

**COMMISSION ON
SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515**

**REPORTS OF
HELSINKI ACCORD MONITORS
IN THE SOVIET UNION**

**VOLUME THREE
OF THE
DOCUMENTS OF THE PUBLIC GROUP TO PROMOTE OBSERVANCE
OF THE HELSINKI AGREEMENTS IN THE USSR**

**A PARTIAL COMPILATION, EDITED AND PREPARED BY THE STAFF
OF THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

NOVEMBER 7, 1978

Table of Contents

Page

I Statements of the Moscow Helsinki Group:

In Defense of Aleksandr Podrabinek and Iosif Terelya--An Appeal	1
Statement to the Press on Joining H.A.I.G.	2
Statement on Charter '77	4
On the Life of Soviet Workers by Anatoly Marchenko	5

II Documents of the Moscow Helsinki Group:

<u>Document No. 24</u> -- Discrimination Against the Crimean Tatars Continues	11
<u>Document No. 25</u> -- To the Heads of Signatory States of the Helsinki Final Act	23
<u>Document No. 27</u> -- On the Pre-Trial Detention of Orlov, Ginzburg and Shcharansky	25
<u>Document No. 31</u> -- An Appeal for Levko Lukyanenko	27
<u>Document No. 32</u> -- On Violations of the Right to a Free Choice of One's Country of Residence	29
<u>Document No. 33</u> -- In Defense of Aleksandr Zinoviev	36
<u>Document No. 34</u> -- Statement on the Lengthy Illegal Detention of Professor Yuri Orlov in Prison	38
<u>Document No. 35</u> -- Statement to the Belgrade Conference	40
<u>Document No. 36</u> -- Announcement on the Formation of an Association of Free Labor Unions in the Soviet Union	41
<u>Document No. 37</u> -- Statement on the Need to Create a Free and Independent Association of Disabled Persons	43
<u>Document No. 38</u> -- On the Right to a Fair Pension	45
<u>Document No. 39</u> -- On the Belgrade Conference	49
<u>Document No. 40</u> -- On the Case of Anatoly Shcharansky	50
<u>Document No. 41</u> -- On the Revocation of P.G. Grigorenko's Soviet Citizenship	51
<u>Document No. 42</u> -- On the Revocation of M. Rostropovich and G. Vishnevskaya's Soviet Citizenship	52
<u>Document No. 43</u> -- Discrimination Against the Crimean Tatars and Mustafa Dzhemilev	53
<u>Document No. 45</u> -- Persecution of Adventists	56
<u>Document No. 46</u> -- Deprivation of the Right to Employment and Housing on Political Grounds	59
<u>Document No. 47</u> -- The Abuse of Labor Legislation	65
<u>Document No. 48</u> -- Ten Years of 'The Chronicle of Current Events'	69
<u>Document No. 49</u> -- On Violations of the Right of Kolkhozniks to Emigrate and to Leave the Kolkhoz	70
<u>Document No. 50</u> -- The Trial of Professor Yuri Orlov	73
<u>Document No. 51</u> -- On the Arrest of Aleksandr Podrabinek	75
<u>Document No. 52</u> -- The Arrest of Vladimir Slepak and the Institu- tion of Criminal Proceedings Against Maria Slepak and Ida Nudel	77
<u>Document No. 53</u> -- Additional Information on the Orlov Trial	79

	<u>Document No. 54</u> -- On the Trials of Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel	89
	<u>Document No. 55</u> -- To the International Olympic Committee President, Lord M. Killanin	90
	<u>Document No. 56</u> -- On the Trials of Anatoly Shcharansky, Aleksandr Ginzburg and Viktoras Petkus	92
III	<u>Joint Statements of the Moscow and Ukrainian Helsinki Groups:</u>	
	A Pre-Belgrade Summary	97
	Supplement to Professor Yuri Orlov's Proposal for an International Conference on Declassification of Information	109
	The Rudenko-Tykhyy Trial	110
	New Repressions and a New Stage in the Human Rights Movement in the USSR	114
IV	<u>Documents of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group:</u>	
	<u>Memorandum No. 2</u> -- Concerning the Participation of Ukraine in the Belgrade Conference, 1977	130
	Statement on the Fate of Bohdan Chuiko	134
	To the Belgrade Conference to Review Implementation of the Helsinki Accords	138
	Information Bulletin No. 1	141
	An Open Letter on Mykola Rudenko	150
	A Letter to the Executive of the Socialist International and to all Socialists Throughout the World on Levko Lukyanenko	152
	Statement on the Trials of Helsinki Monitors	156
V	<u>Documents of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group:</u>	
	<u>Document No. 3</u> -- In Defense of Mart Niklus	158
	<u>Document No. 4</u> -- The Jurgutis and Anvoldaite-Belapetravichiene Family Reunification Cases	159
	<u>Document No. 5</u> -- The Arrest of Henrikas Jaskunas	160
	<u>Document No. 6</u> -- On Discrimination Against the Volga Germans in the USSR	161
	<u>Document No. 7</u> -- On Erik Udam and KGB Attempts to Enlist Him as a 'Dissident'	162
	<u>Document No. 8</u> -- Persecution of the Vasilev Family, Russian Pentecostals Living in Vilnius, Lithuania	163
	<u>Document No. 9</u> -- On the Situation of Lithuanian Former Political Prisoners	165
	<u>Document No. 10</u> -- On the Arrest of Balys Gajauskas	167
	<u>Document No. 11</u> -- On the Persecution of Enn Tarto	168
	<u>Document No. 12</u> -- On the Psychiatric Imprisonment of Algirdas Zipre	169
	Statement on the Situation of the Roman Catholic Church and of Other Believers in Lithuania	170

VI Documents of the Armenian Helsinki Group:

To the Delegates of the Belgrade Conference and Armenian Fellow Countrymen--Supplement	177
Statement of Armenian Helsinki Group Member Robert Nazaryan with a Request for Acceptance into the Helsinki Agree- ment Implementation Group	178
An Appeal to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR	179
An Appeal to Armenians Abroad	181
A Collection to Aid Political Prisoners and Their Families--A Supplement	182

INTRODUCTION

This volume is the third compilation of selected documents emerging from the Helsinki accord monitoring groups in the Soviet Union published by the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. In a sampling of reports written between late 1976 and the summer of 1978, it is intended, as in the previous compilations, to illustrate the broad range of human rights concerns of the various monitoring groups whose common goal is the furthering of Final Act implementation in their own country.

Efforts to promote CSCE compliance in the Soviet Union began in May of 1976 when 11 human rights activists in Moscow, led by Yuri Orlov, formed the first Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements. Inspired by its example, other Helsinki groups were formed in Kiev, Vilnius, Yerevan and Tbilisi. Additional independent organizations with more narrowly defined focus, such as the Christian Committee for the Defense of Believers' Rights and the Working Commission on the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, also emerged. Today, more than 50 group members, representing a broad spectrum of religious, ethnic and professional affiliations, are actively documenting human rights violations and engaged in promoting implementation of the Helsinki accord.

While maintaining their individual identities, Soviet monitoring groups have frequently collaborated in their efforts to promote human rights. When the Lithuanian and Ukrainian groups were formed, for example, the Moscow group sponsored a joint news conference to publicize their creation. The Christian Committee, composed of four members of the Russian Orthodox Church, has written appeals on behalf of Adventists, Jews and Baptists. On occasion, two or more groups have issued joint declarations and other documents.

Ordinary Soviet citizens, learning of the Helsinki groups via Western radio broadcasts, have traveled thousands of miles from remote regions in order to present documented evidence on human rights violations. Similarly, monitoring group members have journeyed great distances to conduct interviews and related research. Representatives of the Moscow group, for example, were sent to the northern Caucasus and to distant Nakhodka to visit Pentecostal communities desiring to emigrate.

The representative documents of the Soviet Helsinki monitoring groups reproduced here address a wide range of human rights concerns: repressions of group members, violations of the rights of ethnic minorities, difficulties of emigration from the USSR, problems of religious believers and difficulties of current and former political prisoners. Economic concerns are also treated in several documents in the compilation.

The Soviet monitoring groups carry out their work in an extremely repressive environment. Although 20 members of these organizations have been arrested and imprisoned, many new members have joined. Frequently, documents have been confiscated by the KGB. During a search of Orlov's apartment in Moscow, for example, material documenting persecution of parents advocating religious practices for their children was removed. In another case, Aleksandr Ginzburg's residence was searched and information on the health of seriously ill political prisoners was seized.

The documents of the Soviet Helsinki monitors are truly a testament to their strength, courage and dedication. Their long-range goal -- the achievement of a humane society based on respect for law -- has yet to be realized. But already they have attained a moral victory in gaining the attention and respect of private and governmental groups throughout the world.

(The Commission is grateful to Khronika Press of New York, ELTA News Service, the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners, Radio Liberty Research and Smoloskyp for assistance with some of the translations published in this collection).

* * * * *

Materials on the Soviet Helsinki Groups published by the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

1. Reports of Helsinki Accord Monitors in the Soviet Union; Documents of the Public Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR (February 24 and June 3, 1977)

2. Basket III: Implementation of the Helsinki Accords: Hearings before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; Volume IV: Soviet Helsinki Watch, Reports on Repressions (June 6, 1977)

3. The Right to Know, the Right to Act; Documents of Helsinki Dissent from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe (May 1978)

4. Profiles: The Helsinki Monitors (June 6, 1978)

5. Basket Three: Implementation of the Helsinki Accords: Hearings before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; Volume VI: Soviet Law and the Helsinki Monitors (June 6, 1978)

* * * * *

In the interest of providing information about the continuing activity of the Soviet Helsinki Groups, the staff of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe has prepared this compilation. The views expressed in these materials are those of the Soviet Helsinki Groups.

Information on the 20 Imprisoned Members
of the Soviet Helsinki Groups:

Moscow

Aleksandr Ginzburg - arrested February 3, 1977; charged with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 70 RSFSR CC). Convicted and sentenced on July 13, 1978 to 8 years in special regimen labor camp; RSFSR, Mordovian ASSR, pos. Sosnovka, Uchr. ZhKh 385/1-6.

Yuri Orlov - arrested February 10, 1977; convicted May 18, 1978, anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 70); sentenced to 7 years in strict regimen labor camp and 5 years in internal exile. Articles on physics confiscated. RSFSR, 618810, Permskaya obl., Chusovskoi rayon, Stavitsa Vsesvyatskaya, Uchr. VS 389/37.

Anatoly Shcharansky - arrested March 15, 1977; charged with treason (Article 64) and anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 70). Convicted sentenced on July 14, 1978 to 3 years in prison and 10 years strict regimen labor camp. RSFSR, Vladimir rayon, Vladimir, 3 Internatsionalnaya ul., #58, Vladimir Prison.

Malva Landa - convicted May 31, 1977, to serve 2 years in internal exile for arson (Articles 99 and 150), setting fire to her own apartment; released under a general amnesty in January 1978.

Feliks Serebrov - arrested August 22, 1977; convicted October 12, 1977, falsification of documents (Article 196) -- irregularities in his work documents not usually punishable under Soviet law -- after the statute of limitations had expired; sentenced to one year in a strict regimen work camp. In August 1978 he was released after serving his sentence.

Aleksandr Podrabinek - arrested March 15, 1978; charged with circulation of anti-Soviet fabrications (Article 190-1). Convicted and sentenced on August 15, 1978 to 5 years of internal exile. Was not given a written copy of the verdict and so cannot appeal his sentence. Reportedly beaten, Krasnopresnenskaya prison, Moscow.

Vladimir Slepak - arrested June 1, 1978; charged with malicious hooliganism (Article 206 RSFSR CC). Sentenced on June 21, 1978 to 5 years in internal RSFSR, Chitinskaya oblast, Aginsky rayon, village of Tsokto-Khangil, Pochta do Vostrebovaniya.

Ukraine

Mykola Rudenko - arrested February 5, 1977; convicted July 1, 1977, anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 62 UKSSR CC); sentenced to 7 years strict regimen labor camp, 5 years internal exile. Poetry confiscated; assigned strenuous physical labor, although he is a war invalid. RSFSR, Mordovian ASSR, pos. Lesnoy, Uchr. ZhKh 385/19.

Oleksiy Tykhy - arrested February 5, 1977; convicted July 1, 1977, anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 62) and illegal possession of firearms (Article 222), for an old rifle Tykhy claims was planted; sentenced to 10 years special regimen labor camp and 5 years internal exile; RSFSR, Mordovian ASSR, pos. Sosnovka, Uchr. ZhKh 385/1-6.

Myroslav Marynovych - arrested April 23, 1977; convicted March 29, 1978, anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 62); sentenced to 7 years strict regimen camp and 5 years internal exile. Address unknown.

Mykola Matushevych - arrested April 23, 1977; convicted March 29, 1978, anti-soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 62); sentenced to 7 years strict regimen camp and 5 years internal exile. Address unknown.

Levko Lukyanenko - arrested December 12, 1977; charged with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 62); convicted and sentenced July 20, 1978 to ten years in special regimen camp and five years internal exile; RSFSR Mordovian ASSR, pos. Sosovka, Uchr. ZhKh 385/1-6.

Pyotr Vins - arrested February 21, 1978; convicted April 6, 1978, parasitism (Article 214-1); sentenced to one year in a standard regimen labor camp. Reports of beatings; in September was transferred to another labor camp, Sumskaya oblast, Ukrainian SSR.

Georgia

Zviad Gamsakhurdia - arrested April 7, 1977; convicted May 19, 1978, anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 71 GSSR CC); sentenced to 3 years in labor camp and 2 years internal exile. Address unknown.

Merab Kostava - arrested April 7, 1977; convicted May 18, 1978, anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 71); sentenced to 3 years in labor camp and 2 years in in-ernal exile. Address unknown.

Grigory Goldshtein - arrested in January 1978; convicted March 20, 1978, parasitism (Article 234-1); sentenced to one year in a standard regimen labor camp. RSFSR, Arkhangelskaya oblast, Gorod Velsk, Uchr. U.G. 42/14.

Valentina Pailodze - arrested November 6, 1977. Tried in September 1978, probably on charges of anti-Soviet slander. Sentence and address unknown.

Viktor Rtskhiladze - arrested January 25, 1978; convicted in early September 1978 on charges of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 71); sentenced to two years of internal exile.

Lithuania

Viktoras Petkus - arrested August 24, 1977; charged with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 68 LithSSR CC). Convicted July 13, 1978; sentenced to 3 years in prison, 7 years special regimen camp and 5 years in internal exile; RSFSR, Vladimir rayon, Vladimir, 3 Internatsionalnaya ul. #58, Vladimir prison.

Armenia

Shagen Arutyunyan - arrested December 1977, convicted January 18, 1978, resisting a representative of authority (Article 218 ArmSSR CC); sentenced to 3 years standard regimen camp; address unknown.

Robert Nazaryan - arrested December 23, 1977; reportedly to be tried in November 1978 on charges of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Article 65) and resisting a representative of authority (Article 218).

Two other members of the Helsinki Monitoring Groups, Tomas Venclova (Lithuania) and Major General Pyotr Grigorenko (Moscow and Ukraine), have been stripped of their Soviet citizenship while visiting abroad on temporary visas. Venclova, who had accepted a one-year teaching assignment at the University of California, was informed of the June 14, 1978 Supreme Soviet Decree on August 23, only after the end of the Belgrade Conference's preparatory meeting. Similarly, the decree stripping Grigorenko of his citizenship while he was in the U.S. for medical care was announced after the close of the main Belgrade meeting on March 8, 1978, although it had gone into effect nearly a month before.

In Defense of Aleksandr Podrabinek and Iosif Terelya

Appeal to: Psychiatrists of the World
World Association of Psychiatrists
Amnesty International
All People of Good Will

The use of psychiatry for political purposes is one of the most dangerous violations of human rights. The struggle against these violations has particular universal human significance. However, this struggle confronts especially great obstacles.

The authorities of our country jealously guard all facts on the abuse of psychiatry, and take all kinds of repressive actions against those who decide to overcome these obstacles.

In the West, the memoirs of Iosif Terelya were recently published. In this work, Terelya gave a sincere and authentic account of the horrors of the Sychov special psychiatric hospital. The authorities responded quickly: Terelya was again imprisoned in a special psychiatric hospital. We call upon you to act in his defense!

Today the threat of reprisal hangs over Aleksandr Podrabinek, an active and selfless member of the Working Group to Investigate the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, who has made essential beneficial contributions. He had already spent 15 days in prison under that well-known law often invoked in such repressions (hooliganism). He and his friends underwent many searches; during the latest, a cartridge (for harpoon guns--Ed.) was planted as a provocation. Already for more than a week, Podrabinek is followed constantly by KGB agents who dog his every step, exerting blatant moral and physical pressure on him. We know from experience that such "intensive" surveillance frequently precedes arrest (that is what happened with Shcharansky).

We call upon you to act in the defense of Aleksandr Podrabinek*. Reprisals against him can and must be forestalled.

October 17, 1977

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Petr Grigorenko
-- Andrei Sakharov

* (On March 15, 1978, Podrabinek was arrested again, charged with circulation of anti-Soviet fabrications, and was sentenced on August 15, 1978 to five years of internal exile--Ed.)

Statement to the Press on Joining H.A.I.G.*

We, members of three Soviet Helsinki Groups, announce that we have joined H.A.I.G. We also think it would be timely that another international organization to monitor compliance with the Helsinki Final Act be formed.

We think that the international character of the Accords signed in Helsinki by 35 countries, and the universal human significance of the humanitarian provisions of the Accords, make it essential to create a public international organization to help bring the Accords to life.

We completely support and approve the Declaration of H.A.I.G. In particular, its important and timely idea that the obligations to respect human rights -- a fundamental part of the international agreement -- are therefore no longer the internal matter of the participatory states of the Accords. Such agreements are deprived of meaning if requests to observe their provisions are seen as interference in the internal affairs of any signatory to the agreement.

Moreover, in light of such an approach, the Agreements become a method of misleading public opinion. The aims and tasks of H.A.I.G. and the Moscow, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, and Georgian Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accords in the USSR, which were created earlier, are essentially the same. However, the aims and tasks of H.A.I.G. have a more global character.

Unfortunately, the Soviet authorities hinder the normal work of the Helsinki Groups and cruelly repress the members of these Groups. Already, for many months, the founders of the Helsinki Groups have been imprisoned while they are under investigation: Professor Yuri Orlov, the publicist Aleksandr Ginzburg, the mathematician Anatoly Shcharansky; and also members of the Ukrainian, Lithuanian, and Georgian Helsinki Groups: Mykola Matusevych, Myroslav Marynovych, Viktoras Petkus, Balys Gajauskas**, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, and Merab Kostava.

In accordance with the existing inhumane laws and prevailing norms in our country, all who are held in pretrial detention are denied the right to meet with lawyers and witnesses, and cannot write to their relatives. Therefore, our arrested friends have been in total isolation for more than half a year, without any ties to the external world.

* (Helsinki Agreements Implementation Group, an international association to promote the implementation of the Helsinki Accords -- especially Basket III -- based in Brussels, Belgium--Ed.)

** (Gajauskas, in special regimen labor camp with Group members Oleksiy Tykhy, Levko Lukyanenko and Aleksandr Ginzburg, has requested to join the Lithuanian Helsinki Group--Ed.)

Already, two members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, the writer Mykola Rudenko and the teacher Oleksa Tykhy, were tried during closed trials at which they were sentenced to cruel terms (seven and ten years imprisonment). Two Members of the Moscow Groups, Malva Landa* and Feliks Serebrov**, were convicted on trumped-up criminal charges. We stress that the activity of all our persecuted friends was purely humanitarian in character and was outside the realm of politics.

Each of the above-named Helsinki Groups, since its inception, has exposed concrete instances of Soviet violations of the humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki Accords, and has described them in documents which are addressed openly to the governments of the participating countries. In part, these documents reveal instances of violations of the following rights: freedom of conscience and religion; the right of prisoners to proper treatment and living conditions; the right to freely choose one's place of residence and to return to it; the right to the free exchange of ideas and information; and also the rights of ethnic minorities.

We are convinced of the legality and the utility of the legal activities of the Public Groups to Promote the Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR, and in this conviction, we continue our work.

October 19, 1977
Moscow

Members of the Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accords in the USSR:

Petr Grigorenko
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Vladimir Slepak

Members of the Working Commission to Investigate the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes:

Vyacheslav Bakhmin
Irina Kaplun
Aleksandr Podrabinek

Members of the Christian Committee to Defend the Rights of Believers in the USSR:

Father Gleb Yakunin
Viktor Kapitanchuk
Nikolai Goretoi
Nikolai Kunitsa
Vadim Shcheglov

* (Landa is a member of the Moscow Helsinki Group--Ed.)

** (Serebrov is a member of the Working Commission on Psychiatric Abuse--Ed.)

Statement on Charter '77

On October 17, 1977, the trial of Vaclav Havel, Jiri Lederer, Frantisek Pavlicek, and Ota Ornest began in Prague.

As in the Moscow trials, and now in Prague, foreign correspondents are not allowed into the courtroom, while friends of the defendants are not even permitted to travel to Prague. Four brave Czechs sit in the dock because they have kept their civic honor and have not lost their human worth in the face of lies, demagoguery, and open violence.

In Prague, in Warsaw, in Berlin, and in Moscow, people sit in the dock; their only fault is that they want to see their countries free and happy.

Today, we declare our solidarity with the Prague defendants and express our support and respect for them.

We demand freedom for Vaclav Havel, Jiri Lederer, Frantisek Pavlicek, and Ota Ornest!

October 19, 1977

Aleksandr Podrabinek*
 Irina Kaplun*
 Vyacheslav Bakhmin*
 Vadim Shcheglov**
 Gleb Yakunin**
 Naum Meiman***
 Viktor Kapitanchuk**
 Petr Grigorenko***
 Vladimir Slepak***

-
- * Member, Working Commission on Psychiatric Abuse
 ** Member, Christian Committee to Defend the Rights of Believers
 *** Member, Moscow Helsinki Group

On the Life of Soviet Workers
by Anatoly Marchenko*

I learned that I was invited by you as a guest from foreign broadcasts, I thank you for the invitation. I was not able to accept it, since I did not receive your letter. One of those invited - Vladimir Borisov - did receive his invitation but he was refused an exit visa. He was told that 'he did not represent anybody'.

Recently some of our citizens visited the U.S. as invitees of the American National Committee of Labor Union Action for Democracy. At first they had some trouble with their U.S. entry visas, but they received Soviet exit visas with no difficulty. Whom do they represent? Metallurgists, schoolteachers, the trade union masses in general? Not at all. They are the eyes, ears, and mouthpiece of our regime.

They told us about the desperate situation of one black woman worker; that American teachers beat their pupils and that some American high school graduates don't know how to read; that there is inadequate industrial safety technology in American mines; and that American workers have a friendly attitude towards the USSR. That was all they derived from a two-week trip through the U.S.

How much does that poor black woman make, and what can she buy for her pay? Are her five children in school, and how does she pay for their medical care? Where, how, and in what schools did America train its scientists, who year after year have come away with most of the Nobel prizes? Perhaps they are semi-literate? What is the accident rate at an American mine? There was nothing concrete -- only a general and grim picture.

If Semyonova had not visited you as a representative, she might have shared with your teachers the information that in our schools there is also a low level of education -- I know more than a few semi-literate people who have recently graduated from our schools. And the miner Gatsenko might have told about the systematic practice we have of not registering on-the-job injuries so as not to spoil the statistics and not to deprive a shop or a team of its bonuses. But our representatives, judging by the newspaper account, did not see a single positive feature in the life of working America, and enriched you with the information that we walk around in shoes and our women use cosmetics.

The reporting of their trip is published in the column 'Chronicle of Detente'. Apparently this means that now you and we, American and Soviet working people, know each other better. But we used to read the same sort of stuff about America thirty years ago in the worst years of the Cold War.

* (Anatoly Marchenko, a founding member of the Moscow Helsinki Group, completed his four year term of internal exile--which was spent in the Siberian settlement of Chuna--in September 1978. He had been invited by George Meany to attend the Twelfth Constitutional Convention of the AFL-CIO which met in Los Angeles in December 1977. Marchenko sent this message to the Convention--Ed.)

If I could visit America, I would not only show you my shoes, but I would tell you that I paid a fifth of my monthly wage for them. I would tell you what the concept of 'general employment' means to us, and what, other than cosmetics, the workers are concerned with. I would base all this on my own recent experience of work at a timber-processing enterprise in the Siberian settlement of Chuna. This experience is typical enough of our system of production and does not contradict official statistics.

It was not your fault or mine that I was unable to visit you. Still, I would like my short statement to be heard at your convention. And so let me tell you about the workers' life in a Siberian settlement, Chuna. Of course, I will not try to describe all aspects of this life; I will touch on three questions only.

The average pay of our workers is approximately at the level of the official average pay in the whole country, that is about 160 rubles per month. How does the worker earn this salary? In the drying section, the sorting and stacking of boards is done only by hand. Mostly women are used for this work. The damp boards coming in from the lumber mill measure five meters in length, and 19-20 mm. in thickness. The production quota for each worker, be it a man or a woman, is from 10-17 cubic meters per shift, paid for at the rate of 23-40 kopecks per cubic meter. A worker can make no more than four rubles per shift, or not more than 120 rubles per month (about \$170 a month at the official exchange rate. There are one hundred kopecks in a ruble). Added to this is a premium of 20 percent for working in a remote area. If the plan is overfulfilled (more than 400 cubic meters per person per month) a bonus is added. All this hardly reaches 160 rubles per month.

But this income is not guaranteed. In the first place, because of bad organization of labor the fulfillment of the plan does not at all depend on the worker himself. Secondly, the bonus is awarded only when the monthly plan is met by the whole section or shop, not just by the individual worker.

There are a thousand reasons why the section might not meet its plan, and these also do not depend on the worker. In order to fulfill the plan and receive the bonus, at the end of the month people have to work not one shift of seven to eight hours as established by law, but two shifts in a row, even on days off. These extra hours are not registered and no overtime is paid for them. The management of the trade union, together with the plant administration, organizes these illegal extra shifts. This happens because the trade union defends the interests of the state, not of the workers, and fulfilling the plan is the chief measure of its work.

I decided not to work additional shifts, and I was fired from the plant for 'violation of labor discipline' by decision of the union and plant committees.

The workers of the drying section work in any weather under an open sky, in winter in temperatures lower than -40. The law states that extra pay, the so-called 'cold-weather premium', must be paid under such conditions. But, with the knowledge and approval of the trade union, this premium is not paid to us.

Often the weight of the boards exceeds the maximum weight limit set for women or adolescents. Adolescents are put to work paired with adults, that is, on an equal basis with them. I refused to work with an adolescent and the shop foreman punished me by transferring me to other work.

In the settlement, many people come from other regions, for instance, from the Ukraine; a round trip takes from 12 to 14 days. Most of the workers at the plant receive 15 days paid vacation. This means that relatives may not see each other for years.

Except for the drying section, the whole plant works in two shifts. Women with small children, of whom there are many at the plant, also work these shifts. All the kindergartens and nurseries in Chuna are operated in the daytime only. In order not to leave the children alone, married people arrange to work different shifts, and they see each other only on days off. It is even worse for mothers without husbands: they are forced to leave their small children completely alone at night. An acquaintance of mine tells me that her children (aged seven and ten) don't go to sleep until she returns from the second shift, that is until two o'clock in the morning.

Women go to work under such conditions because a family cannot live on one average salary. (Incidentally, our statistics are silent about the minimum wages necessary to live in the Soviet Union).

Can a family live on 160 rubles per month? The following things can be bought for this sum of money: one round trip ticket from Chuna to Moscow by air; two tires for the compact car 'Moskvich'; or three to five children's coats.

A kilogram (2.2 pounds) of meat in the store costs two rubles; a kilogram of dried fruit -- 1.60; milk -- 28 kopecks per litre (one quart); eggs -- .90 to 1.30 rubles for ten; butter -- 3.60 rubles per kilogram. But most of the time none of this is available in the stores. If one is able to buy anything privately, one must pay almost twice as much: a kilogram of pork costs four rubles; milk -- 40 kopecks per litre.

Judging from all this, you can see how far our average monthly pay goes to cover the minimum needs of the family. We may not have unemployment, but the average pay of a worker here is probably less than your unemployment compensation.

It is said that our rents are the lowest in the world; rent for an apartment is only one-eighth or one-tenth of an average salary. My friend pays 17 rubles a month for his apartment. He and his wife, two working daughters, and a son, a high school senior, live in a two-room apartment (one: 170 square feet, the second: 130 square feet) with a tiny,

hardly passable corridor, a cramped kitchen and a shared bathroom. Their multi-family dwelling has facilities: central heating, an electric stove in the kitchen, hot and cold running water, and indoor plumbing. That is the maximum of convenience known to us.

About a quarter of the Chuna population lives in such housing. Half of the two-story, sixteen-apartment buildings have no facilities: communal lavatories, cold wooden outhouses in the backyard, water at a street pump, stoves for heating. The rest of the people in the settlement live in their own or government-owned huts, also without any facilities whatever: often there is not even a water pump, only a manually operated well, several hundred yards from the house. We have no standards by which a dwelling can be condemned as a hovel unfit for habitation. If people live there, it means it must be usable. Such living is guaranteed for us in the 21st Century also: 'In the Tenth Five Year Plan it is planned to create for the use of more than... 60% of the population well-equipped housing with heating, water, and plumbing.' This is the report of the chairman of the Chuna regional executive committee, G.M. Krivenko, at the eighth session of the regional soviet (Communist Party, August 28, 1977). This means that the remaining 40% of the people will continue to use outhouses at 40 degrees below zero.

It is not known what portion of our population is provided with housing, even of these standards. In Chuna, families wait for years to get an apartment, and meanwhile rent what they can get privately: an outdoor kitchen, a bath, a room or a corner in the owner's room. And the rent here is not just symbolic: for a tiny room of seventy square feet they pay ten rubles; while in Moscow rent for a one-room apartment can be 50-60 rubles a month.

All our citizens have equal rights, including rights to the amenities of life. But recently I learned from an article written by the First Secretary of the Minsk City Committee of the CPSU, Bartoshevich, that among the equals there are those who are 'most equal', who have first claim to amenities. I myself know this in practice.

Everyday I pass Shchors Street. On one side of the street, there are modern private houses with large windows, all facilities and telephones. They are inhabited by regional and factory bosses. They have more than the five square meters living space per person, such as is available to my friend, a driver. The people who live on the opposite side of the street drag sleds with containers to the nearest pump, and each backyard is decorated by a collective outhouse. Obviously, there were not enough water and sewer pipes to go around.

If anybody from the 'most equal' set gets sick, he also gets special medical attention. He will have a bed in a separate ward, he will receive medicine and food--which is in scarce supply--and not be limited to half a ruble a day's worth as is the ordinary patient.

The 'most equals' will only hear rumors on whether there is meat or milk in the stores. Everything they need is delivered to their homes, and for them there is always enough of everything, from food to books.

In this way the principle of pay according to work performed has been transformed into amenities given for service to the state and according to rank in the state hierarchy. Our whole society is riddled with considerations of hierarchy. With permanent shortages of the most necessary goods, this principle is carried to ridiculous extremes.

In our settlement there exist several distribution systems in addition to the one for the bosses. Lumberjacks can buy sheepskin jackets; the other residents of the Siberian settlement can buy them only if any are left over. Today, they brought eggs to the store for the workers constructing the Baikal-Amur railroad. The workers at the plant get canned pressed meat which is handed out right at the plant, so that outsiders cannot somehow get at it. People living on pensions will get neither eggs nor canned meat.

A quilt jacket can substitute for a sheepskin jacket, but potatoes are no substitute for eggs in a child's diet.

In the women's dormitory on the Baikal-Amur project, the most essential things are lacking: a kitchen table, wall-coverings to prevent the cold from seeping through, a dresser. The girls sleep in blankets without topsheets. Topsheets apparently don't exist in any of the other dormitories either, with a few exceptions; We issue them only to exemplary individuals. Those who behave themselves', explained A. Y. Ostrolutsky, chief of the housing department, as quoted in the local newspaper, Communist Path, May 7, 1977.

And thus, the principle of hierarchical distribution of goods extends to everything: from bedding to cottages equipped with toilet paper.*

I can understand those Americans who may be dissatisfied with political, social, or even economic conditions in their country. I sympathize with their striving for a better life. But when I read the ecstatic reports of your compatriots about my country, I would like to address them with the words of our contemporary song: 'If you envy this, you can come and sit next to me.' Yes, next to my stove, next to me on a bed without sheets, next to me in a communal outhouse (preferably in the winter time).

* Such conditions for the working people of our huge country are possible only because we are totally without rights in our own home. In the USSR the administration, the labor unions, the organs of power and those of repression are all links in one chain, which has totally fettered our whole people. All organizations, including the church, are under the control of a small group of rulers and are subordinate to them. Let our sixty years experience serve as a warning to other peoples!

I invite Messrs. Mike Davidoff, Gus Hall, and anybody else with their families as my guests to Chuna. If they agree, I will file official invitations for them. I also invite any delegate of your convention who is willing to visit me; I ask you to communicate his name to me so that I may prepare an official invitation.

Please accept my greetings to the convention and my best wishes for your successful activities on behalf of American workers and for the continued prosperity of the United States.

December 1, 1977

Anatoly Marchenko
Chuna Settlement
Irkutsk Oblast
18 Chapayev Street

To the Participants of the Belgrade Meeting on Security
and Cooperation in Europe:

Discrimination Against the Crimean Tatars Continues

Document No. 24

We have already raised the subject of the Soviet Union's non-compliance with the section of the Helsinki accords dealing with discrimination on the basis of nationality. Document No. 10, published in November, 1976, was devoted to this question and told of discrimination against the Crimean Tatars. Unfortunately, we are forced to turn to this subject once again as it has acquired particular urgency.

Stripped of their national territory, the Crimean Tatars are on the verge of national extinction. While laws forbidding other deported peoples to return to their homelands have been repealed, such laws are still in effect for the Crimean Tatars. While peoples like the Jews and Germans have been able to combat discrimination preventing their emigration to their original homelands, the Crimean Tatars have no such possibilities. Their homeland -- the Crimea -- is an official part of the Soviet Union.

In view of this, we request the heads of governments signatory to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to pay particular attention to this document and to adopt an appropriate resolution.

1. A Brief History

It is known that not long before the end of the war, the Soviet government deported a number of small nations from their homelands to sparsely populated areas where they were forced to live in special settlements under particularly harsh conditions. Among these peoples were the Crimean Tatars. As a result of the brutal treatment they suffered during deportation and in the first year of settlement, almost half (46.2%) of the Crimean Tatars perished. The Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union subsequently labeled the deportation and the conditions of the special settlements 'genocide'.

The Crimean Tatars describe their expulsion from the Crimea and the consequences of this action in one of their last letters to the Central Committee of the CPSU:

"Everybody was expelled, right down to the families of soldiers, partisans and members of the underground who had been killed in action. Deprived of their providers, most of these families did not survive the first years. At the end of the war, and after the demobilization, others were placed under this official military supervision: soldiers and officers who had fought in the ranks of the Soviet army against the Fascist aggressors; Heroes of the Soviet Union and many honest Communists and non-Party members.

Until the last days of the war, these people had helped to free the occupied territories, including the Crimea."

In each case, the government conducted the deportation strictly on the basis of nationality, without ever alerting the people of its decision.

The military action on May 18, 1944 against the Crimean Tatar people was explained as "a necessary measure" against "the most inveterate of enemies". At every station along the way, specially organized crowds jeered and threw rocks at the red railroad cars, packed with children, women, the elderly and the sick.

A similar reception awaited the Crimean Tatars at their final destination. According to a previously fixed plan, they were sent off to the remotest areas in backward provinces. Moreover, individual fitness for hard physical labor was never even taken into account.

This action dispossessed the Crimean Tatars of:

-- their homeland, where their forefathers had tamed the land and shaped a nation in the early centuries of the first millenium, A.D. In their native language, they named this land "Krym" (Crimea - ed.), and themselves, Crimean Tatars;

-- cultural monuments and artifacts fashioned over the centuries by talented Crimean Tatar craftsmen.

The Crimean Tatars no longer have:

-- primary and secondary schools with teaching in their native language -- guarantees for the existence and preservation of the Crimean Tatar language;

-- institutions of higher and middle education, special, professional and technical schools with native language instruction -- the breeding ground of a nationality's professional circles;

-- national theaters, ensembles and workshops;

-- newspapers, publishing houses, radio stations and other national organs and institutions (unions of writers, journalists, artists, etc.);

-- scientific research institutions and centers for the study of the Crimean Tatar language, literature, art and national culture.

Destroyed were Crimean Tatar:

-- cemeteries and the tombstones and inscriptions of the graves of their ancestors;

-- monuments and mausoleums to national historical figures.

The Crimean Tatars were stripped of:

- national museums and libraries containing thousands of volumes in their native language;
- clubs, reading rooms, houses of worship -- mosques and seminaries.

The history of the development of the Crimean Tatars as a nation has been falsified, and names of cities and villages, streets and neighborhoods, geographical locales, etc., have been changed. Folk legends and other forms of folk art created over centuries by the Crimean Tatars' ancestors have been adapted and claimed by other peoples.

As a result of these policies, which have undermined the national existence and development of the people, the honor of the entire Crimean Tatar nation has been soiled in the eyes of the Soviet people and the world.

After the Twentieth Party Congress, from the moment the USSR Supreme Soviet Decree of April 28, 1956 was made public, the Crimean Tatars began a petition campaign to regain their national equality. This decree eased the lives of the people in exile, since it repealed the requirements of special settlement and released them from administrative supervision. It did not, however, repeal their treason conviction or return their national rights. The removal of restrictions did not include the return of Crimean Tatar property confiscated during deportation, and did not accord them the right to return to the place from which they had been exiled.

Naturally, the decree did not satisfy the Crimean Tatars. They needed their homeland -- their territory, language and culture. Consequently, their petition campaign expanded to a mass scale. Letters to the Central Committee and the government initially were signed by dozens and hundreds, then by thousands and tens of thousands of people. One, demanding the repeal of all discriminatory legislation and the people's return to the Crimea, was signed by 126,000 people. In all, during the sixties, three million signatures were collected. In other words, each adult signed six or seven petitions.

Under the pressure of this mighty wave of public national protest in increasingly organized form, the government was forced to start maneuvering. Members of the Politburo met with Crimean Tatar representatives on three occasions, and promised to review and decide their case favorably. At the same time, repression against the campaign's organizers grew.

The turning point came after the third meeting between representatives of the Crimean Tatars and the Politburo. This meeting produced the USSR Supreme Soviet Decree of September 5, 1967, "On citizens of Tatar nationality, who resided in the Crimea". It would be hard to imagine a more hypocritical document.

On the one hand, groundless charges against the people were repealed, a move that could be taken as raising the rights of Crimean Tatars to the level of those enjoyed by other peoples and nations. On the other hand, despite the true wish of the people as reflected in their petitions, the decree maintained

that the Crimean Tatars had "put down roots" in the areas where they had been exiled. This was a feeble attempt to mask the fact that the April 23, 1956 Supreme Soviet Decree which forbids return to the Crimea remains in effect.

Finally, this signifies an attempt to eliminate the Crimean Tatars from the ranks of nations. The decree calls them "citizens of Tatar nationality, who resided in the Crimea". There are no more Crimean Tatars. Formerly the sovereign rulers of the Crimea; they were subsumed into the Russian empire. There are, rather, citizens of Tatar nationality, who lived in the Crimea along with many other nations. Your homeland, Crimean Tatar, is not the Crimea, but the Tatar Autonomous Republic. It's hard to imagine a cruder historical distortion.

A nation that independently evolved over the course of many centuries, that developed its own rich culture, has only one thing in common with the Kazan and Volga Tatars -- the word "Tatar" in their names. But, suddenly this nation is declared non-existent, never-existing, and transformed into some variety of Tatar nationality. What people won't come up with to justify the exile of an entire people.

The overwhelming majority of the simple Crimean Tatars, however, did not notice this hypocrisy. The people were overjoyed that they were no longer "criminals", that they could now look working people of all nations boldly in the eye. And they assumed they could now freely return to their native land.

Two years following the decree, more than 20,000 Crimean Tatar families (nearly 100,000 people) returned to the Crimea, but they were met by policemen and troops. Some of them were deported to the places where they had "put down roots", that is, where they had lived in exile. The remainder were simply evicted from the Crimea, and settled on its fringes. A sobering sense of disillusionment, as well as a loss of determination overcame the people. Repression continued, and by 1970 the popular movement was crushed. The more active participants of the petition campaign ended up in prisons and camps. More than 300 Crimean Tatars were sentenced to various prison terms for their participation in the nationality movement, despite the fact that it was a loyal and peaceful one.

2. Soviet and International Law

What happened to the Crimean Tatars along with thirteen other small nations during 1943 and 1944 has been called genocide by the highest organ of the Party -- the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU. Moreover, the Soviet Union has ratified "The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide" which entered into force in the USSR on August 1, 1954. However, no one was ever punished in connection with the genocide of 1943-44. If the absence of such convictions is explained by the fact that the convention entered into force after the crime was committed, nothing can justify the fact that the laws that led to the genocide are still in effect.

The deportation of the Crimean Tatars was implemented on the basis

of a May 8, 1944 order of the State Committee for Defense. Not only has this order not been repealed, but, on the contrary, it has been translated into law. On June 25, 1946, the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet adopted a "Law on the Abolition of the Checheno-Ingushsky ASSR (Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic - ed.) and the Transformation of the Crimean ASSR into the Crimean Oblast".

The Decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet of April 28, 1956, freed the Crimean Tatars and several other nationalities from the conditions of special settlement and released them from MVD (Ministry of Internal Affairs--Ed.) administrative supervision. At the same time, it left the previous genocidal laws in effect and even specifically stipulated that those affected were not to be reimbursed for property confiscated during deportation or to be allowed to return to the areas from which they were deported.

Lastly, the September 5, 1967 Decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, "On citizens of Tatar nationality, who resided in the Crimea", insured, once and for all, that the genocide would be complete and took away the Crimean Tatars' right to consider themselves a nation. Under the elegant wording that seemed to repeal a groundless conviction and return the rights of a Soviet citizen, the decree actually stripped a people of their ancestral territory. (The ban on returning to the Crimea was not repealed, and in fact, guides local Crimean officials in their decisions not to register* Crimean Tatars.) The decree also stripped the Crimean Tatars of their language and culture and left them scattered over many Soviet republics. The authorities are obviously counting on assimilation to complete the national destruction, begun with the May 18, 1944 deportation decree.

This is the way the Soviet Union, despite its adoption of the "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide" continues to commit genocide vis-a-vis the Crimean Tatars. In doing so, the Soviet government relies on laws adopted before the convention's ratification, on the laws which originally sanctioned the genocide.

Soviet law and practice as regards the Crimean Tatars also contradicts the "International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination", as well as the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Principle VIII of the "Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations Between Participating States" states:

"By virtue of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, all peoples always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development."

The Crimean Tatars were forcibly removed from their territory and subjected to genocide. Considering that the ruling party once committed genocide against them, who should now be left to decide the fate of the Crimean Tatars, except they themselves? Nevertheless, their fate, as before, is decided on the basis of the same tyranny that reigned at the end of the war.

* (Soviet law requires all citizens to register at their place of residence. Such registration is a prerequisite for housing, employment and access to social services--Ed.)

Soviet laws regarding the Crimean Tatars completely contradict the USSR's international commitments. In signing the Final Act, the Soviet government recognized that:

"In exercising their sovereign rights, including the right to determine their laws and regulations, they will conform with their legal obligations under international law; they will furthermore pay due regard to and implement the provisions in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe."

