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Stalin did not recognize cybernetics. Yet he made a great contribution to this discipline: he invented the programmed man. Stalin is the creator of the Cog. There were cases when, after reading Solzhenitsyn's novel, people said: "One wants to hide in a corner and not show oneself in any way." It is easy to imagine how much stronger this feeling was twenty years ago, when people were eyewitnesses of mass executions and other horrors and one did not know in the evening where one would be by the morning. The desire not to be conspicuous in any way whatsoever, to press oneself into the mass, to get to look like the next person in order not to draw attention to oneself, became universal. This meant a complete levelling of individuality. At one time the separation of the individual from the mass of matter meant the birth of life, the origin of the organic world. Now the opposite process had begun: the blending of individuals into a grey mass, a return to a solid non-organic, non-individual existence. Society was overcome by the spirit of grey facelessness. It was considered a crime to be an individual. "What do you think you are—a special person?" One has had to hear this dozens of times both before and after arrest.

—Valentyn Moroz
("Report from the Beria Reservation")
This pamphlet is the fourth in a series on Soviet political prisoners issued by the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners. It is meant to serve as a resource guide to actions in defense of Soviet and East European political prisoners. It is likewise meant to serve as an introduction to the dissident movement in the USSR.

Organizing defense activities in the form of educationals, seminars, petition drives, press conferences, pickets, are all activities that can be successfully carried out by small groups of individuals. Furthermore there are many actions like letterwriting, which an individual can undertake without belonging to a larger group. All these activities are of great importance because a concerted defense effort by those of us in the West not only provides moral support to Soviet political prisoners but also exerts pressure upon the regime that is repressing them. It is hoped that this publication will lead to an intensification of activities in behalf of the men and women mentioned in its pages.

— The Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners
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INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT TO THE WESTERN PRESS

Andrei Grigorenko, the son of Soviet dissident Gen. Pyotr Grigorenko, emigrated from the Soviet Union in September, 1975. Upon reaching the West, Andrei Grigorenko released the following appeal.

First of all, I would like to express my thanks to all the people in the West who have unstintingly defended independent thinking people in the USSR. Because of their solidarity, it has been possible for many in my country to secure release from prisons, psychiatric hospitals, and labor camps.

Only public outcry prevents Soviet authorities from physically destroying all those people who allow themselves the luxury of their own thoughts, let alone their personal opinions; the luxury of not having to think and read what is prescribed, but that which they wish.

The Human Rights Movement in the USSR has thrown up a challenge to one of today's totalitarian systems. But alone, in isolation from the rest of the world, we do not envisage a successful opposition to a state apparatus that is unprecedented in its scale. Only the united effort of people of goodwill can be capable of averting the onslaught of a totalitarian psychology, no matter what face it chooses to hide behind, no matter what motto it places on its banners.

I believe that the humanity and the compassion of others will triumph in our world. And for the sake of this humanity, I would like to mention those who have been crushed by the Soviet state apparatus. We cannot, in the name of justice, forget of the occupation of the Baltic countries, of the annexation of Eastern Prussia, of the crushing of the Hungarian revolution in 1956, of the occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968, of the massive executions in Novocherkassk, Tbilisi, and other cities in the USSR in the early sixties, and of still much, much more. There, on the other side of the barbed wire which divides our world, Armenians, Jews, Crimean Tatars, Lithuanians, Meshkhide-Turks, Germans, Ukrainians, believers of various faiths, and many others, (a list of whom would take up an entire page) struggle in defense of their national and cultural rights. In the prisons, psychiatric hospitals, and labor camps of the USSR, thousands languish. I will mention, here, but a few of them:

Mustafa Dzhemilyev, against whom new accusations are being fabricated. An individual whose every effort is dedicated to the fate of his people—the Crimean Tatars, but who does not for one minute forget the cases of numerous other individuals and peoples in his defense of human rights. Dzhemilyev is a member of the Initiative Group for Human Rights in the USSR. Because he has defended the freedom of others, Dzhemilyev has paid with his own freedom—he has received three prison sentences. Today, he is awaiting a fourth sentence.
Leonid Plyushch, incarcerated in a Dnipropetrovsk psychiatric hospital. A member of the Initiative Group for Human Rights in the USSR. A man of great erudition, with a brilliant and sharp mind, whose brain the criminals in white jackets are attempting to suck dry.

Yuriy Byelov and Georgiy Paramonov, cast into the psychiatric prisons of Sichevka and Chernyakhovsk for their beliefs, without the slightest hope of ever attaining their freedom.

Vladimir Bukovsky, who exposed the illegal practice of committing perfectly sane individuals into psychiatric hospitals.

Semyon Gluzman, who exposed a falsely delivered psychiatric ruling, and paid for having fulfilled his duty as a physician with a sentence of many years imprisonment in a concentration camp.

Ivan Svitlychny, a Ukrainian patriot, a brilliant poet and humanist, incarcerated in a labor camp for political prisoners.

Aleksandr Feldman, thrown through the grate on the basis of a fabricated accusation of hooliganism. His actual crime—a desire to live in the homeland of his people, in the state of Israel.

Anrei Tverdokhlebov and Sergei Kovalev, whose only crime appears to be humanitarian activity—helping prisoners of conscience.

Anatoly Marchenko, who is exiled in Chitinska Oblast (Region), the author of a well-known book on contemporary Soviet concentration camps for political prisoners.

I appeal to everyone for whom universal human values are dear. Only the ceaseless attention of the world community can protect the individuals I’ve mentioned, help them preserve their lives, and, perhaps even, obtain their freedom. It is unimportant if, for the moment, such pressure seems insufficiently effective. In time, the Soviet authorities will fully feel its effect. That many of us have the opportunity to speak freely today is due to the pressure of world public opinion.

The world is indivisible, and the struggle for freedom is also indivisible.

September 17, 1975
— Andrei Grigorenko.
AN APPEAL FROM UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS IN THE USSR

We, a group of political prisoners from the sub-Ural concentration camp No. 36, appeal to governments of all countries, to the United Nations Organization and to all honest people to call attention to the unbearably harsh conditions of political prisoners in the USSR, and to influence the leaders of this country to change these conditions and bring them into line with the international standards laid down for holding political prisoners.

Not wishing to acknowledge the irrefutable fact that opposition to the present regime, as well as national-liberation movements of the countries within the USSR, exist, the government does not recognize the existence of political prisoners within the USSR, depriving us of our rights as provided for by our appropriate status.

We have been sent thousands of kilometers away from our families, and many have been taken outside the country they were living in until their arrest. Thus we have been deprived of the opportunity of seeing our loved ones even two or three times a year because of the expense and difficulties involved in such a long journey. Apart from this we can be deprived of visits for any reason whatsoever—all that is required is for the KGB representative to give an order.

Our mail comes under fierce censorship and incoming and outgoing mail is systematically interfered with. In fact, a non-Russian is actually forced to write in Russian. Many letters are confiscated on the grounds that their contents are “suspicious”. Many complaints and declarations are not sent away at all either because of a supposed distortion of Soviet reality or they are arbitrarily re-addressed by the administration. As a rule, our complaints receive a formal, bureaucratic and mocking answer.

We are forced to undergo degrading searches. Even our families, supposedly free citizens, have to strip naked during searches when they come to visit us.

We are forced to shave and have haircuts. We have to dress in ugly prisoners’ uniforms all exactly the same and to wear breastplates.

Our camps are out of bounds not only to representatives of foreign organizations, but also to Soviet organizations.

We are not allowed to meet with foreign correspondents, legal representatives of the International Red Cross or the UN to tell them about the conditions under which we are kept, about our convictions, about our cases (the majority of which have been fabricated), about the closed trials, and about the enormous violation of the law and our rights permitted by the judiciary organs of the USSR.

During transportation we are often mixed in with war prisoners (probably with a provocative aim) and also with criminals, this with an obvious aim.

We are harshly punished for any reason whatsoever, tormented with hunger, have physical and moral pain inflicted upon us, are taunted in all sorts of ways, deprived of even elementary citizen’s rights, and have our human dignity lowered. Through continuous victimization and unnecessary prohibitions, the guards manage to create an insufferable atmosphere, a
shocking situation, which leads many to fall gravely ill or even to commit suicide.

The whole system of so-called re-education is directed at the creation of a denaturalized, untroubled, silent and submissive slave, who obediently carries out the orders of the leadership.

Much can be said about the atrocious situation of medical supervision, about the disgusting nourishment provided by valueless food, which does not even have the protein of its animal origin and is often putrid.

The reaction to this whole system of force and violation is constant hunger strikes to which the administration responds with an increase in repressive measures. For many years now Soviet political prisoners have attempted to attain legal recognition and definition of their prison terms in accordance with the generally accepted status of political prisoners.

A group of political prisoners from the neighboring camp No. 35 (Svitlychny, Gluzman and others) were on hunger strike for over three months in support of their demands. The administration paid no attention to their protest.

The political prisoner V. Kalynychenko is threatened with being sent to a lunatic asylum because of similar demands. Thus anybody who attempts to obtain rights due to him through his status is declared psychologically abnormal.

While going into the fight for our rights, we are aware of the fact that in the first days we will be confronted by the full might of the enormous state machinery of this country, which will try not only to eradicate our beliefs, but also to destroy us. Nevertheless, we are determined to carry out our objective to the very end—to achieve the fulfillment of our valid demands.

We are neither thieves or robbers, nor gangsters, hooligans or swindlers. We are not guilty of any criminal acts. We were sentenced because of our beliefs and aims. Therefore we are convinced that our appeal for support will be answered by all honest people everywhere. We trust that in the next session of the General Assembly of the UN the question of the status of political prisoners in the USSR will be discussed.

The propaganda agencies of the USSR savagely expose other countries for the inhuman treatment of political prisoners. We believe, however, that this criticism will not draw the world’s attention away from the terrible conditions of Soviet political prisoners or from the gross violation of their rights by the Soviet government.

Yakiv Suslensky, Pavlo Kampov, Yuriy Hrodetsky, Mykola Bondar, Anatoly Zdorovyi, Vitaliy Kalynychenko, Stepan Sapelyak.
1. Work.

On the question of reporting to work, there were disagreements. Some were categorically against reporting. Others—we had to report to take a trump card away from the administration—"slacker"—on the basis of which they could deprive us of everything: throw us in [a punishment cell], transfer us to strict regimen and [actively harass us]. But though going [to work], we should actively protest in writing.

Work from the Second [7] Moscow Radio Plant. Radio parts. Norm: making up sets—3,000 pieces. Laminating—1,500 pieces. People going to work are issued an extra 100 grams of bread a day, and soap.

On December 3, 1974 four men were taken out to work from Cell 36, Wing I: A. V. Safronov, V. K. Pavlenkov, Yu. V. Vudka, and Volodya Afanasyev. About a week before that, the following were taken out to work from Cell I, Wing 10: M. Ya. Makarenko, Bobur Shakirov, Mo-Khun, and Pedan.

The workroom has ben set up on the ground floor of Wing I in one of the cells. Four lower bunks have been raised up (set against the wall). The fifth, an upper bunk, has not been moved and hangs over the table. When you’re working at the table you can bang your head on that upper bunk.

We demand:

(1) That the bunks be removed, and most important, that the upper bunk be cut off. (2) That a wooden floor be laid down (the floors in the cells are of painted concrete). (According to Article 2 of the Regulations on the Internal Regimen (PVR), Order # 20: floors are to be laid over the concrete foundation. According to the earlier [?] Order # 40, cell floors are to be covered with ceramic tile). (3) That the blinds be removed from the cells so that they receive natural illumination. (4) That special artificial illumination (bulbs providing the equivalent of daylight) be installed in the cell. (The parts are very small, and one constantly has to squint while working on them. With the poor illumination we got headaches after the very first day. The work is fraught with danger to a person’s eyesight.) (5) It is cold and damp in the cell. Although the work requires clean white clothing (white jackets are issued), we have to put pea-jackets on over them because of the cold. The temperature in the working cell ranges from fifty to fifty-four degrees. The entire Wing I of Vladimir Prison is the only one of the four wings in which the heating system was installed with gross defects: standard specifications and health regulations were violated. The radiators are located against the wall opposite the window rather than under the window. The result is that the air coming in the window fills the lower part of the space; that is, the part where the prisoners are—and they are there twenty-four hours a day. When it reaches the opposite wall, the cold air is heated, rises, and escapes outside. Thus although the radiators are in the cells, they heat the courtyard. As a result of this little "trick," the cells are constantly cold and damp. (6) We demand that one work space be eliminated. (According to the health regulations, # 100-SN, approved by the USSR Council of Ministers All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, there is supposed to be an area of four square meters per person.)
The shop superintendent has stated: "If the labor protection norms were observed, we would never fulfil the plan." The director of production is Captain Kapustin.

2. Conditions of confinement
   1. The cells lack wooden floors. (A violation of PVR, Order # 20.)
   2. Cells 1-36, 1-61, 1-69, and 1-85 lack proper mess tables. In 1-36, a five-man cell, only four can eat at the table; the fifth man must eat from the bunk. In 1-61, 1-69, and 1-85, the three-man tables are smaller than in a train. The bench at the table is so small that you can’t sit on it for long: your body gets tired from the tension, and you slide off the bench.
   3. State specifications were violated when the heating system was installed. (Cf. the "Work" section, nara. 5)
   4. Cell 1-61 has no toilet. (There is a slop-pail in the cell.)
   5. Cells 1-69 and 1-85 (corner cells on the second floor) are cold and damp. In autumn, winter, and spring the dank cold is such that you can’t keep warm even in a pea-jacket. And at night, even under two blankets and wearing two sets of underwear, you have a slight chill. . . . damp areas around the window frame and in the corners next to the walls. The temperature drops to fifty-four degrees.
   6. Unlawful restrictions on acquiring articles of prime necessity: envelopes—up to ten per month; soap—up to two bars per purchase, tooth powder, socks. Such restrictions are not specified in Order # 20 which lists the articles of prime necessity permitted to be sold in prison.
   7. Unlawful restrictions on acquiring baked goods; no more than two kilograms per purchase, twice a month. Bearing in mind that we make purchases once every two weeks, we demand established by the Ministry of Trade for normal retail outlets, be lifted as not corresponding to the conditions applying to us, or that we be allowed to purchase bakery items more often.
   8. According to Nutrition Norm # 3 (nutrition in prison under a general regimen: Order # 118 of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, 1972) a ration includes six packets of shag tobacco and three boxes of matches per person per month. If necessary, shag tobacco can be bought at the canteen. But the procurator has forbidden the sale of matches at the canteen since they are not included in the list of articles of prime necessity permitted to be sold in prisons. As a result, a person who smokes must make one box of matches last ten days. We demand that matches either be included in the list of articles of prime necessity or that their issue in the ration be increased.
   9. Concessions we have gained: a) the sale of sunflower seed oil, listed in Order # 20; b) the lifting of the unlawful prohibition against acquiring food items while on a reduced diet under strict regimen. But the administration is still unwilling to compensate for this illegal deprivation, taking into account the time spent on a reduced diet under strict regimen.
   10. Violation of Article 34 of the Corrective Labor Law (Cf. Commentary, para. 2): refusal to supply newspapers, magazines and books to punishment cells. Violation of Article 30: refusal to deliver letters to punishment cells.
   11. The prison administration has annulled the force of Article 25 of the
Corrective Labor Code: it forbids the purchase of notebooks and refills for ball-point pens (this is permitted only to students), and prohibits buying them via "mail order." Recently, we ostensibly obtained permission to buy them by "mail order." But there is reason to fear that orders for them will be intercepted by the administration, since it forbids sending them by registered mail.

12. Books. The commentary on the relevant article of the Corrective Labor Code states that prisoners are entitled to have five books in their possession. This limit excludes textbooks, reference books, and books used for correspondence. But the administration includes dictionaries, etc., in the number of books allowed.

13. The administration opens sealed packets containing complaints addressed to the procurator (a violation of Article 36 of the Corrective Labor Code).

14. The prison administration: a) does not issue receipts for registered letters addressed to relatives; b) refuses to send by registered mail (fee paid by the prisoners) statements and complaints to higher authorities, or orders for books and magazines; c) does not forward "return receipt requested" slips. Either the latter are simply torn off and thrown away or the letter is returned to the prisoner. This makes it possible for the administration not to forward statements (if it considers this advantageous).

15. The prison administration regularly confiscates complaints and statements under contrived—and often patently false—pretexts. Thus on January 16, 1975 it confiscated the complaints which, on January 12, 1975, Butman and Davydov had addressed to Timakov (chairman of the Public Health Commission of the USSR Council of Nationalities) on the subject of Valentyn Moroz's health. The reason given for the confiscation was that the complaints were not written by Moroz himself! Complaints have also been confiscated because the phrase "political prisoner" was used, this being considered an inadmissible expression. Under similar pretexts, letters are confiscated (for any reason: "because of the content" or "prearranged codes"), and prisoners are deprived of visits.

