . . . I left Brussels on 27 December 1971 . . . for the Soviet Union . . . My task was as follows: in Kiev and Lvov . . . I was to meet Ivan Svitlychny, Zinoviya Franko, Anna Kocurova and Leonid Seleznenko (see Chronicle Nos. 24, 25) and Stefaniya Hulyk, and obtain through them anti-Soviet and other information with the aim of using it in the West, and also I was to hand over money to some of these people . . . On 29 December I arrived in Kiev . . . I was in Kiev from 29 December to 1 January . . . At pre-arranged places I met I. Svitlychny, Z. Franko and L. Seleznenko, and with their help I met A. Kocurova. I gave to all these persons information about the anti-Soviet activities of Ukrainian organizations in the West, and told them that Ukrainian nationalists were collaborating with the Zionists in their activities, and I obtained from them the political information I required and documents relating to it. I gave to I. Svitlychny and Z. Franko 50 rubles each for their support, and I also gave 50 rubles for the filmed documents. Continuing to carry out my instructions, I came to Lvov on 3 January . . . On 3 January I met S. Hulyk. During this meeting I informed her about the anti-Soviet activities of nationalist organizations in the West, obtained from her the political and other information we needed, and gave her 30 rubles for her support. Having completed my mission in full I left Lvov on 5 January. At Chop, the frontier station, I was arrested for the crime I had committed and criminal proceedings were instituted against me. I confessed to having committed a heinous crime against the Soviet state. At the investigation I gave an account of all my hostile activities in the Ukraine. I expressed the hope that the organs, taking into consideration my youth and my frank confession, would come to a humane decision on my case. I give the Soviet government my assurance that never again in my life will I engage in anti-Soviet activity and, if I am given the opportunity to return to Belgium, once there, I will never commit any acts against the Soviet Union."

After this, Dobosch replied to questions from representatives of the Soviet public and press attending the conference. At the close of the conference it was announced that, taking into account J. Dobosch's frank confession, it had been resolved to discharge him from criminal responsibility and deport him from the USSR.

Naturally the question arises: will the chief witness for the prosecution, J. Dobosch, appear at the trial of I. Svitlychny, L. Seleznenko and the others, or will his testimony, as was the case with the testimony of H. Sebreghts at the trial of V. Bukovsky (Chronicle No. 23), not be subject to cross-examination at the judicial hearing?

[34] Hulyk is a former official of the Lvov branch of the Society to Preserve Cultural and Historical Monuments. See the Ukrainian Herald Nos. 3 and 4, Seleznenko, in an "open letter" presumably written in prison, confesses to meeting Dobosch and to giving his former student Kocurova a collection of poems by V. Stus. See the Ukrainian paper Robitnicha hazera, 8 July 1972, and a full translation in the paper News from Ukraine (English version of Visna Ukraina), 6 Zoloto vorota St., Kiev-34, No. 17, August 1972.

[35] In a press-statement released on 12 June Dobosch retracted much of this testimony.
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New Functions for the [Security] Organs

On 2 July the Ninth International Congress of Gerontologists opened in Kiev. An hour before the inauguration of the congress, the well-known Soviet biologist Zh. A. Medvedev, propounder of a theory on the causes of ageing which has been received with much interest, was detained and expelled from Kiev. Zh. A. Medvedev is the author of works which have circulated widely in samizdat, and have been published in the West: A History of the Biological Debate in the USSR, International Cooperation between Scientists and National Frontiers, Secrecy of Correspondence is Guaranteed by Law, and A Question of Madness (written jointly with R. A. Medvedev, being an account of the compulsory hospitalization of Zh. A. Medvedev in a psychiatric hospital—see Chronicle No. 14). The story of Medvedev's highly original "participation" in the congress runs as follows: about a year ago Zh. A. Medvedev accepted a proposal from the Council of the International Association of Gerontologists to deliver a lecture at the Kiev congress. Such a proposal is traditionally regarded as a mark of recognition of the researcher's indisputable success. Soon afterwards he was also invited by the Soviet organizing committee in Kiev to participate in the congress. Zh. A. Medvedev sent the organizing committee a resume of his lecture, the necessary documents and the registration fee. But shortly before the congress the organizing committee returned his fee and informed Medvedev that in connection with the large number of applications to deliver lectures, his address had not been included in the agenda of the congress. Medvedev communicated the decision of the organizing committee to the Council of the International Association of Gerontologists. The Association's President expressed his bewilderment at this action on the part of the organizing committee, which had been taken without the Council's consent and in defiance of its wishes. 

Depressed thus of his official invitation to the congress, Zh. A. Medvedev took his normal holiday leave and on

29 June travelled to Kiev, where he stayed with friends. A Vice-President of the International Association of Gerontologists and Chairman of the organizing committee, Academician D. F. Chebotaryov of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, and his deputy on the organizing committee, in a talk with Medvedev, turned down his request to participate in the work of the congress, alluding first to the absence of vacant rooms in hotels and then to the lack of time to complete the formalities. However, it was indicated that entrance to the conference sessions was unrestricted. Prior to the start of the congress Zh. A. Medvedev had professional meetings with several Soviet and foreign scientists.