If the Soviet government wants to fulfill the commitments it has freely undertaken, it is obligated to help all the Crimean Tatars who wish to do to return to the place from which they were exiled on May 18, 1944. It must also accord them the opportunity "...in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, social and cultural development."

3. The Destruction of the Nation Continues

Genocide is the destruction of a race, a tribe, or so the word is defined in the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia.

The Crimean Tatars' deportation from the Crimea to sparsely populated regions with unfamiliar climates cost them the lives of half their sons and daughters. Their dispersal over a large territory -- the Urals, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenia, Kirghizia -- and among different nationalities; the loss of their native language schools, national culture, periodical press and other mass media has left the Crimean Tatars in a state of national humiliation. They are losing their sense of community with their linguistic and cultural brothers, their sense of belonging to a nation. The nation is dying.

This is not a natural, but a forced death. A nation is the people, Members of a nation experience a sense of their nationality from birth...

"No man has not felt a profound feeling of love, of attachment, to the land of his fathers and grandfathers, to his native culture, language and traditions."

But the nation lives only as long as this feeling lives in the people.

The words in quotes belong to Leonid I. Brezhnev. Therefore, we may assume that our government understands the inadmissibility of persecuting such feelings. And these are the feelings which rise up in the fight against conditions under which a people may perish as a nation. The artificially divided Crimean Tatars poured enmasse into the Crimea from all the corners of their exile after the Decree of 1967. Thrown out of the Crimea, they settled on its borders -- in the Kherson and Zaporozh oblasts, in the Kuban and on the edge of the Caucasus. As a result, the scattering of the nation has increased. On the other hand, a staging area for resettlement in the Crimea has in effect been created.

The bolder, more stubborn and enterprising of the Crimean Tatars,

those who fear no obstacles, have begun to make their way back into the Crimea. In accordance with the unchanged genocide laws, related instructions and spoken orders, the authorities have waged a decisive battle against this "disorderly conduct".

If one analyzes the situation in the Crimea in terms of arrests and convictions, things have improved. Presently, only Mustafa Dzhemilev* remains in captivity. According to a press statement by Enver Ametov, several dozen others are serving terms at correctional labor without loss of liberty, or in exile.

Nevertheless, extra-legal repressions against all those who attempt to settle in the Crimea have intensified immeasurably. Only a person of incredible tenacity and endurance can withstand all the blows of the authorities, can settle down and live in the land of his forefathers. Since the issuance of the decree "On citizens of Tatar nationality who resided in the Crimea", in ten years only 1,409 families (7,000 - 8,000 people) have been able to return and to register to live in their native land. How many years will it take for the entire nation to return, if today they number more than half a million? Six hundred and fifty families live without being registered and many of these have been trying to register for two or three years already.

For example, in the village of Pushkino, the Khallich family (seven children) and in the village of Vostochnoye, the Ablyakimov family (five children) have lived without official registration since 1974. Because she is not registered, Dilyara Khallich has spent that entire time without receiving the government allowance extended to women with many children. In retaliation for their petitions, complaints and protests, both families have had their electricity cut off. For a year, the Khallich children were not listed in the rosters of the school they nonetheless attended; then, they were not promoted to the next class.

The situation of unregistered families is horrible. First of all, they live with the constant threat of arbitrary persecution. How is this reflected? All those who are unregistered have bought houses. (Crimean Tatars cannot get housing by any other means; state and cooperative housing is not allowed them.) However, when an unregistered person buys a house, though he observes all the formalities and pays the full price, the house is still not his. The notary will not finalize the sale without proof of the buyer's registration, but in this case the buyer cannot get registered.

When a person is not registered, the threat of eviction constantly hangs over him. Day and night he waits for the band of drunken thugs led by the police or the authorities, who will throw children and old people, invalids and cripples out into the streets; who will smash and break property, and steal money and valuables.

These are not just isolated cases, but the rule. Following are instances of evictions that occurred in the space of just one month -- September, 1977. And these are just the instances we know about.

Sadovoye, Nizhnegorsk district - Nuri Mustafaev, together with his wife and

* (See Moscow Helsinki Group Document No. 43--Ed.)

two small children (ages three and one-and-a-half), was taken from the home he had bought into an open field in the Dzhanzsky district.

Semistoka, Leninsky district - Three families (Sh. Bekirov, A. Karaev and S. Khodzhametov) were evicted from the homes they had purchased. Two of the houses were sealed, the third given to the local drunk.

Runnoye, Saksy district - Two pensioners, Nuriye and Karime Kurseitov, and their brother, Rustem Khalilov, a disabled World War II veteran, were evicted from the home they had bought.

Molochnoye, Saksy district - Zera Mustafaeva and her ten-year-old daughter were evicted.

Mityaev, Saksy district - World War II veteran Seitmemet Mametov and his family were thrown out of their house and taken to a forest.

Trudovoye, Saksy district - The family of Akhmet Ganaev was thrown out of their house.

Lesnovok, Saksy district - Seidamet Mametov bought a house which led to the institution of criminal proceedings against him on the grounds of 'violating passport regulations'. (He is threatened with up to one year's loss of liberty.) A case stemming from violation of passport regulations has also been initiated against Nuretdin Useinov (Batalnoye, Leninsky district).

The intensification of repression in the Saksy district is connected with the presence of a new District Executive Committee Chairman. On his first day in office he announced: "In my district there won't be a single Crimean Tatar." This is one more proof of the utter tyranny facing the Crimean Tatars. Such an official will always find the Crimean Tatar guilty, and there is no one to stop him. If he isn't afraid to make such statements, it means he does so with his superiors' blessings.

Supplement No. 2 contains letters from people who have been evicted. These letters give a general picture of evictions, but it should be kept in mind that there have been worse cases. These evictions are illegal, but laws are not meant for the Crimean Tatars. When they complain to the Procurator, he says: "That's illegal. Lodge a complaint." The complaints, however, go to people like the Chairman of the Saksy District Executive Committee and go unanswered. There have been no cases where the goons who carry out these evictions have been punished, or where the victims have won suits for reimbursement for ruined and stolen property. Thus, the unregistered live in constant fear.

Secondly, the threat of hunger hangs constantly over the heads of the unregistered. Because they are not registered, they are not given jobs. Crimean Tatars are conscientious workers, a fact that has been noticed by Uzbek authorities who have gone, and are going, to great lengths to keep them in Uzbekistan. As a rule, they have several skills and are ready to work anywhere, but, despite the general labor shortage in the Crimea,

are banned from work everywhere.

Most Crimean Tatars have large families. There are seldom less than three, and more often four to five, or even six to seven children in a family. They must be fed, but how? The best way has been to cultivate the land around the house, now no longer possible. The authorities, taking advantage of the fact that all land is state land, have confiscated the Crimean Tatars' garden plots. They say: "You have bought a house. Well, live in the house, but land is not for sale in the Soviet Union."

Another means of subsistence has been for Crimean Tatars to gather what is left in the fields after the harvest -- bits of grain, corn cobs, potatoes... In old Russia, this type of post-harvest scavenging (the local name is "chambalovka") was always encouraged and children trained to do it. This is no longer true. Harvested fields are quickly plowed over. If Crimean Tatars are noticed hurrying to scour the fields before the plowers, they are detained and fined many times over the cost of what they could possibly gather. As a result, this source of food has also disappeared.

Presently only one food source remains available for the Crimean Tatars: gathering wild plants -- flowers, herbs, thistles, wild berries, nuts, etc. Crimean Tatars utilize this source a great deal.

The one livelihood that is denied Crimean Tatars is productive labor at factories, collective and state farms. The injustice is that workers for the Crimea are being recruited all over the country. In the Crimea itself, signs at every step announce: Wanted...wanted...wanted, workers of every profession: engineers, economists... And those who are wanted walk past. They walk past because they won't be hired. They won't be hired because they're Crimean Tatars.

This is the situation of those who live in the Crimea, but who are not registered. Those who have not yet settled in the Crimea encounter greater difficulties. They must first of all buy a house -- no simple task. The authorities are conducting a campaign to discourage the population from selling to Crimean Tatars. They employ terror tactics: "Sell a Crimean Tatar a house and we'll take it away", or, "we won't issue a permit". At the same time, they're stirring up hatred against the Crimean Tatars, spreading slanderous lies about them. Even now, in spite of the decree, the authorities tell the people that the Crimean Tatars were traitors during the war. The situation has gotten to the point where signs of the following description can be seen: "For sale: a house in Belogorsk. Inquire after 5 p.m. at 2 Nizhnegorskaya Street, apartment 5. House will be sold to Russians only."

It is naturally difficult to obtain a house under these circumstances. But if one does manage to buy one, it is still too early to celebrate. The authorities will use every means to force the owner to cancel the transaction. They even go so far as to buy the house themselves, basing their actions on the law which gives collective or state farms preference in buying buildings located on their land. Moreover, the purchase is made at an official, i.e., lower, rate, and then the house is immediately torn down.

There is another injustice here: hundreds of houses built for collective and state farm workers recruited from other areas stand empty. Many found Crimean conditions intolerable and left. As a result, the houses stand empty for years. For example, in Krymsky Kumys in the Belogorsk district, more than fifty homes have been boarded up. Beside them walk people who are ready to pay for these houses, who are ready to work anywhere, at any job.

Let's say, however, a Crimean Tatar does manage to buy a house and he and his family become unregistered residents of the Crimea. At some point he will register, experiencing all the trials that face the unregistered. Before that, however, he has to get his household effects from Central Asia. This is also a problem. Strict orders have gone out in Central Asia: "Don't rent shipping containers to Crimean Tatars." And how does one tell a Crimean Tatar? So, they don't rent shipping containers for the Crimea. If, however, a container does manage to make it to the Crimea, it's impossible to get it from the train station. Container haulers are not rented to Crimean Tatars.

But suppose, you, a Crimean Tatar, have registered in the Crimea. Don't think that's the end of your troubles. First of all, you're discriminated against at work. To give only one example, Beshevin Nariman is a winner of the State Award for Construction. In Almalyk, Central Asia, he was a director in a construction enterprise, but since moving to the Crimea, he's been unable to get even a job as a foreman.

Secondly, you will have to deal with hostility from part of the population. Communists, members of the Komsomol (Communist youth group - ed.), as well as average citizens are prejudiced against Crimean Tatars through slanderous rumor campaigns. Hoodlums are literally incited to commit petty crimes against Crimean Tatars. No one will risk reporting a hoodlum to the police, however, for it can only result in criminal charges being brought against the Crimean Tatar himself.

One memorable incident occurred when two drunken hooligans stole three sheep from a Crimean Tatar. He and his two neighbors caught the thieves and took them to the police station. The result: the three Crimean Tatars were sentenced to several years in camp for "causing bodily injury" (to the thieves). The version of the incident whereby the Crimean Tatars attacked peaceful citizens was put together at the police station four days after the thieves had been turned in. There were no observers at the trial and the only witnesses were the two "victims" who testified against the three Crimean Tatars. The court believed the "victims".

So, the former masters of the Crimea today live without recourse against slander, unable to repulse hoodlums, without legal protection, and in constant fear of provocations. Their only defense is national solidarity.

This is especially true with regard to illegal evictions and destruction of homes. When Crimean Tatars from neighboring villages hear about plans to evict someone or to tear a house down, they rush to put up a concerted defense. It was this solidarity that forced the authorities to begin evicting people at night. The bands of thugs break into houses at night, and bind and gag the evictees so that their screams will not alert the neighbors. In such circumstances, the neighbors find out about the eviction only in the morning.

Crimean Tatars who have cars drive around the Crimea looking for people who have been evicted. When they find them, they return them to their home -- if the authorities have not had time to tear it down. If the house has been demolished, the Crimean Tatars erect tents on the spot. In general, the authorities are waging virtual war against the people.

The activists, the organizers of the fight against tyranny, are particularly hard hit. Currently, the threat against one of the long-time Crimean Tatar activists, Enver Ametov, is cause for concern.

In 1976, the authorities tore down a house Ametov had bought. He was forced to buy another. While he was absent, visiting his former residence in the Kherson oblast, his wife and small child were thrown out into the steppe. Upon his return, Ametov found his wife and child and again moved into his house. Soon after, in October, 1976, he was put on trial under Article 196 (violation of passport regulations) and sentenced to two years banishment. Ametov refused to carry out his sentence, first of all because he considered it illegal (its illegality was confirmed by the court itself, which refused, in violation of the law, to give Ametov a copy of the verdict). Secondly, Ametov felt that he could not leave his wife and two small children (ages three and one) without protection, particularly since his previous experience (the eviction of his wife) had given him sufficient grounds for concern.

Now, Enver Ametov is being threatened with a new trial, one which holds the possibility of not just banishment, but of a more serious punishment. This is especially true if you consider that he is constantly followed and threatened by the KGB. They see his guilt in his open and lawful fight against discrimination and the rightless condition of the Crimean Tatars; his bold and open declarations against tyranny... (An October 10, 1977 press statement by Ametov, attached as a supplement to this document is on file with the Commission - ed.)

Ametov is a skilled worker -- a tractor driver and a builder, but he has gone almost two years without a job, despite the fact that tractor drivers are needed in the village where he lives. Because he is a Crimean Tatar, he is discriminated against in work, and because he does not accept this, he is threatened with imprisonment.

It is impossible to consider the situation in the Crimea a normal state of affairs. The Crimean Tatars should be returned to the Crimea. Either under the direction of the state organs, or with the help of independent citizens' groups; through utilizing the network of worker recruitment organizations, or by letting those who wish to return to act for themselves; by some means, the people must be returned to the land of their forefathers.

The Soviet Union must implement its international obligations. Its internal affairs lie in deciding whether or not to undertake a particular international obligation. But once it has undertaken a commitment, that commitment's implementation is no longer just its affair. Not only may South Africa not drive the Namibians from their territory, but the Soviet Union also does not have the right to act in a similar fashion vis-a-vis the Crimean Tatars, or any other nation of the USSR.

We hope that the participants of the Belgrade meeting on Security and Cooperation in Europe will remind the Soviet Union of its international duty.

Supplements*

1. Decrees and directives of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, relating to the deportation of the Crimean Tatars in 1943-44.
2. Letters from Crimean Tatars describing their arbitrary victimization at the hands of the authorities.
 - a. Enver Ametov: Statement for the Press, October 10, 1977.
 - b. K. Kurtseitova, N. Kurtseitova, R. Khalilov: Statement on Monstrous Reprisals Against Us in Our Native Land, September 23, 1977.
 - c. Aishe Seitmuratova: Appeal to the Participants of the Belgrade Meeting.
 - d. Z. Mustafaeva: Statement to the Procurator General of the USSR, Rudenko, September, 1977.
 - e. M. Ablyakimov: Statement to the Chairman of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Brezhnev, summer, 1977.
 - f. Dilyara Khallich: Statement to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, summer, 1977.

November 4, 1977

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Petr Grigorenko
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Vladimir Slepak
Naum Meiman
Tatyana Osipova

-- Aleksandr Lavut assisted in the preparation of this document.

November 4, 1977

I would like to add my support to the Helsinki Group document on discrimination against the Crimean Tatars.

Every day the resolution of these problems is delayed, the instances of human tragedy, lawlessness and arbitrary persecution are infinitely multiplied. This is a disgrace to our country.

-- Andrei Sakharov

* (The supplements are on record in the Commission's files--Ed.)

To the Heads of Signatory States of the Helsinki Final Act

Document No. 25

The Moscow Helsinki Group is concerned about the fate of 12-year old Mikhail Voikhansky, who has been separated from his mother, Marina Voikhanskaya, for over two years. In 1975, his mother emigrated from the Soviet Union to England. Misha's mother was not allowed to take her son with her, since the boy's father, her former husband Evgeny Voikhansky, kept their son in Leningrad until Marina could find work abroad.

As it turned out, this reason was merely a pretext. Although Marina Voikhanskaya has met all the conditions imposed by her former husband, the father still does not let their son leave. The boy lives permanently with his maternal grandmother; he has not lived with his father for even a single day. Mr. Voikhansky does not visit his son for months on end but, in order to create the impression that he is concerned about him, goes to Misha's teachers at school.

Witnesses are ready to confirm the fact that he does not love his son and that Misha's fate is a matter of complete indifference to him. The father's attitude to his son is clearly characterized in a letter he wrote to Voikhanskaya. In particular the letter states:

"All three of us have brought up Misha (mother, father, and Misha's maternal grandmother). Now the best for him (author's stress) would be if you brought him up alone. But I need some time to see if you can do that by yourself. You can ... replace everyone for him. Even if you bring up a son with two people, one must then give up some things. I want to give Misha over to you, if only for egotistical reasons. I have no idea what I would do and how I would find someone to look after him if I would have custody of him. The main thing is that for ages I have been trying to lead an active life, but with Misha I would have to give up all of that."

What is the reason for the father's stubborn refusal to allow his son to live with his mother whom he loves so dearly? He himself explains his decision by saying that he does not want to risk his position (he works in a closed enterprise).* In response to Misha's grandmother's request that she be allowed to go to England with her grandson, the Deputy Head of OVIR told her directly that if Voikhansky allows his son even to visit his mother -- with whom he might want to stay permanently -- then he will have to answer for it. And the Secretary of the Party Organization of the place where Misha's father works told the grandmother "We will never allow the child to leave."

* (a job requiring security clearance--Ed.)

It has become obvious that it is the Soviet authorities which are responsible for the present situation. References to the father are misleading, and used to hide one who is really to blame for this tragedy of a mother and a son who dreams of seeing his mother. And for the past year the child has been living with the threat of being separated even from his grandmother. The authorities are preparing a trial as a result of which the child can be taken away to an orphanage by force.

The Soviet authorities are taking their revenge on a brave woman by holding her little son hostage. Marina Voikhanskaya, a psychiatrist, is an activist in the human rights struggle in the Soviet Union. While still in the USSR, she protested against psychiatric repression of dissidents, and in the West, she has devoted all of her efforts to helping the victims of psychiatric repression. Materials collected by her, together with other evidence, convinced the psychiatrists at the Honolulu Congress to make an uncompromising stand, condemning the abuse of psychiatry for political purposes. Voikhanskaya is also the foreign representative of the "Working Commission to Investigate the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes."

Misha Voikhansky's appeal to the Soviet authorities and to Brezhnev remained unanswered; the 12-year-old child then turned for help from his mother's friends:

"I beg you to help me go to my mama! She left in April 1975, after having gotten my father to promise that he will let me leave in August 1975, but he deceived us and still is doing so. I think he is a bad man. I hate him!

Help me leave. I love my mommy so much! Where is justice if they don't allow a son to live with his mama!"

(Mikhail Voikhansky)

Such is the cry of a child's soul!

Since we know all the facts about Misha's fate, we state with complete assurance: the forced separation of mother from child -- a tragedy that has been going on for years -- is a violation, for unworthy political ends, not only of the Helsinki Accords, but of all moral precepts.

We call upon representatives of governments which are participants in the Belgrade meeting, to defend this child and to help the Voikhansky family be reunited. This case is not the internal matter of the USSR, but is a violation of human rights, of the right of a child to be with his mother and cannot be the internal matter of any single country.

October 1977

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Petr Grigorenko
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

Members of the Working
Commission to Investi-
gate the Abuse of
Psychiatry for Political
Purposes:

Irina Kaplun
Vyacheslav Bakhmin
Aleksandr Podrabinek

To the Belgrade Conference

On the Pre-Trial Detention of Orlov, Ginzburg and Shcharansky

Document No. 27

KGB investigators in Moscow and in Kaluga have informed (orally) the relatives of the well-known arrested human rights activists and members of the Moscow Helsinki Group, Yuri Orlov, Aleksandr Ginzburg, and Anatoly Shcharansky, that by order of the Supreme Soviet the term of their pre-trial detention has been extended for another six months beyond the nine month period provided by law.

Aleksandr Ginzburg has been imprisoned awaiting trial for 10 months, 20 days; Yuri Orlov for 10 months, 13 days; and Anatoly Shcharansky for 9 months, 10 days.

Of course, these orders are unpublished and are not even read to relatives. As we know, the issuing of such "personal orders" on the extension of the period of pre-trial detention is now part of Soviet legal procedure. We think we should note the clear illegality, anti-constitutionality and inhumanity of these orders to extend the term of imprisonment for Orlov, Shcharansky and Ginzburg. Article 34, "The Foundation of Criminal Legal Procedure of the Soviet Union and the Union Republics" (approved by a session of the Supreme Soviet on December 25, 1958), established that "Detention under Guard during the Investigation of a case" cannot continue more than 2 months. If a case is particularly complicated, this term may be extended to 3 months by the procurator of an autonomous republic, a krai, an oblast, an autonomous oblast, a national okrug; by a military procurator of a military okrug or a military fleet; and by a procurator of a Union republic or by the chief military procurator for 6 months from the first day of detention.

Further extensions of the term of detention under guard can be determined only in exceptional instances by the Soviet Procurator General for an additional term of not more than 3 months.

Therefore, if 9 months from the first day of his detention under guard have elapsed without the case having been transferred to court, the arrested should be released as soon as possible.

The expiration of the term set by law for detention under guard as a measure of suppression is directly cited in Article 18 of "Provisions for Pre-trial Detention under Guard" (Law of February 12, 1963) as justification for the rapid release of the arrested.

No other basis for extending the term of detention under guard of a prisoner under investigation is given in the Soviet Constitution nor in any current law of a Union Republic. Therefore, orders of a republic Presidium of the Supreme Court contradicting All-Union legislation are invalid. Moreover, these orders are anti-constitutional, since they are in direct contravention of Article 34 of the Soviet Constitution which declares that all Soviet citizens are equal under the law.

If all Soviet citizens were equal under the law, the detention for more than nine months under guard of an arrested person under investigation before transfer of his case to the court would be forbidden. The extension of this term (9 months) which has been established by law to another six months for Orlov, Shcharansky and Ginzburg, is an arbitrary and crude violation of human rights.

One cannot ignore the moral aspect of this issue, since such a long detention under guard in a KGB "investigation isolation cell" (in a prison of the closed type) is an act of inhumanity. Orlov, Ginzburg and Shcharansky are living in complete isolation from the rest of the world.

Articles 12 and 13 of the above-mentioned "Provisions for Pre-Trial Detention Under Guard" permit "meetings with relatives and other people" and "correspondence with relatives and other citizens." But, Shcharansky, Ginzburg and Orlov, in all the long months of their imprisonment, were never allowed to see their mothers and wives even for five minutes and were never given permission to write or receive even one letter.

These people, already immured in inaccessible stone walls for more than nine months, can only approach the investigators, procurators and prison guards. They are completely denied the right to defense, a right proclaimed in Article 158 of the Soviet Constitution and by Articles 13 and 22 of the "Basic Criminal Procedure in the Soviet Union and in the Union Republics."

It is terrible to think that they have not had one meeting with a defense lawyer during the nine to ten months of imprisonment; there are no lawyers who are permitted to represent them. Even Shcharansky, who has been charged with espionage under Article 64 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR which carries a possible death sentence, is without counsel.

In this appeal, we deliberately do not treat the question of the legality of the arrest itself and detention under guard of Orlov, Shcharansky and Ginzburg -- their arrest is only an attempt by the Soviet authorities to suppress dissent and is a repressive measure against those who engage in the nonviolent struggle for the right of the individual to free thought and speech. The illegal extension of the term of pre-trial detention longer than the established nine months in effect turns a "preventive measure" into a method of punishment determined without trial imposed by the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, functioning as a punitive organ.

A government of law, especially a government which calls itself socialist, should not violate its own laws so crudely, and scoff at the rights of citizens -- even the rights of real criminals such as murderers and terrorists -- as is certainly not the case here.

We appeal to the participants of the Belgrade Conference to make a determined stand for the immediate release of Yuri Orlov, Aleksandr Ginzburg, and Anatoly Shcharansky.

December 25, 1977

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

An Appeal for Levko LukyanenkoDocument No. 31

Repressions continue against the members of the Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accords in the USSR. As has been already reported (by the Ukrainian Helsinki Group), a member of the Ukrainian Group, Levko Lukyanenko, was arrested in the City of Chernigov on December 12, 1977. This is the fifth member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group to be arrested**; moreover, Mykola Rudenko and Oleksiy Tykhy have already been sentenced to unjustly cruel terms, while Matusevych and Marynovych have been held in pre-trial detention for many months. We remind you that in addition to repressions against the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, there have been similar actions taken against members of other Helsinki Groups formed in the USSR: A. Ginzburg, Yuri Orlov, A. Shcharansky, and M. Landa in Moscow; Z. Gamsakhurdia, M. Kostava, V. Pailodze, and V. Rtskhiladze in Georgia; and V. Petkus and B. Gajauskas* in Lithuania. Both P. Vins (Ukraine) and G. Goldshtein (Georgia)** have been held in detention for short periods. We're not even counting the searches, summonses for questioning, or deprivation of one's right to work in one's specialty.

These repressions undoubtedly bear witness to the fact that the authorities have planned to stifle and destroy the Soviet Helsinki Groups. Each member of these Groups lives under the constant threat of repression.

The tragic fate of Levko Lukyanenko evokes particular alarm. Lukyanenko is 50 years old, fifteen of which have been spent in prisons and camps.

After he completed his 15-year term of imprisonment in 1975, Lukyanenko was settled in the city of Chernigov. The less than two year period of his "free" life was spent under the open administrative surveillance of the militia, was accompanied by searches, interrogations, and the inspection of his personal correspondence.

Fifteen years of imprisonment have not made him indifferent to people; have not dampened his love for his country.

* (B. Gajauskas, now in special regimen camp, has asked to become a member of the Lithuanian Group--Ed.)
 ** (See section on 20 imprisoned members of the Soviet Helsinki Groups--Ed.)

In November 1976, Lukyanenko joined the Ukrainian Helsinki Group. And now -- a new arrest.

As always in political persecutions, the authorities do not provide any information about the specific charges against the arrested person. But it is known that Lukyanenko has not only not committed, but never even advocated any violent or illegal acts. Therefore, it is obvious that the reason for Lukyanenko's arrest is his activity in the Ukrainian Helsinki Group.

We, together with the members of the Ukrainian Group, are deeply concerned about the fate of Lukyanenko and we join in their statement that the Belgrade meeting cannot serve its purpose if members of the Helsinki Groups remain in prisons or camps. At the same time, we wish to stress that Lukyanenko's fate and his recent arrest are typical reprisals against people who have already served a sentence on political charges. After release, these people are almost always deprived of the opportunity to engage in public activities, to interact freely with other people, not to mention the fact that they are under open administrative surveillance.

When such people remain true to their own convictions, they are usually involved in new trials as "repeaters", they are seen as recidivists, and are sentenced with particular cruelty. The recent conviction of Oleksiy Tykhy is a typical example of such sentences.

In appealing for the defense of the lawyer, Levko Lukyanenko, we once again call for the defense of all the members of the Soviet Helsinki Groups who have been arrested earlier.

February 2, 1978
Moscow

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Viktor Nekipelov
Naum Meiman
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

On Violations of the Right to a Free Choice
of One's Country of Residence

Document No. 32

The right of choosing one's country of residence and of traveling abroad is one of the most frequently violated human rights in the USSR. Furthermore, the Soviet authorities do not consider it to be their obligation to specify to a person the reasons why he has been refused permission to emigrate or to travel.

We cite the case of Dr. Vera Livchak as an example of how the right of unrestricted travel is violated by Soviet authorities. On three occasions, Livchak has been denied permission to visit with her only child, a daughter, who has been living in Israel since 1971. The reason given for the first refusal of Livchak's request to travel was the absence of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel. To circumvent this obstacle, the second time Livchak applied to travel not to Israel but to Austria where she has a relative, the plan being that the daughter would journey there to meet her. This time the grounds of refusal were given as insufficient closeness of kinship with her relative in Austria. The third time Livchak filed documents to obtain permission for her daughter to come to Moscow for a visit. No reason was given for the third refusal. Unless Livchak applies to leave the country altogether which, for personal reasons, she does not want to do, the 74-year-old mother must abandon all hope of seeing her daughter again.

Documents, submitted to the visa office (OVIR) by Germans who want to emigrate from the USSR, often are not even accepted for consideration. Soviet officials claim that the vyzovs (invitations) sent them are from relatives who do not have a sufficiently close degree of kinship. Often, however, the authorities refuse such requests even when the vyzovs are sent by parents or siblings.

The most frequent reason given for refusing travel or emigration requests is so-called knowledge of state secrets. There is, however, no official time period after which one's knowledge of such secrets -- in the event that there is such knowledge -- is considered to have become obsolete. Furthermore, there is no official list of jobs and institutions for which one needs a security clearance. We refer to Academician A. Sakharov's letter to the American Federation of Scientists on Dr. Yu. Golfand and Dr. N. Meiman.

As a supplement to this document, we append a letter and lists of former students and teachers of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology attesting to the fact that many graduates of the Institute have received permission to emigrate from the country, while others -- Anatoly Shcharansky is one of them -- have been refused permission to do so on the grounds of "knowledge of state secrets". Since 1973, Shcharansky has been trying to obtain permission to emigrate. At present, he is being held on treason charges in an isolation cell at a KGB investigation prison. Two of Shcharansky's classmates, I. Sherman and L. Kogan, who both got permission to emigrate in 1974, are also listed.

A careful review of these lists gives the reader a clear idea of the ways in which the words "knowledge of secrets" can frequently decide a person's fate and that of his family, even though they may have absolutely no knowledge of government or military secrets.

P.S. We consider it essential that the present document of the Group be made known to Anatoly Shcharansky's lawyers, since the information it contains is directly relevant to his defense.

January 2, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

Former Students and Faculty Members of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology
Who Have Emigrated to the West

Name	Home City	Year Graduated/ Department	Date of Submission of Emigration Application	Date of Departure from USSR	Destination	Remarks
1 SHERMAN, Igor	Lvov	1972 FOPF ^{1/}	1974	2.5 months ^{2/}	Canada	
2 KOGAN, Lev	Moscow	1972 Aeromekh	December 1972	October 1974	Israel	While in the USSR, Kogan was never employed in his field.
3 TRIFONOV, Eduard	Moscow	1961 ^{3/}	1975	1976	Israel	
4 NADEZH DIN, Aleksandr Danilovich	Donetsk	1972 FMKhF		1977	Canada	
5 ZAVELOVICH, Evsei Beniaminovich	Moscow	1972 FMKhF	3 months	October 4 1977	Canada	
6 GORBOV, Igor	Chernovtsy	1968	1971	1974	Israel	
7 MUCHNIK, Boris	Moscow	1970 FMKhF	1.5 months	1976	USA	

8	PERETSMAN, Leva	Mendeleevo, Moscow Province	1964 ^{3/} ?	...months ^{3/}	1975	Israel	
9	PAMM, Dima	Moscow	1964	1972	1975 ^{4/} ?	Rehovot, Israel	
10	DAVYDOV, Vladimir	Moscow	1964 ^{3/} ? FRTK	1974	1975	USA	
11	GURVITS, Sergei	Moscow	1967 FOPF	1971 (1.5 Years)	1972	1969	Gurvits was expelled from graduate program by order of the authorities.

1/ The full name of the departments and institutes are listed in the Attachment.

2/ i.e. After submission of his emigration application.

3/ As written in the original text.

4/ As written in the original text. Dima Pamm emigrated in February 1976.

Students and Faculty Members of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology who have
Been Refused Permission to Emigrate on Secrecy Grounds

Name/Address	Year Graduated	Faculty	Institute	Date of Submission of Emigration Application	Nature of Work Prior to Submission of Application
1 PARGAMANIK, Efim Iosifovich Kiev-87 ul. Erevanskaya 13, kv. 32	1974	FMKhF ^{1/}	IVTAN	1977	NIKTI--city planning Kiev, 1974-March 1977
2 GERTSBERG, Vladimir Leonidovich Kiev-112 ul. Parkhomenko 60a, kv. 41	1974	FMKhF	IPM	December 1976	
3 TSYRULIN, Evgeny Ilich Moscow E-215 Sirenevy bulvar 37/40, kv. 67 tel. 464-85-56	1972	FMKhF	IKhF	January 1977	1) VNIPI--oil 1972-1974 2) NIOPIK 1974-1976
4 ULANOVSKY, Lev Efraimovich Moscow Obrucheveva 3, korpus 1, kv. 64 tel. 432-07-63	1973	FOPF theoretical division	FIAN	1973	EhNIN/Krzhizhanovsky, ACU division
5 KHAIT, Mikhail Moscow Province 140 000 Lyubertsy Oktyabrsky prospekt 199, kv. 47	1970	FRTK	IPPI	March 1974	1) Odessa--programmer 2) Moscow--programmer

6	KALENOV, Yuri ^{2/} Arkadevich Moscow ul. Kraxnoyarskaya 10, korpuz 7, kv. 51 tel. 467-71-47	1967 undergraduate degree; 1970 grad- uate degree	FMkhF	IKhF	July 1974	IKhF 1970-1972
7	SHCHARANSKY, Anatoly Borisovich born 1948 Lefortovo Prison	1972	FUPM			Institute of Oil and gas
8	PEKKER, Mark ^{3/} Ioelevich Leningrad ul. Repina 27, kv. 24	1971 (IAT)	FRTK	IPU	July 1975	Unskilled labor
9	FINKELSHTEIN, Eitan born 1942 Vilnius Liepas 10, kv. 10					
10	GUREVICH, Igor Moscow					

^{1/} The full name of the departments and institutes are listed in the Attachment.

^{2/} KONDRATEV signed a declaration attesting that KALENOV had no access to classified information.

^{3/} PEKKER, in reprisal for his underground writing activities, was expelled from MFTI a few days before he was to have finished his thesis.

AttachmentDepartments of MFTI

FMKhF Department of Molecular and Chemical Physics
 FOPF Department of General and Applied Physics
 FRTK Department of Radiotechnology and Cybernetics
 FUPM Department of Management and Applied Mathematics

Institutes

VNIPINeft All Union Scientific Research and Planning Institute of Oil Refinery
 and the Petrochemical Industry
 IAT Institute of Automation and Telemechanics (name changed to IPU as
 of May 1970)
 IVTAN Institute of High-Temperature Physics, USSR Academy of Sciences
 IPM Institute of Applied Mathematics
 IPPI Institute of Problems of Information Transfer
 IPU Institute of Problems of Management (known as IAT until May 1970)
 IKhF Institute of Chemical Physics, USSR Academy of Sciences
 MFTI Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology
 NIKTI gor. Institute of Scientific Research and Construction-Technology for Urban
 khoz Planning, Ministry of Communal Planning of the Ukrainian SSR, Kiev
 NIOPIK Scientific Research Institute for Organic Semi-Prepared Foods and
 Colorings
 FIAN P.N. Lebedev Institute of Physics, USSR Academy of Sciences
 EhNIN Krzhizhanovsky Institute of Energetics, Division of Automatic Manage-
 ment Systems

In Defense of Aleksandr Zinoviev*Document No. 33

Aleksandr Zinoviev is a Doctor of Science, a Professor of Philosophy specializing in mathematical logic, a member of the Finnish Academy of Sciences, and the author of many well-known scientific works.

In September 1976, his work of philosophical fiction, "The Yawning Heights", was published in Switzerland. This work became widely known abroad and already has been translated into a number of European languages. In December 1977 it was awarded a literary prize in Switzerland.

Soon after the appearance of this book, on January 19, 1977, Aleksandr Zinoviev was dismissed from his job as a Senior Scientific Worker in the Institute of Philosophy of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and then was deprived of all his scientific degrees and honors (the decision of the Scientific Council of the Institute was upheld by VAK**).

A. Zinoviev, who served his country as a pilot during World War II, was stripped of his medals and decorations. Zinoviev was read the text of the order stripping him of his military honors, but they would not give him a copy of the order itself.

Zinoviev's telephone was shut off illegally; his mail is confiscated. Any possibility for contacts with foreign colleagues has been cut off. Zinoviev's friends and relatives are under systematic pressure so as to isolate him from those close to him. The militia and local council summon him to explain his "evasion of work activity".

The KGB summoned Zinoviev for questioning four times -- he came voluntarily three times, but once he was taken by force.

Aleksandr Zinoviev has received an invitation from Munich University to give a course on mathematical logic. On May 16, 1977, Zinoviev requested of OVIR that he be allowed to go to West Germany to read a series of lectures. On January 25, 1978, after eight months, he received an oral refusal, giving no reason for the decision.

Thus:

1. Aleksandr Zinoviev is persecuted, is deprived of work and the means of earning a livelihood, not for his actions but for his thoughts; for his independent, unregulated, undictated thoughts; and for his own personal philosophical view of things and events.

2. Aleksandr Zinoviev was not allowed to travel abroad for scientific work, thus violating the agreements on scientific contacts, although since he has worked in the areas of philosophy and mathematical logic, he has no knowledge of any government secrets.

* (Professor Zinoviev was given permission to accept an invitation to teach at Munich University on July 18, 1978--Ed.)

** (VAK: All-Union Attestation Commission--Ed.)

A. Zinoviev is well known in the West. His tragic fate can only arouse the sympathy of all people of good will. But we must note that this violation of Zinoviev's rights is typical for the Soviet Union and many face similar persecutions.

February 1978
Moscow

Members of the Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

Statement on the Lengthy Illegal Detention
of Professor Yuri Orlov in Prison

Document No. 34

On February 6, 1977, KGB Investigator Trofimov told Irina Valitova-Orlova, wife of Yuri Orlov, founder of the Moscow Helsinki Group, that on December 29, 1977 the charge against her husband was changed from Article 190-1, which carries a maximum sentence of three years, to Article 70 (anti-Soviet propaganda), for which one can be imprisoned for seven years plus five years of internal exile.

Bearing full responsibility for our claims, we state that Professor Orlov has not broken any Soviet laws, and that his arrest on February 10, 1977 and all further repressive measures taken against him have purely a political motivation -- namely to punish him for the creation and leadership of the Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accords in the USSR. The activity of this Group is open and public in nature, and its frequently proclaimed goal is to promote the fulfillment of the humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki accords. This activity still continues as before the arrest of its leader, Yuri Orlov, and those of its active members, Aleksandr Ginzburg and Anatoly Shcharansky; the exile of member Malva Landa; and the emigration of member Lyudmila Alekseeva, and of Valentyn Turchin and Tatyana Khodorovich, who worked closely with the Group.

Laws and civilized norms were violated not by Yuri Orlov, but by the KGB investigators who are holding Yuri Orlov under harsh prison conditions for a year without allowing him any meetings with relatives and legal counsel.

We wish to draw the attention of international public opinion to the fact that all this is taking place 60 years after the Revolution with its proclaimed aim of creating a just social order, and after the adoption in 1977 of "the most democratic" -- according to the Soviet mass propaganda -- "Constitution in the world."

The investigatory authorities' characteristic inhumanity and indifference to a human fate is revealed by the fact that only 40 days after the switch had been made, did they inform Yuri Orlov's wife of the essential change in the nature of the charges against him.

We do not know the principles which guide the KGB in its game of malevolent patience by which some human rights activists are arrested, while others are forced to emigrate. We only affirm that its obvious aim -- namely to crush the human rights movement -- is unattainable.

The following facts attest to the growing cruelty of the persecution of human rights activists:

1. On February 7, 1977, Andrei Tverdokhlebov -- who had returned on January 21, 1977 after serving five years in prison and internal exile -- was sent to prison for ten days on a trumped up charge. Furthermore, he was treated very rudely and violently in the militia. Andrei Tverdokhlebov has been on a hunger strike since the morning of February 8.

2. A member of the Georgian Helsinki Group, Grigory Goldshtein, has been informed officially that a criminal case on charges of hooliganism is being prepared against him and that the trial will take place even if he manages to find work in the immediate future.

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipov
Vladimir Slepak

Statement to the Belgrade ConferenceDocument No. 35

We consider it essential to make the following statement about the threatened Soviet veto of the Concluding Document at the Belgrade Meeting on human rights and on evaluating fulfillment among the participating states of the Helsinki Accords:

1. At Helsinki, the Western countries made such substantive concessions as acknowledging the stability of the post-war boundaries and cooperating in the fields of technology and economics. These areas were of vital interest to the Soviet Union. The only concessions made by the Soviets were to include humanitarian articles in the Final Act and to agree to periodic meetings to review compliance with the Helsinki Accords.

2. The basic aim of such monitoring of compliance with the Helsinki Accords is in regard to the humanitarian sections of these Accords. This is because there is no threat to the stability of the borders. Questions of economic and technical cooperation are continuously examined in various types of bilateral and multilateral negotiations, while the problems of European arms limitation are examined in negotiations convened for that purpose in Vienna:

3. The veto which the Soviet delegation threatens deprives both the humanitarian sections of the Accords and the Belgrade Meeting of both purpose and substance. In effect, such a veto would mean a renunciation of the Helsinki Accords.

4. We wish to remind you of the warning in our Appeal to the Belgrade Conference (Document No. 26) that if the Soviet Union were to break up the Belgrade Conference on the pretext of interference in its internal affairs, this would be a great misfortune and one of long duration. Nevertheless, such a step would merely be a temporary impediment on the historically inevitable path of detente. However, it would be a far greater misfortune for the future of mankind -- a catastrophe with consequences hard to rectify -- if countries capitulate to the threat to break up the meeting.

February, 1978

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

Announcement on the Formation of an Association of Free Labor Unions
in the Soviet Union

Document No. 36

Recently, in Moscow, there were several press conferences at which a group of laborers and engineering and technical workers from various cities announced that together they will strive to obtain their rights in the areas of occupational safety, work conditions, fair wages, and distribution of living space, and defense against illegal firings, especially for making critical remarks. Now this group has announced the formation of an Association of Free Labor Unions.

We are following its activities with great interest, and await the publication of a statement of the aims and tasks of this Association. We hope that the formation of a new labor union will have a significant effect on the development of civic awareness in our country. In this connection, the Helsinki Group wishes to remind Soviet and world public opinion that the creation of such a labor union is both just and based on law.

Article 225, Section XV of the Law Code on Labor of the RSFSR (Juridical Literature, Moscow, 1972), "The Right of Workers and Civil Servants to Unite in Labor Unions," proclaims:

In accord with the Constitution of the Soviet Union, workers and civil servants have the right to unite in labor unions. Professional unions follow their own regulations and are not subject to registration with state institutions. Government organs, enterprises, institutions, and organizations must offer all kinds of assistance to professional labor unions and their activities. (This is a translation of the complete text of the article).

The Helsinki Group never had the intention -- and still does not -- of participating directly in the activities of various unofficial associations and groups in the country (religious communities of Pentecostals, Evangelical-Baptist Christians, Adventists, and others; Germans and Jews struggling for the right to emigrate; Crimean Tatars fighting to return to the Crimea; political prisoners trying to get decent treatment, medical service, normal diet and living conditions, etc.). The Group's task is to reveal violations of rights of citizens or groups, and to promote the realization of these rights in accordance with the provisions of the Final Act.

In this connection, the Helsinki Group relates to the newly organized Association of Free Labor Unions in the same way it does to the other groups mentioned above.

Furthermore, we believe that the aims and tasks of this Association derive from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and from those pacts to which the Helsinki Final Act refers.

February 9, 1978
Moscow

Members of the Moscow Helsinki Group:

•
Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

Statement on the Need to Create a Free and Independent
Association of Disabled Persons

To: The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet;
The U.N. Human Rights Commission;
UNESCO: and
Norman Acton, Council of World Organizations Interested in
the Handicapped

Document No. 37

In this appeal, the Moscow Helsinki Group would like to draw the attention of the Soviet Government and of international public opinion to the need to create in the USSR a free, independent association of paralyzed persons. Such an association would include those who have become, either totally or partially, incapacitated at work, through illness, or by childhood disease. It could, moreover, be modeled along the lines of the All-Union Society of the Blind or the All-Union Society of Deaf Mutes, both of which already exist in the Soviet Union.