The inmates of Cell 1-36, Lyubarsky, Vudka, Safronov, and Afanasyev—went on hunger strike from January 27 to February 7, 1975. The reasons: the systematic confiscation of letters under contrived pretexts; unlawful restrictions on books; the demand that Afanasyev be allowed to complete his secondary education (he has completed only six grades), etc. The hunger strike continued for twelve days. On the ninth day, Lyubarsky was taken to the hospital. On the eleventh day they began force-feeding the others through a thick tube, saying they didn't have any other, although the gastric juices are collected with a thin tube.

The hunger strike was broken off, since representatives of higher authorities who had come to the prison because of it, promised to meet the strikers' demands. (On the basis of their statements, Lyubarsky's demands were satisfied, and he too broke off his strike.)

And in fact, letters did start to be delivered, and they aren't giving us trouble about books. But they are still stalling on Afanasyev's education, putting him off with books.
3. The political prisoners


All twenty-five are under strict regimen.

Most of our “striped ones” (prisoners from special regimen camps) are confined in 3-53. They work.

Valentyn Moroz was in Wing 2 with Oppelfeld (?). who is half-mad (?). According to Captain Dmitriev, Moroz demanded that he be confined separately, and after confinement in a punishment cell (fifteen days) he achieved this. He is ready to put up with the cold and damp (Cell 1-85) since in any case he is alone, and it will soon be summer.

According to rumors, few of the “striped ones” are ours [political prisoners]. Although they are from our camps, most of them are common criminals.

The Jews are confined separately from one another. They protest against this discrimination, demanding they be kept at least in pairs, so that they can use their mother tongue.

On December 19, 1974 Lukyanenko was taken to Rybinsk to the lunatic asylum. He spent two months there, and returned classified as an invalid of the second category. According to unconfirmed information, prior to being sent to the lunatic asylum he was in the same cell with Bukovsky, Serhiyenko,
and Chernoglaz (4-38). According to further unconfirmed information, before his transfer Lukyanenko was called into see Obrubov (KGB). It was proposed that he request a pardon, and recant his views. He refused, after which he was taken to Rybinsk.

Gladko is in the hospital with an ulcer (?). There Captain Dmitriev told him: "Stop filing complaints or you'll be put in the hands of the psychiatrist."

We protest: against psychiatric blackmail and its use as a method of "re-educating" dissenters.

Ivan Nikolayevich Pokrovsky was born in 1921. In 1944-45, he was confined in German labor camps. In 1945 he was liberated by the English and repatriated to the Soviet Union. In 1949 he was arrested and, under articles 54-1a, 54-10, and 54-11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, sentenced to twenty-five years. In December 1974 he was released from Camp 36 (Perm Oblast). He has fallen ill and needs help. Address: Poltava Oblast, g. Gorodnya, Tuberculosis Clinic.

Those who are corresponding with Mikhail (Ira Kaplun and others) are requested systematically to send large quantities of envelopes, stamps, and "return receipt requested" forms. He has run out of money, and he doesn’t want to take any from his wife.

Mikhail was released from the camp prison on September 5, 1974. A few days later he was taken to the hospital in Camp 35 with a hernia. He fell into the clutches of the Most Holy KGB (Afanasov, Ivkin, Kromber). They told him they knew what he was up to in the camp; that the joint action in late June was his work. They proposed that he tell about his activities and renounce them, in which case they would take him to the hospital for an operation. If not, they would institute proceedings under Article 70, Section 2. In late August, to this end, the investigator from Perm declared that he had familiarized himself with Mikhail's personal file; that many of his statements were slanderous; and that on the whole he (the investigator) discerned in M.'s activities the aim of subversion and undermining (on which he drew up a report). Mikhail refused to do what was proposed, and they took him to court in Chusovoi, where he was sentenced to prison for the rest of his term.

On October 1974, Oleg Vorobyev was in the hospital (deficient stomach acidity). For his and Melikyan's demand that the prison regimen be discontinued in the hospital, both were returned to the 36th compound. As soon as they got there, they were put into a punishment cell for ten days.

As before, we are observing September 5th as a day commemorating those who have suffered in Soviet concentration camps.
STATEMENT

To: The Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (Copy to the United Nations)
From: Baltic, Ukrainian and Caucasian prisoners in Mordovian concentration camps

The Constitution of the USSR guarantees the sovereignty of the national Union republics and provides for several basic regulations guaranteeing their sovereignty.

According to the regulations of the Constitution, the supreme power and the local government belong fully and indivisibly to the sovets (councils. Ed.) of representatives of the working people—democratic, elected, and public organs—while the Supreme Soviet of the USSR theoretically adheres to the principle that equals do not subject equals to their power. Contrary to the Constitution, the CP of the Soviet Union has become a sovereign government. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, having abused the regulations of the Constitution about the right to exercise an influence on all the governmental organs through its party units within them, has forcibly created a situation which goes far beyond an internal influence on the course of the state's policy, but actually amounts to the transfer of governmental power from the elected democratic institutions to the purely political organs, in concrete terms—to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR.

The organizational structure of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, that provides for strict subordination of the Communist units of the Union republics (units practicing locally the same usurpation of power from the elected organs) to the Center, makes the state sovereignty of those republics null and void. Moreover, in a situation where the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Central Committee are identical with the Communist organization of the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic and simultaneously act as the supreme institution vis-a-vis the Central Committees of the other Union republics, then the latter are practically downgraded to the level of obkoms (regional committees) of the Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic.

In its Party documents, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union proclaims as its goal the creation of a new Soviet nation and the raising of a new man. In advertising the pseudonational assertion that the fusion of nations is a natural and inevitable process, the Communists assert that they are merely regulating that process.

With the monopoly of power in its hands, the Central Committee of the Communist Party transforms its own goals into a state policy and uses the entire weight of the state machinery for carrying it out, while branding any disagreement with it or resistance against it a crime against the state.

As regards the individual, the policy of raising a new Soviet man is carried out through the widespread and all-encompassing system of persuasion, spying and compulsion, directed toward a total standardization of thinking and world views. Guided by their utilitarian goal of strengthening the monolithic character of the government as well as their own power, the
Communists are inculcating their materialistic ideology, their social ideology, and blind obedience to the party’s authority with a boundless intolerance, while pretending to be the only holder of a “genuine truth” and to an enormous degree elevating their own party above the entire remaining nation.

In the sphere of international relations, the Communist policy is geared toward the fusion of the non-Russian nationalities with the Russian nation. The creation of the new Soviet nation which they advertise turns out to be in practice nothing but the old policy of Russification. It is true that this policy is now carried out less crudely and cruelly than in the prewar and the first postwar years, when masses of non-Russian population, and even entire nations, were forcibly deported to remote regions of the RSFSR where, dispersed among the Russian inhabitants and torn away from their national soil, they were assimilated and have quantitatively supplemented the Russian nation. The empty regions resulting from the forcible deportation of the inhabitants were settled with Russian colonists who alone in the Soviet Union have the right to cultural autonomy beyond their administrative boundaries (Russian schools, publishing houses, theaters, etc. in the territories of all Union republics) and are therefore not inclined to assimilate themselves with the local population but, on the contrary, exert a powerful Russifying influence on them. The intensified economic buildup in the border national areas today is connected with the sending of a multinational labor force to these areas. Faced with the choice between the local and the Russian language, as a result of the Russification of the industry and its management, this labor force chooses the Russian language, thus sizeably augmenting the Russian-speaking population of the national republic and becoming a new and powerful factor of Russification of these areas. The Russification of industry, of the VUZ’s (higher educational establishments) and technical schools often compels the native inhabitants to give priority to the Russian language.

The same situation can be observed in the key industrial plants (the so-called all-Union dependence plants) which, although situated on the territories of the national union and autonomous republics, are not under their control.

The Russian language has illegally become the state language in the territories of national Union and autonomous republics, acquiring a privileged status as a result.

Having arbitrarily appointed itself a mediator in the cultural, spiritual, and economic relations between the nationalities of the Soviet Union and in their relations with the rest of the world, the Russian language is enjoying the privileges of a spiritual banker, amassing values it has not created and simultaneously acting as a filter which allows to pass into international life only those things that are in accordance with Russia’s interests.

Through the system of state schools, the young generation is compelled to glorify Russia and all things Russian in all kinds of ways. The history of the USSR taught in schools is factually nothing else but the history of the Russian empire—the key historical role in it is accorded to Russia and to the Russian nation, while other nations figure only in the light of Russia’s state interests. In the unusually condensed courses of the histories of the Union republics, only recently allowed to be taught in the schools of the national Union republics, the facts of history are also distorted and onesided. The
Russian conquest of the neighboring states and nations as well as their incorporation into the structure of the Russian empire is always presented as a source of great happiness to them. The freedom fight of the non-Russian nations against the Russian empire is either passed away in complete silence or depicted as reactionary conservative movements. Today, too, any movement promoting national self-determination is branded as bourgeois nationalism and cruelly persecuted by the state punitive organs.

It is typical that in the Soviet places of detention where political opponents are imprisoned one finds no Russian nationals who had fought for the separation of Russia from the USSR, while individuals of many other nationalities, which organized movements for their separation from Russia, are amply represented there.

Convinced that the most favorable soil for man's spiritual growth is an indivisible nation, developing universally, an equal among equals, we protest against the Communist attempts to change the national foundations of society by purely social ones. This cannot be justified either by economic achievements, or by the interests of state security, because only the nation's indivisibility, its native tongue and traditions guarantee the continuity and progress of spiritual culture—that highest striving of man. The conscious effort by the Communists to destroy these natural institutions and to replace them with abstract, fabricated constructions promises tragic results.

Vitaly interested not only in the physical survival and in the economic wellbeing of our nations, we demand a strict adherence to the regulations of our Constitution, guaranteeing a future for our nations, namely:

1. Obligatory status of state languages for the national tongues in the national and autonomous republics.

2. Granting and embodying the right of cultural autonomy to all national minorities outside their administrative borders, or the cancellation of the exclusive privilege to that right now enjoyed by the Russians.

3. Broadening of the sovereign rights of the Union republics to enjoy direct relations with the rest of the world in the cultural, political and economic areas.

4. Formation of military units of the republics, as provided in para. 18 of the Constitution of the USSR.

5. Transfer to the full control of the Union and autonomous republics of all the industrial plants in their territories, as well as of the exploitation of natural resources existing in the national territories. Organization of inter-republic relations on the basis of equality.

6. Restoration of full power to the constitutional organs, i.e. to the soviets of the representatives of the working people. State separation of governmental power from the party influence, establishment of control over the activity of the Communist Party of the USSR.

7. The policy of the governments of the Union and autonomous republics must be in genuine accord with their national interests. To defend their national interests, citizens of each nationality must have the opportunity to use the right granted them by para. 125 of the Constitution of the USSR.

8. The failure to observe the norms and the regulations of the Constitution, guaranteeing sovereignty and equality to the nationalities, as well as the policy of the ruling party endangering the very existence of our nations gives
us the moral justification to make use of the right granted by the Constitution (para. 17 of the Constitution of the USSR) to conduct propaganda in favor of our republics leaving the USSR. Our activity, according to the above mentioned regulations of the Constitution, should not be punishable.

STATEMENT

To the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Comrade N.V. Podgorny

Vyacheslav Maksymovych Chornovil, a journalist by profession, was born January 1, 1938 in Cherkassy province of the Ukrainian S.S.R. After graduating from the Faculty of Journalism at the University of Kiev in 1960, he worked as an editor in the Lviv television studio and on the editorial staffs of several publications. He was also formerly a member of the Komsomol (Young Communist League).

Chornovil's first encounter with KGB authorities came in 1966 when he was sentenced to three months at hard labor for refusing to testify at a Lviv trial of four Ukrainian dissidents on the grounds that the trial proceedings were closed. Chornovil is best known for writing The Chornovil Papers published by McGraw-Hill, 1969, an expose of judicial violations perpetrated by the KGB in the trials of 30 Ukrainian intellectuals arrested in 1965.

Chornovil was rearrested on January 13, 1972 during a wave of arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals and dissidents by the KGB. He was sentenced the following year on April 12, 1973 to seven years hard labor and five years exile, on charges of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda under article 62 of the Ukrainian S.S.R. criminal code. He was transported to a Mordovian Labor Camp. His present address is 5110/1 Moskva, Mordovskaya A.S.S.R., P. Ya. Zh. Kh. 385/19.

For the last ten years my status in Soviet society has been determined not by my educational level, abilities or aspirations, but by the dictates of the KGB. For my attempts to hold my own opinions on a number of aspects of Soviet life and to express these opinions openly I have been deprived of everything: the opportunity to work in my field and to publish, the inviolability of my private life, and protection from slander. Ultimately, I was deprived of my freedom for a period of many years.

The organs of repression have assigned to me (as well as to a whole group of members of the Ukrainian intelligentsia) a role of their own invention—the role of "material" evidence of the validity of the dubious theory that ideological struggle and ideological diversion are becoming more intense in the period of detente in international relations (this theory can be regarded as the modern version of the Stalinist thesis on the intensification of the class struggle in proportion to [our] approach to communism, which served as a creative platform for the mass repressions of the 30s and 40s.)

Not only did the KGB resort to a thoroughly fantastic interpretation of existing facts in its concoction of my "case", but it did not hesitate to indulge in outright fabrication of a considerable portion of the "charges". During the "investigation" of my case, the procurator and the court proved to be the obedient instruments of the KGB, thereby giving further proof of the relativity of Soviet law and the impossibility of relying on them. My arrest and trial were accompanied by harassment of my family and friends, and even my children, and this harassment still continues.
In the conditions that currently prevail in Ukraine, having once been placed on the KGB’s black list means that I will remain a target of repression for the rest of my life if I refuse to become a moral monster, an eventuality I absolutely reject.

And so there is no guarantee that after the completion of my long term of imprisonment the KGB will not fabricate another “case” and imprison me for a third time behind barbed wire.

And so there is no guarantee that I will not be pronounced insane (such threats have already been made) and locked up for the rest of my life in “Ward No. 6” as was done to M. Plakhotnyuk, V. Ruban and a number of other Ukrainians.

And so there is no guarantee that in order to settle accounts with me they will not imprison someone close to me, for such attempts have already been made with respect to my wife and my sister.

And so, finally, there is no guarantee that I will not be physically destroyed or deliberately crippled. For only such intentions can justify the scene of brutal sadism arranged by the Lviv KGB on February 11 of this year when in addition to being forced on a long and difficult journey in a state of health which should have precluded transporting, I was tortured: debilitated by a hunger strike and ill, I was put in irons and then held, naked and barefoot, for more than three hours in the freezing cold.

Having no wish to remain a victim of the KGB for the rest of my life and vegetate in conditions in which fundamental human rights and my very life are under constant threat, I ask the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet to relieve me of my Soviet citizenship and after my release to grant me permission to leave the USSR. Taking into account existing precedents, I will not object to being released before my term is up and expelled from the USSR.

At the same time, not wishing to sever my spiritual ties with my homeland, without which I cannot imagine my existence, in the event of my official change of citizenship, I will continue to consider myself also a citizen of Ukraine, where I will return when Ukrainian patriotism is no longer regarded as a crime and is removed from the “protection” of the KGB.

Irrespective of your reply, from the moment of the submission of this statement, that is, from March 1, 1975, I cease to consider myself a citizen of the USSR. Until the time that I am granted (in person or in absentia) citizenship by any democratic country of the world, I will regard myself as a person without official citizenship with all the consequences that this decision entails.

I am forwarding a copy of this statement to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR.

March 1, 1975

V. Chornovil

Simultaneously, I sent a statement to the office of the Procuracy informing them that from March 1, “I consider myself to be a person who is being forcibly held in the USSR”, as well as that “I refuse all contact with the KGB (conversations and such), because I consider the KGB to be an immoral and antisocial organization.” Shortly after this, I was summoned by the camp’s KGB representative, Lt. Zuyko. His comment regarding my refusal to speak
with him was as follows: "I’ve had others who refused to talk, but the things I said to them made them speak up immediately. The same will happen in your case." The future will show how this threat is carried out in practice. In the meantime, I have petitioned the Canadian Government to grant me Canadian citizenship and to intercede on behalf of my release and exit from the USSR. I sent my appeal to the Canadian Embassy in Moscow, but I am certain that the administration [of the camp] has not forwarded it.
Danylo Shumuk was an active member of the Communist Party of Western Ukraine in the 1930's. In 1935 he was arrested by the Polish authorities and sentenced to 8 years' imprisonment. During the war, Shumuk served in the Red Army and because of his disenchantment with the Soviet reality he joined the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. He was captured in 1945 and until 1967, was at liberty only two years. In 1972 Shumuk was arrested for the fourth time and sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment and 5 years' exile for anti-Soviet activities. The excerpt that follows is from Shumuk's memoirs, which were published in 1974 by Smoloskyp publishers.