On 2 July, the day of the official inauguration of the congress, Medvedev noticed that he was being shadowed. An hour before the opening, as he stood near the theatre where the opening ceremony was to be held, he was surrounded by a group of six plain-clothes men accompanied by a police officer. The persons surrounding Medvedev ordered him to go along with them. To Medvedev's question of why, or at least, by whom he was being detained, they did not reply. At that moment a group of people wearing congress badges appeared nearby. Noticing this, the plain-clothes men grabbed Medvedev by the arms, bundled him into a car and drove him to a police station. At the police station Medvedev was accused of disturbing the peace, the allegation being made first that this had taken the form of resistance to a representative of authority, and then that he had attempted to gain entrance to a congress with which he had no connection. The persons who talked with Medvedev were fully aware of the fact that his lecture had been included in the congress's agenda and that he had had an interview with Chebotaryov. Medvedev was in the police station for about five hours. Finally he was told simply that he must leave Kiev, and that if he tried to return to the congress he would be expelled again. Although Medvedev had not named the address of the friends with whom he was staying, a little

ährial

[13. Among them Dr. David Gersten of Israel and Dr. Leonard Hayflick of Stanford, who recounted his subsequent meetings with Medvedev in Moscow to correspondents. See an AP dispatch dated 11 July. The whole episode was widely covered by the western press on 5-7 July.]
while later his luggage was brought by one of the “plain-clothes men”. Medvedev was handed a ticket to Moscow, for which he paid there and then. The employee of the mysterious organs or authority who escorted him to the station stood on the platform until the train left.

Zh. A. Medvedev turned out to be the only Soviet scholar whose works were mentioned in the opening address by the President of the International Association of Gerontologists [Dr. Nathan Shock of Baltimore].

Recently Zh. A. Medvedev was officially informed that his request to attend the International Biophysical Congress in Moscow in August 1972 as a guest had been granted. Shortly afterwards, however, on the order of the General Secretary of the organizing committee of the Biophysical Congress, L. P. Kayushin, he was rejected in connection with the limited seating accommodation.

Events in Lithuania

On 14 May, in one of the squares of Kaunas, Romas Kalanta (born 1953), who had finished secondary education and was the son of a college lecturer, died by self-immolation, under the banner “Freedom for Lithuania”. Three of his friends surrounded the burning youth and would not allow anyone to approach him. They were arrested and charged with “premeditated murder with aggravating circumstances” (equivalent of article 102 in the Russian Criminal Code). Their names are so far unknown to the Chronicle.

R. Kalanta died in hospital a few hours later. His funeral was scheduled for 18 May. A few hours before the appointed time his body was secretly taken from the morgue and buried. People who had arrived for the funeral gathered at the place of his self-immolation. A very large crowd gathered. The police set about dispersing it. The assembly offered resistance. Rumour has it that one policeman died. After this troops were called in, and they dispersed the crowd. The “disorders” continued on 19 May also. Many people were arrested. Some were given ten to fifteen days’ imprisonment for “petty hooliganism”.

Criminal proceedings were instituted against several people.

A Kaunas newspaper printed a photocopy of a letter from the parents of Kalanta: “A great misfortune has befallen our family—the suicide of our son. Everyone understands the grief of his parents. But some irresponsible elements, taking advantage of our misfortune, are talking of the persecution of relatives, and trying to disturb law and order in the town. Others, simply out of curiosity, are following their example, thereby causing us even greater pain. No one has the human right to behave thus. The greatest comfort to our family would be to be left in peace.” This letter was reprinted in newspapers in Vilnius in the Lithuanian and Russian languages.

The Chairman of Kaunas City Soviet Executive Committee [J. M. Seris] appeared on Kaunas television with “interpretations”. In particular, he said: “The investigating organs have enquired into and elucidated the circumstances of this suicide. A forensic-medical commission was created. The doctors who participated in its work were: J. Andriuskevičienė, Reader in the Faculty of Medicine at Vilnius University; V. Berneris, Head Doctor of Kaunas Psycho-neurological Hospital; J. Gutmanas, Chief Psychiatrist of the Lithuanian Ministry of Health; I. Surkus, Professor at Kaunas Medical Institute; and other specialists in the field [among them A. Daukšienė]. Having carried out a forensic-psychiatric examination and studied the documents, letters and sketches of the deceased at its disposal, and also taking into account the evidence of parents, teachers and friends, the commission came to the conclusion that Romas Kalanta was mentally ill and had committed suicide while in a morbid frame of mind. Certain irresponsible persons, a group of juveniles, not understanding, and incorrectly appraising, the above-mentioned fact, and devoid of any sense of responsibility, tried to disturb law and order in the town . . . . We appeal to school directors, teachers, parents and young people and . . . .

[38. Prof. Kayushin's repressive role in another case was described in Chronicle 8. See Reddaway, p. 409.]
call upon them to assist in safeguarding the peace in this town."

In one issue of the paper Kauno Tiesa letters were published "condemning the acts of hooliganism".