Groups of activists (drawn from among the handicapped themselves) have made numerous attempts to obtain permission to form their own public association. They have, however, met with categorical refusal from the responsible authorities, who maintain that the Ministry of Social Services already provides everything these invalids need.

In fact, these people are poor and humiliated. They are helpless, in constant need of aid, but despairing of receiving even the most basic assistance. Their lives are a vicious cycle of alienation, loneliness, and a daily struggle for survival far below the poverty level.

The bureaucrats of the Ministry of Social Services either do not understand, or do not want to understand, how difficult it is for handicapped people to return to a full and normal life. They may also be unable to resolve this problem and, as a result, have themselves become obstacles to its solution.

In fact, handicapped people of the types mentioned above, are deprived in the USSR of the right to meaningful work, education, leisure, a good diet, medical treatment (medicine is too expensive for people living on disability pensions), a normal personal life, physical therapy, and participation in sporting events, particularly the International Olympic Games for the Handicapped.

Those with the most severe types of paralysis are, in effect, deprived of the right to independent movement. This contrasts with the situation in other developed countries (developed in both the technical and moral sense), where a whole series of mechanical devices and 'aids' are available. These devices enable the handicapped person to move about with a certain degree of self-sufficiency, both at home and on the street (by means of various types of motor and auto transport which the invalid himself can operate). In comparison with these world standards, Soviet orthopedics and bio-medical engineering are very underdeveloped.

The problem of transport is crucial. Wheelchairs are unreliable and of poor quality. The development of new models does not take into account the special problems of various types of paralysis. The price of care for the handicapped has been inflated by black market speculation, and people living on disability pensions cannot afford these technical aids (a special discount was abolished). The maintenance and repair of motorized wheelchairs and specially outfitted cars is difficult and expensive. Spare parts are in short supply. Gas is too expensive for people with such paltry pensions. Public transportation is so constructed that most handicapped people cannot use it.

The needs of the disabled are not taken into consideration when residential housing is constructed; existing structures are not remodeled and specially equipped homes and apartments for the disabled are not built. (A person in a wheelchair cannot, for example, get into the bathroom or toilet, cannot climb the stairs to the elevator, etc).

The situation would be different if there were a free public association of the handicapped, an association that would be linked with international organizations of disabled persons. The All-Union Society of the Blind and the All-Union Society of Deaf Mutes, with their education programs and network of special industrial enterprises, not only provide their members with an income, but help them to lead active, normal lives and preserve their self-respect. At the same time, these All-Union Societies make the work of the blind and deaf-and-dumb productive and profitable to the state.

The creation of an association of the handicapped would enable people who are lonely and helpless to join forces; it would help hundreds and thousands of disabled people leading bitter existences to return to full lives. This is a problem of enormous moral and ethical significance.

Linking such an association with international organizations of the handicapped would open up possibilities for cultural and technical exchanges which could help the disabled lead fuller lives. Exhibits of artificial limbs, technical aids and sports gear for the handicapped could be arranged; the association could participate in drafting international conventions on obligatory world standards for the physical rehabilitation and reintegration of the handicapped into daily life.

A refusal to permit the creation of this association would contradict the Declaration of Human Rights and the Soviet Constitution.

At the same time, we call on handicapped people not to accept their humiliating situation and not to wait for outside help. Rather, they should organize, on their own initiative, mutual-aid societies which could serve as the nucleus for a free public association of disabled persons in the future.

February 23, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Petr Grigorenko
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Vladimir Slepak
Naum Meiman
Tatyana Osipova

On the Right to a Fair Pension

Document No. 38

In Article 22 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights it is stated: "Everyone, as a member of Society, has the right to social security."

Article 8 of the Convention on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights establishes "the right of everyone to social security, including social insurance."

Article 43 of the Soviet Constitution loudly proclaims the right of citizens to material security in old age, in the event of illness, disability, or loss of a breadwinner.

In the present document we shall -- without giving a complete analysis of the social security system in the USSR -- restrict ourselves to only two of the most important questions: (1) the dependence of the right to a pension on the length of employment and (2) the size of the pension.

1. The basic form of social security for old age and disability is the social insurance pension. Blue and white collar workers do not pay insurance contributions: pensions are considered to be paid at government expense. To all intents and purposes, however, the resources for social insurance are drawn from a certain percentage of the wage fund contributed by enterprises and institutions. An article by Professor of Economics, L. Blyakhman (Molodoi kommunist, No. 6, 1968), includes the following calculation: from each ruble of value created by a worker, fifty-five kopecks is paid out to him in the form of wages, and forty-five kopecks goes towards public consumption funds.

Under such a system of social insurance, many categories of workers have no right to pension security:

a. Years of work in places of imprisonment (i.e. prison labor) do not count towards length of service for purposes of entitlement to a pension.

In the case of long prison sentences imposed by the criminal courts there are tens -- if not hundreds -- of thousands of people who on their release from prison receive no pension because of "the lack of the required period of employment," even though they have labored for many years under harsh conditions of imprisonment. (The number of prisoners is great: indirect statistics indicate that prisoners make up no less than one percent of the whole population).

b. Handicraftsmen who work all their life creating material values but who do not belong to the categories of blue and white collar workers have no right to a pension.

c. Those who are disabled since childhood do not receive social insurance pensions (on allowances for them, see the following section).

d. Pensions are not granted to former kolkhozniks who ceased to work on the kolkhoz before passage of the law on pensions for kolkhozniks (in 1964) and who have become old or disabled without having worked for the required period of time as blue or white collar workers.

e. Many persons do not receive a pension because, for one reason or another, they do not have the possibility of proving by strictly official (legal) means that they have met the length-of-service requirement.

f. Finally, old or disabled persons who, for one reason or another, do not have the length of service required by law do not receive a pension either. There are certain cases established by law where so-called proportional old-age pensions (when length of service is incomplete) may be granted, but this depends on a number of conditions -- e.g. that the pension age is reached while working for hire, etc. These "incomplete" pensions are, as a rule, extremely low.

The strict secrecy that surrounds statistics prevents us from ascertaining the number of people who do not receive a social insurance pension, but there can be no doubt that this is a real problem for a considerable number of citizens in the USSR.

2. According to information from the Scientific Research Institute for Labor, the subsistence wage in the USSR amounts to fifty rubles per person per month. This is confirmed by a decree of the Council of Ministers dated September 9, 1974, on the allocation of allowances for children up to the age of eight in needy (maloobesrechennye) families where the total per capita income of the family does not exceed fifty rubles. This allowance, incidentally, amounts to twelve rubles per month per one child and is paid up only till the age of eight.

Without doubt, this "subsistence" wage means living on the brink of poverty.

The size of the lowest pensions fixed by law is below even this level of poverty.

The lowest old-age pension is forty-five rubles a month, which means that proportional (that is, without complete length of service) pensions must be considerably lower.

The minimum pension for invalids of group II is forty-five rubles a month and of group III twenty-one rubles a month. (In the case of disability resulting from an injury on the job or from an occupational disease, the pension is somewhat higher).

The minimum pension for disabled members of a family without a breadwinner is twenty-three rubles a month for one member, forty-five rubles a month for two members, and seventy rubles a month for three or more family members.

If the deceased breadwinner of a family did not complete the required length of service, then the minimum pension for one member of the family is five rubles a month, for two members eleven rubles a month, and for three or more members seventeen rubles a month.

The law on pensions for kolkhozniks passed in 1964 provides minimum pensions of sixteen to thirty-five rubles a month when a certain period of employment on a kolkhoz has been completed (depending on the degree of disability and other conditions).

3. Legislation for the republics has established the payment of monthly allowances to certain groups of disabled citizens who have no right to a social insurance pension.

The conditions under which these allowances are paid, however, severely limit the number of people who receive them, and the value of the pensions (from eight to sixteen rubles a month) is insignificant.

4. Another kind of "social security" established by law needs to be mentioned here -- i.e. child allowances for unmarried mothers -- not entitled to alimony because the identity of the father has not been legally determined.

State allowances are paid out to unmarried mothers in the following sums: five rubles a month for one child (the cost of fifteen liters of milk), seven rubles and fifty kopecks a month for two children, and ten rubles a month for three children or more.

This brief and far from complete review of some important problems of social security in the USSR testifies to the existence of a considerable number of disabled Soviet citizens who do not receive any pension or allowance, and a still larger number of old, disabled people and children who receive such paltry pensions and allowances that they do not have the means of subsistence even by Soviet standards.

Since economic rights -- among which is the right of the invalid, the old-aged, and the disabled members of families (including children) -- to an adequate standard of living are an essential element of civil rights, the Public Group to Promote Implementation of the Helsinki Agreement in the USSR wants to draw attention to all states that have signed the Helsinki Agreement to the massive violations -- sanctioned under the existing laws -- of the rights of Soviet citizens unable to work.

February 23, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

On the Belgrade ConferenceDocument No. 39

The Belgrade Meeting is over. The Concluding Document does not reflect the five month-long discussions on various aspects of observance of the Helsinki Act, and in particular, those on fulfillment of its humanitarian provisions. The Concluding Document does not refer to human rights. In general, it represents a step backwards from the Final Act itself which affirmed the unbreakable link between the observance of human rights, security and cooperation.

All provisions of any international agreement are mandatory for all its signatory states. Therefore, the Soviet assertion that discussion of Soviet implementation of the humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki Accords constitutes interference in its internal affairs contradicts the Final Act and confirms Soviet violations of its obligations. The arrest of 18 members of the Public Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accords in the USSR provides abundant evidence of these violations.

In Belgrade, there were many months of discussion of the human rights issue. In response to Western accusations of Soviet non-fulfillment of the humanitarian provisions of the Accords, the Soviet delegation attempted to counter the problem of human rights with that of social and economic rights. In reality, individual rights are intimately tied to social and economic rights and it is impossible to set one off against the other. Without guaranteed rights for the individual, one cannot successfully defend social and economic rights. This is proof of the real state of affairs in the Soviet Union where social and economic rights are less secure than in any developed democratic country. Wages, for example, are lower than unemployment compensation in the Federal Republic of Germany and the situation of pensions (See Document No. 37) for entire categories of citizens is simply shameful. In the USSR, there also exists hidden unemployment, aggravated by difficulties of resettlement inside the country, by the lack of official statistical information, and also by the lack of unemployment compensation.

We see a potential danger in the Concluding Document in that the terms of the Madrid Meeting in 1980 will be partially set by the present Concluding Document which makes no mention of human rights.

The prevailing situation after the Belgrade Meeting makes the activity of the Public Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accords in the USSR even more essential and urgent. The legality of this activity is a logical consequence of the fact that the Soviet Union is one of the signatories of the Final Act and that the USSR has ratified all the International Pacts enumerated in Principle VII of the Final Act.

March 14, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

On the Case of Anatoly ShcharanskyDocument No. 40

On March 15, it will be one year that Anatoly Shcharansky has been held in strict confinement, deprived of the opportunity to see or correspond with members of his family. Soviet law provides for a pre-trial confinement of up to nine months. The fact that we cite this law in no way means that we support it, or its practice, in any degree. The harsh nine-month term of confinement has no justification, and actually constitutes a presumption of the guilt of the accused. The length of this term, we can say from experience, sharply contrasts with the lightning speed with which the trial itself is conducted.

Anatoly Shcharansky was arrested after the publication of slanderous articles in the Soviet press. The same was true in the case of his Helsinki Group friends, Yuri Orlov and Aleksandr Ginzburg, arrested the month before. Shcharansky stands charged with treason under Article 64 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, an article that provides for a maximum penalty of death. We categorically dismiss as hypocritical and slanderous the charge that Shcharansky was involved in any espionage activities. He particularly irritated the authorities as a leader, not only of the Jewish repatriation movement, but also of the human rights campaign. His arrest and the charges against him are based on purely political motives.

The trial of Anatoly Shcharansky for treason will evoke memories of the Dreyfus case, a treason trial in France at the end of the 19th century, and the Doctors' Trials during the last months of the Stalin regime. Broad circles of democratic people in all countries understand very well that Anatoly Shcharansky is being tried for his civic activities.

March 15, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

On the Revocation of P.G. Grigorenko's Soviet CitizenshipDocument No. 41

According to a Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet issued on February 13, 1977 (and signed by Presidium Chairman Brezhnev and Secretary Georgadze), Petr Grigoryevich Grigorenko was stripped of his Soviet citizenship. In November 1977, Grigorenko received permission for a six month trip to the United States for medical treatment and to visit his son. This permission corresponded to the letter and spirit of the Helsinki Final Act.

In his own country and abroad, Grigorenko is well-known as a courageous and steadfast individual, one who gave his strength and health to the human rights struggle in the USSR, who campaigned against the personality cult, against the continued exile of the Crimean Tatars from the Crimea and against the use of psychiatry for repressive ends. Grigorenko paid a heavy and unjust price for his courage and steadfastness, years of incarceration in psychiatric prisons, deprived of his freedom. Throughout his life, Grigorenko has followed the arduous path of a toiler and heroic soldier. He defended the Soviet Union in two wars, rose to the rank of Major General, and was decorated with five military orders and several other medals. All those who met Grigorenko came under the spell of his personality: his active kindness and sympathetic nature, his open-mindedness and tolerance. Grigorenko's public activity was always open and legal, and founded on the laws and Constitution of the USSR. In the last few years, Grigorenko worked actively with the Moscow and Ukrainian Public Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accords in the USSR, and was a founding member of both.

The Supreme Soviet decree states that Grigorenko was stripped of his citizenship for systematically engaging in activities detrimental to the prestige of the USSR. Grigorenko, however, did not participate in any public activities while he was in the United States. Therefore, the Supreme Soviet considers Grigorenko's life and work in the USSR to have been detrimental to the prestige of the Soviet Union.

In sending this document to the heads of signatory states of the Helsinki Accords, the Moscow Helsinki Group asks them to assist in Grigorenko's efforts to return to the USSR and, in an open court, to prove that all his public work was to foster the prestige of his country and people, in defense of human rights and of the international agreements and covenants signed by the leaders of the USSR and ratified by the Soviet government.

March 15, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

On the Revocation of M. Rostropovich and G. Vishnevskaya's
Soviet Citizenship

Document No. 42

For the reasons outlined below, the Moscow Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accords in the USSR protests the revocation of Mstislav Rostropovich's and Galina Vishnevskaya's Soviet citizenship and of their right to return to their native land.

1. The deprivation of Rostropovich's and Vishnevskaya's citizenship violates the international obligations of the Soviet government, specifically, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Accords.

2. The foremost cellist of our times, Mstislav Rostropovich, and the well-known singer, Galina Vishnevskaya, have, through their artistic work, inspired the sympathy and respect of millions of people around the world. Admiration for an artist's talent and the gratitude of his listeners inevitably reflects well on his country, thereby raising its prestige. No government has the right to be the sole custodian of its own prestige or that of the country it governs.

March 18, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Malva Landa
Vladimir Slepak
Tatyana Osipova

Discrimination Against the Crimean Tatars and Mustafa DzhemilevDocument No. 43

Mustafa Dzhemilev was still an infant in 1944 when Stalin promulgated the inhuman order to expel hundreds of thousands of Crimean Tatars (mostly old people, women and children) from their ancestral lands, and to deport them to the "special resettlement zone" in the Urals or Uzbekistan.

The repressions against those Crimean Tatars who have struggled to return to the Crimea are widely known. We have written frequently about the tragic fate of the Crimean Tatar people in appeals to the Soviet government, to the heads of signatory states to the Helsinki Accords, and to world public opinion (See Document Nos. 10 and 24).

Dzhemilev, an activist in the struggle for the right of the Crimean Tatars to return to their native lands, has been sentenced to imprisonment several times. In total, he has spent more than eight years in places of imprisonment. He was charged with slandering the Soviet government and social system. The court found that Dzhemilev's demands for the solution of the so-called "fabricated Crimean Tatar problem" and his claims about the infringement of the Crimean Tatars' rights were attempts to undermine the Soviet system. His last conviction was on completely trumped up charges, in violation of the provisions of the Final Act. The Moscow Helsinki Group discussed this trial in its first document.

Having served his term, Dzhemilev was released on December 22, 1977 and, although his sentence did not call for either exile or banishment, he has since been forced to live in his brother's apartment in Tashkent. He lives under conditions of administrative surveillance. Dzhemilev's request to be allowed to move to the Crimea, where his parents and sister presently live (they moved to the Crimea in 1977), is refused.

The authorities continue to persecute Mustafa Dzhemilev and may be preparing to arrest him again. In January, a violation of his administrative surveillance was fabricated. In March, the militia warned Dzhemilev that he was liable for prosecution on charges of "parasitism". They demanded that he find work immediately, although his health has been severely undermined by many years of imprisonment and by many months of hunger strikes in protest against the falsified charges brought against him.

We have received the text of an official document sent to the camp where Dzhemilev was held, in response to an inquiry on the possibility of sending Dzhemilev to the Crimea upon his release.

The complete text follows:

October 28, 1977

692710 RSFSR
Primorsky Krai
Khasansky rayon
Institution VP 267-26

To the Head of the Institution:

re: V/I 30/26-5210-A, of 10/3/77

The parents of convict Dzhemilev, Mustafa, live on the territory of the Belgorodsky rayon, in blatant violation of the passport regimen and without a residence permit. Since they are specially resettled people, their access to residence permission in the Crimea is restricted. In connection with the above-mentioned facts, it would not be appropriate to send Dzhemilev, M., to the Crimea, since he will be refused a residence permit there.

Chairman of the Oversight Commission
under the Executive Committee of the
Belgorod Regional Council of Peoples'
Deputies,

Lieutenant Colonel

(Signature)

Tsapenko

Office 267/26
Issue No. 3532 2/9/77

* * * * *

In this way, a government representative in the Crimean oblast has confirmed, in an official document, the existence of restricted rights for Crimean Tatars on the basis of their national origin.

However, when Dzhemilev, or other participants of the Crimean Tatar movement, have spoken or written about this national discrimination, the courts have called it "slanderous to the Soviet system".

The document quoted above shows that, along with the Constitution and the Order of September 5, 1967 on the rehabilitation of Crimean Tatars, there are secret "instructions" under which the Crimean Tatars have restricted rights and are still considered "specially resettled people."

This fact was confirmed further by Lieutenant B. Atashkulov, a worker in the Preventive Division of the Administration of Internal Affairs, who is in charge of the administrative surveillance of Mustafa Dzhemilev. In a talk with M. Dzhemilev and T. Osipova (a member of the Moscow Helsinki Group) in his office on March 24, 1978, he said that Dzhemilev is forbidden to live in the Crimea, since he is a "specially resettled person."

Dzhemilev's tragic fate must touch all people of good will.

Once again, we call the attention of public opinion and of the governments which signed the Helsinki Accords to the fact that the persecution of Mustafa Dzhemilev is an inextricable part of discrimination against 500,000 Crimean Tatars who are illegally deprived of their right to live in their native land.

April 6, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepka

Appended to this document are two supplements, which are on file with the Commission.

Supplement No. 1: A letter from Mustafa Dzhemilev to the Chairman of the Oversight Commission under the Executive Committee of the Belgorod Regional Council of Peoples' Deputies, Lieutenant Colonel Tsapenko.

Supplement No. 2: An appeal to the Procurator General of the Soviet Union from Mustafa Dzhemilev.

Persecution of AdventistsDocument No. 45

As a Helsinki Final Act signatory, the Soviet government pledged to:

"respect... human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief" and "within this framework... (to) recognize and respect the freedom of the individual to profess and practice, alone or in community with others, religion or belief acting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience."

Its pledge notwithstanding, the Soviet government has not only continued but lately intensified its persecution of believers. Evidence of this can be found in the completely arbitrary arrests, searches, and other repressive measures taken against members of the All-Union Church of True and Free Adventists of the Seventh Day.

In Tashkent, V.A. Shelkov, the 83-year-old chairman of the Adventist Church, was arrested on March 14, 1978. Shelkov's religious activities have always been performed under conditions of constant repression. Shelkov has already spent 23 years in prison, exile, and camp: By decision of a special Board of the OGPU* and without benefit of trial, Shelkov was sent into exile in the northern Urals on a forced labor detail from 1931-1934; in 1945 he was arrested and sentenced to be shot but the sentence was subsequently commuted to 10 years of strict regimen camp. Under threat of a new arrest since 1969, Shelkov has been forced to take up illegal residence. He was editor of the underground press, "The True Witness", which authorities actively repressed and has authored a series of books and articles on freedom of conscience and religious belief.

The authorities conducted a four-day long house search at the home of Shelkov's daughter (Uzbekistan, Tashkent #56, Soyuznaya St.) where the arrest took place. Photographs made available to the Group, information from eye-witnesses, and the personal impressions of Helsinki Group member, Tatyana Osipova, who visited the house after the search, all show that the house was totally ransacked: floors, walls, and ceilings were torn out; chimneys were destroyed; mattresses, pillows, and upholstery were ripped open; things were thrown in heaps all over the place; holes about two meters deep were dug in the yard and under the floors; the asphalt in the yard was upturned; and even the toilet pits were searched. The material loss caused by the search is irreplaceable. The police confiscated religious literature, tapes of sermons, psalms, and recordings of western radio broadcasts; written complaints, protests, statements on human rights violations; and personal savings. During the search, someone rang the doorbell. On hearing the bell, six policemen ran out of the apartment and when the caller tried to hide, they shot at him with pistols.

* (People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs, predecessor of the KGB--Ed.)

In addition to V.A. Shelkov, Ilya Sergeevich Lepshin, the owner of the house and a very ill man, was also arrested.

The police conducted a similar search on March 14 and 15, 1978, at the house of Sergei Ivanovich Maslov (Tashkent, #8 Elektrotekhnicheskaya St.). They gained entrance by breaking down the front door. Maslov, a World War II invalid, was arrested, as was Arnold Albertovich Spalin, who happened to be in the house. Elena Gerlampievna Krivoberets, who entered the house during the search, and Viktor Gennadevich Bedarev were also arrested.

In Tashkent on March 29, 1978, the following people's homes were searched:

1. F.I. Karbovskaya, Leninsky rayon, #7 Kzyl Arbatskaya St., tupik 2;
2. Sofya Prokopevna Furlet, #6 Kzyl Arbatskaya St., tupik 2;
3. Maria Pavlovna Podosinnikovaya, #2 Arkheologicheskaya St.;
4. Valentina Petrovna Yakubinaya, #36 Vinokur St.; and
5. Aleksandra Semenovna Onishchenko, #15 Dostoevsky St.

On March 17, 1978, Adventists in Riga, Latvia were subjected to house searches: Petr Semenovich Boshev and his daughter, Loida Petrovna Bosheva (#1 Pastendes St., Apts. 3 and 5 respectively); Eita Kaze Nagretskaite (#8 Kveles St.); Eugenios Prono Darguzhis (#59 Seyas St.). When the Boshevs requested that they be shown some official identification, the searchers threatened to put handcuffs on them and to put them in pre-trial detention. The Boshevs were threatened with guns several times and they were verbally assaulted. During the search of Nagretskaite's house, the authorities confiscated not only religious literature and money, as was specified in the search warrant, but also "bedsheets made by the 'Wave' factory (a broad strip of lilac colored material), a dirty sheet, two Chinese towels, 10 bottles of shampoo for women, and two bars of bath soap."

In an open letter Shelkov's relatives express fear that he may not survive. They base these fears on the threats made by KGB workers during the search: "Now, old man, you'll have to pay for everything", and on the methods used to interrogate believers.

The story of Yakov Nikolaevich Dolgoter (born in 1959; address: Ukraine, Belgorod-Dnestrovsky rayon, Odesskaya oblast, village of Ugodnoe) can serve to illustrate this. On January 29, 1978, Dolgoter was detained in Pyatigorsk. During the interrogation, he refused to give evidence about his religious activities and on the religious literature which had been confiscated from him. Then the investigators, Captain Vladimir Nikolaevich Maltsev and another man who remained anonymous, took turns beating Dolgoter. They beat his head, face, neck -- every time taking care to lift his collar so that no marks of the violence would remain -- they beat him in the area of the kidneys demanding: "Tell us where you got it (the religious literature-- Ed.) and who gave it to you or else we'll show you what Soviet power is like!" They strangled him with a scarf about his neck while continuing to beat him. The two interrogators stood facing each other, knocking Dolgoter

from side to side like a ball, often forcing him to squat uncomfortably for prolonged periods of time and threatening him with the electric chair. They brought him to his senses by throwing cold water over him, after which time the "interrogation" continued. Other militia men took part in the beating, for example, MVD (Ministry of Internal Affairs--Ed.) Sergeant Aleksandr Soloviev. Not getting any evidence, they let Dolgoter go, demanding that he promise not to tell anyone about the beating and humiliations which he had undergone. Dolgoter categorically refused to give such a promise.

In addition to the above-mentioned criminal methods used on the Adventists, administrative measures are also applied.

On February 14, 1978, Nina Fedorovna Mikhel (RSFSR, Krasnodar krai, village of Enem, #5 Shchors St.) was fined 30 rubles for giving her children a religious upbringing. Due to their religious convictions, the children do not attend school on Saturdays. This absenteeism has no detrimental effect on their grades, since the children learn their lessons in advance. Z.M. Yagumov, the director of the school; Motyagina, a teacher; and Z.B. Khotko, the class director; and other teachers in the school treat the children intolerably: They make fun of Misha and Nadya Mikhel in front of the class and sometimes in front of the whole school (during school breaks). They threaten to take the children to an orphanage and to take away the mother's parental rights.

A woman who recently moved to the same village of Enem, Dina Alekseevna Podyachaya, was also threatened with deprivation of parental rights. She has already been fined 30 rubles. Because of the prevailing conditions at the school, parents must accompany their children to and from school every day.

Rostislav Galetsky, an active member of the All-Union Church of True and Free Adventists of the Seventh Day, is under the constant threat of losing his children. Galetsky is living in hiding from the authorities and is forced to see his children in secret.

The above mentioned facts reveal that the Soviet Union violates Final Act provisions on the right to freedom of conscience and religious convictions. In addition, the Soviet government violates Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "No one shall be subject to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

The Group expresses its alarm about the fate of the arrested Adventists, particularly, V.A. Shelkov, whose imprisonment threatens his life.

April 16, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner	Viktor Nekipelov
Sofya Kalistratova	Tatyana Osipova
Naum Meiman	Vladimir Slepak
Malva Landa	

Appended to this document are three supplements which are available from the files of the CSCE Commission:

1. An open letter from the relatives of V.A. Shelkov;
2. An appeal on the situation of Soviet Adventists from Andrei Sakharov; and
3. A copy of the protocol of the search of V.A. Shelkov's house.

Deprivation of the Right to Employment and Housing
on Political Grounds

Document No. 46

Discrimination on political (ideological) grounds with regard to employment and, frequently, place of residence and housing steadily is becoming more widespread, common and matter-of-course in our country.

In particular, former prisoners of conscience who have completed their terms fall victim to this type of discrimination. Helsinki Group documents printed in July and August 1976, and in December and January 1977, described this problem using the cases of Ivan Kandyba, Nadiya Svitlychna, Kronid Lyubarsky, Aleksandr Ginzburg, and several others as examples.

This type of discrimination, which may deprive an individual of the means to provide himself with food and shelter, persists. In this document we will use the situations of Nikolai Bondar, Kuzma Matviyuk and Andrei Tverdokhlebov as illustrations. Also, the Supplement provides new information on the continuing discrimination against Nadiya Svitlychna, Ivan Kandyba and Levko Lukyanenko (until his new arrest in December 1977); materials on the present situations of Pavel Kampov, Roman Semenyuk and Lev Sergejev are also included. The case of Iosif Begun is especially significant. This man has already served a sentence for leading a so-called "parasitic way of life" and now has neither a job nor a place to live. In addition, Mustafa Dzhemilev is currently in difficult and desperate straits (Document No. 43).

Prior to his arrest, Nikolai Bondar, a worker in the city of Cherkassy (Ukrainian SSR), was convicted for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" (he had appeared at a November 7th demonstration with a placard critical of the Communist Party). He served his 7-year sentence -- November 7, 1970 through November 7, 1977 -- in the strict regimen camps of Mordovia and Perm, and later in Vladimir Prison. While in detention, his vision deteriorated severely, and now he suffers from progressive myopia and constant pain in his eyes. Bondar appealed in writing to the Gelmgoltz Institute in Moscow and received a response stating that the Institute would provide him with medical aid after his release when he would be able to travel to Moscow. Just before his release, however, Bondar was transported to Vinnitskaya oblast in Ukraine and placed under administrative surveillance immediately after his release. This action deprived him of his right to travel; his movement is limited to Cherkasskaya oblast (earlier he was restricted to Vinnitskaya oblast) for the purposes of finding a job and a place to live. Each week Bondar is required to appear at the militia station in charge of his surveillance to renew his permit.

In the course of the next few months, Bondar was unable to secure either housing (even a small room, a corner of a room or a cot in a dormitory) or a job, although he had been willing to take any he could find. The major obstacle was his "political past" (which is noted in his internal passport). When people have shown a willingness to rent him housing, local authorities have denied Bondar permission to register. (The absence of proof of registration is considered a crime and punishable by law; no one will hire you without this document). Places of employment with vacancies and dormitories for their employees have denied Bondar space in the dormitory, and, consequently, a job, using his "past" as the pretext for doing so. Bondar is not even allowed a cot in a hotel: there they tell him "it's impossible" because he is not registered anywhere. Tired and cold after a day of searching for a room and a job, Bondar ends up spending the night at the train station... (See extracts from Bondar's letter in Supplement 1).

Kuzma Matviyuk of Uman (Ukrainian SSR) was arrested in the summer of 1972 and sentenced to 4 years for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" (authorities had discovered several samizdat publications during a search of his apartment). Before his term was up, Matviyuk was convoyed to the city of Aleksandria (Kirovogradskaya oblast, Ukrainian SSR), where he was placed under administrative surveillance. Matviyuk has a higher technical education and insists on working in his field although he is denied the opportunity to do so.

Six months after his release, Matviyuk finally managed to get a temporary job. In Aleksandria, he, his wife, and his two children had huddled in a dank and dark basement. Therefore, in August 1977, after Matviyuk's surveillance ceased and he regained the right to move, he started working at an experiment station in Rovenskaya oblast as a senior scientific researcher. Nevertheless, after a certain period of time, and after he failed to exhibit the "conformity" required by the KGB, Matviyuk was fired. In March of this year he unsuccessfully appealed to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and to the Procuracy of the Ukrainian SSR (Supplement No. 2 contains specific details).

Physicist Andrei Tverdokhlebov spent five years in exile (a year of it in prison under investigation) on the charge of "distributing deliberately false inventions discrediting the Soviet state and social order," referring to his statements and articles in defense of human rights. In January 1978, he returned to Moscow to live with his relatives (daughter, mother, step-father, and sister) who had agreed to his living with them. Tverdokhlebov has been taken to the militia station on more than one occasion for "illegal" residence in Moscow; the militia has fined his relatives when they have come for Tverdokhlebov. Authorities kept Tverdokhlebov in custody for ten days (under conditions much like those in a cell) after arbitrarily charging him with "insubordination to authority".

The fact that Tverdokhlebov has neither proof of registration nor an official job (which cannot be procured without such proof) poses the threat of new criminal prosecution for violation of internal passport regulations and for leading a "parasitic way of life".

On April 6, Tverdokhlebov arrived in Kiev to attend the trial of Pyotr Vins. There he was detained by the militia and forcibly sent back to Moscow. (At a trial conducted behind closed doors in a building surrounded by a chain of militiamen, the court sentenced Pyotr Vins to a year in detention for "parasitism". Before placing Vins under arrest, the authorities deliberately blocked opportunities for Vins to work in order to devise for themselves the "legal right" to try him later...).

The discrimination suffered by Nikolai Bondar, Kuzma Matviyuk, Andrei Tverdokhlebov, and many others constitutes a violation of Articles 2, 13 (para. 1), 23 and 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; Articles 2 (part 2) and 26 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and subsequently, Principle VII of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference.

This discrimination also contradicts the "right to work" and the "right to housing" proclaimed in the Soviet Constitution.

April 20, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Viktor Nekipelov
Naum Meiman
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

Supplements:

1. N. Bondar (excerpts from correspondence)
2. K. Matviyuk
3. L. Lukyanenko (statement)
4. I. Kandyba
5. R. Semenyuk
6. P. Kampov
7. L. Sergejev (statement)
8. M. Landa
9. N. Strokatova
10. N. Svitlychna

The statement by Levko Lukyanenko contained in Supplement No. 3 above, provides a good description of the conditions under which a former political prisoner must typically live and work in the USSR. In the interests of brevity, and because the Lukyanenko statement is representative of the other supplements to Document No. 46, the editors have chosen here to include it alone. The remaining supplements may be found in the Commission's file.

Lukyanenko, a lawyer by profession, was convicted of treason and anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda in 1961 and spent the next 15 years in labor camps. Upon his release in 1976, he became a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, and, as a result, was again arrested and sentenced to ten years in camp and five years in exile in July 1978. Lukyanenko wrote the following appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet in August 1977:

"In 1961, the court sentenced me to death for wanting to raise, along with my colleagues, the issue of the peaceful secession of Ukraine from the USSR. The Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR commuted my death sentence to 15 years of detention in strict regimen labor camps.*

The secession of a Union Republic from the USSR does not contradict Marxist theory on the issue of nationality... these are fundamental truths of Marxist theory and Soviet law. But, nevertheless, I spent 15 years of torture in captivity.

For 15 years, the organs of repression tried to prove to me that Ukraine's constitutional right to secession and my aspirations constitute a threat to the territorial integrity of the Soviet Union. My inability to accept such an interpretation of the law caused me endless humiliation and torture, including a psychiatric examination at the Rybinsk psychiatric hospital.

Thank God I was able to get my soul out from behind bars to freedom in a healthy state. But there is no freedom here either.

I went from the hands of the prison wardens to those of the militia with their overt surveillance. Under surveillance, I do not have the right to leave the city without the permission of the militia, to leave my apartment, enter a hotel, cafe, bar or restaurant in the city: every Friday from 5 to 6 p.m. I must appear at the militia station to register. The police and volunteer police visit my apartment. They check up on me at work. This is official surveillance. Unofficial surveillance keeps the organs aware of my every step -- where are the limits? There is no privacy whatsoever in my life.

The KGB opens my letters and then uses them as evidence against me. For example, once I had written a letter to Oksana Meshko in which I protested Valentin Moroz's examination at the Serbsky Psychiatric Institute. Later, during the investigation of the signed protest, Senior Lieutenant Colonel of the Chernihiv KGB Derenchuk showed this letter to my brother Valentin's wife, who fell ill from fright.

The "secrecy" of telephone conversations is such that once, in dialing my number, Ivan Kandyba got the militia station which mockingly informed him that 3-39-13 was their phone number.

Authorities use such surveillance as a means of compiling data (minor violations of surveillance regulations) capable of bringing an individual to trial again. Therefore, a person under administrative surveillance is forced to glance at his watch constantly in order to avoid being late to the militia station or his own apartment; to scrutinize everyone he passes in the street to see whether he is an informer. The person under surveillance is in a constant state of nervous tension; he is deprived of the opportunity to be involved in civic activity, he is isolated and, in this manner, eventually brought to his knees.

* (In July 1978, Lukyanenko was tried and sentenced to 10 years in hard labor camps and 5 years internal exile--Ed.)

I am no longer young and can forget about Friday occasionally, or not manage to get home by nine-thirty at night. This will serve as the basis for a new extension of my surveillance.

Finally, even without formal grounds, the militia (if the KGB deems it necessary) can always find a way to justify a new extension of surveillance. When will it end?

There is no end. The decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of July 26, 1966 on administrative surveillance grants the militia the right to extend surveillance for additional six month periods until the record of conviction is eradicated from any documents. In accordance with Part 3, Article 55 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, my conviction will stand forever. My record could be cleared only by court order, an order possible only if I were to change my attitude and opinions. These I will never change. Consequently, until I die there will always be legal grounds to extend my surveillance, and I will never be rid of this tiresome watch.

I don't find the prospects of such a life at all attractive. There is no law banning a person from work in his profession in the Soviet Union but, along with the absolute majority of Ukrainian dissenters, I have been stripped of the opportunity to work in my specialty and I have been forced to earn my bread in the most primitive surroundings.

I have spent more than 8 of my 50 years in your military barracks and prison cells and this is my second year under house arrest.

I love the Ukraine more than life itself, and when I earned my first 18-day leave, I had a desire to visit Kaniv to pay my respects to Taras* and to visit the Kiev museums. I was not given permission so that I would not have the opportunity to meet with other dissidents there.

I then asked permission to go to Trstyanka and Kochanovka to admire the scenery of the marvelous arboreta and to expand a bit my knowledge of the native land there. Again, I was denied permission, in spite of the fact that I don't know a single dissenter in these places. When I travelled to Druzhkivka for the trial (the trial of Tykhy and Rudenko--Ed.), I wanted to stay through the second day to talk with their relatives. In the morning, two militiamen "invited" me to the local militia station where they detained me until 11 o'clock. Then they took me to Kramatorsk and put me directly on a train.

In this manner, I am banned from seeing both my acquaintances and the countryside of my native land.

And this is what they call living?! And will it be like this until my death?

* A statue of Taras Shevchenko, a famous Ukrainian poet, is located in this city.

No, judging from the latest events, the KGB is preparing another future for me: the presbyter of the Chernihiv Baptist commune (which I had once visited), Vladimir Mikhailovich Chernukha was, for six hours, cajoled into signing a paper. This paper ascribed to me statements I had never made.

There is no doubt that, if the KGB conceives the idea of fabricating and ascribing to me anti-Soviet statements, it will be able to do so; if it feels like driving me behind bars, it is also capable of doing that. It is largely capable of doing anything except convincing me I am wrong, because I am right, like Taras Shevchenko was right, as Ivan Franko was right, as Valentin Moroz was right.

The prospect of working as an electrician for the rest of my life; of seeing my country only within the bounds of Chernihiv; and receiving a new sentence do not satisfy me.

I therefore request permission to leave the Soviet Union for residence beyond its boundaries."

The Abuse of Labor Legislation

Document No. 47

In the early 1960's, the Soviet authorities began to pass special laws against so-called parasitism.

At present, the criminal codes of all Union republics have articles on the prosecution of people who are not working for wages (Article 209 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and corresponding articles of the Criminal Codes of the other Union republics). These laws are in direct violation of international agreements which forbid forced labor.

According to the specific language of such articles, the accused is incriminated by "systematic vagrancy, begging, or other kinds of parasitic life styles over a lengthy period of time."

The language of the law is vague enough to allow for the broadest and most arbitrary interpretation of the term "parasitism".

An unpublished decision by the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet dated August 7, 1975 (amended on May 30, 1977) reads:

"... under Article 209 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, a parasite is defined as an able-bodied adult who has refused socially useful work and has had no source of income from such work over an extended period of time, said period of time specified as four months in a row or over the course of one year, and commencing once the person has been officially warned that his parasitic lifestyle is not permissible."

In practice, the question of what constitutes unearned income is not addressed by the courts. We can cite, for example, people such as craftsmen, tutors, etc., who do not work for wages and are not registered with the financial organs but who nevertheless have official permission to do their work.

The above-mentioned decision by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet obliges local executive committees to provide jobs for people "who are performing socially useful labor" taking into account their professional qualifications.

In practice, however, scientific researchers, engineers, writers, and other people with a high level of professional training are not given appropriate jobs.

The total secrecy of statistics on trials deprives us of the possibility of determining how many cases of parasitism are examined in the courts. However, we emphasize that the very existence of forced labor laws ascribing criminal penalties for parasitism is, in and of itself, inadmissible.

Since the Soviet authorities have threatened to bring or have actually brought parasitism charges against dissidents and people who are fighting for their right to emigrate in numerous instances in the past, we have dedicated a document to this question.

The first "parasitism" cases were tried in the early 1960's: At that time, the leading contemporary poet, Iosif Brodsky, and the well-known historian and publicist, Andrei Amalrik (both of whom now live in the West), were sentenced to exile in Siberia. This practice has continued since the signing of the Helsinki Agreement.

People attempting to emigrate most frequently fall victim to the parasitism trap: a considerable number of dissidents and people who have applied to emigrate from the USSR are subsequently fired from their jobs. Usually, their attempts to find new jobs in their profession are futile. So, people with excellent professional qualifications try to find any kind of work at all. Physicist Yuri Mnyukh, who is now in the United States, worked for a long time as an elevator operator (furthermore, to avoid "unpleasantness" at work the job was registered in his wife's name). Iosif Beilin, who recently emigrated to Israel, also worked for many years as an elevator operator. Vladimir Kislik, who has a candidate degree in physical and mathematical sciences, works as a bookbinder in Kharkov. Konstantin Babitsky, a highly trained linguist and author of scientific works, still cannot find work in his profession and works as a carpenter, even though the restrictions of internal exile previously placed on him were lifted many years ago. There are many other examples of this practice.

Not everyone manages to get permission to register his job or to give private lessons (tutoring school children): In the summer of 1977, Iosif Begun, teacher of Hebrew, was arrested and sentenced to two years of internal exile. The court did not consider the teaching of Hebrew to be "socially useful labor" since the authorities refused to register this work with the financial organs. Thus, in effect, they forbade teaching Hebrew in the USSR. Begun's term of exile was shortened by an amnesty occasioned by the 60th anniversary of the October revolution. Begun recently returned to Moscow, but the authorities refuse to give him a residence permit, although he was born in Moscow and his wife lives in Moscow.*

Now another teacher, Pavel Abramovich, may face trial on parasitism charges.**

* (At the end of June 1978, Begun was sentenced to three years of internal exile for violating regulations on residency--Ed.)

** (At present, no court action has been taken against Abramovich--Ed.)

Petr Vins, 22 years old, is persecuted by the authorities for his participation in the Ukrainian Helsinki Group and for his attempts to emigrate to Canada with his father, Pastor Georgy Vins, who is currently in prison camp. In the summer of 1977, Vins was fired from his job and only could find work as a stevedore. He then was dismissed from the loading job for health reasons (he had had a serious stomach operation). On December 8, 1977, Petr Vins was detained in Kiev in connection with his attempt to travel to the December 10 demonstration* in Moscow: he was beaten up and the next day was sentenced to 15 days on charges of petty hooliganism. Then his detention was illegally prolonged for another 15 days. Vins announced a hunger strike and fasted for 15 days (See Document No. 28). In February 1978, Vins was arrested again, and on April 6, 1978, was sentenced to a year of labor camp for parasitism. Vins' friends and even his sister were not admitted into the courtroom.

On March 20, 1978, a member of the Georgian Helsinki Group, Grigory Goldshtein, Candidate of Science, was sentenced in Tbilisi to one year of imprisonment on charges of "parasitism". After Goldshtein applied to emigrate to Israel, he could not find work in his profession and lived on savings from his previous jobs (Goldshtein is a bachelor and had been employed continuously for 17 years at jobs which are well paid by Soviet standards). Although Goldshtein continued his scientific research on his own, and gave free lessons to students in math and physics, the court did not consider him to have been engaged in socially useful labor. It is characteristic that the court, in condemning Goldshtein for parasitism, did not present any evidence of his living on "unearned income". Furthermore, the court refused Goldshtein's demand to investigate documents on the sources of his income.

At the present time, the threat of going on trial for "a parasitic lifestyle" hangs over Grigory's brother, Isai Goldshtein, who is also a member of the Georgian Helsinki Group.

Yuri Gastev, a Moscow mathematician, cannot find work in his profession and the militia has been persecuting him for several months already, threatening him with criminal charges for parasitism. The jurist Vsevolod Kuvakin is also threatened in this way; he has been trying to find a job in his profession since November 1977.

