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Chapter 1

NOTES


2For example, see the United States Department of State, Publication 8677 (Bureau of Public Affairs, September 1972), Current Foreign Policy series, Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Chapter 2

NOTES


2 The import of the affective-instrumental connection in social action has been most forcefully argued by Daniel Bell, "Ethnicity and Social Change," in Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, eds., Ethnicity Theory and Experience (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975).


For case studies of two of these groups, see Thomas E. Sawyer, The Jewish Minority in the Soviet Union (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1979), and Alan Fisher, The Crimean Tatars (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978).


8 For the theoretical case for this, see Fredrik Barth, "Introduction," in F. Barth, ed., Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Cultural Difference (Bergen-Oslo: Universitets Forlaget, 1969).


13See the references to Lithuania in footnote 10, above; especially Thomas Remeikis, op. cit.


15See sources referenced in fn 10, above, especially the three comparative ones on the Baltic by T. Parming, op. cit.

16See T. Parming, "Population Processes...," op. cit.

17See J. Dreifelds, op. cit.


21 See, for example, Robert A. Lewis, Richard H. Rowland and Ralph S. Clem, Nationality and Population Change in Russia and the USSR. An Evaluation of Census Data, 1897-1970 (New York: Praeger, 1976).


23 See sources in preceding footnotes on these groups.

24 See the studies of this in the Baltic; T. Parming, "Population Processes....," *op. cit.*

25 The developments in national assertiveness in many respects parallel those in the general dissent and opposition movement as described by G. Saunders, *op. cit.*


27 The collection of the recent essays on nationality issues in the USSR in the Brezhnev-Kosygin era, in G. Simmonds, *op. cit.*, evidence this.

Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, 1979) for a thorough analysis.

29 For an example of this, see the discussion in Gertrude J. Robinson, Tito's Maverick Media (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977).

30 The role of elites, and some of the related political issues here have been argued earlier by Teresa Rakowska-Harmstone, "Ethnicity in the Soviet Union," op. cit., and her "The Study of Ethnic Politics in the USSR," in C. Simmonds, op. cit. For a discussion of equivalent elites in the United States, see, for example, John Higham, ed., Ethnic Leadership in America (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978).

31 See the theoretical discussion on this from the anthropological perspective, in F. Barth, op. cit.

32 For an example of some such problems, see T. Parming, "Population Processes and the Nationality Issue in the Soviet Baltic," op. cit.

33 See the detailed discussion of this in M.Y. Cheung, op. cit.

34 See some of the historical roots of this in Russia, in Michael B. Petrovich, The Emergence of Russian Panslavism 1856-1870 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956); Hans Rogger, National Consciousness in Eighteenth Century Russia (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960);
S.F. Starr, op. cit.; and the contemporary effects of this, S.E. Wimbush, op. cit.

Chapter 3

NOTES

1 Until his expulsion in 1974, it could also boast of counting in its ranks Aleksander Solzhenitsyn, the Laureate of a 1970 Nobel Prize in Literature.


3 The book on that is Robert Conquest's, The Great Terror: Stalin's Purge of the Thirties (New York: Collier, 1973; rev. ed.).


Saunders, Samizdat Voices, pp. 20-21.

Ibid., p. 256.

See below, Chapter 5, pp. 5-4 ff.


See also Chapter 5, below, pp. 5-73, 5-77.

Besides Petro Sichko and Ambartsum Khlgatyan, Oles Berdnyk and Oksana Meshko of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group had also been imprisoned under Stalin. We have not been successful in finding out exactly what for—see also p. 5-19 below.

The best source on this is the open letter by 17 Latvian Communists, of July-August 1971, reprinted without date as "Against Russification," Samizdat Voices, pp. 427-40, on p. 430. Henceforth abbreviated as "17 Latvian Communists' Letter." See also same letter in [US] Congressional Record, 92nd Congress: 2nd session, February 15-22, 1972, Vol. 118,


15 See *ibid.*, Chapters 2-11 (pp. 12-133), also Priscilla Johnson, *Khrushchev and the Arts* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1965), *passim*.


17 Saunders in *Samizdat Voices*, pp. 27-28.


22 See Chapter 5, below, p. 5-24.

24 It was published in Pravda, Oct. 21, 1962. See also Rothberg, Heirs of Stalin, pp. 50 ff. on the circumstances.

25 It was published in Novy mir in November 1962. See also Rothberg, ibid., pp. 56 ff.

26 Tökés, "Introduction . . .," Dissent in the USSR, p. 11. Undoubtedly under the impact of the (temporary) suppression of the Chronicle of Current Events from October 1972 to May 1974, Professor Tökés speaks of the following years (1971-) as those of retrenchment and polarization (ibid.).


29 Ibid., pp. 205 ff.

30 Ibid., p. 208. See also Samizdat Voices, pp. 274-75 for appeal itself.


34 Litvinov, *ibid.*, pp. 278-79, 405-06.


36Saunders in Samizdat Voices, pp. 32, 30.


38His revealing political memoirs (Léonide Pliouchtch, Dans le carnaval de l'Histoire . . . [Paris: Seuil, 1977] or Leonid Plyushch, History's Carnaval: A Dissident's Autobiography [New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979]--the two versions differ somewhat) have been published after he had been allowed to emigrate to the West.

39Roy A. Medvedov is the author of the monumental history, Let History Judge: The Origins and Consequences of Stalinism (New York: Knopf, 1971; xxxiv + 566 + xix pp.).

40Interview with Y. Bilinsky, March 24, 1979, Also judging by his remarks in his introduction to Mykola Rudenko, Ekonomichni Monolohy ([Munich]: Suchasnist', 1978), p. 11, Gen. Hryhorenko does no longer regard himself as an orthodox Marxist. (The introduction was written in June-July, 1976.)

42 Ibid.

43 *Samizdat Voices*, p. 263. On the "resurrection" of the *Chronicle* see *N.Y. Times*, May 13, 1974, p. 5 and May 19, 1974, Section IV, p. 3.


47 See Dr. Albert Boiter's introduction to HRC and AI (Soviet Chapter) in *Samisdat Archiv e.V., Sobranie dokumentov samizdata*, tom 30, Khel'sinkskii samizdat iz SSSR (Munich: Samizdat Archive Association, 1978), pp. 203 and 143-44. Source will henceforth be abbreviated: **SDS 30**.


51 "Ocherk K. Vol'nogo 'Intelligentsia i demokraticheskoe dvizhenie'," SDS 8, AS No. 607, p. 36; or English translation of excerpts in Survey, Vol. 17, No. 3 (Summer 1971), p. 185.

52 Boiter, SDS 30, pp. 219-220; quotation on p. 220.


54 Boiter, SDS 30, pp. 95-96.

55 See especially Solzhenitsyn's Letter to the Soviet Leaders of September 5, 1973 (comments on original version by Theodore Shabad in


57See Bilinsky, loc. cit. (note 46, above), p. 83.

58See Yanov, The New Russian Right, pp. 62-84; also Bilinsky, loc. cit. (note 46, above), pp. 84-85.


62Shimanov, "Kak ponimat' nashu istoriiu" (Keston College Archives), p. 9; as cited by Yanov, \textit{ibid.}, p. 123.

63Yanov, \textit{ibid.}, p. 6.


66"17 Latvian Communists Letter"--see Note 13, above. It has also been reprinted in \textit{Nats. vopros v SSSR}, pp. 185-200, which also contains letter of Ukrainian Communists on pp. 133-141.

67For English translation see The Estonian Democratic Movement and the Estonian National Front, "Memorandum to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, of October 24, 1974" and "Memorandum


69 See the brilliantly concise but unfortunately undated anonymous "Evreiskii vopros: Tezisy" in Nats. vopros v SSSR, pp. 349-355. See also SDS 13 of August 1974 (746 pp.).


71 For publication data see below, Note 53, p. N5-11. Incidentally, the authenticity of the last double issue, No. 7/8 has been questioned by Professor Kenneth C. Farmer in his review of that issue in Slavic Review, Vol. 37, No. 3 (September 1978), pp. 521-22. There is a break in the style between issue 6 and issue 7/8. The Chronicle of Current Events has reviewed all issues of the Ukrainian Herald except this one. I still believe that issue 7/8 is authentic, but has been written by dissidents from Western Ukraine.

The allusion is evidently to the removal of the nationality designation from Soviet [internal] passports.

Anonymous, "Obzor otnoshenii mezhdu Moskvoi i Gruziei do i posle 1917 g. (Tbilisi, 1974 g.)," Nats. vopros v SSSR, pp. 400-401, 402-403.


See Chapter 5, below, pp. 5-55 and 5-68 (Dr. Gamsakhurdia).

See p. 5-71, below (on Nazaryan).

Father Vasyl E. Romaniuk, p. 5-38, below.


83 As quoted by Shipler, _loc. cit._


85 See "AS 3215. Moscow OGS, A statement in connection with the creation of the Free Labor Union Association, February 9, 1979 [Document No. 36], SDS 30, pp. 141-42, also Boiter's introduction on p. 119.


Chapter 4

NOTES


4Dobrosielski, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

5Ibid., pp. 21-22.


10. On the Talks between the GDR and the FRG in Erfurt (Dresden: Verlag Zeit im Bild; Documents on the Policy of the German Democratic Republic No. 4, 1970).

11. See the German-Soviet Treaty in *The Atlantic Community Quarterly*, Volume 9 (No. 1, Spring 1971), pp. 133-136, and the German-Polish Treaty, same source, pp. 115-116. See also *The Bulletin* (Press and Information Office of the Government of West Germany), Volume 20 (No. 18, 23 May 1972). In general, the West German parliamentary opposition had refrained from voting on ratification. Importantly, West Germany was quite explicit on the point that these treaties do not in any way preclude the peaceful reunification of Germany.

12. See the text of the quadripartite agreement on Berlin; *Atlantic Community Quarterly*, Volume 10 (No. 1, Spring 1972), pp. 103-113.
13M. Dobrosielski, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-25; and, Telex, KB1037AED 11 August 1970, Bonn to the German Information Service in New York City; in archives of latter.

14See, for example, P.P. Cherkasov, et al., *op. cit.*, pp. 112-114.


19M. Dobrosielski, *op. cit.*, p. 27.


24. Actually, the MBFR issue was made explicit already in December 1967 in NATO's "Harmel Report" (named for Belgian Foreign Minister Pierre Harmel). However, it was the Nixon-Kissinger years during which this became a prime component of U.S. foreign policy; see sources in fn. 6, above.

25. *New York Times*, 15 November 1969. Indeed, the general NATO emphasis on strategic issues was evident already in the "Harmel Report" of late 1967, and the MBFR issue was made an explicit goal by the NATO ministerial meeting in Reykjavik in June 1968. See *The Atlantic Community Quarterly*, Volume 6 (No. 1, Spring 1968), pp. 114-117, and (No. 3, Fall 1968), pp. 443-444. The NATO communiques of 1969-1971 all also evidence the relationship of strategic issues such as MBFR to the convening of a security conference; see the aforecited source, Volume 7 (No. 2, Summer 1969), pp. 294-296; (No. 4, Winter 1969-1970), pp. 601-604; Volume 8 (No. 3, Fall 1970), pp. 426-430; Volume 9 (No. 1, Spring 1971), pp. 103-111, (No. 3, Fall 1971), pp. 390-394; Volume 10 (No. 1, Spring 1972), pp. 118-124, (No. 3, Fall 1972), pp. 407-410. In addition, from the Western perspective, the solution of the Berlin situation was the second major precondition (after MBFR) for convening a security conference; see, for example, the State Department representative's testimony to Congress in the spring of 1975, in *United States...*
Congress... Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, pp. 2-3.


29 Hamburg’s Die Welt, 4 January 1972.


31 M. Dobrosielski, op. cit., p. 31.


33 M. Dobrosielski, op. cit., p. 32.

34 The American passivity in the late 1960s and early 1970s probably reflects its early insistence that the CSCE be related to other strategic issues and concrete steps. See Secretary of State Rogers’ comments in Brussels in late 1969; New York Times (7 December 1969), p. 1; also, Drew Middleton’s reporting in the same newspaper on 19 August 1970, p. 3. Further, see the background on this issue in Wolfgang Glaiber, et al., op. cit. The U.S. passivity had been also noticed in Eastern Europe on sources; for example, see M. Dobrosielski, op. cit., p. 46.
35. It must be further noted that the American position was perhaps harsher toward the CSCE proposals from the Warsaw Pact countries than that of other NATO countries; see, for example, Secretary of State Rogers' comments to the Belgo-American Association in Brussels immediately following a NATO ministerial meeting, reported in the New York Times (7 December 1969), p. 1. Also, the same source reports on 19 August 1970, p. 3, that some NATO members (Denmark, Norway, Italy, Holland and Belgium) were more receptive to the CSCE initiatives than others (the United States, Great Britain, Greece, Turkey and Portugal).


The chronology is drawn, again, from M. Dobrosielski, op. cit.

See, for example, the actual statements of the diplomats, ministers, heads of state, and others, at Helsinki, 1972-1975; Konferenz Über Sicherheit und Zuzammenarbeit in Europa (Bonn: Verlag für International Politik, 1976). Journalistic reporting from Helsinki also evidences this.


See source referenced in fn 40 above. See also Relay from Bonn, Volume 4 (#115, 9 July 1973); comments of West German Foreign Minister Walter Scheel reported in Süddeutsche Zeitung (22 January 1973). Also comments of Italian Ambassador Marco Favale, as cited by Hedrick Smith, New York Times (10 December 1972), and of French Foreign Minister Maurice Schumann, reported in Die Welt (Hamburg, 4 January 1972). Lastly, joint Common Market Foreign Ministers' viewpoint, reported in European Community News (21 November 1972). It appears that the smaller European countries, both the NATO members and the neutrals, are the ones who most favored human rights.


M. Dobrosielski, op. cit., p. 53.
Most participants saw, in the end, the symbolic significance of the third phase. For example, the State Department's Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, on the eve of the Final Act told Congress: "it is clear that they [the final accords] will be seen as having important political commitments behind them, since they will be signed by high-level representatives of 35 nations;" see United States Congress.... Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, p. 3. The Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and the Council of Ministers of the USSR, in a joint statement right after the Final Act was signed, saw the CSCE as having "ushered in a new stage in the easing of tension.... it opened up new possibilities for the solution of the central problems of our times--the consolidation of peace and security of the peoples;" A.L. Adamishin, et al., op. cit., p. 23. Also, A. Sheetikov, Chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation, afterward stated: "The European Security Conference, which ended in Helsinki on August 1, 1975, was an unprecedented event and was of paramount importance for Europe and the whole world. Europe has never known a political conference on such a scale or dealing with questions of such vast importance for all states;" D.P. Cherkasov, et al., op. cit., p. 12.


See the section on bilateral acts in Part One of A.L. Adamishin, et al., *op. cit.*


See, for example, the Comments of Congressman Philip M. Crane as early as on 6 January 1973, *Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 93rd Congress, 1st Session, Volume 119, No. 3* (6 January 1973). Interestingly, while the Baltic-American political leadership was cool, if not hostile, to the U.S. participation in the CSCE, the same was not necessarily true in the constituency. For example, a poll of the Legion of Estonian Liberation (generally World War II veterans) in October 1972, in response to the question, "Do you support the US decision to participate in the European Security Conference?," 64% of the members said yes, only 18% no (the rest had no opinion); see *Congressional Record*, cited above, entry by Samuel S. Stratton.
53. See full text, United States, State Department, Publication 8826, op. cit.

54. This and ensuing citations are from the official English-language version of the Final Act, as published by the United States, State Department, Publication 8826, op. cit.


59. See, for example, the comments of the US Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs to Congress in May 1975, in United States Congress..., Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, pp. 2-23.

60. Ibid., p. 3.


64 See Bill Anderson's column in the Chicago Tribune, 15 March 1975, also 18 March 1975. Also, *New York Times*, May 18, 1975. Also, see J. Genys, *op. cit.*

65 The "Kersten Committee" in the early 1950s held lengthy and thorough hearings on the incorporation of the Baltic states by the Soviet Union in 1940. Its records of hearings and its "Third Interim Report" (cited in fn 63 above) are a voluminous study and collection of materials on the Baltic.

66 This is evidenced by the sharp rise in the number of Congressional Record entries on the Baltic, and the fact that Baltic activists and organizations figure extensively in the hearings, both in the Senate and House of the US Congress, which deal with the CSCE and related topics. The early catalyst for renewed attention was the "Kudirka affair" (the case of the
Lithuanian seaman whose defection was aborted by the US Coast Guard in 1970, followed by massive rioting in Lithuania in 1972, and then the CSCE issues.


69 See Congressional Record, Senate, Wednesday, 5 September 1973, entry by Senator Buckley.

70 See, for example, the letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations to the Chairman of the House Committee on International Relations dated 11 April 1975; United States Congress..., Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, p. 11. Also, see gist: The Baltic Republics: US Policy (Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State, July 1979). For a background on this issue, also see Richard Snorf's series of articles in Lituanus, Volume 12 (Spring 1966), pp. 33-53; (Winter 1966), pp. 56-75; and Volume 14 (Fall 1968), pp. 43-60. And, Lawrence Juda, "United States' Nonrecognition of the Soviet Union's Annexation of the Baltic States: Politics and Law," Journal of Baltic Studies, Volume 6 (No. 4, Winter 1975), pp. 272-290. Lastly, see the important
Chapter 5

NOTES

1Ginzburg had served two- and five-year terms in 1960-62 and 1967-72; Grigorenko was in special psychiatric "hospitals" from 1964-1965 and again from 1969-1974; Marchenko had served six-, one-, and two-year terms in 1960-66, 1968-69, and 1969-71 in prisons and strict regime camps, March 31, 1975, he was sentenced again to four years' exile (biographical information by Radio Liberty Research Division).

2See "Turchin ob areste Orlova," Khronika zashchity prav v SSSR (New York) No. 26 (April-June 1977), pp. 5-6. Another friend of Orlov's, on whose interview much of the biographical sketch is based, told Y. Bilinsky that Orlov returned to Moscow already in 1966. Turchin notes that while Orlov did live in Erevan (Armenia) until 1972, he repeatedly made trips to Moscow in connection with his scientific work. This may partly explain the discrepancy in dates.

3Y. Bilinsky's interview with Mrs. Alekseeva, October 12, 1979.

4Henceforth the original Ukrainian spelling of his name will be used, the more so since he has been active in the Ukrainian Helsinki Group (see below).

5Not to be confused with the American Ph.D. degree. A rough equivalent of the latter is the Soviet kandidat degree, which is inferior to the doktor.


Ibidem.


13 Bilinsky interview with Mrs. Alekseeva, October 12, 1979.


15 Vladimir Bukovsky, To Build a Castle - My Life as A Dissenter (New York: Viking, 1979), pp. 436-437. In the book, the entire epilogue has been set in italics, here transposed into Roman script. Admittedly, in the next paragraph Bukovsky makes a disparaging remark about "the Helsinki agreements and so on," but his attack on the UN is the most bitter of all.

16 See Brezhnev's speech at Helsinki (and Brezhnev's photograph), "Vo imia mira, bezopasnosti i sotrudnichestva," Pravda, August 1, 1975, pp. 1-3 and Pravda, August 2, 1975, which on p. 1 shows Brezhnev signing Final Act and on pp. 2-6 reproduces the full text of the Act, including names of signatories and their countries. On the other hand, the New York Times, August 1, 1975, carried a huge headline across entire page 1: "BEAME ASKS PAY FREEZE IN AUSTERITY PLAN; 50-cent TRANSIT FARE ORDERED FOR SEPT. 1; MAC DEMANDING FURTHER BROAD REFORMS" (Brezhnev's speech was mentioned less prominently on p. 1, excerpts from his address plus his
photograph were on p. 2). *N.Y. Times*, August 2, 1975, had story on President Ford's speech on pages 1 + 8; text of his speech (minus clear picture of Ford) was on p. 9; the text of the agreement was not "fit to print." In the diplomatic community it was well known that Brezhnev had become personally identified with the success at Helsinki (interview with American diplomat).

17 An American diplomat told one of the authors the story of an old peasant woman who went up to a policeman in Minsk saying that she wanted to emigrate to be reunited with her family. "Well, old lady, you cannot emigrate just like that, you have to put in the proper application." "But now it is allowed. See here, young man," said she pulling out a newspaper with the text of the Helsinki Final Act. "It does have Comrade Brezhnev's signature on it, does it not?"

18 For details and documentation see Chapter 7, below.


21 See "Announcement of the Formation of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR" in


24 The earliest use of the new title that we are aware of was in the joint Moscow Group–Ukrainian Group protest against the Rudenko-Tykhyy trial, of June 30–July 2, 1977—see Note 22, above. On the other hand,
the letterhead for Moscow Group document No. 45, of April 10-16, 1978, was still the old one: Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords in the USSR, see SDS30, p. 587.


26 There is, however, a most remarkable anonymous declaration of the political prisoners of the Vladimir jail, of August 1, 1976, which calls for holding referenda on national independence in the Soviet Union Republics, under supervision of an International Commission from the Signatories of the Helsinki Final Act. The declaration is noteworthy in two respects: (1) it explicitly refers to the self-determination principle (VIII) of the Declaration of Principles in the Helsinki Final Act, has been dated on the 1st anniversary of Helsinki, and (2) the declaration has been adopted on the initiative of ethnic Russian political prisoners. See "Zaiavlenie politzakliuchennykh Vladimirskoi tiur'my, sdelannoe 1 avgusta 1976 g.," in SDS30, pp. 595-599.

27 The best two sources on the Orlov trial would appear to be documents 50-53 of the Moscow Group: "The Trial of Professor Yuri Orlov" (May 18, 1978) and "Additional Information on the Orlov Trial" (June 15, 1978). The trials of Anatoly Shcharansky, Aleksandr Ginzburg and Victoras Petkus are the subject of a brief declaration of the Moscow Group (Document No. 56, of July 15, 1978). Those documents are conveniently available in the CSCE (Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe) News Release, of September 1979: Soviet Helsinki Group Documents: "Imprisoned Helsinki Watch Group Monitors and Other Prisoners of
Conscience in the USSR," A Partial Compilation, Edited and Prepared by the Staff of the [CSCE] for the International Sukharov Hearings, September 26-29, 1979 (pages unnumbered). See also the extensive coverage of those trials in the American media, particularly that of Shcheransky's trial.


29See N.Y. Times, April 28, 1979, pp. 1+ for details.


32The following testimony by Ginzburg is both priceless and significant (loc. cit., p. 9):

Ukrainian Group members Levko Lukyanenko and Oleksiy Tykhy were confined to the Mordovian special regimen camp with me. In our camp four others joined us in the Helsinki Group. Balys Gajauskas petitioned the Lithuanian Group to accept him as a member. Our Group in camp made a similar request to the Ukrainian Group on behalf of Father Vasily Romanyuk, a political prisoner. In addition to Gajauskas and Romanyuk, political prisoners Eduard Kuznetsov and Bogdan Rebrik joined us. And so, we had a total of seven members.

I understand that there is also a Helsinki Group in the Perm camps, but all I know about that is that Yuri Orlov, leader of the Moscow Group, is a member.

Our Mordovian camp Group prepared three documents.
33 See "Soobshchenie" (in Russian), SDS30, p. 46. Its AS No. is 2740.

34 In the Lithuanian samizdat journal Ausra No. 5 was reprinted an instruction of the Lithuanian SSR Glavlit based in turn on the USSR Glavlit instruction of October 13, 1978, banning all of Rudenko's books from Soviet libraries. On this occasion Rudenko's books were listed. (See Svoboda [Jersey City, N.J.], January 31, 1980, p. 1.) In the Moscow Group Aleksandr Ginzburg and Anatoly Marchenko could be regarded as writers-publicists.


36 Biographical data from Radio Liberty, RL 44/78 (February 22, 1978), Fact Sheet on Public Groups for Furthering the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR (henceforth abbreviated RL 78 Factsheet), pp. 6-7. Also see Profiles: The Helsinki Monitors (1979), note 7, above.


See Pravda Ukrainy, August 28, 1947, p. 3.


Rudenko, Ekonomichni Monologhy, p. 47.

He confided this to his new friend Petro Hryhorenko--see the latter's introduction to a collection of Rudenko's samizdat poetry--Mykola Rudenko, Prozrinnia (Baltimore, MD: Smoloskyp, 1978), p. XIII. The earliest poems in the collection are dated 1960 and 1963. In the author's preface to the Economic Monologues written in 1976 Rudenko said that he had been writing letters to the Central Committee for twelve years (op. cit., p. 35).

Rudenko attributes his release in April 1975, which may have made the later establishment of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group possible, to a coincidence: May 8, 1975 was the 30th anniversary of victory over Germany, and it would have been mightily embarrassing to jail a well-known wounded veteran of World War II on the eve of that anniversary (Ekonomichni Monolohy, p. 36).

See above, p. 5-20 and Note 37.


See Dr. Boiter's introduction to documents of Soviet AI Chapter in SDS 30, p. 143.


An anonymous Soviet observer was shocked at the vehemence with which Soviet Ukrainian officials were denouncing the economic exploitation of the Ukraine by Russia: if they had not had to contribute so much to the Union budget the Ukrainians would have, e.g., solved their housing problem a long time ago. See Politicheskii dnevnik, No. 9, June 1965. AS No. 1002.

In their "Announcement of the Formation of the Ukrainian Public Group . . . ," See Note 21, above. Emphasis added.


56See note 55, above, for full citation. Book has 477 pp. The Informational Bulletins are being published by another Ukrainian-American organization.
57 See his biography in Svoboda (Jersey City, N.J.), December 28, 1979, pp. 1 + 4, on p. 4.

58 The author may have in mind the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which had been adopted at the UN and opened for signature December 16, 1966.


60 Interview with Mr. Petro Vins, September 30, 1979. -- Speculating on the possible reasons for the non-participation of Jews in the Ukrainian Group the authors (not Mr. Vins) assume that some assimilated Jews may have disagreed with the Group's sharp protests against Russification. Other Jews simply wanted to emigrate to Israel and did not want to jeopardize their chances by joining a Ukrainian nationalist organization. They had lost any hope of changing the system. Writes Israel Klejner, who had lived in Kiev for 36 years until he emigrated to Israel in August 1972: "Thus ended my part in the tragic anecdote which is called the 'building of Communism.' This spectacle, however, is coming to an end: Russia is descending into Fascism, and where the Ukraine is going only Lord knows." See his Anekdotychna trahediia (An Anecdotal Tragedy) (Munich: Suchasnist', 1974), p. 155. Also exceedingly pessimistic on the future of the Soviet Union is Edward (Eduard) Kuznetsov, Prison Diaries (New York: Stein & Day, 1975), p. 63. On the other hand, other Jews have had good personal relations with Ukrainian fellow-camp inmates, West Ukrainian nationalists
included, and have developed an understanding for their cause—see e.g., Avraam Shifrin, Chetvertyi wymir (The Fourth Dimension) (Munich: Suchasnist', 1973), pp. 280, 307-309, 258-360. Ginzburg, Landa, Shcharansky and Slepak of the Moscow Helsinki Group also welcomed the establishment of the Ukrainian Group.

61 Interview with General Hryhorenko on March 24, 1979.

62 Interview with Mr. Petro Vins, September 30, 1979.

63 Documents consulted at Prolog Research Corporation, New York. They are being published.

64 On Rudenko's and Tykhy's trial see summary of court proceeding and text of sentence in UPR, pp. 265-342. See also the joint protests of the Moscow and Ukrainian Groups (Note 22, above). The sources for Soviet attempts to persuade Rudenko to renounce his activity are (1) the open protest by Rudenko's wife Raisa, of November 1, 1977, addressed to the Governments of the states attending the Belgrade Conference (AS No. 3203 in MS No. 15/78 [April 28, 1978]), Ukrainian translation in UPR, pp. 363-366; (2) Rudenko's poem of August 1977, from the Donetsk jail—see Petro Hryhorenko, "Nezlami (Do tret'oi richnytsi stvorennia Ukraïns'koï Hel'sinki koï Hrupy)," Part 2, Svoboda, November 24, 1979, p. 2.


67 Ibid., December 1, 1979, p. 1


70 Svoboda: The Ukrainian Weekly, January 20, 1980, p. 1; and Smoloskyp, Vol. 2, No. 6 (Winter 1980), p. 2 of Ukrainian inset. The father got 3 years of severe regime camp, the son 3 years of moderate (posylenoho) regimen camp.
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2 As pointed out in James Reston's column, New York Times (13 August 1975), p. 33, with reference to a Pravda article.


4 Y. Kashlev, op. cit., p. 19.

5 Ibid.

6 For the United States position see the semiannual reports issued by the Department of State on behalf of the President to the American Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe which deal specifically with implementation issues; for example, the seventh report, dated January 1980 (Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Publication 9002, Special Report No. 62). These reports point out many shortcomings, but they also show significant progress. The Soviet arguments are most forcefully made in Y. Kashlev, op. cit., and A.L. Adamishin, et al., compilers, From Helsinki N6-1
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8 Among the best sources in the West on the early formation of the Moscow Watch Committee are its founding members now in the West. See, for example, the testimony of Lyudmila Alekseeva in: United States Congress (95th Congress, 1st Session), Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Basket III: Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, Volume IV, Hearings... June 3 and 6, 1977 (Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1977), pp. 29-39.

9 Consider here the explicit comments of Congresswoman Millicent Fenwick, a member of this delegation, who was the primary advocate of the creation of a US Commission and the sponsor of the necessary legislation in the House of Representatives, in an interview on 18 September 1979 with one of the authors. Also see Fenwick's testimony on the bill, in United States Congress (94th Congress), House of Representatives, Committee on International Relations, Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs, Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Part I, Hearings.... November 18, 1975, and May 4, 1976 (Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1976), pp. 6-10.
10 See Marta Haraskowa and Orest Olhovych, editors, *The International Sakharov Hearing* (Baltimore: Smoloskyp Publishers, 1977) for the proceedings of the first hearing in Copenhagen in 1975. The papers and proceedings of the third hearing in Washington in 1979 have not been published; but copies of virtually all printed material distributed there, as well as taperecordings of the oral testimony and comments, are in the research archives of the present project.


12 See, for example, the exchange in *Science* over the advocated boycott of the International Cancer Congress in Argentia in October 1978; *Science*, 21 October 1977, p. 253; 3 February 1978, p. 480; 21 July 1978, p. 211; and 18 August 1978, p. 572. Also, the coverage given to the tribal issues in Volume 206 (December 1979), p. 1161.

13 See, as an example, the news items in *Science*, Volume 199 (3 March 1978), pp. 954-955.


29 Science, Volume 204 (13 April 1979), p. 124.


32 Reproduced in Lituanus, Volume 21, (No. 3, Fall 1975), pp. 65-73. The issues in dissent in the Baltic at this time are covered in Tõnu Parming, "Contrasts in Nationalism in the Soviet Baltic" (Paper delivered at the 15th Annual Southern Conference on Slavic Studies, University of Virginia, October 1976).

34 The reference here is taken from Peter Reddaway, ed., *Uncensored Russia: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union. The Unofficial Moscow Journal. A Chronicle of Current Events* (New York: American Heritage Press, 1972), pp. 171-183. The Baltic document was also referenced in the *Chronicle of Current Events*; Reddaway gives additional source references in Possev and *Studies in Comparative Communism* for the full text. As noted appropriately by Reddaway, this was not the only early Baltic involvement in the Democratic Movement.


40 See, for example, the essays in George W. Simmonds, ed., Nationalism in the USSR and Eastern Europe in the Era of Brezhnev and Kosygin (Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1977), for material evidencing the nationalism and national assertiveness of the 1965-1975 period.

41 See the relevant essays on the Baltic and Ukraine in G. Simmonds, op. cit., also, T. Parming and E. Järvesoo, eds., op. cit., V.S. Vardys, op. cit., and the documents in the series The Ukrainian Herald [the Ukrainian equivalent of the Moscow Chronicle] issued by Smoloskyp Publishers in the West in the 1970s, especially Issue 6. Dissent in Ukraine (Baltimore, 1977).

42 See, for example, Rein Taagepera, "Nationalism, Collaborationism, and New Leftism," and Jaan Pennar, "Soviet Nationality Policy and the Estonian Communist Elite," both in T. Parming and E. Järvesoo, eds., op. cit.; and G. Saunders, op. cit., pp. 427-440. Indeed, much of the dissent in the USSR in general and in the Democratic Movement was not disloyal, often calling itself neo-Leninist. They were opposed to Stalinism, not "scientific Communism" or socialism. See the material in P. Reddaway, op. cit., G. Saunders, op. cit., and R. Tökes, op. cit.
See, as an example, the Lithuanian memorandum of the secular "National People's Front" of mid-1974; reproduced in Lituanus, Volume 22 (No. 1, Spring 1976), pp. 65-71. Also, consider the 1972 Estonian memorandum to the United Nations: reprinted in Lituanus, Volume 21 (No. 2, Summer 1975), pp. 64-75.


For example, see the documents in Lituanus, Volume 22 (No. 1, Spring 1976), pp. 65-71; Volume 21 (No. 3, Fall 1975), pp. 65-73; Teataja (Stockholm: 28 March 1975).
47 For example, by Lithuanian believers already in 1972; Lituanus, Volume 18 (No. 4, Winter 1972), pp. 69-79. And by Estonian Democrats in the same year; Lituanus, Volume 21 (No. 2, Summer 1975), pp. 64-75.

48 For example, the appeal by Lithuanian believers to both SSR and all-Union organs, respectively, in Vilnius and in Moscow; see Lituanus, Volume 18 (No. 4, Winter 1972), pp. 71-72, and Volume 20 (No. 4, Winter 1974), pp. 63-64.

49 The Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Georgian and Armenian documents are reproduced herein in the documentary appendix. For the documents of the Moscow group, we have used the numerous publications compiled by the United States Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; for example: Documents of Helsinki Dissent from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe (May 1978), Reports of Helsinki-Accord Monitors in the Soviet Union, Volume 2 (June 3, 1977) & Volume 3 (November 7, 1978); Soviet Helsinki Group Documents on Socio-Economic Rights of Soviet Citizens: The Workers' Question, Freedom of Movement Inside the USSR, and Socialist Legality (all three volumes dated September 26-29, 1979).

50 The reference here is to the issues addressed by the Democratic Movement, individuals such as Sakharov, and Baltic activists already in the late 1960s. See G. Saunders, op. cit., pp. 365-453; T. Friedgut, op. cit., P. Dornan, op. cit., and the Baltic references in P. Reddaway, op. cit.

51 On this issue, see the documents of the Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Armenian and Georgian groups in the appendix. The documents of the Baltic
dating to earlier 1970s are reviewed in T. Parming, "Contrasts in Nationalism...," op. cit.

Commentary on this topic has been frequent in the Baltic press. An undated pamphlet circulated in the 1960s by the Estonian-American National Council and the Estonian World Council—Karl Arro’s Ikestatud Eestiga suhtlemisest—is a typical analysis. As late as 1979 the New York Estonian weekly Vaba Eesti Sona editorially criticized a cultural symposium of the younger generation for showing Soviet Estonian films (29 March 1979, p. 2) and participation by Estonian youth in a language-cultural symposium in Tallinn (12 July 1979, p. 2). The main points of concern are: (1) "brainwashing" of exile youth by Communist propaganda; (2) the tactical problem of group members interacting with "the enemy;" and (3) the Soviets' conscious attempt to splinter the exile community through such measures.

It is true that in recent years in a number of Western societies, specifically, Australia, Canada, the United States and Sweden, there has been a movement toward some cultural pluralism, with the most extensive change having occurred in Sweden, followed by Canada. For a good but brief review of assimilationism in America, see Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964). It is interesting to note, in the context of the present discussion that people of East European background (including Jews) have been the most instrumental in pushing the theoretical part of the shift toward cultural pluralism here. America's most prominent advocate of cultural pluralism, Horace
Kallen, was Jewish; Jews and East Europeans were the most important testifiers at the Congressional hearings leading to the ethnic heritage studies bill in the early 1970s; see United States Congress (92nd Congress, 1st Session), Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Education, *Education Amendments of 1971, Hearings... March 4, 31; April 1, 20; and April 21, 1971* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1971).


57 The document is reproduced in G. Saunders, *op. cit.*, p. 275.


59 See the reference in P. Reddaway, *op. cit.*, pp. 171-172.

60 For a review of the development in Sakharov's position on the nationality question, see P. Dornan, *op. cit.*, pp. 369-379.


63 Interview conducted by Yaroslav Bilinsky. For some of Grigorenko's own general human rights views see the selection of documents he authored or co-authored, reproduced in G. Saunders, *op. cit.*, and his forthcoming memoirs.

64 The essay is Chapter 3 in R. Tokes, ed., *op. cit.*

65 *Arkhiiv samizdata* 694, as cited by P. Dornan, *op. cit.*, p. 376.

67 Ibid., pp. 57-60.

68 Ibid., pp. 52-56.

69 See, for example, the mid-1975 memorandum to the CSCE participants; reproduced in Lituanus, Volume 21 (No. 3, Fall 1975); pp. 65-73.

70 See, for example, the 1974 Lithuanian memorandum; reproduced in Lituanus, Volume 22 (No. 1, Spring 1976), pp. 65-71.


72 See T. Parming, "Contrasts in Nationalism...," op. cit.

73 See the full text in Lituanus, Volume 21 (No. 3, Fall 1975), pp. 65-73.

74 Among the most interesting work in this area would be that of a recent conference at Columbia University (sponsored by its Program on Soviet Nationality Problems) on Russian nationalism. See also the brief reviews of this subject by Dina R. Spechler, "Russia and the Russians,"


See some references to this in J. Pennar, op. cit.


Interview with Congresswoman Millicent Fenwick, 18 September 1979, by Tõnu Parming. Interestingly, the third Sakharov Hearings, in Washington, D.C. in September 1979, which were held under the "indirect sponsorship" of the US Commission (several of its members served as co-chairs of the Hearings), did not have Soviet nationality questions on its
agenda, in spite of the fact that Sakharov himself, the Moscow human rightists and the Watch Committee there all devoted much attention to it. Indeed, nationality issues had been a major part of the agenda at the first Sakharov Hearings in Copenhagen in 1975. Sakharov's close associate, himself a leading Soviet human rightist, Pyotr Grigorenko, now in the United States, protested this and raised the issue in an unscheduled address at the Washington forum. See the full text in Svoboda. The Ukrainian Weekly (7 October 1979), p. 7.

81See, for example, gist: "Human Rights: the Disappeared" (December 1979; Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State) and Department of State Current Policy publication No. 119, Human Rights in Africa (January 1980).
Chapter 7

NOTES


4Information primarily derived from ibid., p. 113.

5The formal arguments may be gleaned from the State Department letter of January 19, 1976, in CSCE Hearings Part 2, pp. 4-5.
6 See ibid.

7 US Congress (94th - 2nd Session), Calendar No. 716, Senate, Report 94-756, p. 3.

8 See US Congress (94th - 1st Session), House International Relations Committee, Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs, Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, [Part I], (Hearing, May 6, 1975).


10 The Honorable Dante B. Fascell, Letter to Y. Bilinsky of October 30, 1979, p. 1; quoted with permission.


12 See above, p. 7-4 and Note 7-5.

13 This sketch is based on the printed documentary sources cited in Notes 2 (2nd reference) and 7. See also "Helsinki Agreement," in 1976 Congressional Quarterly Almanac, pp. 266-267 and 62-H and 63-H. It is also mainly based on the following interviews: The Hon. Millicent Fenwick with T. Parming, September 18, 1979; The Hon. Dante B. Fascell with Y. Bilinsky, September 19, 1979; written replies by Mr. Fascell to Y. Bilinsky's follow-up questions, October 30, 1979.

14 Main source is 1976 Congressional Quarterly Almanac, pp. 718, 720, 722-23.
Sponsors of the bill [S2679] charged that the Soviet Union and the Communist countries of Eastern Europe had continued to follow policies 'which are completely inconsistent with the principles set forth at Helsinki.' The Soviet Union, for example, refused to allow Andrei Sakharov to travel to Oslo, Norway, to receive his Nobel Peace Prize in 1975. 1976 Congressional Quarterly Almanac, p. 266.

See above, Chapter 5, pp. 5-1 and 5-7 ff.

As reproduced in US Congress, US Senate and US House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Relations and Committee on International Relations, Legislation on Foreign Relations through 1976, Vol. 1 (Joint Committee Print, February 1977), pp. 560, 561. References to US Code have been transferred into main text, emphasis has been added.

The Commission published three major and several minor reports, many volumes of hearings, and five volumes of documents, a handbook of biographies of members of Soviet Helsinki Groups. Here is, in essence, the Commission's published output arranged by categories.


VOLUMES OF HEARINGS: (1) US Congress (95th - 1st Session), US CSCE, Hearings before the [US] CSCE . . . on Basket II - Helsinki Final Act: East West Economic Cooperation, January 13 and 14, 1977 (Washington, D.C.:
(Continued)
18 (Continued)

(i) US Congress (96th - 1st Session), US CSCE.  
(j) US Congress (96th - 1st Session)  
US CSCE.  
k) US Congress (96th - 1st Session), US CSCE.  

DOCUMENTS COLLECTIONS, MAJOR:  (i) US CSCE, title of series:

DOCUMENTS, OTHER:  (1) US CSCE, Profiles: The Helsinki Monitors:
(a) June 6, 1978.  
(2) Fact Sheet: The Soviet Helsinki Monitoring Groups  (a) In form of
18 (Continued)


19 See US CSCE, US and Helsinki Final Act (see note 18, above, under REPORTS, MAJOR), p. 3.

20 Loc. cit. (see note 10, above).

21 Ibid.


26 President Carter signed the two Covenants October 5, 1977, some two months after the CSCE filed its preliminary report on the Final Act and a day after the opening of the Belgrade Conference (US and Helsinki Final Act, p. 172). In November 1979 they were before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which had scheduled public hearings on them for mid-November 1979 (ibid., p. 173).

27 For instance, December 6, 1978, President Carter sent a memorandum to 22 federal Departments and Agencies, including the President of the National Academy of Sciences and the Chairmen of the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Science Foundation. The two most important operative sentences were: "This Administration attaches the greatest significance to achieving full implementation of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) . . . I request that you designate an official at the Assistant Secretary or the Deputy Assistant Secretary level to serve as CSCE contact [with the Department of State and the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe]." See US Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Sixth Semiannual Report.

28 See note 18, above, under DOCUMENTS, OTHER, 2(b) and 5(a-c).


30 Ibid.


32 US CSCE, US and Helsinki Final Act, p. 311. The quotation is actually one by a US private civil rights organization, but it is implicitly accepted by the Commission.