On 22 May the same paper printed an article "Who are They, these Disturbers of the Peace?". The article says: "On 18 and 19 May a small band of hooligans caused a disturbance of law and order. In order to inform our readers who these hooligans are, the editors addressed themselves to the town Procuracy. There we discovered that the majority are persons with previous records of conviction on more than one occasion for hooliganism and other criminal offences. They are long-haired, degenerate perverted hooligans, of unsightly appearance. Here are the character-references we have received on some of them." The article continues with a description of five of those arrested in the square. One of them, Genrikas Pociunas, a school-leaver, has had criminal proceedings instituted against him for "breach of the peace, insubordination and use of violence against members of the police force".

On 28 May, during a fair on the market-square of the town of Varena, Stonis (a sanitary technician born in 1949) and three of his friends hoisted the [Lithuanian] national flag. Stonis's friends were seized immediately by the police, but he himself managed to get away. Next day in the same square he set fire to himself." He died on 10 June in a military hospital. The funeral took place under police...

[40. This speech was also reported by Vilnius Radio in English on 27 May. Similar accounts of the commission's findings appeared in Kauno Tiesa, 20 May, and Svetakana Lieto, 21 May, and another such was given by I. Udaltsov at an official press-conference in Moscow on 25 May. According to an eyewitness of the events, however, Kalanta's friends said that he was mentally healthy, a member of the Kom- somol, and neither drunk nor disturbed when he immolated himself. See the Sunday Telegraph, London, 2 July 1972. For other press coverage see agency reports dated 21 and 22 May.]

[41. See AP and UPI dispatches from Moscow dated 13 June.]
Materials from Newspaper Articles

On 8 February the paper Peaza Pravda [Penza is 450m. SE of Moscow], under the heading "Legal Feature", published an article "The Fall" (by O. Telbukh) concerning the trial of A. S. Lakalov, who was accused of "the dissemination of deliberate fabrications defaming the Soviet system" (evidently article 190-1 of the Russian Criminal Code) and also probably of bribery. The charge is not precisely formulated in the article. There is merely an indication that Lakalov had, under the pseudonym of "A. Karpov", been sending letters to Radio Liberty, however not directly to the radio station but to the private address of one of its announcers. "God will protect the protected!"—remarks the author of the article at this point. (Evidently the author, and his editor and censor with him, regards the X-ray inspection of mail as a matter of course, and is referring ironically to the naive precautions taken by Lakalov.)

Under the same pseudonym, says the article, Lakalov tried to take part in a debate in Komsomolskaya Pravda. It is not clear from the article how all these letters came to be known to the investigation. It is alleged merely that "These lampoons were exposed by simple Soviet people". The verdict of the court is not cited in the feature. It is said simply to have been "harsh but just".

Extra-judicial Persecution

At the beginning of December the "Circle of Christian Democratic Students" asked the Soviet Ambassador in West Germany, V. M. Falin, to either refute or condemn certain facts regarding the persecution of dissenters in the USSR. In reply, representatives of the circle were invited to a meeting with Soviet press-attaché Bogomolov, which took place on 10 December. In a discussion about the affair of Sinyavsky and Daniel, Bogomolov asked his guests what would be their attitude towards a West German writer who praised the West German system in some of his works while simultaneously criticizing that system in other works published abroad under a pseudonym. They answered that a Western writer had every opportunity to publish criticism of any kind in his own country: nor, moreover, was publication abroad at all at variance with the law. When they expressed an interest in knowing why certain psychiatric hospitals in the USSR were under the jurisdiction of the KGB, Bogomolov replied that there might be cases of mental sickness amongst foreign spies. They had to be treated, and so they were accommodated in clinics under the authority of the KGB.

[An account of this interview was published in the paper Rheinischer Merkur, 17 December 1971.]
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In the Spring of 1971 the Belorussian composer G. Shinna, speaking at a plenum of the board of the Composers' Union, referred disparagingly to the experiments of young composers in the field of musical form; he said that it was precisely such attitudes that had led to the events in Czechoslovakia. The Kiev conductor Igor Blazhkov expressed his strong objection to Shinna from the floor. When Shinna continued to speak in the same vein, Blazhkov walked out of the hall. Some time later Kiev's composers were asked to condemn Blazhkov's conduct. The young composers Godzatinskii, Grabovskii and Silvestrov, all only recently accepted into the Composers' Union, refused to do so. All three were expelled from the Union for a year. A year later, in the Spring of 1972, the question of the renewal of their membership of the Union was raised, but the leaders of the Ukrainian branch of the Union said that "now was not the time to discuss the matter".