... The KGB, procuracy and courts were, it would seem, created ... in order to protect the people and the state, but for some reason these organs, instead of executing their vocation publicly, in the sight of the people, are very careful to conceal their work from the very people which they supposedly protect. I was first tried in Poland in 1935 for being active in the communist underground. In the Soviet Union, however, I have already been tried twice for anticommunist activity, so, logically speaking, it is not the KGB, procuracy or court, but I who should fear a public examination of my case. But, unfortunately, everything is done backwards in our country. Lack of logic is taken for logic and that is why the so-called protectors of the people's interests conceal their defense work, as if it were the greatest of secrets, from the very people which they supposedly protect. But I, for example, from whom the people are being protected, am not afraid of my people and feel no shame before them. Quite the contrary, I feel impelled to disclose my activity, the reasons for it and my thoughts before all the people and all of humanity. Which is why, after having already been imprisoned for 27 years in Poland, in a German POW camp, and in Russia, I shall very probably have to live out my life in harsh captivity. I do this consciously...

Why is it that, compared to the size of their respective populations, there are so many fewer political trials of Russians in Russia, Romanians in Romania, and Poles in Poland, than of Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians? And even when they are so tried, it is not for nationalism. Nationalism is born of the subjugation of one people by another, whatever the form—whether as a direct and open occupation, or as an "older brother", "guardian", or "protector."

Let Ukraine have the exact same social and socio-political order as Russia, but let it live a separate state life, at least like Poland, and then here too there would be no nationalism. As long as Ukraine does not have its own economy, its own state bank, its own army and its own higher and secondary special educational institutions [with instruction] in its native language, so long will nationalists remain in Ukraine. I do not want a bourgeois order in Ukraine, I want democracy and independence. I regard the Russians as a fraternal Slavic people and I would like to live fraternally with them, but I cannot consider myself a "lesser brother". Such an attitude is insulting to my personal and national dignity...
FROM: AN INTERVIEW WITH POLITICAL PRISONERS IN PERM CAMP NO. 35

The following is an excerpt from a samizdat document, entitled, "An Interview with Political Prisoners in Perm Camp No. 35." The document reached the West in the Winter of 1975. Its full text appears in the Fall 1975 issue of Survey, translated by Adrian Karatnycky.

The interview was conducted in a labor camp for Soviet political prisoners in the Perm region of the Urals. The participants included political prisoners of various nationalities. Those who participated in the excerpt printed below are Ivan Svitlychny, a Ukrainian literary critic from Kiev, who was sentenced in 1972 to 7 years imprisonment and five years exile for anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda; Ihor Kalynets, a Ukrainian poet sentenced to 6 years' imprisonment and 3 years' exile; Ivan Kandyba, a Lawyer from Lviv, Ukrainian SSR, sentenced in 1961 to 15 years' imprisonment for anti-Soviet agitation; and Semyon Gluzman, a Jewish psychiatrist sentenced to 7 years' imprisonment and 3 years' exile.

The interview begins with the claim that political prisoners in Chile have an "opportunity to meet with the press . . . and to answer any questions they are asked." This, in fact, is not the policy being pursued by the Pinochet regime. That such a belief might be held by the prisoners in Perm Camp No. 35 is best explained by Semyon Gluzman's statement that "spurious information often makes its way in the closed universe of the camp.

As we know, Chilean political prisoners have the opportunity to meet with representatives of the press, even with the foreign press, and to answer any questions they are asked.

Soviet prisoners are deprived of this opportunity. They are totally isolated from the outside world. Nonetheless, in spite of these great difficulties, we were able to transmit a series of questions to the labor camp near Vsesvyatskaya. And the individual who received them conducted an interview with several political prisoners. Our first question, naturally, dealt with the very fact of isolation, the methods through which it is realized, and the underlying reasons for its implementation.

IVAN SVITLYCHNY: The administration of the camp really does strive toward the most total isolation that is possible. All direct contacts with the outside world are realized through two general meetings and one private meeting per year. These meetings can only be held with one's closest relatives. A prisoner can be deprived of all these meetings as a result of administrative decision, and the cause for such a decision can be anything that is found to be convenient. In my case, for example, in 1974, I was denied two general meetings, once because I was sitting on my bed (such an infraction had not been foreseen in the regulations), the other time because several poems which had been taken from me were not appreciated.

A general meeting, if it is granted, lasts from one to four hours. It is always held in the presence of a supervisor, who insures that the conversations do not extend beyond the bounds of sanctioned topics, that they do not touch on politics, conditions of camp life, and so forth. Personal meetings take place in quarters specially equipped with eavesdropping...
devices. Naturally, there can be no objects brought to such meetings, and it is forbidden to make use of papers, pens, etc. One can judge how total the isolation of political prisoners is from the fact that even the overseers, individuals specially selected and carefully trained, are not allowed to converse with the political prisoners. And representatives of the prison administration carefully assess all permissible topics of discussion.

Another method of exchange with the outside world, correspondence, is subject to the strictest type of censorship. It is forbidden to write about the circumstances of camp life, to name one's fellow political prisoners, to speak of the poor state of one's health. It is even impossible to simply describe nature and the weather.

The same strict form of censorship is also applied to incoming mail. Censorship, as a rule, does not burden itself with the necessity of seriously debating the confiscation of letters... For this, it is enough to mention that a letter contains some sort of expression or information that is not based on official announcements, that a letter is of suspicious content, or that it contains "distortions of international reality." To what extent this practice is arbitrary can be judged from the fact that I. KALYNETS and I had letters from our families confiscated in the Mordovian political prisoner camp, and that those letters which the Mordovian censors had passed were found to be seditious by the Ural censors, and vice versa. In addition to this, the censors in one or another camp can react totally differently at any given moment. Toward the end of 1973, I had a letter to my wife confiscated. After that, I decided to conduct a simple experiment: I wrote the same kind of letter a second time, adding only the mention of the confiscation of my previous letter. And this letter, the second, passed the censors. Even at this very moment I don't know what that indicates. Either the letters were reviewed by different individuals or everything depended on the disposition of one or another person... And I'd like to add just one last thing. Worst of all is the fact that correspondence is placed in the hands of the camp administration, and thus, in the event of confiscation, it becomes impossible to appeal to anyone higher up. Confiscated letters are destroyed and a review of the grounds for confiscation becomes impossible.

QUESTION: Why is such strict isolation called for?

I. KALYNETS: To me, it seems obvious that this is done solely for the purpose of covering up the facts and the reality which violate international law and moral standards as well as the articles of the Soviet Constitution. To give an example, I was tried solely for my literary output, never having harbored any anti-Soviet inclinations, nor possessing to a greater or lesser degree a tangible socio-political temperament. It's silly, then, to say that my "case" involved some sort of state or war secrets. In spite of this my trial was held in camera; even my closest relatives weren't allowed to attend. This is understandable. There could be no real case of "extremely dangerous anti-state crimes" based on several not-at-all political poems. And knowledge of this could have even shocked a Soviet public which is used to just about everything.

Attempts are naturally made to keep transcripts of all similar cases in the strictest cloak of secrecy that is possible. And in many cases, again in contradiction of existing legal procedures, even copies of the verdicts are not
issued. Clearly, this is possible only within the context of a total isolation of prisoners.

In addition, the camp administration keeps all conventional "criminals" in inhuman conditions. They are maintained on a semi-starvation diet, exhausted by cold, tired by hard work. Their human dignity is constantly degraded. If all this became common knowledge, such conditions couldn't exist outside the law.

The authorities are interested in covering up the truth, and this is only possible within the context of the strict isolation of the subjects of this barbarian experiment.

Such are the "cases" of V. STUS, E. SVERSTYUK, M. OSADCHY, and many others.

A.M. HORBAL was sentenced to 5 years camp and 2 years exile for a single poem, "DUMA."

QUESTION: What can you say about the actual status of political prisoners in the U.S.S.R.?

IVAN KANDYBA: It is well known that in the USSR the authorities usually deny the existence of political prisoners, and we are forbidden to call ourselves political. This tradition stems from Tsarist Russia. Only then, political prisoners were called "enemies of the state." Now they have also added the term "extremely dangerous."

Another difference here is that in the USSR "extremely dangerous enemies of the state" are far more numerous than in Tsarist Russia, and the authorities treat them far more viciously.

The status of political prisoners in the USSR has one important peculiarity. If one maintains that the Constitution in the USSR manifests itself as the fundamental law, then the majority of those who are referred to as political prisoners, convicted of violating the Constitution, are held unlawfully; they were only attempting to make use of their constitutionally guaranteed rights. In the strict sense of the word, to call these people political prisoners is truly difficult. Nonetheless, the criminal code is also operable, categorizing as it does exercise of rights guaranteed by the Constitution as crimes, and calling people who dare to make use of their rights "extremely dangerous enemies of the state."

Thus, even the political prisoners assess themselves and their situations variably. Those who take the Constitution into account consider themselves innocent while those who base themselves on the criminal code admit their blame. The status of political prisoners in the USSR, in this case, is paradoxical from the very beginning.

LEV YAGMAN: In addition to the dichotomy which we discern between the written constitution and the actual code, a dichotomy also exists between the statutes of the CL Code (Corrective Labor Code) and the actual rights enjoyed by prisoners.

I'll try to give you several examples of this. In the preamble to the CL Code, it is stated that the serving of a sentence is not supposed to cause physical or mental suffering.

But then how is one to understand the practice of transferring political prisoners into the PKT (camp prison) for terms of up to six months, where one is maintained on the infamous category 9 diet. Surely, this is a well
thought out means of ruining the health of an individual. You can just imagine what it means for a prisoner to be maintained on a lower level of nourishment when, according to even the testimony of camp physicians (employees of the KGB), the normal camp diet during the course of several years, as a rule, causes intestinal disorders.

Can there be any mention of the avoidance of mental suffering, when religious believers are forced to shave their beards, and those who refuse, are tied down and forcibly shaved; when it is impossible to receive religious literature in the camp; when what is sanctioned by lists is confiscated during searches; when hindrances are placed in the way of religious observances and holidays; when work is assigned on Sundays, and those who refuse are punished?

The question of correspondence long ago became the source for ridicule.

In article 30 of the CL Code, it is stated that letters are supposed to enter and leave the camps at three day intervals. But the administration and the representatives of the KGB tell us we should be happy if letters are received or sent at all, and that to speak of the intervals in which they come and go is superfluous. Letters in Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Armenian, and other languages, take months to arrive. Letters from abroad, written in English and Hebrew take several months to be delivered; it takes 10-15 days for them to reach Moscow, and then from 1½ to 2 months to arrive in the camp. "We have no translators" is the answer to all our inquiries. Then why is it that letters from abroad that are written in Russian take a month and a half to be delivered? And what happens to scores of other letters? We haven’t been given an answer to these questions in several years. Clearly the mythical institution no. 5110 in Moscow, through which letters from abroad pass, is an entity which is not even subject to control by the administrative organs of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

In the CL Code, it is stated that prisoners are to be assigned to work on the basis of their capabilities, and when possible in the area of their specialty. Nonetheless, the practice in the camps indicates that everything possible is done to prevent prisoners from working in the area of their specialty; this at a time when there, as a rule, is a need for specialists. Engineers work as unskilled laborers, physicians as stokers, philologists as lathe-operators, etc.

IVAN KANDYBA: Non-Russian political prisoners suffer an abridgement of rights in additional ways. They are taken out of their republics, into foreign countries, and kept in an environment with an extremely severe climate.

Their relatives often cannot visit them if even for the meetings that they are entitled to.

Not only do the political prisoners suffer from this, but so do their relatives. Under such circumstances families frequently break up. The authorities are interested in breaking up families and they do this consciously; later stating that such break-ups occur as a result of political differences. Political prisoners who are non-Russian are forced to converse with camp administrators exclusively in Russian. And both incoming and outgoing letters are held up for the reason that they are not written in Russian. It is forbidden to speak in one's native tongue even with relatives during public visits. The numerous pleas and petitions requesting that political prisoners be allowed to remain within their native republics are denied.
LEV YAGMAN: It's interesting that in all cases where the law gives the administration some leeway, the administration always decides against the interests of the political prisoner. If long meetings are scheduled to last one to 3 days, and short meetings 1 to 4 hours, there is practically no chance of being given the maximum. If the law does not specifically ensure the right to rest during the daytime or to smoke in specially designated areas, then the administration does not allow it. It's curious that to this day it is forbidden to take a break from work—there is no mention of that in the regulations.

IVAN KANDYBA: In such circumstances, words concerning the unacceptability of physical and moral suffering become so much empty rhetoric, and the whole system maintains itself because political prisoners endure the various means and methods that cause physical and mental anguish. It is in this way that the system attempts to achieve its ends...

SEMYON GLUZMAN: Political prisoners who are especially active become the subjects of reports concerning their violations. They are often punished, never allowed to do easy work, and denied visiting rights. The chastisers not only benefit from all the rights granted the zek, but they are also allowed a greater number of visits and packages, and are hospitalized for even the slightest illness. The same also applies to informers and members of the "amateur" organizations (the SKK and SVV).

Spurious information often makes its way into the closed universe of the camp, usually it enters by way of the informers and serves one or another of the administration's purposes. Sometimes the information is chauvinistic in nature, and has as its goal the fragmenting of groups, especially the groups of younger prisoners (the principle of divide and conquer).

On the whole, I would like to say that it is here in the camp that I, for the first time, have seen an internationalism of deeds and not of words; first of all among those who are called "bourgeois nationalists". And this in spite of the numerous and already traditional attempts by the KGB and the MVD to cause dissension among political prisoners of different nationalities.
1-12, cells.
13, punishment isolation ward
14, the censor.
15, the head of the zone.
16, K.G.B. officer.
17, Head of guard.

18, medical aid unit.
19, storehouse, camp's shop, Library, barbershop, work detail unit.
20, guards' room.
21, hospital isolation ward.
22, dish washing room.
23, workshop (14 m. x 12 m. x 3.2 m) with grinding machines.
24, walking yards & toilets.
25, bath.
26, washroom.
Shalom, haverim!

"Progress to Communism foresees the education of conscientious and highly educated people capable of both physical and mental labour"—from the Programme of the CPSU. (Slogan in the institution ZH KH 385–19).

I would have gladly written to each one of you but you know that this is impossible. It so happens that I can only write to all of you together. You have been free for a long time, you are now at home, your heads are full of your new lives and you have, possibly, forgotten many things. Yet, a part of you is still here with us: your boots and overcoats which we continue to wear, some of your things—all this reminds us of you. It seems to me that you left only yesterday and that those who came here recently, who did not know you, were here a long time. Bogulavsky left on July 2 1973; he was the last of you in this zone. It is now Tolik’s turn and then Boris’s. I was lucky enough to meet you all and I will most probably have to see you all leave. I will be left all alone with the Soviet regime. A sad exception, although a slogan hanging in the zone sounds somewhat encouraging:

"The Soviet regime does not take revenge upon the criminal but, in fact, reforms him and opens before him the victorious meaning of work, the meaning of social life, the noble aim of socialism which is growing in order to create a new world."

Victor’s farewell party was very short because of the hurry and surprise with which he was sent off to Piter. I assume that he told you about it and about everything that happened here during his stay. I will start my letter at the point where he left and will continue the story—"the chronicle of events in our life".

August ’73 was an unlucky month for us. There was a major failure of an attempt to smuggle out a letter to the Committee for the Defense of Human Rights in Moscow. The letter was signed by a large number of people and, naturally, the KGB knew about it. A day before his release Ivar Zhukovsky went through a “shmon” at the watch post and the letter was found in the heel of his boot. Ivar was released the next day—already from the “shizo”—and we saw him only briefly from behind the fence. It became known that he had many troubles later. The circumstances of the failure are still unclear to us. Only the role of F. Klimenko and another person about whom I will tell later became clear in August. We saw by chance a denunciation written by Klimenko to the KGB in which he both stated facts and gave his evaluations of some of us. The boys intended to have a talk with him in the next few days, but he managed to slip out of it: surprisingly for all of us he was pardoned on September 12—six months before the end of his term. Repres-
sions followed this failure. Lubarsky was harassed in the hospital (an investigation is on the way here in his absence), then brought to the zone and immediately afterwards, on August 18, he was sent to the PKT for six months. Pashilis, Shakirov and Budulak-Sharigin were sent to the BUR after Lubarsky. The last two were sent to Vladimir for three years a couple of months later.

Aleksandr Romanov came back from Vladimir on September 7. He was taken away from this zone on August 30; I would have told you about it, but the censor would not let me.

Sanya also brought a present from Vladimir: a song written by the Ukrainian poet Sokulsky. Some of us perhaps remember him: he was imprisoned in 1969 and got four-and-a-half years for the appeal sent in the name of the artistic youth of Dnipropetrovsk, and for three poems which were judged as anti-Soviet and which he was charged with having written. Sokulsky was sent from the camp to Vladimir for the rest of his term.

Common Song
There is no better prison in the world than the “special” one—
Here we prosper in freedom and breathe freely.
Say: common regulations, common regime.

There is a common order, a common law in the beautiful common home.
If you are looking for truth—look for it
In the common soup and the common gruel.