36 See Doder, loc. cit. (note 34, above).


38 See "Yuzyk calls for 'loud diplomacy' in dealing with USSR," ibid., March 11, 1979, p. 3.
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Appendix I:

LISTS; DOCUMENTS

OF UKRAINIAN GROUP
LISTS OF MEMBERS OF SOVIET HELSINKI WATCH COMMITTEES

(as of December 1979)

(a) Moscow Group to Promote the Implementation
     of the Helsinki Accords

*1. ALEKSEEEVA, Lyudmila\(^2\) (now in USA)

*2. BONNER, Elena

*3. GINZBURG, Aleksander (now in USA)

*4. GRIGORENKO, Pyotr [HRYHORENKO, Petro] (now in USA)

5. KALISTRATOVA, Sofia

6. KOVALEV, Ivan

*7. LANDA, Malva

*8. MARCHENKO, Anatoly

9. MEIMAN, Naum

10. MNIUKH, Yuri (now in USA)

11. NEKIPELOV, Victor

*12. ORLOV, Yuri (Group Leader)

13. OSIPOVA, Tatiana (wife of Ivan KOVALEV)

14. RUBIN, Vitali (now in Israel)

*15. SHCHARANSKY, Anatoly

16. SLEPAK, Vladimir

17. YARYM-AGAEV, Yuri

\(^1\) Moscow Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords

\(^2\) Now in USA
(b) Ukrainian Group

1. BERDNYK, Oles
2. CHORNOVIL, Viacheslav
3. HRYHORENKO, Petro (now in USA)
4. KALYNCHENKO, Vitali
5. KANDYBA, Ivan
6. KRAVIVSKY, Zynovi
7. LESIV, Yaroslav
8. LUKYANENKO, Levko
9. LYTVIN, Yuri
10. MALYNOVYCH, Volodymyr (now in Austria)
11. MARYNOVYCH, Myroslav
12. MATUSEVYCH, Mykola
13. MESHKO, Oksana
14. POPOVYCH, Oksana
15. REBRYK, Bohdan
16. ROMANIUK, Father, Vasyl
17. ROZUMNYI, Petro
18. RUDENKO, Mykola (Group Leader)
19. SENYK, Iryna
20. SHABATURA, Stefania
21. SHUKHEVYCH, Yuri
22. SHUMUK, Danylo
23. SICHKO, Petro (father)
24. SICHKO, Vasyl (son)
25. SOKULSKY, Ivan
(b) Ukrainian Group (continued)

26. STRILTSIV, Vasyl

*27. STROKATA-KARAVANSKY, Nina (now in USA)

28. STUS, Vasyl

*29. TYKHY, Oleksii

30. VINS, Petro (now in USA)

(c) Lithuanian Group

*1. FINKELSHTIEIN, Eitan

2. GAJAUSKAS, Balys

*3. GARUCKAS, Father Karolis (deceased)

4. JUREVICIUS, Mecislovas

5. LAURINAVICIUS, Father Bronius

*6. LUKAUSKAITE-POSKIENE, Ona

*7. PETKUS, Viktoras

8. STATKEVICIUS, Algirdas

*9. VENCLOVA, Tomas (now in USA)

(d) Georgian Group

*1. BEZHAUSHVILI, Beglar

*2. DZHANELIDZE, Teimuraz

*3. GAMSAKHURDIA, Zviad

*4. GOLDSHTEIN, Grigory (brothers)

*5. GOLDSHTEIN, Isai

*6. KOSTAVA, Merab

*7. RSTKHILADZE, Viktor
(e) Armenian Group

1. ARUTYUNYAN, Eduard
2. ARUTYUNYAN, Shagen
3. AVAGYAN, Sirvark
4. KHLGATYAN, Ambartsum
5. NAZARYAN, Robert
6. OGANYAN, Rafel

NOTES:

1 This list does not include two founding members of the Moscow Group, viz., *BERNSHTAM, Mikhail, and *KORCHAK, Aleksander. The RL Factsheet (1978)—please see Bibliographic Note, below, for full citations—notes that Korchak has become inactive as member since approximately mid-1977 and that Bernshtam emigrated September 29, 1976 (nothing is said about his being inactive, however). We have followed the listing in US CSCE Factsheet (Dec. 1979).

2 All founding members have been marked with an asterisk (*). This means that they joined the Moscow Group May 12, 1976, the Ukrainian Group—November 9, 1976, the Lithuanian Group—November 25, 1976; the Georgian Group—January 1977 (the US CSCE Factsheet of Dec. 1979 and RL Factsheet (1978), p. 4, give a more precise date of January 14, 1977), and the Armenian Group—April 1, 1977.

3 Some sources (e.g., the Appeal of the Human Rights Commission of the World Congress of Free Ukrainians, see Svoboda [Jersey City, N.J.], January 15, 1980, pp. 1+) give two additional members of the Ukrainian Group, viz., HORBAL', Mykola, and OVSIENKO, Vasyl'. RL Factsheet (1978) gives a third additional member GEIKO (or, really, HEIKO), Olha, the wife of Mykola MATUSEVYCH. She is said to have joined the Group May 14, 1977. On balance, it would appear that none of the three should be considered to be a member now. On the other hand, all of the three have been very close to the Ukrainian Helsinki Group (e.g., in his testimony before the US CSCE on July 19, 1979, Mr. Petro Vins identified Ovsiienko as a "corresponding member"). We accept on this issue the judgment of the US CSCE—see their Factsheet of Dec. 1979. Svoboda, Feb. 22, 1980, pp. 2-3, carried an undated declaration by Mrs. Nadia SVITLYCHNY that she had formally joined the Ukrainian Helsinki Group after having been invited to do so by Rudenko and Berdnyk at the end of January 1977. Most likely Mrs. Svitlychny joined after December 1979—hence her name is not included in list above. On the other hand, she has always been close to the Group.
4To establish the exact membership of the nearly destroyed Georgian Group is exceedingly difficult. For instance, the RL Factsheet (1978) questions whether Kostava was ever a member of the Group—we have it on good oral authority that he was. The US CSCE also lists him as member. The US CSCE (Factsheet of Dec. 1979) also lists Mrs. Valentina PAILODZE as a member—here we would be inclined to be more conservative and to exclude her, as does the RL Factsheet (1978). This is not to deny that Mrs. Pailodze has been very close to the Georgian Group.

5Third founding member of the Armenian Group, viz., *OSYAN, Samvel is no longer active in the Group having withdrawn under government pressure. But he has not attacked the Group either. The US CSCE Factsheet (Dec. 1979) lists Shagen Arutyunyan and Ambartsum Khlgatyan as two additional founding members. There does not appear to be sufficient evidence for that.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: The founding members of the Group can be found among the signatories of the initial, charter documents (though the Georgian Group has not issued such a document, to the best of our knowledge—in the Georgian case we have to rely on the Khronika tekushchikh sobytii [see Georgian document No. 9, below]). Following the other members of the Groups from 1976 or 1977 on becomes a little tricky. We have carefully examined and used the following sources: (1) Radio Liberty Research, RL 44/78 (February 22, 1978): Factsheet on Public Groups for Furthering the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR, 7 pp. (abbreviated RL Factsheet [1978]), of which a new edition is in preparation; (2) US Congress Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (henceforth: US CSCE), Fact Sheet: The Soviet Helsinki Monitoring Groups, published as News Release, May 11, 1979; (3) US CSCE, Factsheet: Update on the Soviet Helsinki Movement . . . (Revised December 1979), abbreviated US CSCE Factsheet (December 1979); (4) US CSCE Profiles: The Helsinki Monitors (Rev. December 10, 1979); also (5) US CSCE, Fact Sheet: Update on the 33 Imprisoned and Exiled Members of the Soviet Helsinki Groups (Rev. Dec. 10, 1979).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subject of Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>AS #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The case of Mustafa Dzhemilev, a Crimean Tatar</td>
<td>May 18, '76</td>
<td>2591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The fate of Jews in village of Ilinki</td>
<td>Oct. 12, '76</td>
<td>2760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Repression of the Crimean Tatars</td>
<td>Nov. 10, '76</td>
<td>2830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ukrainian refugees</td>
<td>Dec. 2, '76</td>
<td>2834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Dismissal of seven students from Vilnius school</td>
<td>Dec. 8, '76</td>
<td>2895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The situation of the Meskhetians</td>
<td>Jan. 14, '77</td>
<td>2952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Disruption of Moscow seminar on Jewish culture</td>
<td>Jan. 10, '77</td>
<td>2953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The right of ethnic Germans to emigrate</td>
<td>Apr.-May '77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The discrimination against Crimean Tatars continues</td>
<td>Nov. 4, '77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>In defense of Petr Vins, Ukrainian Group member</td>
<td>Dec. 31, '77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>In defense of Levko Lukianenko, Ukrainian Group member</td>
<td>Feb. 2, '78</td>
<td>3208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>On the case of A. Shcharansky</td>
<td>Mar. 15, '78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Deprivation of P. Grigorenko's citizenship</td>
<td>Mar. 15, '78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Discrimination against M. Dzhemilev upon his release</td>
<td>Apr. 6, '78</td>
<td>3327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Trial of Levko Lukianenko, member of the Ukrainian Group</td>
<td>Aug. 20, '78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Discrimination against Crimean Tatars continues</td>
<td>Sep. 2, '78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Persecution of the Helsinki Groups</td>
<td>Jan. 25, '78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Flagrant violations of human freedoms and rights in the Ukraine, Moscow, Leningrad, and Tashkent</td>
<td>Mar. 15, '78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
84. On the condition of Petr Vins who is making efforts to emigrate to Canada  
   Apr. 14, '79 --

93. Freedom to all imprisoned members of the Helsinki Groups!  
   Jun. 11, '79 --

99. Repressions on ideological grounds from August 1978 to August 1979 (main emphasis on repression in the Ukraine)  
   Aug. '79 --

NOTES:

1Samizdat archives number.

2Said number not available at time when original list was compiled in 1978.

3Document not received by Mrs. Alekseeva in US as of November 1979.

1. DECLARATION
of the
Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation
of the Helsinki Accords*

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

Universal Declaration of Human Rights,
Article 19.

We, Ukrainians, live in Europe, which in the first half of the twentieth century has been twice ravaged by horrible wars. These wars covered with blood the Ukrainian land as they did the lands of other European countries. And that is why we consider as illegal the fact that Ukraine, a full member of the UN, was not represented by its own delegation at the Helsinki Conference on European Security and Cooperation.

Nevertheless, we take into consideration that according to the treaty of December 27, 1922, forming the Soviet Union, all international agreements, signed by the Government of the Soviet Union, are operative also on the territory of Ukraine. It follows, therefore, that the Declaration of Human Rights as well as the Declaration of Principles, on which the signatory nations of the Helsinki Conference are to base their relations, are in effect also in Ukraine.

*Please refer to BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE at end of text.
Experience has shown that the implementation of the Helsinki Accords (especially the humanitarian sections) cannot be guaranteed without the participation of the broad community of citizens (shyroko hromads'kosti) of the signatory nations. For this reason, on November 9, 1976, we formed the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords. Since the humanitarian articles of the Final Act of the Conference on European Security and Cooperation are based wholly on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Ukrainian Public Group has set for itself the following objectives:

1. To acquaint wide circles of the Ukrainian public with the Declaration of Human Rights; To demand to have this international legal document become the basis of relations between the Individual and the State (Derzhavoiu);

2. Convinced that peace among nations cannot be guaranteed without free contacts between people and the free exchange of information and ideas, to actively promote the implementation of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act of the Conference Security and Cooperation in Europe;

3. To demand to have Ukraine, a sovereign European nation and member of the UN, represented by its own delegation at all international conferences at which the conclusions about the implementation of the Helsinki Accords are discussed;

4. In order to promote the free flow of information and ideas, to demand the accreditation in Ukraine of foreign press correspondents, the formation of independent news agencies, and the like.

The Group regards as its prime objective informing the signatory nations and the world public about violations in Ukraine of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the humanitarian articles accepted by the Helsinki Conference. To this end, our Group to Promote [The Implementation of the Helsinki Accords]:

a. Accepts written complaints about violations of Human Rights and does everything necessary (use neobkhidne) to bring them to the attention of the governments that signed the Helsinki Accords and also the world community.

b. Compiles this information on the state of legality in Ukraine and, in [full] accordance with Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, disseminates this information without regard for national boundaries;

c. Studies actual instances (fakty) of violations of Human Rights with respect to Ukrainians living in other republics in order to give wide publicity to those facts.
In its activity the Group is guided not by political but only by humanitarian and legal considerations. We realize that the long established governmental bureaucracy, which continues to grow, can take countermeasures against our legitimate aspirations. But we also fully understand that the bureaucratic interpretation of Human Rights does not exhaust the meaning of international legal agreements, signed by the Government of the U.S.S.R. We accept these documents in their widest interpretation, without bureaucratic distortions or arbitrary cuts by officials or official agencies. We are fully convinced that only through such an understanding of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Accords can a real relaxation of international tensions be achieved. It is to this great end that the humanitarian and legal activities of our Group shall be dedicated.

The Members of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oles' BERDNYK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kiev-159, bul'var Lykhachova 8-b, kv. 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Pyotr Grigorenko]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan KANDYBA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lvivska obl., s. Pustomyty, vul. Shevchenka, 176, tel. 33913.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levko LUKIANENKO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chernihiv, vul. Rokosovskoho, No. 41-b, kv. 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oksana MESHKO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kiev, 86, vul. Verbolozna, 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myroslav MARYNOVYCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kievska obl., Vasylkivsky r-n, s. Kalynivka, tel. 246100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykola RUDENKO (Group leader)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kiev, 84, Koncha-Zaspa, 1, kv. 8, tel. 614-853.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina STROKATA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleksiy TYKHY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Donetska obl., Kostiantynivsky r-n., khutir Izhevka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 9, 1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The signed copy is retained by the Group to Promote

12/5/76 /signed/ Mykola Rudenko
BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translated from Ukrainian original by the Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee, P. O. Box 32397, Washington, DC 20007. Ukrainian original, which is kept in the Committee's archives, is a carbon copy of a typescript, 2 pp., 29.0 x 20.5 centimeters. On top of p. 1 it bears the hand-printed notation in Russian SShA. Ukrainskaia Gruppa Sodeistviia Khel'sinsk. sogl. Doktoru Andr. Zvorunu, meaning "USA. Ukrainian Group for the Promotion of the Helsinki Accords. To Dr. Andrew Zwarun." This notation has been omitted from the text above. The second notation at the end of the document has been reproduced. The Committee's translation has omitted the telephone numbers of the signatories—they have been restored from the original text and put in italics.

The text above has been checked for accuracy by Y. Bilinsky. Where it deviates from the Committee's text italicized English words have been used. In some cases the original Ukrainian words have been inserted in parentheses, also italicized.

The Declaration has been widely published. The Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee lithographed the Declaration and the Memorandum No. 1 (undated, 20 pp.). The Declaration was included by photographic means in Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C. 20515, Reports of Helsinki--Accord Monitors in the Soviet Union: Documents of the Public Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR: A Partial Compilation, Edited and Prepared by the Staff of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (February 24, 1977) [Vol. I], pp. 96-98. The Committee has also published the Declaration in a bilingual letterpress edition: The Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, Kiev, Ukraine, Declaration and Memorandum No. 1 (Translated and Edited by "Smoloskyp" Information Service for the Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee, Washington, D.C.; Published for the Ukraine National Association by "Svoboda" Press [1977; 31 pp.; henceforth referred to as Bilingual Declaration/Memorandum #1]. It is from the latter edition that the Ukrainian text of the Declaration was reproduced under number AS 2839 in Arkhiv Samizdata, Sobranie dokumentov samizdata, tom 30: Khel'sinkskii samizdat iz SSSR (Munich: Samizdat Archive Ass'n, 1978), pp. 41-43; its English translation is taken substantially from the lithographed typewritten brochure, see ibid, pp. 43-45. The Munich publication will henceforth be referred to as SDS 30.

Finally, the Declaration has been reprinted in Ukrainian, with the signatories' telephone numbers restored in Komitet Hel'sinks'kykh Garantii dla Ukrayiny Washington, Osyp Zinkevych, comp., Ukrain's'kyi pravozakhysnyi rukh: Dokumenty i materiały kyyv's'koj Ukraïns'koj Hrupy Spryiannia vykonannia Hel'sinks'kykh 'Uhad (Baltimore, Md.: Smoloskyp Publishers, 1978), pp. 11-14. (The author and title are translated as follows: Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee,
Osyp Zinkevych, comp., *Ukrainian Movement for Human Rights and Justice: Collection of Documents of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords in the Ukrainian S.S.R. and Related Materials*. Henceforth this important source will be referred to as UPR.
2. UKRAINIAN PUBLIC GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

MEMORANDUM NO. 1

The Effects of the European Conference
on the Development of Legal Consciousness in Ukraine

1. The Formation of the Ukrainian Group.

The evolution of the movement for Human Rights in the Soviet Union led to the formation on May 12, 1976, of the Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords in the USSR. Yuriy F. Orlov, a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR, was elected leader of the Group. At first Orlov was summoned by the KGB and warned that his efforts to organize the Group were provocative and could be considered anti-Soviet. The wide support of the Group, however, on the part of the world community (svitovoï hromads'kosti) forced the KGB to refrain from repressive measures against the Group's members, and within a few months, the Moscow Group accomplished much in promoting the implementation of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Today, the Group's activities are winning support even among the Communist parties of the West.

Although the Government organs [i.e., the secret police - Y.B.] so far have not stopped their repressive measures against civil rights activists, these measures are clearly losing their effect. Government officials are forced to conclude that prisons and concentration camps not only do not strengthen their position, they weaken it. In fact, they weaken it more than would the unhindered activity of dissidents, if such were indeed possible.

But then, excessive optimism is as dangerous today as underestimating the democratic forces and their effect on the state apparatus. One thing can be said with complete certainty: the struggle for Human Rights will not cease until these Rights become the daily norm of public life.

In these circumstances, the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords was formed on November 9, 1976. It includes the following members:

OLES BERDNAK
Prisoner of the Beria concentration camps (1949-1956);
science-fiction writer, prominent in Ukraine and abroad;
author of close to 30 books, some translated into English,
German, Portuguese and other languages; expelled from the
Writers' Union of Ukraine in 1972 for deviating from Socialist Realism; currently earns his livelihood from physical labor.

PETRO HRYHORENKO  Former major-general and department head at the [Frunze] Military Academy; for his legal aid to the Crimean Tatars, who seek to return to their homelands, he was stripped of his rank and placed for over 5 years in a special psychiatric hospital; released, he immediately renewed his active struggle for Human Rights; author of numerous scientific articles and books. He is the representative in Moscow for the Ukrainian Group.

IVAN KANDYBA  Lawyer; one of the authors of the program of the Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union; although the Union was never formed, he was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment, which he served in full; now lives under surveillance in Lviv Oblast; deprived of the right to work in his profession, lives in extreme hardship.

LEVKO LUKIANENKO  Lawyer; one of the authors of the program for the Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union; at first sentenced to be shot, but later he and his co-author, I. Kandyba, received 15 years' imprisonment; served his sentence in full; lives under surveillance in Chernihiv, where he works as an electrician; known abroad for his numerous appeals in defense of the rights of Soviet political prisoners.

OKSANA MESHKO  Prisoner of the Beria concentration camps (1947-1956); mother of Oleksander Serhiyenko, now a political prisoner in Vladimir Prison; active in the Human Rights movement in Ukraine; listeners of foreign radio broadcasts know her for her fervent appeals on behalf of her son in which she raises the most acute problems of today.

MYKOLA MATUSEVYCH  Historian; born 1946; denied the fight to complete his education when dismissed from the university for his convictions; once jailed for 15 days for Christmas caroling; dismissed from work several times for supporting political prisoners; lives from odd jobs.

MYROSLAV MARYNOVYCH  Electronics engineer; born 1949; does not work in his profession; for his independent thinking and friendship with dissidents, he was thrice dismissed from his job; presently editor for the Tekhnika publishing house.

MYKOLA RUDENKO  Prominent Ukrainian poet and writer; author of over 20 books; was a political officer (politruk) of a platoon during the siege of Leningrad; was severely wounded and is now a disabled war veteran; expelled from the Communist
Party of the Soviet Union and the Writers' Union of Ukraine for his philosophical and economic works; until recently, worked as a watchman; member of Amnesty International and head of the Ukrainian Public Group.

NINA STROKATA
Microbiologist; wife of the well-known Ukrainian political prisoner, Sviatoslav Karavansky; sentenced to 4 years' imprisonment for defending her husband; presently lives under surveillance in Kaluga Oblast; forbidden to work in her profession.

OLEKSII TYKHY
Teacher; from 1957 to 1964 he was in prison and concentration camps for his political views; barred from his profession, he works as a fireman and common laborer; interested in problems of education; in June 1976 his home was illegally searched; he was detained for 2 days and brutally mistreated.

Immediately after its formation, the Group was the victim of a vicious act. On the night of November 9, 1976, the home of the Group's leader, Mykola Rudenko, was devastated. Someone threw bricks through the windows. For several minutes the building shook from the hits. At first neighbors thought there was an earthquake. Following the attack, eight sharp brick fragments, ranging from one-half to one-fifth of a brick, were found amidst the broken glass in M. Rudenko's apartment. A member of the Group, Oksana Meshko, was injured by one of the fragments. The police, summoned to the scene, refused to file a report; but a week later, police officials confiscated the brick fragments, explaining that they would be examined for possible fingerprints. Needless to say, the matter was dropped; they only wanted to dispose of the evidence.

If you take into account that M. Rudenko lives in the woods where Soviet V.I.P.'s (nomenklatura osoby) hunt boar and elk, it becomes clear that the destruction of the apartment was a rather transparent warning. Only the support of world opinion can protect the Group from merciless reprisals.


From the first years of Stalinist dictatorship, Ukraine became the scene of genocide and ethnocide. To show that we are not merely exaggerating, let us review the definition of genocide. Here it is:

GENOCIDE - one of the most heinous crimes against humanity, consisting of the destruction of national, ethnic, racial or religious populations . . . especially, the deliberate creation of living conditions that lead to the total or partial physical destruction of any population group.¹

¹Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia, Volume 3, page 186.
That is the definition of genocide in the Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia. The authors of the article, however, do not cite examples of genocide—examples for which they would not have to search very far.

In 1933, the Ukrainian people (narod), which for centuries had not known famine, lost over 6 million persons, dead by starvation. This famine, which affected the entire people, was artificially created by the Government. Wheat was confiscated to the last grain. Even ovens and tool sheds were destroyed in the search for grain. If we add the millions of "kulaks" who were deported with their families to Siberia, where they died, then we total more than 10 million Ukrainians who in the short span of some 3 years (1930-1933) were destroyed with premeditation. That was one-quarter of the Ukrainian population. Then there was 1937, when hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian prisoners were shot. Later, there would be the war with Germany, which would destroy 7 to 8 million more Ukrainian citizens. And after this, another war was to begin: the destruction of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, which took up arms against Hitler and would not put them down at Stalin's command. Along with the insurgents, innocent people were also killed. Hundreds of thousands of minors, women and the elderly went to concentration camps only because some insurgent drank a cup of milk or ate a crust of bread in their home. Some "insurgents" turned out to be Chekists in disguise. The prison term was uniform: 25 years. Later, more years would be added. Few of these martyrs have returned to their homeland.

If one looks at the last half-century of our history, it becomes clear why our native language is not heard today on the streets of Ukrainian cities. Here is what the Ukrainian political prisoner M. Masiutko wrote from a concentration camp in 1967, that is, at a time when we were expecting that the barbed wire would be coming down forever:

If a traveler somehow, despite all the categorical prohibitions, were to succeed in entering a camp for political prisoners in Mordovia, of which there are as many as 6, he would be extraordinarily astonished. Here, thousands of kilometers from Ukraine, he would hear at every step the Ukrainian language in all its present dialects. The traveler would naturally ask, "What is going on in Ukraine? Disturbances? Insurrections? How do you explain such a large percentage of Ukrainians among political prisoners, a percentage that reaches 60 and even 70 per cent?" If this traveler were to visit Ukraine soon after this, he would immediately see that there are no insurrections nor disturbances in Ukraine. But then a new question would arise: "Why is the Ukrainian language so rare in the cities of Ukraine, but so prevalent in the camps for political prisoners?"

Where can we find the source of these horrors that have befallen the Ukrainian people? In our opinion, the answer lies in the fact that over the course of three decades of Stalinist dictatorship, Human Rights, which were proclaimed in the Declaration of the Rights of Workers and Exploited Masses and in the Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia, were ultimately reduced to naught. As a result of the bureaucratic destruction of the principles contained in the Declaration of the Formation of the USSR, the
national rights of Ukraine as a member of the Soviet Union ceased to be a reality of public life.

In the 1960's Ukraine suffered another calamity. The most talented members of the young Ukrainian intelligentsia were thrown into prisons and concentration camps. These intellectuals had grown up under Soviet rule. They had been taught to believe Lenin's every word, and they believed. They ended up in concentration camps and special psychiatric hospitals because of this belief.

Here, the national question is paramount. For decades, the Ukrainian had it pounded into his head that for him there was no national question whatsoever that only the accursed enemies of Soviet rule could contemplate the separation of Ukraine from Russia. Even the very thought--nay, even if the thought had passed inadvertently--appeared to be so terrible that it had to be immediately banished from one's head. And God forbid that someone should mention it to a friend, or even one's brother. A worse crime has never existed during the entire 1000-year history of Ukraine.

Then, behold, a young person begins to learn Soviet law and unexpectedly discovers that such yearnings cannot be considered a crime at all; they are legal under the Soviet Constitution. Neither does the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR say that agitation for the separation of Ukraine from Russia is a criminal offense. The Code (Article 62) speaks of something else: "Agitation or propaganda conducted with the intent of undermining or weakening Soviet rule." Such agitation is punishable by imprisonment of from 6 months to 7 years.

But the separation of a republic from the Soviet Union does not necessarily have to weaken Soviet rule. On the contrary, this government could find greater support among the populace--the republic remains a soviet one [in its structure], but is completely independent. In this case, there is absolutely no agitation against Soviet rule. Or if there is, then it should be noted that such "agitation" is also present in the Treaty of December 27, 1922, by which the USSR was formed:

The union is based on the principle of voluntariness and equality of the republics, with the right of each republic to freely leave the Union.\(^2\)

We could cite dozens of quotes from Lenin, which show that it is precisely in this voluntariness that one should interpret the spiritual and political nature of the Soviet Union.

As a matter of law, it cannot be inferred that a young person who dreams of the separation of Ukraine from the USSR, yearns simultaneously to weaken Soviet rule. Let us, therefore, assert that even the restructuring of the economy on the basis of "capitalism which exists alongside communism" (NEP) was just another form of Soviet rule--a truly Leninist form for that matter.

\(^2\)Lenin, V. I., Collected Works, Volume 45, page 360.
In spite of this, Levko Lukianenko was sentenced to be shot, his sentence later commuted to 15 years' imprisonment. Levko Lukianenko certainly did not intend to eliminate Soviet rule in Ukraine; he simply wanted the Ukrainian people to realize their constitutional right. With this as their goal, the young lawyers L. Lukianenko and I. Kandyba, who sincerely believed in the Soviet Law they had learned so conscientiously, prepared a relatively moderate draft of a Program of the Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union. That was all they did, nothing more. The Union itself, naturally, was never formed.

But then, when several persons sit around a table, discussing something serious, that, according to the standards of the KGB, already constitutes an "organization." In this case Article 64 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR permits the application of all articles of the section entitled "Especially Dangerous Crimes Against the State"--Articles 56-63. High treason is also listed here (Article 56) and it is punishable by death. That was the justification for the death sentence for one of the authors of the Program.

Actually, there was no legal basis for sentencing L. Lukianenko and I. Kandyba. There was none because they never agitated against Soviet rule, and only such agitation can be considered a crime. And it is totally incomprehensible how they could receive punishment that the Code prescribes for high treason.

Here it should be noted that according to Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights even anti-Soviet agitation (if non-violent) is not a crime but merely an expression of personal convictions. Can a nation be considered civilized if it ratifies international agreements that guarantee the highest of Human Rights and then passes internal laws that nullify these rights?

But then, the issue in Ukraine is not anti-Soviet agitation. None of the members of the young intelligentsia who were arrested in the 1960's and 1970's called for the destruction of Soviet rule; most did not even dream of the constitutionally allowed separation of Ukraine from Russia. The issue was the far too widespread Russification, thinly disguised as "internationalism." The motivating force of this movement was I. Dzyuba, who later, after almost a year in KGB prisons, repudiated his own convictions. But they were not disavowed by V. Moroz, V. Chornovil, V. Stus, O. Serhiienko, I. Svitlychny, Y. Sverstiuk, and many others. Prisons, dungeons, concentration camps, special psychiatric hospitals, strict KGB surveillance and a half-starving existence are the harsh rewards for their ardent belief in the sanctity of the spirit and the letter of the Soviet Constitution.

It is Power that sits in judgment and not Law. And Power always interprets the laws to suit its needs. What is Soviet in nature is called anti-Soviet, including the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR and the Soviet Constitution.

What is it that gives even the illusory justification (since it is not Soviet Law) for such trials? We often hear that the Constitution of the USSR
should not be interpreted literally because of Article 126,\(^3\) which establishes that the leadership nucleus of our society is to be the Communist Party. The Party issues its decisions and resolutions and it is they and not some other documents, that explain how we are to interpret this or that problem. If, for instance, a Party resolution is issued to combat nationalism, then nationalism should, of course, be considered an anti-Soviet activity. Efforts to instill in one's compatriots a love for the Ukrainian language and national culture are then considered anti-Soviet and are made punishable by 10-12 years of imprisonment.

The legal contradictions are convincingly exposed by Ukrainian political prisoner Hryhorii Prykhodko in his letter of November 17, 1975, to the Fourth Session of the Ninth Convocation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Externally, the Soviet Union is the most enthusiastic supporter of the Declaration of Human Rights, while inside the USSR citizens are still so disenfranchised that they would not even dare to demand those rights; furthermore, the Declaration has never even been printed in Ukrainian.

Externally, the Soviet Union speaks out against colonialism and for the right of national self-determination, while inside the USSR, it smothers every effort of non-Russian nations toward separation from Russia and independence . . . In fact, the actions of the Soviet Government contradict the very laws of the USSR.

They are in contradiction because these laws are always interpreted not as they are written but as the Party leadership demands. In fact, a law in the USSR is a trap for the naive--it provokes but does not protect from arbitrary application.

Even if it is accepted, however, that the Party must comprise the leadership nucleus of society, it does not automatically follow that any other form of thinking other than the Party's is unconstitutional. The Constitution gives Soviet citizens freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom to assemble and demonstrate. The leadership does not have the right to interpret these democratic articles of the Constitution for its own benefit; its role is limited to ensuring that these democratic freedoms are real and not just formal declarations. If it acts otherwise, then its activities are unconstitutional and not those of citizens who struggle to attain those democratic freedoms. The Constitution is above the will of the Government because, theoretically, and historically, the subject of Law is not the Party nor the Government, but the Individual.

The bureaucracy seeks to liquidate this 1000-year-old legal norm. That is why, in practice, the situation again arises about which the Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia writes, "He (the serf-Ukrainian Group) was the object and not the subject of Law."\(^4\)

\(^3\)This obviously refers to the 1936 Constitution. In the new 1977 Constitution the Party is similarly described in Article 6.-Y.B.

3. The Savageness of the Sentences

In 1972 massive arrests began in Ukraine. Arrested were scores of young people who sympathized with I. Dzyuba, whose book, *Internationalism or Russification?*, became popular in "samvydav."

Vasyl Lisovy, a Ph.D. (kandydat) in Philosophy, never voiced his support for the "Generation of the 60's," as the young people began to be called. He was absorbed in his scholarly work. But when Lisovy heard of the arrests of I. Dzyuba, I. Svitlychny, Ie. Sverstiuk, V. Stus, O. Serhiienko and others, his conscience would let him remain silent no longer. Lisovy clearly saw that neither universal laws or Soviet Law could justify these arrests. They were, in essence, illegal and unconstitutional, and, as such, anti-Soviet. Believing in the sanctity of the Soviet Constitution, the Communist Vasyl Lisovy wrote to the Party and Government leadership, citing the illegality of the arrests. Toward the end of his letter he wrote something like that: if these people were criminals, then he was also a criminal, because he shared their views. Socratic consistency then led him to the conclusion that he too should be arrested and tried along with them. Naturally, in writing these words, Lisovy did not actually believe that he would be arrested.

But the soulless machine of the KGB immediately went to work. V. Lisovy's "request" was granted with extreme generosity. He was sentenced to 7 years' imprisonment and 3 years' exile.

For what? No one other than government officials and judges had read his letter. The question arises: Are these people so uncertain of their Soviet convictions that they should decide immediately to protect themselves from Lisovy's "agitation"?

Another example. Sviatoslav Karavansky and Hryhorii Prokopovych never concealed their nationalism; it forms the basis of their beliefs. It is known that V. I. Lenin insisted on differentiating between the nationalism of subjugated nations and the nationalism of subjugating nations. Lenin did not condemn nationalism of a subjugated nation, but justified it morally and politically, especially if it was not aggressive, but legally defensive in character. Nonetheless, S. Karavansky and H. Prokopovych and hundreds of other Ukrainian nationalists who peacefully demanded Ukrainian independence were sentenced after the war to 25 years' imprisonment because of their convictions. Later, under Khrushchev, some were released for several years. But as soon as the Khrushchev thaw ended, they were again thrown into concentration camps for the same thing—for their convictions.

In a year or year and a half from now, S. Karavansky will complete his term of imprisonment, which now totals close to 30 years. We are compelled to ask: Will the KGB lengthen his sentence by another 10-15 years? S. Karavansky does not conceal the fact that he has not renounced his nationalist convictions—they have only been strengthened and hardened. He is also well aware that under Soviet Law these convictions and their propagation are not crimes.
The scheme by which the KGB operates in taking the [nonviolent] legally oriented (pravozakhysnyi) nationalism of subjugated nations, a phenomenon Lenin found completely natural and politically justified, and transforming it into a "serious crime against the state," is well illustrated by the case of V. Marchenko. A philologist and linguist, he was simultaneously indicted for Ukrainian and Azerbaidzhanian nationalism. This combination by itself is enough to understand that no real nationalism is involved here.

At the trial, the Azerbaidzhanian nationalism was dropped (Article 63, Criminal Code, Azerbaidzhanian SSR), only the charge of Ukrainian nationalism was retained.

The court (we quote the decision of the court) "determined that from the end of 1965 to 1973, Marchenko, V. V., residing in Kiev, under the influence of nationalist convictions, which resulted from reading illegal anti-Soviet literature, listening to hostile broadcasts of Western radio stations and misinterpreting isolated issues of the nationalities policy of the Soviet State, with the intention of undermining and weakening Soviet rule . . . "

We quote no further, for it is abundantly clear that these simple, normal acts, the natural expressions of public life, in no way fall under any of the articles of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, not to mention international conventions. But to force the Criminal Code to work for the KGB, the following formula is arbitrarily invoked: "with the intention of undermining and weakening Soviet rule . . . " By applying this formula where it just will not fit, a talented linguist's love for the Ukrainian and Azerbaidzhanian languages was construed as a "serious crime against the state."

On the basis of these obviously demagogic charges, V. Marchenko was sentenced to 6 years' imprisonment in a severe-regime corrective labor camp and 2 years in exile.

On September 19, 1974, Vasyl Fedorenko illegally crossed the border at the train station at Chop. The Czechoslovakian border guards arrested him and turned him over to Soviet authorities. In March of 1975, on the basis of Article 56 (treason, desertion to the enemy) and Article 52 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, the Uzhhorod Oblast court sentenced him to 15 years' imprisonment, 5 years of which were to be served in Vladimir Prison.

If we are to adhere to normal logic, then it follows from this inhuman sentence that the Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic is an enemy of the USSR. How else could V. Fedorenko have been charged with "desertion to the enemy"?

The point is that V. Fedorenko had earlier served a sentence for his nationalistic beliefs. That is why he was tried under Article 56 and not Article 75 (crossing the border without a valid passport or permit) which is punishable by 1 to 3 years' imprisonment. They were not even ashamed to call Czechoslovakia an enemy state. But then, perhaps that is what the KGB
thinks of Czechoslovakia.

In his final statement to the court, V. Fedorenko said:

Citizen judges: Is the independence of my thoughts so dangerous to your order? Can it be that my ideas, and only they, force you to try me on such an unbelievable charge as treason and to issue this brutal sentence?

Soon you will be celebrating the 30th anniversary of Victory. Then you feared neither cannon nor tanks—that was an army! Now you fear my convictions . . .

Only where the government does not fear its people and tells them the truth about its achievements as well as its failures can freedom and democracy exist . . . a state whose government hides the truth from its people can be neither democratic nor free.

V. Fedorenko, in protest against this savage arbitrariness, announced an indefinite hunger strike. Existing on the brink of death, he has continued his protest for many months now.

We could cite dozens of examples where Ukrainian nationalism, real or imagined, leads to inhuman sentences. This clearly shows that it is not Soviet authority that conducts the trials (for Soviet laws do not permit trials for nationalism protective of legal rights), but fanatical Great-Russian chauvinists. Power, not Law, sits in judgment.

4. After the Helsinki Conference

When the European Conference was being prepared, a rumor began to circulate among the Ukrains'k community (hromads'kosti): there would soon be an amnesty. Children, now of school age, would be able to embrace their emaciated fathers, whom they had never seen as free men.

But these hopes turned out hollow. The Helsinki Accords, just as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ended up between the propaganda millstones, from where emerges the same old grist: bombastic proclamations that have nothing in common with reality.

We will say nothing about free contacts among people of various countries and continents. That is a luxury about which Ukrainians may not even dream. The main issue is that government agencies, which consider themselves Soviet, should adhere to their own laws.

Our Group could cite many examples of prison authorities forcing Ukrainian political prisoners and their families to speak only in Russian during visitation. No doubt this is explained by practical considerations: they want to monitor the conversation. But when you analyze it, this administrative measure takes on symbolic meaning: for the sake of the jailers' convenience, one is forced to renounce his greatest spiritual treasure—his native language.
Or, take for example, Article 6 of the Corrective Labor Code of the Ukrainian SSR, which states:

Persons sentenced to prison for the first time, who prior to their arrest lived or were sentenced within the Ukrainian SSR, are to serve their sentence, as a rule, within the Ukrainian SSR.

A perfectly natural question arises: How did those tens of thousands of Ukrainians end up in Mordovian camps, where, according to the testimony of M. Masyutko, they comprise close to 70 per cent of all prisoners? Has the situation changed totally, perhaps, since the Helsinki Conference? The group has abundant evidence that no changes for the better have occurred in this area.

Article 6 of the Corrective Labor Code of the Ukrainian SSR recognizes exceptional cases, when, "for the sake of a more efficient rehabilitation" of Ukrainian prisoners it is permissible to send them to other republics. It is unclear what educational principles are involved here. One thing is known: in the past half century, more Ukrainians have died in Mordovia than Mordovians were born.

Our Group does not have at its disposal all of the information about Ukrainian political prisoners. We only have individual reports that we were able to gather. We list some of them:

Men's Zones in Mordovia

Especially severe regime

(431120, Mordovian ASSR, Zubovo-Polianskii raion, Sosnovka, ust. ZhKh 385/1-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AND PATRONYMIC</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>PROFESSION</th>
<th>YEAR OF ARREST</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TERM IN CAMP &amp; EXILE</th>
<th>DATE OF RELEASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEL', Ivan Andriiovych</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Student-Historian</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>10 + 5</td>
<td>1/12/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOROZ, Valentyn Iakovych</td>
<td>4/15/36</td>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>9 + 5, of which 6 in prison</td>
<td>6/1/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSADCHY, Mykhailo Hryhorovych</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>7 + 3</td>
<td>1/12/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARAVANSKY, Sviatoslav Iosypovych</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Poet-Publicist</td>
<td>1965 (2nd time)</td>
<td>25 + 10</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5In the original, the columns have been arranged as follows:
1. Name and Patronymic
2. Length of Term in Camp and Exile
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AND PATRONYMIC</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>PROFESSION</th>
<th>YEAR OF ARREST</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TERM IN CAMP &amp; EXILE</th>
<th>DATE OF RELEASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHUMUK, Danylo Lavrentiiiovych</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>10 + 5</td>
<td>1/12/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3rd time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURCHYK, Mykola Iakovych</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Locksmith</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURZHENKO, Oleksii</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REBRYK, Bohdan</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Poet</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMANYUK, Vasyl' Omelianovych</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHYNKARUK, Trokhym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>(2nd time)</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Date of [Expected] Release
4. Date of Birth
5. Profession
6. Year of Arrest

This rearrangement in the translation makes for a more logical and smoother presentation but may rob the impact of the heavy sentences somewhat.-Y.B.

6 April 27, 1979 Valentyn I. Moroz, together with Soviet dissidents Aleksandr Ginzburg, Mark Dymshits, Eduard S. Kuznetsov and Rev. Georgii P. Vins, were released by the Soviet Government in exchange for two convicted Soviet spies held in the United States (Valdik A. Enger and Rudolf P. Chernyayev) -Y.B.

7 In the original, figures in this row have been added in European handwriting-Y.B.
### Strict regime

(Mordovian ASSR, Ten'hushivsky raion, s. Barashevo, ust. ZhKh 385/3-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Patronymic</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Year of Arrest</th>
<th>Length of Term in Camp &amp; Exile</th>
<th>Date of Expected Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chornovil, Vyacheslav Maksymovych</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6 + 5 (2nd time)</td>
<td>1/12/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stus, Vasyl Semenovych</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Poet</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5 + 3</td>
<td>1/12/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhurakivsky, Mykhailo</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kравtsov, Ihor Ivanovych</td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semenyuk, Roman</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mordovian ASSR, st. Pot'ma, village of Lisne, ust. ZhKh 385/19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Patronymic</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Year of Arrest</th>
<th>Length of Term in Camp &amp; Exile</th>
<th>Date of Expected Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalynets, Iryna Onufriivna</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Poet</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6 + 3</td>
<td>1/12/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popovych, Oksana Zenonivna</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>8 + 5</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senyk, Iryna Mykhailivna</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6 + 5</td>
<td>11/17/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabatura, Stefania Mykhailivna9</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Artist-Gobelín weaver</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5 + 3</td>
<td>1/12/80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women's Zones in Mordovia

(431200, Mordovian ASSR, Ten'hushivsky raion, s. Barashevo, ust. ZhKh 385/3-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Patronymic</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Year of Arrest</th>
<th>Length of Term in Camp &amp; Exile</th>
<th>Date of Expected Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalynets, Iryna Onufriivna</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Poet</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6 + 3</td>
<td>1/12/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popovych, Oksana Zenonivna</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>8 + 5</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senyk, Iryna Mykhailivna</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6 + 5</td>
<td>11/17/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabatura, Stefania Mykhailivna9</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Artist-Gobelín weaver</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5 + 3</td>
<td>1/12/80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8Not in original, added by Y.B.