At a meeting of employees of the All-Russian Performing and Concert Society (VGKO) on 17 May, Party Committee Secretary A. V. Gibov demanded a condemnation of the behaviour of musicians Mikhail Gusev and Vladimir Kondratev. He told of how Gusev and Kondratev had held conversations about politics in a railway carriage and uttered critical remarks: their fellow-travellers in the compartment—a State farm chairman and a deputy to the Supreme Soviet—had denounced them in writing to the KGB, and the KGB had sent this denunciation on to the VGKO Party Committee. Despite the demands of those in attendance, Gibov declined to give the names of the authors of the letter of denunciation, or to read it out in full, justifying his refusal by saying that the letter was too long. He merely stated that Gusev and Kondratev had said that living conditions were better in West Germany than in the USSR, and that in our country the finest writers were not published. To Gusev's objection: "I had in mind Pasternak", Gibov rejoined: "We know what sort of person your Pasternak was!" Gusev said that he had only been speaking the truth and therefore he would not retract anything. The meeting gave Gusev and Kondratev a public reprimand.

In mid-May Elena Alekseyevna Kosterina, daughter of A. E. Kosterin (see Chronicle No. 5), was dropped from the party bureau and expelled from the party "for activities incompatible with continued membership of the CPSU, and support for anti-Soviet elements". This "activity" and "support" consisted in the fact that in May 1969 E. A. Kosterina has associated herself with a letter sent by the Action Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR to the UN (see Chronicle No. 9); she had also signed one of the collective letters in defence of V. Bukovsky [see No. 22, note 3]. Here are a few excerpts from speeches on the occasion of Kosterina's expulsion. From the speech of a spokesman for a higher party committee: "... Our court knows what it is doing, but you defend the anti-Sovietists... You have recalled your father, who was convicted in 1937. Well, he was rightly convicted..." From the speech of the party bureau secretary: "... I have not read the letters which Kosterina signed, but in those letters people are defended whose relations with the higher organs are not all they should be..." From a speech by a member of the party bureau: "... Solzhenitsyn wrote a calumny in his work A Day in the Life of Ivan Trofimovich (sic)... I do not know Bukovsky, but since he was convicted, it must have been right..." After the meeting, at which Kosterina was...
expelled from the party, the participants said: "We don't really know why Kosterina has been expelled. She signed some letters or other, but they didn't show them to us or read them out. But since it was a party bureau decision, it must have been something bad." On 25 June by order of the chief administrator, Kosterina was relieved of her post as station director without any explanation, and transferred to temporary work for a period of two months.

A few days later employees of the KGB presented themselves at Kosterina's home with an order for the seizure of a typewriter. The order had been made in connection with case No. 24 (see Chronicle No. 24). Since there turned out to be no typewriter in her home they left after ten minutes.

News in Brief

Moscow

At 5 o'clock on 23 May the editor of the journal Verkh, Vladimir Osipov, was walking along a Moscow street. A policeman approached him and, after checking his documents, ordered Osipov to get into a car that had driven up. Osipov was driven to police station No. 2, there, without any explanation and without the sanction of a Procurator, he was subjected to a body search, had his fingerprints taken, and a statement was drawn up concerning his violation of the residence regulations. Are the authorities not preparing to prosecute V. Osipov, as they once did A. Marchenko (see Chronicle No. 3), for a breach of the secret "Statute on Identity-cards" (see also article 198 of the Russian Criminal Code)? Furthermore, the police, again without any Procurator's sanction, confiscated everything in Osipov's briefcase (academic and literary materials).

On 5 June V. Osipov wrote a letter to the Minister of Internal Affairs, N. A. Shchelokov, about the unlawful incident that had occurred, demanding the return of his belongings that had been taken from him and the punishment of the guilty persons.

On 3 July M. N. Landa (see Chronicle No. 25) was declared a suspect under article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code. Until then she had been summoned to interrogations in the capacity of a witness.

At the beginning of June leaflets addressed to working people were distributed in Moscow. The subject of the leaflets was economics. The Chronicle does not know the precise content of the leaflet."

[49. Among many dispatches giving extracts from it, the longest was a New York Times one dated 20 June. It exists in a full version and two shorter ones. See Russian texts in Possee 8, 1972, pp. 13-15, and Russkaya mysl, August 24. The full text appears in French in Cahiers du Samizdat, 105 3ème du Dour, 1170 Brussels, No. 1, 1972.]
Mordovia

In June 1972 prisoners convicted at the Leningrad aeroplane trial (Chronicle No. 17) declared a hunger strike in connection with the second anniversary of their arrest. One of the strikers' demands was: "inasmuch as the Israeli government had granted them Israeli citizenship they should be transferred to a camp for foreigners.

Gennady Guvrilov (see Chronicle Nos. 10, 11, 15) has been transported from Mordovia to the Lefortovo KGB Investigation Prison, apparently for interrogation.

Kiev

On 25 May employees of the Department of Internal Affairs presented themselves at the apartments of Zinovy Melamed, Lazar Slutsky and Alexander Feldman, and escorted them to a police station. There they were required to put their signatures to a typewritten text concerning the "non-commission of anti-Soviet acts". When they refused to do so they were put in a preventive detention cell. Melamed and Slutsky were released on 27 May, A. Feldman on 30 May.

On 25 May Kl. Geldman received a summons to come to a police station. There she was charged with causing a breach of the peace. After this she was placed under arrest for fifteen days. As a protest against her groundless arrest Kl. Geldman declared a hunger strike from the very first day of her imprisonment.