We hate the itch of money-grubbing,
We are guaranteed the right to work,
We don’t know the words “Mine” and “Yours”
And everything we have belongs to all, even the underclothes.
So, you who did not yet get used to it, get used to it soon:
Common Motherland, common language.
We sang you all together, we, the common ones,
The common song of the special prison.

"Think well! Have you done everything in order to review your convictions and to improve your citizen's qualifications"—(a slogan from the library in the institution ZH KH 385–19).

October passed under the sign of the war. A tangle of nerves. No information except for the few and ghastly reports of the Arab news agencies in Soviet interpretation. It was absolutely impossible to learn anything definite. The letters from Israel were not let through. We demanded to receive them, but Statsenko 14 said laughing: "What do you need them for? Perhaps Israel does not exist anymore?"

The knowledge of the special character of the Soviet radio and papers did not help much. We read and listened to everything, but the real picture we received much later. Only then did we breathe freely.

On November 3 the administration decided to play a joke on us. The timing of the joke was very suitable. The November celebrations were coming near and it is known that they have a custom of taking away the "unreliable ones" to some kind of isolation in such cases. In the morning we were told: "You are leaving with a transport. Come to the watch post with your belongings". At the watch post we went through a thorough "shmon". Both of the "opers" 15 were present as well as the DPNK 16 and Velmakin himself. I took along our "reserved funds": two tins of preserves and sugar, and they were taken away after the search. Two hours later we were told: "There will be no transport today, go back to the zone. We are taking away the food. You are not allowed to keep it". The joke is 56 years old, but we fell for it like kids.

"Soviet laws are quite strict in relation to criminals, but they are very humane as they defend people from anti-social deeds" (slogan at the entrance to zone of inst. ZH KH 385–19).

December 4. On this day, the anniversary of the death of Yu. Galanskov who was tormented in the camps, the boys expressed their protests. The answer of the Procurator of Institute ZH KH 385, Ganiev, to one of them was: "To declare to A.I. Romanov that there was no reasonable connection between the death of Galanskov and the illegal actions of the administration of places of deprivation of freedom. Romanov's protest is groundless. 27.12.73."

December 10. This day was the date of the anniversary of the acceptance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in connection with the violations of it by the USSR there were protests and a hunger-strike (10 persons participated). The three of us expressed our protests.

December 24. We planned a hunger-strike to mark the anniversary of the Jewish trials. (We received answers to our protests sent to various institutions; they were standard ones: "Soviet people enjoy full freedom and democracy. There is no basis for protest.")

"Communism maintains peace, freedom, equality and the happiness of all nations in the world" (slogan in the inst. ZH KH 385–19).
End of 1973. A.A. Petrov came to the camp from the Vladimir prison. You have heard about him perhaps. He is a poet and a writer who spent three years in Vladimir for the publication in the West of his book "The Prison Meetings". He is a man of an extremely interesting fate. Here are two of his poems given as presents to Tolik and Boris:

If I Were A Jew

To A. M. Goldfeld on his birthday—with love.

"Brothers! The desire of my heart and my prayer to God
Is Israel's salvation.
I therefore ask: has God rejected his people? No, as

I am also of the people of Israel, of the kin of Abraham,
the knee of Benjamin."

They and their fathers and Christ who is of their flesh,

God blessed at all times, Amen. (from St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans),
If I were a Jew I would never call myself anything else.
We are all men and all brothers and each of us has his Paris and his Rome.
But Israel . . . Yes, my friend, there is only one Israel in the world.
He is Cain, but he is also Abel.
He is a slave, but he is also a master.

And from there, do you hear? From there
Comes the freedom. And the truth. And—the sin.
There is the end and the beginning. And—the miracle.
And the salvation, salvation for all of us.

If I were a Jew! But we must be what we are,
Not to judge anyone, not to defame anyone,
We must preserve our home and the honour of our people.

But I would never call myself anything else.
We are all men and brothers and each of us has his Paris and his Rome,
But there is only one Israel.

The Jews are the salt, the sense and the essence.
Without self-praise, without conceit and without getting fat,
Remember it, my friend.

No matter where fate will bring you remember, my friend,
That you are a descendant of David.
And that God, God—is your goal.

Remember, my friend, your goal is Judea,
Your people, your language.
And you must collect and preserve all your strength for the struggle.
In the days of festivities and in the days of troubles,
Among all the trials and lightnings and in the years of sorrow—
Be worthy of your great ancestors.
Remember, my friend, you are a Jew, you are a Jew."
If I were a Jew!

7th March. Lesnoye. Mordovia.

Zion is Calling

To Boris Azernikov—with love.

"Hear, my loved ones,
God is speaking to you.
Days of sorrow stand before you
And I will deliver you from them.
Do not fear and do not doubt
As God is your leader." (From the Book of Ezra.)

Yes, I am guilty but the guilt is not only mine.
I bend my head for the whole of the earth, for the whole of mankind.
Shame and pain have been for years eating away my heart
When I heard the shot: "Zhíd!"
I shudder.

And someone’s bullet, someone’s poison, is again throwing me into fire.
... stakes are burning, stakes are burning, I know.
Medieval stakes. The stakes of this century—the gifts of civilization.
And—“everything in the name of man”.

Whatever happens—"it's the Zhids", "it's the Zhids' fault".
But you must know, Boris, and you too,
That I, a Russian, am always with you.

Yes, an Orthodox one. Yes.
Christ is my Saviour. And yours—too.
God did not bring us hatred, anger and enmity.
He left us love. And we? We, the people of the world?...

Blood is flowing at the Golan Heights.
It is the sword of the Creator.
This battle is the battle of worlds.
The great payment is coming: for Buchenwald, for the smells of burning,
For all that people are guilty of.

And we are guilty of everything.
Following a perilous path we insulted the House of God
And cried in madness: There is no God!
Boris Penson: "NUDE"
No, there is a God!
And He did not forsake His people.
Sacred Zion is calling you
And the Jews are going into a just battle!

... Yes, I am guilty before You!
But the guilt is not only mine.
For the whole of the earth, for all mankind
I say: "God be with you! God be with you!
And the truth will win the battle!"


As a result of a number of new trials in the Ukraine the number of the Ukrainians increased during the last few months. Among the new arrivals—Zoryan Popadyuk, a philology student of the University of Lviv, born in 1953, fought actively against the Russification of the Ukraine. Was sentenced for it to seven years of imprisonment and five years of exile. On April 18, 1974 he was placed into the PKT for six months, allegedly for violations of the regime of detention. (Mikitko, who was convicted in the same trial for the same actions, was sentenced to five years of imprisonment and is now in a different camp.) I have also met recently a young literature teacher, V. Ovsienko, born in 1949, who was sentenced to four years. His co-defendants are: E. Pronyuk, born in 1936, a worker of the Kiev Institute of Philosophy, sentenced to seven years of camps and five years of exile and now in Perm; V. Lisovy, born in 1937, received seven years of imprisonment and three years of exile, is a Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, now here in Mordovia, in the 3rd zone. The youngest of the Ukrainian political prisoners here is Lubomyr Starosolsky, born in 1955. He was arrested a few days before his school exams and was practically taken away from the school bench.

On January 12, 1974 the Ukrainians sent letters of protest against the arrests and the trials and held a hunger-strike. Boris and Tolik had also sent a letter each (I did not want to risk a forthcoming family visit) which said: "On January 12, 1974 it will be two years since the day of arrest of a number of leaders of Ukrainian culture convicted and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment despite the fact that the only crime committed by these people was their desire to preserve national cultural life. I, a Jew desiring to leave for my historic Homeland, for Israel, and convicted for it by a Soviet court, understand very well the feelings of the nationally-minded Ukrainians, their motives and their hopes as well as the suffering of their relatives and friends. On the anniversary of arrests of these people I express my protest and demand their release."

"The policy of our Party is imbued by the great idea of Communism—everything in the name of Man, for the good of Man" (slogan near the main barrack of inst. ZH KH 385–19).

Very recently several people from the special regime camps were transferred here. I will mention three of them. Serhiy Oleksandrovych Babych, born in 1939, Ukrainian worker (worked as a carpenter prior to his arrest) who protested against the Russification of the Ukraine, against
difficult living conditions, low salaries. Was arrested for it in 1960 and sentenced by a court in Zhytomyr to three years of imprisonment in a camp of strict regime. Sat here in Mordovia. In 1962 was sent by the administration to the Vladimir prison for allegedly violating the regime. He stayed there until the end of his term. Was released in April 1963 and on September 27 he was again arrested—this time on charges of distribution of leaflets criticising the Soviet leadership (then N. Krushchev). The new trial was held on February 19, 1964 in the town of Rovno and this time he was sentenced to ten years of especially strict regime. On May 17, 1964 Serhiy came to the special zone. The extremely difficult conditions there, the long term—all this guaranteed the young healthy man that he would become an invalid by the end of the term and that his life would be destroyed. Babych decided on a desperate plan—to escape. On August 14, three months after his arrival in the zone, he succeeded to escape. But two days later he was caught—a woman at whose place he stopped for the night denounced him. Again he was placed in the investigation cell (solitary) and had to wait for a new trial for his escape. Yet he tried to escape even from the isolation ward—through a tunnel made under the plank bed, but at the last minute the tunnel was discovered by the guard and Babych was thrown into the "shizo" where for the first five days he was not given any food and held without his clothes at below zero temperature. The trial took place in October 1964 and his prison term was extended by three years for his attempt to escape. After the trial, expecting to be sent to Vladimir, Serhiy decided to try to escape again, for the last time: it is better to die quickly than to die slowly and painfully in Vladimir and in the camps. On the way to Vladimir he managed to get civilian clothes from the criminals who were travelling together with him (to escape in striped prison clothes would be impossible) and at the end of the journey, at the Vladimir railway terminal, during the change of trains on December 24, he quickly passed the guards and started running. The soldiers opened fire but it was too late. An officer ran after him and wounded Babych in the foot. He was brought to the Vladimir prison and although the prison doctor insisted that he should be placed in the hospital, he was placed into a cell. Even before the wound healed the authorities started demanding that he should obey all the prison regulations. The bed was raised to the wall during the day and Serhiy had to stay up for 16 hours per day. He was put in the "shizo" for smallest violations. Another trial—for the next escape—took place on February 19, 1964 and Babych got another three years. Serhiy stayed in Vladimir until 1968, was then sent to a camp of special regime where he stayed until January 4, 1974 and now he was transferred to zone No. 19.

Ludvig Simutis, born in 1935, a Lithuanian, participant of the national underground movement against the Soviets for the independence of Lithuania. As a boy he was a messenger in the partisan groups, had actively participated in the unequal battle and only his sudden and dangerous sickness (tuberculosis of the spine) made it impossible for him to go on and kept him bed-ridden. In 1955 Simutis was arrested while staying in hospital, went through an investigation and was put on trial. Special commission had sentenced Ludvig to death, but several months later the sentence was commuted to 25 years of imprisonment and, still hopelessly sick, Simutis was transferred to the camp. Already in the camp a medical commission decided in 1958 that
Simutis was hopelessly ill and recommended that the administration should release him. Yet, he was not released and is still in prison. He has six more years to go; despite the fact that he is an invalid the authorities demand that he should work. Ludvig came to the camp together with Babych, on January 4, 1974.

Pyatras Paulaitis, born in 1904, a Lithuanian and a participant in the national underground, a man with an interesting and tragic fate who dedicated many years to the fight for the independence of Lithuania. He received his education in philosophy in Italy and worked in Germany and Portugal. In 1938 he returned to Lithuania and worked as a teacher of Latin. In 1940, when the Soviets came, he left for Germany. In 1941 he came back to occupied Lithuania and entered the anti-German underground movement. He participated in the editing of an illegal newspaper “For Freedom”, wrote articles protesting against the crimes of the Fascist administration. He was arrested for this by the Gestapo in 1942, was interrogated and sent to a concentration-camp but managed to escape on the way and go into hiding. In 1944 Lithuania was taken over by the Soviet administration and Paulaitis remained in the national underground: he edited the underground newspaper “The Bell of Freedom”. In 1947 he was arrested—this time by the Cheka. The Cheka did not mess around much with its opponents: at the first questioning in the NKVD the Head of the Investigation Department, Zakharov, took out his main argument—a rubber club—and Paulaitis was beaten through all the nine months of the investigation. Then a special commission sentenced him to 25 years of imprisonment. In 1956, during the “rehabilitation period”, the sentence was commuted to 10 years. In 1957 Paulaitis was released from prison. He lived in Lithuania but hardly a year passed when in 1958 he was again arrested and charged with nationalist propaganda and organization activities (Art. 58—10, II). He was again sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment and sent to Mordovia, the 11 camp with strict regime. In 1961 he was suddenly transferred by the administration to a zone with special regime for “harmful contacts with the youth” for a period of six months, but instead was kept in the stone sack for 12 years and only now has been transferred to the 19th camp with a strict regime. In 1963 a certain Major Svyatkin suggested to Paulaitis that he write an article called “A Rebuff to the Slanderers from the West” for a Lithuanian newspaper and said that this would ease Paulaitis’ fate. When Paulaitis refused Svyatkin said: “You will rot to death here. You will never get free, you can believe me.” Paulaitis is now 70 years’ old and he has nine more years to go; perhaps this time Svyatkin was right.

On February 18 Lubarsky came back from the BUR and a month later, on March 18 an event with the description of which I will end my “mini-chronicle” took place. On that day the boys presented charges to V. Belokhov and demanded that he should explain the ambiguous and unpleasant facts connected with him. The “investigation” was conducted almost in the best tradition of the “best houses on Liteiny and Lubyanka” 21. About three hours later Belokhov admitted that he systematically wrote denunciations “of general character”, as he explained, “not about anyone concretely”. He did it for some powerful organization which he refused to name. I think it would not be too difficult to guess what it was.

“Each prisoner who is able to work is obliged to do so. Invalids of the 1st...
and 2nd groups are obliged to work while their medical reports would be taken into account.

"The prisoners who fall ill must report about their state to the head of the work-group no later than 30 minutes before the time of leaving for work, to register in the special book of the work-group and to come to the medical aid unit together with the guard on duty"—from the Regulations of Regime Maintenance (Placard in inst. ZH KH 385–19).

Our every day life has remained the same. They feed us with the same gruel and the same rotten herring. The regime got harsher and now they intend to introduce drill practice as well.

"The convicts must wear the appropriate identification tags on their breasts and sleeves"—from the Regulations of Regime Maintenance. (Placard in inst. ZH KH 385–19).

We work the same way as before. True, I was sent through all the stoke-holds, worked on the transportation of the clock-cases and now we together with Tolik are swallowing the dust at the cleaning works. They spoke about a transfer to the North once, but it seems that it was postponed to the autumn. The administration is interested in us as in a good source of food. Furniture, souvenirs—one can get lots of drink out of them. Cupboards and chess-boards are sold "on the side" in droves and tea is a great stimulator!

"Love of work and knowledge, honesty and discipline—with these you will be able to earn the trust of the Motherland, the people, the family." (Slogan in inst. ZH KH 385–19).

The Director of the colony, Usov, was demoted and transferred to the position of a regime director in some camp near Ryazan. The reason for this was his fight with the son of a higher-ranking official. Usov was drunk when he got into the fight. Everything would have been alright, but he wanted to arrest that fellow (he did not know whose son he was). He could have done it, but it came out that "you have to know what your boss's family looks like". The Administration remembered everything then: the drunkenness, the caddishness (one episode with the Azernikov visit was worth remembering!), the operations with the furniture, his village adventures, etc. In short, he almost lost his party card. Now we have a new Director, Pikulin.

"When meeting the officials of the ITU (Corrective-Labor Institutions)—or other officials the convict must greet them, rise from his place and remove his headgear during the warm seasons of the year.

"The convict uses the form 'you' when speaking to the workers of the ITU and calls them 'citizen' and then adds their title or position"—from the Regulations of Regime Maintenance. (Placard in inst. ZH KH 385–19).

I have recently read an article called "What is the time, cuckoo?" published in "Izvestia" of April 17, 1974. It tells about the Serdobsky Clock Factory for which we are making the clock cases. The factory exports its production overseas, in particular, to England. It would be interesting to learn whether the English know that this production is made by Soviet political prisoners? Do the fans of Soviet souvenirs know that a considerably large part of Soviet products is made by prisoners? After all, by buying them they show their approval of all this in a way.