9In the original, another entry follows, which has been crossed out by hand-Y.B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AND PATRONYMIC</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>PROFESSION</th>
<th>YEAR OF ARREST</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TERM IN CAMP &amp; EXILE</th>
<th>DATE OF RELEASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KALYNETS', Ihor Myronovych</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Poet</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6 + 3</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOVALENKO, Ivan Iukhymovych</td>
<td>1914?</td>
<td>Philologist</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1/12/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRONYUK, Ievhen Vasyliovych</td>
<td>193?</td>
<td>Philosopher</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>7 + 5</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVITLYCHNY, Ivan Oleksiiovych</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Philologist</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>7 + 5</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMYCH, Myron</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(2nd time) 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BESARAB, Dmytro</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERKHOLIAK, Dmytro</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHULIAK, Oleksa</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIDHORODETS'KY, Vasyli'</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRYSHLIAK, Ievhen</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMCHUR, Stepan</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVETS'KO, Dmytro</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 + 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTRIUK, Mykola Mykolaiovych</td>
<td>2/20/49</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOVKOVY, Ivan Vasyl'ovych</td>
<td>7/7/50</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMYDIV, Dmytro Illich</td>
<td>11/3/48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARMUS, Volodymyr V.</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 + 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARMUS, Mykola Vasyl'ovych</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 + 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Perm Oblast, Chusovsky r-n, S. Kuchyno, VS 389/37)

SVERSTYUK, Ievhen Oleksandrovyvych 1928 | Writer | 1972 | 7 + 5 | 1984 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AND PATRONYMIC</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>PROFESSION</th>
<th>YEAR OF ARREST</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TERM IN CAMP &amp; EXILE</th>
<th>DATE OF RELEASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERNYCHUK, Anatolii</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRYN'KIV, Dmytro Dmytrovyvch</td>
<td>6/11/48</td>
<td>Poet</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>7 + 5</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUPRII, Roman Dmytrovyvch</td>
<td>7/1/48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIZNYKIV, Oleksa Serhiiovych</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Poet</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5 1/2</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYRCHAK, Hryhorii Andriievych</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUTSALO, Iurii</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STROTSYN', Pavlo</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYN'KIV, Volodymyr Iosafatovych</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>4 + 3</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYSELYK, Vasyl'</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLYVA, Volodymyr</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALIICHUK, Dmytro</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KULAK, Onufrii</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IANKEVYCH, Stepan</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDIUK, Vasyl'</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISOVY, Vasyl' Semenovych</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Philosopher</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>7 + 3</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vladimir Prison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AND PATRONYMIC</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>PROFESSION</th>
<th>YEAR OF ARREST</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TERM IN CAMP &amp; EXILE</th>
<th>DATE OF RELEASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTONIUK, Zinovii Pavlovych</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Chemical engineer</td>
<td>1/12/72</td>
<td>7 + 3</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONDAR, Mykola Pavlovych</td>
<td>11/21/39</td>
<td>Philosopher</td>
<td>11/7/71</td>
<td>7 + 3</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 In the original, another entry follows, which has been crossed out by hand—Y.B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AND PATRONYMIC</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>PROFESSION</th>
<th>YEAR OF ARREST</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TERM IN CAMP &amp; EXILE</th>
<th>DATE OF RELEASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAIIDUK, Roman Vasyl'ovych</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 + 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDOROVY, Anatoliy Kuz'movych</td>
<td>1/1/38</td>
<td>Ph.D. in technical sciences</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>7 + ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROKYTS'KY, Volodymyr Iulianovych</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Publicist</td>
<td>1/12/72</td>
<td>5 + ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRYKHOD'KO, Hryhorii Andriiovych</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Electronics engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 + ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPADIUK, Zoreslav Volodymyrovych</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student at Lviv University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERHIHENKO, Oleksander Fedorovych</td>
<td>6/26/32</td>
<td>Artist-restorer</td>
<td>1/13/72</td>
<td>7 + 3</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPELIAK, Stepan Tevstafiiovych</td>
<td>2/26/52</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 + 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURYK, Andrii Markovych</td>
<td>10/14/27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDULAK-SHARYYN, Mykola Oleksandrovych</td>
<td>4/22/26</td>
<td>9/20/68</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDAN, Leonid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2nd time)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDORENKO, Vasyl' Petrovych</td>
<td>3/30/28</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/16/75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Not in original, added by Y.B.
In Exile

NAME AND PATRONYMIC
HORBAL', Mykola Andriiovych
HANDZIUK, Volodymyr
KAMPOV, Pavlo Fedorovych
KOTS, Mykola
KRAVETS', Andrii
PROKOPOVYCH, Hryhorii Hryhorovych
HUBKA, Ivan Mykolajovych

ADDRESS
Tomsk Oblast, s. Porabel, SU-6, vahon 16.
636400, Tomsk Oblast, Chainsky r-n, s. Pidhorne, Lermontova 34/4.
636842, Tomsk Oblast, Pervomaisky r-n, s. Komsomolske, prov. Poshtovy 3, kv. 2
Tomsk Oblast, s. Hehul'det, vul. Pushkina 48, kv. 2.
636500, Tomsk Oblast, Verkh'okets'ky r-n, p/v Bilii Yar, selyshche Poludenovka.
663120, Irasnoiarsky Krai, Pyrovsk, vul. Koreneva 47.

The Group's goal is to continue to collect information about Ukrainian political prisoners. The information at hand, however, is quite sufficient to conclude that the "exception" mentioned in Article 6 of the Corrective Labor Code of the Ukrainian SSR has become the norm. None of the above-mentioned political prisoners is serving his judicial sentence in his homeland. For writing poems that were never made public, the talented poets Ihor Kalynets and his wife Iryna have been banished from Ukraine to the snows of Mordovia for nine years, to be subjected to KGB re-education "in the spirit of an honest attitude toward work" (Article 1, Corrective Labor Code of the Ukrainian SSR). Where else but in the USSR and China are poets thus "re-educated"? 12

On the other hand, Ukraine is well supplied with psychiatric hospitals.

By a decision of the Kiev Oblast Court, in September 1972 Vasyl' RUBAN was placed in the Dnipropetrovsk special psychiatric hospital for a manuscript which had been confiscated from him, one with the expressive title "Ukraine--Communist and Independent." This topic has already been discussed in previous sections. For Ukrainian political prisoners, this manner of thinking is typical.

12 In the original, there follows a paragraph of four sentences which have been crossed out by hand.-Y.B.
Anatolii LUPYNIS was placed in a psychiatric hospital without any judicial proceedings. In 1971, he was taken for a "little therapy." They took him and "forgot" to release him. Lupynis had been imprisoned from 1957 to 1967; he took part in a strike in the Mordovian Camp 385/7. For this he was placed in Vladimir Prison. He maintained an 8-month-long hunger strike, which left him an invalid. He was bound to a bed in a camp hospital for approximately two years until rehabilitated in 1957 (sic). His family and friends assume that Lupynis is kept in a psychiatric hospital for reading poetry by the Taras Shevchenko monument on May 22, 1971.

Boris KOVHAR was thrown into the Dnipropetrovsk special psychiatric hospital for refusing to work for the KGB. Our Group has at its disposal conclusive evidence to prove this.

Mykola PLAKHOTNIUK, a physician, was kept in the Dnipropetrovsk special psychiatric hospital from January 12, 1972, to August 1976, when he was transferred to a similar hospital in Kazan.

Below we list individual incidents of serious violations of Human Rights that have occurred in the last few months.

Mykhaylo KOVTUNENKO, a Kiev physician, was arrested in September 1976 for refusing to work for the KGB. As with Kovhar, the Group has serious evidence to prove this. He was accused of Bribery, as in the noted case of the physician M. Shtern of Vinnytsia.

Recent information indicates that M. Kovtunenko was transferred without trial to a psychiatric hospital in Kiev. Should world opinion remain silent, he too will be "forgotten," as were Kovhar and Lupynis.

On November 2, 1976, IOSYP TERELIA was thrown into the psychiatric hospital in Vinnytsia. Terelia has spent 14 of the 33 years of his life in camps, prisons and special psychiatric hospitals for his religious and nationalistic convictions. Freed in April 1976, he was pronounced perfectly healthy and even subject to military service. In fact, he had become an invalid; during torture in prison his spine had been injured. He worked as a cabinetmaker in a district (raion) hospital. From there he was taken by ambulance to an insane asylum.

I. Terelia is a promising poet. He was never given the opportunity to study, but nobody could suppress the emotions he expresses in his poems. For his uncompromising national and religious feelings, expressed in large part in his poetry, Terelia has sacrificed almost half his life in camps, Vladimir Prison and special psychiatric hospitals. From the Vinnytsia psychiatric hospital Terelia writes:

Today, on the 10th, I received my first injection, though I did not request it at all. But when people want to do "good" for their neighbor, they sometimes permit themselves the impermissible (that is, the amoral, the unconscionable). The reaction has started bubbling—how wonderful; there is much acid.
The room holds almost 40 variously sick persons. I was placed among the violent, with a few alcoholics with high fever tossed in, who scream every night as if cut up (nedorizani—literally not yet cut to death—Y.B.). Outdoor exercise is not permitted—fresh air is forbidden! The same goes for any contacts, even the orderlies are warned not to speak to me. "No exchanges."13 The food is horrendous, almost like the prison swill, and there are days when you wonder where you are.

The KGB, it appears, as early as a month before the Witches' Sabbath had planned to have me killed by someone else's hand. As far as I am concerned, Psychiatry and the Police are like siblings, serving the almost legendary KGB in order to show their better side, lest, Heaven forbid, they get a "mark." With this in mind Police Captain Tymoshchuk summoned me and began to blackmail me, threatening me with jail for "parasitism," for not working, although he knew very well that I had a job and that I have a job now.14

Among the gross violations of Human Rights, which have not abated since Helsinki, are the "camp trials"—a method borrowed from Beria's version of jurisprudence. The "trial" is held without witnesses, without counsel and often without a representative of the local authorities, who should supervise. A typical "troika" from Stalinist times! With the aid of such "troikas," the camp administration maintains its zone in fear and submission and transfers the more active prisoners, who demand the status of political prisoners, to the harsh treatment in Vladimir Prison. That is how they pacified Zone 36 by transferring Krasniak, Vudka, Serhiienko and others to prison. Of the 14 Ukrainian political prisoners in Vladimir, 12 were sent there by "camp courts," most of them for 3 years.

Finally, a summation is in order. It is far from encouraging. More than a year has gone by since the Helsinki Conference, and it has not brought the Ukrainian people any improvement. New prisons are being built and the budgets of the KGB continue to grow. Today, every establishment has its own KGB curator. Monitoring of telephone conversations, of private mail, microphones in ceilings, "hooligan" muggings of Human Rights activists that have been planned in advance—all of these have become a matter of daily life. And there is no one to complain to.

True, there are fewer politically motivated arrests than in 1972, but all those considered "unreliable" lose their professional positions. The ranks of guards, engine stokers and common laborers are filled by writers, lawyers and philologists. Psychiatric hospitals are still being used as

13 Nikakikh predvizhenii in the original, i.e., in Russian—Y.B.

14 On November 30, Y. Terelia was released from the psychiatric hospital (Ukrainian Public Group).
institutions for "re-educating" those who think differently. False accusations, such as bribe taking, are made in order to hide political motives. Refusal to cooperate with the KGB, that is, to be an informer, brings sadistic, vicious reprisals, while informers are rewarded with automatic promotions.

All aspects of life today are controlled by the KGB, from the employee's bed on top of which stick out microphones (often even unconcealed!), to the writer's study. For example, Mykola Rudenko summoned the KGB to remove microphones from his ceiling. Later, the KGB decided to place an informer by Rudenko, choosing Dr. Mykhailo Kovtunenko for this ignominious role. When Kovtunenko refused, he was immediately arrested for "accepting bribes."

Another example: After an illegal search, former political prisoner Oleksii Tykhy was arrested on suspicion of robbing a store. A guard then began to beat him. When Tykhy protested to KGB Lt. Col. V. O. Melnikov, the latter responded with brutal obscenities and shouted, "And who do you think you are?"

Actually, this detention was necessary for the KGB to confiscate Tykhy's manuscripts. In two days, he was released, but his manuscripts were not returned.

In the meantime, former political prisoners are returning unbroken, hardened, and determined to continue the struggle for Human Rights. It is enough to examine the membership of our Group to be convinced of that. This is a new, strange social phenomenon, for which the authorities are not prepared. It appears that prisons, camps, and psychiatric hospitals cannot serve as dams against a movement in defense of justice. On the contrary, they temper cadres of unyielding fighters for freedom. And the KGB can no longer make sure that political prisoners will never return.

If world opinion does not lessen its moral support, if the Western news media focus more attention to the struggle for Human Rights in the USSR, then the coming decade will bring great democratic changes in our country.

Since the overthrow of feudalism, the individual has become an active element in the formulation of government policy; in other words, a Subject of the law. This means that if there is a single individual that does not think as does the rest of society, the law must protect this individual's convictions. Otherwise the Aristotles, Copernicuses, Einsteins and Marxes would never see the light of day: they would always be thrown into psychiatric hospitals and concentration camps.

There is but one Civilization—this is clearly seen from the Cosmos. The Sun's ray knows no earthly boundaries. Man is formed from the rays of the Sun; he is a child of the Sun. Who has the right to restrain his thought, which flies into Infinity? For the sake of life on Earth, for the sake of our grandchildren and their children, we say: Enough! And our call is echoed in the Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Accords, which were ratified also by the Soviet Government.
OLES' BERDNYK
PETRO HRYHORENKO [Pyotr Grigorenko]15
IVAN KANDYBA
LEVKO LUKIANENKO
OKSANA MESHKO
MYKOLA MATUSEVYCH
MYROSLAV MARYNOVYCH
MYKOLA RUDENKO (Group Leader)
NINA STROKATA
OLEKSIY TYKH

November-December 1976

A signed copy is retained by the Group.

12/6/76 /signed/ Mykola Rudenko16

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translated from Ukrainian original by the Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee, P. O. Box 32397, Washington, DC 20007. Ukrainian original, which is kept in the Committee’s archives, is two carbon copies of the typescript, 18 pp., 29.0 cm x 20.6 cm. Handwritten notation at the end is in ballpoint.

The text above has been checked and slightly modified by Y. Bilinsky, as explained in the preceding bibliographic note.

Memorandum No. 1 has been widely published. See bibl. note above. It will be found in the U.S. Helsinki Commission’s Reports of Helsinki-Accord Monitors in the Soviet Union . . . (February 24, 1977) [Vol. I], pp. 99-118. Also in Bilingual Declaration/Memorandum #1, pp. 9-24. It has been omitted from SDS 30. It has been reprinted in UPR, pp. 63-97 (see esp. facsimile of first page on p. 69 and of last page on p. 70).

15Russian version of name, which is better known in the West, added by first translator.-Y.B.

16Handwritten in original.-Y.B.
3. OPEN LETTER

Concerning the Participation of the Ukraine in the Belgrade Conference and the Establishment of the Ukrainian Group to Promote [the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords]

TO: [All] Men of Good Will

[FROM:] Mykola Rudenko
Kiev 84, Koncha-Zaspa
No. 1, Apt. 8, Tel. 614863

My voice is not loud, nor is that of my people. To-day in the streets of the Ukrainian capital [Kiev--Y.B.] the Ukrainian language is heard seldom. For the most part it is also not to be found in the colleges\(^1\) and schools. We are told that this is as it should be, for allegedly "a new people has emerged"--the Soviet People. And for some reason this "new people" shall not speak Lithuanian, Bielorussian, or Ukrainian. We are being insistently persuaded (vmovliaiut') that the Soviet language is Russian, and Russian only! And if you do not agree with this, you will be sent to jail or to a psychiatric hospital.

After the October Revolution the peoples of the former Russian Empire concluded a voluntary union. Lenin wrote at that time:

... We, the Council of People's Commissars, recognize the Ukrainian republic, her right to complete separation from Russia or to the conclusion of a treaty with the Russian republic (Lenin, Full Collected Works, Vol. 36, p. 143)\(^2\)

December 27, 1922, that treaty was signed. It read, among other things:

As the basis for the union there should be laid the principles of the voluntariness and of the equality of the republics. (V. I. Lenin, Full Collected Works, Vol. 36, p. 360).\(^3\)

---

\(^1\)The literal but misleading translation of v instytututakh would have been in institutes. - Y.B.

\(^2\)See "Manifest k ukrainskomu narodu s ul'timativnymy trebovaniami k Ukrainskoi Rade" (Manifesto to the Ukrainian People with an Ultimatum to the Ukrainian Rada--in Russian), in V. I. Lenin, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (Moscow: State Publishers of Political Literature, 1962; 5th edition), Vol. 35, p. 143. - Y.B.

\(^3\)Could not be located in 5th Russian edition of Lenin's Works. Rudenko may have used Ukrainian language edition of Lenin, or else there is a mistake in the citation. - Y.B.
When that treaty was being affirmed with signatures, I was two years old, and Lev Lukianenko had not yet come into this world—he was born when Stalin began the collectivization. To-day, having served his [full] sentence of fifteen years' imprisonment, Lukianenko has returned to his native city of Chernyhiv, where he is living under surveillance. Soon there should end the thirteen years' prison sentence of Sviatoslav Karavansky, who was born the same year as I. Valentyn Moroz, however, Viacheslav Chornovil, Vasyl' Lisovy, Oleksander Serhiienko, and hundreds of others are still being worn out (mortat'sia) in prisons, concentration camps, and psychiatric hospitals. What for? Only for having believed that we were voluntary allies. Our language is as much a Soviet language as is Russian. And if this not be so, then the concept of "Soviet" becomes an unnatural and unacceptable one...

Before the war I served in an NKVD division which guarded the Government. During the war I was the political officer of a platoon in Leningrad, which was then under siege. I have always believed and continue to believe in the sincerity of Russians. But I do not trust Russian chauvinists—it is they who turned the solemn (sviaschennyi) Treaty of the Ukraine with Russia into a worthless scrap of paper.

In the United Nations the Ukraine is represented as a sovereign state. But August 1, 1976 [sic] in Helsinki there were assembled the heads of governments to sign the most important document of our era—the Final Act of the Treaty of Security and Cooperation in Europe. Did anybody of them recall that at the Conference there was not represented one of the great European states—the long-suffering Ukraine? Most probably, the world has long become convinced that the membership of the Ukraine in the UN is a Stalinist tactical ploy, which the new rulers of Russia have inherited. Because in the West our multinational country is still being called Russia. And this firmly rooted tradition is water on the mill of Russian chauvinists.

In order to somehow change this injustice crying to heaven, November 9, 1976, there has been established in Kiev the Ukrainian Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords. It has been joined by the well-known Ukrainian writer Oles' Berdnyk, the jurist Levko Lukianenko, who has returned from imprisonment, the microbiologist Nina Strokata, and the mother of the prisoner of conscience Oleksander Serhiienko, Oksana Meshko. She, like Berdnyk, had been a prisoner of...

---

4 Sviatoslav Kravansky and his wife Nina Strokata Karavansky were allowed to emigrate November 30, 1979. December 11, 1979, they settled in the United States. See Svoboda-The Ukrainian Weekly, December 16, 1979, pp. 1, 2. - Y.B.

5 April 27, 1979, Valentyn Moroz, together with four other Soviet dissidents, was exchanged against two convicted Soviet spies. - Y.B.
Beria's camps. (The jurist Ivan Kandyba, who had served sixteen years in labor camps and who heard about the establishment of the Group on the radio, has expressed his wish to join it as a member—M.R.).

At the request of Ukrainians who shared his ideas (ukrains'kykh odnodumtsiv) General Petro Hryhorenko consented to act as our Group's representative in Moscow. All the world knows about his long incarceration in special psychiatric hospitals. From among the Group's members only I have not had this bitter experience—I have only been dismissed from the Party and the Writer's Union. This has, of course, deprived me of any possibility to have my works printed, but in our conditions such a penalty is considered a light one.

But somebody suddenly decided to amend my fate—immediately upon the creation of the Group during the night of November 10, bricks started flying through the windows of my apartment. They were sharp-edged and heavy—and had been designed to hit me in the head. But it so happened that I was out that night. One of the bricks wounded Oksana Meshko, the mother of a prisoner in Vladimir jail. Neighbors told me [later] that for several minutes the house was shaking from all that rumbling. They thought that an earthquake had struck. The militia have not caught anybody, of course, and refused to write a report. The militia officer said that no great significance should be attached to this "petty occurrence" (nevelykii podii) for "nobody had been killed." The cat was out of the bag (Tak os' skazav).

I live on the outskirts of the city, in a forest with hardly a soul nearby. V.I.P.'s come here to hunt boars. I have not the slightest desire that something should happen, which would merit the attention of the Kievan militia, from their point of view. It is for that reason that I am appealing to all men of good will: Support us with your good word!

Our Group has no political aims whatsoever. Our objective is an exclusively humanitarian one: to promote the implementation of the Helsinki Accords in the field of human rights. But we cannot bypass the nationality question: the majority of the Ukrainian political prisoners have been sentenced for alleged or real nationalism. It is precisely this Ukrainian nationalism that the regime, which considers itself Soviet, is most afraid of!

In the communiqués on the establishment of our Group there has appeared somewhere [the statement] that we are a "branch" ("viddilom") of the Moscow Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords. This is incorrect. Our relations are based on friendship and cooperation, not on subordination. The saddest thing is that Ukrainians and Russians are really fraternal peoples. But our good-neighborly relations are being undercut by [Russian] great power chauvinism. Insofar as the latter is being looked down upon with unconcealed disdain in dissident circles, we are courageously establishing ties of friendship with the Moscow democrats.
From under the thick ice of the fettered human spirit, there is timidly pushing up his head another child of Freedom. Whether he will be barbarically destroyed or whether he will survive depends on you, men of good will.

Mykola Rudenko

November 14, 1976

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translated from Ukrainian by Y. Bilinsky. Ukrainian original has been reprinted in UPR, pp. 15-17. Checked by Y.B. against carbon copy of typescript in Russian, which is kept in the archives of the Prolog Research Corporation, New York City. Russian version differs from Ukrainian version in two respects: Reference to the jurist Ivan Kandyba, in 6th paragraph in Ukrainian text, is not integrated in main text in Russian version, but placed at bottom of page. Secondly, the Russian version includes at the end of the letter a snapshot with the following caption: "Photograph made by the Author: 'Stones instead of Bread.' Bricks gathered in my apartment after the night pogrom of November 10, 1976. Signed M. Rudenko."
4. UKRAINIAN PUBLIC GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

MEMORANDUM NO. 2

Concerning the Participation of Ukraine in the Belgrade Conference, 1977

In several months, leading statesmen from the thirty-five countries which participated in the historic Conference in Helsinki will gather in Belgrade.

At the Belgrade Conference will be represented countries whose populations are two to three times less than were Ukraine's losses in the last world war and even those whom the war had passed by. Such wide representation, of course, can only be heartening. But will long-suffering Ukraine, which has made innumerable sacrifices in the name of peace among nations, be represented?

The Helsinki Conference was dedicated precisely to this problem, the problem of peace and security in Europe. How could it have happened that a highly developed European country, with a population of fifty million and territory which surpasses that of any Western European state, was not invited to the forum of nations in Helsinki?

Why didn't any of the participants of the Helsinki Conference notice her absence? Is not Ukraine a member of the UN, with all the rights due her as such? Was it not over her land, from the upper Dniester to the lower reaches of the Donets, that fascist tanks rolled?

It would be easy to ask many more rhetorical questions. But to us, members of the Ukrainian Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, it is obvious why this happened. We will attempt to clarify this misunderstanding with complete frankness. And, of necessity, not without a feeling of bitterness.

Western diplomats, if not from podia, then in lobbies during international conferences, continue to call the Soviet Union by the ancient "Russia." This is not happenstance. The historical fact that the Russian Empire disintegrated long ago and in its place was created a voluntary Union of sovereign states was neither mentally assimilated nor psychologically fixed either in the West or in the Soviet Union itself. Tradition took precedence over law.
From an administrative-juristic standpoint, the Soviet Union should be compared not to the United States, as is sometimes done, but to a United Europe. It is precisely here that equal, allied states strive to unite their efforts. Precisely here is created an all-European Parliament which, through its prerogatives, reminds one of the all-Union government in its original form. But a United Europe was never a single empire—while the Soviet Union was created in place of the Russian Empire which existed for several centuries. This is why that which was formed after October was burdened with all the horrors of the past.

Each of the Union republics, in accordance with the Constitution of the USSR, is as sovereign as any state that belongs to the European Commonwealth, which one can indeed call a Union.

However, the imperialistic past of Russia hangs like a black shadow over the allied peoples, not allowing them to speak of their constitutional rights. That is why the personality cult, which in its worse form reproduced czarist authoritarianism, is substituted with another cult; from podia the word "Union" goes forth, but is understood as "Russia." And that this has continued for six full decades is in no small measure the responsibility of Western leaders, for whom it was just as difficult to break away from age-old traditions as it was for the peoples of the Russian Empire.

In the meantime, the real sovereignty of the allied states, for the sake of which rivers of blood have been spilled, is being steadily transformed into a convention of protocol. And in recent years, chauvinistically inclined officials of the Russian Federation, whom no one ever punished for their militant chauvinism, contemptuously disregard even this pitiful convention. Today, for example, while these lines are being written, a senior investigator of the procuracy of the city of Moscow, someone named Tikhonov, is digging among papers confiscated on his orders from five members of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords. It had not even dawned on him to turn to the procurator for the city of Kiev. He arbitrarily signed the orders for searches of citizens of the Ukrainian SSR, just as this was done in the czarist empire, where no republics existed. Also, S. Kovalev was convicted in Lithuania on the basis of the Code of Procedures of the RSFSR. The uncontrolled KGB still sends hundreds of Ukrainian political prisoners to Mordovia and the Urals (that is, onto the territory of neighboring states). And this is considered normal. This is how it is with the laws of the republics—they are simply ignored.

It should be noted that Marxism as the official ideology of the Soviet Union loses some of its allure with each passing year. What should take its place? Over here, they never stop repeating: patriotism, love of the homeland. As a result, today, just as during the years of the Great Patriotic War, that which is Russian is constantly being pushed to the forefront, though under the label "of the Fatherland." However, a citizen of the USSR has the right to say: an Armenian has his Fatherland and a Russian his. Do Union obligations really demand the renunciation of republic citizenship? Does a Ukrainian really not have the right to consider Ukraine his Fatherland? Which laws deny him this natural right?
Such laws did exist in czarist Russia; there are none such in the USSR. Instead, the USSR has the KGB, an organization of war (voennnaia) which opposes sacred human rights with brute strength. According to the norms of the KGB, patriotism can only be Russian or "all-Soviet," which in practice also means Russian. The vice-president of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, P. N. Fedoseyev, even created an "all-Soviet" language, one which, of course, is not a new form of Esperanto, but the same old Russian.

Russia is glorified in hundreds of poems and songs, something which, as Russian culture in general, we, of course, treat with respect. But if you try to express your love for Ukraine in the same images, Mordovian camps or special psychiatric hospitals await you. Do the popular masses of Russia know this? Of course they do not.

Thus, for example, in the ardent, deeply patriotic work of V. Moroz, A Chronicle of Resistance, for which he was arrested, there is not even a reference to armed resistance. The theme deals with the inhabitants of the village of Kosmach who, in preserving their native traditions, oppose spiritual standardization and the standardization of their everyday lives, i.e., pseudoculture. Nothing more! Nevertheless, this proved to be enough to have V. Moroz thrown into the worst of prisons--the Vladimir--for six years. After this prison, eight years of concentration camps and Siberian exile remain. But he had sung the praises of things of the fatherland, something that Soviet writers call for these days. But these things of the fatherland he saw not just anywhere, but in Ukraine. In this alone does his "crime" lie.

Here is another example. A native talent, the artist-encruster P. Ruban, created a highly artistic work, an encrusted model of a book out of wood, as a gift to the American people on the occasion of the Bicentennial of the USA. On the cover was the Statue of Liberty and the caption "200 years." The work was stolen out of the workshop and the artist sentenced, on the basis of artificially fabricated charges, to eight years in strict-regime camps, and five years' exile, with confiscation of property. They imputed to him the pilferage of materials at the furniture factory where he worked. The charges, however, were constructed cynically and without any evidence. And all this happened just a half year before the conference in Belgrade. This inhuman verdict clearly shows what it is that the unbridled chauvinists seek from the Helsinki Accords. The tactics are simple: it is alright to sign any international document whatsoever, but at home, as they say, "we will put things in order ourselves."

Dozens, if not hundreds, of such examples can be cited. In truth, there is no more bitter fate than to be born a Ukrainian.

There is no doubt in this: in a civilized state such things cannot go on for too long. Such experiments can be conducted only with confused, illiterate people, and there are less and less of them in the USSR. This is why we are convinced that in the end law will triumph over an imperialistic tradition. For, in its legal foundations, the USSR is, after all, still an empire.
Yes, we are aware that Western government officials have a basis for treating with skepticism the issue that has been raised by the Ukrainian Group: will Ukraine be represented at the Conference in Belgrade or will it not? And yet we still turn to the countries which participated in the Helsinki Conference with this appeal: demand the participation of Ukraine at all conferences on security in Europe! Security in Europe cannot become a reality if a nation of fifty million, which has suffered through countless misfortunes during two world wars, is artificially kept from participating in European affairs.

The forms of Union relationships are not eternal; they change with time. New generations will come, generations which will read in the agreement of December 27, 1922, on the basis of which the USSR was created, that which is written there, and not that which is being dictated by the KGB. Then the conditional will become the unconditional, that which has been declared in form will be transformed into state and national reality.

The citizenry of the world can do very much to hasten this day. Only then will the nations of Eastern Europe achieve full independence, only then will Western Europe sigh in relief; the threat of a new world war will have disappeared forever. If only this would come to be understood!

Members of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords:

O. Berdnyk
I. Kandyba
L. Lukianenko
O. Meshko
M. Rudenko (head of Group)
N. Strokata
O. Tykhy

January 20, 1977

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Handwritten copy (ballpoint) in Russian, on 5 pp. of white paper, 29.5 x 21 centimeters, consulted in archives of Smoloskyp Publishers. English translation made by Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee was checked against that Russian original and the literal Ukrainian translation in UPR, pp. 99-102.
This memorandum, which reached the West relatively late, was first published in English translation by the Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee (P. O. Box 32397, Washington, D. C. 20007) as a lithographed pamphlet: Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, Kiev, Ukrainian SSR, MEMORANDUM NO. 2 and MEMORANDUM NO. 18 (no date). It has been reprinted in Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C. 20515, Reports of Helsinki Accord Monitors in the Soviet Union. Volume Three of the Documents of the Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR: A Partial Compilation, Edited and Prepared by the Staff of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. November 7, 1978. Pages 130-133.
On New Repressions in Ukraine Against Members of the Helsinki Group

On February 5, 1977, the organs of the KGB and the procuracies of Kiev, Donetsk, and Moscow regions again conducted searches of the apartments of the members of the Ukrainian Public Group. In the apartment of the leader of the Group Mykola Rudenko, his literary archives, 90 percent of which had been purloined during the previous search, this time were stolen in their entirety. In addition, Rudenko's wife Raisa, his son Iuriy, and a member of the Group, the writer O. [Oles] Berdnyk, were subjected to personal searches (without the presentation of a warrant). Those performing the search conducted themselves roughly; obviously, they were employees of the organs [of the KGB]. After the search the leader of this "action," the deputy procurator of Donetsk Region, Noskov, took Rudenko away without answering his wife's questions as to the grounds on which he was being held. For three days the Kiev procuracy did not answer Raisa Rudenko's questions about the fate of her husband; finally, on the fourth day she was informed that he was in investigation solitary confinement cell No. 1 in Donetsk Region.

Not a search, but a real pogrom was conducted in the apartment of O. Meshko, a member of the Group. Investigating officer Pankov of the Kiev procuracy, the warrant issued at the request of the Moscow procuracy, broke a window like a bandit and climbed into the apartment. He took everything that was either handwritten or typed (as he put it, "all the trash").

After Oksana Meshko refused to submit to a personal search, demanding a warrant for that, the investigating officer twisted her arms and, with the help of two women, searched her roughly.

---

1 Memorandum No. 3 has not yet reached the West as of November 1979: it had been confiscated during the searches of February, 1977. - Y.B.

2 Russian original has another sentence which has been struck out by hand. - Y.B.

3 "Searched her" is preceded in Russian original by several words struck out by hand. - Y.B.
Searches were also conducted in the apartments of M. [Myroslav] Marynovych and M. [Mykola] Matusevych, both members of the Public Group, as well as in the apartments of their parents and relatives in Kiev, Vasyl'ko, and Drohobych. Those performing the searches conducted themselves roughly, not even granting the necessities to small children—a walk, rest, food.

All these searches and the violence were conducted supposedly in connection with the "case of O. [Oleksii] Tykhyy," a member of the Public Group living in the Donbas. The essence of the "case" on the basis of which O. Tykhyy was arrested has not been disclosed.

One thing is clear: the arrest of the leader of the Group, M. Rudenko, and a member, O. Tykhyy, as well as the searches in the apartments of the other members, are but the beginnings of a whirlwind of regression, which the KGB is preparing to direct against the Public Groups in the USSR.

(Note: On February 8 of this year, the physician M. Kovtunenko, who had refused to act as the KGB's informer on M. Rudenko, was sentenced to one and a half year's imprisonment. The regional court punished him for [taking] "bribes"—three and a half rubles, a can of coffee, etc. It is obvious that this case had been fabricated.)

A lot depends on world public opinion: will this ominous wave subside, will the repressive organs return those arrested back to their homes, will they allow the legal monitoring of the implementation of the Helsinki Accords?! Or will the spirit of Helsinki—the Spirit of Cooperation and Friendship, of Trust among peoples—be laid to rest beneath the crags of ruthless despotism and lawlessness?!

Members of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords:

L. Lukianenko⁴
O. Berdnyk⁵
P. Hryhorenko
O. Meshko
M. Marynovych
M. Matusevych
N. Strokata
I. Kandyba⁶

February 9, 1977
The signed copy is kept in the Group's archives

[signed] O. Berdnyk⁷

⁴Printed by hand in original. - Y.B.
⁵Handwritten signature on top of typewritten name in original. - Y.B.
⁶Printed by hand in original. - Y.B.
⁷Handwritten in original. - Y.B.
BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: The original that reached the West is in Russian. Y. Bilinsky has consulted a xerox copy kept in archives of Prolog Research Corporation: it is interesting in that it includes handwritten corrections and notes, including an authenticating notation by O. Berdnyk, the acting head of the group. The English translation which underlies this text is that of Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee (P. O. Box 32397, Washington, D. C. 20007), was published originally in its lithographed pamphlet DOCUMENTS OF THE UKRAINIAN PUBLIC GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS, Kiev, Ukraine: Memorandum No. 4, ... No. 5, ... No. 6, ... No. 7 (with supplement), ... No. 8, ... No. 9, Open Letter to Congress, Open Letter to Shcherbytsky (no date), pp. 1-2 (Source henceforth abbreviated Docs. Ukr. Public Group: Memoranda 4-9, etc.). English translation has been reprinted in United States Congress (95th Congress: 1st Session), Basket III: Implementation of the Helsinki Accords: Hearings Before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, 95th Congress, 1st Session, on Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, Volume IV: Soviet Helsinki Watch, Reports on Repression June 3, 1977; U. S. Policy and Belgrade Conference June 6, 1977 (Washington: U. S. G.P.O., 1977), pp. 69-70. (Source henceforth abbreviated Basket III Hearings, Vol. IV). Ukrainian translation in UPR, pp. 103-104.
6. UKRAINIAN PUBLIC GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

TO THE COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE BELGRADE CONFERENCE
IN THE SUMMER OF 1977:

MEMORANDUM NO. 5

UKRAINE OF THE SUMMER OF 1977

Introduction

The historic will of a people inevitably manifests itself in one or
another form, revelation or action. As a mountain stream searches out
crevices in order to carve out a channel for itself, so does the dynamic
essence of a people find spokesmen for itself—spokesmen who are sons
of its spirit—in order to give to other fraternal peoples a sign of
its will.

The Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the
Helsinki Accords is one such sign.¹

The bureaucratic structure of the Soviet Union reacted to the
appearance of the Group to Promote with great pain and hostility. During
the three months it has been in existence the security organs [KGB]
conducted several brutal, harsh and savage searches in each of its members'
apartments, confiscating almost all of the Group's literary, epistolary
and philosophical archives, its documents, a number of books which had no
relationship to the case, etc. Finally, on February 5, 1977, the head of
the Group, the poet Mykola Rudenko, and a Group member, teacher Oleksii
Tykhy, were arrested, with no charges whatsoever being filed against them.

What is it that the initiators of the above-mentioned lawlessness
and arbitrariness are so terrified of? What terrifying things do they see
in people who openly state their convictions, while inviting the ruling
circles of their own country and other states to a creative, evolutionary
dialogue?

¹Unless specifically indicated the emphasis is in the original. - Y.B.
The courage and openness with which the Group has come forward prove that its members are not enemies of the Soviets, nor to the revolutionary ideals of a New World, nor to the humane ideals of Socialism and Communism.

What need was there for the searches and arrests, when all of the Group's documents were released to the world for the purpose of making them public?

We are not building an underground--this proves that we do not intend to overthrow the Soviet system.

We are not afraid of discussion--this proves that we are sure of our convictions.

We are ready to have our ideas either approved or rejected in an all-national referendum--and this proves that we would joyfully accept the will of the nation.

[But] is the bureaucratic structure--which has at its disposal an apparatus of repression, censorship, obedient servants and the fear sown in the Stalin era and undispelled to this day--ready for these things?

We are few, but we contend that with us is the will of Evolution. That is why again and again, patiently, in friendship and with hope, we appeal to the ruling circles of the land: Cease the repressions against honest people who think differently than do dogmatists and the orthodox! Such people are the hope of the future! Such people can be counted on in threatening times: they will not betray. Why should they be feared, those who speak the truth while risking their lives, health and personal happiness? On the contrary, they should be invited to take part in constructive discussions and action.

A normal governmental structure should be interested in our opposition, for forces that criticize are a sign and certification of the existence of shortcomings and, therefore, of the opportunity to better the situation.

On the other hand, "approval by the entire people" at "elections," congresses, and meetings is not joy, but misfortune and a terrifying sign, for it all attests that the spirit of the people is dying.

A nation's monolithic quality is manifested not through bureaucratic resolutions and decisions, but through the freedom and unfettered nature of the spiritual and intellectual life of the people.

Such freedom should be aspired to rather than have its coming obstructed with arrests and repressions.

We declare, sincerely and courageously, that we have no fear of a new wave of persecution, for Truth is on our side.
All people die, but some die as nobodies, cowards and traitors, and some as true sons of their Mother, their Nation. We prefer to die the way the glorious knights of the Zaporozhian Sich died, the way Taras [Shevchenko], Lesia Ukrainka and the Stonecutter [Ivan Franko] died, having carried out Ukraine's will, as it had made itself known within their hearts.

And now the voice of Mother Ukraine thunders in our hearts. In doing her bidding we offer to [other] Fraternal Peoples our credo, our hopes, our confidence that Light will conquer Darkness, that the era of enmity, fragmentation, and hostility will come to an end and the Sun of Freedom will rise over the Earth.

Listen to the Message (slovo) of Ukraine of the year 1977.

1. Statehood

All of the historical cataclysms that the Ukrainian people lived through during the past few centuries were born of the idea of Statehood. The Will of a Nation aspires to nonsubordination, to sovereignty, to the building of its own independent life; at the same time, neighboring imperialistic predators do everything in their power not to allow such sovereignty, but to preserve the nation chosen as victim in the form of raw material—as a source of food, of spiritual force, of energy, of everything else.

This is what happened to Ukraine. Though possessed of an enormous reservoir of love of freedom, wisdom, creativity, of rare riches of the earth and the spirit, in a critical moment she was unable to hold on to her statehood and became a colony of a cruel, merciless empire, whose will was diametrically opposed to the will of Ukraine.

Russia violated all the fraternal treaties and trampled underfoot the Word spoken at [the Treaty of] Pereiaslav. A people whose love of freedom Europe had enthused over became serfs, slaves, bondservants to alien ravagers. Hryhorii Petrovsky, speaking in the Duma, provided an excellent characterization of autocracy's criminal activity in Ukraine—degradation of cultural and spiritual life, merciless exploitation of natural resources, unceasing genocide.

This is why the Ukrainian people so joyously supported the Revolution and the proclamation of the Ukrainian Republic.

The more outstanding ideas of the Ukrainian revolutionaries, as well as Lenin's ideas on the nationality question, however, were never put into practice. In the following years the chauvinistic spirit of autocracy could not be defeated and "the spirit of Catherine and Peter" found its still more terrible embodiment in Stalin's notorious activity.
Millions tortured to death, millions executed, millions dead of starvation—all of this has been known to everyone for a long time. Sometimes it even seems strange why Ukraine still exists on geographical maps, why a Ukrainian word can still be heard now and then. And the strangest thing of all is that Ukraine is a member of the United Nations and is therefore considered a sovereign state.

We will not be playing blindman's buff: this statehood of ours is nothing but a paper mirage. And the time has come to dot all the "i's," to end the incessant and insidious game with our sovereignty, as well as with the sovereignty of all the other Union republics.

The will of history is such that every nation (even the smallest) stepped onto the field of history as the one-for-all-time Son of His Mother within the One Brotherhood of Mankind.

We deeply respect the culture, the spirituality, the ideals of the Russian people. But why should Moscow be making the decisions for us at international forums (for example, the Helsinki or Belgrade forums) as to these or other problems, obligations, etc.?! Why should Ukraine's cultural, creative, scientific, agricultural, and international problems be defined and planned in the capital of the neighboring (even if allied) state?

We are not naive simpletons. We understand that at work here is that very same spirit of imperialism and chauvinism, about which our Bard [Taras Shevchenko] wrote with such clarity and anger:

It was he, [Peter] the First, who crucified Our Ukraine, And [Catherine] the Second finished off The widow-orphan . . . Executioners, executioners and cannibals . . .

You can't say it better than that! And present-day revolutionaries, communists, romantics and builders of the New World of Love and Brotherhood should carefully read through the manuscripts of the past, so as not to wander among the abstractions of farfetched schemes but instead to gird themselves in the impregnable armor of the testaments of the Spirit of the People.

We are not ones to be caught in a netting of criminal fabrications, unless the satraps of the bureaucratic citadel simply crush us without resorting to any kind of "legality."

Simply, sincerely and with conviction we announce several thoroughly thought-out positions on the subject of statehood (that of neighboring peoples as well as of our own):

--Not the Individual [exists] for the State, but the State for the Individual. That is why any and all social transformations should receive the Nation's approbation through a popular referendum. All those "voices of the people" that have been organized in the press will be discarded onto the trash heap of history.
We are not raising the issue of Ukraine's "separation." We don't have anyone to separate from? The planet is one. Mankind is one. Fraternal peoples are our neighbors. From whom should we separate? On the contrary, we raise the issue of joining, the joining of Ukraine, Russia, Georgia, Latvia and other fraternal nations to the One Spirit of Mankind.

We are for an Association whose name is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which will in time be transformed into a Brotherhood of Free Peoples of the Earth. But every nation should be a free agent within this association and independent in its creative spirit. Only under this condition will vanish those deformations that distort relations among peoples and sow discord and suspicion. In short, a people should be masters of their land, their tradition, their creative inheritance, their futurological aspirations, their will to build a better life for all, for everyone.

Therefore, the most radical demand of the spirit of the Ukrainian Nation, for itself and for fraternal peoples, is full sovereignty of creative manifestation in all areas of spiritual and economic life. Nothing on earth can prevent the embodiment of the idea into visible forms of historical reality, for this is the will of evolution.

Exactly how the social transformations, the strengthening of the sovereignty of this nation or another will be manifested is difficult to foresee and it should not be planned. A nation—a sleeping giant—has in its heart many surprises for its enemies and skeptics.

But one thing is clear: no great action of historical importance will ever be realized without a free, thinking and fearless individual. That is why special attention is due the Individual, his spirit and his rights.


A miserable (khimerna) situation: we have a Constitution that is not altogether bad, our country signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Accords, and in all these documents are endless repetitions about Human Rights, about all that Man can do and has a right to and this and that, etc. But when it comes to reality, then all of these rights and opportunities turn not only into mirages but into cruel blows. By demanding that which is declared in official documents, a man dooms himself to endless tortures. Himself and his closest . . .

Their futurological aspirations is not found in Ukrainian version as printed in UPR, p. 23.

For this is the will of EVOLUTION not found in UPR, p. 24.
A terrifying paradox, one which needs to be explained.

Without a doubt, the gist of the matter is that **rights** are declared by the bureaucratic structure, they are, so to speak, being decided [by being posted] on a wall, rather than **flowing out of man's legal consciousness**.

We shall cite a very simple example.