On 25 May S. Borschchevsky was stopped on the street by a stranger who stated that Borschchevsky had pushed him. There happened to be some druzhinniki standing nearby. Borschchevsky was taken off to a People's Court where he was sentenced to fifteen days' imprisonment for "petty hooliganism", which had consisted in his having "expressed himself in obscene language and insulted national pride . . ." (whose is not known—Chronicle). A. Feldman, Kl. Geldman, and S. Borschchevsky are being questioned as witnesses in the case of L. Plyushch and L. Serednyak (see Chronicle No. 24).

The son of Nadiya Svitlychna (see Chronicle No. 25) has been returned to his relatives.

Releases

Valery Ronkin [see Reddaway, passim] has been released from camp and sent to serve his term of exile in Syktyvkar. He was sentenced in Leningrad in 1965 to seven years' imprisonment and three years' exile, for participating in a clandestine Marxist circle which produced the journal Kolokol [The Bell].

On 12 June, upon the expiry of his term of imprisonment, Khakhayev was released from camp. He still has three years' exile to serve.

Departures

On 22 May the artist Yury Titov and his wife Elena Stroyeva left the USSR. When they received their luggage in Rome, all Titov's paintings were found to have been burned through with sulphuric acid.

On 25 May Kl. Geldman received a summons to come to a police station. There she was charged with causing a breach of the peace. After this she was placed under arrest for fifteen days. As a protest against her groundless arrest Kl. Geldman declared a hunger strike from the very first day of her imprisonment.

On 25 May S. Borschchevsky was stopped on the street by a stranger who stated that Borschchevsky had pushed him. There happened to be some druzhinniki standing nearby. Borschchevsky was taken off to a People's Court where he was sentenced to fifteen days' imprisonment for "petty hooliganism", which had consisted in his having "expressed himself in obscene language and insulted national pride . . ." (whose is not known—Chronicle). A. Feldman, Kl. Geldman, and S. Borschchevsky are being questioned as witnesses in the case of L. Plyushch and L. Serednyak (see Chronicle No. 24).

The son of Nadiya Svitlychna (see Chronicle No. 25) has been returned to his relatives.

Releases

Valery Ronkin [see Reddaway, passim] has been released from camp and sent to serve his term of exile in Syktyvkar. He was sentenced in Leningrad in 1965 to seven years' imprisonment and three years' exile, for participating in a clandestine Marxist circle which produced the journal Kolokol [The Bell].

On 12 June, upon the expiry of his term of imprisonment, Khakhayev was released from camp. He still has three years' exile to serve.

Departures

On 22 May the artist Yury Titov and his wife Elena Stroyeva left the USSR. When they received their luggage in Rome, all Titov's paintings were found to have been burned through with sulphuric acid.

[51. Wife of Dmytro Shumuk since 1969. Shumuk was arrested in January (see No. 25) and reportedly sentenced to ten years of strict-regime camps and five of exile on 5 July in Kiev. See the Ukrainian American paper Svoboda, 22 July.]

[52. Sergei Khakhayev belonged to the same group as Ronkin. See Petrov-Agafonov's portrait of him in Grani 83, p. 52.]

[53. See a UPI dispatch from Rome dated 8 June, and Time, 19 June, which carries a picture of Titov with a destroyed painting.]
On 20 May, Alexander Volpin, the poet and mathematician (who has opened up a new field in fundamental mathematics), a consultant of the Human Rights Committee, and the son of Sergei Esenin, left the USSR.\[54\]

Jerusalem
During Nixon’s visit to Moscow repatriates from the USSR carried out a hunger strike at the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem in protest at the persecution of Jews in the USSR. About 200 people took part in the hunger strike, most of them young. They also staged a demonstration in front of the building of the Orthodox Mission, where Patriarch Pimen, who had come to Israel, was staying. The demonstrators chanted “Let My People Go!” and handed in a petition to the Patriarch demanding freedom of religion in the USSR.\[55\]

Brussels
At the end of 1971 an “International Committee on the Situation of Minorities and on Human Rights in the USSR”4 was founded, with its headquarters in Brussels. Directly concerned in the founding of the Committee were Nobel Peace Prize winner and President of the International Institute for the Rights of Man, René Cassin, and René Cassin, and...

[54] See his statement about the current threat to the Human Rights Committee, and especially to V. Chalidze, in The Times, 21 July 1972; also note 54 to Chronicle 24, and his long interview in Russkaya mysl, 14 September.


[56] At its first conference, held in Paris in June 1972, the committee renamed itself “The International Committee for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR”. Its Honorary President is René Cassin, its President is Major-General A. Guérisse, alias Pat O’Leary and also President of the International Union of Resistance and Déportée Movements, and its Secretary-General is Hubert Halin, also editor of La Voe Internationale de la Résistance. Its address is 28, place Flagey, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium. A detailed account of the first conference, including the contributions to it by L. Rigerman, Yu. Titov and E. Shirovaeva, appears in Human Rights in the USSR No. 6-7, 1972.

the Norwegian public figure Odd Nansen, son of Fridjof Nansen. The Committee has begun publishing, in French, English and Russian [in fact only in English and French], an information bulletin Human Rights in the USSR, a voluntary group attached to the Committee has published a French language edition of Nos. 19 and 20 of the Chronicle of Current Events.