After he applied to emigrate to Israel, Gennady Khasin, a teacher with a Candidate's degree in physical and mathematical sciences, has been deprived of the opportunity of teaching school. The regional financial administration has refused to register him as a tutor in math and physics. Now he faces the choice of either taking a job outside his profession (if he manages to find one!) or of being prosecuted for a parasitic lifestyle.

* (There is a tradition among Soviet dissidents to hold a silent demonstration in Pushkin Square in Moscow on December 10, Soviet Constitution Day--Ed.)

In Tashkent, Uzbekistan, the militia has warned Mustafa Dzhemilev (See Document Nos. 1 and 43), who has been recently released from camp, that he may face charges of parasitism. Dzhemilev is in bad health after many years of imprisonment and a nine month hunger strike. His request to get classification as an invalid (which, depending on the category, would exempt him from certain types of labor and give him a small pension--Ed.) was refused because he does not have a residence permit for Tashkent. In Samarkand, Uzbekistan, Aishe Seitmuratova, another Crimean Tatar activist, is also being threatened with a parasitism charge.

In Kiev, Lyubov Murzhenko (wife of A. Murzhenko, the imprisoned "airplane hijacker") received a warning about parasitism at the end of March 1978. She received this warning despite her written statement that she will find a job in May as soon as her mother retires from her job and can look after her rather sickly daughter.

Valentin Poplavsky, one of the founders of an "independent labor union" is currently under investigation for "a parasitic lifestyle." Baptist minister Nikolai Saffran was refused permission to continue living in Moscow and has been sent to the Serbsky Institute for Forensic Psychiatry for a mental examination by its medical commission.

In our country, people with creative occupations such as writers, artists, poets, philosophers, are only considered to be performing socially useful labor if they are members of the proper official unions.

Recently, representatives of the militia appeared at the homes of the well-known writers Georgy Vladimov (who has resigned from the writer's union), Vladimir Voinovich and Vladimir Kornilov (both of whom were expelled from that union), and Aleksandr Zinoviev (who has been stripped of all his titles and has been dismissed from his work in philosophy), and demand that they give information on their sources of income. A member of the militia even went to see Lev Kopelev to ask why he did not work (Kopelev has been on pension for a long time).

Why must these people, the pride of Russian literature, work as elevator operators and stevedores? Why must they face warnings "to stop their parasitic lifestyle" and, shortly thereafter, be made to stand trial for parasitism?

April 22, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Sofya Kalistratova
 Elena Bonner
 Malva Landa
 Naum Meiman
 Viktor Nekipelov
 Tatyana Osipova
 Vladimir Slepak

(Appended to this document is one supplement, an open letter in defense of Grigory Goldshtein, written by Andrei Sakharov on March 8, 1978. This full text of the letter is in the Commission files)

Ten Years of 'The Chronicle of Current Events'Document No. 48

The human rights movement in the Soviet Union originated over ten years ago, influenced by, and as a direct result of, very significant internal and external events of that time. One of the most important factors in the formation of this movement was the appearance of the news journal, "The Chronicle of Current Events", the first issue of which appeared April 30, 1968. On the title page -- as on the title pages of all subsequent issues -- is the text of Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

"Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."

The ten years of "The Chronicle of Current Events" have been years of struggle for public debate, of the fight against the intolerance and injustice of our society, and to open, democratize and, in general, humanize Soviet life. For all these years and up to the present day, "The Chronicle" has been one of the most objective, complete and exact factual records of Soviet human rights violations. It is widely used both in the USSR and abroad in defense of human rights. In particular, Amnesty International regularly publishes "The Chronicle of Current Events" in English and other languages, extensively using this material in defending political prisoners.

All these years, "The Chronicle" has heroically withstood official repression and provocation. However, it has sustained heavy losses: the persecution of its editors, publishers and those who collect its material, as well as those who distribute and read "The Chronicle". Today, some of these people are in the camps, others have been forced to emigrate, and still others are continuing their responsible, self-sacrificing work. One cannot overestimate the significant educational function of "The Chronicle of Current Events" for all members of the human rights movement, and for all its countless readers in the USSR and abroad.

April 27, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

On Violations of the Right of Kolkhozniks*
to Emigrate and to Leave the Kolkhoz**

Document No. 49

Several times, the documents of our Group have dealt with the issue of the illegal obstacles the Soviet authorities put in the way of those who want to emigrate or join their relatives outside the USSR. This information, however, was mostly about people who live in cities or in urban settlements. In this document, we have decided to discuss the situation of peasants who want to emigrate from the USSR.

The village of Ilinka (under the Kazan village council in the Talov rayon, the Voronezh oblast in the Russian Republic) was settled almost entirely by orthodox Jewish peasants. There are about 130 households in the village. Since the Jewish faith forbids any kind of birth control, most families in the village have, on the average, six or seven children. The overwhelming majority of the villagers want to emigrate to Israel.

Twelve to fourteen families emigrated from this village from 1974 to 1976. From 1975 until 1977, however, the authorities did not allow vyzovs (invitations) sent through the mail to reach the villagers. According to unofficial information (one of the officials of the Talov regional Party committee let it slip in conversation with the Ilinka villagers), in mid-1976 the Talov regional committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was holding 109 vyzovs sent from Israel to the people of Ilinka and which had been confiscated in the mail. Vyzovs were then sent to relatives and acquaintances living in other places and delivered to the Ilinka Jews through other means.

A new obstacle then arose. The Chairman of the "Rossiya" Kolkhoz, Viktor Demyanovich Tarasov, and the Chairman of the Kazan Village Council, Vasily Vladimirovich Lebedev, refused to give those villagers of Ilinka who wanted to apply to emigrate the necessary certificates: of their place of residence, on the number of people in their family, and of their place of employment. Without these certificates, the Voronezh OVIR has not, and will not, accept applications for emigration. Towards the end of 1976, about 50 households had vyzovs but were unable to obtain the necessary certificates.

Fourteen families are trying to push OVIR into accepting their applications for consideration and, at the same time, are also trying to get the required certificates from the kolkhoz and the village council. Three families: Samuil Mordofeevich Matveev (8 people), Yakov Issevich Matveev (8 people), and Divora Yakovlevna Matveeva (9 people) sent their documents -- without the certificates -- by mail to the Supreme Soviet. The documents were sent back to the Voronezh OVIR. Representatives of these families were told in the Voronezh OVIR that they should take back these documents. After they refused to do so, they were told that OVIR would not consider their emigration requests until the missing certificates had been produced.

* (Farmer on a collective farm--Ed.)

** (Collective farm--Ed.)

Five families, including the three named above, and also the families of Fira Isakovna Matveeva (6 people) and Ein Mikhailovich Piskarev (10 people) began the struggle to get these certificates. Several times, representatives of these families have dealt with five bureaucracies at all levels: the Soviet, from the village council to the Supreme Soviet; the Party, from the kolkhoz Party organization to the Ministry of Agriculture; the Ministry of Internal Affairs, from the Regional Executive for Internal Affairs to the Ministry for Internal Affairs of the USSR. Thus, for example, the family of Yakov Isaevich Matveev has sent 55 statements and complaints to various offices during 1977 alone. The result of these meetings and correspondence was an oral reply: "We do not have the right to give orders to the kolkhoz chairman", or a refusal to respond at all.

Driven to despair, in April 1977 they stopped working on the kolkhoz, stopped sending their children to school, announced their withdrawal from the kolkhoz and called for the convening of a general meeting or a meeting of the authorities to confirm their withdrawal from the kolkhoz. Shortly thereafter, a special commission of representatives of the section on popular education of the regional committee of the Party and of the regional Soviet was established in Ilinka. The commission decided that if the parents did not stop preventing their children from going to school, they would be deprived of their parental rights and the children would be sent to orphanages. Under the threat of losing their children, the villagers were forced to start sending their children to school again. As an additional harassment, in 1977 and 1978, all Ilinka males of draft age were conscripted.

There was no general meeting of the kolkhoz until December 1977. According to the rules of the kolkhoz, however, such meetings should be held at least every three months. In response to all complaints, the local leaders said "The people are busy working in the fields". Only involvement by the Ministry of Agriculture -- to which these families had appealed by insisting they wanted such a meeting convened -- produced results. On December 21, 1977, the authorities held a meeting of the kolkhoz.

The directors of the kolkoz and the regional authorities were well prepared and the meeting was conducted like a well rehearsed play. Not one of those who wanted to withdraw from the kolkhoz was given permission to do so. In a vote of 86 to 17, the meeting decided: Do not allow the applicants to withdraw from the kolkhoz!!!

The response to complaints sent by the would-be emigrants to the regional procuracy was: "There were no violations of kolkhoz democracy in the resolution of this issue" and "I do not find any grounds to protest the decision of this question". A similar response was sent by the oblast procuracy: "There is no basis to indicate involvement of the procuracy." Complaints sent to the Procuracy of the Soviet Union and to the Procuracy of the RSFSR, were sent "for examination" to the oblast procuracy. And so the circle is complete.

The new chairman of the kolkhoz, Aleksei Grigorevich Kuvaldin (V.D. Tarasov, the former chairman, has been promoted and is now Director of the Regional Agricultural Executive) and the new chairman of the Village Council have told the Ilinka villagers, "You will work here until the day you die. We are not going to let you go anywhere."

This is how serfdom has triumphed. Peasants are tied to the land and cannot leave their villages!

The most shameful fact is that all this does not conflict with "Model Regulations for the kolkhoz" which is the basis for regulations for all Soviet kolkhozes. In regard to withdrawal from the kolkhoz it says only "Statements on withdrawal from the kolkhoz must be examined by the leadership and by a general meeting of all kolkhozniks no later than within a three month period from the day of the formal announcement (of the intention to withdraw from the kolkhoz)" -- not one word about the freedom to withdraw from the kolkhoz!

April 30, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Naum Meiman
Malva Landa
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

(Appended to this document are three supplements which are held in the Commission files).

- Supplement No. 1: Excerpt from the "Model Regulations for a Kolkhoz".
- Supplement No. 2: Copies of letters to the families in Ilinka from the Procuracy.
- Supplement No. 3: List of 14 families struggling for the right to emigrate to Israel.

The Trial of Professor Yuri OrlovDocument No. 50

The trial of Yuri Orlov, founder of the Helsinki Group in the Soviet Union, well-known physicist, professor, Corresponding Member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, took place in Moscow, May 15-18, 1978.

The fabricated nature of the trial is made obvious by the fact that the authorities needed to keep Orlov in preliminary detention for 15 months under the strictest isolation to prepare for the trial, and spent only three days in examining the 58 volumes of investigative materials collected over those fifteen months. The court needed only a few hours to discuss and formulate the sentence -- the maximum punishment under Article 70 of the Criminal Code -- 7 years imprisonment in strict regimen camps followed by 5 years of exile.

The nominally open trial took place behind closed doors. Aside from specially selected individuals, only Orlov's wife and two sons were allowed into the courtroom. Each time they entered, the three were subjected to degrading searches: Orlov's wife was stripped naked in the presence of three men. Orlov's son was struck on the head several times. Orlov's friends, among them Academician Sakharov, were barred from the courtroom.

A series of searches and the arrests of Aleksandr Podrabinek and Iosif Begun took place during the trial. N. Nokin, D. Leontiev and V. Korotich were sentenced to 15 days' detention.

During the trial, the procurator and the court painstakingly avoided any mention of the fact that the documents used to incriminate Yuri Orlov were Moscow Helsinki Group documents.

The court only established the fact that Orlov had participated in compiling documents and cut off all attempts by Orlov and his lawyer to analyse the contents of the documents -- the court had decided beforehand that all the documents were "slanderous."

Furthermore, in violation of the constitutional principles requiring the court's openness, thoroughness and direct acquaintance with all materials pertinent to the trial, the documents were not made public in the course of the trial, and Orlov and his lawyer not only were forbidden to discuss the content of any of the documents, but even to utter the full title of a document.

All of the petitions presented by Orlov and his lawyer in Orlov's defense -- the calling of witnesses, filing of documents, etc. -- were rejected by the court. Orlov's testimony was persistently and repeatedly cut off; his attorney's questions were overruled.

Aware of the fact the Ye. S. Shalman could not present the political aspects of the defense, Yuri Orlov expressed his gratitude to his lawyer for his legal and moral assistance at the end of the trial, excused his lawyer from participating in the final statement, and announced that he himself would give the summing up.

Nevertheless, the final defense statement was broken off by numerous interjections from the judge and hostile shouts from the courtroom filled, as mentioned above, with a specially selected audience.

The judge also interrupted the defendant's "last word." Orlov said, "You should be ashamed for interrupting me. This is, after all, the final statement the law permits me." Even after this, interruptions deprived him of the opportunity to speak unhindered.

Neither the statement of the defense nor Orlov's "last word" were ever finished.

After the court had consented to excuse Orlov's attorney, Ye. S. Shalman, from further participation in the trial, Shalman was forcibly removed from the courtroom and allowed to return only after making a call to the directorate of the Collegium of Attorneys.

At the end of each session of the trial, we recorded everything that had occurred in the courtroom from the words of Irina Orlov.

Therefore, we confirm that Orlov's trial was not an objective and fair examination of the case, but a reprisal for free thought and free speech.

The significance of the trial of Yuri Orlov -- and of earlier political trials and the upcoming trials of his friends, publicist A. Ginzburg and cyberneticist A. Shcharansky, in the Moscow Helsinki Group -- reaches far beyond Soviet borders.

These trials have a direct relationship not only to the human rights issue, but to the issue of relaxation of international tensions.

We appeal to the governments and heads of state of Helsinki signatories, to public organizations in these countries, and to private individuals, especially scientists and writers, to come forward in defense of the Helsinki movement, and thereby the Helsinki Final Act which confirms the indissoluble bond between the issues of human rights and international security.

May 18, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Georgian Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

Grigory Goldshtein

We fully support the Helsinki Group statement on the trial of Professor Yuri Orlov

Andrei Sakharov
A. Lavut
Yu. Yarym-Agayev

Ida Nudel
A. Polikanova
L. Kopelev

S. Polikanov
I. Kovalev
V. Kornilov

On the Arrest of Aleksandr Podrabinek*Document No. 51

On May 14, 1978, the eve of the Orlov trial, Aleksandr Podrabinek was arrested. Podrabinek is a well-known Soviet human rights activist and author of "Punitive Medicine", a book soon to be published in the West.

Aleksandr Podrabinek is an active member of the Working Commission for the Investigation of the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes. In the past two years, he has worked diligently in the defense of mentally stable individuals who are committed to psychiatric hospitals for their dissenting beliefs, their defense of human rights, or for their religious activities. At the same time, Podrabinek has also defended the interests of mentally disturbed individuals who present no threat to society, but who are forcibly institutionalized merely because they hold certain dissenting or religious beliefs.

The painstakingly documented information Podrabinek collected on the abuse of psychiatry for political purposes, not only served as material for "Punitive Medicine" (the draft of which was confiscated by the KGB during a search in March 1977), but also figured in the materials of the Congress of the World Psychiatric Association in Honolulu.*

It is common knowledge that the KGB persistently sought to force Podrabinek to emigrate by using his brother, Kirill, as a hostage. When Aleksandr refused to leave the USSR, Kirill was arrested without grounds and, in March, sentenced to two years and six months deprivation of liberty.

Aleksandr continued his work, although he was constantly followed and harassed. Now, he has been arrested and put into prison.

The investigation is being conducted by V.M. Guzhenkov of the Moscow oblast Procuracy, under Article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code: "dissemination of fabrications known to be false, which defame the Soviet state and social system." As is the case with all Soviet political prisoners, Podrabinek has been deprived of his right to correspond with or see his family, friends or a lawyer, during this pre-trial imprisonment.

Podrabinek did not engage in any illegal or secret activities. He acted within the framework of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants and Soviet Law. All those who know Podrabinek do not doubt his truthfulness, honesty and selflessness.

* (Podrabinek was charged with Article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, convicted and sentenced on August 15, 1978 to five years of internal exile--Ed.)

** (The Congress, at its meeting in Honolulu in August 1977, condemned the alleged abuse of psychiatry for political purposes in the USSR--Ed.)

We call on the governments and heads of states signatory to the Helsinki Final Act, on civic organizations in these countries, and on the World Psychiatric Association to come forward in defense of Aleksandr Podrabinek and against the continuing persecution of the human rights movement in the USSR.

May 22, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Vladimir Slepak

The Arrest of Vladimir Slepak and the Institution of Criminal Proceedings Against Maria Slepak and Ida Nudel

Document No. 52

On June 1, Vladimir Slepak was arrested; his wife, Maria, was detained. They were charged with malicious hooliganism under Article 206-2 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, an article which provides for a penalty of one to five years of imprisonment. After she suffered an attack of pancreatitis and angina pectoris, Maria Slepak was released on her own recognizance on June 3, 1978; Vladimir Slepak was interned in Butyrsky Prison.

Why were the Slepaks threatened with such severe punishment? As of this May, it became eight years since the Slepaks were first denied permission to emigrate to Israel, where their older son and Maria's parents live. They were denied permission on the notorious pretext of "state secrets", to which Vladimir supposedly had access. Their younger son, who was ten when the family first applied to emigrate, is now facing the possibility of being drafted into the army. For some time now, Maria Slepak has been waging an unsuccessful campaign to obtain an exit visa for herself and her younger son.

On June 1, Vladimir and Maria Slepak stood on the balcony of their eighth floor apartment with two signs. Vladimir held one reading: "Let us go to our son in Israel." Maria's read: "A visa for my son." It was a silent and orderly demonstration, which in no way disturbed the peace. The acts of malicious hooliganism and disturbing the peace, with which the Slepaks were charged, should be levelled against the authorities instead. They were the ones who poured boiling water from the ninth floor of the apartment building onto the Slepaks, who were badly burned. (Later TASS, in one of its foreign wire service reports, falsely accused the Slepaks of pouring boiling water on the crowd below). Within half an hour, plain-clothes policemen broke the door down and, without a warrant, took the Slepaks away. Vladimir Slepak is the twentieth member of the Soviet Helsinki Group to be arrested.

The same charges, under Article 206-2, were brought against another leading Jewish activist, Ida Nudel, after she staged a similar protest on the balcony of her apartment. Nudel is particularly well-known for her self-sacrificing work with prisoners of conscience. For more than six years, she has been trying to obtain permission to emigrate to Israel where all her relatives live.

In both these cases, the Slepaks and Nudel have engaged in very moderate public protests against the arbitrary decisions of OVIR — in violation of the Helsinki Accords -- to block the reunification of families. It is not only a violation of the Helsinki Accords, but also of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (which the Soviet Union ratified), to bring criminal charges against the participants in a peaceful demonstration.

June 5, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova

This Document is accompanied by several supplements* involving the Ida Nudel case. Information on the case of Vladimir Slepak is unavailable, since he has been held in total isolation since June 1, and has had no contact either with family members or with an attorney. The Group is also unable to distribute material on the charges against Maria Slepak, as she is currently in the hospital with an aggravated ulcerous condition, including a bleeding ulcer of the stomach. We have reason to believe, however, that the investigation and inquiry into the Slepak case will be similar to those in the Nudel case.

June 15, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Ospivoa

* (On record in the Commission files--Ed.)

Additional Information on the Orlov Trial

Document No. 53

In addition to Document No. 50 on the trial of Yuri Orlov published on May 18, 1978, the day of the trial's verdict, the Public Group issued a collection of documents in the form of witness' testimony. These documents are meant to show that the statements for which Orlov was incriminated are, in reality, not slanderous in nature.

Included in the collection are:

1. A statement by Professor Meiman on the difficulties of publishing scientific works.
2. A letter from a group of scientists, signed by Orlov and others. (The court found the letter to be slanderous, without considering or investigating the substance of its contents).
3. A numerical comparison of the number of Soviet Nobel laureates in various scientific fields to the total number in those fields, worldwide.
4. A letter from Natalya Fedorova, wife of political prisoner Yuri Pavlovich Fedorov, interned in special regimen camp No. 1, Mordovia, Sosnovka, institution ZhKh 385/I-6.
5. A statement by Malva Landa on the testimony of witnesses (Sukhanova, Sheliya, Emelyanova, Anisimov, Dovganovich, Lyubarskaya and Blokhina) at the Orlov trial.
6. Report on a declaration by political prisoner, biologist Sergei Kovalev (Perm oblast camp No. 37), on his desire to have appeared as a witness at the Orlov trial.
7. Several reports on camp conditions even after the arrest of Yuri Orlov.

In addition, we request study of Document No. 49 on the situation of kolkhoz workers in the village of Ilinka since the court found this document (published before Orlov's arrest) to be slanderous.

The Public Group will continue to collect documents, proving that the Orlov trial was intended not to uncover the truth, and proving that the harsh sentence imposed on Yuri Orlov was a pre-arranged reprisal for his public defense of human rights.

June 15, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova

* * * * *

The full texts of the supplements to Document No. 53 are on record in the Commission files. Below are synopses of the contents of the supplements.

Supplement No. 1

In a brief statement dated June 7, 1978, Professor Naum Meiman recounts a conversation he had in the summer of 1976 with the director of the Institute of Physical Problems of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician P.L. Kapitsa. During this conversation, which focused on Meiman's own attempts to obtain an exit visa for Israel, Kapitsa confirmed that refusenik scientists are, in effect, barred from publishing in Soviet scientific journals. Kapitsa, editor of the Journal of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, told Meiman of his inability to obtain permission from the Institute's experts' commission to publish an article by refusenik physicist Mark Azbel.

Meiman asks that his statement be considered as proof of the veracity of Part I of the letter signed by Orlov and contained in Supplement No. 2 below. The court found this letter to be evidence of Orlov's anti-Soviet slanderous activity.

Supplement No. 2

In a letter to the Chairman of the Soviet State Committee on Science and Technology, V.A. Kirillin, and the President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, A.P. Aleksandrov, eight Soviet scientists (Orlov, Sakharov, Turchin, Levich, Lerner, Meiman, Azbel and Brailovsky) call attention to the following violations of the professional and civil rights of scientists in the USSR, and demand that they be stopped immediately:

1. The authors note that the existence of "experts' commissions", which are attached to all scientific institutes and which review and approve any works submitted for publication, constitutes a limitation on scientists' professional rights. Since these commissions only review papers written by colleagues of their institutions, scientists working independently cannot publish their material.

2. Similarly, scientists who do not belong to institutes cannot present scientific papers publicly, participate in public scientific discussions, or take part in scientific conferences. Papers presented at such conferences require the same official review and approval by experts' commissions as do scientific publications. Attendance at such conferences is, as a rule, also decided by these same experts' commissions.

3. A scientist's participation in international scientific conferences and the number of professional trips he may take abroad are subject to unpublished regulations. Since Soviet scientists must obtain permission from their scientific institute before they can travel abroad, a significant number of scientists will never have the opportunity to do so. Scientists who receive personal invitations from foreign institutes cannot accept them without approval by the administration at their institute.

4. The authors insist that scientists must be allowed to express their beliefs freely -- whether of a professional, religious, or ideological nature -- and that these convictions should not be held against them professionally. Scientists should be free to live and work in the country of their choice.

5. Because secrecy limitations are not specific as to extent or duration and can be imposed arbitrarily and retroactively, Soviet authorities can easily cite secrecy grounds for denying scientists the right to travel or to emigrate.

6. All scientists who are fired from their institutes by order of the authorities are ostracized and, in effect, are barred from working in their profession. They often must resort to performing unskilled labor. However, there are employment regulations which prohibit hiring someone with a higher education for manual labor. Therefore, scientists who are barred from working in their field, live under constant threat of being prosecuted for "parasitism". Scientists who have been convicted of political crimes are stripped of their professional rank and titles.

Supplement No. 3

At Yuri Orlov's trial, a document he wrote entitled "10 Questions for Comrade L.I. Brezhnev" was used by the prosecution to incriminate him of slandering the Soviet state. In this article, Orlov made the assertion that only 3 percent of all Nobel laureates in science were Soviet. The facts refute the prosecution's claim and support Orlov's assertion.

For the period from the formation of the Soviet state in 1918 through 1973, the year Orlov's work was written, exactly 2.9 percent of all Nobel science laureates have been Soviet:

	<u>Number of Nobel Science Prizes Awarded from 1918-1973</u>	<u>Number of Nobel Science Prizes Awarded to Soviets</u>
Physics	79	6
Chemistry	68	1
Physiology and Medicine	94	0
TOTAL	241	7 (2.9 percent)

Supplement No. 4

In a letter dated May 17, 1978 to Aleksandr Ilich Ginzburg's lawyers, E.A. Reznikov and Edward Bennett Williams, Natalya Fedorova, wife of political prisoner Yuri Pavlovich Fedorov (interned in special regimen camp No. 1, Mordovia, Sosnovka, Institution ZhKh 385/I-6), calls attention to the unethical medical practices of a Dr. Emelyanova. During the Orlov trial, Emelyanov's testimony was introduced to refute Orlov's claims that severely ill political prisoners (Karavansky, Murzhenko, Fedorov and others) are denied proper medical attention.

Fedorov's wife states that during the eight years of her husband's internment in the Mordovian camps, he has been constantly ill. Emelyanova herself had sent Fedorov to the camp hospital five times since she began work as camp physician. At the time Mrs. Fedorova wrote the letter, her husband was in the prison hospital for the sixth time at Emelyanova's direction.

Although Emelyanova had told the Orlov court that Fedorov is perfectly healthy, his wife points out that his medical chart lists him as suffering from the following ailments: nefritis, gastritis, rheumatism of the right knee, and chronic conjunctivitis. Fedorov is just over six feet tall but weighs only 114 pounds.

Assuming that Emelyanova's testimony might figure in the prosecution of Ginzburg, Mrs. Fedorov made the above information available to his attorneys in the hope that it will aid in his defense.

Supplement No. 5 (paraphrased)Refutation of Prosecution Witnesses' Testimony Concerning the Treatment of Political Prisoners in the USSR

In Supplement No. 5, Moscow Helsinki Group Member Malva Landa refutes the testimony presented at the Orlov trial on the medical treatment of political prisoners in the USSR by Doctors Sukhanova, Sheliya and Emelyanova (Medical staff of prisons and labor camps); by prisoners Anisimov (Vladimir Prison) and Dovganich (Perm Labor Camp No. 36); and by Doctors Lyubarskaya and Blokhina (Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital).

As author of Moscow Group Document No. 3 (June 1976) on inhumane prison conditions for political prisoners, and as co-author of Moscow Group Document No. 17 (January 1977) showing that a significant number of political prisoners are seriously ill, Landa attests to the veracity of those documents and welcomes verification of the assertions made in them by an independent and competent international commission.

Instead of calling independent investigators, "impartial" witnesses such as the physicians assigned to the very institutions implicated in the documents were summoned by the court.

Doctors at correctional institutions in the USSR are functionaries of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, directly responsible to the KGB. In other words, their first responsibility is to follow the orders of the authorities, not to minister to the health of the prisoners.

Witness Sukhanova, a physician at Vladimir Prison, testified that there are no seriously ill prisoners at Vladimir, and that when a prisoner falls ill, he gets immediate medical attention. In response to Orlov's questions on political prisoners Sergienko and Superfin, Sukhanova said that Sergienko has recovered from tuberculosis and Superfin is in good health. In vain, Orlov requested that Sergienko's mother, Ukrainian Helsinki Group Member Oksana Meshko, be allowed to testify as a defense witness.

Moscow Helsinki Group Document No. 17 lists seriously ill prisoners at Vladimir (Z. Antonyuk, N. Budulak-Sharygin, A. Sergienko, and others). Their situation has never been subject to international inspection. Not one of these prisoners was summoned to testify for Orlov.

The Group wanted to have Yakov Suslensky, a former POC released from Vladimir Prison in early 1977, called. Suslensky, who suffers from cardiac insufficiency, was kept on a starvation diet in an isolation cell in Vladimir for a protracted period. In May 1975, Suslensky had a severe heart seizure and lay in his cell unattended for many hours. To revive him, the prison medical personnel gave him an injection directly into the heart muscle. Instead of sending him to the prison hospital, however, Suslensky was kept in the isolation cell for ten more days and nights. During the spring of 1977, Suslensky emigrated to the West.

The health of POC Zinoviya Antonyuk who also suffers from heart disease is gravely endangered.

For over a year, the witness Sheliya had been in charge of serving Perm Camp Hospital Nos. 35, 36 and 37, and was responsible for sanitary conditions there. During his testimony, Sheliya asserted that prison conditions are good and that medical attention is readily available. However, prisoners under Sheliya have complained that he is unscrupulous and inhumane. In May 1977, Russian, Ukrainian, Jewish, Armenian, and other prisoners in Perm Camp No. 35 planned to stage a protest to have Sheliya removed. The protest did not get underway since the camp was partially reorganized and many activists were transferred. Sheliya had assumed his post at Perm after the Moscow Group documents in question had been written.

The following seriously ill prisoners in Perm Camps 35 and 36 are among those listed in Moscow Group Document No. 17: Ivan Svetlichny, Anatoly Marchenko and Evgeny Pronyuk. Not one of these men was called as a defense witness.

Witness Emelyanova, a doctor assigned to a special regimen camp in Mordovia, testified that prison food is good, that there are no seriously ill prisoners, and that when needed, proper medical care is available. Orlov asked Emelyanova whether she thought that prisoners S. Karavansky, V. Moroz, A. Murzhenko, and Yu. Fedorov were in good health. Emelyanova replied that they were.

When Fedorov's wife, Natalya, was told of Emelyanova's testimony, she prepared a written statement on the poor state of his health (See Supplement No. 4). One day after Orlov was convicted, this statement was confiscated from Landa's home by agents of the MVD and KGB. Then, Landa was taken into custody.*

The prisoners Anisimov and Dovganich testified for the prosecution in the Orlov case in exchange for favors from the authorities.

Anisimov, an inmate of Vladimir Prison, swore that he had never had any rotten food while in prison. When asked if there are hunger strikes in the prison, Anisimov replied that some prisoners strike, but that others do not, even though they say they do.

Anisimov has been a prisoner for a longer time than just the six years stated in court. First imprisoned on a criminal charge, he was then given an additional term for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda". Anisimov has a serious stomach ailment, probably ulcers. Landa has read letters from Anisimov describing his poor physical condition and bad prison food. She knows from the letters that the prison authorities had considered freeing him early because of ill health, but that a court ruled against it since he had taken part in "anti-Soviet activities"?!

Neither the prosecutor nor the judge asked Anisimov about his health or about conditions in prison hospitals. It was obvious that Orlov had nothing but pity for this emaciated, pathetic man. Landa says that Anisimov's physical appearance was evidence enough of the inhumane treatment he had received in Vladimir Prison.

Witness Dovganich, a prisoner from Perm Strict Regimen Camp No. 36, stated that prison conditions were good; that linen is changed weekly; that inmates are shown films several times a week; that there is a recreation room; that the barracks are spacious; that prisoners may buy butter, jam, wafers, candy, cookies and biscuits at the prison store. Dovganich said that there was trouble between two groups of prisoners -- the older prisoners vs. young troublemakers such as Gluzman, the Zalmanson brothers, Altman, etc. (all Jews--Ed.). When the prosecution attorney asked to what

* (Landa, who does not live in Moscow, is frequently detained by the Moscow police and then released--Ed.)

Dovganich attributed this unpleasantness, the judge had the question withdrawn. Orlov asked Dovganich for what crimes he was imprisoned. Dovganich answered "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" and currency speculation.

Landa observes that Dovganich's testimony in no way disproves the existence of inhumane living conditions of prisoners. She notes that Dovganich neglected to mention that access to prison stores is quite restricted: prisoners in special and strict regimen camps may buy only five rubles worth of goods per month (four in general regimen camps, and two or three in prison); the goods they may purchase are limited to a few essential food items; and, the right to use the prison store is often denied as a form of punishment.

As to his statement about linen changes, Dovganich did not mention that a prisoner in an isolation cell has neither bedsheets nor outer clothing. At night, the prisoner in such a cell must either sit or lie on the bare boards of his cot.

Landa offers the following explanation of why conflicts exist among groups of prisoners: in special regimen labor camps for "especially dangerous political offenders", there are political prisoners; people who failed in their attempts to escape to the West, and former partisans from the national liberation movements in the Ukrainian and Baltic Republics who were active during and immediately after World War II (many of whom have already served 20-25 years in confinement). In addition to them, there are a few spies (a rarity) and Nazi collaborators. The authorities recruit the latter, and amoral, weak persons and hardened criminals, as stool pigeons and provocateurs. However, their attempts to create dissension among prisoners by fanning national and racial hatreds have usually been unsuccessful. "Old" inmates, especially the former partisans, often sympathize with the younger activists and sometimes join in protests. The authorities and stoolies often accuse these "old-timers" of having "sold out to Jews". Landa asserts that Jewish prisoners do not instigate conflicts, but are victims of provocation and unfair punishment.

The authorities sometimes use bribery to get what they want. Dovganich was allowed to receive a generous food package after he testified against Orlov.

Orlov requested that Ukrainian Helsinki Group Member Nina Strokata-Karavanska, a former prisoner of conscience released in December 1975 who is presently living under administrative surveillance, be allowed to testify in his defense. Strokata is married to POC Svyatoslav Karavansky, who spent 30 years of his life in prisons and labor camps. In 1965, Karavansky was confined in Vladimir Prison. Subsequently, he was sent to a special regimen labor camp in Mordovia.

Likewise, former POC's now living in the West, such as Vladimir Bukovsky, Kronid Lyubarsky, Iosif Meshener, David Chernoglaz, Lev Yagman, and others, could have been eloquent defense witnesses for Orlov.

The witnesses Lyubarskaya and Blokhina, physicians at the Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital, were questioned about Orlov's writings in 1975 on Leonid Plyushch. Plyushch was arrested in January 1972 and charged with "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" for his samizdat writings and membership in the Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights in the USSR. Plyushch, a healthy man, was forcibly committed to Dnepropetrovsk on the approval of Dr. Snezhnevsky*. From August 1973 through January 1976, he was given injections and medications by the hospital staff which severely debilitated him mentally and physically.

Lyubarskaya, who had "treated" Plyushch, testified that on dismissal from her hospital, he was healthy, but she maintained that the original diagnosis -- continuous schizophrenia of the sluggish subtype -- had been correct. Blokhina, the head doctor at Dnepropetrovsk, supported Lyubarskaya's testimony.

As Landa points out, Plyushch owes his release in January 1976 to the combined efforts of Soviet human rights activists and concerned individuals and organizations abroad, not to recovery from a non-existent mental illness.

Lyubarskaya had also testified at the trial of human rights activist Sergei Kovalev in December 1975. On that occasion, she stated that conditions at Dnepropetrovsk were good and that Plyushch's severe mental illness required his continued forced treatment. (It was obvious that Lyubarskaya had not yet been informed that the authorities planned to release Plyushch within the next month). Up until the last day of his confinement, the head doctor at the hospital, Blokhina, maintained that Plyushch was mentally ill and in need of treatment. Testifying at the Orlov trial, however, she took the opposite point of view. Psychiatrist Snezhnevsky was to have testified at the Orlov trial but he did not appear.

Orlov asked that Mrs. Plyushch, who now resides with her husband in France, be called as a witness for his defense; his request was denied.

Supplement No. 6

On December 7, 1977, Sergei Kovalev** sent letters through the prison mails to the Procuracy in Moscow, to the KGB, to the Procurator of Kaluga Province, and to the Ukrainian KGB of Kaluga Province, asking that he be allowed to appear as a defense witness at the Orlov and Ginzburg trials. He based his request on the fact that in February 1977, many prisoners from Perm labor camps No. 25 and 36 were interrogated about Orlov and

* (Snezhnevsky, Andrei, founder and head of the "Moscow School" of psychiatry, who has been chief defender against Western charges of psychiatric abuse--Ed.)

** (Professor-biologist and human rights activist, Kovalev was a member of the Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights in the USSR. Arrested in late 1974 and tried in December 1975 on charges of "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda". He was sentenced to seven years in strict regimen labor camp plus three years of internal exile. Kovalev has been serving his term in Uralsky Labor Camp No. 36. In May 1976, he was transferred to the prison within the labor camp for six months --Ed.)

Ginzburg and that prisoners M. Sado and Zeitunyan were transported for that purpose to Perm and Kaluga. Kovalev intended to:

1. Give character references for Orlov and Ginzburg;
2. testify on conditions in political labor camps in general; and
3. relate concrete examples of the inhumane treatment accorded prisoners in correctional institutions in the USSR.

Kovalev felt that his testimony would insure Orlov and Ginzburg a fair defense. The fact that Kovalev was not allowed to appear in court further indicates that the judge was not really interested in establishing the facts of the case and that higher authorities had already determined, in advance of the trials, the guilt of Orlov and Ginzburg.

By the end of December 1977, the Kaluga Procuracy informed Kovalev that his request had been forwarded to the Investigative Department of the Ukrainian KGB. On January 12, 1978, Senior Investigator of the Ukrainian KGB, Saushkin, advised him (Issue No. 26.253) that his testimony was not needed in the Ginzburg case. Then, Commissioner of the Skalninsky KGB (Chusovsky region), Chepkasov, wrote to Kovalev informing him that his testimony was not relevant.

Supplement No. 7

The Helsinki Group Documents on violations of the rights of Soviet political prisoners, written between the spring and winter of 1976, were used to incriminate Yuri Orlov. Such conditions presently continue to exist.

In Supplement No. 7, Landa relates the experiences of two seriously ill prisoners in Perm Camp No. 36, Mikhail Slobodyan and Ivan Svetlichny. Landa accuses the camp's doctors Sheliya*, Chepkasova, Petrov and Yuzhakov, of professional irresponsibility and deliberate malpractice in their treatment of these two men.

Slobodyan, who suffers from bleeding ulcers, was hospitalized in late 1977 with severe hemorrhaging, anemia, extreme exhaustion and abnormal sweating. After he was dismissed from the hospital, his condition continued to be poor, and his relatives tried unsuccessfully to obtain permission from the camp authorities to send him a food package, in the hope that a more nutritious diet might improve his health. By January 1978, his condition had deteriorated to the point that he could not fulfill his work norms. Instead of re-hospitalizing Slobodyan, the authorities placed him in an isolation cell as punishment for poor work efficiency.

Fearing for Slobodyan's life, fellow prisoners declared a hunger strike and refused to work until he was examined by medical specialists. To restore order in the camp, specialists were called in on March 16, 1978. However, the specialists decided not to send Slobodyan outside the camp for

* (figured as a prosecution witness at the Orlov trial--Ed.)

medical treatment. On March 20 and 23, Slobodyan was again punished -- although less severely than before -- for non-fulfillment of work norms. Only on March 29, after the pain in his stomach became intolerable, was Slobodyan admitted to the camp hospital.

Svetlichny suffers from hypertonia, severe headaches, and circulatory disorders including oxygen deficiency of the brain. On January 22, 1978, he fell ill with jaundice. Only the repeated appeals of Svetlichny and two other prisoners, Sergei Kovalev and Igor Kalinets, induced Dr. Yuzhakov to examine him. Finally, on January 25, Svetlichny was released from work. On the 27th, he was admitted to the isolation ward of the camp hospital; on the 30th, he was examined by specialists from Chusova and diagnosed as having Botkins disease (serum jaundice) contracted from poorly sterilized medical instruments.

Political prisoners Basarab and Ismagilov also contracted Botkins disease when they were sent to Perm Camp Central Hospital -- managed by Dr. Sheliya -- for treatment.

The following human rights violations have occurred in Perm Camp No. 36 from January through March 1978:

1. Prisoners have been punished for exercising their right to send letters of complaint about their treatment to Soviet officials (i.e. Sorokina).
2. Prisoners were punished for transmitting information about inhumane camp conditions (i.e. Mukhamedshin).
3. The prisoners' right to privacy in their personal correspondence was violated (i.e. Sergienko).
4. Conditions in the camp endanger the health of the inmates. Prisoners are forced to work when seriously ill, and are threatened with punishment for non-fulfillment of their work norms if they do not do so (i.e. Slobodyan -- placed in an isolation cell; Demidov -- his right to purchase goods in the camp store was suspended).
5. False information is recorded on prisoners' medical charts (i.e. Slobodyan). Prisoners are often victims of medical malpractice (i.e. Svetlichny, Basarab, Ismagilov).
6. The camp authorities have infringed on the prisoners' right to practice religion (i.e. Kovalev and ten others were punished for celebrating Christmas).

On the Trials of Vladimir Slepak and Ida NudelDocument No. 54

In opposite ends of Moscow and in almost completely closed courtrooms, Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel were sentenced on June 21, 1978 to five and four years in internal exile, respectively, on patently false and absurd charges of malicious hooliganism. The authorities chose their victims carefully. Both of the accused were leading members of the Jewish emigration movement. In addition, Vladimir Slepak is an active member of the Moscow Helsinki Group, and Ida Nudel is well-known for her self-sacrificing work with prisoners of conscience. Vladimir Slepak has been seeking permission to emigrate since 1970, and Ida Nudel since 1971. Added to those bitter years, there will now be long years of internal exile. In this way, the authorities are hoping to get rid of those seeking to exercise their right to emigrate.

On May 18, a similarly closed court sentenced the scientist, Professor Yuri Orlov, to seven years of labor camp and five years in exile. We are not citing this disgusting reprisal against Professor Orlov as a standard for comparison: greater evil does not justify lesser evil, and the civilized world does not recognize such a thing as "degrees of lawlessness". All three sentences are flagrantly arbitrary, and in addition, are violations of the Helsinki Final Act. Rather, we alert the 35 signatory states that the prosecution and sentencing of Slepak, Nudel and Orlov signal the virtual emasculation of the humanitarian provisions of the Accords in the U.S.S.R.

June 26, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova

To the International Olympic Committee President,
Lord M. Killanin

Document No. 55

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Things are going on in the USSR which you cannot ignore. People whose activity was of a purely humanitarian nature (members of the Soviet Helsinki Groups and other human rights activists) have been arrested and convicted. The country which is to host the 1980 Olympics scorns universal standards of human rights as well as international obligations.

It is already evident that the atmosphere of the Moscow Olympics will be substantially different from that of preceding Olympic Games. The number of visitors to the Games has been restricted by advance agreement with the International Olympic Committee. Furthermore, since entrance into the USSR is controlled, then obviously, the mass influx of tourists and sports fans from various countries which has characterized earlier Games will not be permitted. The cultural program of the 1980 Olympics, controlled by the Soviet censors, will be limited to highlighting Soviet national achievements. The movement of foreign guests about the country will be predetermined by "corridors" under the aegis of "Intourist". Such is the nature of a closed society. But how does one reconcile all this with the idea of international trust proclaimed in the Olympic charter?

Your agreement to hold the 22nd Olympics under conditions imposed by the USSR, your "Olympic serenity" about what is going on in the USSR, blots out the wonderful words of the Olympic charter. "Sport is separate from politics"- such is the wise Olympic principle. And just as separate from politics -- and, in fact, above politics -- are the fundamental humanitarian issues which are essential elements of the Olympic movement. Today, your silence constitutes direct support for the policies outlined above.

The USSR attaches great propaganda significance to the upcoming Olympic Games. Obviously, the Soviet authorities want to make Moscow in 1980 a city of official smiles; the process of "cleansing" Moscow from dissidents has already begun and one can expect a broadening of that campaign. We ask you not to allow this. Not one family should have to mourn the Olympics.

We, just as you, attach great significance to the Olympics in our country as an important event which could foster friendship and mutual understanding among the peoples of our planet, as it aids international trust and security. But the Olympics can play this lofty role only if Olympic principles are strictly followed.

We call upon you not to compromise those principles in the XXII Olympiad and to ensure the same level of cultural exchange, contacts among people, and unimpeded movement of people in the host country as has been attained during previous Games.