**Freedom of speech, freedom of expression, freedom of emigration and immigration**, and so on . . .

In declaring these rights, the government structure didn't tell Man anything new, but blasphemously only interprets for him that which has characterized (*bulo prytamanno*) every thinking being down through the centuries, and not only Man, but every living thing. And whereas spontaneous Man consulted only himself, the "God within him," whether to act one way or another, now he must request permission for freedom of speech or action from some bookworm, from some bureaucratic soul. And bureaucrats, it's clear, will always find a plethora of paragraphs and pseudolegal loopholes (*hachkiv*) in order to forbid Man to realize his will.

As example [can serve] the present situation.

If you wish to leave, you're an enemy of the State. But the State is formed by my voluntary agreement with others; it follows, then, that I can create a State and also dissolve it. And if others wish to retain it, this does not give them the right to keep me a prisoner of their will, for they themselves turn into jailers and slaves.

If you think differently, you're an enemy of the State.

Does the State have **some imperative idea** which should guide all thinking?

An idea is lightning! How can it be brought into line with a canon? Whoever says that he thinks as the State demands, does not think at all, for to ape (*povtoruvaty po-mavp"iachomu*) someone else's thoughts—even though they be brilliant—is to become a parrot, a phonograph record.

The essence of all these ideas is that we must, without fail, return Man to his status as the Subject of Law, which is attested to in Article 6 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and act according to the will of the Subject, and not according to a paragraph of a statute created to obscure the rights, rather than to fulfill them.4

---

4Emphasis under obscure and fulfill them added by Y.B.
Therefore, all declarations in the constitution, international legal documents, and the like, concerning Human Rights, should not be viewed as the right of a bureaucrat to allow me this or that, but as the Right of Man to turn to sword of Law on the bureaucrats when one or another of them does not allow the legal expression of the will of the Subject. (We, of course, are not speaking here of those impingements by the Subject upon others, upon their rights, that are clearly criminal.)

Concretely, we demand:

--Freedom to leave one's homeland and to return,

--Freedom to disseminate one's ideas and to get acquainted with the ideas of others,

--Freedom to form creative, artistic, philosophical and scientific associations and to dissolve them,

--Freedom to take part in the formulation of the consciousness of the people and in the affairs of state.

--Freedom to work toward the complete unification of the Spirit of Man, based on Brotherhood, Love and Reason.

-----

Man is a wondrous Flower of Evolution. His mission—to unite a world fragmented since creation into a Magic Wreath of Beauty and Harmony. In the way of the realization of this idea stands the spirit of militarism, of present-day imperialism, of chauvinism. In these menacing times, when the ecological, demographic, energetic and economic balance of the Planet has been catastrophically disturbed, we cannot do without the amicable, selfless, sincere actions of all peoples and individuals.

Governmental structures which do not understand or which do not want to understand the horror of the situation, or which, though understanding, criminally ignore it—such structures are enemies of Evolution, and, as such, of all of Mankind.

Therefore, the violation of the right of nations to self-determination, to a sovereign spiritual life, as well as the violations of the Human Right to sovereign self-expression, are violations of cosmic law. A governmental structure which is guilty of such violations is an enemy of all of Mankind and falls under the merciless verdict of history—to be erased from the Stone Tables of the Future and [covered with] eternal shame and damnation.

We are puzzled by the calm and indifference with which government leaders of certain countries react to repressions in countries which signed the Helsinki Accords. It is clear that mockery of Human Rights is a routine occurrence for all states, but such indifference should not have a place in the 20th century, for we are on the threshold of the Cosmic Birth. Even one cruel, vandalic act against any single Individual could be decisive on God's Cosmic Judgement Day!

Can it be that anyone would find it pleasant to become renowned as a modern inquisitor and tyrant? Would it not be more pleasant and more

-----

5The rest of the words in the paragraph not in UPR, p. 26. - Y.B.
humane to open the prison doors, eliminate censorship, disperse the informers and provocateurs, dispel the fear that has enveloped the soul of the people and prevents them from spreading their shoulders to full width and rushing forward toward evolutionary renewal?!

Ukraine of the Year 1977 Proposes:

-- That all political prisoners be freed and all corresponding articles in the Criminal Codes of the [Soviet] Union and the Republics eliminated.

-- That the borders of the country be opened to allow [people] to leave and to enter.

-- That broad channels (richyshcha) be opened for the free flow of information—scientific, artistic, literary, personal and any other kind that does not infringe upon Human Rights.

-- That censorship, as an institution that is a relic of feudalism, be eliminated for all time, with the transfer of the right to publishers to withhold all military and pornographic publications from books and other markets.

-- That capital punishment be eliminated, as a manifestation of the criminality of governmental structures. The State cannot give birth to life, it does not have the right to take it away.

-- That the very idea of killing be condemned at the level of the United Nations, thus branding all states and persons that desire to further their designs through killing (wars) as enemies of Mankind who have no right to enter into a Common Future.

-- That all armies (except internal security forces) be eliminated within the next few years and an All-Planetary Brotherhood of Peoples be created, based on the United Nations.

-- That economic, ecological, demographic and cosmological problems be resolved through common effort.

It is time to awaken from the bureaucratic somnolence, to realize that the problem of one human being is the problem of all of Mankind, and in all our actions to start from this base, common to all.

Ukraine of the Year 1977 is filled with the most sincere aspirations, desires and wishes and sends to the brotherly peoples at the Belgrade Forum its Greeting and Love!

---

6The rest of the words in the paragraph not in UPR, p. 27. - Y.B.
Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords

Oles Berdnyk
Petro Hryhorenko
Oksana Meshko
Levko Lukiunenko
Ivan Kandyba
Nina Strokata
Mykola Matusevych
Myroslav Marynovych

February 15, 1977

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: The original that reached the West is in Ukrainian. English translation by Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee, published originally in Docs. Ukr. Public Group, Memoranda 4-9, etc., pp. 3-10, reprinted in Basket III Hearings, Vol. IV, pp. 70-74 (see Bibl. Note to Memorandum 4 for full citation). Bilinsky has compared it to the Ukrainian text as published in UPR, pp. 19-28, and slightly modified the first English translation.
7. UKRAINIAN PUBLIC GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

MEMORANDUM NO. 6

Concerning the So-Called "Internal Affairs"
of a State

In response to the arrests of the leaders and members of the
Ukrainian and Moscow Public Groups, the sea of World Conscience has
stirred. Today it is no longer possible to oppress with impunity the
champions of Law in any country, for on the horizon of History Nuremberg
looms to this day, menacingly warning all kinds of tyrants.

Having usurped the constitutional prerogatives, the bureaucratic
structure of the USSR attempts to save its unlawful privileged position
by labelling all international protests against arbitrariness as "inter-
ference into the internal affairs" of the Soviet state.

If one were to accept this jurisdictional thesis as the basis for
international activity, then this would grant present-day tyrants of
the East and West the right to suppress with no hindrance freedom of
thought and action, thus bringing to a stop Mankind's progression toward
a World of Justice.

The legal person (pravovoi lichnost'iu) (Subject of Law) in the
internal life of a State is Man. The legal person (Subject of Law) in
international relations is the State. This is well known. But if a State,
in its internal life, tramples on the interests and rights of its citizens,
such a country, in legal terms, is bankrupt, and cannot be trusted in the
least, for in its laws it declares one thing, but in practice does something
totally different.

Masquerading behind the fiction of "internal affairs of the state,"
the repressive organs of our country imprison creative and thinking
individuals, fighters for Law and independently minded cultural workers,
plunder literary and scientific archives, destroy the works of writers
who are not to their liking, completely control correspondence, deprive
"disobedient" individuals of their jobs, install electronic surveillance
devices in apartments and offices, persecute these and other people with the help of provocateurs, agents and informers, fabricate "criminal cases" against dissenters (inakomyshchikh), do not give the persecuted an opportunity to emigrate to another country, etc. This entire bouquet of lawlessness, this total disregard for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Accords, is hidden behind the formula of non-interference into "internal affairs".

Of course, for the old Stalinists, who (because the task of censuring the personality cult was not brought to conclusion) still abound in the judicial-investigative organs and in the KGB and who are accustomed to working in the dark of night and in total secrecy from the Soviet and world public, aspirations to act in the spirit of the Helsinki Accords and to make public facts about violations of Human Rights constitute interference into their internal affairs. However, pre-trial investigation, solitary confinement cells, prisons, concentration camps—these are not the internal affair of the KGB or the MVD, they are the affair of all Soviet peoples, the affair of all of Mankind. If the Soviet peoples are not indifferent to the fate of Chilean patriots and if mass rallies of workers in the USSR in their support are not interference into the internal affairs of Chile, then, by the same token, mass rallies of citizens of Western countries in support of Soviet and, particularly, Ukrainian fighters for the realization of the Helsinki Agreements do not constitute interference into the internal affairs of the USSR.

Indeed, international solidarity in defense of Justice is the most beautiful symbol of our era! It is the harbinger of a New World of Love and of a Single Spirit of Mankind, which is being born in the social upheavals of the 20th century!

Nations of the World, nations of the Belgrade Forum! We appeal to you—demand an answer from the usurpers of the Law, wherever they may appear! Arbitrariness and lawlessness cannot be permitted to rage on Earth just before the dawning of a World of Unity! The struggle for Human Rights is not the internal affair of this or that state, it is THE INTERNAL AFFAIR OF A UNITED MANKIND!

Freedom to the courageous Fighters for Law!

Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords

February 21, 1977

Oles Berdnyk
Petro Hryhorenko
Oksana Meshko
Mykola Matushevych
Myroslav Marynovych
Ivan Kandyba
Levko Lukianenko
Nina Strokata

The signed original is in the Archives of the Group.

1All capitals in the original. - Y.B.

2All last names capitalized in original. - Y.B.
BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: The original that reached the West is in Russian. A xerox copy was consulted in archives of the Prolog Research Corporation, New York City. English translation by Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee in Docs. Ukr. Public Group, Memoranda 4-9, etc., pp. 11-12, reprinted in Basket III Hearings, Vol. IV, pp. 74-75 (see Bibl. Note to Memorandum 4 for full citation). Translation slightly modified after comparison with original. Ukrainian translation in UPR, pp. 105-107.
The Ukrainian Group to Promote

[the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords]:

The First Four Months

On March 9, 1977, the Ukrainian Group to Promote [the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords] marked the first four months of its existence. In our Declaration and Memorandum No. 1 we announced the basic principles of our activity and defined our mission as a movement in defense of law, directed at correcting bureaucratic and other distortions and abuses, which are unavoidable in a society with an immature democracy or a dictatorship.

Human Rights encompasses the widest spectrum of thought, feelings and actions. Therefore, we indicated that in giving priority to the humanitarian aspects of the Helsinki Accords, the Group would also note violations of rights in the social, economic and national spheres of the life of the Ukrainian people.

In our Declaration we stated that it is an absolute necessity (neobkhidnist) that Ukraine participate in all conferences of European countries as a sovereign nation, a member of the United Nations. There is no rational alternative to this. (Incidentally, it must be noted that other European Republics of the USSR find themselves in a similar position: Bielorussia, Moldavia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and, most of all, the largest of the Republics, the Russian Federation. They too have never been represented at European conferences by separate delegations. In addition to this, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Moldavia and Russia, as well as the Asian Republics of the Union—Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaidzhan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Kirghizia and Tadzhikistan—are not even members of the UN. Actually, it is a startling fact that one of the largest nations in the world, the Russian nation, is not a member of the UN, along with the other above-mentioned nations. Although we point this out only in passing, it is a bitter fact, which supports the conclusion that the problem of rights and mutual relations of the Republics of the USSR is totally unresolved.)
We have also declared it our aim to struggle to increase consciousness of Law among broad masses of the Ukrainian people, in the hope that by the joint efforts of fighters for Law and World Opinion we would succeed in overcoming the opposition of the bureaucratic structure and the various repressive organs in the area of violations of the Law.

In Memorandum No. 1 we have outlined the wide-scale violations of Law in our Republic, which have continued to the present day despite the exposure of the crimes of the "epoch" of Stalin and Beria. We have tried to bring to the attention of the world community the fact that the sharpest edge of the repressions and terror that the punitive organs can bring to bear has been turned against the people who defend spiritual sovereignty in the various spheres of national and creative life. This constitutes a scandalous violation of the Constitutions of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Accords and other international pacts ratified by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

We have presented a list of several scores of prisoners of conscience (in actuality there are thousands of them!)—honest, selfless, courageous workers in the fields of culture, science, religion, who languish in prisons and [labor] camps on the territory of neighboring republics, something unheard-of in the practice of international law.

But before we could publish our documents, the procuracy of the City of Moscow, in cooperation with the Ukrainian KGB, pounced on us: during the night of December 23-24, 1976, they conducted searches in the apartments of Group members M. Rudenko (Kiev), O. Berdnik (Kiev), L. Lukianenko (Chernihiv), O. Tykhy (Donbas) and I. Kandyba (Lviv). During these searches all of the Group's documents were confiscated, as were literary archives and correspondence. At the same time, pornographic material and weapons were planted in the apartments, which compelled us to predict in a written protest to the Procurator of the USSR that some kind of provocation was being planned against the members of the Group; this has been confirmed later.

In our letter, addressed to the world community—to PEN International, to Western Communist Parties, etc.—we voiced our concern that the fierce attack on the Ukrainian Group to Promote [the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords]—dead-of-night searches, threats, surveillance—even when taken separately from other facts, is proof of the complete disregard by the bureaucratic structure of the USSR of those commitments which our country accepted in signing the Helsinki Accords. This indisputable fact strengthened our resolve to continue our activity.

In Memorandum No. 2 we have again pointed out the necessity of Ukraine's participation in the Belgrade Conference in 1977 as a sovereign European state.

In Memorandum No. 3 we illustrated the violations of the freedom of conscience in our Republic, using as an example the tragic fate of the Christian and Catholic, Y. Terelia, who has spent half his life in [labor] camps and psychiatric hospitals, and is now wandering from place to place in search of somewhere to stay and a job, always under the never-sleeping eye of the KGB.
Group to Promote with complaints about flagrant violations of the Law with respect to them. Thus, not only the activity of the Group, but even contact with it is considered a crime!

In a lightning blow, the wife of a political prisoner V. Lisovy, Vira, and Nadia Svitlychna were fired from their jobs, and thus deprived of all means of subsistence, merely for their acquaintance with members of the Group. N. Svitlychna has also been threatened with arrest because she has not yet registered at a place of residence after being released from a [labor] camp (this, although she has been repeatedly denied her legal right to do so).

In its Memorandums Nos. 4, 5 and 6, in letters to the countries that will participate in the Belgrade Forum-77, to PEN International, to the leadership of the USSR, etc., the Group to Promote [the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords] has called the attention of the world community to the complete lack of any guarantees in defense of Law in Ukraine, which proves that the bureaucratic structure of the USSR and the organs of internal security have usurped the constitutional prerogatives of the Soviet of Deputies of Workers, and because of this, the Fundamental Law of the State [the Constitution], and all the more so the international agreements on Human Rights are not being implemented.

What will happen now? Will the movement in defense of Law be destroyed with the tacit approval of the signatories of the Helsinki Accords, accompanied only by the sorrowful shaking of heads? Or will the Belgrade Conference-77 call on those that violate laws and rights to answer?

We do not consider that world public opinion should painfully react to every single violation of rights in our country—every nation has plenty of its own troubles, similar to ours. Such a reaction would be senseless and even dangerous to the movement in defense of Law, for it would make this movement dependent on unknown forces and influences, and would tear it from its own roots, from the evolutionary development of the consciousness of Law in one’s own nation. The guarantee must be established here and the rights by demanding the unswerving implementation of the laws of the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR.

This is why we are firmly committed to the continuation of our uneven struggle to the end, in the sincere belief that the national will, sooner or later, will confirm the Rule of Law in all spheres of thought, creative pursuit and action.

Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords

Oles Berdnyk
Petro Hryhorenko
Oksana Meshko
Levko Lukyanenko
Myroslav Marynovych
Mykola Matushevych
Nina Strokata

March 15, 1977
SUPPLEMENT TO MEMORANDUM NO. 7

As we have already reported, on February 5, 1977, organs of the KGB, in addition to arresting M. Rudenko and O. Tykhy, conducted searches in the homes of many members of the Group to Promote and their relatives.

In the apartment of M. Rudenko (Kiev) the literary and scientific archives were completely devastated. The KGB confiscated a volume of poetry, consisting of some 50,000 verses, the manuscripts of a science fiction novel, philosophical works on economy, cosmogony, etc. M. Rudenko's wife, his son Iurii, and writer O. Berdnyk, a member of the Group, were subjected to personal searches. O. Berdnyk's literary archives were also almost completely confiscated.

In the apartment of Group member O. Meshko the KGB conducted not so much a search as a rout. Investigator Pankov (of the Kiev procuracy) entered the premises like a true bandit—he broke in through a window. All books and things were turned upside down, letters and manuscripts were confiscated wholesale without writing down their contents. "All the trash," as Pankov expressed himself. A body search of O. Meshko was conducted forcibly: the investigator held her arms while two women searched her.

A search was conducted at the apartment of Group member Nina Strokata, who lives in exile in Tarusa (the RSFSR).

In Drohobych, a search was conducted in the apartment of M. Marynovych's mother, L. I. Marynovych. The warrant was issued separately in the names of Marynovych and Matusevych, who live elsewhere and were only visiting. The action was conducted during the night. When Matusevych and Marynovych protested against a body search, they were taken to the headquarters of the militia, where the search was made. A record of the proceedings, however, was denied them. Agents of the organs [KGB] acted as witnesses.

A search was conducted in the apartment of Matusevych's sister Tamila (Kiev), who had been arrested in Vasylkiv and brought to Kiev. Letters, documents, the book The Sword of Arey, a camera and a photoenlarger were confiscated. The home of Matusevych's mother, Anastasiia Fedorivna (in Vasylkiv), was searched. She was arrested at the school where she teaches. At the time of the search her 8-year-old grandson was not allowed to go for a walk. On that same day a search was conducted at the home of Marynovych's wife Raïsa Serhiivna Serhiichuk (village of Kalynivka, Vasylkiv district). During the search she was not allowed to feed her 9-year-old daugher, and the daughter was not allowed to go for a walk.

A search was conducted at the apartment of Matusevych's wife, Olha Dmytrivna, in "connection with the case of O. Tykhy." She and a guest, Y. Badzio, were bodily searched.

The dacha of the Matusevych family was searched (village of Shevchenko, Vasylkiv district) in the presence of Matusevych's father, Ivan Petrovych, who had been brought there from his apartment in Vasylkiv.
A search was conducted in the home of Matusevych's wife's parents, Heyko and Sushan (Kiev). The mother, Anna Ivanivna Sushan, fainted, and as a result, the search was conducted without the presentation of a warrant and without a record of the proceedings.

During the searches, hundreds of objects were confiscated--books, manuscripts, notebooks, letters, etc. In all cases there were flagrant violations of procedural law.

Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords

March 10, 1977

9. UKRAINIAN PUBLIC GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

MEMORANDUM NO. 8

On the Persecution of V. Lisova, Wife of a Political Prisoner

The name of V. [Vasyl] Lisovy—philosopher, courageous champion
of Law—is known to the world public. He is suffering in the [labor] camps
of Perm Region for having selflessly defended his countrymen sentenced for
their beliefs.

Here we would like to draw the attention of the Washington-based
Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee and the participating countries
of the Helsinki Conference to the miserable and helpless situation of
the wife of this political prisoner, Vira Lisova, and her two children.
For many years she was unemployed and led a beggar's existence. Finally,
she received temporary work. But still she had no peace: collaborators
of the KGB regularly broke into her apartment, terrorizing her psychologically,
threatening and frightening her children.

After her letters to the French Communist Party and other organi-
zations in defense of her husband, the organs of the KGB became rabid
(osatannly). On March 4 of this year she was ordered by phone to come to
the Ukrainian KGB in Kiev for a conversation. She refused. That same day
a messenger brought to her a notice summoning her to appear on March 5 as
a witness, not, however, before an examining magistrate, but directly to
the Ukrainian KGB. She refused, in view of the fact that the summons,
from a legal standpoint, was groundless.

On March 9, while she was at work, an operative (operupovnovazhenyi)
of the Ukrainian KGB, who refused to give his name, called her into the
office of the deputy director of the Institute for the Organization of
Labor and Modernization of Industry. He ordered the administration officials
to leave and proceeded with character assassination.

Here are some gems of his expressions: "You are an indecent
(neporiadochnaia) woman! You take part in nationalist activities, just
like your husband! You pass information abroad." (This was a reference
to a letter to Georges Marchais [leader of the French Communist Party].)
"You were at the sendoff for Amalrik. You kept contact with Rudenko.
You reproduced copies of your husband's 'Open Letter.' You receive
packages and help from nationalist sources. If you have the conscience

1 Sentence not contained in text in UPR, p. 118. Is in Russian
original, however.
of a Soviet person, give them up!"

V. Lisova answered that if the packages were from hostile sources, the KGB could prohibit their delivery. The collaborator of the Ukrainian KGB replied that they have no such power, but that she herself was obliged to do so.

"You bitterly hate the KGB and the Soviet government. You live in a hostile environment. We fight for you. We will be reporting to the procurator. We can imprison you, but we feel sorry for you."

V. Lisova walked out of the office in a terrible state. After taking medication, she visited the procurator of the Republic who oversees the KGB, where she wrote a statement about all this. The procurator promised to pass on her statement to the KGB for "review." At home V. Lisova fell seriously ill. Emergency aid personnel diagnosed a pre-heart failure state. Rest and treatment were prescribed.

The following day—more calls from the KGB and promises to continue the "conversation" after her recovery. The personnel office of the Institute informed her that she was fired and that same day brought to her home her job registration book.

Thus, V. Lisova—mother of two children, a sick and unprotected woman—finds herself without work, without any means of subsistence, and under the Damoclean sword of the KGB. The tyrannical ugly despot (derzhimorda) and complete lawlessness exult triumphant. When V. Lisova promised to address a complaint to V. Fedorchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian KGB, she received the cynical reply: "Be sure to write also to Andropov!"

We will stop right here! These facts are sufficient to illustrate the revelry of lawlessness in Ukraine.

Ukraine Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords

March 11, 1977

O. Berdnyk
O. Meshko
L. Lukyanenko
I. Kandyba
N. Strokata
P. Hryhorenko

2Added in printed handwriting.
10. UKRAINIAN PUBLIC GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

MEMORANDUM NO. 9

To the Procurator of Ukraine:

On the Gross Violations of Law in the Investigative "Case" of M. Rudenko

The Procuracy of Ukraine sanctioned the arrest of the poet M. Rudenko, the leader of the Group to Promote (Helsinki) in Ukraine. According to Article 116 of the UPK [Code of Criminal Procedures] of the Ukrainian SSR, an investigation must be conducted where the suspect or the majority of the witnesses reside, or where the crime took place. Taking into account all the points specified in the UPK, the investigation should be conducted in Kiev.

Why has procedural Law been violated? Of what concern is the formation of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords to the Donetsk KGB Administration and to its senior investigator, Nagovitsyn, who is in charge of the investigation and who summons scores of people to Donetsk from Kiev, Chernihiv, Lviv and so on?

It seems that we see here juridical abuse on the part of the organs of repression, which are preparing a reprisal against the poet in secrecy from the public of Ukraine. Inasmuch as the subject of discussion is the movement in defense of the law in the Republic, our Group demands adherence to all procedural norms and an open trial. We feel that the Ukrainian KGB in Donetsk has no right to summon witnesses in a case involving the Group, since the nucleus of the Group is in Kiev. We ask you to point out this gross violation of the law to the security organs.

March 18, 1977

Oles Berdnyk,
Member of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords

/signed/ Oles Berdnyk
BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: The original that reached the West is in Russian. Literal Ukrainian translation in UPR, pp. 121-122. English translation by Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee in Docs. Ukr. Public Group, Memoranda 4-9, etc., p. 21; reprinted in Basket III Hearings, Vol. IV, p. 80.
TO: THE PRESIDIOUM OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE USSR, MOSCOW
THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON.

Copy: The Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee in Washington,
Dr. A. Zwarun

AN OPEN LETTER

Honored Legislators of the USSR and the USA!

In signing the Helsinki Accords, the two most powerful countries on Earth gave their Solemn Word that they would cooperate in the cause of safeguarding Peace, Security and Human Rights. People with a honed sense of legality in different parts of the world received the Accords as a kindred cause and began to form groups to promote the implementation of these agreements. Such a group appeared also in Ukraine, a group which in its declaration pointed to instances of violations of the Law in our Republic. But even before the declaration had a chance to be heard in the world, blows rained upon the Group—numerous searches, persecution, threats, and, on February 5, 1977, the arrests of the head of the Group, the poet Mykola Rudenko, and a Group member, teacher Oleksii Tykhy.

They were arrested with no warrant being issued, with no indication of the substance of the crime. For weeks now they have held Mykola Rudenko in a Donetsk dungeon, without informing his family and friends about the reasons for his arrest and forbidding his wife to send him even the most indispensable things.

An ominous precedent! All the standards of Law violated completely! The organs of repression have returned to the practices of Beria's time, the practices that have been accursed by the people. What Helsinki Accords is it possible to speak of when a prominent poet and thinker and the author of the Economic Monologues, in which he reveals for mankind a new understanding of the interdependence of Man and the Cosmos, when such a selfless human being has been brutally tossed into a dungeon, as in the darkest periods of the Inquisition?!

In this can be clearly traced the purposeful actions of the anti-evolutionary forces, which strive to destroy the efforts of the governments of the USSR, the US and the other signatories of the Helsinki Accords, aimed at safeguarding peace and securing Human Rights. It is imperative that the criminal acts of persecution against fighters for Law be resolutely investigated.

Putting forth my demand for such an investigation, by right of friendship and brotherhood that have been practiced in Ukraine since ancient times, I declare a hunger strike as a sign of protest against the arrest of Mykola Rudenko and other fighters for Law.
The hunger strike will last until either Mykola Rudenko is released, or competent organs announce in the press what he was arrested for and what they plan to do with him.

I will begin the hunger strike March 3, 1977. I ask the Helsinki Guarantees Committee in Washington to support me. I ask other fighters for Law and all honest people in the World to join with me at least symbolically by demanding the release of Mykola Rudenko and other fighters for Law.

March 1, 1977
Kiev

Writer OLES BERDNYK
Member, Ukrainian Public Group
To Promote the Implementation
of the Helsinki Accords

/signed/

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: The original that reached the West is in Ukrainian. English translation by Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee, published originally in Docs. Ukr. Public Group, Memoranda 4-9, etc., pp. 22-23; reprinted in Basket III Hearings, Vol. IV, pp. 80-81 (see Bibl. Note to Memorandum 4 for full citation). Bilinsky has compared it to the Ukrainian text as published in UPR, pp. 205-206.
May 18, 1976, there returned after four years' imprisonment in the Mordovian camps the well-known activist Nadiia Oleksi'ivna Svitlychny. She had been sentenced for having been so bold as to criticize her own government, which she had helped to elect; for considering as her inalienable (nedotorkanyм) right to have convictions of her own; and for not wanting to believe that, as of now, to that right there was [attached] a corresponding duty to imprisonment for "anti-Soviet activities" (Article 62 of the Ukrainian SSR Criminal Code).

Nadiia Svitlychny served out her sentence for a crime which she had not committed. She has served the full sentence, and according to all the world's laws she has the right to be treated (vzahytysia) as a full-fledged member of society. Soviet laws are even called upon to rehabilitate the punished offender to a normal life as soon as possible. What new crimes has Nadiia Svitlychny committed that those laws do not apply to her? How dangerous is she to the Soviet government so that after four years' detention in strict regime labor camps she is suffering even more horrible psychological tortures [today]? That those are really tortures we are going to prove [here].

1. After her release N. Svitlychny was directed in writing to go where she had lived before her imprisonment and where she had had a residence permit, viz., the Kiev apartment of her brother Ivan Oleksiovych Svitlychny and his wife Leonida Stepanivna Svitlychny. At the present time [he] is serving a sentence according to the very same article of the Ukrainian SSR Criminal Code. June 15, 1976 [Nadiia Svitlychny] was issued

1Memorandum No. 10 has not reached the West as of November, 1979. - Y.B.
A-73

a passport, i.e., she became a full-fledged citizen of the Ukrainian SSR. But when she put in an application for permission to reside in the city of Kiev she was turned down. The cause that was given was lack of residential space (the apartment in which four persons had lived before imprisonment has an area of 28.4 square meters). This refusal is in contradiction with the USSR Council of Ministers' decision of August 28, 1974 "On the System of Passports," which decision had not been cancelled. An excerpt from the above-mentioned document follows:

Some Rules Concerning the Issuance of Residence Permits to Citizens

1. Be it decreed that in cities and in villages of an urban type the following persons are issued residence permits regardless of the size of living space: . . .

(a) Persons who have been freed after having served their penalty in the form of deprivation of freedom, exile, expulsion . . . [may occupy] that living space which is occupied by members of their families or parents with whom they had lived before sentencing.

(Sotsialisticheskaia zakonnost', No. 12, 1974, p. 70)

Here is an incomplete list of offices to which N. Svitlychny presented her complaints: the passport [section ? — word unclear, Y.B.] of Kiev City, the Directorate of Interior Affairs of Kiev City, the USSR Ministry of Interior Affairs, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Party Central Committee, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee L. I. Brezhnev, the District (raion) Procuracy, the Procuracy of Kiev City. The reply to her complaints [always] was the same: "Permit is to be denied in connection with lack of residence space."

Finally, the very same conclusion was reached by the Kiev City Commission on Issuing Residence Permits, the decision of which, according to law, is not subject to the jurisdiction (nahliadovi) of the Procuracy. The Secretary of the Municipal Council, who at the same time headed the above-mentioned Commission, a Mr. Zahrebsky, explained in a conversation: "Your sister-in-law, Leonida Svitlychny, can remarry, and in that case there would be friction between you and her probable (imovirnym?—word does not seem to make sense — Y.B.) husband. We cannot contribute to such incidents." This sentence has the force of law, whereas the decision of the USSR Council of Ministers, as Zahrebsky and his like have proved successfully, carries weight only as another opus in the realm of Soviet phantasy.

2. Since December 8, 1976, after being unemployed for seven months, N. Svitlychny has been working as a janitor and gardener of Kindergarten No. 164, though she has a university degree in philosophy. March 16 [1977] she was dismissed from her job because of the lack of a residence permit, and the directress of the kindergarten was fined fifty rubles. Thus Nadiia Svitlychny, a full-fledged citizen of the USSR was
de facto deprived of the right to work, which she is guaranteed by the Constitutions of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR.

3. The seven-year-old son of Nadiia Svitlychny, Iarema Svitlychny, lives with his mother and he, too, does not have a residence permit. In May 1972 after the arrest of Nadiia Svitlychny he was forcibly taken to a children's home, of which none of his relatives were notified for ten whole days. The Commission on Child Care of the District Executive Committee decided not to entrust the education of the then two-year-old Iarema to his grandmother because of her advanced age and the smallness of her pension--20 karbovantsi (or rubles--Y.B.) a month. Against Nadiia Svitlychny's will, i.e., acting illegally, [the Commission] gave the right of child care to her sister, who lives in the city of Voroshilovgrad. At that time Iarema was deprived of his residence permit, which, too, is a violation of the law, for he was not serving a court sentence with his mother.

As Iarema Svitlychny is not legally registered [in Kiev], he has been deprived not only of his right to education, but also of his right to medical care. His mother Nadiia Svitlychny was refused a certificate of care in the district hospital which by law guarantees payment [for medical care], she was given only an official paper (dovidku) without right for payment. Furthermore, having evidently forgotten her Hippocratic oath, the directress of the hospital's [pediatric] section told her rather coarsely: "I give you a paper for three days. Don't count on any more." They also refused to issue a certificate or paper to Leonida Svitlychny that would have enabled her to continue to care for the child of her sister-in-law.

4. In September 1976 the police authorities raised the question of Svitlychny's malicious evasion of her obligation to obtain a residence permit, which according to Article 196 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR is punishable by deprivation of freedom for up to two years. It is not possible to regard those actions of the authorities as anything but a cynical and sadistic mockery of a human being, because all of Svitlychny's efforts after her release from labor camp had been precisely aimed at obtaining a residence permit.

The above-mentioned Article of the Ukrainian SSR Criminal Code requires two official notices by the police and a meeting of the Commission, which in turn brings the matter to court. The first notice was given to Nadiia Svitlychny in the beginning of October 1976. The second--in December of the same year. Moreover, Leonida Svitlychny paid a fine for illegally harboring Nadiia Svitlychny, without a residence permit. The Commission's session took place March 16, 1977, and its results are not yet known. But it is [already] quite evident that under the conditions of a meticulously well-thought-out campaign of terror, that has been planned down to the smallest details, sooner or later the

---

2 In the Soviet Union the ordinary police are called "militia." A literal translation would have been misleading, however.--Y.B.
Commission and, after it, the court will render their shameful verdict. We neither want nor can we remain silent witnesses of this.

From all the aforesaid it follows:

The Governments of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR [not only] do not have the power to observe the laws which they themselves have established and also the decisions of their official representatives, but they themselves refuse to abide by them.

The Government of the USSR is flagrantly violating the [Universal] Declaration of Human Rights and specific provisions of the humanitarian section of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, both of which documents have been signed by it.

We demand that the Governments of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR urgently reestablish legality in the matter of issuing a residence permit for Citizen Nadiia Svitlychny and in helping her to find work commensurate with her profession and her education.

If the Governments of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR be powerless to reestablish legality we demand from the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to decide the question of the emigration of Citizen Nadiia Svitlychny as soon as possible.

We call on the Governments of the States that participated in the Helsinki Conference to demand from the USSR Government an explanation as to why it has flagrantly violated the Final Act of this Conference.

We call on Soviet and international organization, on all honest people in the USSR and abroad to rally to the defense of a victim of administrative arbitrariness—Nadiia Svitlychny. 3

Oles Berdnyk
Ivan Kandyba
Petro Hryborenko
Levko Lukianenko
Myroslav Marynovych
Mykola Matusevych
Nina Strokatova

Kiev, March 20, 1977

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Original in Ukrainian consulted at the Prolog Research Corporation, New York, Text deciphered by Staff of Prolog, compared with original by Bilinsky. Translated by the latter. Ukrainian original printed in UPR, pp. 123-126.

3 All those efforts were eventually crowned with success: after a brief stay in Rome, Mrs. Svitlychny and her two sons (she had had another child) arrived in the US November 8, 1978. January 15, 1980 Mrs. Svitlychny's husband Pavlo Stokotelny arrived in Rome en route to the United States. See Svoboda, January 26, 1980, pp. 1 + 3.
13. UKRAINIAN PUBLIC GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

MEMORANDUM NO. 18

To the Belgrade Conference of 35 Countries:
On Discrimination Against Ukrainians
In the Area of the Right to Emigrate [from the USSR]

The question of emigration from the USSR has always been a sensitive one for the leadership of the CPSU [Communist Party of the Soviet Union]. They have portrayed the Bolshevik Revolution to all the world as that event toward which the working classes of all countries of the world have striven since ancient times and which finally had its realization in what was once the Russian Empire.

According to their claims, the Bolshevik Revolution—for the first time in the history of mankind—brought to life the brightest ideas of the philosophers, economists and social reformers of yesterday and destroyed an evil that went back to time immemorial—the exploitation of man by man—destroyed social antagonisms, ensured the highest possible rate of economic development, created the conditions for the all-around development of the individual, and so on and so forth. In a word, the revolution created on our sinful Earth that which until then had existed only in dreams.

Inasmuch as the Bolsheviks saw themselves as the ideological heirs of the Communist Manifesto, the Paris Commune and the First International, they viewed their victory and their order as the model for all other countries of the world and—in accordance with the idea of proletarian internationalism—yearned to bestow this fortune upon others. To this end, immediately after the revolution they turned to a systematic, persistent and ever-widening campaign of glorifying their actions aimed at restructuring all aspects of social and family life and the Soviet order. Communist parties were formed in dozens of developed countries which helped to create in their countries the myth of the ideal nature of Soviet society. And the fact that people did not emigrate from the Soviet Union served to support the idea of the unblemished perfection (bezukoriznennosti) of the Soviet order.
Indeed, no one flees from paradise. People leave from where things are bad. "Emigration," according to the dictionary of foreign words, "is 1) a mass migration from one country to another, caused by various reasons (economic, political, religious and others); an unavoidable companion of an exploitative society"¹ (State Publishing House of Political Literature, Kiev, 1955).

Because the Soviet Union is not an exploitative society, emigration is not characteristic of it.

There is also no reason for emigration for nationality reasons (natsional'nym motivam), because the nationality question has been decided in the most just manner once and for all.

This is how matters looked from the words of communist propaganda. And so that living witnesses would not refute it, the borders were sealed tight.

For half a century the West listened to odes to the great achievements of the free Soviet peoples and citizens, while within the Soviet Union brave fugitives, caught in border traps and on barbed wire fences, went silently into the GULAG "archipelago" for 10-15 years.

The situation changed in the 70's. As a result of a widening of international contacts, it became impossible to secretly lock people away in prisons. In dictionaries there appeared a definition of the word "emigration" as "the departure to another country for permanent or temporary residence" (Political Dictionary, Kiev, 1976), a definition which no longer contradicts the right, declared in international legal acts, of a citizen to freely leave his country and return to it again.

The present leadership no longer labels as treason a person's desire to emigrate and no longer puts people on trial for merely expressing such wishes, but it does employ many means to lessen emigration and to destroy the inclination towards emigration. In addition, we discern a different approach on the part of the government to three different categories of citizens who are potential emigrants--Jews, Russian dissidents and non-Russian freethinkers (inakomisliashchim).

For Jews who have expressed the wish to go to their historic homeland the government creates a great many various unpleasant experiences and sometimes completely unbearable living conditions, but in the end lets the stubborn ones go; it expels the "incorrigible" Russian dissidents from the Soviet Union and puts non-Russian dissidents behind bars.

The Soviet state signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference. Both of these celebrated documents declare the right of citizens to emigrate, regardless of nationality, but the leadership of the USSR takes a plainly varying approach to applications for emigration, basing it on nationality.

¹Emphasis in original.--Y.B.
We are outraged that the government transforms the natural yearnings of Jews for the homeland of their ancestors into an ordeal of difficult, testing experiences. We are outraged that it attempts to depict to Soviet citizens the banishment of Russian dissidents from the Soviet Union as the expulsion of unworthy persons. But we are most outraged by the discrimination on the basis of nationality designation (natsional'nomu priznaku), which is manifested in the total deprival of the right of non-Russian freethinkers (inakomisliashchikh) to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

Not taking up the question of discrimination against us Ukrainians in other areas of life, we point out that in the area of emigration this discrimination is manifested in that so far not one Ukrainian freethinker (inakomisliashchii) has received permission to emigrate for permanent residence abroad. Even in those cases where an individual has completed a sentence for an attempt to leave the Soviet Union and, following release, continues to seek to leave, the government does not give him that possibility. Here are a few examples.

Vitaly Vasylovych Kalynychenko tried to cross illegally the Soviet-Finnish border. He was captured and sentenced to ten years' deprivation of freedom. While imprisoned he consistently and officially declared his intention to leave the USSR after completing his term. Released in the spring of 1976, he immediately renewed his efforts—he renounced his Soviet citizenship, wrote appeals, conducted a hunger strike from October 17 to October 26—but everything was in vain, so far has not received permission to leave.

Ievhen Hrytsiak and the prominent Ukrainian writer Oles Berdnyk have actively sought permission to leave for close to four years now.

Also demanding permission to leave—so far, with no success—are Nadia Svitlychna, Nina Strokatova, Volodymyr Zatvarsky, Ivan Kandyba, Levko Lukianenko, Vadym Stochitel, Hrihorii Prokopovych, Pavlo Kampov, Vasyl Ovsienko, Mykhailo Lutsyk, Iosyp Terelia.

The unlawful refusal by the government to allow the opportunity of going abroad has pushed many onto the road of illegal border crossings; Ukrainians Apolonii Bernichuk, Oleksa Murzhenko and Vasyl Fedorenko are now doing time in prison for this.

2Not quite true when written, perhaps, but certainly no longer applicable in early 1980. The following Ukrainian dissidents or freethinkers were allowed to emigrate: Leonid Plyusheh with wife and children (January 1976); Petro Hryhorenko (Grigorenko) in November 1977, albeit on a temporary visa; he was deprived of his USSR citizenship in February 1978; Mrs. Nadia Svitlychny, with her children, but without her husband in November 1978; Valentyn Moroz with wife and children in April 1979 (in exchange for Soviet spies, however, i.e., under extraordinary circumstances); and Sviatoslav Karavansky and Nina Strokata Karavansky in November 1979; Dr. Malynkovych in December 1979 and Mr. Pavlo Stokitelnny, Mrs. Svitlychny's husband in January 1980.—Y.B.
Iurii Dzyuba is now serving a four-year sentence of imprisonment for seeking to leave the USSR for religious reasons.

Because of gross violations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the USSR and the creation of such difficult living conditions for freethinkers that make impossible even minimal productive activity--community, national, literary, religious or in other public areas--a number of Ukrainian political prisoners, while incarcerated, declared their intention to emigrate following the completion of their terms of imprisonment. Iurii Romanovych Shukhevykh, Andrii Markovych Turyk, Dmytro Varkhovliak, Oleksander Fedorovych Serhiienko, Ivan Oleksiiovych Svitlychny, Vasyl Omelianovych Romaniuk, Dmytro Basarab, Ivan Shovkovy, Hrihorii Herchak, Volodymyr Vasylyovych Vasylyk, Zinovii Mykhaylovych Krasivsky.

Consider: after the arrest of three members of the Moscow Public Group--Orlov, Ginzburg, Shcharansky--and two of the Ukrainian Group--Rudenko and Tykhy--two more members of the Group--Matusevych and Marynovych--were arrested in Ukraine.

Then they sentence Ukrainians Rudenko and Tykhy to 12 and 15 years' imprisonment, respectively, sentence Barladianu and arrest Terelia, but send Moscow Group members V. Turchyn and T. Khodorovych, and an activist of the movement in defense of rights, K. Liubarsky, off to emigrate.

Furthermore, they arrest the Ukrainian Sniehiryov but propose to Moscow resident Podrabinek that he leave the USSR.

Twelve and fifteen years of imprisonment and emigration--obviously these are totally different punishments. This enormous difference is a function of the peculiarities of the movement in defense of rights in Russia on the one hand and in Ukraine on the other. In Russia it is directed against illegal restrictions of the democratic rights of citizens. In Ukraine it has the same goals plus our national problems. This plus is what makes the Ukrainian movement in defense of rights--exactly like that in the Baltic and the Caucasus--so especially dangerous in the eyes of the powerful ruling bureaucrats with the chauvinist Great-Russian depositions (zakvaski), because it threatens to destroy the old propagandistic myth about the most just resolution of all nationality problems (for all future time!) and to begin anew the discussion over it by a new generation of Ukrainians and under new historical conditions.

Because the "sovereign" Ukrainian SSR has not established diplomatic relations even with the major European countries and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian SSR does not conduct normal business abroad, the emigration of some (neskol'kih) Ukrainian freethinkers would promote the familiarization of Western society with Ukrainian problems. The government of the USSR knows this and, as we can see, does not wish to allow such familiarization. But inasmuch as the highest criterion of goodness and justice for people of European civilization is not the well-being of the state but of each individual, we demand that in the resolution of a conflict between the state and the individual preference be given to the good of the individual and not the state. We believe, therefore, that no considerations of a propagandistic (prestige-oriented) order can provide satisfactory justification for the forced detention of an individual within a state.
Peace in Europe cannot be built on lies and the secret designs of the rulers of individual countries. Peace cannot be built on the oppression of peoples, for such a peace does not mean happiness for the oppressed and disenfranchised and they will strive to destroy it.