London
The International Committee for Amnesty of Political Prisoners [correctly: Amnesty International] has published an English edition of all the issues [in fact only No. 16 onwards] of the Chronicle of Current Events and is continuing to publish issues as they appear. In Sweden the SMOG-Committee is publishing a Swedish translation of the Chronicle of Current Events.\[57\]

In 1972 the publishing-house Polonia Book Fund in London published a book in Polish [Kronika Bytowyh Wydanech] consisting of the complete texts of Nos. 1-12 of the Chronicle of Current Events and excerpts from Nos. 13-16 of the Chronicle. In the introduction to the book the translators, Nina Karso and Seymon Sechler, write: “... in the Summer of 1968 an unusual text found its way to the West... From that day issues of the Chronicle began to appear steadily in samizdat, and to reach the West at regular intervals of two months. And probably no-one realised at that time how tremendously significant this journal was to be for the development of the democratic movement and in particular for informing the...”

Available from the committee at P.O. Box 7053, Uppsala, Sweden. The only regular publication of the Chronicle in Russian is in the journal Volnoye Samizdat, Samizdat, Presse-Verlag, Frankfurt, No. 1 (1972) of this journal has published Chronicle 21, No. 2 Chronicle 22, No. 3 Chronicle 23, No. 4 Chronicle 24 and 25, and No. 5 is due to publish Chronicle 26. The Chronicle is also published regularly in Italian, in condensed form, in Russia Cristiana, Milan.

Western public about events in the Soviet Union. The Chronicle's laconic, to-the-point, non-editorializing, we might even say dry reporting on judicial and extra-judicial terror, conditions in Soviet prisons, camps and prison psychiatric hospitals . . . and, finally, the review of samizdat news which appears in each issue—all of this has become the chief and sole source of accurate information, especially for those who wish to make use of such information. . . . For the Western press the Chronicle has become a source of non-falsified information. It is thus fulfilling a task of prime importance: the informing and consequently the mobilization of the Western public, so that it should react more strongly than it has in the past to what is happening in the Soviet Union. There is still a great deal that can and must be done in this sphere; truth to tell, what has been done is very little, but for what has been achieved we are indebted to samizdat and to the Chronicle in particular”.

The English language book Uncensored Russia has come out in London. Its compiler is the English historian Peter Reddaway. The book contains the text of the first eleven numbers of the Chronicle, split up into chapters and sections. The text of the Chronicles is annotated, and accompanied by an introductory article by the compiler. The book contains many photographs. The forward to the book is by J. Telesin (see Chronicle No. 14).

Letters and Documents

In May 1972 there appeared in samizdat an open letter, whose authors are concerned about the fate of K. Lyubarsky, V. Chornovil, I. Svitlychny, D. Shumuk and L. Plyushch (see Chronicle Nos. 24 and 25), who were arrested in January 1972, and others. The letter talks of the protracted periods of investigation and the refusal of the authorities to release K. A. Lyubarskiy, for whom Academician A. D. Sakharov and Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences I. R. Shafarevich have offered to stand bail. The authors call on readers to demand free admission and publicity at the forthcoming trials. The letter carries 17 signatures.

On 7 June Vladimir Osipov sent a letter to Angela Davis asking her to petition the Soviet government for the release of I. Ogurtsov (see Chronicle No. 1), V. Bukovsky and P. G. Grigorenko.

At the end of June the Action Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR, in an Appeal to the UN Secretary-General, protested against the new wave of persecuting people for their beliefs, the violation of the principle of the presumption of innocence, the brutal treatment of political prisoners and persons under investigation, and the criminal use of psychiatry as a means of bringing pressure on freedom of conscience.

On 7 June the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet issued a decree. The first paragraph of this decree says: “For the illegal transmission, concealment from examination or attempted transmission, by whatever means, to convicted persons, of articles, food products, money, liquor, and also other substances and goods prohibited from use in corrective labour institutions, it has been laid down that where such activities do not involve criminal responsibility the guilty parties shall be subject to an administratively imposed fine of from ten to fifty rubles, or to measures of social pressure.”

Academiains Sakharov and Leontovich sent the following telegram to the Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, Academician [M. D.] Millionshchikov: “In connection with the forthcoming ratification, at a session of the Supreme Soviet, of Decree No. 615 of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of 7 June 1972, we ask you to bring the following statement to the attention of the deputies.

The culpability for illegal transmission of food products to prisoners which is established by the Decree is an official
indication of the existence of a régime of chronic starvation in our camps and prisons. No-one would resort to illegal transmission if there were no necessity for it.

The Decree opens up possibilities of making the tragic situation of prisoners, which is well known to us from a multitude of reliable sources, even worse, by instituting searches of prisoners and their visitors.

We call upon deputies to vote against ratification of the shameful Decree of 7 June 1972. We call upon deputies to speak out for a reform of corrective labour legislation, with the aim of putting an end to the intolerable torturing of prisoners through starvation.