"Convicts! Participate actively in the work competition for the fulfilment of the 9th 5-year plan." (Placard in inst. ZH KH 385–19).
Very alarming news has been coming from the special regime zone. The situation of our boys there is extremely difficult. The living conditions and the work conditions are inhuman and it is absolutely obvious that if nothing will change they will either perish or remain complete invalids with their prison terms. They are always kept in small, dark cells—a 15 sq. m. cell houses eight people (on two-storey plank beds). They are often being deliberately held together with criminals which makes life even more difficult. The humidity in the cells is such that two mattresses can rot there per year. The work is very difficult and harmful—polishing of lead glass. The workshop is very small and dirty, the ceiling is low and there is no ventilation at all. The air is always full of abrasive and silicate dust. The glass is polished on abrasive and cast iron circles; hot water is constantly used and the hot steam evaporates and water runs from the walls. The whole of the workshop is permeated by humidity. No special clothes and no special food prescribed to those doing harmful work are provided. The prisoners demanded to be given milk and although the medical commission had recognised this work to be harmful they refused to provide the milk. They simply said: "It might be even worse if you get milk". This situation—hard work for eight hours per day, the food ration which they are getting, life in the airless cells with criminals and almost without books—all this inevitably leads to physical and spiritual degradation.

One must give Edik's due: even under such conditions he managed to write and smuggle out his diaries. Even the "personal" "stukach" which the administration had supplied Edik with did not help. After the publication of the diaries Edik, Alik and Yura were taken to the KGB in Saransk, and threatened with a new trial. We have also found out about a funny incident which happened to Edik and Yura during the "great" transfer of the special regime zone. Yura and Edik were put in the 10th cell and they noticed that there was no one who seemed to be a spy among the other cell-mates. This was impossible. They started looking over the cell carefully and noticed a fresh strip of concrete on the floor and on the wall. When they tried to get some of the concrete off they found a listening device the wires of which led to the room of the KGB officer whose office was opposite the cell. It became known recently that Osipov, the head of the administration of ZH KH 385 of "Dubrovlag" had received a promotion; one could assume that his activities were highly praised and he has now been made Deputy Minister of Interior of Mordovia. You can send him your congratulations if you want.

"Think—what have you done and what can you still do for the prosperity of the Motherland" (Placard in the dining room of inst. ZH KH 385–19).

To end the description of our day-by-day life I will tell you about some of the new conversations with "officials visiting the ITU", conversations which you might find interesting. Thus, recently there was such a conversation between the official of the Vilnius KGB, Trakimas, and Rimas Chekyalis (born in 1955, a Lithuanian, a student of the Vilnius Musical College arrested on April 26, 1973 and sentenced at a closed trial to three years of imprisonment in a strict regime camp according to Art. 70, part 1). The KGB was very much alarmed that the students of the Musical College where Rimas studied not only refused to condemn their friend but even shared his views. This transpired at the general meeting held at the college after Chekyalis' arrest. Now Trakimas proposed to Rimas that he speak at a meeting with the stu-
dents of his College and renounce his views and deeds. He was promised that in this case his fate would be eased and he would perhaps be released. Rimas, of course, refused this offer and said: "All I want is a free Lithuania. Is it possible to condemn this and to renounce this?"

Some days ago Azernikov was called to the headquarters. Four people were present: Statsenko, the new director of the Yavas KGB Drotenko and two men in civilian dress who said that they were also KGB officials. It seemed to Boris that one of them was the Head of the KGB of Mordovia. The talk concentrated on two main topics: first, the KGB men were interested to know "why Jews emigrate to Israel?" and "what does Azernikov think about it?" Secondly, they warned Boris that he should keep quiet and should not participate in any of the local activities; if he were to participate in them his departure for Israel would be greatly delayed and he would have to pay the education tax of 12,000 rubles in full. The theme and the timing of the conversation make one think that it was meant to be a local preventive measure connected with Nixon's visit. The following conversation also took place between Boris and the official of the political section of the administration, Nikitin. The following is an almost exact transcript of the conversation.

-Why didn't you, Azernikov, come to the meeting of the work-group's collective when you were called there?

-I did not find it possible to do so. Your collective meeting consisted of four war criminals sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment, former Fascists who directly participated in murdering Jews. It is possible that they personally killed my relatives. The meeting was conducted by a Communist, the Party secretary of the institution, Major Kropotov. They called me, as you said, in order to re-educate me. See for yourself: four Fascist murderers led by a Communist intended to reform me, a Jew. Not so long ago my father was being reformed in such a way in a Fascist concentration camp.

-Azernikov, we know very well who did what during the war. Now these people have started to reform and they are, naturally, helping us to reform others, such as you. You must bear in mind that if you will not change your behavior we will punish you.

Nikitin does not just talk. Zoryan Popadyuk once had to spend 15 days in the isolation ward merely for having called one of these "reformed" prisoners a "policeman" after that prisoner wrote a slanderous denunciation about Zoryan.

The next conversation was between the director of the Yavas KGB, Lieutenant-Colonel Drotenko, and K. Lubarsky. It took place in the central hospital of the "Dubrovlag" where Lubarsky was then staying because of his poor state of health following his six months' long stay in the PKT. An interesting point of this conversation was the attempt of the KGB man to use the fact of Lubarsky's stay in the hospital in order to compromise him: "I recently visited camp 19 and all your friends there said that the KGB is feeding Lubarsky in the hospital. Why is that?" Then Drotenko went on speaking in a harsher tone: "You are not only misbehaving yourself in the camp, but you are also instigating others to do so. There is not one event in camp 19 in which you did not participate. We have now treated you a bit in the hospital, but you must pay us back in an appropriate way. How do you intend to behave in the future?" - "The way my conscience tells me," an-
swered Kronid. "In that case your term will be extended," said Drotenko. "Fit your conscience to this fact." "A very interesting measure for the conscience," noted Kronid. "I made a mistake," Drotenko quickly corrected himself. "I wanted to say: fit your behavior." "Well, an interesting mistake . . ." "Look, Lubarsky," concluded Drotenko, "it is now completely clear to me who you are. I will never let you out of my sight. We will not permit—do you hear?—we will not permit you to engage in anti-Soviet activities. Consider this to be a most serious warning."

In conclusion—a few words about our correspondence. The letter situation is, to our greatest regret, very bad. The local ones reach us somehow, but almost all the letters from overseas disappear without a trace. It is very bad that this question still has not moved off the dead end. And it is very important to move it—not only because we are glad to receive news from relatives and friends—if, of course, there are some sort of international norms which keep the postal authorities responsible for delivering these letters. The Censorship Department in Moscow arbitrarily takes away the main bulk of the correspondence and neither we nor the correspondents are informed about it. It is important to make the Main Post-Office in Moscow responsible for each undelivered letter. The possibility of achieving success would be increased if the letters were sent to us through some public organization which would make sure to register the letters prior to sending them to Moscow and which could then demand information about the delivery of each letter. It would be much more difficult for the Censorship Department to deal with an organization than with a private person.

Embracing you, I wait for your letters!

Boris Penson

Lesnoye, Mordovia.

Spring 1974.

Footnotes

1 — The submission of any kind of collective statement to any of the camp's institutions is forbidden and is harshly punished. "The Committee for Human Rights" is an organization headed by Academician A.D. Sakharov. The letter in question was signed by several dozens of prisoners of different nationalities and was intended to tell the world about the illegal tortures of prisoners in the camp.

2 — Ivar Zhukovskis, a Latvian from Riga, a journalist sentenced to five years of imprisonment for having passed on to the West German press forbidden information. During his imprisonment he was known as a very decent person, but in this situation "the circumstances of the failure still remain unclear".

3 — A "shmon" is the slang term for a search.

4 — "shizo" or "shtrafnoy izolyator" is a solitary punishment ward.

5 — Fedor Klimenko has for two years presented himself to be a democrat but it transpired that he was a criminal who was by accident sent to a camp for political prisoners. He managed to earn the trust of many decent people but received a pardon before the end of his term for having written denunciations.

6 — Kronid Lubarsky, a Moscow bio-physicist, the best Soviet specialist on the biology of Mars; was convicted for democratic activites (connected with the Yakir-Krasin trial). A charming and clever man, he quickly became a center of attention for the young and gathered around himself both the democrats and the young nationalists.

7 — PKT—"cell-type premises".

8 — BUR—"intensified regime barracks".

9 — Aleks Pashilis, a young Lithuanian sentenced at the age of 19 to four years for
engaging in nationalist propaganda in Klaipeda.

10 - Babur Shakirov, an Uzbek born in China. His Russian is very poor and it was therefore difficult to find out the circumstances of his arrest.

11 - Budulak-Sharygin, a Ukrainian who lived in England for many years.

12 - "Vladimir" is the term for the isolation prison in the town of Vladimir where prisoners from the camps are sent as a punishment.

13 - Aleksandr Romanov, a young member of the democratic movement in Saratov. He was sent to the Vladimir prison six months after V. Vudka, who was convicted in the same case.

14 - Statsenko, a KGB lieutenant and the camp's KGB officer. Mocking "jokes" are his favorite pastime. Contrary to the instructions of the camp's administration he has engaged in open speculation in tea: he used to come with a full case of tea and sell "his" prisoners 50gr. packets of tea for a ruble (it costs 38 kopecks "outside") allowing them to sell the tea for an even higher price. It must be noted that it is forbidden to keep money in the camp.

15 - an "oper" is the slang term for the KGB representative in the camp.

16 - DPNK—"dezhurny post narodnogo kontrol'ya"—representative of the Popular Control on duty.

17 - A.A. Petrov-Agadov, a Russian Orthodox activist; his book "Meetings in Prison" has been published by the emigre press in the West.

18 - Anatoly Goldfeld, one of the Jewish prisoners.

19 - Boris Azernikov, one of the Jewish prisoners.

20 - Valery Belokhov, a young man from Saratov, a former Komsomol worker convicted for having written a "Dossier on the Party" (made up from materials from Soviet sources) and for an attempt to organize a worker's discussion group. Found life in prison very difficult and most probably found an "unoriginal" way of shortening his term of five years by writing denunciations to the KGB. Is a mentally unstable person and had been treated in the "mental" ward of the prison hospital.

21 - "the best houses on Liteinya and Lubyanka"—the buildings of the KGB offices in Leningrad and Moscow are situated in these streets.

22 - the work performed in zone ZH KH 385-19 is making wooden clock-cases and (on a half-legal basis) making furniture (which is scarce in the USSR) as well as hand-carved chess-boards. There is work of different degrees of difficulty and the easier tasks are given to those prisoners who "cooperate" with the authorities whereas the "undesirables" are sent to do the most difficult tasks: to unload wood, to work in the stokeholds, etc. The furniture and the chess-boards are sold "on the side" by the camp’s authorities: for a packet of tea a prisoner will supply a complete dining-room set of furniture and the set could be sold for hundreds of rubles.

23 - in the beginning of the meeting of Mira Azernikova, Boris's aunt, and Boris (the visit was to last four hours and was to take place in the presence of a guard) the drunken Usov came in and said that either Mira will come "to visit" him or he will stop the meeting. And he did stop it.

24 - Eduard Kuznetsov, the Jewish prisoner convicted and sentenced to 15 years of imprisonment for an attempt to leave the USSR illegally for Israel.

25 - "stukach" is a slang term for a spy.

26 - according to the law, i.e. to the "Corrective Labor Code" there are five types of "regime" in the corrective labor institutions: common, intensified, strict, special and prison. The regime is determined by the court in accordance with the term of the sentence and the number of previous convictions. Contrary to the Code, only three types of regimes—strict, special and prison regime—are applied to political prisoners. The special regime is the "minimum" one in cases of second convictions and it was applied to Kuznetsov, Fedorov and Murzhenko tried at the First Leningrad Trial.

27 - under the strict regime a prisoner is allowed to send two letters per month (through a censor). The receipt of letters is restricted only by the censorship (formally), but the censorship itself is not controlled by anyone. In accordance with the law a prisoner must be told about the confiscation of a letter, but this is done in very few cases.
THE COMMITTEE FOR THE DEFENSE OF SOVIET POLITICAL PRISONERS

The Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners was formed in January of 1972 in New York City by Ukrainian students in response to a wave of KGB arrests throughout the Soviet Union. By 1973 other groups defending Soviet political prisoners had begun their activities in metropolitan areas of the United States, Canada, and Western Europe. And so in the winter of 1973, an international conference that was aimed at coordinating activities of various local defense groups was held in New York City.


In its four years of activity the primary function of the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners has been to inform Western public opinion about the dissident movement and the repression of dissent in the Soviet Union. The Committee has also attempted to mobilize Western public opinion in defense of political prisoners in the USSR.

In our activities we have concentrated on the broad spectrum of liberal and left-wing public opinion, believing it to be a progressive social and political force which, unfortunately, has been relatively silent on the issue of repression in the Soviet Union.

As part of our informational and educational activity, the CDSPP has organized numerous petition drives, maintained a press release service, published books and pamphlets of samizdat writings in English, and sponsored advertisements in such publications as the Village Voice, New York Times, Commentary, and the New York Review of Books. Individual members of the Committee have written articles on national and social questions in the Soviet Union, as well as on repression of dissent for the Village Voice, New Politics, the International Socialist Review, the New York Review of Books, and Survey. Additionally, the Committee has organized rallies, educational seminars, and conferences at which Noam Chomsky, Jiri Pelikan, Paul Mayer, Daniel Berrigan, Alfred Kazin, Murray Kempton, George Novack, Grace Paley, Eric Bentley, Ivan Morris, David McReynolds, and former Soviet dissidents Pavel Litvinov, Aleksandr Yesenin-Volpin, Yuri Stein, Boris Shragin, as well as many others, have spoken and participated.

In addition to our informational activities, the Committee serves in a consultative capacity to Amnesty International, Amnesty for Dissen- ters (a group headed by Julius Jacobson, Daniel Berrigan, I.F. Stone, and others), and is a group member of the Coalition Against Repression in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The Committee has, with the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, co-sponsored three International Days of Protest in defense of Ukrainian, Czech, and Russian political prisoners, and has cooperated with the International
Mathematicians Committee in Defense of Leonid Plyushch, the Copenhagen Sakharov Hearings, and with the Committee to Defend Czech Socialists.

In the future, the CDSPP, plans to continue organizing demonstrations, educationalists, press conferences, and rallies in defense of political prisoners in the USSR and Eastern Europe. We will, likewise, be expanding our press release and lecturer's services, and will continue to publish materials dealing with dissent and repression in the Soviet Union.

Individuals interested in working in defense of Soviet political prisoners, are urged to join the activities of local defense committees where they exist. If groups do not exist in a local area, individuals are encouraged to organize local branches of the CDSPP.

The New York-based Committee can supply literature, speakers, and advice to local groups, as well as to individuals who are interested in defending prisoners.
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Committee for the Defense of
Soviet Political Prisoners
PO Box 142
Cooper Station
New York, N.Y. 10003
USA
Tel: (212) 850-1315

Philadelphia:
Committee for the Defense of
Valentyn Moroz
PO Box 5257
Philadelphia, Pa. 19126
USA

Rochester:
Committee for the Defense of
Valentyn Moroz
PO Box 180
Webster, N.Y. 14420
USA

Detroit:
Committee for the Defense of
Human Rights in Ukraine
26019 Cunningham Drive
Warren, Michigan, 48091
USA

Washington:
Moroz Committee
4842 16th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20011

Toronto:
Committee for the Defense of
Valentyn Moroz
191 Lippincott St.
Toronto, Ontario
CANADA

Winnipeg:
Committee for the Defense of
Valentyn Moroz
PO Box 3782, Station 'B'
Winnipeg, Manitoba
CANADA

Montreal:
Committee for the Defense of
Valentyn Moroz
PO Box 177
Montreal, Quebec
H8K 3V1
CANADA

England:
The Bertrand Russell Peace
Foundation
Bertrand Russell House
Gamble Street
Nottingham NG7 4ET
ENGLAND
Cable: Russfound Nottingham

West Germany:
Comitee gegen die Repression in
der CSSR und Osteuropa
Angelika Brandt
2 Hamburg 39
Grossheimerstrasse 1
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF
GERMANY
Tel: 040/ 27 68 87
PRISONER PROFILES

PARUIR AIRIKYAN

Paruir Airikyan was born in 1949. While a student at Erevan Polytechnic, he was arrested and sentenced with four others (in February 1970) to four years in the Mordovian camps for having organized an “illegal” group. Named after the writer Levon Shant, the aims of the Shant group were to study Armenian history, defend the purity of the Armenian language, prevent the assimilation of the Armenian people and to unite the Armenian SSR with the former Western Armenian territories (now in Turkey) and with the Artsakh and Nakichevan regions (now in the Azerbaijan SSR) in an independent Armenian state.

Airikyan was charged with leading the group. He was also accused of having distributed the nationalist newspaper Paros [The Beacon] and leaflets against the Soviet nationalities policy and Russian chauvinism. Freed in 1973, he was rearrested early in 1974 and given a twelve-month sentence for "infringing the passport regime." The ten-year sentence which was added in November 1974 was based on no better evidence of criminal activity than a letter seized by the camp censor.

In his final plea Paruir Airikyan said that he was being sentenced not for any activities but for his convictions. Although he had done nothing in his short spell of freedom for fear of getting his friends into trouble, KGB officials had told him that they would find some method of putting him out of the way because his very presence among his friends was enough to arouse their nationalist feelings. Despite the harsh sentence which threatened him, Airikyan refused to compromise. He ended his plea by shouting: “Long live free Armenia!”