A strong and lasting peace is possible only with a just approach to the individual, including respect for his right to emigrate. The latter can serve as a means of resolving a conflict between society and the individual where the individual cannot reconcile himself with the existing order and society does not want to change to satisfy the individual's demands. Society has the right to remain as it is, but the individual likewise has his own right to his own outlook on life or the right to broaden his Weltanschauung. A situation in which an individual is forbidden either to disseminate his ideas or to leave the country is the height of injustice, for it completely deprives the person of his or her individuality and sentences him or her to spiritual death. Sadly, many Ukrainian freethinkers have found themselves in such a predicament. This is what forced us to appeal to the Belgrade Conference reviewing the implementation of the Helsinki Accords with the request that it discuss the issue of discrimination against Ukrainians with respect to the right to emigrate, in order to promote its just resolution by the government of the USSR.

Members of the Group:
O. Berdnyk
I. Kandyba
V. Kalynychenko
L. Lukianenko
O. Meshko
V. Striltsiv
N. Strokatova

Kiev, December, 19778

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: English translation by Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee (P. O. Box 32397, Washington, D.C. 20007), original published in lithographed pamphlet Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, Kiev, Ukrainian SSR, Memorandum No. 2 and Memorandum No. 18. This translation has been compared to Russian original and somewhat corrected. Russian original kept by Smoloskyp Publishers consists of carbon copy on 5 pages of tissue paper, 28.7 x 20.5 cm. Ukrainian translation in UPR, pp. 127-132. English translation has been reprinted in The Right to Know, the Right to Act: Documents of Helsinki Dissent from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Compiled and Edited by the Staff of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Washington, D.C., May, 1978), pp. 91-96.
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DOCUMENTS OF THE LITHUANIAN PUBLIC

GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF

THE HELSINKI AGREEMENTS

Announcement of Formation and Statement

We, Tomas Venclova, Father Karolis Garuckas, Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene, Viktoras Petkus, Eitan Finkelstein, announce the formation of a Lithuanian Group to Promote Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR. The aim of the Group is to promote the observation and fulfillment of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Group intends to concentrate on those articles which relate to human rights and basic freedoms, including freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief, and also contact between people (the reunification of families, meetings with relatives, residence in other countries, etc.).

We are prepared to accept statements from individuals, groups, and organization on matters relating to violations of the (humanitarian) articles of the Final Act on the territory of Lithuania, relating to Lithuania or specifically to Lithuanian problems.

We hope, that the participant states of the Helsinki Conference will consider that the contemporary status of Lithuania was established as a result of the entrance of Soviet troops onto her territory on June 15, 1940, and will pay special attention to the observance of humanitarian rights in Lithuania.

Vilnius
November 25, 1976

* * * *

October 19, 1976 in the city of Vilnius, were arrested two of its residents -- Jonas Matulionis (born in 1933) and Vladas Lapienis (born in 1906) -- on charges of the dissemination and printing of religious and so-called libelous literature.

On the same day, Jonas Matulionis' apartment was searched. During the search, several copies of the typewritten journal The Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania was confiscated.
The Lithuanian Public Group to Promote Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements announces that the arrests of J. Matulionis and Vladas Lapienis are a violation of Principle VII of the first part of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Tomas Venclova,
38-60 Pozelos, Vilnius.

Father Karolis Garuckas, Priest
of the village of Ceikiniai, Ignalina rayon.

Ona Lukauskaitė-Poškiene,
32-37 Kleinerio, Siauliai.

Viktoras Petkus,
16-4 Gorelio, Vilnius.

Eitan Finkelstein,
21 Liepos, 10-10, Vilnius.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: The formation of the Lithuanian Group was actually announced in the Moscow apartment of Yuri Orlov, not in Vilnius. Orlov was the leader of the Moscow Group founded earlier that year. The document here is reproduced from Lituanus, Volume 23 (No. 1, Spring 1977), pp. 64-65. It has not been checked against an original. The same document also appears in the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Reports of Helsinki-Accord Monitors in the Soviet Union, Documents of the Public Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR (Washington: mimeographed Commission report, 24 February 1977), p. 120. At least one source, SDS 30, 64, suggests that this founding document was issued jointly by the Moscow and Lithuanian groups, signed also by Lyudmila Alekseeva and Yuri Orlov.
DOCUMENT NO. 1: ON THE SITUATION OF TWO LITHUANIAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS

Two Catholic bishops in Lithuania -- Julijonas Steponavicius and Vincentas Sladkevicius -- for a long time have been removed from pastoral duties and are in exile.

Both were ordained as bishops in complete accordance with Catholic rites for which Vatican approval was obtained.

The appointment of J. Steponavicius was approved by the Council on Religious Affairs under the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and for six years he fulfilled his pastoral duties both as administrator and as bishop of Vilnius. In 1961, Rugienis, who was in charge of religious matters for the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian SSR, announced to Bishop Steponavicius orally that the Soviet authorities no longer wished him to serve as bishop and that he was instructed to leave Vilnius for Zagare -- a small settlement in another diocese. Bishop Steponavicius refused to obey this illegal order, but they forced him to move to Zagare by taking away his passport and refusing to give him a residence permit for Vilnius.

Since then fifteen years have passed, but Bishop Steponavicius continues to live in Zagare and to work as a pastoral assistant -- (he is a pensioner who is helped by the local dean and he does not receive a pension.) The duties of the Vilnius Archdiocese are fulfilled by a priest who has been "temporarily" named by the Soviet authorities, Ceslovas Krivaitis, who has not been ordained as bishop.

After Bishop Steponavicius turned to the Soviet authorities in 1972, rejecting his illegal and wholly unjustified exile, he was called in by Tumenas, the man in charge of religious affairs for the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian SSR, who told him that his situation has not changed in the slightest because he had "not reformed." In 1975, 65 priests (out of 100) in the diocese signed a collective letter to the Soviet authorities calling them to turn their attention to the unbearable situation of Bishop Steponavicius which is in blatant contradiction with the spirit and letter of the Helsinki Agreements, and asking them to return him to the conduct of his duties. They never received an answer to their letter, and Bishop Steponavicius remains, as before, at Zagare.

Bishop V. Sladkevicius, who received the bishop's stole from Bishop Teofilis Matulionis in 1958, for all practical purposes was not allowed to assume his pastoral duties in the Diocese of Kaisiadorys which had been given to him by the Vatican, since in 1959 he was sent, in a
manner similar to Bishop Steponavicius, to the little village of Nemunelio Radviliskis which is located in another diocese. Until now only his place of exile has changed—now he lives in the little village of Pabirze, where he also works as a parish assistant. His appeals to the Soviet authorities also remain unanswered since he has several times refused suggestions for "sincere cooperation" with the organs of the KGB.

The Diocese of Kaisiadorys, as well as Archdiocese of Vilnius, for the last 17 years have been "temporarily" ruled by priests, appointed by the Soviet authorities, who do not have the bishop's stole. Tumenas, the man in charge of religious affairs under the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian SSR, explained to Bishop Sladkevicius that his situation cannot change until he adopts a common language with the Soviet authorities, but they can't find a reason to put him on trial.

The forced detention of the Bishops Steponavicius and Sladkevicius in exile without legal basis of any kind, and their prolonged separation from their pastoral duties are a contradiction of points I, III, VIII of the Declaration, the principles of which must direct (the actions) of the participant states of the Helsinki Conference.

DOCUMENT NO. 2: SOVIET DECREED ON THE STATUS
OF RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

On July 28, 1976, after the Helsinki Conference, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR approved (the decree) "The Status of Religious Organizations."

Since the majority of the articles of this Decree are aimed at diminishing the freedom to practice religion and at repression of a normal religious life, which is in obvious contradiction to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, we consider it essential to bring this to the attention of the governments of the participating states of the Conference and to the notice of world opinion.*

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Reproduced from Lituanus, Volume 23 (No. 1, Spring 1977), p. 67. Not checked against an original. Lituanus omits the text of the decree referred to in the document; the asterisked footnote below is by the editor of Lituanus. The document appears in U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Reports of Helsinki-Accord Monitors in the Soviet Union. Documents of the Public Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR (Washington: mimeographed Commission report, 24 February 1977), pp. 122-123; this source also translates in paraphrased form parts of the referenced decree. The original appendix to the document is reported to be nine pages in length. The decree in question, post-dating the Helsinki Final Act, places greater restriction on religion than had existed before.

* Appended here is the Russian-language text of the decree. It is omitted here because the text is essentially the same as of the RSFSR decree, English translation of which is available from Radio Liberty Research, 155/75, March 31, 1976.]
IN DEFENSE OF MART NIKLUS

DOCUMENT NO. 3

Twelve Lithuanians came to us requesting that we intercede on behalf of the Estonian, Mart Niklus, since they knew him to be an honest and decent man. They said he was a fine friend who visited Lithuania many times a year and who feels a deep attachment to their country.

A member of our Group found Mart Niklus in Tartu Republic Hospital recovering from an almost two-month long hunger strike that he had undergone while incarcerated in Tallinn Prison. He had been informed that the case against him was being closed.

Niklus had been forcibly arrested on September 30, 1976, despite the fact that the procurator had not authorized the arrest -- there had only been a warrant for the search of Niklus' apartment, but the search warrant itself was illegal since it lacked the required official signatures. The apartment was searched in Niklus' absence. Niklus was taken to the police station and frisked; then he was released. On October 8, Niklus was arrested again and imprisoned. In protest, he tore up his internal passport, renounced his Soviet citizenship, and declared a hunger strike. Procuracy officials tried to convince his mother and father to sign a written statement to the effect that their son was mentally ill, advising his parents that it would be in Mart's best interest for them to do so. But the old people refused to put their signatures to a false statement. On November 11, Niklus was arraigned. Initially, he was accused of theft, then the charge was changed to inflicting minor bodily harm on a militia employee.

Previously, Mart Niklus had been tried for political reasons and was condemned to serve out a term in the Mordovian camps.

Sources:
1. "Mart Niklus accuses..." (in Russian)
2. "Mart Niklus accuses..." (in Estonian)

December 23, 1976
Vilnius

Members of the Lithuanian Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR:

O. Karolis Garuskas
Eitan Finkelstein
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Tomas Venclova
THE JURGUTIS AND ANVOLDAITE-BELAPETRAVICHEINE
FAMILY REUNIFICATION CASES

DOCUMENT NO. 4

Mrs. Marija Jurgutis and her daughter, Daina (Vilnius, Zhirmunu 75-100), have been denied permission to emigrate and join their husband and father, Aloyzas Jurgutis, who lives in Chicago, Illinois.

The Jurgutis have been forced to undergo two searches and have been interrogated several times -- the daughter was first subjected to questioning at the tender age of eleven years (June 1976). The Soviet authorities have denied the Jurgutis' request to emigrate three times (March 1975, April 21, 1976, and December 24, 1976).

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

West German citizen Adolf Anvold's (FRG, Castorf-Ranchel, Bozhangenerstr. 89) daughter Valya Anvoldaite-Belapetravichiene and her husband Steponas Belapetravichius (Klaipeda, Taikos 13-60) are denied permission to emigrate to the Federal Republic of Germany for the purpose of family reunification. To that end, the daughter twice appealed to the Soviet authorities, but without success; the appeals the father has made have also been for naught.

The Soviet authorities' refusal to grant exit visas to the Jurgutis and Belapetravichius families directly violates Helsinki Final Act provisions on family reunification.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Sources:

1. A statement
2. A statement (in Russian)
3. A declaration to "World Public Opinion" (in Russian with appendix)

February 25, 1977
Vilnius

Members of the Lithuanian Group to
Promote Observance of the Helsinki
Agreements in the USSR:

O. Karolis Garuckas
Eitan Finkelshtein
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Tomas Venclova
THE ARREST OF HENRIKAS JASKUNAS

DOCUMENT NO. 5

On December 22, 1976, Henrikas Jaskunas' apartment (Ionava, ul. XXX-letiya, 25-18) was searched "with the object of finding and confiscating literature of an anti-Soviet nature in addition to other documents and materials that could be relevant to the case" (excerpted from the text of the warrant and the official record of the search). Following the search, Jaskunas was arrested.

We hereby inform the signatory governments of the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement of the arrest of Henrikas Jaskunas and enclose for their information all the evidentiary materials that were used to incriminate Jaskunas (copies of materials confiscated by the KGB during the search). As far as we know, the materials found in Jasjunas' apartment had not been disseminated.

Sources:
1. A statement
2. The official record of the search
3. Manifesto of the Union of Independent Peoples (in Russian)
4. Open Letter #1 (in Russian)
5. "Unity is the Best Weapon" (in Russian)
6. "The Voice of the People" (in Russian)
7. "End the Occupation" (in Russian)
8. "Monopolistic Capitalism Soviet-Style" (in Russian)

February 28, 1977
Members of the Lithuanian Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR:

O. Karolis Garuckas
Eitan Finkelshtein
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Tomas Venclova
ON DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE VOLGA GERMANS IN THE USSR

DOCUMENT NO. 6

During the Second World War, Stalin committed one of the most heinous crimes of the century -- he deported entire ethnic populations from their native territories and repopulated their lands with new arrivals from different places. This was the fate of the Crimean Tatars, the Volga Germans, the Kalmyks, the Ingush, the Chechens, the Kabardin Balkars, and others. Twenty-four years have passed since the death of Stalin, yet forty-nine Volga German families from the Radviliskis Region of Lithuania came to us with documentation showing that the Volga Germans are still being treated like second-class citizens; countless obstacles are put in their way when they attempt to obtain residency permits or find employment. Initially, the Volga Germans appealed to the authorities in Moscow and Vilnius for help, but they had no hope of redress. For this reason, they declare that they will renounce their Soviet citizenship and will demand to emigrate to their historical homeland, the Federal Republic of Germany, if discrimination against them as a national minority does not cease.

Discriminatory treatment of the Volga Germans is in direct contravention of the 1965 Directive lifting restrictions on Germans living on Soviet territory, of the USSR Constitution itself, and of the Universal Declaration on Civil and Political Rights, to which the Soviet Union is signatory.

The Lithuanian Helsinki Group declares that the continued persecution of the Volga Germans violates both the letter and the spirit of the Helsinki Agreement.

Sources:
1. Statement with 47 signatures (in Russian)
2. Statement with 49 signatures (in Russian)

March 19, 1977
Vilnius

Members of the Lithuanian Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR:

O. Karolis Garuckas
Eitan Finkelshtein
Ona Lukauskaitė-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Tomas Venclova
ON ERIK UDAM AND KGB ATTEMPTS TO ENLIST HIM AS A 'DISSIDENT'

DOCUMENT NO. 7

We have been approached by Erik Udam, an Estonian, born in 1938, and residing in Tallinn. An electrical engineer who speaks Lithuanian, Molok has twice won the Estonian wrestling championship. He was arrested twice and has spent five years in Soviet prisons and camps as a political prisoner.

A listening device was installed in the wall of his communal apartment. When Udam removed it, the KGB agents in Tallinn became angry. It was then that Udam met Albert Molok, a KGB agent whom he had known from the time of his first arrest in 1956 and who had since been made a major.

On April 4, 11, and 14 of this year, Albert Molok suggested that Erik Udam form a dissident committee in Estonia. Thereupon, the major would establish contacts between the committee and American diplomats accredited in Moscow. Major Molok offered one half million rubles for this purpose. Erik Udam replied that he might try to form such a committee, but only with Finnish contacts. Major Molok said the KGB was not interested in Finns, but only in Americans and offered Udam 250,000 rubles for initial expenses. When Udam refused, the KGB major asked him to recommend someone who would agree to organize such a committee.

During their conversations, Molok claimed the credit for the unsuccessful journey of the English journalist David Satter* (London's Financial Times) to the Baltic countries during February of this year.

Sources:
1. Eriko Udamo pöördumine (in Estonian)
2. Eriko Udamo pöördumine Läänemeremae rehvaste poole (in Estonian)

May 26, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:
Tomas Venclova
Father Karolis Caruckas
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Eitan Finkelstein

* (In February 1977, Satter's briefcase was stolen in a Riga-Tallin train. Among other papers, his case had contained a notebook with Udam's address written on it—Ed.)
PERSECUTION OF THE VASILEV FAMILY,
RUSSIAN PENTECOSTALS LIVING IN VILNIUS, LITHUANIA

DOCUMENT NO. 8

Viktor Vasilev and his family, residing in Vilnius, Architektu St. 224, Apt. 8, have appealed to the U.S. and "to all the Christian countries, to all the Christian-Evangelical missions, to all Christian associations for aid."

The family belongs to the Christian Pentecostal community, therefore, the Soviet administration "wages a ceaseless struggle against us, not because we are evil people, but only because we are profound believers, Pentecostals." This group has been kept outside the pale of the law for a long time. Some individuals and families are experiencing illegal reprisals even today.

During Viktor Vasilev's army service in the city of Termez (1959-1960), Sharonov, captain of the special service, gave him orders to renounce God in writing, because otherwise he would be barred from entering a military institute. The Captain said the institute preferred to produce five bad engineers than one good one who is a believer.

Nina Vasileva, Vasilev's wife, was constantly persecuted by the KGB in Alma Ata.

For the past three years, Vasilev has been living in Vilnius, but the Soviet administration has not forgotten him. Bukashiev, prosecutor of the Spalina region in the city of Vilnius, branded the head of the family an anti-Soviet individual. At Vilnius secondary school 36, their children, Valentin and Timofey, were being forced to join the Little Octobrists. When they refused, the school principal suggested that they find a school without a Little Octobrist organization.* Finally, Viktor Vasilev received a court order to move out into the street. Despite his 24-year work record and the praise and distinction he has earned in his places of employment, he still has not earned a government-approved apartment. KGB people started spreading various fabrications and rumors about the family.

Vasilev wrote appeals to Brezhnev, Podgorny, Kosygin and Rudenko - all to no avail.

* (All schools in the Soviet Union have this organization--Ed.)
Therefore, he and his wife have asked the Soviet administration to give their family permission to leave the USSR. They base their request on:

1. The Declaration of Human Rights;

2. The International Act on Civil and Political Rights; and

3. The Helsinki Agreements.

They have also appealed for aid to the Christians of the world.

Sources:
1. Statement (in Russian)
2. Statement about the emigration from the USSR (in Russian)

June 2, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Tomas Venclova
Father Karolis Caruckas
Ona Lukauskaitė-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Eitan Finkelshtein
ON THE SITUATION OF LITHUANIAN FORMER POLITICAL PRISONERS

DOCUMENT NO. 9

Some political prisoners who have returned to Lithuania are facing a difficult situation. An entire complex system of discrimination has been created against the prisoners who have served their terms. Having acquainted ourselves with the documentation and statements, we have established the following:

1. Some of the political prisoners released from Soviet prisons and camps have been so far categorically denied the right to return to their homeland, Lithuania (Vytautas Slapsinskas returned in 1977 after a 25-year term), although they have not been punished with deportation or with other restrictions of civil rights (Stepas Bubulas, Kostas Buknys, Antanas Deksnys, Alfonsas Caidys, Algirdas Gaišomas, Robertas Indrikas, Antanas Jankauskas, Jonas Karalius, Leonas Lebeda, Kostas Lukas, Juozas Mikailionis, Aleksas Mosteika, Petras Paltarokas, Povilas Peciulaitis, Vytautas Petrusiatis, Albinas Rosytinas, Vincas Saliokas, Vytautas Slapsinskas, Jonas Sarkanas, Vladas Vaitiekunas, et al). They are exiled without a trial, only by administrative order.

2. Some of the returnees refuse to obey the order ("order" - because jurists maintain that such a law does not exist, and therefore they cannot defend these people's rights) and refuse to leave Lithuania. Such individuals must arm themselves with patience, cool nerves, perseverance, and strong will. In some cases, the administration, having tried various penalties and trials, finally allows them to register officially. In other cases, permission to register is refused. They do not deport the stubborn individual, they simply adjust themselves to the accomplished fact. That is what happened on April 20th of this year to arrested Balys Gajauskas, who had lived in Kaunas for four years without having been duly registered. Povilas Peciulaitis was allowed to register in Kaunas, then his registration was cancelled and he was showered with monetary fines for not being registered. On May 20, 1975, he was sentenced to one year in a strict regime camp. After he had served his term, the authorities again refused to have him registered in Lithuania or outside its limits...

3. Sometimes, after permission has been granted for residence in Lithuania, the administration changes its mind after a prolonged time, annuls the registration, and the person is expelled from Lithuania (Leonas Lebeda, Kostas Lukas, Povilas Peciulaitis, and others); Kazys Katkus, for instance, had his registration annulled in Plunge in 1975 after having lived there for ten years upon his return from camp.
4. The Soviet administration sometimes likes to play cat-and-mouse. Juozas Tribusauskas, for instance, returned to his native Panevezys and lived there for several years, but was then expelled from Lithuania. He took up residence in Latvia and a few years later was again allowed to return to Panevezys.

5. These individuals, deported without trial and without any definite term, do not know when they can return home. Everything depends on the whims of the administration since one cannot say that nobody is allowed to return. For example, the priests Petras Jasas, Antanas Mitrikas, Kazimieras Vaicionis, Kasimieras Vasiliauskas, and others were kept in Latvia for over ten years; later they were allowed to return to their native country. Thus, exiled people do not know when they will be able to return to Lithuania.

6. Similarly, people who have never been sentenced have been deported nevertheless. Thus, the Apostolic administrators of the archdiocese of Vilnius and of the diocese of Kaisiadorys, Bishops Julijonas Steponavicius and Vincentas Sladkevicius remain in exile for almost twenty years. It is true they were exiled to the border areas of Lithuania, not outside its limits. Archbishop Teofilis Matulionis and Bishop Franciskus Ramanauskas died in such exile after having been released from prisons and camps.

7. Those exiled are usually fathers and heads of families. The entire family moves to the place of exile. There, the problem of finding schools that teach Lithuanian is very important. At one time, the Lithuanian deportees in Siberia were forbidden to have Lithuanian schools, although they did not lack qualified teachers who were also exiles. For the same reasons, all the efforts of Lithuanians in East Prussia (now the Kaliningrad area) to establish Lithuanian schools for their children collapsed.

In this manner the Soviet administration of Lithuania disregards the international obligations of the USSR, because it exiles both former political prisoners and citizens who have not been tried at all, wherever, whenever, and for whatever term it wishes to, and the deportee's family ends up in exile together with him.

Sources:
1. Statement
2. Application
3. Reply to USSR Ministers' Council
4. Statement (in Russian)
5. Certificate No. 049912 (in Russian)
6. Certificate No. 045589 (in Russian)
7. Certificate No. 094225 (in Russian)
8. Certificate of Form No. 15 (in Russian)
9. Check of Form No. 20 (in Russian)
June 14, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Tomas Venclova
Fath - Karolis Garuckas
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Eitan Finkelstein
ON THE ARREST OF BALYS GAJAUSKAS

DOCUMENT NO. 10

On April 20, 1977, Balys Gajauskas was summoned to the Vilnius KGB and arrested. He had been living in Kaunas, and on May 4th it would have been four years since his return from the Mordovian camps. He was not officially registered in Lithuania, but he refused to leave. For this refusal, Gajauskas became involved with various institutions and a court.

Previously, Balys Gajauskas had been charged under Article 58 and was sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment on May 3, 1948. He completed his entire term in prisons and camps. On his return, he was often interrogated; his apartment was searched on December 23, 1974 and on February 7, 1977. The purpose of the last search was spelled out in the search warrant: To seize "objects and documents that may serve as significant evidence to the case." Also ransacked were Leonardas Staviskis' and Ona Grigaliuniene's apartments in search of materials that might compromise Gajauskas.

On May 22, 1977, Birute Pasiliene's apartment in Giruliai, Klaipeda was searched. The search warrant indicated that the search was to find material on Balys Gajauskas' case. During the search of Pasiliene's apartment, *Khronika* #43, a manuscript *Projektas* (Project), and two typewriters (Lithuanian and Russian) were confiscated by the authorities.

The only surviving member of Gajauskas' family is his ill 73-year-old mother. At the time of Gajauskas' arrest she was undergoing an operation in the hospital. Two weeks after his arrest, she was informed in writing that her son had been arrested and that he was charged with Article 68 (part two) of the Lithuanian Penal Code. Thus, he faces a possible loss of freedom from three to ten years, and one to five years of exile. Leonardas Staviskis and Ona Grigaliuniene were called to the KGB as witnesses in Balys Gajauskas' case.

Sources:
1. Statement-Appeal by Birute Pasiliene
2. Description of the search of Birute Pasiliene's apartment
June 16, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Tomas Venclova
Father Karolis Garuckas
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Eitan Finkelshtein
ON THE PERSECUTION OF ENN TARTO

DOCUMENT NO. 11

Enn Tarto, Estonian, born on September 25, 1938, residing in the city of Tartu, has written to us.

Enn Tarto was arrested in 1956 and in 1962. He spent nine years in Soviet prisons and camps as a political prisoner. Upon his return, the KGB did not leave him in peace, and repeatedly subjected him to interrogations. He was dismissed from an institution of higher learning and was interrogated about his contacts with Naraliya Gorbanevskaya.

This year, there were four attempts to set fire to the building where he lives (Tartu, Anne Street No. 20). Recalling that recently several dissidents in Moscow were victims of fires, we have decided to publish the letter of Enn Tarto as a document.

Source:
Enn Tarto, "Leedu Helsinki grupile avaldus"

June 26, 1977

Lithuanian Helsinki Group:

Tomas Venclova
Father Karolis Garuckas
Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene
Viktoras Petkus
Eitan Finkelstein
ON THE PSYCHIATRIC IMPRISONMENT OF ALGIRDAS ZIPRE

DOCUMENT NO. 12

A cry has reached us. It is the heart-breaking voice of a human being from the so-called psychiatric hospitals which are really prisons. This cry was first heard by Jonas Volungevicius (resident of Vilnius), Birute Pasiliene (resident of Klaipeda), Romualdas Ragaitis (resident of Vilnius) and Jadvyga Petkeviciene (resident of Siauliai) who sent it to us.

It is the voice of political prisoner Algirdas Zipre who, in 1958 had been sentenced to 25 years of imprisonment under Article 58 although a decree had been already passed according to which maximum punishment could not exceed 15 years. The condemned man appealed to various Soviet agencies to have the error rectified. As a result, on October 13, 1973, this healthy, strong, and principled individual was thrown into what prisoners call the "psikhushka" (psychiatric prison-hospital--Ed.) in Mordovia, Barashev camp 385/3-12.

The conditions there are worse than in prison: a hermetically closed window, strict isolation from the outside world, no walks, and prisoners are beaten and forcibly injected with some pseudo-medicine. Algirdas Zipre suffered severe beatings on October 20, 1973 and February 7, 1975. He was twice transferred to the Serbsky Institute in Moscow (September 29, 1974 and February 28, 1977) and was held in Moscow's Butyrky Prison. Recently he was moved to an unknown destination.

May his appeal reach the ears and heart of every decent human being!

Sources:
2. Letter by Algirdas Zipre, "Bak sveikas!" (Greetings'), a copy
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STATEMENT

ON THE SITUATION OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

AND OF OTHER BELIEVERS IN LITHUANIA

In the Soviet Union, the struggle against religion is an integral part of Communist Party policy. "Freedom of conscience" is understood here in a unique way. In his pamphlet, Soviet Laws on Religious Cults (Vilnius, 1963), A. Veshchikov describes freedom of conscience as follows: "We understand freedom of conscience as the ultimate liberation of all men from religious superstition (p. 10). The same idea is also expressed by J. Anicas and J. Rimaitis in their brochure, Soviet Laws on Religious Cults and Freedom of Conscience (Vilnius, 1970):

"Genuine freedom of conscience is possible only when... all available scientific, cultural and ideological means are used to help man liberate himself from the influence of an anti-scientific religious view of the world. As long as the believers have not shed religious superstition, freedom of conscience is impossible." (p. 54)

Such an understanding and interpretation of freedom of conscience is self-contradictory. Freedom cannot exist where there is compulsion, restriction, and struggle. Simultaneously, this interpretation also contradicts international obligations undertaken by the Soviet Union: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Final Act, the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

As a member of the United Nations, the Soviet Union has assumed the obligation to honor and respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, but it has not changed its stand toward religion within its own state. Not only did the old laws remain valid, but on July 28, 1976, already after the Helsinki Accords, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania confirmed the Regulations Governing Religious Associations, 53 articles in all, a fact on which we have reported in our Document No. 2, 1976. Once more we draw attention to the fact that these regulations are based exclusively on various Soviet decrees and regulations created prior to the Helsinki Accords and
which discriminate against the believers. Specifically, anti-religious pro-
paganda is allowed, but religious propaganda is outlawed; only the perform-
ance of religious cults is permitted, etc.

Article 26 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political
Rights states:

"All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any
discrimination to equal protection of the law. In this respect the law
shall prohibit any discrimination and guarantee to all persons equal and
effective protection against discrimination on any ground such as race,
colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or
social origin, property, birth or other status."

International agreements on basic human rights and freedoms state that
they take precedence over the internal laws of states. Since the Soviet
Union recognizes this principle, it should amend Article 124 of the USSR
Constitution and Article 96 of the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR,
which state: "The Church has been separated from the state and the state
from the church. The freedom of performance of religious cults and the
freedom of anti-religious propaganda are granted to all citizens."

The word "separate" as used by the state organs has more than one
meaning. When it is applied to the Church, it is understood in the sense
that the Church has no right to intervene in the state's internal affairs
-- that is, the Church cannot indicate which persons should be elected to
the country's Supreme Soviet or its presidium; who should be chairman of
the raion executive committees; who should be named professors or lecturers
at the universities; etc. But when the term "separate" is applied to the
state, it has an entirely opposite meaning: the organs of the Soviet
government decide which bishops are not allowed to perform their duties
(Bishops Steponavicius and Sistkevicius) and which young people cannot en-
roll in the Theological Seminary (those refused admission are still haras-
sed: M. Petravicius, A. Ciaras, et al.). They even decide which priests
may be invited to religious festivals, and which ones may not (A. Kleina,
K. Garuckas, V. Cerniauskas, etc.). The state authorities have told the
Rev. Bronius Laurinavicius that, "without our knowledge" a priest cannot
even hammer a nail into a church wall. The atheists themselves acknow-
ledge that the word "separate" has a double meaning. J. Anieus and J.
Raimaitis write:

"In the literature that discusses the question of the separation of
church and state, the two are sometimes presented as parties of equal sig-
nificance, e.g., 'The state organs do not interfere in the activity of the
church; church in its turn does not mingle in the affairs of the state.'
This interpretation is doubtlessly incorrect. The sovereignty of the Soviet
state gives it the right to regulate various areas of social life. The
church, in spite of its specific character, cannot be an exception."

If one thinks logically, the separation of the Church from the state
should mean that it is entirely free, independent from the state, and runs
its own affairs. However, judging by common practice and various laws and
regulations issued by the civilian administration, it would appear that the church has not been separated from the state, but rather is strictly controlled by the state administration. When the Soviet press writes about the Church-state relations, it frequently asserts that the Soviet state and its government organs do not interfere in the internal affairs of the Church, i.e., in its canonical and dogmatic activity. Actual experience, however, shows something entirely different: the state disregards the canons of the church law and determines what is permitted the Church and what is not. This is acknowledged by the atheists themselves. A. Veshchikov writes:

"Soviet laws forbid the centers of the clergy to issue any regulations and rules to the faithful. The clergy is also forbidden to guide or even to base itself on previous religious laws." (p. 20)

Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights states:

"The states Party to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians, to choose for their children schools other than those established by the public authorities which conform to such minimum educational standards as may be laid down or approved by the State and to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions."

The same principle is repeated in Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and is emphasized by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children." (Article 26)

Article 56 of the Fundamentals of People's Education in the USSR and the Union Republics admits theoretically:

"If regulations established by an international treaty or an international agreement of which the USSR is a party, differ from those promulgated by the educational laws of the USSR and its Union republics, then the regulations of the international treaty or the international agreement are applied." But the practice is different.

In the Soviet Union, where school has been separated from the Church, the entire educational apparatus is in the hands of the state and there are no other schools except those of the state. The goals and the tasks of those schools are determined by the Fundamentals of Legislation of People's Education in the USSR and the Union Republics, which demand "lay education without religion." (Article 12), "permeation of teaching and education with the spirit of Marxist-Leninist ideas, socialist internationalism, Soviet patriotism, and Communist views" (Articles 19, 31, 36, 41), and state that "Parents and persons who represent them must educate children in the spirit of high Communist morality" (Article 57); "education in the family must be organically harmonized with the educational activity of schools, pre-schools and extracurricular institutions, and social organizations" (Article 57).
The practical application of the above-mentioned articles of the Fundamentals is described by P. Misutis, Deputy Chairman of the Council for the Coordination of the Republic's Atheistic Propaganda, in his book, *Improvement of Ideological Activity* (Vilnius, 1974):

"The Fifth Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (1963) emphasized that scientific-atheistic propaganda is a general party matter. (p. 197)

The differentiation of atheistic activity has recently improved... Atheistic education in schools is also being identified. The main task of the formation of the materialistic world-view is transferred to the classroom process, but without relinquishing the atheistic groups and clubs whose activity in some schools even goes beyond the school limits. It is very important to improve the atheistic education of parents who are still believers, which is exactly what the collectives of many schools are trying to do.

There are important tasks in the education of the young and of university students... The Departments of Atheism and Philological History in Vilnius V. Kapsukas State University, is accomplishing a lot in this respect and is playing an increasing role in the coordination and organization of scientific atheistic activity of university students throughout the entire republic... Therefore, it is very important to improve work with them, as with the young in general. Those youth who are still religious believers must be taken away from the influence of the church." (p. 202)

Such are the goals of all schools. Perhaps, then, the children of the believers and the religious youth can be taught religion privately?

Lenin's decree of January 25, 1918, "On the Separation of the Church from the State and of the school from the Church" allows for private religious instruction (Article 9), while Article 43 of the Penal Code of the Lithuanian SSR forbids it. The violation of this (43rd) Article is described as follows:

"Organization and systematic performance of religious instruction for minors, in violation of the rules established by law. The violation of the rules established by the law refers to religious instruction of minors in any form (e.g., organizing religious organizations and any kind of schools, clubs, groups; holding regular meetings of children on questions of religious instruction; religious instruction performed by parents not only with their own children but also with children of other believers). The exception here is religious instruction performed by the parents themselves." (Commentary to the LSSR Penal Code, Vilnius, 1974, p. 226).

The same idea is expressed in Articles 17 and 18 of the Regulations on Religious Associations. Thus, Lenin's decrees do not harmonize with contemporary state laws.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights states in Article 18:
"Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance."

The freedom to practice a religion is assured by the USSR and LSSR constitutions, yet the believers in Lithuania do not have this freedom. A. Veschikov openly acknowledges that religious associations "have strictly limited functions, according to Soviet law." (p. 31). J. Anicas and J. Rimaitis repeat the same: "Religious communities are formed for the practice of a religion only." (p. 38)

The term "freedom to practice a religion" encompasses not only the holding of religious services or the participation in them, but everything that is closely linked to the religious ritual. To practice the rituals of the Catholic Church, one needs priests, liturgical vessels, hymnals, sheet music, rosaries, organs and similar things.

The Catholics of Lithuania receive as many new priests as the civil authorities, who determine how many will study at the Theological Seminary, allow. The bishops and administrators of Lithuania cannot offer the Sacrament of Confirmation without the permission of the organs of the atheist government. The activity of priests is limited to the homes of members of the parish in which they service, and to the church of the parish where the priest works (Article 19, Regulations Governing Religious Associations). Solemn processions to the cemetery on All Soul's Day are prohibited and priests punished for leading such processions (e.g., the Revs. Alfones Svarinskas, Jonas Survila, and others). In many places, administration of the Last Rites to hospital patients is obstructed, and priests are forbidden to visit the faithful, even if they have asked for a priest (e.g., the Rev. K. Garuckas and others).

After the Second Vatican Meeting, the faithful of almost the entire world perform services in their native language. Lithuanians, however, must still use Latin, because it is impossible to print missals and other necessary books in the Lithuanian language. As for the manufacturing of religious vessels and organs, Lithuanians can only dream about it. According to the regulations governing religious associations, religious centers, the curiae, religious communities and parishes in Lithuania, are not considered judicial entities and, therefore, do not have the corresponding rights. By the same token, they cannot establish their own regulations, cannot own property, are not subject to law and obligations, cannot conclude contracts, cannot be named beneficiaries in a last will and testament, and cannot participate in courts and arbitration proceedings. Article 22 of the above-mentioned regulation states:

"The property indispensable for the performance of the religion, both that which has been transferred, according to the contracts, for the use of the believers who form a religious community, and that which has been acquired or donated to them for religious purposes, belongs to the state." Even the "insurance compensation for a burnt (damaged) house of prayer, is transferred to the appropriate executive committee of the Council of Working People's Deputies, which has the authority over these buildings." (Article 29)
Most Lithuanian Catholics, especially members of the intelligentsia -- teachers, etc. -- cannot participate in religious rituals for they will be dismissed from work as a result.

During the years of Stalin's rule, Lithuanians, deported to distant areas of Russia, used to make rosary beads from bread, string them on a thread, and pray. Today we see in many hands not those bread rosaries, but crude rosaries made in hiding, prayerbooks and hymnals copied by hand. Quite a few have gone to prison for secretly printing prayerbooks, e.g., P. Petronis, J. Grazys, et al. The apartments of the believers are adorned by photographs of no esthetic value, or metal images of the Crucifix, forged or cast secretly.

Can all this be called freedom to practice religion?

The freedom of anti-religious propaganda means that each Soviet citizen has the right to freely express his atheistic convictions and proclaim them orally and in the press. This right is assured by Article 124 of the USSR Constitution and Article 96 of the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR. The freedom of anti-religious propaganda in the Soviet Union means a struggle against religion and is actually a duty. It is one of the platforms of the Communist Party. A. Veshchikov writes:

"The materials of the XXII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union provide guidance on how atheistic activity should be further developed. The Congress made an in-depth analysis of the question of overcoming religious traces." (p. 29)

The Constitution does not grant the freedom to religious propaganda to their citizens who are religious believers, and thus makes them unequal vis-a-vis the atheists in the eyes of the law, and discriminates against them. As a result, Catholics in Soviet Lithuania do not have any religious newspapers, or magazines, Catholic books, or even a catechism, while at the same time bookstores are inundated with atheistic books. Newspapers and magazines are flowing over with atheistic articles, trying to "dethrone" the Catholic Church, but the Catholics cannot reply to them, because they do not have their own press. Therefore, the Catholics of Lithuania cannot take advantage of those rights and freedoms that are enshrined in international agreements that the Soviet Union has committed itself to honor and to put into practice.

Therefore, we address ourselves to the Belgrade Conference, whose task is to monitor the observance of the agreements, signed in Helsinki in 1975. We ask you to help us see to it that the international accords which have been adopted do not remain on paper only, but are concretely applied, and that:

1. The term "freedom of conscience" be understood and interpreted in the same manner as it is understood by the people of the entire world;
2. The people have the right not only to anti-religious but also to religious propaganda;

3. The (religious) believers be granted the rights of meeting, press and expression;

4. Those articles of the fundamentals of legislation on education that restrict the freedom of religion and conscience be abolished; and

5. That all those who have contributed to the universal respect and observance of human rights and fundamental freedom (N. Sadunaite, P. Plumpa, P. Petronis, S. Zukauskas, J. Grazyys, and others) be released from prisons and camps.

June 19, 1977
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Rev. Karolis Garuckas
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STATEMENT TO THE BELGRADE CONFERENCE
ON THE PRESENT SITUATION IN LITHUANIA

The present status quo in Lithuania is the result of an ultimatum, submitted at 11:00 PM on June 14, 1940, in Moscow, by Molotov, the Chairman of the Council of the People's Commissars of the Soviet Union and Commissar of Foreign Affairs, to Urbsys, Lithuanian Minister of Foreign Affairs. The army of the Soviet Union, on these grounds, crossed the frontier of Lithuania already on the following day, June 15, at 2:00 PM, and occupied the main Lithuanian cities.

Molotov's deputy, Dekanozov, was dispatched to Lithuania and tried to standardize the country's life in accordance with the Soviet pattern. The results were terrible: not only were all the political parties closed down, the private press liquidated, social organizations oppressed but, beyond that, over forty thousand people were imprisoned or deported to Siberia, sparing nobody, neither infants nor old people.

It is no wonder, then, that at the outbreak of the German-Soviet war, the four largest Lithuanian political parties tried to restore Lithuanian state sovereignty -- but the Nazis swiftly paralyzed their efforts.

When in 1944 the Red Army once more entered Lithuania, as early as November 11th a special bureau, attached to the Central Committee of the Communist (Bolshevik) party was formed in Moscow under the leadership of Suslov. In the following year alone, more than four thousand employees were purged from various agencies in Lithuania. By April 1947, 1350 more people were discharged because, in April 1945, 6116 officials who could not speak Lithuanian were sent to Lithuania. According to KGB Colonel Mikhailov, who was stationed in Vilnius, fifty thousand Lithuanians perished with weapons in their hands, three times more were sent to prisons and camps where the casualties were as high as in the forests -- and how many were deported to Siberia!

After Stalin's death, some of the deportees were allowed to return, and some of the political prisoners were released from camps. But, alas, to this very day, many are not allowed to return to Lithuania, their fatherland, and are kept in indefinite exile without trial. We publish at least some of their names:

The situation of the Lithuanian language is difficult. Five times as many Russians are living in Lithuania today as before World War II, especially in Vilnius and Klaipeda. Therefore, in some offices it is impossible to make oneself understood in Lithuanian, for instance, in the Vilnius railway station, in some post offices, on the street with the policemen on duty, etc. In Latvia, where on the eve of the war there were eighteen Lithuanian schools, all have been closed.[*]

Many lands, recognized as part of Lithuania by the peace treaty between Lithuania and the Soviet Union signed on July 12, 1920, today are under the Belorussian administration. Lithuanians are autochthonous in those lands. They have no Lithuanian schools, while in Apsas and Vydziai the churches have been closed; the church of Pelesa, built by Lithuanians after World War I, has been transformed into a warehouse, its towers have been razed, while Rector Vienazindis was imprisoned in 1950. Consequently, Lithuanians in Belorussia have no schools, no churches, and Lithuanian priests are not allowed to take up residence there.

The census data indicates that the number of Russians and of Poles in Lithuania is about equal, but various advertisements, slogans posters, booklets, etc. in Vilnius are only in two languages -- Lithuanian and Russian. There is a Russian dramatic theatre in Vilnius, Russian-language groups are understudied in Lithuanian establishments of higher education, while the Polish language is allowed only in the Vilnius Pedagogical Institute.

The smaller national minorities are faring even worse. During the war, the Jews suffered more than any other inhabitants in Lithuania. Prior to World War Two, they had 122 primary schools, three grammar schools, and 14 high schools. At present, the Jews do not have a single school, or a press of their own, although, according to the 1970 census data there were 16,000 of them in Vilnius alone and 4,000 in Kaunas.

Twenty-four thousand declared themselves as Belorussians in Vilnius, but they do not have their own school, and Belorussian religious services were also abolished in churches in the postwar years. When private schools were forbidden after the war, the Karaites suffered a special loss, because the Kenese (Karaite place of worship--Ed.) of Trakai had a parochial school attached to it; the Tatars also suffered a wrong with the closing of their mosques and schools.