Mikhail Dmitrievich, we should like to think that you will not be indifferent”.

This statement was not brought to the attention of deputies. The Decree, of course, was ratified.”

On 29 June the Human Rights Committee studied a paper by Committee-member A. N. Tverdokhlebov, “Notes on legislation in the field of intensifying the struggle against persons who evade socially useful labour and lead an anti-social, parasitic way of life”, and passed an “Opinion” on the subject.

In its “Opinion”, the Committee expresses in particular the wish that punishment should be decreed only in cases where it is clearly indicated what it is that is being punished, i.e. (in relation to the problem under examination) that the meanings of “anti-social, parasitic way of life” and “socially useful labour” should be unequivocally defined. The Committee considers that housekeeping and the bringing up of children should be regarded as socially useful labour, and furthermore that in accordance with article 122 of the USSR Constitution men should enjoy equal rights with women in this question. The Committee points out that the use of labour as a punishment contradicts a proposition in the Constitution, that “labour is a matter of honour”;

Finally, the Committee considers that penalties may be imposed only for particular actions, not for a way of life.

[59. It was published in Vedomosti Verkhovnogo Soveta RSFSR, 15 June 1972, and ratified at the Supreme Soviet session of 29-30 June.]
Veche materials and the consequently rushed publication of issue No. 5, two major articles on August have been omitted. The editors protest at the dishonest campaign in the official press against this unpublished novel.

11. The section “Our mail” publishes a letter by a group of people who feel that in our time not only persons of Orthodox faith, but also those who profess other religions, and even atheists, including followers of Marxism-Leninism, can be Russian patriots.

12. The “Chronicle” section of No. 5 reports on the threat made to historian L. Rendel by the Kalinin Procurator (see Chronicle Nos. 1 and 21); on a letter by a group of employees of the Kirov Theatre of Opera and Ballet (in Leningrad); and cites also a letter by the editor of Veche, V. N. Osipov, to the Director-General of UNESCO, René Maillot, requesting that the materials of the June 1972 Stockholm Conference on the Protection of the Environment be sent to his address.

The “Memorandum” of A. D. Sakharov

On 5 March 1971 Academician A. D. Sakharov sent a “Memorandum” to L. I. Brezhnev. “It has remained unanswered. I do not feel I have the right to defer its publication any longer,” says A. D. Sakharov in a “Postscript” written in June 1972.

As in his previous works (“Reflections on Progress . . . , summer 1968–see Chronicle No. 5; and the letter to party and government leaders written jointly with V. F. Turchin and R. A. Melvede in March 1970 –see Chronicle No. 13) the author’s basic thesis is that consistent and profound democratization is essential to Soviet society.

Pointing out that the “Memorandum” “lists questions which vary in importance and their degree of self-evidence”, A. D. Sakharov formulates, in the first section, his proposals with regard to urgent problems. (From here on italics indicate sub-sectional headings in the “Memorandum”).

Concerning political persecution. A general amnesty for political prisoners is essential; this includes, for instance, persons convicted on religious grounds and those confined in psychiatric institutions. Really free access and publicity are essential in the hearing of judicial cases, as is the review of judicial verdicts delivered when these principles have been violated. There must be a law to protect the rights of persons subjected to compulsory psychiatric hospitalization. There must be acts of legislation concerning openness, freedom of information exchange and freedom of conscience.

The solution of problems of the nationalities and of the problem of leaving our country would be furthered by laws restoring in full the rights of peoples deported under Stalin, and laws ensuring that citizens may without hindrance exercise their right to leave the country and freely to return to it.


[65. See bibliographical details in Reddaway and in the Bibliography in No. 22-23.]
Concerning international problems. There must be a unilateral declaration of our refusal to be the first to use weapons of mass destruction, and we must allow inspection teams to visit our territory for effective arms control. We must alter our political position in the Middle East and in Vietnam, seek a peaceful settlement on a compromise basis, and propose that UN troops be widely used to secure stability in these areas.

The author's more general theses and proposals are expanded in the second section of the "Memorandum". Having remarked on the positive changes in the country since 1956, Sakharov notes the deviations, inconsistency and sluggishness in the implementation of the new line, and the need for a clear-cut and consistent programme of further democratization. Amongst the difficulties in social development, the author notes the aggravation of the nationalities problem, the complexities of the inter-relationship between the party-state apparatus and the intelligentsia, and also of their mutual relations with the majority of the working masses. The latter have become disillusioned with the "line words" of the privileged group of "bosses", whom the more backward sectors of the population, by virtue of traditional prejudices, frequently identify chiefly with the intelligentsia. A. D. Sakharov characterizes the society towards the realization of which urgent state reforms and the efforts of citizens should be directed. The chief aim of the state must be to protect and safeguard the rights of its citizens. "The Defence of Human Rights is higher than other aims". The actions of state institutions must be based entirely on laws that are stable and known to and binding for all citizens. "The happiness of the people must be guaranteed, in particular, by such free competition, economic independence of enterprises, and a review of a number of restrictions with regard to personnel selection, wages, etc.