In antiquity, wars were halted during the Olympic Games. Today, in the USSR, a war is being waged against humanism and mercy. We call upon you to demand a "ceasefire" as a necessary condition for the Olympic Games to be held in the Soviet Union. We implore you to demand that repressions against the non-violent defenders of human rights, of religious freedom, of the right to emigrate and of the right to choose one's residence within one's country, be halted. We call on you to demand that the country which is hosting the Olympic Games release Yuri Orlov, Aleksandr Ginzburg, Anatoly Shcharansky, Vladimir Slepak, Lev Lukyanenko, Viktoras Petkus, Aleksandr Podrabinek, and all the other imprisoned members of the Soviet Helsinki Groups; Sergei Kovalev, Igor Ogurtsov, Georgy Vins, Vladimir Shelkov, Vasily Romanyuk, Ida Nudel, Iosif Begun, as well as all those who have been sentenced for attempting to leave the country. We appeal to you to demand the release of all Prisoners of Conscience.

We call upon you to make this letter known to the national Olympic Committees and the sports associations in various countries so that each participant in the upcoming Olympics can express his attitude to the issues presented here.

June 26, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova

The following people are in complete agreement with this letter of the Moscow Helsinki Group:

Boris Altshuller
Tatyana Velikanova
Andrei Sakharov
Larisa Bogoraz
Georgy Vladimov

On the Trials of Anatoly Shcharansky, Aleksandr Ginzburg and
Viktoras Petkus

Document No. 56

Cruel sentences have been meted out in rapid succession to members of the Helsinki Groups. These sentences are not only personal tragedies for those condemned, but are a severe blow to the Soviet human rights struggle as well. A few days ago, cruel new sentences rang out: Anatoly Shcharansky got a 13 year term: three years in prison and ten years of strict regimen camp; Viktoras Petkus will serve ten years of imprisonment; three years in prison and seven years in special regimen camp, plus five years of internal exile; and Aleksandr Ginzburg will spend eight years in a special regimen camp.

The trials were held from July 10 through July 14, 1978. Anatoly Shcharansky was tried in Moscow, Viktoras Petkus in Vilnius and Aleksandr Ginzburg in Kaluga. These three trials were designed to exert cruel and forceful pressure on the human rights movement in the Soviet Union, in particular, the movement for the observance of the humanitarian obligations undertaken by governments at Helsinki. These trials were calculated to morally discredit this movement and its participants.

Furthermore, each of these trials had its own special target:

-- Shcharansky's trial was intended to foster a hysterical atmosphere of spy mania around the struggle for the right to emigration, and to intimidate its participants, especially Jews, with extreme measures of punishment;

-- Viktoras Petkus' trial was intended to discredit the non-violent national liberation movement in the Baltic countries and to intimidate the entire population of these countries; and

-- Ginzburg's trial was intended to slander the very concept of helping people persecuted by the government, political prisoners and their families, and as a threat both to those giving and receiving aid.

Anatoly Shcharansky is one of the most respected activists in the struggle for the right of Jews to emigrate to Israel and in general for the right to emigrate regardless of nationality, religious belief, etc. Along with charges of so-called "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda", unfounded and absurd charges of espionage and treason were declared against Shcharansky. All this contrived to create a particularly tense atmosphere of hostility and suspicion. Reporting in the Soviet press, on radio and television, linked Shcharansky's trial to that of Filatov, accused of espionage and sentenced to be shot. Filatov, however, has no connection either to Shcharansky or to the human rights movement.

The severity of the espionage charges against Shcharansky is untenable in the face of the absurd and vague evidence against him. In general, the episodes incriminating him are not illegal. The court paid undue attention to such trivial questions as, for example, whether or not Shcharansky's marriage is valid under Judaic law. The two main episodes incriminating Shcharansky in espionage were his compiling a list of "refuseniks" -- people who have long been attempting to emigrate and have been refused permission -- and sending this list abroad, and a certain secret questionnaire, of which Shcharansky learned only after his arrest. The accusation against Shcharansky is based entirely on the evidence of the provocateurs Lipavsky and Tsipin. Their false testimony the court held to be more convincing than the reliable public statements by President Carter that Shcharansky had no connection at all with the CIA. In his speech, the procurator could not present any proof of the crimes attributed to Shcharansky. The court repeatedly mentioned that Shcharansky had met with foreign correspondents, American senators, Congressmen, and other prominent people -- all absolutely legal meetings. The attempt to use such meetings for these charges completely contradicts both the letter and spirit of the Helsinki Final Act.

Shcharansky's trial is a contemporary version of the Dreyfus trial. The difference is that Dreyfus had real possibilities for defense, something which Shcharansky completely lacks. More than anything, Shcharansky's criminal trial is a blow at the emigration movement, especially the Jewish part of this movement; it is also yet another attempt to discredit the Jewish people as a whole.

Viktoras Petkus is a well-known participant in the Lithuanian Catholic Youth Movement, for which he spent 16 years in imprisonment. He is a figure of undisputable moral authority. Along with charges of "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda", and the creation of an "anti-Soviet organization", Petkus faced charges of homosexuality and the corruption of minors. The only witness for the last two charges was a soldier who, appearing in court under guard, testified that V. Petkus supposedly had seduced him in 1973. In view of the intensive surveillance of Petkus from the moment he was released from camp, it is obvious that if such an episode had ever really occurred, Petkus would have been arrested on purely criminal charges five years ago.

Obviously, the main purpose of this trial was to discredit the peaceful national liberation movement in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Dissidents from each of these republics were summoned to testify at the trial in order to create the proper effect and atmosphere, and to threaten repressive measures for all participants and sympathizers in this movement. Most of these people did not, in fact, testify.

During the trial of Aleksandr Ginzburg, the court devoted much time and attention to slandering the character of the defendant, other "dissidents" -- mostly political prisoners -- and former prisoners of conscience. Aleksandr Ginzburg, a former prisoner of conscience, has spent seven years in detention in strict regimen camps and prison for his attempts to exercise freedom of speech and the press. He is a well-known highly-respected Soviet human rights activist, and administrator of the Public Fund for the Aid of Political Prisoners and their Families established

by Nobel Prize for Literature Laureate, Solzhenitsyn. In this latter capacity, Ginzburg had distributed material assistance over the last few years before his most recent arrest.

Ginzburg was formally charged under the article on "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda". For this purpose, the court had as its major witness a certain Gradoboyev, a man with a record of 12 years in camps for such crimes as theft, forgery of documents and pornography. The court spent several hours listening to the moral pronouncements of Gradoboyev, the alcoholic Ivanov, and a degraded and frightened artist from Tarusa, Khvoshchev. The procurator and judge wanted to know whether women had ever visited Ginzburg's house, how many beds were in his room, etc. The false testimony of a certain Lavashov that "Ginzburg was unemployed" could easily have been discredited by available documents. Nevertheless, this accusation was repeated in the list of formal charges against Ginzburg.

As part of the campaign to slander Ginzburg, Sidorkov, the chairman of the court, told Western correspondents outside the courtroom that Aleksandr Ginzburg had not received the maximum term under Article 70.2 of the RSFSR Criminal Code because he had testified against A. Shcharansky and Yuri Orlov. Nevertheless, the judgement against Ginzburg did not mention the fact of cooperation, although by law such cooperation must be noted if, in fact, it has occurred. The judgement did note that, in determining the length of Ginzburg's term, the court took into consideration the fact that he is the sole support of two children. However, the attention Ginzburg's trial has received in the West is probably the true reason behind the relatively "light" sentence which he received. Nevertheless, due to Ginzburg's frail state of health, even the sentence he received can have fatal consequences for him.

One must also note that any witnesses who gave evidence which the procuracy found displeasing during the preliminary investigation of the Shcharansky and Ginzburg cases were neither summoned nor even allowed into the courtroom. Those who expressed a desire to testify for the defense never received a summons. Thus, Academician Andrei Sakharov, a close friend of Ginzburg, failed to receive a summons; nor did S.M. Polikanov, Corresponding Member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences; the well-known writer, Georgi Vladimov; the famous human rights activist and prisoner of conscience, Sergei Kovalev; close friend and co-worker, Vera Lashkova; and many others who had insisted on their right to testify for Aleksandr Ginzburg and in support of the veracity of the documents used to incriminate him, in particular, those of the Moscow Helsinki Group.

One must note that the authorities created a special atmosphere in the courtroom and its environs. In the hall, there was a select audience (admitted only with a special pass!), a particularly hostile "public" which was permitted (evidently even encouraged) to make open attacks on the defendant. Hundreds of KGB agents and militia surrounded the courthouse, protecting it from the defendant's friends who had come there. Some of these guards were in uniform, some wore the red armbands of the people's militia, and others were in civilian clothes. Repeatedly these men brazenly revealed their contemptuous attitude to the defendant and to those people who showed sympathy by coming to the courthouse. None of the friends

and sympathizers was admitted to the so-called "open" court session, even when the sentence was being read. There were acts of additional sadism; Shcharansky's 70-year-old mother was never allowed into the courtroom during his trial; during the second day of Aleksandr Ginzburg's trial, his wife was expelled from the courtroom and was never readmitted. The KGB and the assembled "people" maliciously jeered at the wife of the sentenced defendant. Laughter, hoots and threats drowned out friends' greetings to the sentenced man as he was being driven off in a Black Maria.

During the Belgrade Conference, it became crystal clear that the Soviet Union considers itself obliged to observe only those provisions of the Helsinki Final Act which are to its advantage, openly violating the humanitarian sections of this document.

Now, only a few months after Belgrade, persecution against all the diverse elements in the human rights movement in the USSR has reached its tragic culmination.

We appeal to governments and the heads of all signatory states of the Helsinki Final Act to demand that the Soviet Union fulfill the obligations it voluntarily undertook at Helsinki.

We thank all those who have come to the defense of Anatoly Shcharansky, Aleksandr Ginzburg, Viktoras Petkus, Yuri Orlov, and other human rights activists who are already sentenced or who are under arrest and awaiting trial. We ask that you not slacken your efforts in their defense.

July 15, 1978

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Sofya Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Viktor Nekipelov
Tatyana Osipova
Sergei Polikanov

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Father Karolis Garuckas
Eitan Finkelshtein

Georgian Helsinki Group:

Isai Goldshtein

The Christian Committee to Defend
the Rights of Believers:

Father Gleb Yakunin

The Working Commission for the Investigation of the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes:

Leonard Ternovsky

The Initiative Group to Defend Human Rights in the USSR:

Tatyana Velikanova

The Soviet Chapter of Amnesty International:

Georgi Vladimov

(In the future, descriptions of the trials of A. Gunzburg, A. Shcharansky, and V. Petkus will be append to this document).

A Pre-Belgrade Summary

The Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements to the USSR was formed in May, 1976, at the initiative and under the leadership of Professor Yuri Orlov. According to the statement on its formation:

"The aim of the Group is to promote observance of the humanitarian provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe... . The Group hopes that its information will be taken into account at all official meetings which are provided for in the Final Act under the point 'Follow-up to the Conference'.

The members of the Helsinki Group base their activity on the conviction that humanitarian issues and access to information have a direct relationship to the problem of international security. We appeal to the citizens of other participating States of the Helsinki Conference to form their own national Helsinki Groups which would assist in the full implementation of the Helsinki Agreements on the part of the governments of their countries."

In the course of its existence, the Helsinki Group has issued 22 documents and more than 40 separate statements, among them an evaluation of the results of the first year after the signing of the Helsinki Agreement ("An Evaluation of the Influence of the Helsinki Agreements as They Relate to Human Rights in the USSR", July 22, 1976). All these materials have been given to correspondents of western information agencies and sent to the governments of a number of States participating in the Helsinki Agreement. We hope that these Helsinki Group materials will be studied and discussed at the Belgrade Conference. This document is not a systematic summary of the Helsinki Group materials; it is an evaluation of results two years after the Helsinki Agreement and its prospects for the future, compiled on the basis of Group materials.

Our goal was to answer the following three questions:

Is the USSR observing the humanitarian articles of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe?

What influence have the Helsinki Agreements had on human rights in the USSR and countries of Eastern Europe?

What is the outlook for the Belgrade Conference?

I. Is the Soviet government observing the human rights provisions outlined in the Final Act?

In the Section of the Final Act entitled "Questions relating to Security in Europe", within the "Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States" we find Principle VII in which participating States commit themselves to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms. Here, in part, the Final Act states:

"The participating States recognize the universal significance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for which is an essential factor for the peace, justice and well-being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and cooperation among themselves as among all States."

With this provision, respect for fundamental human rights is included among the obligations accepted by the participating States with the goal of insuring cooperation and security in Europe. The last paragraph of Principle VII leaves no doubt that human rights and basic freedoms in the Final Act are understood to have the same scope as they do in the well-known basic documents: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the U.N. and International Covenants on Human Rights.

In the section "Cooperation in Humanitarian and Other Fields", the Final Act contains a series of provisions dealing with human contacts and the exchange of information which are also related to human rights and which, when honestly fulfilled, necessarily include the observation of human rights.

It is generally recognized that when the Final Act was signed on August 1, 1975, violation of fundamental human rights in the USSR was not limited to separate aberrant incidents, but actually represented normal conduct, reinforced unwritten traditions and written governmental regulations. It is sufficient to indicate the three most obvious facts:

1. In the Soviet Union there is no freedom of emigration. Even for a tourist excursion abroad, character references must be procured from one's place of employment; these are given out only rarely and always under the strict control of Party agencies. The citizens of the USSR are prisoners of their own government.
2. In the Soviet Union there is no freedom to choose one's place of residence (the "registration" system).
3. In the Soviet Union there is no freedom to exchange information, in effect, no freedom of the press. At the very least, this is evident from the fact that in the country no publications are printed independent of governmental and Party control, and none can be freely printed.

It is understood that it would have been naive to expect, and unrealistic to demand, that the situation change the day after the Final Act was signed. But it was possible and proper to expect that the situation would improve, albeit gradually and slowly. The Soviet government could have at least displayed some intention to improve the human rights situation.

Nonetheless, this did not occur. The results a year after the Helsinki Conference were summarized in a Group to Promote document with the following words:

"The Soviet government does not intend to fulfill its international obligations in human rights.

As before many hundreds of political prisoners -- people sentenced merely for political, ethical or religious beliefs or for attempts to provide the public with independent information -- are languishing in prisons and camps. In some respects the conditions of their confinement have been violently brutalized over the year.

The practice of psychiatric repression has been neither condemned nor curtailed.

Both in the question of free emigration and in the more frequent question of reunification of families there have been no changes for the better. The number of "refuseniks" known to us has even grown over the year.

All forms of independent information are persecuted."

Two years after the Helsinki Conference we can say the same thing with even greater assuredness. The materials of the Helsinki Group indicate the numerous violations of human rights. We would, first of all, like to call attention to the following examples:

1. The denial of the right to emigrate and the reunification of families (cf. Group Documents No. 11-14). We note, in particular, the obstacles set before a large group of Pentecostals and Baptists (over a thousand individuals) who have collectively stated their desire to emigrate (Document No. 20). This mass demand for freedom of emigration on the part of the Pentecostals also testifies to the violation of another basic personal freedom -- the freedom of religion -- since the Pentecostals convincingly reinforce their demand with descriptions of gross violations of this right (in reference to this also see "Report on the Trip to Pentecostal Communities", December 1, 1977).

In addition, we note the struggle for the right to emigrate on the part of Soviet Germans (Document No. 22) and Jews. Relative to the reunification of families, we can refer to Document No. 4 which contains a list of separated families making efforts to reunite (a list of the most dramatic cases of separated close relatives which is far from complete). In the meantime, the number of Soviet individuals publicly stating their desire to leave the Soviet Union forever or temporarily is steadily growing. They are very often refused. In many cases they become victims of repressions and are subjected to loss of employment, confinement in psychiatric hospitals, arrests in connection with trumped-up charges, etc.

This we can judge by the growing number of statements sent directly to the Helsinki Group, through the Group, to the Heads of State who signed the Final Act. We know, however, that the vast majority of statements (concerning the desire to emigrate, the renunciation of citizenship, the necessity of leaving the country temporarily) does not reach the Group. A very great number of those desiring to emigrate are simply unknown to the Group.

The Soviet government consistently reduces the full content of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act to one point: reunification of families (disclaiming its violations in this area). It would like to impose this position on other governments just as it imposes it on its own citizens.

In June of 1976, the director of All-Union OVIR, Vladimir Obidin, explained that the Soviet agencies responsible for granting permission to leave the USSR will be "strictly guided by" the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and will grant visas only for the purpose of reuniting families; but family is defined only as spouses and their unmarried children, according to the Marriage and Family Code. Refusal for reasons of "insufficiently close kinship" is becoming as widespread a phenomenon as refusal based on knowledge of "state secrets". In this manner the authorities are attempting to use the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference to restrict emigration.

2. Discrimination on the basis of nationality. The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference states:

"The participating States on whose territory national minorities exist will respect the right of persons belonging to such minorities to equality before the law, will afford them the full opportunity for the actual enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms and will, in this manner, protect their legitimate interests in this sphere."

In the meantime, the Crimean Tatars in the USSR have for many years been waging a fruitless struggle for the right to live in their native Crimea, the land from which they were exiled as a result of a monstrous act of genocide in 1944 (cf. Document No. 10, containing an extensively detailed description of discrimination against the Crimean Tatars). The Meskhetians are in a similar situation (cf. Document No. 18, January 14, 1977). Facts related to discrimination against Jews are well known.

3. The violation of the right to exchange information and ideas freely, including such exchanges with participating States of the Helsinki Conference.

The telephones of individuals carrying on undesirable (according to the KGB) conversations, in particular, with individuals abroad (Document No. 2 cites 43 names) are still being disconnected. We will note that this testifies to the continued and widespread monitoring of telephone conversations. Letters and telegrams are severely censored at the border and often withheld. As before, a non-Communist newspaper can be purchased in Moscow only infrequently and with great difficulty; it is totally impossible to buy news magazines such as Time and Newsweek. Not only has the policy on exchanging information with political prisoners not become more liberal since August, 1975, but quite the opposite; it has become harsher. Letters to and from political prisoners and their relatives are withheld on the most absurd pretexts. For example, the censor can discover "hidden meaning" in a letter and not even make an effort to explain what it is. Even the political prisoner's state of health is among the categories of prohibited information.

Soviet propaganda and the mass media continue to consider ideas coming from the West as infectious diseases and instill into Soviet man the idea that it is his duty to prevent their penetration. Any article printed on this topic in the Soviet Union offers convincing proof of this. For example, in the widely circulated youth-oriented newspaper, Komsomolskaya Pravda, on May 5, 1977 an article entitled "Wrong Side Up" asserts that:

"the bourgeois mass media" seek to be granted the right to wage a "psychological war" on the territory of the socialist countries and to interfere in their internal affairs. Resounding calls for ideological disarmament and intrusive demands to open the borders of the socialist world for the so-called 'free flow of information' are all pursuing precisely this type of goal, but what will 'free flow' bring to our shores? The NATO Bulletin Nouvelle Atlantique fully clarifies this issue: 'A free flow of information is the creation of conditions for penetration of Western ideas into socialist countries.'"

In this manner, Komsomolskaya Pravda calls not for an ideological struggle with Western ideas (which, as with any struggle of ideas, would only have been welcomed), but for the physical construction of obstacles to the penetration of Western ideas. In this manner, the free flow of ideas, which appears in quotes in Komsomolskaya Pravda, is presented as a conscious fraud with no chance to exist. Komsomolskaya Pravda, like all other Soviet newspapers, does not express its own opinion, but simply reiterates the position of higher governmental and Party bodies. The reason for this hostile position towards the free flow of information is clearly stated by the newspaper: it will create conditions for the penetration of Western ideas. How is this position compatible with the obligation "to promote fuller mutual access by all to the achievements -- works, experiences, and performing arts -- in the various fields of culture of their countries. . ." undertaken in the Final Act subsection entitled

"Access". According to Soviet ideologists by the governments of the participating states at the Helsinki Conference, it seems that the concept of "Western ideas" does not enter into the concept of "Western culture".

The practices of authoritative Soviet agencies fully correspond to the theory expounded in propaganda. The measures employed in relation to the International Symposium on Jewish Culture can serve as typical models. This symposium was to have opened in Moscow on December 21, 1976, and was to last three days. There were 51 papers on the agenda of the symposium, 14 of which were to be given by foreign guests. In response to this, the authorities undertook the following measures (cf. Document No. 19):

(1) All foreign scholars invited to the symposium were denied entrance visas. Even tourists suspected of interest in the symposium were denied entrance. At least three U.S. citizens who informed Soviet officials of their interest were expelled from the USSR.

(2) Members of the organizational committee, as well as persons associated with them, were subjected to searches and lengthy interrogations. All literature in Hebrew and Yiddish, right down to dictionaries, texts of reports, and materials for the symposium were confiscated.

(3) Nineteen persons had their telephones disconnected.

(4) On December 21, members of the organizational committee and the majority of individuals slated to present papers were arrested. In the course of the next three days, they were detained either under home arrests or during interrogations.

(5) In Riga, Kishinev, Tallin, Leningrad and other cities, individuals were detained as they attempted to leave for Moscow.

4. Repressions against the Helsinki Groups. The clearest evidence of violations of the Helsinki Agreement is the repression of the Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in Moscow, the Ukraine and Georgia. From February through April, the following people were arrested:

Three members of the Moscow Group - Yuri Orlov (leader), Aleksandr Ginzburg, and Anatoli Shcharansky.

Four members of the Ukrainian Group - Mykola Rudenko (leader), Oleksiy Tykhy, Myroslav Marynovych, and Mykola Matusevych.

Three members of the Georgian Group - Zviad Gamsakhurdia (leader), Merab Kostava, Victor Rtskhiladze (Rtskhiladze was soon released after signing a note stating that he would not leave for reasons of ill health. He was nonetheless subjected to many hours of interrogation).

Certain individuals close to the Groups to Promote A. Barladian, I. Terelya were arrested or confined in psychiatric hospitals. Members of the Groups who have not been arrested and individuals in contact with them are under great pressure and under threat of arrest.

Even though charges against those arrested have not yet been disclosed, there can be no doubt those arrests are directed against the activity of the Helsinki Groups with the goal of destroying these Groups. In May, 1976, immediately following the creation of the first Helsinki Group headed by Yuri Orlov, the authorities attempted to halt the Group's activity. On May 27, 1976, Yuri Orlov made the following statement:

" . . . I must note, that the continuing restriction of free information is a fundamental violation of the spirit and letter of the Final Act of the European Conference.

In part, this violation is now directed against the activity of the Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR itself.

The Group to Promote, completely open and positive in the nature of its activity, was officially labeled an illegal organization by the authorities -- although this sounds mad -- and also a provocational and anti-constitutional organization. A huge number of KGB agents almost ostentatiously follow my every move as well as those of certain other Group members, no doubt in anticipation of an arrest warrant. One would assume, that there is no greater danger for the government than public efforts for the fulfillment of the Helsinki Agreements.

. . . Peaceful struggle for the observance of fundamental personal rights, against cruelty, for religious and social tolerance and for the free movement of information sets the foundation for trust and peace -- a foundation more stable and long-lasting than one simply based on political endeavors. Problems of security in today's world are inseparable from humanitarian problems. This is the obvious point of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act. By the very nature of this issue, all peoples and all governments are interested in their fulfillment.

If, then, the collection and distribution of information on the violation of these articles qualify as state crimes, the very basis of the Agreements is undermined; they no longer have any true content or inner logic.

For this reason, I am appealing to the governments and parliaments of all countries who participated in the European Conference, including the USSR.

I request that you take steps to protect the right of the Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements to pursue its stated reasonable and useful activity. I ask you to protect its members from persecution."

The crushing of the Helsinki Groups on the eve of the Belgrade Conference can only be viewed as a demonstrative refusal by the authorities to fulfill their human rights obligations in the future and as proof of their resolution to punish those citizens who convey information about these violations.

II. The influence of the Helsinki Agreements on human rights in the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe.

The preceding section shows, then, that the signing of the Final Act by the Soviet government has not had a direct effect on the human rights situation in the USSR, in the sense that the government has not demonstrated an intention to improve this situation as might have been expected on the basis of the text of the Final Act.

However, the signing of the Helsinki Agreements has had a definite if indirect influence on the human rights issue in the USSR and in the countries of Eastern Europe.

First of all, the signing of the Helsinki Agreements by the governments of the indicated states gave their citizens grounds to demand that their own governments respect fundamental human rights. It also gave them reason to count on the support of Western public opinion and government officials, since the human rights issue had been linked to the security of 35 countries in Europe and North America and to the recognition of the inviolability of Europe's frontiers. In response, the Soviet government and certain other countries of Eastern Europe have intensified repressions against those who struggle for human rights.

Secondly, the gross and flagrant violation of the commitments made by the Soviet Union in the area of human rights has evoked indignation in many people in Western countries and has opened their eyes to the gravity and difficulty of the human rights situation in all countries which call themselves socialist, and to the absence of any sort of progress in this area.

III. The outlook for the Belgrade Conference.

The historic significance of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is that, for the first time, respect for human rights was declared a necessary element for interstate relations designed to preserve peace and develop cooperation.

This idea lies at the very heart of the Helsinki accords. No matter how successfully this idea has been implemented or what its effect has been up till now, we believe that it has become a permanent issue in international politics. This represents a giant step forward for mankind on the road toward securing individual liberties and toward collective security.

Addressing ourselves toward the realization of the concepts put forth on August 1, 1975, we first of all note the absence of formality in the commitments made by the participating States in the area of human rights. These commitments resemble declarations of intent. They do not include any criteria to measure the fulfillment of these intentions. This form of agreement presumes good faith towards fulfillment. The events of the past two years have clearly demonstrated the absence of such good faith on the part of the Soviet government. The Belgrade Conference may or may not acknowledge this fact; if it does, it may either continue attempts to realize the basic idea of the Helsinki Conference, or it can abandon such attempts. Consequently, there are three logical possibilities and, in the concluding section of our report, we would like to comment on these.

1. In all probability the Soviet representatives at Belgrade will claim that the USSR has implemented the humanitarian articles of the Final Act, and that, if anywhere, human rights are being violated in Western countries. The Soviet representatives will either denounce the Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements or simply ignore them. Beyond that, they will no doubt cite various figures testifying to the great and possibly growing number of tourist excursions, cultural exchanges, foreign books being translated in the Soviet Union and so on. All these figures, of course, have no relation to human rights since they refer to projects undertaken at the initiative and under strict control of state agencies. These figures do not testify to human rights, but to state rights -- and no one has any doubt about the existence of those.

However, due to the absence of formal criteria governing observance of the human rights commitments in the Final Act, Western representatives, if they so chose, could pretend to be "almost satisfied" with the state of affairs and could express the hope that "isolated incidents" of violations of the human rights guarantees would be corrected in the near future. We consider that it would be pure hypocrisy to take such a position in the face of the obvious truth. To do so would do irreparable injury to the cause of human rights as well as to European security. It would simply facilitate the flagrant violation of the Helsinki pledges and turn the Final Act into a laughing stock.

2. In acknowledging the total and flagrant violation of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act by the Soviet Union, the Western countries may conclude that the idea of tying human rights to international relations has failed. This conclusion allows two logical possibilities, both with highly tragic consequences. One, Western countries may repudiate the

Helsinki Agreements as something not observed by the opposite side. This would aggravate international tension, increase military expenditures, and diminish the chances for a stable peace and genuine international cooperation. Two, Western countries may retreat on human rights issues either by formally excluding such points from the Helsinki Agreements, or by virtually ignoring them, while preserving the remaining articles of the Agreements, specifically, guarantees for the inviolability of frontiers. This would be an enormous blow to human rights not only in the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe, but also in the developing world. Politically, any kind of "security and cooperation" achieved at such a cost would be illusory and would simply result in the demolition of the Helsinki Agreements.

3. We feel that any conclusion on the collapse of the "Helsinki idea" is premature and we put our hopes in a third logical possibility -- specifically, that the Western countries will point out the violations of its humanitarian commitments on the part of the Soviet Union and will conclude that the only means of preserving the Helsinki Agreement would be the establishment of agreed criteria for evaluating the facts. The Soviet government may choose not to recognize the violations of its own commitments, but it will have to recognize that the only way out of an impasse resulting from two such opposing points of view is to establish agreed criteria. If the Soviet Union refuses to accept concrete, measurable criteria for the evaluation of facts, then its action will have the force of a unilateral destruction of the Helsinki Agreement.

No matter what the criteria for the measuring of implementation of international agreements, one thing is clear: one cannot imprison anyone for seeking to fulfill international accords. We feel that the preliminary condition for any discussion must be the immediate release of all arrested members of the Helsinki Groups. As long as these people are imprisoned, any discussion of criteria for observance of the Helsinki Agreements would be an insulting farce and a mockery of reason.

Disputes about fulfillment of these human rights obligations primarily center on two concepts: 'interests of state' and 'interference in internal affairs'. Therefore, there should be specific permissible limits on individual liberties in the name of national security and on specific actions of other countries with respect to human rights constituting interference in another state's internal affairs. Soviet authorities now look upon any exchanges of information not initiated by them as contrary to their state interests. If the Soviet government refuses to establish criteria to evaluate violations of state interests in the area of human rights, this will signify a profound and irresolvable contradiction between the observance of human rights and Soviet state interests and that present practice will continue. If this is the case, the Soviet government should not have signed the Helsinki Agreement. It stands to reason that if any criticism of one country by another for violation of human rights or any demand to present pertinent information are viewed as interference in internal affairs, such a country should not be a participant in the Helsinki Agreement.

We would like to note the following as specific aspects of this problem:

A list of state interests should include international codification of the concept of state secrets; a list of categories of information which cannot be considered state secrets is also vitally important. Views on this subject were expressed by Yuri Orlov in a proposal for an international conference on declassification of information which we attach here.

Freedom of emigration holds an especially important position among human rights because of its international aspect; an individual desiring to emigrate from a country belongs to mankind, rather than to the citizenry of a given country; for this reason mankind as a whole is responsible for him. We consider it essential that each government pledge either to allow the immediate departure of a person wishing to emigrate or to give a specific written reason for delay and how long such delay will continue. Copies of such responses should be sent to international organizations.

There is no reason to categorize the distribution of information about court proceedings and prison conditions as contradictory to state interests, nor the request for such information by other governments as interference in internal affairs. The participants in the Helsinki Agreement should guarantee free access for foreign representatives to all trial proceedings and places of detention.

We have cited these three aspects only as examples which by no means fully elucidate the problem. In addition to the agreements and obligations assumed by the participating States, the existence of verifiable criteria for implementation of the Final Act also implies the creation of international bodies to collect and analyse pertinent information. Taking into consideration the limited opportunities of the citizens of the USSR and Eastern Europe, the representatives of such bodies should have the opportunity to visit these countries and accept statements from individual citizens.

The Soviet Union's violation of the humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki Agreement creates a difficult situation with respect to relations between countries participating in this Agreement. The future of Europe and the whole world may depend on the resolution of this situation, but to ignore such violations would be the worst possible solution.

After the arrest of Aleksandr Ginzburg on February 3, 1977, Helsinki Group leader Yuri Orlov issued a statement which included the following:

"Having acted in this way, the Soviet government has plainly discarded its recent international human rights obligations.

Are there any guarantees that it will not discard other obligations when the time is right?

I direct these questions to Western governments.

I also direct these questions to the Soviet government."

The Soviet government's response to this question is evident -- it has thrown Yuri Orlov behind bars.

What will be the response of the representatives of Western governments when they gather at the Belgrade Conference?

February 27, 1977

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Pyotr Grigorenko
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Yuri Mnyukh
Vladimir Slepak

Members of the Group to Investigate
the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political
Purposes:

Vyacheslav Bakhmin
Irina Kaplun
Aleksandr Podrabinek
Felix Serebrov

Chairman of Amnesty International:

Valentin Turchin

Supplement

Professor Yuri Orlov's proposal for an International Conference on Declassification of Information:

I propose that Western governments work out, in general terms, a project for an International Conference on Declassification of Information during the preparation period for Belgrade.

This would be a worthwhile development of the Helsinki Agreements in a crucial direction.

The goal of the conference should be an international agreement on the acceptable level of classification of information. At the same time, an agreement should be reached on the following information to try to gradually reduce the range of classifiable information.

I feel that, at the first stage, restrictions should be set to forbid the classification of information dealing with the following:

- 1) abject poverty
- 2) epidemics and widespread disease
- 3) statistics on crime
- 4) material conditions - provisions of food, clothing, housing, etc.
- 5) the extent and nature of violations of international human rights obligations.

Taking into consideration the history of repression of free information in the Soviet Union, stipulations should be set for the right of individuals to publish information open to discussion -- without criminal persecution for erroneous information -- in regard to an enumerated and agreed list of free (unclassified) information. Further stipulations should establish that the punishment for an intentionally dishonest source of information should be to deny credence to such a source in the future.

I further believe that this last principle, at least with respect to Point 5, could be established at Belgrade.

This proposal is the development of Professor Naum Meiman's idea concerning the need for an international agreement to define acceptable limits to the classification of scientific information.

February 8, 1977*

/signed/
Yuri Orlov
Leader, The Group to Promote

*Professor Orlov was arrested in Moscow, February 10, 1977. On May 19, 1978, Orlov was sentenced to seven years of strict regimen labor camp and five years of internal exile for "anti-Soviet agitation".

The Rudenko-Tykhy Trial

For Attempting to be a Citizen:
10 Years of Prison, 10 Years of Torture

Oleksiy Tykhy was convicted because his name appears under the Ukrainian Group memorandum which announces the Group's intention to defend human rights. This, in the Land of Victorious Socialism, is -- precisely what is called anti-Soviet, anti-state activity -- an especially dangerous state crime.

Mykola Rudenko, aside from his activity in defense of human rights as leader of the Ukrainian Group, was also incriminated for his essay, "Economic Monologues", which criticizes the Marxist theory of surplus value.

Rudenko and Tykhy received the maximum sentence possible under the Article on "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda."

Rudenko was sentenced to 7 years' imprisonment in a strict regimen corrective labor colony ("ITK") to be followed by 5 years of exile in Siberia. The years in the "ITK" will have the force of a death sentence for Rudenko: an invalid of the war who suffered a severe injury to his spinal column, the almost 60-year old Rudenko will not survive the conditions to which he has been condemned.

Tykhy, who has already served a lengthy term on a similar charge, received a sentence of 10 years in corrective labor colonies of the special regimen type, plus five years of exile. For a fifty-year old man, whose health was undermined during his earlier prison term, this sentence means imprisonment for life.

The authorities' opportunities are unlimited: they could have produced these charges and sentences even in an open courtroom. Nonetheless, they preferred to conduct an especially secret, especially closed trial.

While under investigation, the men were kept in Donetsk prison, far from Kiev (1000 km), where Rudenko lived and conducted the activities used to incriminate him. Not even his closest relatives knew that the investigation had been terminated, and that it was finally possible to secure the services of an attorney. The indicted remained in total isolation from the outside world.

The beginning of the trial was not announced. Rudenko's wife and Tykhy's mother were summoned to the trial to appear as witnesses on the 28th of June, even though the trial had begun the 23rd. This was just one of the many gross violations of procedural law committed at this trial. Rudenko's wife and Tykhy's mother were in attendance only at the end of the trial; they heard the prosecutor's speech, the defendants' last words, and the sentence.

The trial was conducted even farther from the cities where the defendants had lived, in the small city of Druzhkivka, 100 km from Donetsk, in the "Red Corner" (the club room--Ed.) of a factory where outsiders are prohibited. The courtroom, containing approximately 70 seats, was filled with a certain sort of people. Workers who had come to Druzhkivka from the factory where Tykhy had been employed, were barred from entering. Friends of the defendants who had travelled from Kiev also were prohibited. P. Starchik and A. Podrabinek who had come from Moscow were detained by the militia. Starchik spent more than 24 hours in a preliminary detention cell and threatened with incarceration in a psychiatric hospital. Podrabinek was in a preliminary detention cell for three full days. The "guardians of order" had threatened that, under the new Constitution, everyone would be brought under control. In Kiev and in Moscow, since mid-month surveillance of many well-known dissenters by "the organs" had intensified; agents literally walk on their heels.

* * * * *

Mykola Rudenko and Oleksiy Tykhy have been convicted. Two more Ukrainian Group members, Myroslav Marynovych and Mykola Matuskevych, are in prison awaiting that which in the Soviet Union is called a trial. The remaining members of this Group also are imperiled. Two members of a similar Group in Georgia -- Z. Gamsakhurdia and M. Kostava -- are imprisoned and awaiting trial. The rest are under threat of arrest. A similar situation faces Lithuanian Group members.

The authorities apparently intend to deal with the Moscow Helsinki Group members in various ways. The punitive agencies have, at their disposal, an entire arsenal of charges from which to choose, ranging from relatively mild to extremely harsh. The selection of a given measure of punishment is based on considerations far removed from legality. For example, Malva Landa, charged with damaging state property (although the fire that occurred in her apartment caused her the most damage), was sentenced to two years exile. Yuri Orlov, arrested in February, is charged with slandering the Soviet state and social order, which carries with it up to three years imprisonment. Simultaneously, Anatoly Shcharansky, arrested in March and charged with "betrayal of the homeland", faces 10-15 years imprisonment or death by firing squad... . The charges against Aleksandr Ginzburg, arrested in February, remain unknown. Articles in Soviet newspapers attribute to him the most incredible and most grave crimes. Journalist (June 1977) called him "a paid agent of the fascist-emigre organization NTS" (Narodno-Trudovoi Soyuz, Popular Labor Alliance--Ed.).

Charges and sentences vary. Their aim, however, is the same: to obliterate from the consciousness of the people the very concept of freedom of conviction, the concept of human rights, to obliterate it with the use of the judicial and propaganda agencies.

The Group, formed at the initiative of Yuri Orlov and its other members, stated its intent to promote observance of human rights in the USSR, rights which the Soviet government formally recognized upon signing the Helsinki Accords, and upon ratifying the International Covenants and other conventions. Over a nine-month period -- up to and following the arrest of Yuri Orlov -- the Group prepared documents which revealed a variety of flagrant violations of human rights in the Soviet state.

1. The suppression of the freedom to hold convictions, to exchange information and ideas. Among the means of suppression: criminal prosecution including indictment with slander of the Soviet system, anti-Soviet propaganda, as well as with crimes never committed (hooliganism, theft, etc.).

2. Suppression of the right to profess religious faith. Aside from the means of suppression indicated above, especially noteworthy is the deprivation of parental rights, the taking away of children.

3. Suppression of the right to movement; deprivation of the right to emigrate.

4. Inhuman and harsh conditions of detention in corrective labor institutions -- prisons and camps (colonies) -- in particular, in places where prisoners of conscience are kept. The use of forced, slave labor, hunger and other physical and spiritual torture.

5. Persecution of former political prisoners: limitations on places of residence, discrimination in employment (de facto ban on employment by profession), administrative surveillance by the militia, etc.

In each of its documents, the Group draws attention to the necessity of independent international commissions to investigate the violations it has documented.

The documents are addressed specifically to all heads of state signatory to the Helsinki accords. Western correspondents and information agencies have been instrumental in giving them wide publicity.

On July 1, a sentence was handed down in Druzhkivka to two participants of the Helsinki Group. The trial of Mykola Rudenko and Oleksiy Tykhy is a menacing warning to the others.

Others have been cautioned as well: anyone who sympathizes, or who openly comes forward in defense of human rights may be convicted. The trial of Vasily Barladyanu in Odessa, conducted simultaneously with the trial in Druzhkivka, is an example. He was charged with slandering the Soviet state and received three years detention for reading and distributing Helsinki Group materials.

With the trials in Druzhkivka and in Odessa -- blatantly political trials -- the Soviet government presented the world with a shameless demonstration of its interpretation of human rights, its refusal to fulfill its international commitments, and its scorn for public opinion in the civilized world.

At the same time, despite the leadership's desire, these trials unmasked official fear of the growing legal consciousness and human rights initiative of its citizens.

June 30-July 2, 1977

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Petr Grigorenko
 Malva Landa
 Vladimir Slepak
 Naum Meiman
 Elena Bonner

Ukrainian Helsinki Group:

Levko Lukyanenko
 Oksana Meshko
 Olha Heyko
 Pyotr Vins
 Oles Berdnyk
 Ivan Kandyba

We support this statement issued by the Helsinki Groups:

Leonid Sery
 Aleksandr Lavut
 Andrei Sakharov
 Yuri Grimm
 Gleb Yakunin*
 Viktor Kapitanchuk*
 Viktor Nekipelov**
 Nina Komorova
 Zinaida Grigorenko
 Aleksandr Podrabinek****
 Atanas Yastrauskas
 Tatyana Velikanova

Larisa Polyektova
 Nina Stokratova-Karavanska***
 Valentina Mashkova
 Kronid Lyubarsky
 Galina Salova
 Ivan Danylyuk
 Vyacheslav Bakhmin****
 Irina Zholkovskaya
 Irina Valitova-Orlova
 Valentin Turchin
 Yuri Gastev

- * Member, Christian Committee
- ** New Member, Moscow Helsinki Group
- *** Member, Ukrainian Helsinki Group
- **** Member, Working Commission on Psychiatric Abuse

New Repressions and a New Stage in the Human Rights Movement
in the USSR

1. How did the Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR come into being?

The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, signed on August 1, 1975, was greeted by the peoples of Europe with a sense of relief and with hope for living in peace and friendship with respect for human rights.

It is known that human rights in the Soviet Union have been crudely violated for decades. Suddenly, the Soviet people read that their government leaders ceremoniously had signed and made commitments to observe their citizens' rights to the freedom of thought, conscience and religion, the freedom to hold and freely express convictions, the freedom of peaceful assembly and association, to movement and to choose one's place of residence, the freedom to leave any country, including one's own, and to return to it.

We knew that this was not the first time the Soviet government had taken on analogous commitments. Long before the Helsinki Conference, the USSR accepted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and ratified ten international covenants (list in Supplement No. 1) and two international pacts on (1) economic, social and cultural rights, and (2) civil and political rights. Nonetheless, not one of these international rights documents has been in effect in the country and the people have known practically nothing about them.

Fearing that a similar fate -- oblivion -- would befall the Final Act, groups of Soviet citizens independently decided to promote the implementation of the obligations undertaken by the Soviet government. Prominent physicist and Corresponding Member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, Yuri Orlov, and his friends were some of the active citizens who participated in this effort. In discussing this issue, they decided to form the Group to Promote the Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR.

It would appear that the government which resolutely decided to observe the commitments it signed would only welcome this citizens' initiative to promote implementation. Nevertheless, since the first day of the Group's existence Soviet organizations have not only obstructed its activity, but have persecuted, slandered and humiliated Group members and their voluntary assistants with malicious persistence and without the burden of evidence. Such persecution began not as a consequence of the Group's activity -- no matter how it is defined -- but before the activity even began. The very day after the Group's formation on May 15, 1976, TASS released abroad an especially provocative and malicious "Announcement" slanderous of the Group. Entitled "A Warning to the Provocateur", the text confirmed that well-known physicist Yuri Fyodorovich Orlov "has dedicated himself to

anti-Soviet activity, is scraping together an anti-Soviet group, is trying to gain popularity among opponents of detente, advocates of international tension and enemies of the Soviet Union." As stated above, evidence was deemed unnecessary although by law only a trial can decide whether or not a person or a group is guilty. The KGB, aided by TASS, labeled the Helsinki Group anti-Constitutional and anti-Soviet even before the Group began its activity. At the same time -- that is, before any activity -- Yuri Orlov was warned that criminal proceedings would be instituted against him if the Group did not cease its activity.