The Lithuanians in Latvia are told, if they want to study in Lithuanian, they must go to Lithuania, but the Russians are not told that their children should go to Russia to learn Russian. The Ministry of Education has specified that the curriculum of the senior class in Lithuanian high schools contain only four weekly hours of the Lithuanian language and five hours of the Russian language. The same Ministry manages to demand and obtain a fluency in Russian from all Lithuanian graduates, but the same Ministry is helpless to make the same Russian graduates learn at least a little Lithuanian.

The publishing houses have gone even further: in some Lithuanian books, Russian texts are now being printed without a Lithuanian translation.
Various administrative officials and the press have begun talking about the bilingualism of Lithuanians -- the Lithuanians are alleged to like Lenin's language. But what is to be done if in Lithuania itself it is impossible to communicate in Lithuanian?

In schools, the history of Lithuania and the world are taught in a special manner -- it is not a history of states, or nations, or kings, or dukes, but the history of economic relationships and of the so-called "class struggle," elucidated by the party line. Therefore, not a single textbook of Lithuanian or world history, or any publication on the subject published prior to 1940, is allowed into the schools. Not only those, but all books published prior to the above-mentioned events have been removed from all school libraries, and most of them have been destroyed. An exception has been made only for certain institutes of higher learning and scientific institutions, where such publications have been placed in the so-called special funds, which are accessible only by special permission.

It is especially strange that even certain books by individuals who occupied various important posts after the events of June 1940, and published prior to those events, have also ended up in the special fund, e.g., the book SSSR -- musu akimis (USSR Through Our Eyes) by Justas Paleckis who for three decades was in name the country's top administrative official. Even such classics of Lithuanian literature as Algimantas by Vincas Pietaris, and others have ended up among the forbidden books.

The history of Lithuanian literature has been arranged in such a way that several writers who had retreated to the USSR during the war years are being recognized as great Lithuanian classics, while there is either silence about the mass of Lithuanian writers who had fled to the West, or some are mentioned only after their death. The writers who have returned from the camps or from Siberia also have a difficult time.

To this very day, KGB agents keep seizing prewar books or periodicals, whenever they are engaged in a house search. Where are they deposited? Only the KGB could answer this question.

The Soviet press explains the matter as follows: "It was necessary to re-evaluate the cultural heritage of the Lithuanian nation from the Marxist-Leninist point of view: by taking over its democratic and socialist tendencies, to criticize the bourgeois-nationalist conceptions, especially in the areas of history, literature and other social sciences. It was also necessary to broadly propagate scientific atheism, a helper in the struggle against the religious views disseminated by the church." (Algirdas Rakunas, Klasiu kova Lietuvoje 1940-1951 metais -- The Class Struggle in Lithuania, 1940-1951, Vilnius, 1976, p. 178).

The propagation of so-called scientific atheism continues today, and the means to propagate it have not improved. Let the official press speak for itself:
"When we were healing the war-inflicted wounds, developing education, culture, improving health care, there was an unusual space shortage in our republic. Therefore, it was completely natural for the local government organs to use the nationalized spacious rectory buildings for these vitally important matters." (Article by J. Anicas, in Už socializmo sukurimą Lietuvoje – For the Creation of Socialism in Lithuania, Vilnius, 1969, p. 306) We would like to add that not only rectories, but also parish halls, their libraries, and even the buildings housing church servants were used for that purpose. Many libraries were destroyed in this manner, e.g., the Marian library in Marijampolė (now Kapsukas), which contained over 50,000 books. One might add that the old archives of the dioceses were seized by force for the same purposes.

The Soviet press continues as follows: "The use of selected former cult buildings, most for culture, education and health care, in the process of improving social services for the population, was a profoundly humane affair, and the substantial majority of the working people gave its support to it" (Ibid., p. 306). Let us express our doubts that the "substantial majority of the working people" did approve, for instance, the transformation for a decade of the St. Casimir Church in Vilnius, built in 1604, into a warehouse for alcoholic beverages.

And is not the period of the "healing of the wounds" and of "postwar humanism" lasting a bit too long? Perhaps it is time to begin to return to the communities of religious believers at least their surviving possessions? After all, three-quarters of the churches in Vilnius, including the Cathedral-Basilica itself, remain closed.

Much is written and spoken about caring for architectural and artistic monuments. The Church of the Sisters of the Visitation in Vilnius (built in 1729) also bears the inscription that it is an architectural monument, but that did not prevent the destruction of its interior in 1965 and its transformation into a prison. That status also did not prevent the removal of the bells on September 8, 1966, from the All Saints Church (built in 1620, also in Vilnius) after it had been closed. A two-story chapel in Antakalnis, Vilnius, erected 300 years ago, was destroyed in the same year, although it was in nobody's way — even today the site remains empty and the trees that used to surround the chapel are still there. And only a couple of years ago, the popularly venerated Hill of Crosses near Siauliai was devastated again.

This sad list could be continued endlessly. Let us also add that all Catholic monasteries in Lithuania remain closed, while of the former, four theological seminaries only one is allowed to continue. Even that seminary could take in only five new seminarians three years ago, while the average mortality of priests per annum is four times as high. The Jews and Tatars of Lithuania, meanwhile, have been left without any clergy.

The Constitution of the USSR guarantees to atheists the right to anti-religious propaganda, yet believers are only allowed to worship, and not to engage in religious propaganda. How, then, is the equality of all citizens to be understood? Because the freedom to worship so far remains limited to
the paper of the Constitution — believers are not allowed to celebrate even their major holidays, which is part of the concept of religious worship.

Religious believers continue to be fired from their jobs for celebrating their holidays. When children stay away from school on such holidays, their parents are summoned to appear and receive a scolding. Television and radio are permeated with atheism, and meanwhile both these organizations are maintained with the money of the believers, too.

The believers of all religious denominations in Lithuania are without their own press. And if that were not enough, not only the laity but even the clergy are forbidden to teach prayers to the children, although such teaching is their direct duty and an inseparable component of the very concept of the cult. Priests who dared to do that have been incarcerated, imprisoned in camps, or otherwise punished. Here are several victims of the last decade: the Revs. Antanas Aleksandravicius (Slavikai), Prosperas Bubnys (Girkalnis), Albinas Deltuva (Veisejai), Antanas Jakubauskas (Pociūnai), Antanas Seskevicius (Dubingai), Juozas Zdebskis (Gudeliai and Prienai). Therefore, the equality of believers and non-believers exists on paper only.

There is one more painful wound. Our entire older generation in Lithuania remembers how, before the war, one could freely purchase in Lithuania such Soviet Russian dailies as Izvestia or Pravda, while at the Mokslas bookstore in Kaunas (under the patronage of the Soviet embassy) and later in a similar bookstore in Vilnius, one could purchase the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin in Russian.

We do not even dare to dream that we shall live to see the day when the central dailies of Paris, London and New York would be freely sold here. But we do not forget for an instant that a considerable portion of our nation, especially its intellectuals, have emigrated or retreated to the West. There they have created a sizeable press, a prolific literature; they have published a huge Lithuanian Encyclopedia.

Yet all the efforts to have the above-mentioned press reach us, too, have been in vain. Whenever a few samples of those publications reach our libraries, they are kept there behind nine locks, or again are available only with a special permit. Meanwhile, Communist literature published in Lithuania reaches the West without any obstruction. Our officials regard us as small children and strictly determine what we are, and are not to read.

In our statement, we have touched upon only a portion of the instances where the agreement signed on August 1, 1975, in Helsinki has been violated. We could also submit materials on how the reunion of families and a series of other questions are being evaded. The purpose of this memorandum is to draw the attention of the states-signatories of the Helsinki agreements to the fact that no agreement in the world is valid if it is observed only by a single party who has signed it.
(Signed by Lithuanian Public Group members Rev. Karolis Garuckas, Eithan Finkelstein, Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene and for Viktoras Petkus -- imprisoned since April, 1977 -- and Tomas Venclova -- allowed to leave for the U.S. in January, 1977, and subsequently stripped of his Soviet citizenship.)

USSR-Lithuania

Vilnius, July 17, 1977


[*] The source used here refers to prewar Latvian schools in Latvia; the reference undoubtedly should be to Lithuanian schools in prewar Latvia.
Vilnius, April 30, 1977

STATEMENT OF EITHAN FINKELSHTEIN,
MEMBER OF THE LITHUANIAN SOCIAL GROUP
TO SUPPORT THE OBSERVANCE OF HELSINKI AGREEMENTS

On April 27, 1977, I was summoned to the KGB department at the Ministers' Council of the Lithuanian SSR, where Major Rimkus, head of the interrogation section, in the presence of an official of the central apparatus of the KGB at the USSR Ministers' Council, accused me of collecting and transmitting to foreign intelligence centers and anti-Soviet propaganda organs slanderous fabrications and information, blackening the Soviet social and state system. He had in mind my activity in the Lithuanian Public Group to Promote the Observance of the Helsinki Agreement, as well as the publication of my articles and statements in the foreign press, and broadcasts of them by the foreign radio, including Radio Liberty.

I was officially warned that if I don't immediately cease such activity, I will be taken to court according to the appropriate paragraphs of the Penal Code.

All this compels me to make the following statement:

My activity in the Lithuanian Helsinki Group consists mainly of advising citizens on questions of emigration, as well as explaining their rights and related possibilities in connection with the Helsinki Agreements. Whenever the Helsinki Agreements are violated in the case of some citizens, I try, together with the other members of the group, to help them in their striving for justice and attempt to convince the governmental authorities to redress such violations.

My appeals and statements -- individual or collective -- deal mainly with the demand to free prisoners of conscience, with protests against the use of trials to persecute people because of their political convictions or because of their desire to emigrate, and with the defense of the right to emigration. In addition, I have signed appeals and statements, protesting against the violations of human rights and against acts of terrorism and radicalism in the countries where they occur.

My articles published in the foreign press deal with the problems of emigration to Israel, the situation and the specific problems of the Jews in the USSR, as well as with life in Lithuania today. In my articles, I
have expressed my own views only and did not intend at all to distort reality or to slander the Soviet Union, its people, or its political system.

My entire social activity is far from being inimical to the USSR, its people, or individual citizens. I never had any contacts of any kind with foreign intelligence agencies and have not transmitted any information to them.

As for the warning I have received from the KGB, I consider it an attempt to intimidate me and to force me to renounce my social activity, linked with the struggle for human rights and with the Helsinki Movement.

E. Finkelshtein
Physicist


END NOTE: The Lithuanian Group has produced additional sequential documents, from no. 13 onward, during 1977-1979, but these were not available to us at the time our compilation stopped. What follows are three important related documents, statements, testimony and opinion of Tomas Venclova, a founding member of the Lithuanian Group, who is now in the United States.
LETTER FROM TOMAS VENCLOVA

TO

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE LITHUANIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

This letter should not surprise you very much. I am a writer, a translator, a researcher in literature. I have labored extensively in all those areas. I think that I have served my fatherland and my nation rather well and that I have done enough work to earn the bread I have eaten during my lifetime. Nevertheless, I have accomplished much less than I was capable of, but the fault is not mine.

My father, Antanas Venclova, was a convinced communist, I have respected him and I continue respecting him as a human being. It was from him, among others, that I have learned to be loyal to my principles. But as I observed life and took part in it, I formed in my youthful days already an ideological system that was different from that of my father. My later experience merely served to confirm it. This was not a secret to my father or to anybody else.

The Communist ideology is alien to me and, in my view, is largely false. Its absolute reign has brought much misfortune to our land. The informational barriers and repressions imposed on those who think differently are pushing (our) society into stagnation and the entire country into regression. This imperils not culture alone. In the long run, this may also become dangerous to the state whose strengthening by such methods is intended. There is nothing I can change here. I could not do it even if I had as much power as you do. What I can and must do is to convey to you my opinion on those matters. And that is already something.

I have formed these views a long time ago and independently. For many years I have not written or uttered a single word contradicting these views. I take a serious view of the Communist ideology and therefore I refuse to repeat its formulas in a mechanical or hypocritical manner. By refusing to echo them I can only invite discrimination, which I have experienced in large amounts during my life.

I am barred from any more extensive and public literary, scholarly and cultural activity. In the Soviet Union everyone who is engaged in humanities, and not only in humanities, must keep constantly proving his loyalty to the reigning ideology in order to be able to work. This is easy for time-servers and careerists. It is not difficult for people who are sincerely convinced about the rightness of Marxism (although some of them might
regard it as an irksome and humiliating procedure). I find it impossible.

Unfortunately, I do not know how to write for the 'desk drawer.' I seek contacts with the audiences and I will seek them under any circumstances. I would not be able and would not like to do any other work than in the fields of literature and culture. Yet the opportunities for cultural activity are becoming narrower for me with every passing year, and my very existence in this land is becoming meaningless and fraught with doubts.

All I have written here applies to my wife as well. She is also active in cultural work as a theatre director.

Please allow me, on the basis of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and of the current laws, to go abroad with my family. The example of my friend Jonas Jurasas and of my other friends indicates that this is not impossible. Since my wife is Jewish, we could also go to Israel. This decision is final. I also ask you not to resort to any discrimination against those members of my family whose views differ from mine and who remain in Lithuania.

11 May 1975

Tomas Venclova

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE: Reproduced from Lituanus, Volume 22 (No. 3, Fall 1976), pp. 76-77. Not checked against the original, but confirmed by Venclova.
The announcement of the formation of the Lithuanian Group to Promote Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements was made on November 25, 1976 and shortly thereafter was announced at a press-conference held in Yuri Orlov's apartment in Moscow. At the present time, the Group consists of 5 people who have all signed the Announcement. We are people of various ages and backgrounds, with differing opinions and, finally, different ethnic backgrounds — four Lithuanians and one Jew.

We are united in one respect: a desire to achieve in a legal and open manner observation of the humanitarian articles of the Helsinki Agreement which in Lithuania are violated not less, and sometimes even more often, than in other republics included in the USSR. Respect for the signed Agreement and for human rights, in our view is an absolutely essential condition for the health of the international situation and of the internal atmosphere in the country. Although we are only a voluntary association of people who think in a similar fashion, we have grounds to believe that our opinion is shared by many other people in Lithuania who for one reason or another cannot express it openly.

Now, I -- one of the five members of the group -- have the opportunity to be in the West. I engaged in the struggle for the right to leave the USSR long before the formation of the Group. After its formation, all of a sudden this right became a reality. My departure is temporary in nature. I was given a Soviet passport which is valid for five years, and in Lithuania I have left my family behind. It is understood that I continue to be a member of the Group, and I intend to represent its interests in the West. In this I see my human and civic duty. Everything which I am prepared to say in the West I would have said -- and have already said -- in Lithuania.

According to information which I now have, one of the members of the Lithuanian Group, the seventy-five-year-old Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene, on January 11, 1977, was warned in the procurator's office of the city of Siauliai about her activities. Attempts to frighten her continued for about 3 hours. Since the members of the Moscow and Ukrainian groups have undergone repression, it is very probable that this will be done in Lithuania also. I ask that international public opinion pay close attention
to the fates of these four members of our Group: Ona Lukauskaite-Poskiene, Father Karolis Garuckas, Viktoras Petkus and Eitan Finkelshtein. I also would like to express my protest about the arrests of our friends in Moscow and in the Ukraine.

At first, the Helsinki Agreement evoked a certain pessimism in Lithuania since it seemed that it would only confirm the European status quo, and that the humanitarian articles would be, even under the best circumstances, no more than good intentions. In connection with this, we decided to document those cases in which the humanitarian articles of the Agreement are violated and to bring them to the attention of world opinion. Now we feel that such documentation and information may often help specific people and may also serve the cause of human rights and broader freedoms in Eastern Europe, including Lithuania. Therefore, the Helsinki Agreement now evokes in us considerably more optimism, especially if Western governments will show interest and a strictly principled approach to the defense of human rights. In this sense we expect much from the conference at Belgrade.

Our Group has published two documents and one announcement about an arrest in Lithuania of two people who were accused of so called anti-Soviet activities. As a supplement to these documents, I would like to tell about some other instances known to our Group and about some trends in our work.

First of all, I must say that many people in Lithuania are brought to trial for expression of their views and at present are imprisoned, usually outside Lithuania. This is a very serious violation of human rights. I am now unable to name all of them. I will mention only Nijole Sadunaite who is now in camp and Sergei Kovalev whose trial is known to all the world and which took place already after the signing of the Helsinki Agreements.

The poet and architect, Mindaugas Tomonis, openly expressed his disagreement with officially accepted views in the USSR: he refused to restore a monument to the Soviet army and then turned to the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, demanding greater freedom and observance of human rights. After this he was subjected to treatment in a psychiatric hospital. On November 5, 1975, upon leaving the hospital, he died under the wheels of a train in mysterious circumstances.

Other people have been subjected to forcible treatment in psychiatric hospitals. For example, a resident of the city of Panevezys, Pukhlyakov, turned to our Group and said he had been forcibly treated only because he had written complaints about abuses by the local authorities.

In many cases, people who do not agree with the official way of thinking are subjected to other types of persecution. One of these is known to us as "the case of the boys." In 1976, Vytautas Bogusis and four of his friends were expelled from the last class of high school for being interested in religion, Lithuanian history, and Russian dissidents. They were expelled by order of the school director who took his orders from the KGB. They were expelled in a flash without a vote of the faculty and in their absence. Now these boys are in a difficult situation and are being pressured by the organs of the KGB.
Many other instances are known of pressuring priests who fulfill their pastoral obligations. The priest of the village of Paberze, Stanislovas Dobrovolskis, known for the independence of his sermons, at the end of 1976 was called in by the KGB in Vilnius, where he was threatened with being transferred to a distant parish. The priest of the village of Vidukle, Alfonsas Saurinskas, in 1976 was sentenced and fined because he organized religious processions which supposedly blocked street traffic, although Vidukle is a small village with hardly any street traffic.

Not only the rights of Catholics are infringed upon, but also those of other religious communities. The authorities directly explain to people what they can and cannot do in the synagogue; for example, it is forbidden to commemorate those who died in the Arab/Israeli War. Members of religious sects are subjected to particular persecution. A resident of Vilnius, Vasilev, a Christian pentecostal, came to our group saying that administrative persecutions had driven him to decide to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

Emigration from Lithuania in the context of reunification of families or human contacts is also extremely difficult. I will mention an instance with Kestutis Jokubynas. This linguist, who is a polyglot, spent seventeen years in camps; he has already for a long time unsuccessfully struggled for the right to emigrate to Canada where his brother lives. Many instances are known of members of religious sects, whether they be Lithuanians, Jews or other inhabitants of Lithuania, receiving refusals -- without any motives -- to their appeals for visits to relatives abroad. Sometimes this refusal is accompanied by expressions of ridicule.

At least several thousand Lithuanians who, after the Second World War participated in the partisan resistance against Soviet authority and served sentences in camps, cannot settle even in their own country, since the militia refuses to give them residence permits for Lithuania. Many of them are forced to live in Latvia close to the borders of Lithuania. Even if one assumes the point of view of the authorities and considers that these people at one time violated the law, they are being punished twice for the same crime. Such limitation of the freedom of movement is a serious violation of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the spirit and letter of Helsinki. The rights of Lithuanians who are living beyond the borders of Lithuania -- in Latvia, Belorussia, the Kaliningrad districts of the RFSFR, Siberia, and also, for example, in Moscow -- are being infringed in that they do not have Lithuanian schools there or any possibility for cultural activities. In many of these places Lithuanians live in compact groups, and organizations or at least schools would be possible for them and extremely desirable. Lithuanian schools existed before the War on the territory of present day Belorussia, Latvia, etc.

All this I can already say today, although our group was formed quite recently. I hope that I can, in the future, be informative about possible violations of the Helsinki Agreement in Lithuania or in connection with Lithuania or specifically Lithuanian problems.
The closing session of the symposium featured a question-period in which the main speaker was Tomas VENCLOVA, Lithuanian dissident poet recently arrived from behind the iron curtain and presently acting as guest lecturer at the University of California, Berkeley. To introduce him, a brief presentation by Joseph Brodsky, reprinted in that day's Capital Times (Madison), was read. In it, Brodsky makes the following statement about Venclova: "the best poet living on the territory of which Lithuania is a small part." Venclova opened the discussion with some preliminary remarks:

My answers to questions about the situation of Lithuanian poetry and poets will not always be accurate. In respect to the Lithuanian literature that is being written today in that country I have been an absolute outsider and sometimes do not really know what is going on. To begin with, I should like to say a few words -- actually, to continue the discussion that has just taken place and has interested me greatly.

One day in Lithuania we were talking -- a Lithuanian literary figure whose name I would rather not mention and I -- on a topic very similar to this one. We were saying that although we both were agnostics rather than believers, we could nevertheless imagine a situation in which God would call us to the Last Judgement at which not only people but also nations and their literatures would be pronounced upon. Well, the Lithuanians would arrive and say: "Here we are, we are Lithuanians, we have survived, go ahead and judge us now." To which God would answer: "All right, so you have survived, so you have come, so what? The ancient Sumerians, for instance, did not survive, but they have accomplishments to show which make them more alive than you are today." This, of course, is not a very pleasant situation. There is, however, a counter-argument of a sort to be found: if you want to achieve something, you ought to survive for some time at least. Unfortunately, the historical situation in Eastern Europe is such that this question is very timely indeed. Perhaps not as painfully timely as some tend to present it here, but timely nonetheless. Here in the West, speaking to audiences of Lithuanians, I have often had to face questions about Russification. To this I can state the following: the whole situation reminds of an episode in the famous novel by Julij Daniel, Moscow is Speaking. For those who are not familiar with it -- I do recommend reading it, it has been translated into English -- I shall briefly summarize its plot. The novel is rather short, and deals with the following: from time to time, a new campaign is started in the Soviet Union. As it begins, it is advertised on the radio: a campaign like the one
for growing corn, or similar campaigns in the past. So the radio announces: "In connection with the fact that the consciousness of the Soviet people has risen considerably, one day a year everybody will be permitted to kill anyone he wishes. The Government is confident that only those will be killed who should." Several months of preparatory time is allowed. Then the day is announced on which anyone may kill anybody. There are terrifying rumors, but the really interesting fact is that practically nobody dies. Some killings occur in the Caucasus; even there fewer than expected. In the Baltic countries, on the other hand, the campaign is botched up so badly that the government has to be criticized, and some officials are even removed from their posts.

One could say that the situation with regard to the campaigns of Russification is similar: they are announced, talked about, and as a rule pass without hardly being noticed, at least in Lithuania. As far as I know, in Estonia the situation is somewhat worse, and much worse in Latvia. It does seem, for the time being, that the survival of the Baltic nations for a considerably long historical period can be more or less assured. Nevertheless, under such circumstances, nationalism does arise—nationalism which was so strongly criticized here a while ago. While in Lithuania, I have often made a statement which has been heartily condemned by my friends—at least by some of them—: that after Communism, nationalism is doctrine number two which I cannot condone. Considering the present condition of the Baltic states, it is, however, more justifiable than in other situations. Without any doubt, it is more excusable and understandable in these countries than in Finland or even Hungary. This forced kind of nationalism generates, as a logical consequence, another phenomenon which was touched upon in the preceding discussion: the inclination to evaluate too highly one's own literature and general cultural heritage. Unfortunately, I myself have already been hurt by this tendency. You have just heard an excerpt from the presentation Joseph Brodsky—whom I may call a good friend—made of me in the New York Review of Books, where my activity as a literary figure is without doubt evaluated too highly. Although Joseph Brodsky is not a Lithuanian, he certainly has a certain amount of Lithuanian patriotism. I have already discussed this article with Brodsky, and I have forgiven him for it only because he knew that I was in a critical situation and that such publicity would be a great help in getting me out of Lithuania and might save me. He made some other mistakes: I never translated Yeats, for instance. I am not and have never been the chairman of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group. The Lithuanian Helsinki Group emphasized upon its foundation that it would not have a chairman. It consists of five members only, all with equal rights. Four of them still remain in Lithuania.

After this brief introduction, I am ready to answer questions.

Question: I should like you to comment on the type of censorship which a writer must face, in Lithuania, to get a manuscript published. He submits his manuscript to the publisher, and it goes then to the censor. How does this operate?
Answer: This is a very complex question. The apparatus of censorship is one of the most secret spheres of the Soviet system. As many Soviet writers have pointed out on several occasions, the first — and most important — facet is the built-in censorship apparatus that each writer carries within himself. This is the first censor you must pass: the most exacting, the most complex. There are very few writers who have ceased to heed its admonitions. If they have succeeded in eliminating it from inside themselves, as a rule from that moment on they only publish in the samizdat or in the West. As far as I know, this applies only to some Russian authors, one Estonian poet — Uku Masing —, and none in Lithuania. Of course, times change, and one can hope that the situation may improve.

After this first censor, the author must face the editor: the editor of a journal, or the chief editor of a publishing house, who, according to the post he occupies, is a functionary of the state and of the Communist party. Also he has the duty of effecting some preliminary screening before passing the work on to the official censorship representatives. Here, much depends on the personality of that editor. As many of you must know, an editor like Tvardowski in Russia managed for quite a while to direct a periodical which was almost independent. Such cases are very rare. There have been a few such editors also in Lithuania — I prefer not to mention their names —, but as a rule they are very soon removed and replaced by true party functionaries who do not have anything to do with literature. This tendency is actually prevalent, to my knowledge, in all the journals and magazines published in the Soviet Union. As a rule, these are not edited by writers any more.

I should like to tell you about a personal rather anecdotal experience with one of the editors. Once I translated a few short stories by Borges and took them to the chief editor of a literary magazine. The first question the editor put forth to me was: "Doesn't that Borges by any chance have an anti-Soviet tendency?" To which I answered: "Well, it is not so much that he would be an enemy of the Soviet system; he just does not like the solar system." This was enough to make the editor turn suspicious. He proceeded: "I must check him out to make sure he is not black-listed any place." My immediate reaction was: "Where are those black lists kept? I should like to have a look at them myself so that the next time I may know who might and might not be translated." The editor replied that he himself did not know exactly where these lists were; he must find out about them by round-about ways, he said, which he is not prepared for the moment to explain, since all this is rather intricate. All ended with only two of the four translations being published. Why two, and why those particular two, I have no idea. Given the present situation, even that was a rather astonishing event: as far as I know, there is not a line of Borges printed in Russian.

Let us continue. After passing the first two stages, the real censorship starts: the so-called GlavLit: an organization the functions and authority of which are not clearly defined nor known to anybody, and whose decisions cannot be appealed. It must be said that lately GlavLit intervenes rather seldom, because the two previous censors — the author and the editor — do a pretty good job nowadays. After the approval from GlavLit
has been obtained, and after the work has gone to the press, it can still be
stopped or condemned to confiscation by the last official authority: the
Central Committee. This happens seldom now, although such occurrences were
more frequent in the past. After this post-censorship there might, however,
still be a post-post-censorship a few years hence. If the author becomes
known in the meantime as a dissident, or a sympathizer with the dissidents,
or if a change occurs in the party line or in the political conjuncture,
even through no fault of the particular author, either all of his works, or
those which no longer comply with the official party line may be removed
from general circulation in the libraries and transferred to the SpecFond:
special holdings. SpecFond is the very last stage of censorship. Usually,
whoever is put in there will never, as in Dante's Inferno, leave it. The
system of the SpecFond has its own hierarchy: there are many degrees in it.
At times, especially in Khushchev's days, voices could be heard claiming
that the SpecFond should be liberalized. I must say, however, that I am
not aware of any liberalization whatsoever that might have taken place. As
you see, the system is very complex, and functions rather well. If the
Soviet Government would put as much effort and imagination into its tech-
nological and economic systems, most likely Soviet Russia's situation would
be more advanced than it is at present.

Question: How significant is it for a writer to be or not to be a member of
the Writers' Union, and of the Communist party?

Answer: This is also a rather complex situation. If the writer has not yet
been admitted to the Writers' Union, his works can be published, and his, as
a writer's, fate may not be very different from that of a member. I per-
sonally never have been a member of the Writers' Union. At one point I did
solicit to join it. It is expected that a person who has written and pub-
lished several literary texts will join it. There are, of course, also
party functionaries in the Writers' Union who have published no literary
texts. The procedure is as follows: the author sends in his curriculum
vitae, a list of his publications, and the recommendation from three mem-
bers of the Writers' Union. Up to that time I had had not much difficulty
in publishing my translations and even my own poems or critical studies,
and I was functioning in the literary life pretty much as most of the mem-
bers of the Union. After submitting the application the situation changed.
My case was discussed, and as I learned, one of the very famous Lithuanian
Soviet writers -- who shall also remain nameless -- vetoed the admission
for the following reason: "This candidate does not comply with the first
paragraph of the by-laws of the Writers' Union." This first paragraph,
about whose existence I did not really know clearly, stipulates that a
writer must, through his works, contribute to building the Communist society.
To this objection, one of the members who had recommended me answered that
I was asking to be admitted chiefly as a translator. The reply was that as
a translator I did not meet the requirements of the first paragraph either.
After the refusal to be admitted my situation deteriorated considerably.
When a person is refused, or when he is eliminated from the Union, he finds
himself in a difficult position.

The situation with regard to membership in the Communist party is
rather similar. A person may not be a member of the party and yet function
as a writer. However, if he is thrown out of the party or -- God forbid! not admitted, then his situation becomes very sad. Both a membership in the Writers' Union and in the party bring some privileges, for instance, a better apartment, or the possibility of travelling outside the Soviet Union, which is highly prized by some. However, insofar as functioning as a writer, the membership in one or the other is not decisive. By the way, many good writers publish their works only in the samizdat, and of course they do not belong to the Union or to the party.

Question: I understood you were saying that the situation in Latvia is much worse than in Lithuania. Why?

Answer: It is worse indeed -- I know it by personal experience. Several factors converge to make it such. First of all, and this is not difficult to see, Latvia is more important for the Soviets because of her geographic position, hence, for military purposes. She holds the key to the Baltic Sea to a greater extent than Lithuania. Because of that; the Russification campaign is being pursued there much more methodically and intensely, and with greater success. I think -- I cannot guarantee -- that this is the foremost reason. The second reason is of a purely demographic nature. Latvia has a very low birthrate. This again can be explained by two factors: Latvia is a protestant, not a catholic country; it has been a more civilized, more Europeanized country for a much longer time. Thus, the birthrate is very low; it must be added that in Estonia it is not high, either. On the other hand, it had a smaller population than Lithuania to begin with. As a consequence, the same number of Russians brought in for colonization has a greater impact percentage-wise. As demographic statistics show -- we must remember that they have been produced by the Soviet system and should be taken with a grain of salt, although in this case by intuition and by personal experience I think I can say they are rather accurate -- at present only about half of the population are Latvians. It would seem that at a certain point a qualitative threshold is reached. When a nation arrives at the point of becoming a minority in its own country, a certain, very sad break occurs in that nation's psychology. As far as I know, from a psychological point of view Latvians are in far deeper despair than Lithuanians or Estonians. There is a chance that this state may be reversed. History has shown that when a really desperate point is reached, nations find a new source of strength. This could probably be termed a second qualitative threshold, which points in a positive direction. So far, however, summing up my observations in Latvia during my various visits, the psychological situation there is, alas, very sad.

Question: Have there been any translations into Lithuanian of works that had not been previously rendered into Russian? I am thinking of Mrozek's Tango, for instance.

Answer: Such occurrences are rare, but they do exist. A case in point are my Borges' translations: there is not a single paragraph of Borges in Russian; in Lithuanian, we have a few. Also Faulkner's Light in August appeared in Lithuanian before it did in Russian, although all in all, there are more translations of his works in Russian than in Lithuanian. In this
respect Estonia occupies an outstanding place in the entire Soviet Union, not only among the Baltic nations. In their days they have created a very impressive undertaking called Looming Library. The Estonians present here are doubtless quite familiar with it. Looming Library has been publishing for years all the important works of world literature, with the exception of some fiercely anti-Communist writings. They pay no attention to whether or not these books have been previously published in Russian. This Looming Library became a real legend. It was said that its editors were "volunteers in the deathrow." After a few months the acting editor was sure to be removed, but the one who replaced him continued the same policy. I do not know how true this is, but considering our present situation it does not seem too exaggerated. We, Lithuanians, have always enormously envied the Looming Library. We have always wanted to create something similar in Lithuania but were never able to achieve it. I remember so well how once, some ten years ago, I visited the famous Estonian poet Paul-Erik Rumm at his home. I was astounded to see that his library contained books in no other language but Estonian. I asked him how that was possible, and he answered simply -- and not without reason -- that he could read whatever he wanted in Estonian. We Lithuanians cannot say the same, unfortunately. We have to read many works in Polish, for instance. Therefore today a great number of Lithuanian intellectuals -- especially in the humanities -- have a perfect knowledge of Polish.

If you are not bored with this story as yet, I can tell you about another rather fantastic experience. There is an important Soviet poet of Chuvash origin who lives in Moscow. His name is Genadii Aigi. His works are fairly well known in the West and have been translated into several languages. I believe the Chuvashes are of Turkish descent; they live on the Volga, are small in numbers, and have practically no cultural life. Genadii Aigi has, however, translated and edited a huge anthology of French poetry in his language. Up to that time, only one French poem had been translated into Chuvash: the International. The anthology includes poets like Saint-John Perse, Henri Michaux, Oscar Milosz, Rene Char, any poet you may think of: many who had never been -- nor will be -- published in Russian. Joseph Brodsky said once that this anthology is one of the best arguments for the lack of meaning in history. One way or the other, this has been quite a fantastic happening. The anthology has been reviewed in the French press (Le Monde and other periodicals), and in our literary life it represents one of the brighter moments. For a while, we Lithuanians had conceived hopes of doing something similar or even better. So far it has been impossible. As a consequence, one might conclude that a lot depends on each personality and the efforts of that particular personality.

Question: I had the impression, speaking with Estonian poets in Estonia, that there is more of a meeting and discussion between Estonian and Lithuanian colleagues; although the Latvians are in the middle and in greatest trouble, they seem to get less sympathy from Estonians or from Lithuanians. Is this true? Why should it be?

Answer: This is in part so. On the one hand, Latvians and Estonians are bound together by their common Livonian past. The Lithuanian cultural tradition and cultural life in general come from an entirely different
source. Therefore, the literary evolution in Estonia and Latvia shows more analogies than that of Lithuania with any of the two. There certainly is a process in the background which unites Latvians and Estonians and separates them from Lithuanians. On the other hand, there exists another development by which Estonians and Lithuanians communicate, so to speak, over the heads of Latvians. There may be many causes influencing this, one of them the already mentioned fact that Latvians find themselves in a deeper depression, and this is reflected in their activities and their attitude. Another may be the general rule that close neighbors usually find it more difficult to understand each other than those living not quite as near-by. One must say that Lithuanians and Estonians complement each other rather nicely. In recent times one can talk about them as compensating cultures. Generally, Estonians are much more up-to-date in what is happening in the world. In their turn, when we state this and say how we envy them for it, they reply that we have a history to lean on, and even now act in a more historical manner. Somehow, Latvians have not been included in this complementary structure. In general, structures of that kind are based on dichotomies. One should not, however, exaggerate. We have a lot in common with Latvians also: our languages are closely related, we have to face common problems, and common interests generate reciprocal sympathies. I must confess I was rather surprised to see that during this whole conference the Latvian poet Knuts Skujenieks (Emil's son) has not been alluded to at all. He is one of the greater Latvian poets today and maintains very close relations with Lithuanians.

Question: Did I understand right that you were teaching World Literature at the university?

Answer: Yes, indeed, I did teach Survey of Western Literature at the University of Vilnius.

Question: What was that experience like? What place does such a course occupy in the curriculum? What interest does it generate? Was there any special difficulty in teaching it?

Answer: My teaching activity had a somewhat peculiar character. My course was never a part of the regular curriculum. I never have been a regular faculty member. Usually they invited me as a substitute, when somebody had to go away or was ill. I generally gave one lecture a week and was paid 3 roubles for it. Therefore, in the words of Marx, I had nothing to lose, and my lectures were geared around those Western authors who happened to interest me at that moment. Thus, I managed to talk about Proust, Borges, Kafka, and several other writers whose names are not included in the official program. Then I would stop lecturing; a year later they would invite me again, and so it continued all the time. Generally, Western Literature is taught according to a rigidly established program which does not include the most essential authors of the twentieth century, or if it does, they are dealt with in an extremely sketchy and limited way. I never followed that curriculum, since my own situation at the university was not regular. The interest in the recent Western authors is very great.
Question: Has any of the Lithuanian literature written in exile been published in Soviet Lithuania?

Answer: Yes, as you well know, a few books have been admitted, among them more than one really important work, as poetry by Algimantas Mackus, Jonas Mekas, or Marius Katiliskis' novel Autumn Comes Through the Forests. Also, during some time, the periodical especially dedicated to follow up developments among emigres, Native Land, would give series of poems by one or the other poet writing in the West. At present this has almost completely stopped. I should mention that it is not too difficult for an emigre writer to get published once he dies. Well, some have not been helped even by death, as Jonas Aistis, one of the most important of the exile poets. On the other hand, presently there is talk about publishing Henrikas Radauskas, and there is good reason to assume it will be done. It depends on the author and to a certain extent on the degree of his anti-Communist persuasion. Also, as already mentioned, on his death. I am not quite sure, but I believe a similar situation exists also in Estonia. I do not know about Latvia; another proof that we have closer relations with Estonia. In spite of this very selective and infrequent printing of very few exile writers, we manage to get and read most of their books. A good case in point is Skema's The White Shroud: almost all Lithuanian writers and intellectuals have read it: one of the best Lithuanian novels written in the West. It was even reviewed in literary journals, in spite of the fact that it was not available officially.

(The questions were answered in Lithuanian and simultaneously translated by R. Silbajoris)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Reproduced from Lituanus, Volume 23 (No. 4, Winter 1977), pp. 54-64. The symposium in question was part of the Third Conference on Baltic Literatures, 29-30 April 1977, University of Wisconsin in Madison. The Lituanus issue is dedicated to the conference.
Appendix III:

DOCUMENTS

FROM GEORGIA AND ARMENIA
DOCUMENTS OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN GEORGIA, 1974 - 1976

(Before the Establishment of the Group for the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords in Georgia)
1. INITIATIVE GROUP FOR THE DEFENSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN GEORGIA

An Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights in Georgia was formed in 1974. The group has as its goal the study of different aspects of the fulfillment in its country of the human rights and basic freedoms formulated in the declaration of the United Nations. Its goal is also to fight against all forms of destruction or weakening of these rights.

The members of the group are: Zviad Gamsakhurdia, Merab Kostava, Viktor Rtskhiladze, and others.

2. THE STUDY OF GEORGIAN HISTORY IN GEORGIAN SCHOOLS

It is well-known that in 1957-58 in Moscow, the question was raised concerning the abolition of the study of national history as a separate object of study in the schools of the national republics. National history was to be studied together with the history of the USSR. Actually, this means Russian history. In short, in students' grade books and on their diplomas, Georgian History is no longer noted.

At the present time Georgian History is studied for just 65 hours; it is taught together with the history of the USSR for the four years of the higher grades.

The division of hours of study with respect to the different grades is as follows: In the seventh grade 35 hours of class time are devoted to Georgian history, more than half the total number of hours. This covers the period from antiquity to the end of the eighteenth century. In the same grade, 70 hours are devoted to the history of the USSR. In the 8th, 9th and 10th grades, only ten hours per grade remain and in the course of these three years only the 19th and 20th centuries are studied. It is worth noting that up until 1957-58 this period of Georgian history was not taught at all. At that time Georgian history was studied as a separate subject and a fairly good textbook was used. Its authors were Ivani Dzhavakhishvili, N. Berizenishvili, and S. Dzhanashia. This textbook was used in the 9th and 10th grades, basically for a period of two years, and it covered the period from antiquity to the beginning of the 19th century. In the years 1948-1952 for each grade 66 hours were devoted to Georgian history, a total of 132 hours. During the years 1953-58, only 99 hours were devoted to this period of Georgian history, 49 hours in the 9th grade and 50 in the 10th. This is all in contrast to the present set up, where this basic and very long period of Georgian history is studied for only 35 hours, as we noted above.

In addition to this, in the 4th grade it is permissible to devote 15 hours of class time to the history of Georgia, to be taken from the time allotted to the history of the USSR, 70 hours. Also, note that the textbook itself is directed to the north, in that two-thirds of it is devoted to the Soviet period, one-third to the period prior to the Great Revolution.

Among educational leaders there is the opinion that it is not necessary to focus students' attention on the history of the feudal period, on the lives of kings and heroes of the past. They think this interferes with the goal of raising the youth to have Marxist international zeal. Whether by dictation from Moscow or on its own initiative, the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee under the leadership of Edward
Shevardnadze,\(^1\) has been especially cultivating this idea of late. Thus, the balance between the study of USSR history (read: "Russia") and the study of Georgian history in each grade is as follows: USSR history -- 105 hours, Georgian history -- approximately 15 hours. Indeed, if eight hours are devoted to the period of Peter the Great and ten hours to Ivan the Third and Ivan the Fourth, then David the Builder and Queen Tamara each receive an hour.

It should be noted that the Republics of Georgia, Armenia, and the Baltic are dissatisfied with the reduction of numbers of hours of study of their own histories and with the collapse of the study of their own histories with the history of the USSR. The Ukraine is silent because the history of Russia begins with the Russia [Rus'] of Kiev. Azerbaidzhan and the countries of Central Asia do not voice dissatisfaction, except for Tadzhikistan, which has a pretty rich history.

At one all-union conference of history teachers, a representative from Georgia testified that it was awkward to combine the study of the history of Georgia with that of the USSR in general, because chronologically, one had to then begin with the history of Georgia, Russian history beginning only later, in the ninth century.\(^2\) "Then let's eliminate the material up to the ninth century," retorted a Moscow official of an educational society/association.

\(^1\) During the terror of Stalin, when no one still harbored beliefs about the possible independence of Georgia, some blessed person actually managed to express the following ideas (in a collection of articles on methodology written for middle school teachers in 1947): "During the study of Georgian history the teacher should devote special attention to those chapters and paragraphs of the text in which cover the cultural highpoint of Georgia and the famous battles of the Georgian people. In the pupils' memories the faces of soldiers who fought for unification of their country, independence, and progress should be deeply imprinted. The teacher must show the pupils with concrete, living examples that the Georgian people at the darkest of times did not give up the fight, did not lose hope, did not bow before stronger tyrants." How these ideas differ from the official ideas of today! (Footnote in original) [Last line almost illegible--I think this is the meaning expressed, but not sure from p. 9 of original--Translator's remark.]

\(^2\) They justify the study of the two histories together, with the opinion that it is better to follow the socialist formation in succession in the course of world history, than according to individual nations. Here they forget the different level of development of different countries, and the priority of considering a single line of development for each nation, flowing from the soul of the people, from the national character. (Footnote in original)
It seems that this new method of the study of history is aimed at the "destruction of nationalism" and the "formation of the new man with international zeal" in the peoples of the Soviet Union. In reality, however, in the name of the history of the USSR, we are offered the history of Russia, thus bringing to light Russia's "objective approach to the histories of other peoples."