Public control over the legality, justice and rightness of decisions as they are taken would be assisted by openness, which would promote progress, prosperity and national security. Competition, openness and the absence of privileges would ensure a suitable encouragement of hard work and a development of people's potential and initiative.
should be abolished. Privileges linked with professional or party status should be abolished, as should the system of nomenklatura [party control over the appointment of personnel]; the pay scales of high officials should be made public.

As measures to promote the expansion of agricultural production on private plots owned by collective farmers, state farm labourers and individual peasants, the author suggests an increase in the land holdings of these people, changes in fiscal policy, and changes in the system of supplying this sector with agricultural machinery, fertilizers, etc.

The author suggests increasing the opportunities for, and profitability of private enterprise in, for instance, the service industries, the health service, small trading and education.

The gradual abolition of the residence regulations is essential, as they violate citizens' rights and hinder the development of the productive forces of the country.

In the sphere of information exchange, culture, science and freedom of conscience, it is essential to encourage freedom of conscience, the spirit of enquiry and constructive concern. The jamming of foreign radio broadcasts must be halted, the international authors' copyright system adopted, and more foreign literature imported into the country. There should be a guarantee of the real separation of Church and State, and legal, material and administrative guarantees of freedom of conscience and worship.

In the social sciences and the humanities we must promote a widening of scope in creative endeavour, an unlimited use of foreign experience, and our own independence of all preconceived opinions.

In the social sphere the question of perhaps abolishing the death penalty should be explored. Special-regime and strict-regime imprisonment must be abolished and the prison system perfected, utilizing UN recommendations and foreign experience. The possibility should be considered of setting up a public organ of supervision with the aim of preventing the use of physical coercion against detainees, arrested persons, persons under investigation, and convicts. A drastic improvement in the quality of education is indispensable. To this end the author suggests increased salaries and independence for teachers; a less monolithic educational system; and additional guarantees of freedom of conscience. To improve the health service, it would be advisable, in particular, to expand the network of private establishments, increase the role of medical workers in private practice, and increase the salaries of medical personnel.

In the legal sphere the abolition of open and concealed forms of discrimination (with regard to national characteristics, beliefs, etc.) is essential; legal proceedings must be truly open; the [UN] Pacts on human rights must be ratified, and the Optional Protocol to these Pacts signed.

In the sphere of inter-relations between the national republics, a legal elaboration of the problem of the right of republics to secede, and the passing of a law guaranteeing this right, are desirable. The author advances, briefly, legal, political, economic and military arguments in favour of this point of view.


We quote extracts:

"...Our society is infected by apathy, hypocrisy, petit-bourgeois egoism and hidden cruelty. The majority of representatives of its upper stratum... cling tenaciously to their open and concealed privileges and are profoundly indifferent to violations of human rights... to the security and the future of mankind. Others, although deeply concerned in their hearts, cannot permit themselves any 'freedom of thought' and are condemned to the torment of internal conflict... The buds of moral regeneration... which sprouted after the curbing of the most extreme manifestations of the Stalinist system of blind terror, encountered no proper understanding on the part of ruling circles. The basic class, social and ideological features of the regime did not undergo any essential changes. With pain and alarm I have to note that after a period of largely illusory liberalism there is once again an increase in restrictions on ideological freedom, efforts to suppress information which is not controlled by the state, persecution of people for political and ideological reasons, and a deliberate aggravation of the nationalities problem..."

"... As before, I consider that it will be possible to overcome the tragic conflicts and dangers of our epoch
only through the convergence and mutual adaptation of capitalism and the socialist system. It seems to me now, more than ever before, that the only true guarantee for the preservation of human values in the chaos of uncontrollable changes and tragic upheavals is Man's freedom of conscience and his moral yearning for good ...

Corrigenda to Previous Issues

The search in the town of Uman (see Chronicle No. 24) concerned not E. L. Olitskaya but N. M. Surovtseva-Olitskaya, the wife of her elder brother, who lives in the same house.

Due to an oversight, it was stated in Chronicle No. 25 that the fate of G. I. Bendersky was unknown. In fact his fate was reported in Chronicle No. 13 and in the Supplement to No. 17: on 12 January 1970, while in the Kiev KGB investigation prison, he committed suicide. Also, Chronicle No. 25 made an error in G. I. Bendersky's initials.

The account of the Memorandum of Lithuanian Catholics to L. I. Brezhnev (in Chronicle No. 24) speaks of the destruction of churches. What the Memorandum actually says is that the authorities do not allow believers to restore derelict churches.

Additional Corrections

[In note 86 to Chronicle 23 the age of P. Airikyan (can also be transliterated correctly as Hairikyan) is given as 33. This should read 23.

Chronicle 19, pp. 180-181: two names are mis-spelt here and should read Averichkin and Zabak; and Vagin's sentence (cf. note 16) is definitely 8 years, not 10.]

[66. See note 37 to No. 25. The initials appeared as G. M. in the original text of No. 25, but are corrected in the translation.]
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