MYKOLA BONDAR

Mykola Vasylyovych Bondar was born in 1939. At the time of his arrest in 1971, he was working as an instructor in the philosophy department of Uzhhorod University in western Ukraine. Bondar was tried that same year by the Kiev Oblast Court and sentenced to seven years’ imprisonment for “anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda” (Art. 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code). A confirmed Marxist, Bondar declared at the trial: “It is my love for Communism, my faith in it, that led me to do what I did.” His “crimes” consisted of criticizing the CPSU at a meeting of the philosophy department and in several letters to a friend and of participating in a demonstration in Kiev on November 7, 1970 at which he shouted the slogan “Shame to the leadership of the CPSU.”

Bondar was first incarcerated in the Mordovian camps, where he took part in a hunger strike in December 1971. He is currently in Perm Camp 389/35, where he was transferred in 1973. Bondar made an official request in February 1975 to be granted the status of a political prisoner, but was punished for this with ten days in solitary confinement.
The popular Turkmen poet Annasultan Kekilova is the author of three books. In 1971 she sent several letters to the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union criticizing shortcomings in the Turkmen SSR. The repressions which followed (loss of her job, a ban on publishing her works) drove her to renounce her Soviet citizenship. On August 26, 1971 Kekilova was forcibly placed into a psychiatric hospital. In a letter to the Central Committee of the CPSU, her mother O. Seydova explained that her daughter was in perfect health and had never had to visit a psychiatrist.

O. Seydova also sent a letter to the international section of the CC CPSU, along with a copy to KGB chief Yu. Andropov, explaining the circumstances of the case: “On August 26 we received a visit from a ‘first aid’ group at our home. . . . They grabbed Annasultan, twisted her arm, roughly shoved her young son aside, pushed her into an automobile and spirited her away to the asylum. . . . The doctors in the psychiatric hospital told her that she was well, but added that unless she signed a statement saying that the letters to the Congress were written under stress, she would remain in the psychiatric hospital for the rest of her life. . . .”

SERGEI KOVALEV

Sergei Adamovich Kovalev was born in 1932. A graduate of Moscow University, Kovalev specialized in mathematical biology and genetics. He worked as a senior research officer at Moscow University until 1969 when he was dismissed for his public activities. Until his arrest in Moscow on December 27, 1974, Kovalev worked in applied biology. He is married to Lusya Boitsova and has one child.

Kovalev is a member of the USSR Amnesty International Group as well as of the Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights in the USSR. He has signed statements and appeals in defense of Vladimir Bukovsky, Mustafa Dzhemilev, Pyotr Grigorenko, Viktor Khaustov, Viktor Nekipelov, Leonid Plyushch, Yuri Shikhmanovich, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and Gabriel Superfin. Kovalev has been particularly outspoken in his support of the “Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church”, an underground samizdat journal circulating in the USSR. It is apparently for this reason that Kovalev was arrested as part of the recent KGB crackdown on the publishers and distributors of the “Chronicle.”

According to Andrei Sakharov, Kovalev is currently in a prison in Vilnius in the Lithuanian SSR.

On the day of Kovalev’s arrest, Sakharov published the following statement:

The arrested scientist Sergei Kovalev holds a graduate degree in biology. Kovalev is my close friend, a person of unusual integrity and vitality, a completely unselfish man. Just a little while ago I discussed with him a New Year appeal for amnesty for political prisoners. Today Kovalev himself is a prisoner.

The formal reason for his arrest is a charge connected with the publi-
cation in Lithuania of *The Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church*. I believe that this is a pretext for the authorities to conduct an investigation and trial far from his friends and without publicity.

Kovalev, an intelligent and talented man, has devoted many years of his life to the defense of human rights and to the struggle to publicize lawlessness. He has been a member of the Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights from its inception; he is a member of the Soviet Group of Amnesty International and he is the author or co-author of major documents defining the direction of the struggle for human rights in our country. Kovalev quietly did many good deeds in difficult circumstances. It was not by chance that Kovalev was the person who succeeded in putting Simas Kudirka’s mother in touch with the United States Embassy, a contact which ultimately led to Kudirka’s release. Last May, Kovalev together with Tatyana Velikanova and Tatyana Khodorovich announced that publication of *The Chronicle of Current Events* would resume and that they would take responsibility for its circulation. This was a brave and historic step. But it was also a challenge to those who have termed *The Chronicle* libelous and anti-Soviet, to those who fear truth and public disclosure.

Yesterday’s arrest was an act of revenge for courage and honesty. I appeal to biologists everywhere, Sergei Kovalev’s colleagues. I appeal to Amnesty International—Kovalev is a member of Amnesty International and all his activity has been faithful to its spirit. I appeal to The International League for the Rights of Man. I appeal to all who appreciate virtue, integrity and intellectual freedom.

I call for an international campaign for Sergei Kovalev’s release.

**MYKHAYLO OSADCHY**

Mykhaylo Hryhorovych Osadchy was born on March 22, 1936 in Sumy Oblast of the Ukrainian SSR into the family of a *kolkhoz* peasant. After graduating from secondary school, he studied at the Faculty of Journalism of Lviv University, from which he graduated in 1958. He worked as editor and senior editor at the television studio in Lviv, and from December 1960, he worked as a lecturer at Lviv University. In 1963-64 he served as instructor for the press of the Lviv Oblast Party Committee. Prior to his arrest he was senior lecturer in the department of journalism at Lviv State University and deputy secretary of the department’s party organization in charge of ideological education. He edited the university newspaper for one year.

Osadchy was a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1962. He was also a member of the Union of Journalists of the USSR.

As a journalist and specialist in literature, Osadchy contributed to the republican and regional press and periodically published poems and short stories. The Kamenyar Publishing House put out a collection of his poems, *Misyachne pole* [Moonlit Field], the entire edition of which was destroyed because of his arrest.

Osadchy is married and has a son, Taras, who was born on April 19, 1966 (the day after the pronouncement of the sentence).

He was first arrested on August 28, 1965, and sentenced on April 18,
1966, by a closed session of the Lviv Oblast Court to two years’ imprisonment in severe regime labor camps on the charge of “anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation” (Art. 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code).

After his release in August 1968, Osadchy returned to Lviv, where he continued to live with his wife and son until his arrest in January 1972. He had, in the meantime, written a samizdat novel, Bilmo [Cataract], a severe indictment of the Soviet juridical and labor camp systems. At his trial in September 1972, he was charged once again with having violated Art. 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and sentenced to seven years’ camps and three years’ exile. He is currently incarcerated in a Mordovian labor camp.

**YURIY SHUKHEVYCH**

Yuriy Shukhevych was born in Western Ukraine in 1933. His father, Roman Shukhevych, a long-time member of the Ukrainian nationalist resistance, acted as Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army [UPA]—the Ukrainian partisan underground which fought both the Germans and the Soviets in its struggle for an independent democratic Ukrainian state—until his death in 1950 at the hands of the NKVD. Because of his father’s involvement in the UPA, the fifteen-year old Shukhevych was sentenced in 1948 to ten years’ imprisonment. On the day of his release, August 21, 1958, he was rearrested and sentenced shortly thereafter to a second ten-year term. He was released in 1968 but denied the right to return to the Ukrainian SSR for five years.

Shukhevych was living with his wife and two small children in Nalchik, Kabardino-Balkarian ASSR, at the time of his third arrest in early 1972. He was again sentenced to ten years for “anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda” (Art. 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code) and is currently incarcerated in Vladimir Prison.

Avraam Shifrin, an inmate of Soviet concentration camps from 1952 to 1962 and emigre to Israel in 1970, wrote the following open letter on May 18, 1972:

> People! You who live in cozy apartments, who eat three meals a day. You who don’t know the terrors of arrest and the distress for those who are left behind—family and children. You who express your indignation about the persecution of Manolis Glesos and Angela Davis.

> I want to shout to your faces: where is your conscience?

> Once again arrests are being conducted in the USSR, once again people are being thrown into jails, and yet you remain silent. Your governments want “friendly relations” with criminals who tyrannize over their own people. “We do not get involved in internal affairs.” How convenient! Let them oppress and murder the Czechs, Hungarians, Ukrainians, Jews and dozens of other nations—your conscience sleeps. Yet, all the Glesoses and Davises can shout and you hear them—the press and TV are at their beck and call.

> Whereas, in the USSR, my friend, Yuriy Shukhevych has just been arrested and he can’t shout—they’ve sealed his lips.

> I sat with Yuriy in the same concentration camp, and he had been
there for 20 years. And now he has been arrested again. Again the persecution of his family, again his children without bread.

The sole “crime” of the Ukrainian, Yuriy Shukhevych, consists in the fact that he is the son of General Shukhevych, who courageously fought against the enslavement of the Ukrainians. The sole “crime” of Yuriy consists in the fact that he loves his country—and in Ukraine one cannot be a Ukrainian. And so, after 20 years of prison, Yura is once again in jail.

He is silent. You won’t hear him. But I, a Jew, who is proud of being a nationalist, appeal to you, citizens of the free world: Help Yuriy Shukhevych. Demand that the Soviet authorities let him go.

YAKIV SUSLENSKY

Yakiv Mykhaylovych Suslensky, a Ukrainian, was born in 1928. Prior to his arrest in February 1970, he worked as a teacher of English at the secondary school in the Moldavian town of Bendery. He had written several Open Letters to the Central Committee about his disagreement with the policies of the party on a number of questions (Czechoslovakia, the lack of freedom of speech in the USSR, the disparity between current practices and the Constitution of the USSR). Suslensky was also a member of a Marxist group that he and Iosif Mishener had formed.

When a search was carried out at his home by the KGB, tape-recordings of BBC broadcasts, copies of his and Mishener’s letters and detailed diaries, describing meetings and conversations with his friends and their ideas, were confiscated. Because Mishener’s name was mentioned in the diaries, he was also arrested.

Suslensky and Mishener were tried in October 1970 by the Moldavian Supreme Court on charges of violating Art. 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code (“anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda”). Suslensky was sentenced to seven years’ camps and Mishener to six.

In the summer of 1973, Suslensky was transferred to Vladimir Prison. He was supposed to remain there for three years, but was returned to the Perm camps sometime in late 1974 or early 1975.

In February 1975, Suslensky, together with political prisoners Vitaliy Kalynychenko and Mykola Bondar, made an official appeal to be granted the status of political prisoners. He was punished for this action with fifteen days in solitary confinement.

HEORHIY VINS

Heorhiy Petrovych Vins, a Ukrainian Baptist minister, was born in 1928. His father studied theology in the United States before returning to Siberia in the 1920s as a Baptist missionary. He was subsequently sentenced to prison where he died during his third term. Vins’ mother also served a term in prison for her religious activity, as did other members of his family.

Vins first came into conflict with Soviet authorities in 1965 when he broke away from the state-sanctioned All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists for its submission to the authority of an “atheist government” and formed his own group, the Initiatyvnyky [Initiators],
who rejected Moscow's right to oversee their religious affairs. The leaders of the All-Union Council, which represents some one half million Baptists, do not support Vins' faction and charge that he is a zealot.

Vins served three years in camps from 1966-69 for alleged violations of Art. 142 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ("violation of laws on separation of church and state and church and school").

He was again arrested on March 31, 1974, and tried in Kiev on January 27-31 on charges of violating Art. 142, Art. 190-1 ("slandering the Soviet state"), and Art. 227 ("infringement of persons and rights of citizens under appearance of performing religious ceremonies") of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

Vins did not accept the court-appointed lawyer for the trial, arguing that an atheist is incapable of defending a person involved in religious matters. Last fall, Vins' family appealed to the World Council of Churches in Geneva to send a lawyer for the trial but the Soviet authorities rejected this move. They also refused to permit Western observers to attend the proceedings. The trial was barred to the press.

Vins was sentenced to five years camps of harsh regime and five years exile with confiscation of property.

ANDREI TVERDOKHLEBOV

Andrei Tverdokhlebov was born in Moscow in 1940. His father Nikolai was Deputy Minister of Culture in the 1950s and later served in West Germany as a diplomat. He studied physics at Moscow University and did post-graduate work at the Dubno Institute of Nuclear Research. Tverdokhlebov published articles on elementary particles and electro-dynamics and worked for some time as an editor of Abstracts of Theoretical Physics, published by the All-Union Institute of Scientific and Technical Information.

Had he not become involved in the human rights movement, he could have been sure of a successful and comfortable career. Because of his civil rights activities, however, his appointment at the All-Union Institute was terminated on February 14, 1972. Tverdokhlebov then found employment at an experimental laboratory for concrete, working on problems of mechanical vibration.

Andrei Tverdokhlebov has been prominent in the civil rights movement in the USSR over the past six years. He was a founding member with Andrei Sakharov and Valery Chalidze of the Moscow Human Rights Committee formed on November 4, 1970. With four others on September 1, 1973 he founded Group-73 (an association devoted to assisting political prisoners and their families) and he also became secretary of the first Amnesty Group in the USSR which was officially recognized by Amnesty International in September 1974. He has drawn attention to the discrepancies between the laws and practices of the Soviet juridical system and generally accepted international standards. He has defended in letters to the Soviet government and international bodies many Soviet citizens prosecuted for their political convictions.

Tverdokhlebov was arrested by the KGB on April 18, 1975 in Moscow. He is being charged with violating art. 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ("slandering the Soviet state").
LIST OF SOVIET POLITICAL PRISONERS

The following is a partial list of Soviet political prisoners.

ABBREVIATIONS
b. = date of birth  ar. = year of arrest  art. = article of criminal code  s. = sentence  pl. = place of imprisonment

ARTICLES OF THE CRIMINAL CODE
Political prisoners are held under the following articles of the Criminal Code of the Russian SFSR:

Art. 58-1: Treason clause.
Art. 64: Treason and attempt to leave the USSR illegally
Art. 70: Anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (also art. 68 of Latvian Criminal Code, art. 68 of Lithuanian code, and art. 62 of Ukrainian code)
Art. 72: Forming an anti-Soviet organization
Art. 142: Violation of the separation of church and state (also art. 138 of the Ukrainian code)
Art. 190-1: Slandering of the Soviet state (also art. 187-1 of Ukrainian code)
Art. 227: Infringement of rights under guise of religious ceremonies

LOCATION OF POLITICAL PRISONERS
DNIP. = Dnipropetrovsk Psychiatric Hospital
MORD = Mordovian Labor Camps No. 1, 3, 17, 19
PERM = Perm Labor Camps No. 35, 36
PSYCH = Psychiatric Hospital
SERBSK = Serbsk Institute of Forensic Psychiatry
SICHEV = Sichevka Psychiatric Hospital

(a list of addresses of all labor camps, psychiatric hospitals and prisons can be found on page 72)

ADDRESSES OF BAPTIST PRISONERS
ALMA = Alma-Ata, uchr. LA-155/3
ARKHAN = Arkhangelsk-50, uchr. UG-42/11-5
BREST = Brestskaya oblast, g. Ivantsevi-chi, uchr. UZh-15/9
BUKH = Bukharskaya obl. Navoi-3, Tinchlik, uchr. UYa.64/46
CHERK = Cherkasskaya obl. Tagancha, uchr. 325/68
DZHAM 2 = Dzhambul, uchr. ZhD-158/2
DZHAM 4 = Dzhambul, uchr. ZhD-158/4
GOMEL = Gomel, uchr. UZh-15/4
GORKIY = Gorkiy-7, uchr. IZ-32/1
GORKOV = Gorkovsky obl. st. Sukhobezvodnaya, uchr. UZ-62/10
KHER = Kherson-24, uchr. ShYa-203/17-204
KHMELE = Khmelintskaia obl. Rainovtsy, uchr. MKh-324-1285
KRAS 1-4 = Krasnodar, uchr. UA-68/1-4
KRAS 2-1 = Krasnodarskiy Kray, Ust-Labinsk, uchr. UA65/2-1
KRAS 19 = Krasnodarskiy Kray, pos. Pervomaysk, uchr. UO-48/19
KURSK = Kursk, pos. Kosinovo, uchr. OKh-30/2
LVIV = Lviv, GSP-5, uchr. VLZ-5/48-2
MINSK = Minsk, uchr. UZh-15/7
ODESSA = Odessa, uchr. 311/124
OMSK = Omsk-35, uchr. UKh-16/8
PAVL = Pavlodar, uchr. AP-162/2
TASHK = Tashkentskaya obl., Bekabad, uchr. UYa-64/21
VITEB = Vitebskaya obl., g. Orsha, uchr. UZh-15/9
VOLYN = Volynskaya obl., Manichevichi, uchr. OV-302/42
VOROSH 15-9 = Voroshilovgradskaya obl., Pervalk, uchr. 314/15-9
VOROSH 24 = Voroshilovgradskaya obl., Petrovskoye, uchr. 128/24
UKRAINIAN PRISONERS