3. ATTEMPTS TO RUSSIFY THE UNIVERSITY OF TBILISI

In the latter part of 1975, an official of the academic studies division of the (State) University of Tbilisi, Marika Pirveli, summoned the chairman of the Georgian History Department, Professor Marika Lortkipanidze, and said to her: "Rektor [i.e., President--Y.B.] D. Chkhikvishvili recently asked me to inform you that you must in your department offer several subjects in Russian." Professor Lortkipanidze was very surprised by such a proposition and responded indignantly. If you don't believe it, she was told, go to the Rektor and he will tell you himself. It seems the Rektor had gone to Moscow in order to receive new instructions concerning Russification. As soon as he returned he sent for Professor M. Lortkipanidze and asked her why she was putting obstacles in his way. Lortkipanidze said, "If it seems to you that I am not in the right, let's call a meeting and let outstanding scholars, academicians and professors decide the question." "You misunderstand me," he replied. "I didn't say that instruction must be in Russian, but that I have sent for lecturers from Russia on an exchange."

After this Chkhikvishvili changed his tactics and began to call each faculty dean in separately. On January 15, 1976, he sent for Zhizhiashvili, Dean of the Mathematics Faculty; Ghomsadze, Dean of the Biology Faculty; Chantladze, Chairman of the Department of Political Economy; Lekveishvili, Dean of the Law Faculty; A. Surguladze, Dean of the History Faculty. He informed them that it was necessary that some subjects be taught in Russian, in order to help improve the learning of Russian. When students graduate from the University, because they don't know the language, they can't go to Russia to work. At the same time he cautioned them not to inform M. Lortkipanidze that he had called them in to discuss this issue.

This kind of reckless attempt at Russification astonished the faculty deans and professors, though by no means all [of them] had the civil courage that protest called for. Some came out on the side of the Rektor. They were Prorektor [i.e., Vice-President--Y.B.] Z. Porakishvili and Dean of the History Faculty A. Surguladze. The majority preferred silence. Only some said a firm (brave) "no." Among these were Dean of the Philological Faculty O. Bakanidze, Dean of the Law Faculty M. Lekveishvili. The latter with great passion gave reasons why reading lectures in Russian at a national University was inadmissible. The Dean of the Mathematics Faculty L. Zhizhiashvili declared to the Rektor, "Whether we say the word 'integral' in Russian or Georgian has no meaning, and this is why I am opposed to reading lectures in Russian." Chairman of the Political Economics Department Chantladze responded, "As long as I am here, this will not happen, and if it is a question of language learning, I have specialists who can read lectures in German and English." Categorically against the reading of lectures in the Russian language was also Lomsadze, Dean of the Biology Faculty. Only the Dean of the History Faculty, A. Surguladze agreed. His assistant told Marika Lortkipanidze, who went to
Rektor D. Chkhikvishvili saying, "Either I leave the University or you do." Chkhikvishvili tried to calm her down. "Miss Lortkipanidze, this does not concern your department. Why are you so upset?" She retorted, "Everything that happens in this university concerns me." Chkhikvishvili then retreated and appeased her. "OK, OK, since you don't want it, let's not discuss it any more."

Dotsent [Assistant Professor] Tikadze read a lecture in Russian in the Oriental Languages Faculty one day and the next day the students didn't come to class. M. Lortkipanidze found out and went to Tikadze to put an end to that abomination. M. Puturidze, Dean of the Faculty of Oriental Studies, sent for Dotsent [Assistant Professor] Tikadze and demanded an explanation for his behavior. Tikadze said, "What I did was charged to do by the Party Committee (R. Gordezi is the Party Committee)."

Rektor Chkhikvishvili ran into special opposition in the Department of Scientific Communism. The staff of this department protested with one voice against the Russification measures. Then Chkhikvishvili called a meeting and told the staff, "Since you don't agree, go to the Central Committee and there we'll clarify things." In the Central Committee, however, they informed the astonished Rektor and professors and teachers that they hadn't given such instruction to the University. They said it was a matter of free will, if they wished, they could give lectures in the Russian language, and so on. After this incident D. Chkhikvishvili rescinded the charge of January 15th.

It is clear that the Central Committee had been behind everything from the beginning, but when they saw the unified opposition, they preferred to retreat temporarily.

Tbilisi (State) University and every school of higher education and research institute which had degree-granting powers received from the USSR Council of Ministers on December 29, 1975: "Ruling No. 1067 on the State and the Procedure of (polozhenii i poriadke) of Awarding Academic Degrees and the Granting of Academic Titles," which had been signed by the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers A. Kosygin.

According to the new rule it was forbidden to write a dissertation for a degree in a native language, it absolutely must be done in Russian. Also in Russian must be the dissertation abstract which is published beforehand, and the dissertation defense itself, unless the committee gives permission to the person defending [the thesis] to speak in the language of the Republic or his native language.

The eighth point of the rule reads:

With the consent of the Members of the Council and of the [Scholarly] Opponents [i.e., Readers - Y.B.] the defense of a dissertation can be conducted in the native language of

---

1Title of Ruling in Russian in the document.--Translator's Note.
the candidate for the degree. All the documents relative
to the awarding of the academic degrees, viz., dissertations, summaries by the candidates (avtoreferaty), personal documents (dokumenty lichnogo dela), stenographic minutes of the sessions of the Councils, etc., must be submitted to the USSR Higher Attestation Commission (VAK SSSR) in Russian. If the main propositions of the dissertation have [already] been published in the languages of other peoples of the USSR or in foreign languages the dissertations should have appended to them corresponding translations in Russian.

A few months earlier the schools of higher education of Georgia and the research institutes were informed of the order of the USSR Minister of Higher and Middle Specialized Education concerning the fact that textbooks owned by the schools of higher education, no matter what the subject be--native languages, history, literature--must be written in the Russian language. Moreover, by the authority of this order they cancelled from Tbilisi's presses all textbooks written in Georgian which had already been delivered to the press for printing. This is to say Georgian history, Georgian language, literature, art history from now on must be written in Russian.


---

2Emphasis in original.--Translator's Note.

3Extract from Ruling in Russian in document.--Translator's Note.
4. RUSSIFICATION OF ONE DEPARTMENT OF THE ACADEMY OF ART

The bitter experience at the University forced the "ruler" (regime) to take a more careful and hypocritical course of action. According to a rule still in existence, the passing of every subject in the Academy of Art takes place in the Georgian language, and the instruction in every department also is in Georgian. This year, however, in the Department of Interior Design, they gave (entrance) examinations in Russian specially for the non-Georgian students; in the end the 35 Georgian applicants were not accepted, but the following were: Davletbegov, Simonian, Papanian, Markarov, Gavrilid, Zakalashvili (an artificial [made-up] name). It is natural of course, that presently their instruction takes place in Russian. In connection with these facts, the Minister of Culture O. Taktakishvili protested to Cherkezia and noted that this was in violation of an existing rule. Cherkezia expressed great surprise at this fact and wrote, "Study the matter and make a proposal." But no one learned of this fact, Rektor [President] Totibadze also remained silent and "unwillingly" opened a Russian Department of the Academy of Art under the chairmanship of O. Cherkezia.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translated from Georgian for this work, from Georgian Herald, No. 1 (1976), p. 18. In the original this document is run like an appendix to the preceding document. Source courtesy of Georgian National Council.

1In the document the names have been imperfectly "Georgianized" such as Davletbegovi for Davletbegov, Simoniani for Simonian, etc. The first name may be of Turkic origin, Simonian and Papanian are Armenian names, Markarov (or is it really Makarov?) sounds Russian. Nationality of Gavrilid is difficult to guess, Zakalishvili is a pseudo-Georgian - Y.B.
5. PERSECUTION OF DAVID KORIDZE

On October 7, 1974, there appeared in the public prosecutor's office of the Kirov District of Tbilisi operative O. Tskaroveli of the (State) Security Committee [i.e., KGB - Y.B.] and had a discussion with the assistant of the public prosecutor, David Koridze. In brief, he said to Koridze that into the hands of the Committee happened to fall a note written by him about the robbery of the [late] Patriarch's [property] (in Russian), did he know who translated the note or how it came to be outside the country? Koridze replied that he knew nothing about it. Then Tskaroveli told him that the [organs]¹ doubted that everything had been done by Zviad Gamsakhurdia, who was very interested in the comings and goings of the investigation of the robbery of the Patriarch's [property]. He also asked Koridze, if he had given the notice to Z. Gamsakhurdia. D. Koridze retorted: "It's true, I showed this notice to Gamsakhurdia, as an administrative official for the protection of monuments, but besides him, many people read it in the [Party] Central Committee, in the Council of Ministers, and in the office of the Public Prosecutor of the Republic. You see, the notice was in many people's hands." Koridze also reproached Tskaroveli saying, "The Security Committee [KGB] should help us in the investigation of the robbery, but you are only interested in knowing who translated the notice into Russian." Later Koridze laid the blame also on those workers of the Security [KGB operatives] who took part in the embezzlement (Bakhtadze, Tvalchrelidze, Bakuradze and others) and demanded their punishment. Tskaroveli answered him with silence. A short time later they called Koridze to the Security Committee, where Inauri [the head of the Georgian KGB - Y.B.] screamed at him and threatened him with arrest, with expulsion from the Party, and with withdrawal of his own personal pension, but Inauri's representative in the ideological sphere, Sh. Zardalishvili "advised" him to commit suicide, as the only way out of his predicament.

In fact, Inauri couldn't arrest Koridze, nor could he expel him from the Party, but the third threat was actually carried out, by forcing the Republic's public prosecutor to ask Koridze to retire and begin drawing his pension. In place of the pension owed him, however, they specified a pension of 60 roubles. They specified a pension of sixty rubles to David Koridze, one of Georgia's outstanding examining magistrates, with 40 years of service; a hero of the battles of Kerch and Budapest; a graduate of the highest Party School. Presently, he asks for a position in the Lawyer's Group, but Inauri categorically has forbidden anyone from offering him work. Shevardnadze² has "washed his hands" and will neither

¹Soviet political slang referring to the police, the KGB in particular. - Y.B.

²First Secretary of the Central Committee, CP of Georgia since September 1972. Replaced corrupt Mzhavanadze. - Y.B.
help nor even listen to this man, who has shown himself to be exceptionally conscientious professionally in the fight against corruption—that same corruption which Shevardnadze is supposed to be fighting so zealously against.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translated from Georgian for this work, from Georgian Herald, No. 1 (1976), p. 147. Document courtesy of Georgian National Council. Honest investigator David Koridze figures in many documents of the Georgian samizdat. This may be the shortest and one of the most moving.
In the course of the last two years there have been an increasingly large number of fires and acts of sabotage in Georgian state institutions and public places. The fires were intentionally set in advance at the following places, which we cite as the most typical events:

1. The technical supplies base of the combine "Georgian Coal" in the city of Tkibuli. Estimated damage 300 roubles (January 27).

2. Kirov factory in Tbilisi producing lathes, 500 square meters of roof burned (January 30).

3. A two-story children's department store in Tbilisi, in Lenin Square on February 24, the opening day of the 25th [Party] Congress! Estimated damage 1 million roubles.

4. Kinos Sakhli ('Movie House') in Tbilisi, a part of the roof was destroyed by fire, estimated loss 1000 roubles.

5. Movie theater Amirani in Tbilisi on February [12], the fire was put out in time.

6. A department store in the city of Bordzhomi, March 1. Estimated loss, 50,000 roubles.

7. A household goods store, Number 18, in the village of Lower-Sazano in the Zestafon District (raion). The store burned down completely, estimated damage 40,000 roubles. Evidence remained and several men were arrested.

8. A post office building and drug store in the village Nokalakevi in the Tskhakala District, the building burned down, loss 4,500 roubles.

9. [Chicken coop No. 2 of] incubation station Number 2 in Zugdidi, building was partially burned, estimated loss, 603 roubles (April 5).

10. Fruit collection station and the office of the collective farm in the village Makvaneti in the Makharadze District. Two-story building was partially burned with all records. April 8, damage is not known.

11. The building of the Union of Cooperatives (?) [Tsekashiri in Russian] in the city of Bolnisi on May 2. Losses aren't known.

12. A tea factory in the city of Makharadze. May 17, losses aren't known.

14. On April 16 at 5:00 [p.m. (dnia in Russian - Y.B.)] 1 a bomb exploded in front of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers Building. Window panes were broken in the Building of the Council of Ministers, in the movie theater Rustaveli, in the [Young] Pioneers Palace; there were no victims. After this event, the police patrolled the area around Government House every night.

15. An explosion at the electric factory of the Ingur (River) Hydroelectric Station, where the whole system of cables was destroyed, June 4. In general in Georgia explosions of cables at water reservoirs are widespread, because where there are fires combined with such explosions, water can't be used to put out the fires. It happened that way, for example, when there was a fire in the Opera House, when they killed a policeman at the water reservoir of Rustavi and damaged the pump. On October 3 of this year there was an explosion at the head of the reservoir of Samgori, the cable was destroyed, water was cut off for a number of hours to a whole series of areas of the city, where a number of fires appeared. On that same day a fire broke out in one television laboratory.

16. A large storage facility of the combine of the deaf and dumb society in Tbilisi (? at Dolabauri). Approximate damage was 8 million roubles, September 7. During the fire one policeman was killed and one was wounded. They arrested the main bookkeeper of the society, on whom the guilt for everything was laid (see Kommunisti [local newspaper in Georgian]). The facility had been closed [sealed] by OBKhSS men (Section for the Struggle Against the Pilfering of Socialist Property--a kind of economic police--Y.B.) two days before. 2

---

1Added by Y.B. from parallel document by Zviad Gamsakhurdia, Antipravitel'nye protesty v Gruzii v 1976 godu, p. l. All following notes by Y.B.

2It is interesting to compare this account with Gamsakhurdia's, which, incidentally, is dated September 17, 1976. Item #1 in Tvaltvadze (T.) identical in G. #2 in T., ditto. #3 in T., identical item #5 in G. #4 in T.--G in #3 adds "on Rustaveli Prospect." "February 8." #5 in T. - G. #4 adds "on Plekhanov Prospect." #6 in T. identical with G. #6. #7 in T. - G. #7 adds date (5 April). #8 in T. - G. #8 adds date (5 April). #9 in T. - G. #9 same, #10 in T. - G. #10 same. #11 in T. - G. #11 same. #12 in T. - G. #12 date is May 5. #13 in T. - G. #14 more detailed: "warehouse and accounting office burnt down" with January 15 inserted in handwriting. #14 in T. - G. #13 a little different: bomb exploded in the vicinity of, instead of in front of. G. has no reference to nightly patrols. #15 in T. - nothing in G. #16 in T. - in G. #15 damage is put at 800,000 roubles. A rather significant further discrepancy: "Before the fire, during the night, unknown persons killed two watchmen."
In connection with the frequent fires from the 12th to the 18th of January, 67 men were fined, of these 40 were officials. Bomb materials were taken away from the following citizens: 1. K. A. Tsintsadze, born in 1927, in the apartment of the collective farm of the village Mudzhiret in the Tertzholi District they found one kilogram of ammonal (explosive) and 6 capsules of an electric detonator (April 12). 2. I. Sh. Karaevi, born in 1919, worker in the Construction Administration No. 2 of the Sagaredzho District, 1.5 kilogram of dynamite and Bickford safety fuse (April 20).

3 The following three paragraphs have been interpolated by editor from Gamsakhurdia's account. - Y.B.

The head of a shop of the woodmilling combine in the city of Akhmet G. A. Badurashvili, the director of ZhEK (? - Y.B.) No. 4 in the city of Tbilisi Sh. I. Korinteli, the director of the automobile-transportation pool of the Ministry of Automobile Transportation in the city of Khashuri M. I. Kakabadze, the director of the Kodzhorsk children's home No. 4 of the Ministry of Education D. G. Dzhikidze, the directors of the following secondary schools in Kutaisi: No. 2—D. V. Devidze, No. 20—G. S. Pruidze, No. 27—S. D. Gochiashvili, No. 8—R. I. Tsintsadze, No. 22—T. G. Tabukishvili, No. 12—E. G. Tavadze, and others.

From July 5 to 11, 8 persons received fines in connection with fires, including five officials:

The manager and sales clerk of the household goods store of the Union of Cooperatives in the village of Dgvani, Shuakhevski District, D. I. Putkaradze; the director of the (Young) Pioneers' Camp of the hamlet of Miusser, Gidautski District, B. G. Buliskeriia; the chief of ZhEK (? - Y.B.) of the Housing Administration of the Ordzhonikidze District, City of Tbilisi, G. T. Kalandadze; the manager of the Union of Cooperatives store in the village of Pitchkhovani, Akhmetski District, N. D. Bachauri; the chairman of the Zhdanov kolkhoz in the village of Makho, Khelvachaurski District, T. M. Chelidze.

4 1.4 kilogram in Gamsakhurdia (G.) G. has comment blacked out.

5 Same in G., but G. has comment blacked out.
3. M. M. Dzhamalovi, born in 1948, worker in No. 2 detonating group of the Teleti area of Saknakti ["Georgian Oil"], 2 electro-explosive mechanisms, 38 detonating capsules, and 35 meters of Bickford fuse were taken away (April 20).  

4. D. O. Gagua, worker on collective tree farm of the District Tsalendishkhskii, 100 detonator capsules, 3 m. Bickford fuse were taken away (April 20).  

5. A. A. Mukebiani, born in 1924, master craftsman of construction district No. 2 of Lentekhi, from him were taken 2 pieces of ammonal, 15 detonator capsules, and 1 m. Bickford fuse (April 21).  

In January 1976, some unknown persons stole a military airplane from the experimental (test flight) airport of the Dimitrov military aviation factory No. 31 in Tbilisi. Three members of the military-like guard were killed.  

In the night of May 26, unknown persons attacked one part of the arsenal of the Caucasian and Transcaucasian Military District (KZAKVO) near the village Volzardze in the Sagaredzho District. They killed the guards and stole a large number of automatics, hand grenades, and explosives. Two days later in the vicinity of the arsenal at the passage of Gombori the following incident took place: The secretary of the (Party) District Committee of Telavi, Kobaidze, was going from Tbilisi to Telavi in his own car. Suddenly a soldier with an automatic blocked the road and stopped the car. The soldier had everyone get out of the car, got in next to the driver and ordered him to drive towards the Tbilisi airport with great speed. As they drew near to the airport, he ordered the driver to take him to the first airplane which had a staircase. The driver used some trickery: he advised the soldier to lie down in the [back] seat so that the police wouldn't see him and just then he [suddenly] stopped the car, jumped out and began to yell for help, people gathered, the police arrived and took away the automatic and arrested the soldier. It seems that he was a participant in the plundering of the arsenal and wished to flee abroad. The organizers of the raid were Russian military, who were doing business selling weapons and explosives in Georgia and the North Caucasus.

---

6 Date missing in G. G. also has comment blacked out.  
7 Same as in G., but G's comment blacked out.  
8 Same as in G.  
9 Singular in G.  
10 . . . With his family in G.  
11 In G. the soldier was killed in the exchange of fire.  
12 This last sentence missing in G.
In the past year the "organs" have appeared in a number of places and rendered explosives harmless, for example, at the television tower of the funicular, in the main department store of Tbilisi on Rustaveli Prospect, in the central television building, and so on. In 1975 large fires and explosions took place: at the village technical base in Gachiani, loss approximately 40 thousand roubles, in the factory of Rubberoid, in the shoe factory "Isani," in military aviation factory No. 31 and so on.

Fires and bombings can be divided into two categories: to the first belong fires which are set by this or that worker in the institution with the aim of liberating himself from the claws of OBKhSS [economic police]; this type became especially common after E. Shevardnadze was named First Secretary of the Party in Georgian. Inspections and OBKhSS need evidence of waste and plundering when storerooms and documents burn. This kind of diversion is more and more widespread.

Protest fires and bombings belonging to the second category, as for example the explosion at the test-flight airport of the aviation factory named for Dimitrov, the explosion in front of the government palace, a fire at the bus station, explosions in factories, at the Ingr Hydroelectric station, and so on, are frequent also. So, for example, as it became known, unknown persons threatened to bomb the University building because Russification was taking place there, was being intentionally carried out by the government.

We may assume (it is to be conjectured) that until the economic condition of the people improves perceptibly in Georgia, until wages rise, prices fall, until the harsh measures taken against "economic crime" stop, and until the politics of Russification cease, fires and bombings will (also) continue (in the future). We should look on these events as failings of the system and not as single anarchistic events caused by guilty persons.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translated from Georgian for this work, from Georgian Herald No. 1 (1976), pp. 140-142. Source courtesy of Georgian National Council. Tvaltvadze's account has been compared with Zviad Gamsakhurdia's Antipravitel'stvenne protesty v Grazi v 1976 godu (Anti-Government Protests in Georgia in 1976), copy of 5 typewritten pages, with some handwriting, and the similarities and discrepancies have been noted. Later document supplied by unimpeachable source.
On June 30, 1976, Doctor L. Meladze, on the request of Nikoloz Samkharadze, sent a telegram from Moscow's Central Telegraph Office to L. I. Brezhnev, with the following message: "It is already two years that my brother, Beglar Samkharadze, has suffered injustice, illness, starvation. Scores of telegrams have been sent to the highest state organs of the Republic. We have received nothing positive; in fact, no answer at all. I am sending you this telegram twice. The General Department of the Central Committee of the USSR received a request with documentation on May 17, 1975, but no answer has come. Whether they ripped up the request, or it suffered some other fate, we don't know. By decree of the Party or the Government, workers' requests should be answered in the course of one month.

From you also, there is no reaction.

During the Civil War B. Samkharadze became an invalid of the third group. Because of the torture under interrogation by an enemy of the people, Beria-Rukhadze, Samkharadze became a schizophrenic invalid of the first group.

In June of 1974 Korkotashvili, Chairman of the Pension Department of the Ministry of Social Welfare of Georgia, took away his military pension, which he had been receiving for 25 years. Although Samkharadze worked as a teacher and has a sufficient length of service, Korkotashvili didn't assign a civil pension to him either. Death from injustice, illness, or starvation is worse than war. Such a peace for Samkharadze is like hell.

I ask you to answer me at my address: Tbilisi, Makashvili Street 18."

An employee of the telegraph office informed the State Security Committee [KGB], which sent two members who led Meladze to a room. They asked him what made him send such a telegram. He answered: the sick man is in a hopeless state because no other existing means is left to him.

They told him that it was not possible to send such a telegram, because it was possible that they would learn of this in the United States. They forbid the sending of similar telegrams in the future.

On June 22 the author of the telegram, N. Samkharadze was taken from his own home by two members of the State Security Committee and brought before the Security Committee. There the Chairman of the Department, Tatishvili questioned him. He asked him what caused him to send such a telegram, and why he utters anti-Soviet statements at meetings at his place of work. They reminded him also that in 1959 for such things he had been arrested and sent to a psychiatric hospital for compulsory treatment. Then Tatishvili asked Samkharadze if he knew Gamsakhurdia or not and what sort of connection he had with him and whether he was a member of his "organization." Samkharadze answered that Gamsakhurdia didn't have any kind of organization and that it was a lie.

A-146
Later Tatishvili asked Samkharadze if he had written a medical report about Gamsakhurdia's poisoning and what had caused him to do it. Samkharadze replied that Gamsakhurdia's poisoning was a fact and he was responsible for his own diagnosis. Tatishvili said to him, "Are you aware of the fact or not that for such a diagnosis you could lose your job?" "That doesn't frighten me," replied Samkharadze, "I can't betray my professional conscience. Moreover, in Gamsakhurdia's car together with him I experienced the effect of the poisonous gas on myself, the result of which my blood pressure rose."

"I advise you not to say a word of this anywhere," said Tatishvili to him and called on Samkharadze to be cautious. Samkharadze was detained by the Security Committee [KGB] for about 8 hours.

X X X

In June of 1976 by the order of the Minister of Internal Affairs of the Georgian SSR, Ketiladze, a check of the population occurred in the city of Rustavi: They entered every apartment, looked around in each room, asked questions. The goal was the following:

1. [They wanted to find out] what atmosphere prevailed in the city.

2. [They wanted to know] the state of the passport policy (they deported the ones who weren't registered).

3. To put an end to hooliganism and prostitution and learn about the people engaged in such activities.

4. To put an end to possession of firearms without permission.

5. [They wanted to know] what ties do they [had] with their neighbors.

In the assembly hall of the Executive Committee [i.e., Municipal Council] of Rustavi Ketikadze's assistant Shaduri carried on deliberation, where he cautioned the population to behave politely in receiving this company,¹ since during the carrying out of the same sort of visits in Kutaisi ["things happened"].²

¹Used here Russian word for 'company,' implying the company was Russian (Russian-sent) and not welcome. - Translator's note.

²Translator not quite sure, hence brackets.
This company did the following kinds of things:

1. The city was divided into sectors,

2. The advisor of the control group of each sector was a trusted person of that area of the city; in addition to the trusted individual the group contained one member of the military from the District (Raion) and two or three men from the Party organization of the factory.

X X X

To the Chairman of the State Security Committee [KGB] of Georgia,
General A. Inauri
To the Head of the Ideological Division, Colonel Sh. Zardalishvili

Please return my article about Academician A. Sakharov's book My Country and the World, which the Head of the Police of the Kalinin District J. Khazhalia sent to you. The police found it in Zviad Gamsakhurdia's car, which they had taken. In this article there is information which is true and extremely useful for Georgian readers. Such is the orientation and content of my article. For this reason its confiscation by the Security Committee [KGB] is incorrect and undesired, because it would be more intelligent and humanitarian for you to fight against unpleasant opinions and ideas with ideas, opinions, and other means of culture. This is better than fighting with confiscation and other kinds of repression. Simple noble ethic demands a fight with equal weapons. I hope you will choose the first path and send me my article at the following address:
Merab Kostava, Dzhavakhishvili Street 1, Tbilisi (Telephone: 93-88-23).

Member of the Initiative Human Rights Group in Georgia, Merab Kostava
October 11, 1976

X X X

Colonel Sh. Zardalishvili, Assistant in matters of ideology to the Chairman of the Security Committee [KGB] of the Council of Ministers of the Georgian SSR, a person uneducated in anything, administers matters of literature, art, and philosophy for the entire Republic. He can like or dislike this or that work of art or this or that scholarly work, which delimits its subsequent fate at the press or in a journal. Editors and literary officials secretly bring into line with him many "dangerous" problems in this regard. The kind of ruler he is shows up in his conversations with Georgian writers. For example, in November of 1972 he summoned Zviad Gamsakhurdia to the Security Committee: "Your poems will not be printed, nor will your book be printed, because we don't like them."
His threat was realized in practice in August of 1973, when they stopped the printing of Gamsakhurdia's collection of poems in the publishing house Merani, when the manuscript had already been delivered to the press for printing; they forbid its printing, as if on the initiative of "Main(Head) Office for Literature and Publishing." Here we should also add that in the matter of forbidding publication of this collection B. Zhghenti, M. Nishnianidze, G. Chikovani, Ota Orjonikidze, and others took part.

Realization of the second part of the threat made above was a dialogue of Zardalishvili with the writer N. Tsuleiskiri, who was called to the Security Committee in July of 1975, in connection with the publication of his writing in the journal "The Golden Fleece." In brief, Zardalishvili asked him to censure in print Z. Gamsakhurdia and "The Golden Fleece." When Tsuleiskiri said no to this, Zardalishvili greeted him with vulgar words and threatened him with expulsion from the party, possibility of being fired from his job, and with arrest. The writer N. Tsuleiskiri after this experience took a memo to the Central Committee, in which he complained about Zardalishvili's impudent behavior and his personal insult.

8. INFORMATION ABOUT THE BUSINESS OF THE SECURITY COMMITTEE [KGB]

On July 15, 1976, a member of the State Security Committee Pirtskhalava came to the Republic's Psychiatric Hospital in Tbilisi and had a conversation with the following people at the hospital: A. Makaridze (a professor), P. Kontridze (a doctor), K. Khezhomia (a bookkeeper). Pirtskhalava informed them that the Security Committee had recently received an anonymous letter concerning the fact that certain staff members of the hospital: Assistant to the Director of the Psychiatric Institute B. Naneishvili, Chairman of the Pharmacology Division Sh. Gamkrelidze, and others, frequently had anti-Soviet conversations at work. They told colleagues at the hospital about radio programs from abroad (which they listened to regularly), they also related the content of Solzhenitsyn's books, and they told their colleagues about the dissident writer Zviad Gamsakhurdia's actions and that they were pleased by his activities. For example, publication of the journal "The Golden Fleece," compilation of the document "Facts about Torture in Georgia," and so on. Pirtskhalava asked the people named above to confirm all this, but they couldn't do what was asked. They didn't interrogate the "guilty ones" B. Naneishvili and Sh. Gamkrelidze. The latter also had committed the "crime" of taking a Czech guest to his own village, Zodi, which was 200 kilometers from Tbilisi, when the Czech guest only had permission to go 70 kilometers from the city.

X X X

On July 15, 1976, the Security Committee of Tbilisi summoned some members of the Georgian Orthodox Church, Medea Baiadze and Mariam Tushishvili. They were informed that copies of the religious book "Of the mirror of the heart" duplicated [?? on era ?] had come into the hands of the Security Committee. They asked Baiadze if he hadn't duplicated this book. M. Baiadze told them that it was right of him to have duplicated it since [word not legible, subject of this clause] doesn't see the crime. M. Tushishvili said that this is not a crime and called on the members of the Security Committee not to persecute religion.

X X X

Beginning in 1976, the State Security Committee frequently has bothered a lecturer in the Foreign Languages Institute of Tbilisi, specialist in American literature Z. Megrelishvili, who frequently met foreign correspondants Peter Osnos (of the Washington Post), Alfred Friendly (of Newsweek), and others. Members of the Security Committee frequently come uninvited to Megrelishvili's home, call him on the telephone, threaten him, and demand that he give up his acquaintance with the correspondants. They spread
misinformation; for example, they say that Z. Gamsakhurdia was arrested and is in jail when they only delayed him a few hours in Moscow.

X X X

On June 29, 1976, they took Ghvtiso Gogochuri from the Philosophy Institute to the Security Committee. He was accompanied by Kopadze, a member of the Security Committee, who was specially 'assigned' to the Institute. At the Security Committee unknown persons interrogated him. They asked him why he had icons in his house, whether it was true or not that in his house he celebrated the religious holiday "Khatoba." They also told him that in his dissertation there were places where he expressed sympathy with religion. Then they divulged that it was known to the Security Committee that he had expressed dissatisfaction against the new rule, which concerns dissertation defenses in Russian in Georgian scholarly institutions and they called this "nationalism." They unambiguously let him know that such facts were very dangerous for him.

X X X

In our reality it is a usual occurrence to have members of the Security Committee "assigned" to institutions of higher education and cultural studies. The Security Committee is interested in the psychological disposition of the intelligentsia and especially of the youth, since it is from them that it expects the greatest threat to the totalitarian ideology of the Soviet government. They especially feel the threat from students, since it is among the young people, the future intelligentsia, that the strongest feelings of rage against injustice rightly lodge. For this reason, the Security Committee in institutions of higher education--(special)\(^1\) . . . showing companions (comrades) to be spies, with which they intimidate or blackmail, by means of a thousand kinds of promises (travel abroad, graduate study, jobs, money). For example, in 1959 in Tbilisi State University, an employee of the Security Committee Shalva Papidze called in individually a number of students, Z. Gamsakhurdia and his classmates: Nana Kavtaradze, Kote Gedevanishvili, Nukri Sanadze, Rusudan Tiknanadze, Salodze Bolkvadze, Akaki Vasadze, and others. He offered them jobs as his fellow-workers and asked them if they would watch and get to know what Z. Gamsakhurdia and his friends talked about and how they behaved. In exchange he promised them places as graduate students, the possibility of leaving the department, money, and so on. The students rejected this sort of opportunity to be his "fellow-workers" and told everything to Gamsakhurdia.

\(^1\)Last line on page is completely illegible, p. 143. - Translator's Note.
At the present time in the University, the lecturers and students speak with smiles about the "First Department" of the University, where employees specially assigned by the Security Committee are located. They try to recruit students and tie them into a spy network in the whole University. They have them give evidence about the ideological disposition of students and lecturers. In this respect the following employees of the Security Committee are especially active: Gagua, Shurgaia, and others.

At the State Conservatory, the Academy of Art, and other cultural institutions, Zaur Gachechiladze is assigned as Security Committee employee (formerly Rato Tatishvili was assigned there). It is well-known that he intensively recruits young students into work as agents. In this "proud business" in the Conservatory he is helped by the chairman of the film strip division, Tina Kuzanova.

In February of 1973 a student of the English Language Department of the Foreign Languages Institute, Kakhaber Arsenidze, told his neighbor and older friend, Merab Kostava how the Security Committee had recruited his whole class. They had them sign up to be agents, except for Arsenidze himself and a few of his friends, for which they had made an enemy of the Dean of the Department, Agent Neli Kraveishvili. Arsenidze related this news with great sincerity and in a highly agitated manner. In the Foreign Language Institute Mzia Bakradze, Dean of the French Language Department, was also active. Among the professors and teachers in the University, the chairman of the English Language Department, Dotsent (Assistant Professor) Niko Kiasashvili, former attaché to the Soviet Embassy in London, is an especially loyal employee of the Security Committee. He recruits young people for work as spies with promises of jobs, positions as graduate students, and study trips abroad. He worked as a kind of mediator between the Security Committee and Zviad Gamsakhurdia, when Gamsakhurdia worked in the University in Kiasashvili's Department. Namely, in the person of Kiasashvili, the Security Committee threatened Gamsakhurdia with arrest in 1972 [?? he called on him to be "reasonable"]. Earlier, in 1969, also in the person of Kiasashvili, they offered to him departure from the University, they promised him blessing as Catholikos (head of the church), and so on. In the spring of 1975 Kiasashvili read a secret report to the Security Committee about Gamsakhurdia, where he stated that Gamsakhurdia's religious activity was a mask for his subversive anti-Soviet activity, and other things as well. This report aroused some members of the Security Committee however. This news was spread around by M. Mchedlishvili, an employee of the Security Committee, who also does business at the University. Also working in the University are Agents Zaza Gachechiladze (in the Department of English Philology), Revaz Gachechiladze (the Department of Oriental Studies), Grigol Khavtasi (Chairman of the Germanic Philology Department), R. Kvachakhia (Chairman of the Sociology Department), and others.

Last year the now dead "Professor" Givi Gachechiladze and Dotsent Otar Dzhinoria worked actively as agents in the University.
Such is the role of the Security Committee in the business of "bringing up" the youth and "forming the new man."

DOCUMENTS OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN GEORGIA, 1977

(After the Establishment of the Group for the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords in Georgia)
In January [1977] there was formed the Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords in Georgia. Six persons joined it, to wit: Beglar Bezuashvili, a laboratory technician at the Department of Art of Tbilisi University; Zviad Gamsakhurdia (at present he is a senior research fellow [starshyi nauchnyi sotrudnik] of the Institute of the History of Georgian Literature); Jewish "refuseniks" brothers Isai and Grigorii Goldstein; Teimuraz Dzhanelidze, a singing teacher in the vocational high school of music (tekhnikum) in Rustavi; [and] Victor Rstkhiladze, the chief inspector in the Division of Protection of Monuments of the Georgian SSR Ministry of Culture.

In early March [1977] V. Rstkhiladze was dismissed from his work.

10. ON THE PERSECUTION OF V. RTSKHILADZE

(Press Release)

Historian V. RTSKHILADZE, Georgian human rights activist and member of the Georgian Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreement, was fired from his job on March 9, 1977, in Tbilisi. V. Rtskhiladze was employed at the Ministry of Culture of the Georgian SSR where he served as director of the division dealing with the preservation of historical monuments of Georgian culture. Working in this capacity, he continuously exposed the criminal neglect of authorities in his field—a neglect which reduced the majority of the cultural monuments to a deplorable state.

In September 1976, V. Rtskhiladze, along with the director of the David-Garedzha Museum, V. Batsatsashvili, wrote to the Procurator General of the USSR, Rudenko, lodging a complaint against the use of the grounds of the David-Garedzha Monastery as a firing range for the artillerymen of the Transcaucasus Military Region, who were barbarically destroying this unique monument to Early Christian culture. The appeal contained a demand that the artillerymen be punished on the basis of the Criminal Code.

V. Rtskhiladze has also played a leading role in the struggle of the Meskhis to be returned to their rightful homeland. Among the materials confiscated at the search of the apartment of Yuri Orlov on January 4, were included documents on the Meskhis that Rtskhiladze himself had given to Orlov. Included was Rtskhiladze's letter to the Chronicle and the signatures of 8,000 Meskhis demanding the restoration of their Georgian nationality and the right to return to their homeland. These materials served as the basis for the well-known Moscow Helsinki Group document, "On the Situation of the Meskhetians."

At the beginning of January, edition No. 2 of the Georgian Samizdat journal The Georgian Herald contained a lengthy article (approximately 100 pages) by Rtskhiladze entitled "Crimes Inflicted on the Georgian People (The Tragedy of the Meskhis)."

Barely 10 days had passed since the search of Yuri Orlov's apartment before Rtskhiladze was subjected to harassments at work. In particular, administrative director U. Bakradze began to find fault with all sort of trivial matters, insulted Rtskhiladze in coarse language and tried to provoke a counter attack. Rtskhiladze was then reprimanded for "violation of discipline" which was later revoked by the Ministry directorate itself, since the reprimand had clearly been groundless.

Nonetheless, the directorate (specifically, Deputy Minister N. Gurabanidze, V. Kurava and V. Yakashvili) itself then fired Rtskhiladze for "violation of discipline." This firing is a gross violation even of Soviet labor legislation. The same day, Rtskhiladze was summoned to the MVD (by Investigator Aslanishvili) where he was compelled to write an explanation as to why he "verbally abused and threatened director Bakradze." Prior to the firing, the KGB had sent some "hooligans" who attempted to incite a brawl with Rtskhiladze. (The KGB has used a similar ploy against...
another member of the Georgian Helsinki Group, Z. Gamsakhurdia). Today it is possible that the Rtskhiladze is under threat of arrest for "parasitism."1,2 Here we must add that Rtskhiladze recently suffered a critical heart ailment--angina pectoris.

We appeal to worldwide public opinion with a request to defend this active struggler for human rights in Georgia--Viktor Rtskhiladze. We also ask that voices be raised for the return of the Meskhis to their rightful homeland.

(Signed by Georgian Public Group members Beglar Bezhuashvili, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, Grigori Goldshtein, Isaai Goldshtein, and Teymuraz Dzhanelidze, as well as by members of the Initiative Group to Defend Human Rights in Georgia, Merab Kostava, G. Magulariya, and Nikoloz Samkharadze.)

Tbilisi, March 1977

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: English translation by Staff of the US Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; reprinted from their collection The Right to Know, the Right to Act: Documents of Helsinki Dissent from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Compiled and Edited by the Staff of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Washington, D.C., May, 1978), pp. 104-105. In Russian the document is conveniently available under number AS 3116 in SDS 30, pp. 75-76. This is a very important document because as of October 1979 it was the only document of the Tbilisi Helsinki Watch Committee that reached the West. The Committee is said to have produced one other document (on the protection of historical monuments) but it has not been available in the West, and only sketchy information about the existence of such a document is circulating among dissidents in Moscow. Should the following document be regarded as the second document of the Group?

1Viktor Rtskhiladze was arrested April 23, 1977, at the same time as Zviad Gamsakhurdia and Merab Kostava, but released under orders not to leave Tbilisi. He was re-arrested January 25, 1978. (Note by Staff of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.)

2According to information on file at Radio Liberty, Munich, V. Rtskhiladze was sentenced in Tbilisi on September 7, 1978, to 2½ years in camp and 2 years exile--remaining term to be conditional, 3 years probation. - Y.B.
February 27, 1977, I visited the monastery complex of David-Garedzha. The wall above the main portal had crumbled, [and] pieces [from it] fell onto the tile roofing of the church and damaged it. To judge by the words of V[iktor] BATSATSASHVILI, the director of the museum, he had more than once requested the Direction for the Protection of Monuments and its workshop to repair that wall, but in vain. Apparently the explosions on the artillery firing range also contributed in this case.

The major part of the main church of the Bertubanski Monastery has been destroyed as a result of the artillery firing on the range. Though several unique frescoes from the 12th and 13th centuries, which belong to world masterpieces of painting, have been preserved completely, restorers must quickly lift off those frescoes and transfer them to the museum of art of Georgia, for time does not suffer [neglect]--those masterpieces that are equal to the works of Giotto and Raphael can perish in a short while. If in the near future no appropriate measures are taken and the frescoes perish I will consider that the Government of the Georgian SSR and its Ministry of Culture do not care in the least about the treasure of Georgian culture and that they collaborate in their destruction with the soldiers of the artillery of the Transcaucasian Military District. (Photographs of the destroyed monastery are enclosed.)

signed: Zviad Gamsakhurdia

February 28, 1977

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translated from Russian by Y. Bilinsky. Document is available as AS No. 3115 in Materialy samizdata (MS), No. 4/78 (January 20, 1978). Annotations have not been translated. Please note that formally it is not a document of the Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords in Georgia. See, however, bibl. note to preceding document (No. 10).
Vladimir Grigor'evich ZHVANIIA was born in 1935 in Georgia, in the town of Poti, into the family of a military officer (voennosluzhashchego), who in February 1921 together with other Georgian Communists under the leadership of ORDZHONIKIDZE had led the 11th Russian Army into Georgia, thus participating in her subjugation. His father Grigorii was shot in 1938, his property was confiscated, and his mother with her children found herself [thrown out] into the street.

Vladimir Zhvaniia was brought up by his grandmother, because his mother remarried after a while. He graduated from a secondary school in Sukhumi.

In 1955 he was arrested for attempting to [illegally] cross the frontier near Batum and sentenced to three years. He wanted to leave the USSR since he [already] knew that his father, who was [officially] rehabilitated in 1956, had been shot for no reason at all.

In 1962 he was arrested for the second time for brawling (he told his mother afterwards that it had been a provocation) and was sentenced to six years of imprisonment. He was [however] imprisoned for a total of ten years, since twice he tried to escape from the camps (from the [penal] colonies of Tsulukidze and Kisani) and got two additional years for each attempt to escape. He was released in 1972. For a long time after his release he could not obtain a legal residence permit, nor could he find any work, for everywhere he was refused as a former prisoner. Finally, one relative of his managed to obtain a residence permit in Rustavi, and that only in a dormitory. Since he was shortsighted he was awarded a pension of 28 roubles [a month] after his father's rehabilitation. After he obtained the residence permit in Rustavi his pension was restored, he being an invalid of the second category. V. Zhvaniia learnt English by himself and, not finding any work, he was forced to work as a tutor.

In the course of all these years the ideological outlook of Zhvaniiia kept changing, and he arrived at the conclusion that his Georgian fatherland should become independent. He decided to work in that direction so as to somehow awaken the Georgian people. He would act alone towards that goal: he would set off explosions not to destroy any objects nor [to kill] people, but in order to create an effect, a resonance among the people and to revive them. He set off three such bomb explosions: in front of the municipal council in Sukhumi in 1975, before Government House in Tbilisi April 12, 1976, and in Kutaisi, in the Tsulukidze Park, April 14 of the same year. In Sukhumi, during the explosion a man was accidentally killed after he threw a lighted cigarette into the urn where the explosive was hidden. It should be noted that in Kutaisi V. Zhvaniiia placed a piece of paper at the object of the explosion, with the inscription: "Caution! Will explode!" He was afraid of causing any harm to people.
May 15, 1976, V. Zhvaniia was arrested. This happened as follows. He had written a letter to the director of the trust of the Batum food selling organization and requested monetary help for patriotic objectives. He had written that an organization was being formed which needed material help. That individual agreed, but secretly he notified the KGB. When Zhvaniia went to see him at work and received money from him, he was stopped at the exit. During the arrest three letters were found on Zhvaniia. They were addressed to the Party Central Committee, the Council of Ministers and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Georgian SSR. He had written them on behalf of the organization for the liberation of Georgia. In those letters he expressed his own conceptions in eight points. He demanded a referendum, the withdrawal of Russian troops, and the admission of Georgia to the UN. In the letter he warned the Government that unless his demands would be met, the organization would continue with the bombings. Explosives were found in his possession, too.