Yuri Orlov refused to heed the warning, indicating that it was unlawful. On their own initiatives, other Group members each protested the TASS announcement and the warning to Orlov as totally illegal.

The example of the Orlov Group inspired human rights activists in the national republics. The Ukrainian Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements was formed in Kiev under the leadership of writer and philosopher, M. Rudenko. In Tbilisi, led by writer Zviad Gamsakhurdia, the Georgian Group was organized. Writer Tomas Venclova created the Lithuanian Group in Vilnius, and we have recently learned of the formation of an Armenian Group (we have not yet received any of their materials).

2. What have the Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements done and what are they doing now?

The activity of the Orlov Group and of the national Helsinki Groups can be seen in their more than thirty documents addressed to the heads of participating states and to the press. They contain lists of concrete facts of violations of the Helsinki Agreements in the Soviet Union, indicate individuals who have suffered from these violations; persons guilty of committing these violations; the time and place of the incidents, along with references to Soviet law and international rights agreements. Anyone who familiarizes himself with these documents* will see clearly that they have nothing to do with espionage, anti-Soviet activity or slander. There are only painstakingly verified facts.

As a matter of fact, the Group has been involved primarily in the verification process, since the actual collecting of materials turned out to be less complicated than expected. Human rights violations have become so commonplace, bureaucratic arbitrariness has generated such bitterness and pain in the people, that information on violations has burst forth with its own momentum. Nevertheless, we have tried to verify thoroughly each fact despite a lack of means and manpower, and despite the most unscrupulous obstacles set at every step for those who volunteer to help us. A barrage of searches, interrogations, arrests and confiscations has been aimed at the members of the Helsinki Group since its inception, at the members of the Commission to Investigate the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, and of the Christian Committee, activists in the Fund for Assistance to Political Prisoners, and activists in the Moscow chapter of Amnesty International.

* Documents can be obtained by contacting Lyudmila Alekseeva, representative of the Group abroad. (For English translations of these documents, contact the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe--Ed.)

The Orlov Group has become a unique catalyst for disclosing defective compliance with the provisions of the Final Act. It has set a precedent for civic activism and, despite repressions, our circle of assistants is expanding spontaneously.

We have never objected to our information being verified. Furthermore, we have requested frequently that an international body be formed for precisely this function. Nor would we decline participation if such a commission were created by the Soviet government. The Soviet government, moreover, has never attempted to investigate the facts we have reported, nor has it examined or refuted any of the documents we have sent them. Nevertheless, the authorities subject the compilers of these documents to varying degrees of repression, not for membership in the Group, but for other alleged activity sometimes provocational in nature, but more often it is simply contrived.

Some examples of such unlawful trumped-up charges follow below. Supplement No. 2, the report of the Fund to Aid Political Prisoners in the USSR, provides a limited overview of the obstacles which the KGB set up for individuals who attempt to assist those who suffer from human rights violations.

3. How human rights defenders in the USSR pay for their humanitarian activity.

Three members of the Moscow Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR, Yuri Orlov*, Aleksandr Ginzburg**, and Anatoly Shcharansky***, have been under arrest for over half a year. Moreover, even before the investigation was complete -- for that matter, even before it began -- they fell victim to an on-going licentious slander campaign. Although we have all the facts to do so, it is impossible to print a refutation in the Soviet press.

Petr Grigorenko, at one time illegally confined in a psychiatric prison for over 5 years, was twice illegally deprived of his pension. It is illegal because if he were healthy he should not have been put in a psychiatric prison in the first place. If he were diagnosed as ill, he could not legally have been deprived of his pension. The KGB slanders Grigorenko in the press and in closed meetings, tampers with his correspondence, and interrupts phone calls with his son (and sends him

* (Orlov was convicted on May 18, 1978 for anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda and sentenced to 7 years in strict regimen camp and 5 years in internal exile--Ed.)

** (On July 13, 1978, Ginzburg was sentenced to 8 years in special regimen labor camp on charges of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda--Ed.)

*** (Charged with treason and anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, Shcharansky was sentenced on July 14, 1978, to three years in prison and ten years of strict regimen labor camp--Ed.)

absolutely abusive letters* -- See Supplement No. 4). Now the appropriate "organs" are also applying the following tactics: young people helping Grigorenko and his wife -- who are both sick and elderly -- in their daily chores, are invited for "interviews" where they try to compel them to stop visiting "that building",

Elena Bonner also has been subjected to base slander for a long time.

Malva Landa has been exiled for two years to the Baikal region on a trumped up charge (she was sentenced for "damaging state property" although the fire which took place in her room damaged her more than anyone else**).

Anatoly Marchenko was driven into exile even earlier (to Chuna, a village in Irkutsk oblast) where authorities continue to take vengeance on him for his membership in the Helsinki Group with endless searches and surveillance***.

Vladimir Slepak and Naum Meiman have been fired; Slepak is still being slandered in the press****.

Lyudmila Alekseeva, under threat of arrest and blackmail, was forced to emigrate.

Two members of the Georgian Group have been arrested: Zviad Gamsakhurdia and Merab Kostava*****.

* The letter itself is sheer delirium but the envelope deserves careful examination. The censors who carefully sniff each line from abroad apparently deemed it possible (and probably desirable) to deliver a letter with an address like this. Thus, the author is clear.

** (In January, 1978, Landa was released under a general amnesty--Ed.)

*** (Marchenko's term of internal exile ended in September, 1978--Ed.)

**** (Slepak was arrested on June 1, 1978, charged with malicious hooliganism, and sentenced to five years of internal exile on June 21, 1978--Ed.)

***** (Gamsakhurdia and Kostava were sentenced on May 19, 1978 to three years in labor camp and two years of internal exile on charges of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda--Ed.)

There have been four arrests in the Ukrainian Group: Mykola Rudenko, Oleksa Tykhy, Myroslav Marynovych* and Mykola Matussevych*. The first two were sentenced to prison terms which mean certain death for these elderly and ill men.

A detailed description of the Rudenko-Tykhy trial follows. It certainly merits that. First, we will note repressions inflicted not on Group members, but on those who have simply defended them or assisted them in their work.

On the second day of Crimean Tatar, Zera Dzhemileva's journey to Moscow from Tashkent (July 11, 1977), she was detained on suspicion of stealing money from a woman sharing her sleeping compartment and searched according to all rules of prison procedure. But, they found no money nor were they really searching for any. The woman "sharing the sleeping compartment" was, in fact, a KGB employee, and the only thing they found on (and confiscated from) Dzhemileva was a personal note addressed to Academician Sakharov. The search was not recorded officially nor could the confiscation have been noted in the non-existent search record. Nor, of course, did anyone apologize for this humiliating search conducted on "suspicion of theft". They did not even say something like, "Excuse us please, you're not the thief." No reason was given for the confiscation of a personal letter bearing no relation to the supposed grounds for the search. It could have been worse: they could have planted the money. (Incidentally, their efforts were thwarted. The materials the Crimean Tatars were trying to transmit to us reached Moscow by July 11. People live and learn).

Almost everyone who visits the exiles Kronid Lyubarsky and Nina Strokata in Tarusa is searched. They search Larisa Bogoraz when she visits her husband Anatoly Marchenko, Helsinki Group Member serving his term of exile in Irkutsk oblast. Aleksandr Podrabinek** was searched at Novosibirsk airport in March 1977; no order was presented, no reasons given. Oksana Meshko (member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group--Ed.) is searched and interrogated systematically. She is a person with a deeply tragic fate. (She spent ten years in a Stalinist camp, separated from her young son. Now, her son, Aleksandr Sergienko, as an adult is in Vladimir Prison for dedicating himself to his native Ukrainian culture and is dying from tuberculosis. Neither mother nor son has committed any crime--Ed.) During the last search, the 72 year-old ailing woman lost consciousness twice. Even that makes no difference; they just revive her and continue the search.

* (Marynovych and Matussevych were sentenced to seven years of strict regimen camp and five years of internal exile on March 29, 1978 for alleged anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda--Ed.)

** (Arrested March 15, 1978; charged with circulation of anti-Soviet fabrications (Article 190-1); convicted and sentenced on August 15, 1978 to five years of exile--Ed.)

Why do they search? After all, we conceal nothing, we work openly. Give us the opportunity to publicly air our views and the freedom to struggle against human rights violations in our country and our need to appeal for help to foreign correspondents will disappear. We would distribute our materials and openly inform our people here at home.

The KGB, however, searches for our materials specifically to prevent them from becoming public. They allocate neither funds nor personnel to verify our documents, but spare nothing in their efforts to locate, confiscate and conceal materials on these violations. They send three people -- "the woman sharing the sleeping compartment", and two to conduct the search -- a thousand kilometers to Tashkent to search a defenseless woman. Perhaps even the witnesses were envoys of the same organization?

Are not these facts sufficient proof that the Soviet government expends its energy not in observing the humanitarian provisions of the Final Act, but simply in concealing evidence of its noncompliance?

The searches, perceptibly more frequent over the last few years, as well as interrogations, detentions and trumped-up cases against Helsinki Group members have one goal: to locate material on human rights violations and to confiscate it before it leaves Soviet territory. They are often successful: after all, they spare no funds for surveillance and technology. For example, Aleksandr Podrabinek's* manuscript of his book, "Punitive Medicine", and a set of file cards with information on more than 200 prisoners in psychiatric hospitals were seized in this way. These documents were produced after many months of work of the "Working Commission to Investigate the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes." This project was complicated by the almost total inaccessibility of information on so-called "special psychiatric hospitals." Data were collected bit by bit, and painstakingly were secreted in varying locations. But such intensive surveillance could not be evaded.

However, one cannot dampen easily the spirit of dedicated individuals. Immediately they began to restore lost materials and, although this is usually done from memory, such endeavors are usually successful. "Punitive Medicine", now in the West, was reconstructed in this way.

Experience has shown that the KGB cannot stop the leakage of information on human rights violations in the USSR. Occasionally, it can delay temporarily the transmittal of such information, but it never stops the flow completely. Therefore, attempts to compromise human rights activists and to create difficult living situations for them have become commonplace.

* (Punitive Medicine will soon be published in the West by Khronika Press in New York--Ed.)

Here are some of the latest facts.

On June 23, 1977, Yuri Grimm was summoned to the militia station, taken into custody and tried. He immediately was sentenced to 10 days imprisonment on a groundless charge of "petty hooliganism". The attorney, whose evidence is attached in Supplement No. 3, proved the illegality of the arrest. Nonetheless, the sentence was upheld and Grimm served his ten days.

Why? Three reasons: (1) The KGB had singled out Grimm because he had applied to emigrate (for which he was fired from his job and forced to work as a truck driver); (2) Grimm often visits the elderly Grigorenkos and is concerned for their welfare; and, of primary importance, (3) in connection with his job, Grimm could have attended the trial of Rudenko and Tykhy. Ten days in jail deprived him of this opportunity.

This simple isolation technique was also used to prevent Petr Starchik and Kirill Podrabinek, who had come from Moscow, from attending the trial (which took place in a remote town in the Ukraine--Ed.). Starchik spent a day and a half in preliminary confinement and then forcibly was sent to Moscow with a warning that if he tried to return, he would end up in a psychiatric hospital. Podrabinek was simply kept in a preliminary confinement cell until the trial ended.

Just recently, on August 22, 1977, a member of the Working Commission to Investigate the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, Feliks Serebrov, was arrested suddenly and unlawfully in an investigator's office and sent to Butyrka Prison. He was under investigation for some trivial detail which has nothing to do with the case against the Group and which had been designed simply to disable an active human rights defender. The particular form of suppression chosen for him was to make him sign a note promising not to leave Moscow. Although he did not leave the city, Feliks Serebrov was transferred directly from the investigator's office to prison. They must have thought up more serious charges*.

On August 24, 1977, Lithuanian Helsinki Group member Viktoras Petkus** and Antanas Terleckas*** were arrested.

* (On October 12, 1977, Serebrov was convicted of falsification of documents, although the statute of limitations had expired, and was sentenced to one year in a strict regimen labor camp. In August 1978, Serebrov was released after serving his sentence--Ed.)

** (Petkus, charged with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, was convicted on July 13, 1978 and sentenced to three years in prison, seven years of special regimen camp and five years of internal exile--Ed.)

*** (Terleckas, who is not a member of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, was released after a few days--Ed.)

Repressions have been directed not only at those who assist the Group in its work, but also at those who appeal to the Group for aid. Thus, Aleksandr Voloshchuk landed first in a militia station and then in a psychiatric hospital. Having formally exchanged his apartment in Gorky for one in Khartsyvse in Donetsk oblast, Voloshchuk found that he and his family (a wife and three children ages 11, 9, and 7) could not settle in the new city because the authorities were hard pressed to register a Baptist. Protesting in Moscow in the reception room of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Voloshchuk was separated from his family and taken to a psychiatric hospital.

The KGB employs a wide spectrum of "measures": anonymous letters, searches on trains, hurling rocks at apartment windows, depriving people of their income, arrests without trial and so on. But they use their most terrible and lawless measures to deal with the Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements.

Most illustrative is the example of the Rudenko-Tykhy trial.

4. Retribution without trial.

We may be used to many things, but even given the times and the place of our activity, the Rudenko-Tykhy trial surpassed all standards of lawlessness.

How was this trial different?

First, it was totally closed to prevent anyone in the Soviet Union or abroad from learning about the sessions. The closed nature of the trial was further accentuated by sheer distance. Rudenko, a resident of Kiev, was transported 1000 kilometers to the Donetsk oblast where Tykhy lives. The motive: a search of Oleksa Tykhy's apartment had produced an old German rifle. Whether or not it was there before the search party is not known, but the investigation took the liberty of assuming that, since Tykhy and Rudenko were acquainted, he may have been an accomplice to hiding a rifle in the Donetsk oblast. So they drove Rudenko a thousand kilometers to Donetsk where the rifle is promptly forgotten, and the investigation is begun under Article 62 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR. The article requires that the trial be held in the defendant's place of residence, that is, in Kiev. But how could they take him all the way back! And so the trial stays in Donetsk.

But apparently not even Donetsk was far enough nor closed enough. They transferred the trial to the workers' village of Druzhkovka where neither of the defendants lived. The village is small and the local militia knows all its residents by sight and therefore can accurately spot anyone from out of town. The "courtroom" -- the "political activities room" of the "SMESHTORG" factory (approximately 70 seats) -- was packed with a select audience, as is usual at political trials. But here there was another "novelty" -- not only the defendants, but the contingent of witnesses and audience had all been

brought to the village where they all stayed and took their meals at the same hotel. The locals, finally having caught wind of some major event, tried to get into the "courtroom", but were blocked by the local militia and agents from out of town. The overly stubborn were hauled off (seven youths allegedly ended up in the local militia station for their fervor).

The third peculiarity of the trial was the blatant and cynical denial of the defendants' right to a defense.

The Criminal Procedural Code of the RSFSR states: "the defendant, his legal representatives, or other persons with the instructions or consent of the defendant engages an attorney."

Neither Rudenko nor Tykhy were given the opportunity to engage an attorney of their choice and their legal representatives -- Rudenko's wife and Tykhy's mother -- were also prohibited from doing so. As mentioned, the investigation proceeded in Donetsk. The investigators withheld information about the end of the investigation from Raisa Rudenko, in Kiev, and from Tykhy's mother (who, although she lives in Donetsk, could only have reached the village with much assistance. She is 83). This was done to prevent the hiring of lawyers who would have informed relatives of the beginning of the trial. Consequently, Raisa Rudenko learned of the trial only five days after it had begun, and could only get in on the seventh day.

The court assigned "defenders" without asking permission of the defendants. Aleksevnin and Koretsky -- members of the Donetsk collegium of attorneys -- were brought in.

Oleksa Tykhy immediately stated that he refused the services of the assigned attorneys and that he would undertake his own defense. Article 50 of the Criminal Procedural Code of the RSFSR clearly states that a defendant has this right and his decision to reject such "services" must be recognized by the court. In violation of this law, the judge gave the floor for the opening defense statement not to Tykhy but to Koretsky who essentially supported the charges along with Aleksevnin.

Both defendants pleaded innocent and categorically protested the fact that they were on trial for their words and thoughts. Both public attorneys fully acknowledged the guilt of their clients and petitioned for clemency which their defendants had not even requested. This is the first such incident since the tragic and infamous trials of the 20's and 30's when attorneys played the part of procurators' assistants. But, if in the 30's the attorneys acted as they did, fearing Stalinist reprisals, their contemporary colleagues, Koretsky and Aleksevnin, are motivated simply by a lackey's wish to curry favor with the powers that be. May their names be widely known and covered with shame in the eyes of all honest people!

The third circumstance was the stubborn silence about the real charges. By the way, this is not all that innovative: the five who demonstrated on Red Square in 1968 were tried not for demonstrating in defense of Czechoslovakia, but for... "tying up municipal transportation".

M. Rudenko and O. Tykhy were tried under Article 62 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, that is, for anti-Soviet activity. More specifically for compiling and disseminating documents of the Ukrainian Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements. And what is anti-Soviet about them? Why everything! More specifically? But the court does not want specifics. The court meticulously explains every detail about the documents: Where they were compiled, persons who wrote them, persons who duplicated them on typewriters, model of typewriter, where the documents were kept and their readers. But contents -- that topic is prohibited. The judge dismissed the issue each time it arose. The defendants: "Let's examine each document; let's read them and analyse every fact." The judge demands silence and shouts down the defendants each time the contents of the documents were mentioned. There is no one to defend them: the attorneys have already assumed the role of procurator's assistants. Since the inquiry has labeled the document anti-Soviet, it is anti-Soviet; so what's there to prove?

In fact, the event could not even be called a trial, since it lacked two fundamental elements: prosecution and defense. Nor was there a judge whose responsibility it is to maintain a neutral position, to keep the atmosphere businesslike and orderly, and to unravel confused issues. The procurator and judge -- may his name be known: E.M. Zinchenko -- acted together. Furthermore, the judge was necessary to keep the defendants in line, to make things go smoothly for the procurator.

More on a certain detail of the charge. M. Rudenko was charged with, among other things, "slandering Marxism," allegedly in his philosophical paper, "Economic Monologues", which is a critique of Marx's theory of surplus value.

This type of charge is simple legal nonsense. Slander is a deliberate lie and a charge of slander can relate to an exposition of facts and not to interpretations of scholarly theories. For example, it would be difficult to imagine in a courtroom the supporters and opponents of Einstein's theory of relativity arguing and charging one another with the slander of physics. One can either agree or disagree with Rudenko's critique of the theory of surplus value, or one can refute it scientifically. But to try it in a courtroom?!

O. Tykhy faced similar incriminations. Several years ago, he wrote an historical paper about which all his friends knew, although not everyone had read it (apparently he himself felt it unfinished). Once, without Tykhy's knowledge, the KGB sent a copy of this paper to Ilya Isaakovich Stebun, Chairman of the department of literary theory, to review it. Tykhy found out and asked to read the review. Stebun refused, but offered to discuss the paper in the department. O. Tykhy agreed. Now at the trial, Stebun in the role of "witness", described this discussion as proof that O. Tykhy had dissiminated anti-Soviet materials.

The court acknowledges and welcomes witnesses of this sort. But when M. Rudenko requested that district physician, I. Kovtunenکو, be called as witness, his request was denied on the grounds that the witness was under care for...mental illness.

The fact is that in October 1976, I. Kovtunenکو, tortured by his conscience came to Rudenko to tell him that the KGB had extorted from him a promise to inform on his patient. He asked that Rudenko publicize this fact and wrote an appropriate statement. Soon, I. Kovtunenکو was arrested and the KGB attempted to trump-up a bribery case, which was dropped when Rudenko wrote an open letter stating that the doctor's arrest had been a reprisal for his refusal to collaborate with the KGB. This letter was produced as a slanderous document at the trial. Rudenko requested that I. Kovtunenکو be summoned immediately. It seems that the almighty KGB undoubtedly can make a healthy man a prisoner in a psychiatric hospital, even if it does not always succeed in making informers and bribe-takers out of honest men.

And so Mykola Rudenko and Oleska Tykhy never did manage to be defendants at a trial. They became victims of police reprisals which have dealt a fatal blow to the talented writer and fine teacher.

It is truly a fatal blow, for in fact, they have not been sentenced to imprisonment but to death.

Mykola Rudenko is 56. During the blockade of Leningrad, while defending his native country, he sustained a serious injury to his spinal column and lumbar sacral region. Without constant medical attention ministered in his own home, he will not last long.

Mykola Rudenko received the maximum sentence of 7 years of strict regimen camp and 5 years exile under Section 1, Article 62. Why the maximum? Let us suppose the court really believes Rudenko committed a crime. According to law, the defendant's personality is taken into account when the punishment is being decided. And what else should they consider other than his behavior while defending his homeland? Soviet legal theory, which is humane and just, differing so drastically from practice, proclaims that crime should not be fought with cruelty but with the certainty of punishment. Then why not assign a minimal sentence (6 months) to an invalid on the verge of death or complete paralysis? Does not such a sentence guarantee the certainty of punishment?

But this is not suitable. Rudenko's death sentence was passed not by the court, but even before the trial began. The court's only task was to devise a form of destruction. Hanging would not do, nor would the firing squad, and they do not use the garotte here. But you can kill with the help of injuries previously sustained in battle -- all you need are the right conditions.

Oleksa Tykhy is younger: he is 50, not quite as ill and may not even die in 7 years. But they found a way around that -- they tried him according to Section 2 as a recidivist and gave him 10 years of an even more severe regimen camp. True, by law he should not have been tried as a recidivist, since his prior conviction was inadmissible. But, legality has little meaning when you have been instructed to pass on extra-legal sentence to comply with the order: don't let them out alive! They managed to take care of Tykhy as well: ten years of special regimen camp and five years of exile guarantee an aging and ailing person to life imprisonment.

Why such cruelty, such arbitrariness?

Why not a trial instead of reprisal, vengeance?

At the very least, a fair trial requires an impartial judge, prosecutor and investigators. Article 59 even states that doubt of impartiality is grounds for objection: "If there are other circumstances which could give grounds to believe that the judge has a direct or indirect interest in the case."

But here there are no judges who would not have a direct or indirect interest in a political case, since the sentence is always dictated to them in advance. Not to mention the fact that the judge, procurator and investigators all are members of the ruling political party whose decisions transcend law. Even if one could locate a non-Party judge, he would never pass a sentence contradicting a Party order or KGB instruction unless, of course, he wants to join the ranks of truck drivers or even defendants. And so can he be considered interested -- "directly or indirectly" -- in the case?

But who would recognize such an objection?

The government and Party elite's fervent desire to take care of those in moral opposition to it and those who expose its lawlessness had an especially striking effect, especially obvious in the case of Rudenko:

"You were in the Party, in the Party elite, and you dare to act against its directives! Well then, take this! Death!"

This is why defense of M. Rudenko and O. Tykhy is so crucial and urgent. They suffer at the hands of vengeful authorities who wish physically to destroy them!

5. Preparation for mass-scale repressions.

How can one interpret the Rudenko-Tykhy trial, the persecution of other members of Helsinki Groups, the slander campaign in the press and everything else? What do they indicate?

The existence of a dual process: (1) the mounting of opposition within the Soviet Union, and (2) the authorities' increasing fear of this opposition and their resultant tendency to adopt tried and true Stalinist methods of reprisal.

Is there opposition in the Soviet Union?

Yes, there is. But, if you will, it is only a potential one. Political opposition requires a political program and a political organization. These do not exist in the Soviet Union. And when people say that the members of the Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements "do not constitute an opposition," they are correct. We are not a political organization, nor do we wish to be one. And when people shout: "You represent no one!" we also will not object; we have no intention of representing anyone. We represent only ourselves and, in any case, consider this to be the most honest representation.

But when people call us and other dissidents, loners and renegades, they speak deliberately distorting the truth. We are neither "representatives," nor renegade splinter groups. There is nothing from which to splinter; we are not splinters from a tree, but trees in the same wood. We arise from common soil, and moisture, and we each grow our own trunk and crown. We understand and value the needs of the forest and the surrounding trees; we participate in their lives. But for all this we remain ourselves. And how can people who give their time, energy and soul to struggling for human rights for their fellow citizens, who help them with crucial everyday needs from finding a place to live to a piece of bread, opportunity to work or act in accordance with their religious convictions, be called loners? Through our direct communication with people of varying social strata, nationalities and opinions, we have the opportunity to see, know and feel our live and creative homeland, not simply the veneer we are forced to applaud.

And we cannot help but see that there is opposition in the country, but given the particular conditions of Soviet life, it does not act like a political movement. Looming opposite it is a strong and rich governmental system with its courts, prisons, labor camps and psychiatric hospitals, an authority which nevertheless fears this opposition. That is because beyond this small group of "estranged" dissidents, the authorities can see the contours of an opposition they themselves have created through their cruel and inhumane politics.

It was not the Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements which created our emigration movement among Soviet Germans. It is several million Germans who have long lived in the Soviet Union who cannot come to terms with having been driven from their national territory, deprived of their national schools, press and culture. And they will never come to terms with the denigration of their national dignity or their forced assimilation.

A million Crimean Tatars and half a million Caucasian Turks find themselves in a similar situation.

These peoples fighting today for their rights legitimately refer to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. And if their demands are not met, their rage will only intensify.

And the Jews! Attempts to explain their striving to emigrate as CIA or Israeli intrigues are hopeless. Those wishing to live under a Jewish government will continue to fight for freedom of emigration. Those with no desire to emigrate will fight for the right to a free and equal existence in the USSR. And the cultivation of zoological anti-Semitism (masked as a struggle with Zionism) will hardly lessen opposition.

In the Ukraine, Lithuania, Estonia, Georgia, Armenia and other Soviet republics, Russification politics of the authorities are escalating in proportion to dissatisfaction with it.

Cruel and imprudent persecution for religious convictions is causing mounting indignation among believers*.

The ever-tightening reins on art and literature cannot help but evoke the indignation of thoughtful and sensitive writers and artists, readers and viewers. This process already has resulted in the loss of many great talents. The future will show either an increase in the emigration of such individuals or the open anger of people in the arts.

A chronic scientific and technological lag in comparison to the West, constant disorder in industrial planning and organization, have brought on covert but steadily mounting opposition among the ranks of the technological intelligentsia and scientists.

And finally, everyday disarray (deficits in goods, exhausting lines, disorganized transport, bureaucratic absurdity) spawns the discontent of the whole population. Citizens are beginning to understand that the major reason behind all these ills is the rigidity of the authoritarian structure and their lack of rights.

The authorities have neither the know-how nor the desire to cure any of these ills. They wish only to remain invisible and inaccessible to their citizen's complaints. The authorities only know one method -- repressions -- and that is why repressions, both major and minor, have become more frequent of late. And why have such repressive measures been so intensely directed at members of the Groups to Promote and those who assist them? Because they "wash dirty linen in public".

In light of these recent trends, events which occurred 40 years ago warrant recollection. The intensity of Stalinist repressions reached a peak after the acceptance of the Stalinist Constitution, "the most democratic constitution in the world." In fact, it was more democratic than that which our press is now painting with all the colors of the rainbow. True, the Stalinist Constitution was not even for a minute implemented, but at least one could refer to it. Now there will be no such point of reference; the declared "freedoms" are so hedged with stipulations, that practically nothing remains of them. In this way, it is easier to paste "socialist" phraseology over the repression campaign. In this sort of situation, Soviet propaganda has a vested interest that Western public opinion react in the most muted way possible. Such

* Recently, we received a letter signed by 1800 Pentecostals and Baptists. Hardly had we received it when the number of signatures jumped to 2500. The letter demands that they be let out of the country where "we have seen nothing but insults, slander, persecution and prisons."

propaganda uses the relatively recent releases of L. Plyushch and V. Bukovsky and the unbelievably harsh sentences of Rudenko and Tykhy. Its plan is more or less the following: "And so you Western activists have clamored about human rights -- and the Soviet government has stood firm. If you had clamored less, Rudenko and Tykhy would have gotten less harsh sentences. In the cases of Plyushch and Bukovsky, there were discussions and "quiet diplomacy" and we set them free.

This is a calculated lie. If not for the wide-scale international campaign in defense of Bukovsky and Plyushch, the Soviet government would never have gone in for any "quiet" negotiations on their behalf. Long live "quiet diplomacy" if it helps to free even one suffering victim, but without publicity, it will free no one. We are glad that Bukovsky and Plyushch have been saved, but we have, in our hands, a list of more than 250 critically ill political prisoners who need immediate release (among them, the long-suffering son of Oksana Meshko, Aleksandr). We also possess information on those still under detention in psychiatric hospitals and those who recently have been "quietly" driven into them. We also know of many many others... .

No amount of "quiet diplomacy" can deal with all this. Publicity and public awareness have galvanized the human rights struggle. Publicity and only publicity will help to unmask the inhuman face of Soviet camps, prisons, and special hospitals. To have any association with institutions which persecute thought and word is a disgrace.

Now the entire repression and propaganda apparatus is gearing up to prepare for a new stage of wide-scale "purges". Gradually and quietly everything -- from intimidation to provocation -- is being set in motion.

The appeals of M. Rudenko and O. Tykhy are set for September 1, 1977, in the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR. All attempts by relatives and proxies of the sentenced individuals to engage Moscow lawyers have been in vain, since they use various pretexts to refuse the case. One attorney (fearing for him, we will not mention his name) said that he did not wish to be a screen for lawlessness and that he could not carry out an effective defense for Rudenko and Tykhy.

Facts about the following incident have reached us. In April 1977, a Major in the Estonian KGB, Moloch (an appropriate name!), tried to recruit the Tallin engineer, Erik Udam, to create a fictitious (provocational) "dissident" organization to implicate foreign correspondents in Moscow and, through them, the CIA. For initial expenses, he promised to shell out a major sum (on the order of one hundred thousand rubles). Erik Udam declined and the deal was never made (Udam's letter is in Supplement No. 5). But Molochs do not give up their plans so readily. We know of similar GPU-created "organizations" during the 20's and 30's which cost the lives of many totally innocent people.

Even more illustrative is information received from Kaluga. In a letter to a friend (see Supplement No. 6), exile Yuri Fyodorov described how he was delivered to Moscow by plane and from there by car to Kaluga. In Kaluga, Investigator Evgeny Saushkin suggested that Fyodorov act as director of an illegal "center" of struggle with the regime. Moreover, Saushkin named A. Ginzburg as the director of a legal "center" connected to the illegal one. Of course, Fyodorov declined and was sent back to "think it over". One can be sure that the KGB will not cease its attempts to stage a sinister spectacle using a slightly updated scenario of the "Wreckers' Trials", Menshevik Trials, or Ukrainian Nationalist Trials of the 20's and 30's.

Efforts to expose such provocational plans must be unceasing. These exposures should not be done "quietly", but in the full glare of publicity so as not to harm the human rights movement.

The aim of the authorities is clear: to continue their noncompliance with the Helsinki accords, and to stop the flow of information about such violations. They think that crushing the Helsinki Groups will dry up this flow. Vain hopes! The situation is so strained that replacements for today's Group members will be found. True, their work will be even more difficult. On the other hand, it will become clear to world public opinion that the Helsinki Agreements are nothing but a blank piece of paper for Soviet authorities.

One thing is for certain. If the USSR has any intention of complying with the Helsinki accords, it should not be persecuting people who point to human rights violations. On the contrary, it should be constructing barriers against those who violate these rights. If it intends to observe the Helsinki accords, it should first of all release those arrested for making public human rights violations.

We are referring to the arrested Helsinki Group members. We demand freedom for Mykola Rudenko, Oleksa Tykhy, Yuri Orlov, Aleksandr Ginzburg, Anatoly Shcharansky, Myroslav Marynovych, Mykola Matusevych, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, Merab Kostava, Feliks Serebrov, Viktoras Petkus, and Antanas Terleckas*.

August 1977

Moscow Helsinki Group:

Ukrainian Helsinki Group:

Elena Bonner
Petr Grigorenko
Sofia Kalistratova
Malva Landa
Naum Meiman
Vladimir Slepak

Oles Berdnyk
Ivan Kandyba
Levko Lukyanenko
Oksana Meshko
Nina Strokata

* Terleckas is not a member of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group.

Concerning the Participation of Ukraine in the
Belgrade Conference, 1977

Memorandum No. 2

In several months, leading statesmen from the thirty-five countries which participated in the historic Conference in Helsinki will gather in Belgrade.

At the Belgrade Conference, countries will be represented who have populations two to three times less than were Ukraine's losses in the last world war and even those whom the war had passed by. Such wide representation, of course, can only be heartening. But, will long-suffering Ukraine, which has made innumerable sacrifices in the name of peace among nations, be represented?

The Helsinki Conference was dedicated precisely to this problem, the problem of peace and security in Europe. How could it have happened that a highly developed European country, with a population of fifty million and territory which surpasses that of any Western European state, was not invited to the forum of nations in Helsinki?

Why didn't any of the participants of the Helsinki Conference notice her absence? Is not Ukraine a member of the U.N. with all the rights due her as such? Was it not over her land, from the upper Dniester to the lower reaches of the Donets, that fascist tanks rolled?

It would be easy to ask many more rhetorical questions. But to us, members of the Ukrainian Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, it is obvious why this happened. We will attempt to clarify this misunderstanding with complete frankness. And, of necessity, not without a feeling of bitterness.

Western diplomats, if not from podium then in lobbies during international conferences, continue to call the Soviet Union by the ancient term "Russia". This is not happenstance. The historical fact that the Russian Empire disintegrated long ago and in its place was created a voluntary Union of sovereign states was neither mentally assimilated nor psychologically fixed either in the West or in the Soviet Union itself. Tradition took precedence over law.

From an administrative-juristic standpoint, the Soviet Union should be compared not to the United States, as is sometimes done, but to a United Europe. It is precisely here that equal, allied states strive to unite their efforts. Precisely here is created an all-European Parliament which, through its prerogatives, reminds one of the all-Union government in its original form. But, a United Europe was never a single empire, while the Soviet Union was created in place of the Russian Empire which existed for several centuries. This is why that which was formed after October 1917 was burdened with all the horrors of the past.

Each of the Union republics, in accordance with the Constitution of the USSR, is as sovereign as any state that belongs to the European Commonwealth, which one can indeed call a Union.

However, the imperialistic past of Russia hangs like a dark shadow over the allied peoples, not allowing them to speak of their constitutional rights. That is why the personality cult, which in its worst form reproduced czarist authoritarianism, is substituted with another cult; from podia the word "Union" goes forth, but it is understood as "Russia". And that this has continued for six full decades is in no small measure the responsibility of Western leaders, for whom it was just as difficult to break away from age-old traditions as it was for the peoples of the Russian Empire.

In the meantime, the real sovereignty of the allied states, for the sake of which rivers of blood have been spilled, is being steadily transformed into a convention of protocol. And in recent years, chauvinistically inclined officials of the Russian Federation, whom no one ever punished for their militant chauvinism, contemptuously disregard even this pitiful convention. Today, for example, while these lines are being written, a senior investigator of the procuracy of the city of Moscow, someone named Tikhonov, is digging among papers confiscated on his orders from five members of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords. It had not even dawned on him to turn to the procurator for the city of Kiev. He arbitrarily signed the orders for searches of citizens of the Ukrainian SSR, just as this was done in the czarist empire, where no republics existed. Also, Sergei Kovalev was convicted in Lithuania on the basis of the Procedural Code of the RSFSR. The uncontrolled KGB still sends hundreds of Ukrainian political prisoners to Mordovia and the Urals (that is, onto the territory of neighboring states). And this is considered normal. This is how it is with the laws of the republics -- they are simply ignored.

It should be noted that Marxism as the official ideology of the Soviet Union loses some of its allure with each passing year. What should take its place? Over here, they never stop repeating: patriotism, love of the homeland. As a result, today, just as during the years of the Great Patriotic War, that which in Russian is constantly being pushed to the forefront, though under the label "of the homeland". However, a citizen of the USSR has the right to say: an Armenian has his homeland and a Russian his. Do Union obligations really demand the renunciation of republic citizenship? Does a Ukrainian really not have the right to consider Ukraine his homeland? Which laws deny him this natural right?

Such laws did exist in czarist Russia; there are none such in the USSR. Instead, the USSR has the KGB, a military organization which counters sacred human rights with brute strength. According to the norms of the KGB, patriotism can only be Russian or "all-Soviet", which in practice also means Russian. The vice-president of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, P.N. Fedoseyev, even created an "all-Soviet" language, one which, of course, is not a new form of Esperanto, but the same old Russian.

Russia is glorified in hundreds of poems and songs, something which, as Russian culture in general, we of course treat with respect. But if you try to express your love for Ukraine in the same images, Mordovian camps or special psychiatric hospitals await you. Do the popular masses of Russia know this? Of course they do not.

Thus, for example, in the ardent, deeply patriotic work of V. Moroz, A Chronicle of Resistance, for which he was arrested, there is not a single reference to armed resistance. The theme deals with the inhabitants of the village of Kosmach who, in preserving their native traditions, oppose spiritual standardization and the standardization of their everyday lives, i.e. pseudoculture. Nothing more! Nevertheless, this proved enough to have V. Moroz thrown into the worst of prisons -- Vladimir -- for six years. After prison, eight years of concentration camps and Siberian exile remain. But he had sung the praises of things of the homeland, something that Soviet writers call for these days. But these things of the homeland he saw not just anywhere, but in the Ukraine. This alone is the essence of his "crime".

Another example is that of native craftsman, artist-intarsist, Pyotr Ruban, who created a highly artistic work -- an inlaid cover of a book out of wood -- as a gift to the American people on the occasion of the Bicentennial of the USA. On the cover was the Statue of Liberty and the caption "200 Years". The work was stolen out of the workshop and the artist sentenced on the basis of artificially fabricated charges to eight years in strict regimen camps and five years exile with confiscation of property. They charged him with pilferage of materials from the furniture factory where he worked. The charges, however, were constructed cynically and without evidence. And all this happened just a half year before the Belgrade meeting. This inhuman verdict clearly shows what the unbridled chauvinists seek from the Helsinki Accords. Their tactics are simple: it is fine to sign any international document whatsoever, but at home as they say, "we will put things in order ourselves".

Dozens, if not hundreds, of such examples can be cited. In truth, there is no more bitter fate than to be born a Ukrainian.

There is no doubt about this: in a civilized state such things cannot continue for too long. Such experiments can be conducted only with confused, illiterate people, and there are less and less of them in the USSR. This is why we are convinced that in the end law will triumph over an imperialistic tradition. For in its legal foundations, the USSR is, after all, still an empire.

Yes, we are aware that western government officials have a basis for treating with skepticism the issue that has been raised by the Ukrainian Group: will Ukraine be represented at the Conference in Belgrade or will it not? And yet we still turn to the countries which participated in the Helsinki Conference with this appeal: demand the participation of Ukraine at all conferences on security in Europe! Security in Europe cannot become a reality if a nation of fifty million, which has suffered through countless misfortunes during two world wars, is artificially barred from participating in European affairs.

The forms of Union relationships are not eternal: they alter with time. New generations will come, generations which will read in the agreement of December 27, 1922, on the basis of which the USSR was created, that which is written there, and not that which is being dictated by the KGB. Then the conditional will become the unconditional, that which has been declared in form will be changed into state and national reality.

The citizenry of the world can do very much to hasten this day. Only then will the nations of Eastern Europe achieve full independence, only then will Western Europe sigh in relief; the threat of a new world war will have disappeared forever. If only this would come to be understood!

January 20, 1977

Ukrainian Helsinki Group:

Oles Berdnyk
Ivan Kandyba
Levko Lukyanenko
Oksana Meshko
Mykola Rudenko (head of Group)
Nina Strokata-Karavanska
Oleksiy Tykhy

Statement on the Fate of Bohdan Chuiko

Every organized society maintains its organized condition through a system of law and order. Law and order can be preserved in various ways (through terror or authoritative leadership, for example), but the most fundamental means is through law. And even when a group of people or a political party, assumes power and legislative authority (as in the case of Hitler's National Socialist German Workers' Party, for example) it nevertheless, with its arbitrary will, gives its law a framework and formulates it as the law of the state.

Democratic societies maintain law and order through legality, the only possible means of attaining a system of maximum justice. Where legality is absent, the average citizen finds himself bound by the unrestrained power of officials, and flutters vainly like a fly caught in a spider web, a bureaucratic maze.

A system of law should be the means of maintaining law and order in the Soviet Union as well. "Respect for law and legality should become the personal conviction of every individual. This applies especially to the actions of official persons. Any attempts to evade or circumvent the law, regardless of the motivation, should not be tolerated. Nor can any violation of the rights of the individual or any encroachment on the dignity of a citizen be tolerated." (Materials of the XXIV Congress of the CPSU. Kiev, 1971, p. 92).

Following is documentation of a gross violation of law which has placed an individual -- Bohdan Mykhailovich Chuiko -- in a horrible situation; he exists on the verge of death.

A Chernivstsy oblast court sentenced Chuiko to 15 years' imprisonment and 5 years' internal exile on June 23, 1972. Since a previous term had been figured into this time, Chuiko's term was to end on December 3, 1976. All that remained for him to serve was exile.

Chuiko wrote formal complaints from camp, based on the belief that he had been convicted illegally. He retained copies of these documents, and replies to them, in order to be able to have the opportunity to renew his petitioning for review of his sentences after his release. Prior to the end of his term, Chuiko gave his notes to the censor of camp -- VS 389-36 -- in the village of Kuchino, Perm oblast, for examination. These have not been returned, in violation of Chuiko's rights, since the law states that he has the right to keep such papers in his possession; this action also deprives him of the opportunity of using this collection of documents for the defense of his legal rights.

Chuiko is an elderly man and has long held the status of an invalid of Group II. In accordance with Article 100 of the Corrective Labor Code of the RSFSR, the camp administration should have transmitted Chuiko's materials to the regional peoples' court in his place of exile for him to be released, since

individuals incapable of supporting themselves cannot be exiled. The camp administration failed to do this, thereby violating another of Chuiko's rights. Chuiko was prohibited from appearing before the court for cancellation of his term of exile; according to Chuiko:

"I think the reason behind such cruelty was the Dolmatov character report which contained the following: '...considers himself innocent. Constantly complains. Hostile toward the regime. Had good relationships with other convicts openly hostile toward the regime. Negative influence on young convicts. Has failed to admit that he has committed a crime and has not stepped onto the path of reform.'"

On August 12, 1976, the VTEK commission confirmed Chuiko's status as a Group II invalid. The findings of the medical administration of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR of October 15, 1976 and November 4, 1976, supported this classification. Nevertheless, Chuiko was sent off to exile -- despite the fact that the law prohibits the application of exile as a form of punishment to Group II invalids.

The difficult journey, resettlement, and transportation by automobile in -50°C temperatures resulted in a new illness: double pneumonia accompanied with the spitting of blood.

Chuiko petitioned with regard to the application of exile in his case on July 15, 1976, to the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR and on August 17, 1976, to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR:

"...I am a Group II invalid fully incapable of work and therefore incapable of supporting myself through my own work. The findings of the VTEK commission of Perm oblast for the last 5 years (1972-76) recorded in my medical card attest to my invalid status and the complete disability which prevents me from working. I have no toes on either foot, deformed fingers on my right hand; I suffer from serious chronic ailments: hypertonia (of the third stage since 1974), general arteriosclerosis (2nd stage), cardiac insufficiency (2nd stage), and I have sustained a brain hemorrhage.

"The findings of the VTEK commission in 1975 stated that the above-mentioned illnesses had advanced to the point where they failed to respond to medication.

"At the present time, the state of my health is extremely poor: I have a buzzing sound in my ears and head, pains in my head and eyes, severely deteriorated vision, increasingly frequent attacks of angina pectoris, constant shortness of breath and impeded movement of the extremities.