ANTONYUK, ZYNOWIY, b. 1933, ar. 1972, art. 70, s. 7+3, Perm 35
BABYSHEVICH, HRYSCHOVY, b. 1930, ar. 1950, art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm 36
BAKHATROVSKY, ROMAN, b. 1894, ar. 1969, art. 70, s. 3+3, exile
BALAN, IVAN, b. , ar. 1970, art. 70, s. , pl.
BASARAB, DMYTRO, b. , ar. , art. 64, s. , Mord. 19
BERNHYCHUK, APOLIY, b. 1944, ar. 1970, art. 64, s. 12, Perm 36
BEZUHLY, VOLODYMYR, b. , ar. , art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm 35
BONDAR, MYKOLA, b. 1939, ar. 1970, art. 70, s. 7, Perm 35
BORTNYK, MYKOLA, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Perm 36
BORTNYK, YEVHENIY, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Perm 36
BOZHAR, VERA, b. 1924, ar. 1963, art. 70, s. 7+5, exile
BRAK, B. , ar. , art. , s. , Perm 36
BUHULYAK, MYKOLA, b. , ar. 1968, art. , s. 10, Vlad
CHORNOVAZ, BOHDAN, b. 1949, ar. 1972, art. 70, s. 4, Perm 36
CHMIL, IVAN, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Perm 36
CHORNOVIL, VYACHESLAV, b. 1938, ar. 1972, art. 70, s. 7+5, Mord. 19
CHRNY, B. 1949, ar. , art. 70, s. 5, Perm 36
CHUCHNAN, PAVLO, b. , ar. 1969, art. 64, s. 15, pl.
CHUCHNAN, STEFAN, b. , ar. 1969, art. 64, s. 15, pl.
CHUHAY, VLEKASANDER, b. 1926, art. 1949, art. 58-1, s. 25, pl.
CHUPRE, b. , ar. 1973, art. , s. 4
DANYLYUK, IVAN, b. , ar. 1974, art. 190, s.
Davydenko, Heorhiy, b. 1947, ar. 1971, art. 70, s. 4, Perm 35
DEMIDOV, DMITRIY, b. 1948, ar. 1973, art. 70 & 72, s. 5, Perm 35
DEMCHUK, HRYSHOVY, b. 1930, ar. 1958, art. 58-1, s. 20, Mord.
DEMCHYSYHENY, b. , ar. 1969, art. 64, s. 15, pl.
DENYSENKO, FENADITIY, b. 1938, ar. , art. 70, s. 7, Vlad.
DROP, b. , ar. 1962, art. 64, 70, s. 15, pl.
DUDYN, ANATOLIY, b. , ar. , art. , s. 15, Perm 36
DYAK, MYKHAYLO, b. 1935, ar. 1967, art. 64, 70, s. 12+5, Perm 35
DYAK, VOLODYMYR, b. , ar. 1971, art. 70, s. 5? 10? Perm 35
FEDORCHUK, KYRYLO, b. 1924, ar. , art. 70, s. , Perm 36
FENYUK, b. , ar. 1950, art. 58-1, s. 25, Mord. 17A
HASYUK, YAROSLAV, b. , ar. 1960, art. , s. 15, pl.
HEL, IVAN, b. 1938, ar. 1972, art. 70-2, s. 5+5, Mord. 1
HEORHIYENKO, VASYL, b. , ar. 1972, art. , s. , pl.
HERCHAK, HEORHIY, b. 1931, ar. 1952, art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm 36
HLADKO, HEORHIY, b. , ar. , art. 64, s. 13, Vlad.
HLADKOVSKY, YEVHEN, b. , ar. 1952, art. , s. 25, pl.
HLYVA, VOLODYMYR, b. , ar. 1951, art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm 36
HNOT, VOLODYMYR, b. , ar. 1961, art. 64, 70, s. 15, Perm 36
HOHUS, BOHDAN, b. , ar. 1962, art. 64, 70, s. 15, pl.
HORBAL, MYKOLA, b. 1941, ar. 1970, art. 70, s. 5+2, Perm 35
HORODETSKY, YURIY, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Vlad.
HORSCHYUK, VOLODYMYR, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Perm 35
HYRN, MYKOLA, b. , ar. , art. 70, s. 6, Perm 35
HYRNIV, DMITRIY, b. 1948, ar. 1973, art. , s. 7+4, Perm 36
HUBKA, IVAN, b. 1930, ar. 1967, art. 64-70, s. 6+5, exile
HUK, LYDIA, b. 1939, ar. 1972, art. 187-1 (190-1) & 208 (210), s. , pl.
HURN, PANAS, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Perm 35
HURN, ROMAN, b. 1939, ar. 1961, art. 64-70, s. 15, pl.
HUTSALO, YURIY, b. 1932, ar. , art. , s. 25, Perm 36
ILCHUK, IVAN, b. 1924, ar. , art. 58-1, s. 25, Mord 17A
IOVCHYK, MYROSLAV, b. , ar. 1961, art. 64-70, s. 15, Perm 36
IVANIV, b. , ar. , art. 70, s. , Perm 36
KALYNETS, IHOR, b. , ar. 1972, art. 62, s. 6+3, Perm 35
NEZDYYMYNOHA, VOLODYMYR, b. 1939, ar. , art. 70, s. 4+3, Perm 36
NIKOLAYENKO, NIKOLAI, b. 1929, ar. , art. , s. 25, Perm 36
OSTROVSKY, VOLODYMYR, b. , ar. 1959, art. 64, s. 15, Perm 36
OLIVNYK, VOLODYMYR, b. , ar. , art. 64, s. 15, pl.
OREL, MYKHAYLO, b. , ar. 1952, ar. , s. 25, pl.
OSADCHYY, MYKHAYLO, b. , ar. 1972, art. 70.2, s. 7+3, Mord. 1
OVSIIYENKO, V. b. 1949, ar. 1973, art. 70, s. 4, Mord 19
OZHEHOV, b. 1939, ar. , art. 70, s. , Serb.
PAL'CHAK, MARIA, b. 1922, ar. 1961, art. , s. 15, Mord 3
PANCHENKO, MYKOLA, b. , ar. 1968, art. 64, s. 13, Mord. 3
PETRASHKO, VALERIY, b. 1951, ar. 1969, art. 68, 70, 72, s. 6 or 7, Perm 36
PIDHORODETS'KYY, VASYL', b. , ar. 1953, art. 58-1, s. 25 & 3, Perm 35
PLAKHOTNYUK, MYKOLA, b. 1939, ar. 1972, art. , s. , Dnip.
PLYUSHCH, LEONID, b. 1938, ar. 1972, art. , s. , Dnip.
POPADYUK, ZORIAN, b. 1953, ar. 1973, art. 70, s. 7+5, Mord. 19
POPOVYCH, OKSANA, b. 1927, art. 1974, art. 62, s. 8+5, pl.
POTSELUYKO, LEV, b. , ar. , art. 64, s. 15, pl.
PROKOPIV, VOLODYMYR, b. , ar. 1973, art. , s. , Kiev Psych.
PROKOPOVYCH, HRYHORIY, b. 1930, ar. 1967, art. 64-70, s. 6+5, pl.
PRONYUK, YEVHEN, b. 1944, ar. 1972, art. 70, s. 7+5, Perm 35
PROTSIV, MYKHAYLO, b. , ar. 1962, art. 64-70, s. 15, Perm 36
PRYKHODKO, FEDIR, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Perm 36
PRYNDYA, HRYHORIY, b. , ar. , art. 58-1, s. 15 or 25, Perm 36
PRYSHLAK, YEVHEN, b. 1913, ar. 1952, art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm 35
PRTYIKA, A., b. , ar. 1971, art. , s. , pl.
PYLYPIAK, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Perm 36
PYRUS, VASYL, b. 1921, ar. 1951, art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm 36
RAKETSKY, VOLODYMYR, b. 1945, ar. 1972, art. 70, s. 5, Perm 36
RAYHORODETSKY, MARKO, b. , ar. 1974, art. 137 (UKSSR), s. 2, pl.
REZNIKOV, ALEKSEI, b. , ar. 1971, art. 70, s. 5% , Perm 36
ROMANIV, MYKOLA, b. , ar. 1952, art. , s. 25, pl.
ROMANYUK, VASYL, b. , ar. 1972, art. 70, s. 10+5, Mord. 1
RUBAN, NATAN, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Dnip.
SAPELYAK, STEPAN, b. 1950 (?), ar. 1974, art. , s. 5, Perm 36
SEMENYUK, IVAN, b. , ar. 1973, art. 70, s. 4, pl.
SEMENYUK, ROMAN, b. , ar. 1950, art. 58-1, s. 25+3, Mord. 3
SENYK, IRYNA, b. 1924, ar. 1972, art. , s. 6+3, Mord. 3
SEREDNYAK, LYUBOV, b. 1954, ar. 1972, art. 187-1 (190-1), s. 1
SERHIYENKO, OLEKSANDER, b. 1932, ar. 1972, art. 70, s. 7+3, Vlad.
SHABATURA, STEFANIYA, b. 1938, ar. 1972, art. 62, s. 5+3, Mord. 3
SHAVKUNENKO, b. , ar. , art. , s. , pl.
SHEKMAN, OLEKSA, b. , ar. 1955, art. , s. 25, pl.
SHEVCHENKO, IVAN, b. 1905, ar. 1959, art. 70, s. 15(?), pl.
SHOPKARUK, TROFYIA, b. , ar. , s. , Mord 1
SHOVKOVY, I. b. , ar. 1973, art. , s. 5, Perm 36
SHUHAYLO, N. B., b. 1928, ar. 1970, art. 70, s. 5, pl.
SHUKHEVYCH, YURIY, b. 1933, ar. 1972, art. , s. 10+5, Vlad.
SHUMUK, DANYLO, b. 1914, ar. 1972, art. 58-1, s. 10+5, Mord. 1
SINKOV, b. , ar. 1974, art. , s. , pl.
SKYBA, YARASLAV, b. , ar. 1970, art. 70, s. , pl.
SMOLYAR, IVAN, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Perm 36
SOKULSKY, IVAN, b. , ar. 1970, art. 70, s. 4%, Vlad.
SOLODIY, b. 1932, ar. , art. , s. 15, Perm 36
SOLODIY, IVAN (VIKTOR?), b. 1930, ar. 1948, 1956, art. 58-1, s. 25+8, Perm 36
SONANYUK, IVAN, b. 1912, ar. 1960, art. 68, s. 15, Mord. 17A
SONMYUK, STEPAN, b. 1950, ar. 1973, art. 70, s. 5, Perm 36
SOROKA, STEPAN, b. 1932, ar. 1952, art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm 36
RUSSIAN, JEWISH, AND OTHER PRISONERS

ABANKIN, BORIS (VITOLD), b. 1949, ar. 1966, art. 64, s. 12, Vlad.
ABEL, b. , ar. , art. , s. , pl.
AFANASEV, b. , ar. , art. 64, s. 10, Vlad.
AKHMEDOV, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Perm 36
AKIMOV, DZHEPPAR, b. 1909, ar. 1972, art. 191-4, 203-1, 190-1, s. 3, pl.
ALESHINA, EKATERINA, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Mord. 3
ALTMAN, ANATOLIY, b. 1941, ar. 1970, art. 64, 70, 72, 93-1, s. 10, Perm 35
TYSHKIVSKY, STEFAN, b. , ar. 1952, art. , s. 25, pl.
VASILYEV, YURIV, b. 1947, ar. , art. , s. , Perm 36
VASILYAN, KH., b. , ar. , art. , s. 7, Perm
VASILYK, VOLODYMYR, b. , ar. 1968, art. 70, s. 7+5, Mord. 3
VENDYSH, MYKHAYLO, b. 1947, ar. 1967, art. 64, s. 15, Mord. 19
VERKHOLYAK, DMYTRO, b. 1928, ar. 1955, art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm 35
VODYSHOK, O.V., b. , ar. 1969, art. 58-1, s. 15, pl.
VOROBEY, H.I., b. , ar. , art. , s. , Perm 35
VUDKA, YURIY, b. , ar. 1969, art. 70, 72, s. 7+2, Vlad.
YAKUBENKO, b. , ar. , art. , s. , Psych.
YANKEVYCH, STEFAN, b. 1922, ar. 1954, art. 58-1, s. 25, Mord. 3
(Yerm 36)
YATSYSHYN, b. , ar. 1972, art. , s. 6, Vlad.
YURKIV, VOLODYMYR, b. 1928, ar. 1947, 1952, art. 58-1, s. 25+5, Mord. 17A
ZABOROVSKY, ROMAN, b. , ar. 1951, art. 58-1, s. 25, Mord. 17A
ZAKHARCHENKO, VASYL, b. , ar. 70, s. 5, Perm 35
ZDOROVETS, BORYS, b. 1930, ar. 1973, art. 142, 191-1, 227, s. 3, Kharkiv
ZDOROVY, ANATOLIY, b. 1939, ar. 1972, art. 70, s. 7, Vlad.
ZHOTTOBOLOVSKY, VASYL, b. , ar. , art. 58-1, s. 20, Mord.
KHARLANOV, VIKTOR, b. 1950, ar. 1970, art. 66, s. 5, Perm 35
KHAYSTOV, VIKTOR, b. 1938, ar. 1973, art. 70-1, s. 4+2, Perm 36
KHAYLO, ANATOLIY, b. , ar. 1964, art., s., pl.
KHEYFETS, MIKHAIL, b. 1934, ar. 1974, art. 70-1, s. 4+2, Mord. 17
KHINOKH, LEYB, b. 1944, ar. 1970, art. 64, 70, 72, 93, s. 10, Perm 35
KHOTSKY, ALEKSANDRA, b. , ar., art., s., Mord. 3
KIREEVA, IRINA, b. , ar., art., s., Mord. 3
KIYRENDY, MATY, b. 1939, ar. 1975, art., s., pl.
KLINK, VIKTOR, b. , ar., art., s., pl.
KOGAN, ANNA, b. 1920, ar. 1969, art., s. 7, Mord. 3
KOLOMIN, VITALIY, b. 1949, ar., art., s. 6, Perm 36
KOMAROV, b. , ar., art., s., pl.
KORENBLIT, b. , ar., art., s., Mord. 19
KOTSNYK, b. , ar., art., s., pl.
KOZLOV, ANATOLIY, b. 1936, ar. 1972, art. 70, 72, s., pl.
KRASAEVA, TATYANA, b. 1904, ar., art., s. 7, Mord. 3
KUKOBKA, MIKHAIL, b. , art., s., Sichev. Psych.
KULDYSHKAYA, GLAFIRA, b. 1929, ar., art., s., Mord. 3
KURTANIDZE, b. , ar., art., s., Perm 36
KURTSENTOV, DZHESHIK, b. 1938, ar. 1973, art., s. 7, pl.
KUZIN, E. b. , ar. 1972, art. 70, 72, s. 4+2, Mord. 3
KUZNETSOV, EDUARD, b. 1941, ar. 1970, art. 64, 70, s. 15, Mord.
LAZAREV, b. , ar., art., s., Vlad.
LEVSHIN, b. , ar., art., s., Mord. 3
LICHUTYN, PETR, b. 1945, ar. 1966, art. 64, 89, 146, s. 12, Perm 36
LINRA, b. , ar., art., s. 25, Perm 36
LYUBARSKY, KRONID, b. , ar. 1972, art. 70, s. 5, Vlad.
MAKAROV, b. , ar., art., s., pl.
MALCHEVSKY, SERGEY, b. 1935, ar. 1969, art. 70, 72, s. 7+3, Vlad.
MALISHEV, KONSTANTIN, b. 1929, ar., art. 190, s. Sichev. Psych.
MARCHUK, b. , ar., art., s. 25, Perm 36
MARKHAM, VIKTOR, b. , ar. 1972, art., s., Krasnoyarsk
MARKOSYAN, RAZMIK, b. 1950, ar. 1974, art., s. 4+2, pl.
MARTIROSYAN, NORIK, b. , ar. 1974, art., s. 3½, pl.
MARTIROSYAN, SAMUEL, b. , ar. 1974, art., s. 3½, pl.
MENDELEVICH, IOSIF, b. 1947, ar. 1970, art. 64, 70, 72, 93-1, s. 12, Perm 35
MENKUSHEV, VYACHESLAV, b. , , art., s., , Barashevo Psych.
MESHENER, IOSIF, b. 1936, ar. 1970, art. 70, s. 6, Vlad.
MIKHAYEV, DMITRIY, b. 1941, ar. 1970, art. 64, 70, s. 6, Mord. 19
MO-KHUN, b. , ar., art., s., Vlad.
MUHAMMETSHYN, BORIS, b. , ar. 1974, art. 70, pl.
MUSTAFAYEV, EYVAZ, b. , ar. 1973, art. 206, s. 5, pl.
NASHPITS, MARK, b. 1948, ar. 1975, art. 43, s. 5, exile
NAVASAHDYAN, ASHORT, b. 1950, ar. 1974, art., s. 7+2, pl.
NEKIPETOV, VIKTOR, b. , ar. 1973, art., s. 2, pl.
NEMAZILOV, K.N., b. , ar., art., s., Perm 35
OGURTSEV, IGOR, b. , ar. 1967, art. 64, s. 15+5, pl. Mord.
OPPELFELD, b. , ar., art., s., Vlad.
ORESHKIN, PYOTR, b. , ar., art., s., Psych.
OSIPOV, VLADIMIR, b. , ar. 1974, art., s. 8, pl.
OSTROVSKY, b. , ar., art., s. 25, Perm 35
PARADZHANOV, SERHIY, b. 1924, ar. 1973, art., s. 6, pl.
PAVLICHENKO, VLADLEN, b. 1929, ar. 1969, art. 70, 72, s. 7, Vlad.
PENSON, BORIS, b. 1947, ar. 1970, art., s. 10, Mord. 3
PETRIKH, IVAN, b. , ar., art., s. 3, pl.
PETROV, VYACHESLAV, b. 1937, ar. 1973, art. 70-1, s. 3+2, Perm 36
PETROV-AGATOV, A.A., b. , ar., art., s., Mord. 19
LITHUANIAN PRISONERS