"In this condition I require constant outside care, support and medication. I am unable to support myself through labor.

"On the basis of what I have documented here, I request to be released from exile."

The reply of P. Tsurenko, Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR: "...petition reviewed and rejected."

Reply of V. Golik, head of the section dealing with questions of pardon: "We inform you that your petition for pardon and release from exile has been reviewed and rejected."

The local authorities in the Bakchar region, Tomsk oblast, where Chuiko is serving his exile, are not in a position to provide him with either a place to live, food or other necessities because "...Soviet law prohibits the application of exile to invalids of Group II who are unable to support themselves through their own work..." (Article 79, "VTK" of the RSFSR; Commentary to the "VTK", Section 3, pp. 204-5, Jurid. Lit. 1973). This legislation fails to provide for the expense of the material support of disabled exiles.

In a complaint from exile, Chuiko writes:

"The petitions of my wife, Mariya Mykhailivna Chuiko, addressed to the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the RSFSR with regard to my transfer to the city of Minurinsk, Tambov oblast, where I could live and be supported by her, were rejected on the grounds that there is no "exile zone" in Tambov oblast. The Ministry also fails to answer the question as to how I am to go about supporting myself, or who should support me in exile.

"As a result of the illegal actions of camp VS 389-36, contrary to the findings of medical commissions, I have been assigned to live in climatic conditions disastrous to my health, to perish from illness, starvation and the cold...

"These inhuman conditions have been created for me consciously and intentionally with the aim of forcing me to leave the village of Bakchara voluntarily, i.e. to violate administrative surveillance regulations and thereby provide them with a pretext for further repressions...."

This and similar statements written by Chuiko fly from office to office, from clerk to clerk, like a soccer ball. No one wants to settle this extremely simple case: the law does not provide for the exile of Group II invalids (nor does legislation mention the source of funds for the material support of such an exile). Chuiko is a Group II invalid who has been sent into exile either because of the evil intent of the administration of camp VS 389-36 or through some mistake; none of the possible and critically necessary actions or any applicable laws have been used to resolve his case.

The local authorities of the Bakchar region cannot take on the material support of an exile, since this would be a continuation of lawlessness. If such lawlessness continues, Chuiko will have to perish from starvation.

In a letter of February 12, Chuiko writes:

"...Authoritative sources have informed me that no one will release me from my term of exile, nor will I be released to the care of my family. I will not receive my invalid's pension because I do not have the requisite 18 years' work record, and the exact time of the onset of my invalid status is uncertain. I cannot have my case resolved in Tomsk because I am prohibited from going there.

"I have argued to the local authorities that the major portion of my term has been served and, through no fault of mine, I, a totally disabled person, have been sent into exile. I have been held here for almost three months without a place to live and without the means to exist. This can only be intended for one purpose: to bring me to the point where, due to hunger, cold, and disease, I would be forced to leave the village voluntarily and thereby provide the authorities with grounds for further cruel treatment; or to lead me to the brink of despair and, in my long-awaited liberty and freedom, to choose the form of torment I most prefer...I am advised to have my family send me money for my support in exile. I tell them that my wife is retired, my son is in the Soviet army and my minor daughter is in school -- who can possibly support me, and where are they to get the money? The authorities shrug their shoulders, the discussion ends along with all talk of a resolution of my case. I came to understand that everyone would be quite happy with the above-mentioned outcome of my situation because I have been dumped on their heads like a snowfall in summer...I await a final decision and my funds are running low. I go to the cafeteria once a day, but how long will this last?"

Chuiko was not given an apartment. He lives in a hotel, but is under administrative surveillance and therefore must stay in the hotel from 8 p.m. to 6 a.m. He is given not a single kopek and has three wardens assigned to him: one to deal with his exile, another with administrative surveillance and a third to monitor his activities -- is this not a cruel mockery!

In Kuchino, Perm oblast, authorities took Chuiko's documents for confirmation of his invalid status, but in Bakchar, other authorities demand the same documents -- what is this if not bureaucratic tyranny and a violation of human rights!

We protest such arbitrary persecution and demand the release of Bohdan Mykhailovich Chuiko from exile on the grounds that he is suffering illegal punishment.

May 1977

Ukrainian Helsinki Group:

Oles Berdnyk,
Group Leader
Petr Grigorenko
Ivan Kandyba
Levko Lukyanenko
Oksana Meshko
Nina Strokata-Karavanska

To the Belgrade Conference
to Review Implementation of the Helsinki Accords

On December 12, 1977, the KGB arrested lawyer and journalist Levko Lukyanenko in the city of Chernihiv, Ukraine. Beginning with Group leader Mykola Rudenko, Lukyanenko is the fifth member of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accords to be thrown behind prison bars.

Lukyanenko was arrested in connection with "Case No. 39", initiated on February 5, 1977, the day of Rudenko's arrest. The "case" centers on the activity of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group and its documents on human rights violations in Ukraine. The official attitude toward the Group as a whole was reflected in the verdicts in the Rudenko and Tykhy trials: The court characterized the first four Group documents as "anti-Soviet" thereby implicitly placing each Group member under threat of arrest.

After the arrests of Rudenko and Tykhy, and later Marynovych and Matuskevych, the Group released another series of documents (the latest: Memorandum No. 18 "On Discrimination Against Ukrainians Who Wish to Emigrate from the USSR*). It is possible that Lukyanenko will be held responsible for these. It is also entirely possible that the KGB will use other pretexts in charging Lukyanenko, in particular his statement to the Supreme Soviet concerning emigration from the USSR, or even fabricated evidence about his "anti-Soviet declarations" (Lukyanenko specifically treats such KGB attempts in his statement).

Lukyanenko spent barely two full years "in freedom" (under militia surveillance), following 15 years in prisons and camps, all simply for his thoughts and writings on the right of Ukraine to self-determination -- a right guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution.

A new charge of "especially dangerous state crimes" threatens him with a sentence equal in severity to the one already given Okeksiy Tykhy: 10 years of special regimen camp and 5 years of exile.

Only immediate steps defending Lukyanenko long before his trial can save him. Most importantly, steps should be taken by the governments and citizens of countries which signed the Helsinki Accords, for whose full and honest implementation Lukyanenko fought.

December 18, 1977	Ukrainian Helsinki Group:	We support the Ukrainian Helsinki Group's Appeal in Defense of Lukyanenko:
	Oles Berdnyk	Aleksandr Lavut
	Ivan Kandyba	Tatiana Velikanova
	Vitaly Kalynychenko	Naum Meiman
	Oksana Meshko	Aleksandr Podrabinek
	Vasyl Striltsiv	Father Gleb Yakunin
	Nina Strokata-Karavanska	Viktor Kapitanchuk
		Vadim Sheglov
		Presbyter Nikolai Goretoi
		Natalia Fyodorova

* cf. "The Right to Know, The Right to Act," Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Washington, D.C., May 1978.

To: The Governments of States Signatory to the Helsinki Final Act
 The U.N. Human Rights Commission
 World Council of Churches
 Amnesty International
 All Christians of the World

Since October 1977, repressions against Evangelical Christian Baptists in the USSR have intensified noticeably.

Authorities have conducted searches in the homes of believers in Kiev, Rostov, Dzhabdula, Alma-Ata, Frunze, and Dzhetyysai in Chimkent oblast. More copies of the Bible, the Gospel, volumes of spiritual hymns and other religious literature are being seized.

In the last three months, arrests and trials of believers have been conducted in many cities around the country.

1. November 5, 1977. Moskalensk region, Omsk oblast. Evangelical Christian Baptists A.A. Pinner and K.G. Gur were arrested.

2. November 17, 1977. Presbyter of the Timashevsk church in Krasnodarski krai G.V. Kostyuchenko, who was recently released from detention, was arrested again. On December 29, the court sentenced him to a year of imprisonment. He is the father of nine children.

3. November 25, 1977. City of Kingisepp, Leningrad oblast. The following employees of "The Christian" publishers were sentenced: Larisa Zaitseva to 3½ years in general regimen labor camp; Lyudmila Zaitseva to 4 years in general regimen camp; I.I. Leven, five years of general regimen camp; D.I. Koop to 3½ years in general regimen camp. Leven is the father of ten children; Koop is the father of five.

4. In the city of Issyk in Alma-Ata oblast, Ya. P. Volf was sentenced to two years in camp, and A. Klassen to 2½ years of imprisonment for giving children religious instruction.

5. On December 9, 1977, in the city of Dzhetyysai in Chimkent oblast, P.I. Verner was arrested. Authorities confiscated from his apartment religious literature that had been printed by "The Christian". Verner is the father of ten children.

6. A. Bibe and A. Petker were detained while transporting religious literature on December 12, 1977.

On December 27, 1977, members of the Novosibirsk Evangelical Christian Baptist Church N. Ye. Zhrebnekov, Ya. K. Kreker, V. R. Karman and L. I. Yakimov were taken off a train in Semipalatinsk.

7. On December 8, 1977, organs of the procuracy conducted searches in the apartments of seven believers in the city of Dzhabula. Church literature, 22,000 rubles of church funds, and privately-owned religious literature was confiscated. The following individuals were arrested: P.F. Panfidin, Ya. Ya. Fot, B.I. Bergen, and G.V. Omelich. Later, B.I. Bergen and G.V. Omelich were released after signing a statement to the effect that they would not leave the city.

8. December 19, 1977, a member of the Evangelical Christian Baptist Council, Ivan Yakovlevich, was arrested in the city of Kirovograd. Previously, he had served two terms of imprisonment for his belief in God.

9. On January 3, 1978, in the city of Rostov-on-Don, minister of the local church, Pyotr Danilovich Peters, was arrested. He has already served three terms of imprisonment for his Christian convictions.

The threat of arrest hangs constantly over members of the Council of Evangelical Christian Baptist Churches (M.I. Khorev, N.G. Baturin, D.V. Minyakov); Council Chairman, G.K. Kryuchkov; Church Council Sextons, Ya. G. Skoriakov, P.T. Rytikov and Ye. N. Plyushkov.

This persecution of believers for their convictions in our country contradicts the Helsinki Final Act which was signed by the Soviet government.

We appeal to all Christians of the world, the U.N. Human Rights Commission, Amnesty International and the World Council of Churches to come forward in protest of the repressions the Soviet government has directed against Evangelical Christian Baptists, repressions which have become even more widespread and single-minded since the adoption of the new Constitution of the USSR.

January 1978

Ukrainian Helsinki Group:

Petr Vins
Nina Strokata-Karavanska

Information Bulletin No. 1Introduction

Not much more than a year has passed since the time when, in the early part of November 1976, our authors' collective got together and chose for itself the name "Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords in the Ukrainian SSR". We agreed unanimously that by bringing violations of rights in our native land openly and directly to the attention of the Soviet government and the world community, our Group would be making a significant contribution to the cause of peace, security and cooperation among peoples. All our appeals, letters and memoranda are based on premises of Law and constitutional guarantees.

The organs of state security viewed the situation differently. Our group has been branded an anti-Soviet organization; more than half its members have been repressed, and all the rest subjected to various forms of extrajudicial persecution.

Under these conditions of cruel, lawless terrorism and psychological pressure, we believe it imperative to continue the struggle for the rights of man and nation, for the dignity of the citizen, for guarantees of freedom of thought and action, all in accordance with the ideals of humanity as expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In 1978 we have begun the publication of an informational bulletin in which we present facts of human rights violations in our republic. We hope that our work, which is based on faith in Law, will bear good fruit, if not now then in the future.

Chapter 1

In November 1977, Mykola Rudenko, leader of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group sentenced in June 1977 by the Donetsk Regional Court to 12 years' deprivation of freedom, was brought to the KGB prison in Kiev. It was proposed to him that he condemn the Group's activities in a written confession in exchange for his freedom. Rudenko declined. He was sent off to serve his sentence in the Mordovian camps (Mordovian A.S.S.R., st. Potma, p/o Lesnoy, uchr. ZhKh 385/19-3).

A second member of the Group, Oleksiy Tykhy, sentenced to 15 years' deprivation of freedom, was also sent off to Mordovia (st. Potma, ZhKh 385/1-6).

In December 1977, Mykola Rudenko declared a hunger-strike (three days) in protest against the confiscation of poetry he had written in prison.

Chapter 2

On December 12, 1977, in the city of Chernihiv (at 41-b Rokosovsky St., Apt. 41) still another member of the Helsinki Group was arrested -- the lawyer Levko Lukyanenko, a man with an especially tragic fate.

In 1961 the young, successful jurist, an 8-year member of the CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union), was sentenced to death by firing squad for writing a theoretical treatise, a draft entitled, "The Ukrainian Workers and Peasants Union." (The draft was written on the basis of the constitutional right of the Ukrainian Republic to secede voluntarily from the USSR-Art. 14).

According to the draft, Ukraine was to remain socialist, developing on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology. Industry would be nationalized, with private enterprise allowed, however, in services, cottage industries and the trades. As for agriculture, a combination of cooperative associations of farmers, based on voluntary membership only, and of independent one-owner farms, was foreseen.

The draft in its essence is a prefiguration of the new trend known as Eurocommunism.

According to the draft, social, economic and political changes could be implemented only in a peaceful, democratic way, and the secession of Ukraine, on the basis of a referendum.

A group of seven men -- jurists and party workers -- was arrested the moment they took to discussing the draft among themselves. In June 1961, a closed court sentenced Ivan Kandyba to 15 years of camps, Virun to 11 years, and the rest (O. Lyubovych, I. Kyshysh, I. Vorovytsky, V. Lutskiv) to 10 years each. The Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR, on appeal, changed Borovytsky's and Kyshysh's sentences to seven years each and commuted Lukyanenko's death sentence to 15 years in forced-labor camps.

Levko Lukyanenko spent two months and six days in a cell for the condemned, and four and a half years in Vladimir Prison.

The completion of his sentence did not bring him freedom. For almost two years -- until his new arrest -- he lived in Chernihiv under the overt surveillance of the police, which was accompanied by covert surveillance and harassment on the part of the KGB.

They indicted him on charges of anti-Soviet activity. As incriminating documents they used, first of all, all the documents of the Ukrainian Group signed by Lukyanenko, personal correspondence and his publicistic articles, which had not been published in the Soviet press and which, regretfully, went unpopularized by samvydav (samizdat).

A talented and sensitive journalist, he has remained unknown to the democratic Soviet public.

He is charged, in part, with the authorship of the following articles:

1. An autobiographical sketch, "A Year of Freedom";
2. "Stop Judicial Injustice," submitted to the Ukrainian journal Folk Art and Ethnography in defense of the artist-intarsist Petro Ruban, whose sentencing has no precedent; and
3. An open letter to Professor Rubin, who recently emigrated from the USSR to Israel.

It was not a search at Levko Lukyanenko's, it was a robbery; everything was taken away, down to the last typewritten line of manuscript, together with a typewriter as well as previously inspected and censored correspondence of a most personal nature and some photographs. He and his wife, Nadiya, were unable to avoid a humiliating personal search.

Eight searches were conducted on December 12 in connection with the Levko Lukyanenko case (Case No. 39): in the city of Chernihiv at the apartment of Oleksander Lukyanenko, Lukyanenko's brother; at his sister's in Horodnyansky District, Chernihiv region; at his parents' in the village of Khrypivka in Horodnyansky District; at the apartment of Raisa Rudenko; and also at the homes of Group members Ivan Kandyba, Vitaliy Kalynychenko, Oles Berdnyk, Petro Vins. The searches were conducted in violation of Article 86 of the Code of Criminal Procedures of the Ukrainian SSR, that is, it was not "documents and objects relevant to the case" that were taken, as specified in the law, but personal correspondence, notebooks with addresses, copies of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (from Kandyba), manuscripts of literary works and a typewriter from writer O. Berdnyk, foreign publications of a religious nature at the home of Vins.

On January 23, a search was conducted at Stefa Hulyk's apartment in Lviv.

After Lukyanenko's arrest, his wife, Nadiya Nykonovna, was, on numerous occasions, summoned to the KGB. Investigator Polunin and Sanko accused her of helping Lukyanenko conduct his anti-Soviet activity by being hospitable to his friends who had drawn him into that activity. They tell her: "Now we will put him away. He'll get the entire 15 years."

Chapter 3

On February 8, Petro Vins, a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, was arrested. He was charged under Article 216 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR.

Two months prior to this, on December 8, Vins was detained at the Kiev rail station just as he was getting ready to leave for Moscow. He was beaten up by the police and placed under administrative arrest for 15 days for "insubordination towards the police." Police agents themselves told Vins' mother that they had beat him because he refused to submit voluntarily to a search. His request that they show him a search warrant was characterized as insubordination.

Vins declared a hunger strike and, because of this, did not report for work. For this they extended his term of arrest by another 15 days. Later, the procurator acknowledged the illegality of the second 15 days and voided that decision... two days before they had run out. Vins fasted in the police cell for 28 days.

The February 8 arrest took place on the street. His family was not informed of the arrest. The following day, Vins' mother went looking for him at the district police station, where they had brought him to be interrogated. Vins just had time to shout that he was being charged with "parasitism".

Petro Vins is 23 years old. He is the son of Georgiy Vins, the well-known Baptist leader who in 1974 was sentenced to five years' imprisonment. The authorities did not allow Petro Vins either to attend college or to set himself up with an acceptable job. He was forced to hire himself out periodically for manual labor which, with his state of health, was beyond his strength (in his youth he had undergone an operation, a stomach resection). Now the trumped-up "parasitism" charge threatens him with a year's imprisonment in camp.

Chapter 4

On February 9, Group member Oksana Meshko was subjected to the next search-assault in the "L. Lukyanenko Case". As they had a year before, the KGB entered the home illegally, having opened the door like thieves with keys they took from her lodger at his place of work (they brought him to the apartment in a KGB car for the purpose of -- as the supervisor of his shop put it -- "carrying out the instructions of the KGB... there is nothing to fear"). While one KGB agent was opening the door, the other eight waited concealed in the gateway of the neighboring house. They showed the search warrant after artificially creating fear and confusion. The search was conducted by nine men over a period of over 19 hours. When Oksana Meshko would not surrender a personal letter she had received from I. Kandyba (in it he described all the excesses of the administrative surveillance illegally ordered against him), Captain Prystayko and Lieutenant Colonel Hanchuk grabbed her, one by the right hand, the other by the left, painfully squeezing her wrists until the veins on her hands stood out and turned blue. The letter dropped from her hands... (Oksana Meshko is 73 years old).

They confiscated personal letters, notebooks with addresses, various notes for personal use which had no connection with the "Lukyanenko case," including also a list of international conventions on civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, which were signed by the Soviet government and reaffirmed in Helsinki in 1975.

Colonel Hanchuk also set aside for confiscation, for the purpose of "studying" them, the personal documents of her son, O. Serhiyenko, a prisoner in the Perm camps; only the arrival of Berdnyk helped save them -- the documents were returned.

O. Meshko ignored summons to come to KGB headquarters. On February 14, with the participation of the police and "medical personnel," they delivered her -- "brought her in" -- to the Kiev KGB.

Investigator Sanenko interrogated her for four hours in the Lukyanenko case. Meshko refused to answer his questions on the grounds that they contradict Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Accords. After the interrogation, Lieutenant Colonel Hanchuk issued her a "warning" about criminal responsibility and showed her a selection of documents, confiscated from her during several searches going back to 1972. Meshko refused to sign a record of the "warning" and challenged the characterization of the documents as "anti-Soviet".

O. Meshko informed the investigator of her demand that the authorities close down the technologically-equipped surveillance base behind her house, which was set up in a neighboring vacant house and which functioned for over a year with no legal basis. The investigators replied with silence.

Over the past year and also during December and January, Meshko's acquaintances were questioned about her and her son, Oleksander Serhiyenko. Some of those questioned were threatened with imprisonment should they visit her and maintain the relationship; others were promised that they would be "released" from their jobs in their professional fields, etc.

O. Berdnyk, who had arrived at the apartment at the time of the search, was subjected to a body search (some poetry was confiscated), then taken home (at present he lives with his family in Rudenko's apartment), where they also conducted a search.

Chapter 5

Ivan Oleksiyovych Kandyba, a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group and a former political prisoner (he spent 10 years in imprisonment in the same case as Lukyanenko), has lately fallen victim to new persecutions.

On September 23, 1977, the head of the KGB in the village of Pustomyty stopped Kandyba on a Lviv street and took him to the regional procurator's office. Rudenko (brother of the Procurator General), the regional deputy procurator in charge of monitoring KGB investigations, and General Poluden, chief of the KGB administration in Lviv, talked with him. They reproached Kandyba for his "incorrect" way of life; they especially imputed to him trips to Moscow, Kiev, Tarusa and Chernihiv. The procurator proposed that he publicly renounce his views in the press and on radio and condemn his own activity and that of his friends (i.e. the Helsinki Group). And for this he was promised permission to live in Lviv (Kandyba is registered in the village of Pustomyty, where for a year, until May 1977, he was kept under surveillance) and to work in his profession (Kandyba is a lawyer, a university graduate). Kandyba declined, for which the procurator called

him an "un-Soviet person," a degenerate and an enemy, and issued him a decree prepared beforehand which placed him under administrative surveillance for a period of a half year. Without even letting him stop off at his relatives' for his personal things, they took Kandyba straight from the procurator's office to Pustomyty, where on September 28 he was visited by General Poluden who again demanded from him a "confession" and promises to change his behavior.

With great difficulty Kandyba found himself a place to live -- a private apartment for 30 rubles a month -- and a job as a stoker paying 70 rubles a month. During the time he was seeking work -- and encountering rejection everywhere -- the police constantly threatened him with criminal prosecution for "parasitism."

The grounds used for setting up the administrative surveillance:

1. He avoided employment;
2. He did not reside at the place of registration; and
3. He travelled to cities throughout the Soviet Union.

Despite the illegality and, with respect to the first point, even the falseness of these charges, Kandyba was unable to get the order voided. His statements, containing qualified, juridically grounded refutations of the reasons for the administrative surveillance, were sent back to the district procurator in whose name the order had been issued.

On December 12, the day of Levko Lukyanenko's arrest, a search was made at Kandyba's apartment during which a hand-written copy of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was confiscated (the Declaration had been confiscated from Kandyba during searches on previous occasions, especially in camp).

On January 2, Kandyba was summoned to the Lviv OVIR (Visas and Registration Office--Ed.). They questioned him there as to whether he had relatives abroad and whether he had asked anyone to send him an invitation. They suggested that he submit a written explanation in reply to these questions. Kandyba declined to comply with a request that was not grounded by law. He stated that if an invitation had come addressed to him, then the authorities are obliged to deliver it without requiring explanations of that sort.

According to the practice that has evolved in Ukraine, statements which contain their authors' intentions to emigrate often serve as the basis for various kinds of persecution, including arrest and incarceration in psychiatric hospitals.

On February 6, administrative surveillance of Group member N. A. Strokata was extended for another half year.

After four years of imprisonment in a camp, N. A. Strokata has already lived under surveillance for two years.

Chapter 6

In October 1977, Vitaliy Kalynychenko and Vasyl Striltsiv joined the Group.

Vitaliy Kalynychenko served a 10-year term of imprisonment (1966-76) for an attempt to flee across the border, which was defined as "betrayal of the Motherland." Since his release he has lived under police surveillance in the city of Vasylkiv, Dnipropetrovsk region, and works as an engineer.

After OVIR's refusal to draw up emigration papers for him (he has an invitation), Kalynychenko stated, on October 23, that he renounces his citizenship and sent his passport, military card and diploma to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR.

Vasyl Striltsiv is a former political prisoner of Beria's camps who was sentenced to 10 years' deprivation of freedom when he had barely turned 15. After exoneration (in the era of the "thaw"), he graduated from Chernivtsi University and worked as an English-language instructor in a high school. Recently, he has become the target of extrajudicial persecution. His complaints to scores of republic and union institutions have remained unanswered.

V. Striltsiv declared a strike and in August 1977 applied for emigration to Great Britain.

A strike was also declared by Ivan Sychko, an engineer from the city of Dolyna who had been transferred illegally to a job not in his profession. He submitted a statement to the government renouncing his citizenship and declaring his desire to emigrate from the USSR. His son, Vasyl Sychko, who had been expelled from the University of Kiev (Department of Journalism) for ideological reasons, submitted a similar statement.

Chapter 7

On February 3, the people's court in Kiev sentenced musician and composer Vadym Smohytel to three years' imprisonment. He was sentenced under Article 206, part 2 (malicious hooliganism). The trial, announced as open, was guarded by the police and KGB agents. Only Smohytel's mother and uncle were allowed into the courtroom; his friends and acquaintances were shoved out. All the places in the small room were occupied by a "specially-chosen public." The trial proceeded without a defense, though with an appointed lawyer present, who declared that he was "not acquainted with the case." They would not let Smohytel defend himself -- the judge would interrupt him: "Stop, you're speaking not to the point."

The only witness was a passer-by (the rest were dryzhynnyky -- volunteer police -- and police) who had not seen the fight of which Smohytel was accused; he testified only that, brought to the police station along with everybody else, "he saw that the victim had scratches on his knees" -- in the police records this was classified as a "slight bodily injury."

The hooliganism incident had been staged December 13, 1977, on a dark street, in a span of two minutes: some man suddenly fell at his feet and Smohytel was immediately shoved into a police car parked nearby.

In protest against the falsified charges, V. Smohytel declared a hunger strike and held it until the trial, i.e. for 53 days.

After the arrest, they made a search of Smohytel's apartment. Books and original tape recordings by the arrested musician were confiscated.

The "fight" was preceded by a telephone conversation with Canada on December 12 -- Smohytel asked an acquaintance of his to help him emigrate. And still earlier, in August, he had sent a statement to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR asking for permission to leave the Soviet Union in order to complete his musical education and work in his vocation.

V. Smohytel, born in 1939, is a talented and original musician. He organized a national ensemble, the Zhayvoronok university chorus, which won popularity among the student youth. His works were recorded for radio broadcasts, he was preparing a film about Nina Matviyenko, a singer with the Veryovka Chorus -- all of these successful innovations were periodically interrupted on signals given secretly. His situation became hopelessly worse after the repressions that came pouring down on the Ukrainian intelligentsia in 1972 (he was a close acquaintance of several of those arrested).

These were the circumstances that led Smohytel to his decision to emigrate.

Chapter 8

Vasyl Barladyanu, sentenced July 26, 1977, in Odessa under Article 187, Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR ("dissemination of consciously false fabrications about the Soviet social and governmental system"), is in a camp in the village of Rafalovka in Rivne region. After a beating to which he had been subjected at the time of his hunger strike in an investigation prison (upon his latest refusal to take food), the condition of his health progressively deteriorated. At the camp he was assigned to heavy work in a rock quarry; only at the end of November, after numerous complaints from his wife, Barladyanu was sent to a hospital in Lviv. Ten days later he was returned with the stipulation that he could not be used for heavy work; he was reassigned to making boxes. However, the swampy Polissya climate itself has a pernicious effect on Barladyanu, who in addition to other illnesses suffers from tuberculosis. They refuse to transfer him to another camp.

* * * * *

Yevhen Sverstyuk, who is in Perm camp No. 35 (VS 389/35), was deprived of the right to receive parcels in 1978.

In January 1978, Ivan Svitylchny (Perm camp No. 36) contracted infectious jaundice. After a long delay, he was sent to a hospital. A quarantine was set up in the camp in February.

In December and January searches were conducted in Ukraine in connection with a case of theft, committed, according to the investigating organs, by one Ivan Dyky. The following were subjected to searches: On December 12- Lyubomyra Popadyuk, the mother of political prisoner Zoryan Popadyuk (in Lviv), his grandmother, Sofya Kopystynska (in Sambir), and Olena Antoniv (in Lviv); on January 5-Bohdan Soroka (son of M. Soroka, who died in a camp) in Lviv, and in Kiev, the wife of political prisoner Vasyl Lisovy, Vira Lisova.

None of them were at all acquainted with I. Dyky.

The Group does not know exactly whether I. Dyky committed the theft, but it does know for a fact that those who were subjected to the searches could not have had anything to do with it. The purpose of the searches was to uncover the monetary means used to aid political prisoners and their families.

It is also known that Ivan Dyky, having returned to his homeland a few years ago after five years of camps and two years in exile, to which he was sentenced under Article 62, Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR ("anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda"), for anonymous letters he sent to state organs, could not get permission to live with his family (he has two children) in a village in Western Ukraine, did not have a permanent registration card or work, and was persecuted by the police.

February 1978

Ukrainian Helsinki Group:

Oles Berdnyk
Vitaly Kalynychenko
Ivan Kandyba
Oksana Meshko
Vasyl Stroltsiv
Nina Strokata-Karavanska

An Open Letter

To: The United Nations, New York
 The U.N. Human Rights Commission
 Amnesty International
 L. Brezhnev, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Court of the USSR

On the Day of Victory Over Facism, I declare a hunger strike with the demand that Mykola Rudenko, war invalid, commissar, poet, and philosopher, be released from dungeon.

The conscience of the living, and the will of those who fell in battle demand: enough killing and dungeons, enough agony and persecution! Peace will come only when the seekers and strugglers for law are no longer persecuted!

Freedom for Mykola Rudenko and his comrades-in-arms!

May 9, 1978

Ukrainian Helsinki Group Member:

Oles Berdnyk
 (writer)

* * * * *

Mykola Rudenko

Rudenko arrived in Mordovian camp #19 on December 2, 1977. On December 22, 1977, he was granted a three-day personal visit with his wife. At that time, he told his wife that, if the camp administration did not interfere with his work, i.e. with his poetry writing, he would behave properly and not take part in the various protests, etc. At that time, he worked in the wood-drying room. The work was not difficult.

But his wife had hardly left when he was re-assigned to heavy labor and his poetry taken away. Rudenko went on a hunger strike in protest and three days later his verses were returned. The work to which Rudenko was assigned, however, was beyond his strength; he is a disabled war veteran and his spine injury prevents him from bending over. Rudenko refused to do this job and, on January 20, 1978, he was sent to the prison hospital in Barashevo to determine the degree to which he was disabled.

Until his arrest on February 5, 1977, Rudenko had been classified as an invalid of the third group, and received a pension of 120 rubles a month. On that day, authorities revoked his invalid record book so that he could no longer receive a pension. All the same, his disability classification had been on the basis of his occupation as a writer not engaging in physical labor. The doctors had the same opinion: Rudenko should have been classified in the second group, but his profession placed him in the third.

In Barashevo, doctors decided that Rudenko should be placed in the second group and confirmed that he, in fact, could not engage in heavy labor. On February 10, 1978, Rudenko was reclassified to group two. Nevertheless, the camp administrators announced that he had no right not to work, and assigned him to daytime duty as an orderly in the barracks. This is what he does now.

From March 21 through April 21, 1978, Mykola Rudenko again was in the hospital at Barashevo due to an aggravation of his back injury. On May 5, 1978, he was granted a two hour general meeting with his wife. To the question as to why the visit could not last four hours, prison authorities told Rudenko's wife that supposedly Rudenko himself was responsible for the short meeting: he had not signed the chart for a visit for the month of May. Rudenko told his wife that there was no such chart, nor had there ever been one.

Since he is allowed two general meetings, Rudenko's wife asked when they could have the second. The authorities answered, "In exactly six months," that is, on November 5. And then a private visit on December 22, 1978.

Rudenko told his wife that the large quantity of verse he had written during his arrest had been confiscated. Rudenko is preparing to declare a hunger strike until his verses are returned.

In addition, he told his wife that he could not keep his promise not to take part in protests since he was not being allowed to live and work in peace.

It was possible to give Rudenko only two pair of socks, two handkerchiefs, one ball point pen without a cartridge, shorts, underwear, a bar of soap, and slippers. Rudenko told his wife that Osipov had tuberculosis and had been transferred to the tubercular ward.

To the Executive of the Socialist International
To All Socialists Throughout the World

Dear Comrades and Friends!

On July 20th, 1978 the Chernihiv oblast court sentenced the socialist Lev Lukyanenko, founder of the Ukrainian Public Group to Monitor Compliance with the Helsinki Accords, to 10 years' imprisonment in a strict regimen labor camp and five years' exile in a remote region of the USSR. In this way Soviet "jurisprudence" has perpetrated one more offense against freedom, justice, democracy and socialism.

Who is Lev Lukyanenko, and what are the "heinous crimes" for which he has received such a harsh sentence?

In 1928, Lev Hryhorovych Lukyanenko was born to a peasant family in the village of Khrypivka, Horodnyansk region, Chernihiv oblast, Ukraine.

As all other children his age, Lukyanenko was a member of "Octobrists" and the "Pioneers".* As a child, he witnessed the greatest tragedy to befall the Ukrainian nation, the famine of 1933, which took several million lives. As a ten-year-old, he witnessed 1937, that horrible year of Yezhov tyranny. World War II singed Lev Lukyanenko's youth as he learned the significance of Hitler's fascism and, as an enlisted soldier, the meaning of war. At sixteen, Lukyanenko entered into combat in 1944, fighting for European liberation from Hitler and tasting victory in Austria. Until 1952, he was in the Soviet Army, and then joined the Communist Party. After demobilization, he studied in the law faculty of Moscow University.

For many people, the death of Stalin, and more important, the "exposure of the personality cult" revealed several characteristic features of Soviet reality. Young Lukyanenko was one of the few Soviet Communists who could no longer shut his eyes to the cult of Khrushchev.

These people assessed the Soviet internal politics and its social structure and reached a critical evaluation of the ideo-political program of the USSR. In this way, independent thought arose -- or what in the West is currently called "dissent". In the Khrushchev era, legal, semi-legal, and underground oppositional groups emerged, essentially socialist in Russia, but having both national and socialist characteristics in outlying regions.

The most representative of these organizations, both nationalist and socialist in character, was the Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union (UWPU) founded by Lev Lukyanenko, Ivan Kandyba, Stepan Virun and others. Its program was consistent with the principles of proletarian internationalism, the foundations of Soviet rule (such as the power of the proletariat), and the spirit and letter of the Soviet Constitution.

* (Two official Soviet youth organizations--Ed.)

One of the principle points of the UWPU Program (which, alas, we cannot cite directly since that document is only in the archives of the KGB and the Court) is about the way in which Ukrainian national consciousness has evolved towards self-determination, and with the resultant possibility of Ukrainian secession from the Soviet Union. The USSR does not fully facilitate the economic, socio-political and cultural development of Ukraine (the Soviet Constitution gives constituent republics the right to secede from the USSR).

From this program it is evident that the UWPU was based on socialist principles and did not favor the restoration of capitalism either in the present-day Ukrainian SSR or in a future independent socialist Ukraine. The Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union held that it was its international obligation to struggle for a union of socialist states based on equality and justice, in no way contradictory to the principles of proletarian solidarity.

In the area of economics, the Workers' and Peasants' Union advocated the evolution of three sectors of enterprise: the societal (socialist), the state, and the private. Its program guaranteed all citizens the right to a separate sector for independent enterprise, while favoring the societal, i.e. the socialist, sector.

In the political sphere, the UWPU advocated limitation of state power and espoused a greater democratization of society. All citizens, organizations, and political parties were to have equal rights and the opportunity to take an active part in the life of society, and to play an active role in government.

In the national sphere, the Union stated that all national minorities residing in the territory of an independent Ukraine would be guaranteed equal rights and opportunities, i.e. civil rights, as well as broad rights and the chance to evolve their national culture. The UWPU was actively opposed to great-power chauvinism and to ultra-reactionary nationalism, arguing that both bring only misfortune to all nationalities, and, above all, to workers.

The UWPU program stated that it did not wish to achieve its goals through violence. The only correct way to attain its program was to raise social consciousness through legal -- and in extreme circumstances extra-legal -- forms of agitation and propaganda.

In brief, this was the basic program of the Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union organized by Lev Lukyanenko and others.

Both in the East and West socialism is evolving toward democratization. In Ukraine, the spirit of democratic socialism endures as it continues to search for new forms of self-expression.

In 1961, the members of the Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union were arrested and charged with "treason against the Fatherland and anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda". The Lvov Regional Court sentenced Lukyanenko to death; Ivan Kandyba to 15 years' loss of freedom; and the remaining members to between 11 and 7 years' loss of freedom. The Soviet Supreme Court commuted Lukyanenko's death sentence to 15 years in the corrective labor camps.

This court action was another blatant denial of an elementary right of the Ukrainian nation to self-determination, i.e. the right of Ukraine to its own freedom.

This court action scorned the right of a society to decide economic, political and other issues.

This court decision scoffed at the basic individual rights and freedoms guaranteed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and in the Soviet Constitution.

Finally, the Soviet government, in its court action against Lukyanenko and his colleagues, sinned against democracy and socialism which the Soviet authorities pretend to uphold.

Neither the investigation and trial, nor 15 years in the Gulag, could break Lev Lukyanenko's spirit. The words of Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian national poet, apply to Lukyanenko: "I suffer, I feel pain, but I do not recant...". These words embody the indomitable Ukrainian spirit, which has helped Ukraine endure, live, and continue its struggle for freedom, dignity, and self-determination. And, as long as there are other people such as Lev Lukyanenko in Ukraine, then, indeed, it has a future.

After completing his sentence in 1976, Lukyanenko was under overt and covert surveillance, daily risking his life and liberty. Nevertheless, Lukyanenko was active in creating the Ukrainian Helsinki Monitoring Group, essentially serving as its founder and leader.

In addition to various other activities, Lukyanenko wrote excellent essays in defense of Moroz*, Ruban**, Rudenko***, and others. He addressed letters, petitions and appeals to Soviet governmental institutions, exposing blatant violations of human rights and freedoms in the USSR. His energy, kindness and faith in the ideals of freedom and justice -- in humanized socialism -- inspired his friends and fellow-thinkers. In his life and struggles, Lukyanenko searched for a new evolution of democratic socialism in Ukraine, and for the international unity of all true socialists.

This is a brief sketch of Lev Lukyanenko, the Ukrainian social activist and socialist lawyer.

* (Valentyn Moroz, Ukrainian historian, sentenced in 1970 to 6 years prison, 3 years camp, and 5 years internal exile for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda"--Ed.)

** (Petr Ruban, an artisan, sentenced in 1977 to 8 years in special regimen camp and 5 years internal exile for stealing state property. In 1976, Ruban carved a wooden book cover with the Statue of Liberty as a present for the American people on their 200th anniversary--Ed.)

*** (Mykola Rudenko, founder of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, see p. for further information--Ed.)

The recent trial of Lev Lukyanenko by Soviet authorities is proof that the present regime in our country has nothing in common either with true socialism or with the general concept of democracy.

We call upon all socialists and their supporters to speak out in defense of our friend, a true fighter for the ideals of an emancipated socialism, a true fighter for freedom and justice!

The blow against Lev Lukyanenko is against socialism be it in Germany, France, Italy, the United States, England, Japan.... It is a blow against the workers' movement throughout the world, and against the national liberation struggle.

We call upon you, dear comrades, to acknowledge this truth.

We call upon you to express true international solidarity with the fighters for social and national emancipation in the Soviet Union.

We call upon you to respond not merely with verbal unity but united action -- with struggle against the world of violence.

We want to believe that the Socialist International will acknowledge that our struggle is not merely "our internal affair".

We want to believe that you will not abandon us today to Soviet totalitarian militarism.

Only in this way can the world socialist movement demonstrate its role as a progressive contemporary force.

August, 1978

Ukrainian Helsinki Group:

Mykola Rudenko
 Oleksiy Tykhy
 Mykola Matusevych
 Myroslav Marynovych
 Petr Vins
 Levko Lukyanenko
 Petr Grigorenko
 Oles Berdnyk
 Vitaly Kalynychenko
 Ivan Kandyba
 Oksana Meshko
 Vasil Sichko
 Nina Strokata-Karavanska

Statement on the Trials of Helsinki Monitors

In the Soviet Union, vile crimes have again been committed against liberty, justice and humanism. There have been political reprisals against activists in the struggle for right and freedom in our country, against Yuri Orlov, Lev Lukyanenko, Aleksandr Ginzburg, Anatoli Shcharansky, Viktoras Petkus, and others who have been sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. We are deeply disturbed by these inhuman forms of violence against our comrades, people whose "criminal activity" consisted solely in that they bravely and openly spoke out against the systematic stifling of basic rights and freedom in their own country. As is known, these rights and freedoms are proclaimed in the United Nations pacts, the Final Act of the Helsinki Accords, and by the Soviet Constitution.

Such "judicial" trials are another of numerous examples that "Soviet justice" has nothing in common with the principles of real law, justice, and with the norms of universal morality. The practice of "Soviet justice" does not reveal a single instance when the "court" has not declared guilty those whom the Party and governmental leadership consider their political opponents. And this -- not to mention all the other instances -- is irrefutable proof of the fact that the decisions of Soviet "courts" are governed only by the political orders of the Central Committee in which truth and justice far from always triumphs. We are absolutely convinced that the Soviet "trial" is merely one of the instruments of punitive policies of the political authorities in our country.

The history of "Soviet justice" and its contemporary reality leads us to believe that Soviet political trials are essentially the same as the so-called "peoples' courts" of Fascist Germany which were not governed by the principles of law, justice and humanism, but by the interests of international socialism and of the Third Reich. The whole world knows what all this brought on the German people. Unfortunately, the world does not yet realize what an analogous practice may bring on the Soviet people.

The world ought to realize that Sovietism and freedom are a basic contradiction.

Such severe punishment by the Soviet regime of leading activists in the struggle for civil rights and freedoms in the USSR -- Yuri Orlov, 12 years; Lev Lukyanenko, 15 years; Aleksandr Ginzburg, 8 years; Anatoli Shcharansky, 13 years; and Viktoras Petkus, 15 years of imprisonment -- is a heavy blow against our movement. Nevertheless, this blow has not killed the spirit of freethinking in our country. New Lukyanenkos, Orlovs, and Ginzburgs are joining the movement. Hundreds, thousands are still becoming active in the struggle for right and freedom. They join us because our movement is timely; it voices the natural need for a free Soviet society.

The bravery and determination and the unwavering adherence to the ideals of freedom and humanism shown by our comrades during the trials and investigation, instills more bravery and determination in us and it even further strengthens our belief in our just cause. We are deeply convinced that we will not stand alone in our difficult struggle for legal rights.

We express our profound gratitude to people of good will -- to all those who sympathize with our movement, revealing understanding and solidarity with it.

We express our absolute contempt for all those who today give direct or indirect aid to the reactionary politics of the Soviet government.

August, 1978

Ukrainian Helsinki Group:

Mykola Rudenko
Oleksiy Tykhy
Mykola Matuselych
Myroslav Marynovych
Petr Vins
Levko Lukyanenko
Petr Grigorenko
Oles Berdnyk
Vitaly Kalynychenko
Ivan Kandyba
Oksana Meshko
Vasil Sichko
Nina Strokata-Karavanska

In Defense of Mart NiklusDocument No. 3

Twelve Lithuanians came to us requesting that we intercede on behalf of the Estonian, Mart Niklus, since they knew him to be an honest and decent man. They said he was a fine friend who visited Lithuania many times a year and who feels a deep attachment to their country.

A member of our Group found Mart Niklus in Tartu Republic Hospital recovering from an almost two-month long hunger strike that he had undergone while incarcerated in Tallinn Prison. He had been informed that the case against him was being closed.

Niklus had been forcibly arrested on September 30, 1976, despite the fact that the procurator had not authorized the arrest -- there had only been a warrant for the search of Niklus' apartment, but the search warrant itself was illegal since it lacked the required official signatures. The apartment was searched in Niklus' absence. Niklus was taken to the police station and frisked; then he was released. On October 8, Niklus was arrested again and imprisoned. In protest, he tore up his internal passport, renounced his Soviet citizenship, and declared a hunger strike. Procuracy officials tried to convince his mother and father to sign a written statement to the effect that their son was mentally ill, advising his parents that it would be in Mart's best interest for them to do so. But the old people refused to put their signatures to a false statement. On November 11, Niklus was arraigned. Initially, he was accused of theft, then the charge was changed to inflicting minor bodily harm on a militia employee.

Previously, Mart Niklus had been tried for political reasons and was condemned to serve out a term in the Mordovian camps.

Sources:

1. "Mart Niklus accuses..." (in Russian)
2. "Mart Niklus accuses..." (in Estonian)

December 23, 1976
Vilnius

Members of the Lithuanian Group to
Promote Observance of the Helsinki
Agreements in the USSR:

O. Karolis Garuskas
Eitan Finkelshtein
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Tomas Venclova

The Jurgutis and Anvoldaite-Belapetravichiene
Family Reunification Cases

Document No. 4

Mrs. Marija Jurgutis and her daughter, Daina (Vilnius, Zhirmunu 75-100), have been denied permission to emigrate and join their husband and father, Aloyzas Jurgutis, who lives in Chicago, Illinois.

The Jurgutis have been forced to undergo two searches and have been interrogated several times -- the daughter was first subjected to questioning at the tender age of eleven years (June 1976). The Soviet authorities have denied the Jurgutis' request to emigrate three times (March 1975, April 21, 1976, and December 24, 1976).

* * * * *

West German citizen Adolf Anvold's (FRG, Castrof-Ranchel, Bozhangenerstr. 89) daughter Valya Anvoldaite-Belapetravichiene and her husband Steponas Belapetravichius (Klaipeda, Taikos 13-60) are denied permission to emigrate to the Federal Republic of Germany for the purpose of family reunification. To that end, the daughter twice appealed to the Soviet authorities, but without success; the appeals the father has made have also been for naught.

The Soviet authorities' refusal to grant exit visas to the Jurgutis and Belapetravichius families directly violates Helsinki Final Act provisions on family reunification.

* * * * *

Sources:

1. A statement
2. A statement (in Russian)
3. A declaration to "World Public Opinion" (in Russian with appendix)

February 25, 1977
Vilnius

Members of the Lithuanian Group to
Promote Observance of the Helsinki
Agreements in the USSR:

O. Karolis Garuskas
Eitan Finkelshtein
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Tomas Venclova

The Arrest of Henrikas JaskunasDocument No. 5

On December 22, 1976, Henrikas Jaskunas' apartment (Ionava, ul. XXX-letiya, 25-18) was searched "with the object of finding and confiscating literature of an anti-Soviet nature in addition to other documents and materials that could be relevant to the case" (excerpted from the text of the warrant and the official record of the search). Following the search, Jaskunas was arrested.

We hereby inform the signatory governments of the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement of the arrest of Henrikas Jaskunas and enclose for their information all the evidentiary materials that were used to incriminate Jaskunas (copies of materials confiscated by the KGB during the search). As far as we know, the materials found in Jaskunas' apartment had not been disseminated.

Sources:

1. A statement
2. The official record of the search
3. Manifesto of the Union of Independent Peoples (in Russian)
4. Open Letter #1 (in Russian)
5. "Unity is the Best Weapon" (in Russian)
6. "The Voice of the People" (in Russian)
7. "End the Occupation" (in Russian)
8. "Monopolistic Capitalism Soviet-Style" (in Russian)

February 28, 1977
Vilnius

Members of the Lithuanian Group to
Promote Observance of the Helsinki
Agreements in the USSR:

O. Karolis Garuskas
Eitan Finkelshtein
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Tomas Venclova

On Discrimination Against the Volga Germans in the USSRDocument No. 6

During the Second World War, Stalin committed one of the most heinous crimes of the century -- he deported entire ethnic populations from their native territories and repopulated their lands with new arrivals from different places. This was the fate of the Crimean Tatars, the Volga Germans, the Kalmyks, the Ingush, the Chechens, the Kabardin Balkars, and others. Twenty-four years have passed since the death of Stalin, yet forty-nine Volga German families from the Radviliskis Region of Lithuania came to us with documentation showing that the Volga Germans are still being treated like second-class citizens; countless obstacles are put in their way when they attempt to obtain residency permits or find employment. Initially, the Volga Germans appealed to the authorities in Moscow and Vilnius for help, but they had no hope of redress. For this reason, they declare that they will renounce their Soviet citizenship and will demand to emigrate to their historical homeland, the Federal Republic of Germany, if discrimination against them as a national minority does not cease.

Discriminatory treatment of the Volga Germans is in direct contravention of the 1965 Directive lifting restrictions on Germans living on Soviet territory, of the USSR Constitution itself, and of the Universal Declaration on Civil and Political Rights, to which the Soviet Union is signatory.

The Lithuanian Helsinki Group declares that the continued persecution of the Volga Germans violates both the letter and the spirit of the Helsinki Agreement.

Sources:

1. Statement with 47 signatures (in Russian)
2. Statement with 49 signatures (in Russian)

March 19, 1977
Vilnius

Members of the Lithuanian Group to
Promote Observance of the Helsinki
Agreements in the USSR:

O. Karolis Garuskas
Eitan Finkelshtein
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Tomas Venclova

On Erik Udam and KGB Attempts to Enlist Him as a 'Dissident'

Document No. 7

We have been approached by Erik Udam, an Estonian, born in 1938, and residing in Tallin. An electrical engineer who speaks Lithuanian, Molok has twice won the Estonian wrestling championship. He was arrested twice and has spent five years in Soviet prisons and camps as a political prisoner.

A listening device was installed in the wall of his communal apartment. When Udam removed it, the KGB agents in Tallin became angry. It was then that Udam met Albert Molok, a KGB agent whom he had known from the time of his first arrest in 1956 and who had since been made a major.

On April 4, 11, and 14 of this year, Albert Molok suggested that Erik Udam form a dissident committee in Estonia. Thereupon, the major would establish contacts between the committee and American diplomats accredited in Moscow. Major Molok offered one half million rubles for this purpose. Erik Udam replied that he might try to form such a committee, but only with Finnish contacts. Major Molok said the KGB was not interested in Finns, but only in Americans and offered Udam 250,000 rubles for initial expenses. When Udam refused, the KGB major asked him to recommend someone who would agree to organize such a committee.

During their conversations, Molok claimed the credit for the unsuccessful journey of the English journalist David Satter* (London's Financial Times) to the Baltic countries during February of this year.

Sources:

1. Eriko Udamo poordumine (in Estonian)
2. Eriko Udamo poordumine Laanemeremade rehvaste poele (in Estonian)

May 26, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Tomas Venclova
 Father Karolis Garuckas
 Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
 Viktoras Petkus
 Eitan Finkelshtein

* (In February 1977, Satter's briefcase was stolen in a Riga-Tallin train. Among other papers, his case had contained a notebook with Udam's address written on it--Ed.)

Persecution of the Vasilev Family,
Russian Pentecostals Living in Vilnius, Lithuania

Document No. 8

Viktor Vasilev and his family, residing in Vilnius, Architektu St. #224, Apt. 8, have appealed to the U.S. and "to all the Christian countries, to all the Christian-Evangelical missions, to all Christian associations for aid."

The family belongs to the Christian Pentecostal community, therefore, the Soviet administration "wages a ceaseless struggle against us, not because we are evil people, but only because we are profound believers, Pentecostals." This group has been kept outside the pale of the law for a long time. Some individuals and families are experiencing illegal reprisals even today.

During Viktor Vasilev's army service in the city of Termez (1959-1960), Sharonov, captain of the special service, gave him orders to renounce God in writing, because otherwise he would be barred from entering a military institute. The Captain said the institute preferred to produce five bad engineers than one good one who is a believer.

Nina Vasileva, Vasilev's wife, was constantly persecuted by the KGB in Alma Ata.

For the past three years, Vasilev has been living in Vilnius, but the Soviet administration has not forgotten him. Bukashiev, prosecutor of the Spalia region in the city of Vilnius, branded the head of the family an anti-Soviet individual. At Vilnius secondary school 36, their children, Valentin and Timofey, were being forced to join the Little Octobrists. When they refused, the school principal suggested that they find a school without a Little Octobrist organization*. Finally, Viktor Vasilev received a court order to move out into the street. Despite his 24-year work record and the praise and distinction he has earned in his places of employment, he still has not earned a government-approved apartment. KGB people started spreading various fabrications and rumors about the family.

Vasilev wrote appeals to Brezhnev, Podgorny, Kosygin and Rudenko -- all to no avail.

Therefore, he and his wife have asked the Soviet administration to give their family permission to leave the USSR. They base their request on:

1. The Declaration of Human Rights;
2. The International Act on Civil and Political Rights; and
3. The Helsinki Agreements.

They have also appealed for aid to the Christians of the world.

* (All schools in the Soviet Union have this organization--Ed.)

Sources:

1. Statement (in Russian)
2. Statement about the emigration from the USSR (in Russian)

June 2, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Tomas Venclova
Father Karolis Garuckas
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Eitan Finkelshtein

On the Situation of Lithuanian Former Political PrisonersDocument No. 9

Some political prisoners who have returned to Lithuania are facing a difficult situation. An entire complex system of discrimination has been created against the prisoners who have served their terms. Having acquainted ourselves with the documentation and statements, we have established the following:

1. Some of the political prisoners released from Soviet prisons and camps have been so far categorically denied the right to return to their homeland, Lithuania (Vytautas Slapsinskas returned in 1977 after a 25-year term), although they have not been punished with deportation or with other restrictions of civil rights (Stepas Bubulas, Kostas Buknys, Antanas Deksnys, Alfonsas Gaidys, Algirdas Gasiunas, Robertas Indrikas, Antanas Jankauskas, Jonas Karalius, Leonas Lebeda, Kostas Laksas, Juozas Mikailionis, Aleksas Mosteika, Petras Paltarokas, Povilas Peciulaitis, Vytautas Petrusaitis, Albinas Rasytinis, Vincas Saliokas, Vytautas Slapsinskas, Jonas Sarkanais, Vladas Vaitiekunas, et al). They are exiled without a trial, only by administrative order.

2. Some of the returnees refuse to obey the order ("order" - because jurists maintain that such a law does not exist, and therefore they cannot defend these people's rights) and refuse to leave Lithuania. Such individuals must arm themselves with patience, cool nerves, perseverance, and strong will. In some cases, the administration, having tried various penalties and trials, finally allows them to register officially. In other cases, permission to register is refused. They do not deport the stubborn individual, they simply adjust themselves to the accomplished fact. That is what happened on April 20th of this year to arrested Balys Gajauskas, who had lived in Kaunas for four years without having been duly registered. Povilas Peciulaitis was allowed to register in Kaunas, then his registration was cancelled and he was showered with monetary fines for not being registered. On May 20, 1975, he was sentenced to one year in a strict regime camp. After he had served his term, the authorities again refused to have him registered in Lithuania or outside its limits...

3. Sometimes, after permission has been granted for residence in Lithuania, the administration changes its mind after a prolonged time, annuls the registration, and the person is expelled from Lithuania (Leonas Lebeda, Kostas Laksas, Povilas Peciulaitis, and others); Kazys Katkus, for instance, had his registration annulled in Plunge in 1975 after having lived there for ten years upon his return from camp.

4. The Soviet administration sometimes likes to play cat-and-mouse. Juozas Tribusauskas, for instance, returned to his native Panevezys and lived there for several years, but was then expelled from Lithuania. He took up residence in Latvia and a few years later was again allowed to return to Panevezys.

5. These individuals, deported without trial and without any definite term, do not know when they can return home. Everything depends on the whims of the administration since one cannot say that nobody is allowed to return. For example, the priests Petras Jasas, Antanas Mitrikas, Kazimieras Vaicionis, Kazimieras Vasiliauskas, and others were kept in Latvia for over ten years; later they were allowed to return to their native country. Thus, exiled people do not know when they will be able to return to Lithuania.

6. Similarly, people who have never been sentenced have been deported nevertheless. Thus, the Apostolic administrators of the archdiocese of Vilnius and of the diocese of Kaisiadorys, Bishops Julijonas Steponavicius and Vincentas Sladkevicius remain in exile for almost twenty years. It is true they were exiled to the border areas of Lithuania, not outside its limits. Archbishop Teofilis Matulionis and Bishop Pranciskus Ramanauskas died in such exile after having been released from prisons and camps.

7. Those exiled are usually fathers and heads of families. The entire family moves to the place of exile. There, the problem of finding schools that teach Lithuanian is very important. At one time, the Lithuanian deportees in Siberia were forbidden to have Lithuanian schools, although they did not lack qualified teachers who were also exiles. For the same reasons, all the efforts of Lithuanians in East Prussia (now the Kaliningrad area) to establish Lithuanian schools for their children collapsed.

In this manner the Soviet administration of Lithuania disregards the international obligations of the USSR, because it exiles both former political prisoners and citizens who have not been tried at all, wherever, whenever, and for whatever term it wishes to, and the deportee's family ends up in exile together with him.

Sources:

1. Statement
2. Application
3. Reply to USSR Ministers' Council
4. Statement (in Russian)
5. Certificate No. 049912 (in Russian)
6. Certificate No. 045589 (in Russian)
7. Certificate No. 094225 (in Russian)
8. Certificate of Form No. 15 (in Russian)
9. Check of Form No. 20 (in Russian)

June 14, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Tomas Venclova
 Father Karolis Garuckas
 Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
 Viktoras Petkus
 Eitan Finkelshtein

On the Arrest of Balys GajauskasDocument No. 10

On April 20, 1977, Balys Gajauskas was summoned to the Vilnius KGB and arrested. He had been living in Kaunas, and on May 4th it would have been four years since his return from the Mordovian camps. He was not officially registered in Lithuania, but he refused to leave. For this refusal, Gajauskas became involved with various institutions and a court.

Previously, Balys Gajauskas had been charged under Article 58 and was sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment on May 3, 1948. He completed his entire term in prisons and camps. On his return, he was often interrogated; his apartment was searched on December 23, 1974 and on February 7, 1977. The purpose of the last search was spelled out in the search warrant: To seize "objects and documents that may serve as significant evidence in the case". Also ransacked were Leonardas Staviskis' and Ona Grigaliuniene's apartments in search of materials that might compromise Gajauskas.

On May 22, 1977, Birute Pasiliene's apartment in Giruliai, Klaipeda was searched. The search warrant indicated that the search was to find material on Balys Gajauskas' case. During the search of Pasiliene's apartment, Khronika #43, a manuscript Projektas (Project), and two typewriters (Lithuanian and Russian) were confiscated by the authorities.

The only surviving member of Gajauskas' family is his ill 73-year-old mother. At the time of Gajauskas' arrest she was undergoing an operation in the hospital. Two weeks after his arrest, she was informed in writing that her son had been arrested and that he was charged with Article 68 (part two) of the Lithuanian Penal Code. Thus, he faces a possible loss of freedom from three to ten years, and one to five years of exile. Leonardas Staviskis and Ona Grigaliuniene were called to the KGB as witnesses in Balys Gajauskas' case.

Sources:

1. Statement-Appeal by Birute Pasiliene
2. Description of the search of Birute Pasiliene's apartment

June 16, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Tomas Venclova
Father Karolis Garuckas
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Eitan Finkelshtein

On the Persecution of Enn TartoDocument No. 11

Enn Tarto, Estonian, born on September 25, 1938, residing in the city of Tartu, has written to us.

Enn Tarto was arrested in 1956 and in 1962. He spent nine years in Soviet prisons and camps as a political prisoner. Upon his return, the KGB did not leave him in peace, and repeatedly subjected him to interrogations. He was dismissed from an institution of higher learning and was interrogated about his contacts with Nataliya Gorbanevskaya.

This year, there were four attempts to set fire to the building where he lives (Tartu, Anne Street No. 20). Recalling that recently several dissidents in Moscow were victims of fires, we have decided to publish the letter of Enn Tarto as a document.

Source:

Enn Tarto, "Leedu Helsinki grupile avaldus"

June 26, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Tomas Venclova
Father Karolis Garuckas
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Eitan Finkelshtein

On the Psychiatric Imprisonment of Algirdas ZipreDocument No. 12

A cry has reached us. It is the heart-breaking voice of a human being from the so-called psychiatric hospitals which are really prisons. This cry was first heard by Jonas Volungevicius (resident of Vilnius), Birute Pasiliene (resident of Klaipeda), Romualdas Ragaitis (resident of Vilnius) and Jadvyga Petkeviciene (resident of Siauliai) who sent it to us.

It is the voice of political prisoner Algirdas Zipre who, in 1958 had been sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment under Article 58 although a decree had been already passed according to which maximum punishment could not exceed 15 years. The condemned man appealed to various Soviet agencies to have the error rectified. As a result, on October 13, 1973, this healthy, strong, and principled individual was thrown into what prisoners call the "psikhushka" (psychiatric prison-hospital--Ed.) in Mordovia, Barashev camp 385/3-12.

The conditions there are worse than in prison: a hermetically closed window, strict isolation from the outside world, no walks, and prisoners are beaten and forcibly injected with some pseudo-medicine. Algirdas Zipre suffered severe beatings on October 20, 1973 and February 7, 1975. He was twice transferred to the Serbsky Institute in Moscow (September 29, 1974 and February 28, 1977) and was held in Moscow's Butyrky Prison. Recently he was moved to an unknown destination.

May his appeal reach the ears and heart of every decent human being!

Sources:

1. Statement of Jonas Volungevicius, Birute Pasiliene, Romualdas Ragaitis and Jadvyga Petkeviciene.
2. Letter by Algirdas Zipre, "Buk sveikas!" (Greetings!), a copy

July 1, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Tomas Venclova
 Father Karolis Garuckas
 Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
 Viktoras Petkus
 Eitan Finkelshtein

To: The Belgrade Meeting to Review the Compliance
with the Helsinki Accords of 1978

Statement

On the Situation of the Roman Catholic Church
and of Other Believers in Lithuania

In the Soviet Union, the struggle against religion is an integral part of Communist Party policy. "Freedom of conscience" is understood here in a unique way. In his pamphlet, Soviet Laws on Religious Cults (Vilnius, 1963), A. Veshchikov describes freedom of conscience as follows: "We understand freedom of conscience as the ultimate liberation of all men from religious superstition (p. 10). The same idea is also expressed by J. Anicas and J. Rimaitis in their brochure, Soviet Laws on Religious Cults and Freedom of Conscience (Vilnius, 1970):

"Genuine freedom of conscience is possible only when... all available scientific, cultural and ideological means are used to help man liberate himself from the influence of an anti-scientific religious view of the world. As long as the believers have not shed religious superstition, freedom of conscience is impossible." (p. 54)

Such an understanding and interpretation of freedom of conscience is self-contradictory. Freedom cannot exist where there is compulsion, restriction, and struggle. Simultaneously, this interpretation also contradicts international obligations undertaken by the Soviet Union: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Final Act, the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

As a member of the United Nations, the Soviet Union has assumed the obligation to honor and respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, but it has not changed its stand toward religion within its own state. Not only did the old laws remain valid, but on July 28, 1976, already after the Helsinki Accords, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania confirmed the Regulations Governing Religious Associations, 53 articles in all, a fact on which we have reported in our Document No. 2, 1976. Once more we draw attention to the fact that these regulations are based exclusively on various Soviet decrees and regulations created prior to the Helsinki Accords and which discriminate against the believers. Specifically, anti-religious propaganda is allowed, but religious propaganda is outlawed; only the performance of religious cults is permitted, etc.

Article 26 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights states:

"All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. In this respect the law shall prohibit any discrimination and guarantee to all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

International agreements on basic human rights and freedoms state that they take precedence over the internal laws of states. Since the Soviet Union recognizes this principle, it should amend Article 124 of the USSR Constitution and Article 96 of the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR, which state: "The Church has been separated from the state and the state from the church. The freedom of performance of religious cults and the freedom of anti-religious propaganda are granted to all citizens."

The word "separate" as used by the state organs has more than one meaning. When it is applied to the Church, it is understood in the sense that the Church has no right to intervene in the state's internal affairs -- that is, the Church cannot indicate which persons should be elected to the country's Supreme Soviet or its presidium; who should be chairmen of the raion executive committees; who should be named professors or lecturers at the universities; etc. But when the term "separate" is applied to the state, it has an entirely opposite meaning: the organs of the Soviet government decide which bishops are not allowed to perform their duties (Bishops Steponavicius and Slatkevicius) and which young people cannot enroll in the Theological Seminary (those refused admission are still harassed: M. Petravicius, A. Ciuras, et al.). They even decide which priests may be invited to religious festivals, and which ones may not (A. Kleina, K. Garuckas, V. Cerniauskas, etc.). The state authorities have told the Rev. Bronius Laurinavicius that, "without our knowledge" a priest cannot even hammer a nail into a church wall. The atheists themselves acknowledge that the word "separate" has a double meaning. J. Anicus and J. Raimaitis write:

"In the literature that discusses the question of the separation of church and state, the two are sometimes presented as parties of equal significance, e.g., 'The state organs do not interfere in the activity of the church; church in its turn does not mingle in the affairs of the state.' This interpretation is doubtlessly incorrect. The sovereignty of the Soviet state gives it the right to regulate various areas of social life. The church, in spite of its specific character, cannot be an exception."

If one thinks logically, the separation of the Church from the state should mean that it is entirely free, independent from the state, and runs its own affairs. However, judging by common practice and various laws and regulations issued by the civilian administration, it would appear that the church has not been separated from the state, but rather is strictly controlled by the state administration. When the Soviet press writes about the Church-state relations, it frequently asserts that the Soviet state and its government organs do not interfere in the internal affairs of the Church,

i.e. in its canonical and dogmatic activity. Actual experience, however, shows something entirely different: the state disregards the canons of the church law and determines what is permitted the Church and what is not. This is acknowledged by the atheists themselves. A. Veshchikov writes:

"Soviet laws forbid the centers of the clergy to issue any regulations and rules to the faithful. The clergy is also forbidden to guide or even to base itself on previous religious laws." (p. 20)

Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights states:

"The states Party to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians, to choose for their children schools other than those established by the public authorities which conform to such minimum educational standards as may be laid down or approved by the State and to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions."

The same principle is repeated in Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and is emphasized by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children." (Article 26)

Article 56 of the Fundamentals of People's Education in the USSR and the Union Republics admits theoretically:

"If regulations established by an international treaty or an international agreement of which the USSR is a party, differ from those promulgated by the educational laws of the USSR and its Union republics, then the regulations of the international treaty or the international agreement are applied." But the practice is different.

In the Soviet Union, where school has been separated from the Church, the entire educational apparatus is in the hands of the state and there are no other schools except those of the state. The goals and the tasks of those schools are determined by the Fundamentals of Legislation of People's Education in the USSR and the Union Republics, which demand "lay education without religion) (Article 12), "permeation of teaching and education with the spirit of Marxist-Leninist ideas, socialist internationalism, Soviet patriotism, and Communist views" (Articles 19, 31, 36, 41), and state that "Parents and persons who represent them must educate children in the spirit of high Communist morality" (Article 57); "education in the family must be organically harmonized with the educational activity of schools, pre-schools and extracurricular institutions, and social organizations" (Article 57).

The practical application of the above-mentioned articles of the Fundamentals is described by P. Misutis, Deputy Chairman of the Council for the Coordination of the Republic's Atheistic Propaganda, in his book, Improvement of Ideological Activity (Vilnius, 1974):

"The Fifth Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (1963) emphasized that scientific-atheistic propaganda is a general party matter. (p. 197)

The differentiation of atheistic activity has recently improved... . Atheistic education in schools is also being identified. The main task of the formation of the materialistic world-view is transferred to the classroom process, but without relinquishing the atheistic groups and clubs whose activity in some schools even goes beyond the school limits. It is very important to improve the atheistic education of parents who are still believers, which is exactly what the collectives of many schools are trying to do.

There are important tasks in the education of the young and of university students... . The Departments of Atheism and Philological History in Vilnius V. Kapsukas State University, is accomplishing a lot in this respect and is playing an increasing role in the coordination and organization of scientific atheistic activity of university students throughout the entire republic... . Therefore, it is very important to improve work with them, as with the young in general. Those youths who are still religious believers must be taken away from the influence of the church." (p. 202)

Such are the goals of all schools. Perhaps, then, the children of the believers and the religious youth can be taught religion privately?

Lenin's decree of January 25, 1918, "On the Separation of the Church from the State and of the school from the Church" allows for private religious instruction (Article 9), while Article 43 of the Penal Code of the Lithuanian SSR forbids it. The violation of this (43rd) Article is described as follows:

"Organization and systematic performance of religious instruction for minors, in violation of the rules established by law. The violation of the rules established by the law refers to religious instruction of minors in any form (e.g. organizing religious organizations and any kind of schools, clubs, groups; holding regular meetings of children on questions of religious instruction; religious instruction performed by parents not only with their own children but also with children of other believers). The exception here is religious instruction performed by the parents themselves." (Commentary to the LSSR Penal Code, Vilnius, 1974, p. 226).

The same idea is expressed in Articles 17 and 18 of the Regulations on Religious Associations. Thus, Lenin's decrees do not harmonize with contemporary state laws.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights states in Article 18:

"Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance."

The freedom to practice a religion is assured by the USSR and LSSR constitutions, yet the believers in Lithuania do not have this freedom. A. Veschikov openly acknowledges that religious associations "have strictly limited functions, according to Soviet law." (p. 31). J. Anicas and J. Rimaitis repeat the same: "Religious communities are formed for the practice of a religion only." (p. 38)

The term "freedom to practice a religion" encompasses not only the holding of religious services or the participation in them, but everything that is closely linked to the religious ritual. To practice the rituals of the Catholic Church, one needs priests, liturgical vessels, hymnals, sheet music, rosaries, organs and similar things.

The Catholics of Lithuania receive as many new priests as the civil authorities, who determine how many will study at the Theological Seminary, allow. The bishops and administrators of Lithuania cannot offer the Sacrament of Confirmation without the permission of the organs of the atheist government. The activity of priests is limited to the homes of members of the parish in which they service, and to the church of the parish where the priest works (Article 19, Regulations Governing Religious Associations). Solemn processions to the cemetery on All Souls' Day are prohibited and priests punished for leading such processions (e.g. the Revs. Alfonsas Svarinskas, Jonas Survila, and others). In many places, administration of the Last Rites to hospital patients is obstructed, and priests are forbidden to visit the faithful, even if they have asked for a priest (e.g. the Rev. K. Garuckas and others).

After the Second Vatican Meeting, the faithful of almost the entire world perform services in their native language. Lithuanians, however, must still use Latin, because it is impossible to print missals and other necessary books in the Lithuanian language. As for the manufacturing of religious vessels and organs, Lithuanians can only dream about it. According to the regulations governing religious associations, religious centers, the curiae, religious communities and parishes in Lithuania, are not considered judicial entities and, therefore, do not have the corresponding rights. By the same token, they cannot establish their own regulations, cannot own property, are not subject to law and obligations, cannot conclude contracts, cannot be named beneficiaries in a last will and testament, and cannot participate in courts and arbitration proceedings. Article 22 of the above-mentioned regulation states:

"The property indispensable for the performance of the religion, both that which has been transferred, according to the contracts, for the use of the believers who form a religious community, and that which has been acquired or donated to them for religious purposes, belongs to the state." Even the "insurance compensation for a burnt (damaged) house of prayer, is transferred to the appropriate executive committee of the Council of Working People's Deputies, which has the authority over these buildings." (Article 29)

Most Lithuanian Catholics, especially members of the intelligentsia -- teachers, etc. -- cannot participate in religious rituals for they will be dismissed from work as a result.

During the years of Stalin's rule, Lithuanians, deported to distant areas of Russia, used to make rosary beads from bread, string them on a thread, and pray. Today we see in many hands not those bread rosaries, but crude rosaries made in hiding, prayerbooks and hymnals copied by hand. Quite a few have gone to prison for secretly printing prayerbooks, e.g. P. Petronis, J. Grazys, et al. The apartments of the believers are adorned by photographs of no esthetic value, or metal images of the Crucifix, forged or cast secretly.

Can all this be called freedom to practice religion?

The freedom of anti-religious propaganda means that each Soviet citizen has the right to freely express his atheistic convictions and proclaim them orally and in the press. This right is assured by Article 124 of the USSR Constitution and Article 96 of the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR. The freedom of anti-religious propaganda in the Soviet Union means a struggle against religion and is actually a duty. It is one of the platforms of the Communist Party. A. Veshchikov writes:

"The materials of the XXII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union provide guidance on how atheistic activity should be further developed. The Congress made an in-depth analysis of the question of overcoming religious traces." (p. 29)

The Constitution does not grant the freedom to religious propaganda to their citizens who are religious believers, and thus makes them unequal vis-a-vis the atheists in the eyes of the law, and discriminates against them. As a result, Catholics in Soviet Lithuania do not have any religious newspapers, or magazines, Catholic books, or even a catechism, while at the same time bookstores are inundated with atheistic books. Newspapers and magazines are flowing over with atheistic articles, trying to "dethrone" the Catholic Church, but the Catholics cannot reply to them, because they do not have their own press. Therefore, the Catholics of Lithuania cannot take advantage of those rights and freedoms that are enshrined in international agreements that the Soviet Union has committed itself to honor and to put into practice.

Therefore, we address ourselves to the Belgrade Conference, whose task is to monitor the observance of the agreements, signed in Helsinki in 1975. We ask you to help us see to it that the international accords which have been adopted do not remain on paper only, but are concretely applied, and that:

1. The term "freedom of conscience" be understood and interpreted in the same manner as it is understood by the people of the entire world;
2. The people have the right not only to anti-religious but also to religious propoganda;
3. The (religious) believers be granted the rights of meeting, press and expression;

4. Those articles of the fundamentals of legislation on education that restrict the freedom of religion and conscience be abolished; and

5. That all those who have contributed to the universal respect and observance of human rights and fundamental freedom (N. Sadunaite, P. Plumpa, P. Petronis, S. Zukauskas, J. Grazys, and others) be released from prisons and camps.

June 10, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Rev. Karolis Garuckas
Eitan Finkelshtein
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Tomas Venclova

To Delegates of the Belgrade Conference and Armenian
Fellow Countrymen

Supplement

On July 22, 1977, KGB operatives broke into the apartment of Zhanna Sargsyan, friend of Robert Nazaryan. After conducting an interrogation in the apartment, they drove Sargsyan and her mother to KGB headquarters where they continued to question the daughter for 8 hours, threatening her with a 2-8 year prison term. Zhanna Sargsyan wrote out a statement dictated by KGB employee Kazaryan. Both women were then driven home where, threatened with a search, they were forced to surrender the following materials: a copy of the Armenian Helsinki Group declaration, Robert Nazaryan's open letter to Jimmy Carter and a snapshot of patriot P. Airikyan. After the seizure of materials, the KGB failed to give Sargsyan a copy of the confiscation order.

That very same day, Eduard Arutyunyan gave a colleague a file of materials related to the defense of human rights in the USSR (works by Amalrik, Solzhenitsyn, the "Chronicle" for 1974, etc. -- over 100 pages). Twenty minutes after her meeting with Arutyunyan, Karina Mkrtchyan was detained by a group of KGB men led by Dzhivanyan. The KGB drove Mkrtchyan to headquarters where she wrote a statement under dictation. Later, threatened with an apartment search and 2-8 years in prison, Mkrtchyan was forced to admit that she had other materials at home. The interrogation was interrupted for a trip back to the apartment where the KGB seized the following materials: copies of the statement by E. Arutyunyan to women of the world, his open letter to Mr. Carter, an open letter to Mr. Brezhnev, a statement directed to the Soviet people, and dissident literature belonging to the Armenian Helsinki Group. Mkrtchyan then was returned to the KGB. The interrogation lasted 10 hours in all. As in the case of Z. Sargsyan, Karina Mkrtchyan was not given a copy of the confiscation order.

On July 25, 1977, at 7:00, employees of the KGB took Manvel Matirosyan from his apartment and delivered him to headquarters for an interrogation which lasted until 2:00 a.m. on July 26. Although Matirosyan has received an invitation from the U.S., he has not received permission to emigrate from the USSR, and on advice from R. Nazaryan, had been planning to move to Moscow. The major goal of the KGB interrogation: to learn the instructions Nazaryan had given him to carry out once in Moscow.

On August 7, 1977, Saro Gyodakyan was detained and searched by the KGB when he arrived in the city of Leninakan from Erevan (Armenian SSR). In spite of the fact that doctors had discovered a breast tumor in Gyodakyan's sister, and that he was to accompany her to Moscow, Gyodakyan was forced to sign a statement to the effect that he would not leave Leninakan through August 25. He was not given a copy of the confiscation order for a roll of film and an Armenian Helsinki Group statement to the Belgrade Conference seized during the search. Gyodakyan was summoned again for interrogation on the same matter on August 16 and 25, 1977.

September 12, 1977

Armenian Helsinki Group:

Eduard Avutyunyan
Shagen Arutyunyan
Ambartsum Khlgatyan
Robert Nazaryan
Manvel Osyan

Statement of Armenian Helsinki Group Member Robert Nazaryan
with a Request for Acceptance into the Helsinki Agreement
Implementation Group

The Armenian Helsinki Group's declaration and its statements addressed to the Belgrade Conference demonstrate that since its inception, the Armenian Helsinki Group has believed that close contacts between Helsinki Groups would lead to more productive results.

The implementation of the humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki Agreements -- on the rights of national minorities and on human rights -- is a natural touchstone which can be used to judge the extent to which any one of the Final Act signatories is observing its commitments, and whether it, in fact, desires detente in the world.

The Soviet government conceals from world public opinion (and its own people) violations of nationality rights and human rights which have occurred in our country. This is why participating states of the Helsinki Conference are insufficiently familiar with facts of Soviet non-implementation of provisions of the Final Act.

Today in the Soviet Union, in the Armenian Republic in particular, gross violations of the nationality rights of Armenians, and violations of human rights in general, are occurring. Soviet authorities interfere with the normal activity of the Helsinki Groups and persecute their members ruthlessly. Armenian Helsinki Group members suffer such persecution as well.

Group leader Eduard Arutyunyan is subjected to threats of incarceration in a psychiatric hospital. I am a victim of a smear campaign in the press. On May 5, 1977 the newspaper Sovetakan Aiastan printed an article entitled "The False Prophet". On June 9, 1977, officials searched me illegally at Erevan Airport and took away my passport which they have not yet returned (over four months have passed). On September 5, 1977, I was fired from my job under the pretext of staff cutbacks and now authorities threaten me with trial for "parasitism". I married recently, but without a passport I cannot register my marriage.

The persecution of Armenian Helsinki Group members illustrates how human rights are "respected" in the Armenian republic.

I support the H.A.I.G. Declaration and, believing that the goals and tasks of H.A.I.G. and the Armenian Helsinki Group coincide in their essence, I am expressing my desire to join the International Association to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements (H.A.I.G.).

October 26, 1977

Armenian Helsinki Group Member:

Deacon Robert Khachikovich Nazaryan

An Appeal to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet
of the Armenian SSR

Impelled by the demands of humanism and in fulfillment of our civic duty, we, members of the Armenian Helsinki Group who have signed below, call upon the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR to petition the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR for the early release of the following citizens of the Armenian SSR from their places of detention:

1. AIRIKYAN Paruir Arshavirovich
2. ZOGRABYAN Razmik Artavazdovich
3. MARKOSYAN Razmik Grigorievich
4. SHAKHVERDYAN Bagrat Levonovich

We have studied carefully the sentences handed down to these men by the Supreme Court of the Armenian SSR, and we have found nothing in their activity which could be qualified as a criminal offense punishable by law. Therefore, we attest, with full responsibility, that these sentences are, in fact, the authorities' vengeance against men who hold convictions and ideals which the ruling party -- Communist Party of the Soviet Union -- does not share.

In a state guided by legal principles; in a state where the Constitution is not just proclaimed for the sake of political posturing, but is strictly adhered to in reality; the government should conduct itself with full respect for the law so that it may have the moral right to demand the same from its citizens. But, the Soviet government, to our great dismay, does not consider it necessary to respect this immutable principle.

Our view is not unsubstantiated, but based on the on-going "witch hunt" in the USSR -- the judicial persecution of citizens for their ideological and political convictions, philosophical views, and religious beliefs.

If one were to examine the case of Paruir Airikyan, for example, one would see that he is neither a thief nor a bribe-taker, rapist nor murderer. He did not resort to extremist measures to achieve his political aims, nor did he take weapons or explosives into his hands. Ideas and convictions, the spoken and written word, have been and remain his only weapons. In combatting words with prison, the KGB finds not strength, but impotence and confusion, and exposes itself before the eyes of intelligent mankind as a political force out of tune with the times, living in the past.

In coming forward in defense of Airikyan and other prisoners of conscience, we also come forward for ourselves, for our constitutional rights and freedoms. We firmly intend to insist upon these at the cost of any sacrifice, since we believe that resignation in the face of arbitrary tyranny is a disgrace meriting the severest condemnation.

We may or may not share the political views and work of Airikyan and other prisoners of conscience, but we do acknowledge their right to hold and defend any feeling or thought which is dear to them and which is directed toward the good of society. That this is an individual's sacred right can no longer be contested now, at the end of the third quarter of the twentieth century. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union risks missing the train of history should it persist in its vain pretensions to a monopolistic guardianship over a scientific formula of social development. Alas, the CPSU is not the only entity which God endowed with a brain...

We are delighted with those of our fellow countrymen who, facing persecution and prison, nonetheless remain true to the call of their humane conscience. And, in fact, how miserable and colorless the existence of mankind would be, were there no people like Airikyan among us! If there were no individuals, possessed of a conscience, no creators of ideas and beauty, no seekers of truth or dreamers -- we never would have learned the way to freedom and the stars; we would be unable to enjoy the music of Mozart and Bach; we could not gaze at the clouds from a bird's-eye view. For all of this mankind is indebted to those people in whose heads God's fire of thought burns unquenching, we are indebted to those who seek and confirm the newest and the best, who brand and crush the reactionaries and idle talkers, no matter what their "might" under any circumstances in the fluctuations of history.

We hope that our call will be heard by those to whom we direct it. We would like to believe that "socialist humanism" is more than an empty phrase, but something possessing real humanistic content.

Karl Marx had the remarkable thought which history has proven true: "Reforms are brought to life not through the weakness of the strong but through the strength of the weak". And so it is, we do not set our hopes on the "weakness of the strong" but intend ourselves to become the strong, to defend our interests and to demand respect and fulfillment of our rights.

Here we do not consider it extraneous to mention that, in the course of the last few years, as if seizing the breath of the times, many states on all continents have announced amnesties and granted release to ideological critics and political opponents of the regimes in power. A list of these countries includes several dozen names well-known to the leaders of the USSR and to you, members of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR. And only our government, for some reason, is in the lead of those few who either deny -- despite the obvious facts -- the existence of political prisoners in their countries, or are deaf to the voices of indignant mankind.

Don't march with the reactionaries -- this is our advice to you!

Freedom to all prisoners of conscience!

Long live humanism!

December 4, 1977

Armenian Helsinki Group:

Eduard Arutyunyan
Robert Nazaryan
Shagen Arutyunyan
Ambartsum Khlgatyan

An Appeal to Armenians Abroad

Ladies and Gentlemen, Comrades! The Armenian Helsinki Group has been crushed. Robert Nazaryan and Shagen Arutyunyan are under arrest. Our apartments are searched, I am harassed. We, Armenians, are a people who have endured over the last thousand years, the most difficult ordeals of persecution, torture and genocide. We have lost a huge portion of our homeland. At the hands of fate we have been scattered throughout the world, but we have not lost our faith in truth and justice. In our country people are persecuted not only for criminal acts, but for convictions as well. Our Group undertook to monitor implementation of the Helsinki Final Act and nothing more. With its arrest of Armenian patriots, the KGB has stamped out the ideals of Armenian humanism and free-thought. The eyes of David Sasunsk have been wrapped in a shroud, the shoulders of Mchera have sunk under the weight of a cliff and he gazes with pain and hope at his people. The honor and national dignity of the Armenian people have been turned to ashes. I appeal to the memory of Vardan Mamikonyan, David the Builder, Shiranatsi, Khorenatsi, Mesron Mashtots, the Great Catholicos Airik, Andranik and to the whole Armenian people to give me their moral support for the release of all Armenian patriots who are political prisoners, in particular, my friends Robert Nazaryan and Shagen Arutyunyan.

I appeal to all political, social, economic, and cultural organizations and to the members of the four active Armenian parties abroad to send defenders, lawyers, observers for the trials, and financial assistance to the families of these political prisoners. Peace to you, Armenians.

February 8, 1978

Armenian Helsinki Group Leader:

Eduard Arutyunyan

SUPPLEMENTA Collection to Aid Political Prisoners and Their Families

In 1973-1974, 18 young Armenians, 14 of whom are now in detention, faced trial in 9 political trials behind closed doors in Erevan. The following individuals were sentenced to prison terms ranging from 2 to 10 years for their national political activity and their convictions:

1. Airikyan, Paruir Arshavirovich, born June 5, 1949, Student.
Sentence: 10 years.
2. Arakelyan, Gagik Serezhayevich, born December 12, 1955, Worker.
Sentence: 2 years.
3. Arshakyan, Azat Levikovich, born August 13, 1950, Worker.
Sentence: 10 years.
4. Badalyan, Levon Patvakanovich, born March 6, 1951, Student.
Sentence: 2 years.
5. Zograbyan, Razmik Artavazdovich, born April 1, 1950, Worker.
Sentence: 10 years.
6. Karapetyan, Anait Agvanovna, born February 20, 1952, Office Worker.
Sentence: 2 years.
7. Karapetyan, Kostan Vaganovich, born June 20, 1955, Worker.
Sentence: 2 years.
8. Markaryan, Andranik Karapetovich, born June 12, 1950, Engineer.
Sentence: 3 years.
9. Markosyan, Razmik Grigorievich, born December 21, 1950, Student.
Sentence: 6 years.
10. Martirosyan, Norik Ambartsumovich, born December 18, 1948, Teacher.
Sentence: 3 years.
11. Martirosyan, Samvel Ambartsumovich, born May 1, 1951, Worker.
Sentence: 2 years.
12. Navasardyan, Ashot Tsolakovich, born March 28, 1950, Worker.
Sentence: 9 years.
13. Saakyan, Kadzhik Varazdatovich, born January 10, 1951, Student.
Sentence: 3½ years.
14. Shakhverdyan, Bagrat Levonovich, born November 23, 1940, Engineer.
Sentence: 7 years.

Guided by the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, in accordance with the aims and principles of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe of August 1, 1975, we consider it the obligation of our thought and conscience to undertake this beneficent task.

Dear friend, Armenian, no matter in which corner of the world you live, respond to our appeal, as would a dear and close relative. Contribute to this collection. In doing so, we should not be concerned about the extent to which the paths and beliefs of the above-listed individuals are right or the extent to which they correspond with our own. These are political issues beyond the bounds of our interests here.

More important for us is the moral issue of good works, a matter not only of our conscience, but of the conscience of every respectable Armenian as well.

February 1978

In Charge of the Fund of Donations:

Deacon Robert Khachikovich Nazaryan*

Address:

Erevan - 51,
Arabkir, ul. 17, d. 9

P.S. Four Armenian political prisoners remain in camps as of May 1977:

1. Airikyan, Paruir Arshavirovich
2. Zograbyan, Razmik Artavazdovich
3. Markosyan, Razmik Grigorievich
4. Shakhverdyan, Bagrat Levonovich

Also film director Sergei Paradzhanov**

* (Nazaryan was arrested on December 23, 1977 and is still awaiting trial --Ed.)

** (Paradzhanov was released from strict regimen camp in Dnepropetrovsk oblast; he had been arrested in December 1973 and sentenced to five years--Ed.)