ABUKAUSKAS, JONAS, b. 1927, ar. 1952, art. 58-1, s. 25, Mord. 19
AKRAMAVICIUS, PETRAS, b. 1930, ar. 1952, art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm 36
ARAMINAS, VYTAS, b. 1935, ar. 1955, art. 58-1, s. 25, Mord. 19
BABICAS, b., ar., art., s., Perm 35
BAGDONAS, POVILAS, b. 1917?, ar. 1957, art. 58-1, s. 25, Mord. 17
BALTRUNAS, ANTANAS, b. 1907, ar. 1967, art. 64, s. 13, Mord. 19
BARANAUSKAS, STASYS, b., ar., art., s.10, Perm 36
BASTYS, VYTAS, b. 1935?, ar. 1953?, art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm 35
BERKANKIS, KAZYS, b. 1917, ar. 1969, art. 64, s. 15, Mord. 19
BIRZYS, POVILAS, b. 1901, ar. 1959, art. 58-1, s. 25, Mord. 19
BRICKUS, ALEKSAS, b. 1910, ar. 1963, art. 64, s. 15, Mord. 19
BRUZAS, IGNAS, b. 1912?, ar. 1966, art. 64, s. 10, Perm 35
BUDREIKA, STASYS, b. 1914, ar. 1952, art. 58-1, s. 25, Mord. 19
BURBULIS, ANANTAS, b. 1917?, ar. 1959, art. 64, s. 15, Mord. 19
BUSINSKAS, KAZYS, b., ar. 1968, art. 64, s. 10, Mord. 19
YUKHNOVETS, Y., b., ar. 1972, art., s., pl.
YUSKEVICH, ARTEM, b. 1932, ar. 1975, art. 70, s., pl.
ZAGREBAYEV, b., ar., art., s. 25, Perm 36
ZAKHAROV, VYACHESLAV, b., ar., art., s., Perm 36
ZALIVAKO, BORIS, b. 1940, ar. 1969, art., s. 8+5, Vlad.
ZALMANSON, IZRAEL, b. 1949, ar. 1970, art. 64a, s. 8, Mord. 3
ZALMANSOHN, VULF, b. 1939, ar. 1970, art. 64A, s. 10, Perm 36
ZELINGER, b., ar., art., s. 3, pl.
VERNÝK, IVAN, b. 1943, ar., art., s. 4, Perm 36
ZEYTUNIAN, ANDRONYK, b. 1924, ar., art., s. 15, Perm 36
ZHUCHKOV, KONSTANTIN, b. 1926, ar., art., s. 7+3, Perm 35
ZOGRABYAN, RAZMIK, b., ar. 1974, art., s. ar.
ZYMELYS, URYS, b. 1942, ar. 1950, art. 66, s. 15, Perm 36
CIUKLYS, KAROLIS, b. 1912, ar. 1963, art. 64, s. 15, Perm 35
DAMBRAUSKAS, ANTANAS, b. 1907, ar. 1962, art. 64, s. 12, Mord. 19
DUBAUSKAS, JULIUS, b. 1927, ar. 1955, art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm 36
DUDENAS, MYKOLAS, b. 1910, ar. 1962, art. 64, s. 15, Perm 35
DZIAUGYS, ANTANAS, b. 1914, ar. 1965, art. 64, s. 15, Perm 36
GALDIKAS, PALYS, b. 1925, ar. 1948, art. 58-1, s. 25+3, Perm 35
GAUDINASKAS, STASYS, b. 1915, ar. 1952?, art. 58-1, s. 25, Mord. 17
GIMBUTAS, JUSTAS, b. 1925, ar. 1948, art. 58-1, s. 25+5, Mord. 19
GLINSKIS, VLADAS, b. 1917, ar. 1961, art. 64, s. 15, Mord. 19
GRAZHIS, E., b., ar. 1974, art. 70, s., 3,
GRICIUŠ, JONAS, b. 1910, ar. 1954, art. 58-1, s. 25, Perm
GRIGAS, STASYS, b. 1913, ar., art. 64, s. 15, Mord. 3
GRUZDYS, STASYS, b., ar., art., s., Mord. 19
HALDIKAS, BALIS, b. 1925, ar. 1948, art., s. 25
Note: All Baptists are convicted under articles of the republican criminal codes corresponding to articles 142, 190-1, and 227, Criminal Code of the Russian SFSR.

DULEPOV, MIKHAIL, b. 1922, ar. 1973, s. 3, pl.
ELISEEV, KUZMA, b. 1904, ar. 1973, s. 5, pl.
ELISEEV, VIKTOR, b. 1927, ar. 1972, s. 3, pl.

DZHANGETO, KONSHAUBI, b. 1928, ar. 1973, s. 3, pl.

ERMOLOV, NIKOLAY, b. 1927, ar. 1974, s. 2, pl. Bukh.

FAST, AVRAM, b. 1928, ar. 1971, s. 3, pl.

FEDORCHENKO, IVAN, b. 1937, ar. 1973, s. 5, pl.

FROLENKOV, ALEKSANDR, b. 1920, ar. 1973, s. 3, pl.

GONCHAROV, ANATOLIY, b. 1952, ar. 1974, s. 2, pl.

HERMANYUK, STEPAN, b. 1934, ar. 1973, s. 4½+3, pl. Vorosh 24

HERMANYUK, YAROSLAV, b. 1936, ar. 1973, s. 3+2, pl.

HRYTSENKO, KATERYNA, b. 1943, ar. 1974, s. , pl.

KABYSH, NIKOLAI, b. 1926, ar. 1971, s. 3+7, pl. Exile

KASPER, ELYA, b. 1949, ar. 1974, s. 3, pl. Alma

KASPER, VALTER, b. 1928, ar. 1973, s. 5, pl. Pavl.

KASPROV, STANISLAV, b. 1928, ar. 1973, s. 4+3, pl. Lvov

KHADARTSEV, YURIY, b. 1938, ar. 1972, s. 3, pl.

KHAReTNOV, NIKOLAI, b. 1930, ar. 1972, s. 3, pl.

KHODOKIN, VIKTOR, b. 1932, ar. 1973, s. 5, pl.

KHODOKIN, GRIGORIY, b. 1922, ar. 1973, s. 5, pl.

KOCHETKOV, VASILIY, b. 1924, ar. 1972, s. 5, pl. Gorkov

KOLESNICHENKO, MYKOLA, b. 1944, ar. 1973, s. , pl.

KONKIN, DMITRIY, b. 1926, ar. 1972, s. 5, pl. Gorkiy

KOZHEMYAKINA, TATYANA, b. 1937, ar. 1974, s., pl.

KOZOREZOV, ALEKSEY, b. 1933, ar. 1971, s. 5, pl. Krasn 2-1

KHODOKIN, GRIGORIY, b. 1922, ar. 1973, s. 5, pl.

KOCHEKOV, VASILIY, b. 1924, ar. 1972, s. 5, pl. Gorkov

KOLESNICHENKO, MYKOLA, b. 1944, ar. 1973, s. , pl.

KORIN, GRIGORIY, b. 1928, ar. 1972, s. 4, pl.

KOZOREZOV, ALEKSEY, b. 1933, ar. 1971, s. 5, pl.

KORLAKOV, IVAN, b. , ar. 1973, s. 1½, pl.

KOROTUN, IDA, b. 1938, ar. 1974, s., pl.

KORZHANELTS, LIDIA, b. 1932, ar. 1973, s. 4, pl. Gomel

KOSTYUKOV, IVAN, b. 1926, ar. 1973, s. 4+3, pl. Volyn
CZECHOSLOVAK PRISONERS

CERENSKY, VACLAV, b. , ar. 1970?, art., s. 8, pl.
HUBL, MILAN, b. , ar. 1972, art., s. 6½, pl.
MEZNIK, JAROSLAV, b. , ar. 1972, art., s., pl.
MULLER, JIRI, b. , ar. , art., s. 5½, Litomerice Prison

SILHAN, MILAN, b. , ar. 1972, art., s. 5, pl.
RUSEK, ANTONIN, b. , ar. 1972, art., s., pl.
SABATA, JAROSLAV, b. , ar. 1972, art., s. 6½, pl.
TESAR, JAN, b. , ar. 1972, art., s. 6, pl.

WRITING TO PRISONERS,

Introduction

Writing to prisoners may seem like a futile expenditure of energy, since you are never certain that any of your letters reach your prisoner, and since the letters are never answered. Even if your prisoner should get one of your letters or cards, he is himself allowed to write only one letter a month, and he uses this “privilege” to write to his family. Nevertheless, we believe that writing to prisoners is a worthwhile activity, if it is undertaken systematically and persistently. The minimum a vigorous letter writing campaign will accomplish is to make the prison authorities aware that your prisoner is not forgotten.

The following is the advice of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, printed in their Prisoners of Conscience Resource Book:

A letter is a tool to establish contact with a prisoner. Soviet authorities try to discourage new contacts with a prisoner. The first few letters sent to the prisoner will not be delivered by the authorities. However, if the authorities see that the sender persistently pursues writing to that particular individual, they will eventually allow the letters to go through. To establish with the Soviet authorities this “acquaintanceship” between writer and prisoner, the American writer should initially send many letters, all short, and mail them at the same time to the prisoner. Numerous letters from the same person to the prisoner indicates to Soviet officials that the writer is persistent in his desire to communicate. The fifth, seventh, or tenth letter may finally get through, and subsequent letters can be expected to be delivered...

Letters to prisoners often go undelivered, despite international postal regulations. We urge that you persist in your efforts, however, for after the fourth or fifth attempt, and after prison authorities perceive that the same writer is contacting the same
prisoner regularly, you are likely to meet with some success. A local commandant might be concerned that an investigation will be launched at some future date.

The Handbook suggests that although many people in a given group might write short letters (to facilitate the task), all letters be signed and sent by one individual,

... so that it appears that the prisoner is receiving many letters from the same sender (e.g., letter topics would be divided among a number of individuals. One person’s letters might all describe the city he lives in; another’s letters might speak about current events in the U.S.; another’s describe the weather; etc. Each person would address one of his letters to prisoner Ivanov, for example. However, each letter to Ivanov would bear the signautre of the same individual. All the letters would be mailed at the same time. Thus, the authorities would receive many letters for Ivanov, on different subjects, all seemingly from the same writer. The “persistence” of the writer would help persuade the authorities to begin allowing that person’s letters to be given to Ivanov.

Contents of Your Letters

Use ordinary stationary. If at all possible, write in Russian (or find someone, who can translate your letters into Russian. This should be relatively easy to do, if you are located in a university community). Identify yourself: Your nationality, your profession, your age, perhaps. Explain that you are concerned with human rights throughout the world. Tell the prisoner that you and your friends are concerned about his well-being and want to help him in any way you can.

In subsequent letters you might
1. inquire about the prisoner’s health and general well being, his medical and other needs.
2. tell him about actions you and your group have undertaken on his behalf—especially tell him about any influential people you have been able to interest in his case: senators, professional colleagues, trade unionists.... This will help once again to alert prison authorities to the fact that there is widespread interest in the particular prisoner.
3. speak in more detail about your jobs, your interests, your family, your travels. Including something in the letters may help in finding topics: a photo, stamps, a drawing, views of places where you have travelled, non-political newspaper clippings. Then you can comment on the enclosure: “I would like to share with you this item."

A prisoner recently requested via a relative in Moscow that people abroad send him the Communist papers published in their coun-
tries. There is no law against prisoners' receiving such items, and it is one small way of contact with the outside world.

Addresses

Most political prisoners in the U.S.S.R. at the present time serve their sentences in the Perm' oblast' (camps, 35, 36) or in Mordovia (camps 1, 3, 17, 19). Many are in the Vladimir prison in Vladimir. In all cases it is necessary to put on your letters the central address in Moscow. See pp. 54-67. for location of individual prisoners.

For Perm camps:

central address of USSR, Moscow VS-389 code of Perm' camps

camp administration Uchrezhd. 5110/1

Name of prisoner

(if you know the exact number of the camp, put it after the VS-389. Thus VS-389/35 or VS-389/36)

For Mordovian (Potma) Camps:

central address of all camp USSR, Moscow Zh Kh-385 code of Mordovian camps

& prison administration Uchrezhd. 5110/1

Name of prisoner

(If you know the number of your camp, put it after Zh Kh 385. Thus Zh Kh-385/1 or Zh Kh-385/3, etc.)

For the Vladimir prison the address is:

Moscow, USSR
5110/1 CD
Gorod Vladimir 20
Uchrezhd. OD-1/St. 2
name of prisoner

Sending Your Letters

It is important to send your letters by registered air mail, with a return receipt requested. This costs about $1.70 a letter, and it automatically "insures" your letter for around $15.00 (there is no other insurance available to the Soviet Union). You may enclose something, but you don't have to. Mark that the letter is to be delivered only to the addressee.

Keep a careful record of every letter you send out. Three things may happen:
a) you will receive the signed return receipt. This does not mean that your prisoner got the letter, but probably that the labor camp censor or some other official did.
b) the letter may be returned to you with a statement that addressee is unknown. If you are reasonably sure that your prisoner is indeed in the particular prison or camp—lodge a complaint at your post office, and get them to send the letter again (if you do have some receipts for letters sent out at the same time, you may try to use them as proof that your addressee is there).

c) Neither the receipt nor the letter is returned to you. After 5 weeks file a “tracer” at the post office. If nothing happens within a month, file a claim for lost registered letter. It will take some time for you to be recompensed, (ca. $15.00 maximum), but when you are, you can use the money to send more letters.

Please send us whatever information or thoughts you may have on this subject. Please let us know if you ever learn (from a prisoner’s relative—from a released prisoner) that any letters or cards from abroad have reached any prisoners.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ENGLISH-LANGUAGE MATERIALS ON SOVIET DISSENT


*Critique, a Journal of Soviet Studies and Socialist Theory*. Glasgow (three issues per annum).


Index on Censorship. London (quarterly).
FORTHCOMING IN 1976 FROM THE COMMITTEE FOR THE DEFENSE OF SOVIET POLITICAL PRISONERS:

THE CASE OF VYACHESLAV CHORNOVIL

PSYCHIATRIC PRISONS IN THE SOVIET UNION

A CASE HISTORY OF FATHER VASYL ROMANYUK

AN INTERVIEW WITH POLITICAL PRISONERS IN

PERM CAMP NO. 35 (reprint from Survey)

IN DEFENSE OF VASYL LISOVY

(for further information write PO Box 142, NYC, 10003, USA, or call (212) 850-1315.)

WHERE TO WRITE PRISONERS

Dnipropetvrosk Psychiatric Hospital:
USSR, Ukrainian SSR
m. Dnipropetrovsk
vul. Chicherina 101
p.ya. Ya. E. 308/rb-9
Name of Prisoner

Vladimir prison:
USSR
g. Vladimir 600020
uchr. OD-1, ST-2
Name of Prisoner

Mordovian Camp No. 17A:
USSR
5110/1 Moskva
Mordovskaya ASSR
p.ya. Zh. Kh. 385/17A
Name of Prisoner

Mordovian Camp No. 3:
USSR
5110/1 Moskva
Mordovskaya ASSR
p.ya. Zh. Kh. 385/3
Name of Prisoner

Mordovian Camp No. 19:
USSR
5110/1 Moskva
Mordovskaya ASSR
p.ya. Zh. Kh. 385/19
Name of Prisoner

Mordovian Camp No. 1:
USSR
5110/1 Moskva
Mordovskaya ASSR
p.ya. Zhikh 385/1
Name of Prisoner

Perm Camp No. 35:
USSR
5110/1 Moskva
Permskaya oblast
p.ya. VS 389/35
Name of Prisoner

Perm Camp No. 36:
USSR
5110/1 Moskva
Permskaya oblast
p.ya. VS 389/36
Name of Prisoner

Name of Prisoner

Name of Prisoner

Name of Prisoner

Name of Prisoner

Name of Prisoner

Name of Prisoner
Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners
P.O. Box 142
New York, N.Y. 10003