He was tried in the beginning of 1977 under Articles 69, 71 (1st part), 154 and 238 (1st part) of the Criminal Code of the Georgian SSR. The trial began January 17, 1977. The judge was O[tar] DZHIBLADZE (the public accuser [obshchestvennyi obvinitel'] was Sh. REVISHVILI, and B. HOMERTKI was the defender). The prosecutor demanded the maximum penalty under all the articles. He stated that he (Zhvaniia) had not been employed anywhere and was, therefore, a "parasite." He did not tell the reason for his first arrest nor the fact that after his release he was not accepted for work anywhere. Nor did he tell that Zhvaniia was an invalid of the second category and had full right not to work. Under Article 69 which deals with (podrazumeval'schei) "Destruction or damage to . . . enterprises, equipment, transport and communications, . . . the spreading of epidemics and epizootics animal diseases with the purpose of economically weakening the Soviet Union" (Zhvaniia) was sentenced to the supreme penalty—death by shooting. But that article has been applied incorrectly. Since he had not destroyed any objects he should have been tried under Article 100, part 2, which provides for imprisonment of 8 years.

The court needed one week in order to reflect on the sentence, i.e., that they did not know what to do. (Zhvaniia's) last word and the sentence of the court were pronounced on one and the same day. In his last word Zhvaniia said that he considered himself guilty only insofar as he had chosen a wrong path for the liberation of Georgia, that he loved his fatherland and believed that it would become independent. He also said that a one party system in the state violated democracy. The Soviet press in Tbilisi noted that the audience in the room met the sentence with approval. But nothing like that occurred: after sentence was pronounced, all left the

---

1Three dots added by the Radio Liberty editor. - Y.B.

2Zhvaniia was executed probably in December 1977. See Kommunisti (Tiflis), December 17, 1977, and Reuter wire dispatch from Paris, January 13, 1978. Exact date and place of execution have not been revealed. - Y.B.
room silent, with downcast eyes (one should not forget that to enter the room one had to have a special pass). The room was guarded not by the ordinary police, but by KGB operatives: even one policeman was not admitted to the trial. The relatives of the condemned were not given a copy of the conclusion of the act of prosecution nor a copy of the sentence, despite the fact that his sister N. Zhvaniia\(^3\) had written a declaration [a request? - Y.B.] to Judge Dzhibladze. This constitutes a flagrant violation of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Tbilisi, March 19, 1977

M. Gamsakhurdia

M. Kostava

---

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translated from Russian by Y. Bilinsky, from document AS No. 3114, "V. Zhvaniia osuzhden za vzryvy" in MS 4/78 (January 20, 1978). Annotations have not been translated. This is not a formal document of the Tbilisi Helsinki Watch Committee, though the two signatories are its members.

\(^3\)Apparently his cousin Nina Romanovna Zhvaniia (note by editors of Radio Liberty).
DOCUMENTS
OF THE ARMENIAN GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION
ACCORDS (NOS. 1-7) AND RELATED MATERIALS
ON THE ARMENIAN NATIONAL AND HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENTS
(NOS. 8-12)
1. ARMENIAN GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
RESOLUTIONS OF THE FINAL ACT OF THE HELSINKI ACCORD

DECLARATION

Incidents of flagrant violation of human rights and dignity, of
the basic freedoms of thought, . . . conscience, worship and opinion, are
taking place in the Armenian Republic.

In spite of the fact that the USSR has taken part in the drafting
of the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and Inter-
national Covenants on Human Rights, and has subscribed to them, the
persecution and harassment of dissidents and believers has not ceased.

In the period 1973-1974 alone, nine political trials have taken
place in Erevan, the capital of the Armenian Republic, and eighteen
Armenian dissidents have been sentenced to prison terms ranging from six
months to ten years.

The acceptance by the Soviet Union of the International Covenants
on Human Rights and of the provisions of the Final Act [of the Helsinki
Conference] on Security and Cooperation in Europe places on her, in
accordance with International Law, the legal obligations to follow
unswervingly the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

But since, in the question of basic freedoms and civil rights, the
accepted international obligations are being violated in the Soviet Union
and in particular in the Armenian Republic, the movement for civil rights
will retain its urgency so long as the causes for concern have not been
removed.

Admitting that the respect for the overall significance
of civil rights and basic freedoms is an essential factor of peace, justice
and prosperity, which are indispensable for the safeguard of the development
of friendly relations and cooperation among all States,

Conscious of the negative effect that the violations
of political and civil rights, and basic freedoms have had on the economic,
cultural and scientific progress and on the people's standard of living
in the USSR and, in particular, in the Armenian Republic,

Taking into consideration the vital interests of the
Armenian people, viz., the rights accorded to the citizens and guaranteed
by Article 101 of the Constitution of the SSR of Armenia, as well as
provisions of the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,
the International Covenants on Human Rights, and the Final Act of the
Helsinki Conference,
Guided by the principle of freedom and justice, proclaiming our faith in peace and democratic ideals, convinced of the legality of our undertaking and realizing the necessity of safeguarding the basic interests of the people and of human rights,

Noting with satisfaction the fruitful activity of the existing organizations in the USSR dedicated to the protection of civil rights, noting also the enormous interest that is being manifested here and in the entire world towards the activities aimed at protecting human rights in the USSR,

Guided by faith, by conscience, by conviction and by the sense of civic duty,

We have taken the initiative of setting up in the Armenian Republic a group to monitor and promote the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference. Our aims are as follows:

1. to defend the civic, political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and freedoms which are inherent to human dignity and are vital for man's free and full development;

2. to defend man's right to freely seek, receive and disseminate information and knowledge, free from the limitations of political boundaries and official ideologies;

3. to defend man's right to have and freely proclaim his religious convictions;

4. to strive to liberate political prisoners and to collect contributions for the material support of their families;

5. to defend the rights of inviolability of person, of residence, and of the confidentiality of personal correspondence which have been guaranteed by Articles 102 and 103 of the Constitution of the SSR of Armenia;

6. to defend the rights of free association, of reunification of families, of free movement in and out of the country, of free choice of place of residence, but cooperating all the while with the activities aimed at encouraging the concentration of Armenians within the boundaries of the Armenian Republic;

7. to raise the issue of the acceptance of the Armenian Republic as a member of the United Nations with a view to solving the national question of the dispersion of Armenians in all corners of the world;

8. to raise the issue of the reintegration within the Armenian Republic of the regions of Mountainous Karabagh and of the Nakhichevan ASSR that have been incorporated in the SSR of
Azerbaidzhan, and this in accordance with Article 1 of the first part of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as well as with Point 8 of the Final Act of the Helsinki Accord;

9. to demand that all administrative activities in the fields of civil service, economics and culture be conducted unswervingly in the Armenian language, in accordance with Article 119 of the Constitution of the Armenian SSR;

10. to study the questions of improving the legislation and Constitution of the Armenian SSR, with the aim of correlating them with the spirit and the letter of civic rights and basic freedoms in accordance with Principle 10 of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference;

11. to work towards ending all forms of censorship except military;

12. to assemble, to study and to circulate data relative to the implementation or the violations of the provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference;

13. to supply counseling services to citizens in cases where their human rights have been violated.

The Armenian Group to Promote the Implementation of the provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference pursues no political or religious aim and is nothing but a public, philanthropic organization, respectful of Soviet laws.

Any citizen of the Armenian Republic who feels close to our principles and aims may, within the limits of his power and his means, render assistance to our group through personal participation by entering into contact with the members of the group.

This present declaration has been made in accord with the principles and provisions of the Final Act agreed upon at Helsinki. It is based on the spirit and letter of the concluding document drawn up at the Conference of twenty-nine Communist, proletarian and progressive parties of Europe, on the ideas of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and on the basis of the constitutional norms of the USSR.

1. Group Leader: Eduard Bagratovich ARUTYUNYAN
   Address: 375014, Erevan-14, Nersessian Street, Building 1, Apartment 5

2. Treasurer: Deacon Robert Khachikovich NAZARYAN
   Address: 375051, Erevan-51, Arabgir Street 17, Building 9
3. Samvel Vladimirovich OSYAN
Address: 375012, Erevan-12, Vatutin Street, Building 113

April 1, 1977

ANNOUNCEMENT TO THE BELGRADE CONFERENCE

Since we have no means of gathering or receiving any sort of information on implementation of the other provisions of the Final Act, members of Helsinki Watch Groups active within the borders of the USSR have focused their attention on the Final Act's humanitarian provisions. This does not mean, however, that the Groups have ready access to data in this sphere. The mass media in the Soviet Union do not perform the function their name suggests; the meager quantity of information which succeeds in filtering through to the press, radio and so on, appears in completely distorted form. This is true both of extra-political as well as political reporting.

With respect to the undertakings the Soviet government has made in the area of humanitarian concerns, the Armenian Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreement notes the following:

A. Civil rights violations in Armenia have not ceased since the signing of the Final Act. We understand the concept of "civil rights" to include national, political, religious, economic, cultural and other freedoms. The free and unhampered activity of Armenian citizens in any of the above-named areas is not guaranteed. The very fact that members of the Armenian Group to Promote have been persecuted speaks most eloquently for itself.

B. The signing of the Final Act found no reflection in the treatment of political prisoners sentenced for their beliefs and "activities" (the dissemination of their beliefs) to various terms of punishment prior to the Helsinki Conference. Those isolated incidents when Armenian political prisoners have been released are simply a hypocritical demonstration of an "eased" regime--a regime which is in fact on the verge of inflicting new outrages upon citizens seriously concerned with the fate of their country. For instance, far ahead of the end of their terms, two political prisoners--Ashot TsoIakovich NAVASARDYAN and Asat Levikovich ARSHAKYAN--were released. They were not, however, acquitted, but, following their policy of human degradation, the authorities induced them to ask for clemency, to produce additional testimony, to renounce their convictions in written form and to pledge to refrain from any sort of activity in the future. Political prisoners continue to be detained in inhuman conditions.

C. Radio broadcasts continue to be jammed, the receipt of publications still obstructed. The Soviet government destroys publications even of Soviet authors who, for one reason or another, have left the country, or who have expressed opinions which do not reiterate the official viewpoint. Persons wishing to leave the country are harassed.
D. The rights of the Armenian people as a national minority are grossly violated. The Armenian nation stands in danger of losing its national identity through assimilation. The following data attest to this:

The USSR—being a union of nations enjoying equal rights—is obligated to preserve the national dignity and national rights of all peoples entering into its union. However, the government of the USSR itself acts as the prime violator of these rights. Adhering to a superpower policy with anti-nationalist aims, the USSR not only does nothing to resolve the Armenian question—based on the just demands of a nation deprived of the major portion of its historical homeland and a people sacrificed to the first genocide of the twentieth century—it uses all possible means to block its resolution.

The dictatorship of the CPSU, which managed to wreck the country’s economy, proceeds in its suppression of national cultures and the cynical violation of its citizens’ rights. The Communist Party, while monopolizing all the power in the Armenian republic, neither reflects nor protects the interests of the Armenian people; moreover, it functions as the primary instrument in violating the national rights of Armenian citizens bold enough to express criticism of the anti-nationality policies of the central and republic governments, and subjects them to persecution and long-term deprivation of freedom.

Ancient national customs and language are being distorted and stand on the verge of destruction. A Russian replaces an Armenian school on the average of once a year. Russian preschools and elementary schools are maintained in better condition than their Armenian counterparts; highly qualified specialists fill their staffs and the government provides them with more extensive funding.

Russian is the language of all (business) in governmental, cultural and economic bodies, as well as in scientific research institutes. This is practiced in spite of Article 119 of the Constitution of the Armenian SSR which establishes Armenian as the republic’s official language. All documentation—ranging from financial statements to scientific papers—is in Russian. Russian is the language most often heard on radio broadcasts and television programming. The single means of contact with world culture is through the Russian language—translations into Armenian are discouraged and obstructed.

The republic’s intelligentsia is deprived of all means of self-assertion, in the true sense of the word, and it is deprived of the possibility of real contact—free of hypocrisy and falsehood—with the people. The intelligentsia and the working people both are deprived even of a consultative role in the resolution of national, political, economic, cultural, social and moral issues.

The rights of citizens living in the Karabagh region—once part of the Armenian republic—continue to be violated. Citizens of the Karabagh wish to rejoin the Armenian republic, as 80% of its population is Armenian.

1Alternative spelling is Karabakh, which was in the Commission’s translation. - Y.B.
E. The new Draft Constitution offers us the possibility to assume that no changes in this sphere can be expected; if anything, further limitations on these rights might be imposed. This assumption is based in particular on the contents of Article 39 which begins Chapter 7 called "The Basic Rights, Freedoms and Duties of Citizens of the USSR." Article 39 states: "Exercise by citizens of rights and freedoms must not harm the interests of society and the state, and the rights of other citizens." There is only one way this can be interpreted. All civil rights delineated in the Draft Constitution are clouded by amorphous stipulations: "In accordance with the aims of strengthening the socialist system . . .", "In conformity with the aims of Communist construction . . ." (Art. 47, 50, 51). Citizens of the USSR are acknowledged to possess the right "to profess any religion and to carry on atheistic propaganda," but there is not stipulation for religious propaganda (Art. 52).

The indicated "freedoms" geared toward strengthening the "might and prestige" of the Soviet government, Soviet ideology and an atheistic world view, have never been limited by the Soviet government, even when these have been founded on false information. Moreover, in reality these "freedoms" have been and continue to be not rights but obligations of Soviet citizens, to which Article 62 attests: "The citizens of the USSR shall be obliged to safeguard the interests of the Soviet state, to contribute to the strengthening of its might and prestige."

The Armenian Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreement was organized on April 1, 1977, and has been in operation for only two months. Decades of pervasive suspicion, intimidation and fear inherited from the past, hamper Group activity. Citizens wishing to join or work with the Group in the data-gathering process on human rights violations refrain from doing so for fear of direct reprisals and from their sense that the struggle for basic human rights and freedoms in the Soviet Union is hopeless and cannot produce any positive results.

Nevertheless, Armenian Helsinki Group members have at their disposal a number of reliable facts which demonstrate that the Soviet Union has not been observing the international conventions it has signed in the area of equal rights of peoples and their inherent rights to determine their own fate, as well as in the area of fundamental human rights and freedoms.

The following facts are presented in accordance with the points made above:

A. (1) Persecution and loss of freedom for those whose views are incompatible with the official ideology. This relates especially to citizens and workers in the fields of education and culture.

   a) Sarkis ARUTYUNYAN, 2 Erevan State University, instructor of philosophy (reinstated).

---

2For consistency's sake the name endings -ian (as in Commission's translation) have all been changed to -yan. The latter spelling appears to be the preference of Armenian Group member Khlgatyun. - Y.B.
b) Kamo PETROSYAN, Erevan Polytechnic Institute, instructor of philosophy.
c) Aleksandr Rubenovich MALKHASYAN, physics teacher.
d) Edik MELKONYAN, physics teacher.
e) Eduard Bagratovich ARUTYUNYAN, Candidate of Economic Sciences.

(2) Known cases of isolation in psychiatric hospitals for political and religious convictions:

a) Eduard Bagratovich ARUTYUNYAN—for entering the Embassy of Great Britain;
b) Aleksandr Rubenovich MALKHASYAN—for issuing critical statements to higher governmental agencies;
c) Gerasim STEPANYAN—for a religious gathering in his apartment.

(3) Immediately following the announcement of the formation of the Armenian Helsinki Group, members of the Group and their families fell victim to reprisals and threats. The newspaper of the Central Committee of the Armenian SSR, Sovetakan Hyastan, published a feuilleton aimed at manipulating public opinion, entitled "The False Prophet" which used distorted facts and filthy attacks on Group member Deacon Robert Khachikovich NAZARYAN.

Another Group member, Samuel OSYAN, student at the polytechnic institute, was summoned for a talk with his dean who hinted at the possibility that his thesis would not be accepted. OSYAN's parents were summoned to KGB headquarters for an "interview" where allusions were made to physical reprisals in store for their son.

B. (1) The rights of political prisoners are being violated, in particular the right to correspondence, medical assistance, receipt of parcels, monthly purchases and visits with relatives. Political prisoners are subjected to humiliation, including discrimination on the basis of nationality. According to our data, the following political prisoners are being held under inhuman conditions:

a) Razmik Artavazdovich ZOGRABYAN; b. 1950, sentenced to 10 years;
b) Paruir Arshavirovich AIRIKYAN; b. 1949, sentenced to 10 years;
c) Razmik Grigorievich MARKOSYAN; b. 1950, sentenced to 6 years;
d) Bagrat Levonovich SHAKHVERDYAN; b. 1940, sentenced to 7 years;
e) Sergei PARADZHANYAN—we have no information on this talented film director. (Also known as Paradzhanov, he was reported to have been released from prison camp in late 1977--CSCE).

(2) On the other hand, pervasive corruption and bribery have penetrated government agencies, including those dealing with security and health, a situation which obstructs the solution of serious crimes.

Daniel Ambartsumovich IRADYAN was killed in a pre-detention cell; appropriate government agencies have not ordered an investigation of the murder, and authorities are clearly evading his parents' inquiries.
C. (1) According to incomplete data, the following library books were burned over the last two months:


We know that the director of the Main Administration for the Maintenance of Government Secrets of the Council of Ministers of the Armenian SSR issued orders (No. 1-.02) on February 8, 1977, for the confiscation and destruction of books by Armenian writer and translator, Paruir MIKAELYAN, who had previously renounced his Soviet citizenship (7 titles).

(2) The government violates the rights of citizens who wish to leave the country for permanent residence.

a) Tatoss ARTIN has been denied permission to emigrate and has been without citizenship for 8 years;

b) Aleksandr Rubenovich MALKHASYAN renounced his citizenship, yet his request to leave the country has stood unresolved for five years;

c) Edik BEGLARYAN renounced his Soviet citizenship after governmental agencies violated his civil rights; nevertheless, the appropriate agencies have not examined his request to emigrate.

D. (1) The political prisoners named in B. above were also accused of nationalist activity which Soviet law equates with anti-Soviet activity.

(2) The government bars citizens from commemorating the National Day of Mourning, April 24, the date of the Armenian Genocide in Turkey in 1915.

a) Gatherings and memorial dinners dedicated to the memory of the victims are prohibited;

b) Groups of more than 3-4 persons on the streets of Erevan are dispersed.

c) The preparation of bulletin board displays on this theme is prohibited in official establishments and educational institutions (Erevan State University)

The Armenian Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreement stresses that this report contains only a selection of verified facts on the violation of civil rights and fundamental freedoms in the republic of Armenia. Additional data are still being checked.

The Armenian Helsinki Group appeals to the good will of the heads of participating states and to the peoples of the world who hold dear the concept of the defense of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and requests them to mobilize public opinion in compelling the Soviet government to:

1. Strictly observe its international obligations toward its citizens in the area of civil rights;

2. Officially recognize our Group along with the other Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreement and other humanitarian civic organizations active within the Soviet Union.

The Armenian Group turns to the Belgrade Meeting with an appeal to:

1. Examine the issues of centralization and effectiveness of the Soviet Groups to Promote Observance of the Final Act;

2. Examine the question of granting the Soviet Helsinki Groups official recognition and giving them the force of a legal body;

3. And, as a natural consequence, to organize future conferences on human rights and basic freedoms at which the Soviet Helsinki Watch Groups could present world public opinion with the true situation with regard to human rights in the USSR.

(Signed by Armenian Public Group members Eduard Arutyunyan, Robert Nazaryan and Samvel Osyan.)

Erevan, June 1977

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translation is that contained in US Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Staff, Compiler and Editor, The Right to Know, The Right to Act: Documents of Helsinki Dissent from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe (Washington, D.C., May 1978), pp. 106-112; slightly modified by Y. Bilinsky. The Commission's translation has also been reprinted in The Armenian Review, Vol. XXXI, No. 4-124 (April 1979), pp. 418-423. Russian text in SDS 30, pp. 85-94 (AS No. 3074). The Russian text includes a long, 13 point list of documentary appendices, which have not been reprinted, however—hence this list is omitted from this text.
On July 22, 1977, KGB operatives broke into the apartment of Zhanna Sargsyan, friend of Robert Nazaryan. After conducting an interrogation in the apartment, they drove Sargsyan and her mother to KGB headquarters where they continued to question the daughter for 8 hours, threatening her with a 2-8 year prison term. Zhanna Sargsyan wrote out a statement dictated by KGB employee Kazaryan. Both women were then driven home where, threatened with a search, they were forced to surrender the following materials: a copy of the Armenian Helsinki Group declaration, Robert Nazaryan's open letter to Jimmy Carter and a snapshot of patriot P. Airikyan. After the seizure of materials, the KGB failed to give Sargsyan a copy of the confiscation order.

That very same day, Eduard Arutyunyan gave a colleague a file of materials related to the defense of human rights in the USSR (works by Amalrik, Solzhenitsyn, the "Chronicle" for 1974, etc.--over 100 pages). Twenty minutes after her meeting with Arutyunyan, Karina Mkrtchyan was detained by a group of KGB men led by Dzhivanyan. The KGB drove Mkrtchyan to headquarters where she wrote a statement under dictation. Later, threatened with an apartment search and 2-8 years in prison, Mkrtchyan was forced to admit that she had other materials at home. The interrogation was interrupted for a trip back to the apartment where the KGB seized the following materials: copies of the statement by E. Arutyunyan to women of the world, his open letter to Mr. Carter, an open letter to Mr. Brezhnev, a statement directed to the Soviet people, and dissident literature belonging to the Armenian Helsinki Group. Mkrtchyan then was returned to the KGB. The interrogation lasted 10 hours in all. As in the case of Z. Sargsyan, Karina Mkrtchyan was not given a copy of the confiscation order.

On July 25, 1977, at 7:00, employees of the KGB took Manvel Matirosyan from his apartment and delivered him to headquarters for an interrogation which lasted until 2:00 a.m. on July 26. Although Matirosyan has received an invitation from the U.S., he has not received permission to emigrate from the USSR, and on advice from R. Nazaryan, had been planning to move to Moscow. The major goal of the KGB interrogation: to learn the instructions Nazaryan had given him to carry out once in Moscow.

On August 7, 1977, Saro Gyodakyan was detained and searched by the KGB when he arrived in the city of Leninakan from Erevan (Armenian SSR). In spite of the fact that doctors had discovered a breast tumor in Gyodakyan's sister, and that he was to accompany her to Moscow, Gyodakyan was forced to sign a statement to the effect that he would not leave Leninakan through August 25. He was not given a copy of the confiscation order.
order for a roll of film and an Armenian Helsinki Group statement to the
Belgrade Conference seized during the search. Gyodakyan was summoned
again for interrogation on the same matter on August 16 and 25, 1977.

September 12, 1977

Armenian Helsinki Group:

    Eduard Avutyunyan
    Shagen Arutyunyan
    Ambartsum Khlgatyan
    Robert Nazaryan
    Samvel Osyan

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translation from US Commission on Security and
Cooperation in Europe, Reports of Helsinki Accord Monitors in the Soviet
Union, Volume Three of the Documents of the Public Group to Promote
Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR, A Partial Compilation,
Edited and Prepared by the Staff of the Commission on Security and
Cooperation in Europe, November 7, 1978 (henceforth abbreviated Reports
Helsinki Monitors III), p. 177. Reprinted in Armenian Review, Vol. XXXI,
No. 4-124 (April 1979), p. 423-424. Russian version carries AS No. 3125
(see Materialy samizdata, No. 5/78 [January 25, 1978].
4. STATEMENT OF ARMENIAN HELSINKI GROUP MEMBER ROBERT NAZARYAN WITH A REQUEST FOR ACCEPTANCE INTO THE HELSINKI AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

The Armenian Helsinki Group's declaration and its statements addressed to the Belgrade Conference demonstrate that since its inception, the Armenian Helsinki Group has believed that close contacts between Helsinki Groups would lead to more productive results.

The implementation of the humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki Agreements—on the rights of national minorities and on human rights—is a natural touchstone which can be used to judge the extent to which any one of the Final Act signatories is observing its commitments, and whether it, in fact, desires detente in the world.

The Soviet government conceals from world public opinion (and its own people) violations of nationality rights and human rights which have occurred in our country. This is why participating states of the Helsinki Conference are insufficiently familiar with facts of Soviet non-implementation of provisions of the Final Act.

Today in the Soviet Union, in the Armenian Republic in particular, gross violations of the nationality rights of Armenians, and violations of human rights in general, are occurring. Soviet authorities interfere with the normal activity of the Helsinki Groups and persecute their members ruthlessly. Armenian Helsinki Group members suffer such persecution as well.

Group leader Eduard Arutyunyan is subjected to threats of incarceration in a psychiatric hospital. I am a victim of a smear campaign in the press. On May 5, 1977, the newspaper Sovetakan Aiastan printed an article entitled "The False Prophet." On June 9, 1977, officials searched me illegally at Erevan Airport and took away my passport which they have not yet returned (over four months have passed). On September 5, 1977, I was fired from my job under the pretext of staff cutbacks and now authorities threaten me with trial for "parasitism." I married recently, but without a passport I cannot register my marriage.

The persecution of Armenian Helsinki Group members illustrate how human rights are "respected" in the Armenian republic.

I support the H.A.I.G. Declaration and, believing that the goals and tasks of H.A.I.G. and the Armenian Helsinki Group coincide in their essence, I am expressing my desire to join the International Association to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements (H.A.I.G.).

October 26, 1977

Armenian Helsinki Group Member:

Deacon Robert Khachikovich Nazaryan
5. AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDIOUM OF THE SUPREME SOVIET
OF THE ARMENIAN SSR

Impelled by the demands of humanism and in fulfillment of our civic duty, we, members of the Armenian Helsinki Group who have signed below, call upon the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR to petition the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR for the early release of the following citizens of the Armenian SSR from their places of detention:

1. AIRIKYAN Paruir Arshavirovich
2. ZOGRABYAN Razmik Artavazdovich
3. MARKOSYAN Razmik Grigorievich
4. SHAKHVERDYAN Bagrat Levonovich

We have studied carefully the sentences handed down to these men by the Supreme Court of the Armenian SSR, and we have found nothing in their activity which could be qualified as a criminal offense punishable by law. Therefore, we attest, with full responsibility, that these sentences are, in fact, the authorities' vengeance against men who hold convictions and ideals which the ruling party—Communist Party of the Soviet Union—does not share.

In a state guided by legal principles; in a state where the Constitution is not just proclaimed for the sake of political posturing, but is strictly adhered to in reality; the government should conduct itself with full respect for the law so that it may have the moral right to demand the same from its citizens. But, the Soviet government, to our great dismay, does not consider it necessary to respect this immutable principle.

Our view is not unsubstantiated, but based on the on-going "witch hunt" in the USSR—the judicial persecution of citizens for their ideological and political convictions, philosophical views, and religious beliefs.

If one were to examine the case of Paruir Airikyan, for example, one would see that he is neither a thief nor a bribe-taker, rapist nor murderer. He did not resort to extremist measures to achieve his political aims, nor did he take weapons or explosives into his hands. Ideas and convictions, the spoken and written word, have been and remain his only weapons. In combating words with prison, the KGB finds not strength, but impotence and confusion, and exposes itself before the eyes of intelligent mankind as a political force out of tune with the times, living in the past.
In coming forward in defense of Airikyan and other prisoners of conscience, we also come forward for ourselves, for our constitutional rights and freedoms. We firmly intend to insist upon these at the cost of any sacrifice, since we believe that resignation in the face of arbitrary tyranny is a disgrace meriting the severest condemnation.

We may or may not share the political views and work of Airikyan and other prisoners of conscience, but we do acknowledge their right to hold and defend any feeling or thought which is dear to them and which is directed toward the good of society. That this is an individual's sacred right can no longer be contested now, at the end of the third quarter of the twentieth century. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union risks missing the train of history should it persist in its vain pretensions to a monopolistic guardianship over a scientific formula of social development. Alas, the CPSU is not the only entity which God endowed with a brain . . .

We are delighted with those of our fellow countrymen who, facing persecution and prison, nonetheless remain true to the call of their humane conscience. And, in fact, how miserable and colorless the existence of mankind would be, were there no people like Airikyan among us! If there were no individuals, possessed of a conscience, no creators of ideas and beauty, no seekers of truth or dreamers—we never would have learned the way to freedom and the stars; we would be unable to enjoy the music of Mozart and Bach; we could not gaze at the clouds from a bird's-eye view. For all of this mankind is indebted to those people in whose heads God's fire of thought burns unquenching, we are indebted to those who seek and confirm the newest and the best, who brand and crush the reactionaries and idle talkers, no matter what their "might" under any circumstances in the fluctuations of history.

We hope that our call will be heard by those to whom we direct it. We would like to believe that "socialist humanism" is more than an empty phrase, but something possessing real humanistic content.

Karl Marx had the remarkable thought which history has proven true: "Reforms are brought to life not through the weakness of the strong but through the strength of the weak." And so it is, we do not set our hopes on the "weakness of the strong" but intend ourselves to become the strong, to defend our interests and to demand respect and fulfillment of our rights.

Here we do not consider it extraneous to mention that, in the course of the last few years, as if seizing the breath of the times, many states on all continents have announced amnesties and granted release to ideological critics and political opponents of the regimes in power. A list of these countries include several dozen names well-known to the leaders of the USSR and to you, members of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR. And only our government, for some reason, is in the lead of those few who either deny—despite the obvious facts—the existence of political prisoners in their countries, or are deaf to the voices of indignant mankind.
Don't march with the reactionaries--this is our advice to you!

Freedom to all prisoners of conscience!

Long live humanism!

December 4, 1977

Armenian Helsinki Group:

Eduard Arutyunyan
Robert Nazaryan
Shagen Arutyunyan
Ambartsum Khlgatyan

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translation from Reports Helsinki Monitors III, pp. 179-180. Reprinted in Armenian Review, loc. cit. (see Note to document #3, above), pp. 425-427. Russian text carries AS No. 3217, has been reproduced in SDS 30, pp. 82-84. The Russian text carries the following P.S. (in English translation): "This is a project, which should be amended and confirmed by the Armenian Helsinki Group." Nor does the Russian explicitly identify the signatories as members of that Group. A scanning of the two versions has shown them to be identical except for those two discrepancies.
6. AN APPEAL TO ARMENIANS ABROAD

Ladies and Gentlemen, Comrades! The Armenian Helsinki Group has been crushed. Robert Nazaryan and Shagen Arutyunyan are under arrest. Our apartments are searched, I am harassed. We, Armenians, are a people who have endured over the last thousand years, the most difficult ordeals of persecution, torture and genocide. We have lost a huge portion of our homeland. At the hands of fate we have been scattered throughout the world, but we have not lost our faith in truth and justice. In our country people are persecuted not only for criminal acts, but for convictions as well. Our Group undertook to monitor implementation of the Helsinki Final Act and nothing more. With its arrest of Armenian patriots, the KGB has stamped out the ideals of Armenian humanism and free-thought. The eyes of David Sasunsk have been wrapped in a shroud, the shoulders of Mchera have sunk under the weight of a cliff and he gazes with pain and hope at his people. The honor and national dignity of the Armenian people have been turned to ashes. I appeal to the memory of Vardan Mamikonyan, David the Builder, Shiranatsi, Khorenatsi, Mesron Mashtots, the Great Catholicos Airik, Andranik and to the whole Armenian people to give me their moral support for the release of all Armenian patriots who are political prisoners, in particular, my friends Robert Nazaryan and Shagen Arutyunyan.

I appeal to all political, social, economic, and cultural organizations and to the members of the four active Armenian parties abroad to send defenders, lawyers, observers for the trials, and financial assistance to the families of these political prisoners. Peace to you, Armenians.

February 8, 1978

Armenian Helsinki Group Leader:

Eduard Arutyunyan

In 1973-1974, 18 young Armenians, 14 of whom are now in detention, faced trial in 9 political trials behind closed doors in Erevan. The following individuals were sentenced to prison terms ranging from 2 to 10 years for their national political activity and their convictions:

   Sentence: 10 years.
   Sentence: 2 years.
   Sentence: 10 years.
4. Badalyan, Levon Patvakanovich, born March 6, 1951, Student.
   Sentence: 2 years.
5. Zograbyan, Razmik Artayazdovich, born April 1, 1950, Worker.
   Sentence: 10 years.
   Sentence: 2 years.
   Sentence: 2 years.
   Sentence: 3 years.
   Sentence: 6 years.
    Sentence: 3 years.
11. Martirosyan, Samvel Ambartsumovich, born May 1, 1951, Worker.
    Sentence: 2 years.
    Sentence: 9 years.
    Sentence: 3½ years.
    Sentence: 7 years.
Guided by the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, in accordance with the aims and principles of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe of August 1, 1975, we consider it the obligation of our thought and conscience to undertake this beneficient task.

Dear friend, Armenian, no matter in which corner of the world you live, respond to our appeal, as would a dear and close relative. Contribute to this collection. In doing so, we should not be concerned about the extent to which the paths and beliefs of the above-listed individuals are right or the extent to which they correspond with our own. These are political issues beyond the bounds of our interests here.

More important for us is the moral issue of good works, a matter not only of our conscience, but of the conscience of every respectable Armenian as well.

February 1976

In Charge of the Fund of Donations:

Deacon Robert Khachikovich Nazaryan^1,2

Address:

Erevan - 51, Arabkir, ul. 17, d. 9

P.S. Four Armenian political prisoners remain in camps as of May 1977:

1. Airikyan, Paruir Arshavirovich
2. Zograbyan, Razmik Artavazdovich
3. Markosyan, Razmik Grigorievich
4. Shakhverdyan, Bagram Levonovich

Also film director Sergei Paradzhanov^3

^1(Nazaryan was arrested on December 23, 1977, and is still awaiting trial—Ed. CSCE)

^2(December 2, 1978, Nazaryan was sentenced to 5 years in strict regimen labor camp and 2 years of exile. — Y.B.)

^3Paradzhanov was released from strict regimen camp in Dnepropetrovsk oblast; he had been arrested in December 1973 and sentenced to five years—CSCE).

APPEAL TO KHRUSHCHEV BY THE ARMENIANS OF MOUNTAINOUS KARABAGH

Translated by DR. V. N. DADRIAN

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, to the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, to Comrade Khrushchev

WE, THE KOLKHOZNIKS, workers and toilers of the Autonomous Region of Mountainous Karabagh, and of the Armenian population of the regions of Shamkhor, Khanlar, Dashkesan and Shaumian of Azerbaidjan SSR, having reached a point of desperation as a result of the crushing burden of our living conditions, decided to address ourselves to you to enlist help and protection.

From times immemorial, our territory, circumscribed by the rivers of Kur, Araks and the Sevan Lake, which historically is known under the name of "Artzach," has always been an inseparable part of Armenia. As a result of the Turko-Mongol incursions, the Armenians were forced out of the esplanades, their villages and towns were destroyed and were reduced to pastures. The Armenians succeeded in fortifying themselves and enjoying protection only in the semi-mountainous and mountainous regions of Karabagh.

After the annexation to Russia, the danger which imperiled the physical existence of the Armenians of Karabagh was removed even though they were still suffering under the yoke of the Tsarist regime.

To protect themselves from the consequences of the growing revolutionary movement, the Tsarist authorities in the period of 1903-1905 instigated artificial hostilities and sanguinary massacres between the Armenians and the Azerbaidjanis.

During the first imperialist war, as in the periods prior to and after the onset of the national republics, the Mussavat government of Azerbaidjan isolated the Armenian regions of Karabagh from the outside world and proceeded to annihilate the Armenians whenever the however it could. With an optimum tightening of stamina, the Armenians of Karabagh defied the Mussavat government by defending their independence and ethnic authenticity through heroic efforts. This is the pattern of the endless chain of the misfortunes and sufferings of the Armenians of Karabagh; and it was only in April, 1920, that the Soviet regime did put an end to it.

We were not mistaken in our belief that the Leninist policy of nationalities would triumph, and that Armenian-populated Karabagh would be incorporated into Soviet Armenia. Indeed, after the advent of the Soviet regime in Armenia, the Soviet government of Azerbaidjan conceded in a declaration of willingness to cede Karabagh and Nakhichevan to Armenia. The declaration was signed and made public by N. Narimanof in the celebrated session of the Baku Soviet on December 1, 1920.
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However, this judicious and entirely fraternal decision was not carried out. In March, 1921, as a result of a treaty signed with Turkey, Nakhichevan was incorporated in the territorial complex of Azerbaijan SSR. In 1923, within the territorial borders of Azerbaijan, mountainous Karabagh was given autonomy, and the regions of Shamkhar, Khanlar, Dashkesan and Shaumian, where the Armenian population is predominant (approximately 90 per cent), were directly incorporated into Azerbaijan SSR. Thus, the Armenians of Karabagh were cut off from Armenian SSR and the Autonomy did not embrace all Armenian regions. The rights of the Autonomous region were gradually curtailed and presently are almost entirely abrogated.

The Armenian population of Azerbaijan SSR has been subjected to nationalistic policies involving disabilities and extremely unfavorable conditions of life. At the inception of the Autonomy, certain positive steps were undertaken for the development of industry and agriculture of the region. Subsequently, however, every enterprise has been thwarted, and initiated establishments have either been inhibited from functioning or transferred to regions inhabited by Azerbaijanis. On the other hand, demands were imposed upon our region which were exacting and beyond the limits of our capacity. They resulted in such desperate acts as our being forced to extricate from our beds, bedcovers and pillows wool in order to meet the quotas imposed upon us.

These hidden measures, which were intended to bring about a deterioration in the economy of the Armenian population and eventually force the latter's exodus from the region, were supplemented by acts of sabotage and counter-revolutionary operations.

In spite of the fact that large expanses of irrigated soil were at hand in some regions of Azerbaijan SSR, people's enemy Bagirof was repopulating the Armenian villages of Marduni and Mars with Azerbaijanis. In consequence, clashes between the two nationalities in these villages became imminent. Apparently, the followers of people's enemy Bagirof have not forgotten his instructions. Their objective was not only the termination of the autonomy of the region, but also the expulsion of the Armenian population of Karabagh. To this end, they relentlessly and systematically trampled upon the interests of the Armenian population, derided the workers and subjected the people in general to inexcusable hostile treatment.

Let us cite some examples:

1) The bread factory of Stepanakert has been placed under the jurisdiction of Asdam—an Azerbaijan regional center located at a distance of 40 km. In other words, it has been proposed for the purpose of planning the production of flour and regulating the quality of bread, and altogether managing the preparation of bread for Stepanakert in distant Asdam.

2) The health department of Mars has likewise been subjected to Asdam, where appointments to and removals from posts of the department for workers are initiated and medical supplies and other material needs of the hospitals and other institutions are supposed to be secured, but in fact
are not provided. The same applies to pharmacies and pharmacists.

3) The management of construction works is under the jurisdiction of Minkechaour, which is located 120 km away from Stepanakert. The immediate result of this arrangement was the removal of the best machines and mechanism to Minkechaour and their substitution by useless and antiquated implements and technical systems. The top laborers of one particular concern were flatly dismissed and were replaced by Azerbaidjanis.

4) The combine of Mars which produces silk and employs 3,000 workers (the only industrial concern of Mars) has been placed under the jurisdiction of a comparable but much smaller enterprise in Nuchi, which is 120 km away from Stepanakert. The dye factory has been transported to Nuchi, as a result of which the wage fund has been reduced and the wages of the workers of Stepanakert have been lowered. The silk spinning factories of Khnzorestan, Seyidshen, Gheshlach and other villages have been closed.

5) The sojuzpetchat department of Mars (in charge of distribution of newspapers and other printed material) has been transferred to Asdam (since May 1962). Now Asdam is to plan what we are to read. As to the workers of Stepanakert sojuzpetchat, they remain jobless.

6) The cement factory in Stepanakert has been placed under the jurisdiction of the region of Barda (60 km distance), which has absolutely no connection with the factory.

7) The Tartarkes project has been made part of the post-war five year plan, but until today has not been realized. Tartarkes is meant to solve the problems of electrical energy and irrigation of the semi-mountainous and mountainous regions. The construction of Tartarkes has been discontinued because of the construction of Minkechaour, which can not solve the problems assigned to Tartarkes.

8) A number of projects provided in the recent five year plans for Mars have not been fulfilled. Still, nothing is being done, even though those projects have been made an integral part of the seven year plan, e.g., the cake combine, the wine factory of the Gurbadkino, etc.

9) In spite of the problem of available prerequisites and necessary personnel, the auto repair plant, provided in the seven year plan for Stepanakert, has been erected in Kirovabad instead.

10) In forty years not one kilometer of new road has been constructed between villages and the regional center; nor have existing roads been repaired.

11) No possibilities have been explored for developing the agriculture of the region. The corn, potato and vineyard acreages have not been expanded. There is no increment in the rate of the growth of produce. Cattle breeding is in decline; the authorities are oblivious to the problem of water resources. Reservoirs have been erected on the banks of a number of rivers of mountainous Karabagh, but only Azerbaidjani villages are benefiting from these waters. The kolkhozniks of Karabagh have not been given the right to utilize the waters of their own rivers. Since ancient
times mountainous Karabagh has been famous for its mulberry farms which often were cultivated with great strain on the rocky slopes of the highlands. These farms were being utilized to produce spirit and doshab used for construction material and fuel. Disregarding the protest of the population, with a stroke of the pen, they forbade the extracting of spirit and ordered the cultivation of mulberries for the sole purpose of feeding the silkworms. As a result, large numbers of mulberry bushes were destroyed, and the rocky slopes became barren and useless for agriculture. Besides, the mulberry wood is known to have precious qualities for industrial use.

Mars has not been carefully studied in terms of its soil and climatic conditions; no narrowly specialized subregions were created for the purpose of enhancing productivity.

The experimental station of the region of Martoushaven has been placed under the jurisdiction of Baku. One is led to believe that the management in Mars is not interested in investigating its agricultural problems and in resolving other problems of local significance.

12) Culture and education are in decline. The low level of work in the field of education is particularly evident in the results of tests taken by our students in order to gain entrance to the higher educational institutions of Armenian SSR. The two-year Pedagogical Institute and the Conservatory of Stepanakert is a notable cultural achievement, but it has been instituted at the cost of relinquishing the Armenian Theater in Baku—in spite of the fact that there is a large contingent of Armenians in Baku.

We could go on with the description of the illegal and harmful measures and operations inflicted upon the Autonomous Region and its Armenian population. The cursorily described cases above fully reveal the abnormal and critical status of the population of the Region. It is a status which mocks the idea of autonomy, the interests of the Armenian population, the rights of Soviet citizens, and the Leninist policy of nationalities.

The aims pursued on various occasions for many years and now coming close to fruition are beyond doubt. They consist of the propensity to subordinate the institutions and enterprises of mountainous Karabagh to corresponding enterprises which are located at a distance of 40-60 km and are integral parts of Azerbaidjani regions (Asdam, Barda, Minketchour, Kirovabad, Nuchi, etc.); of transferring the institutions and enterprises of the region to the regions of Azerbaidjian SSR; of blocking the construction of the industrial concerns and of all other necessary enterprises provided in the plans of the region. As a result of all these, the managerial-administrative functions of the region have all but disintegrated.

These unilateral harmful measures have deprived the Armenian population of the region of its livelihood and wellbeing and forced it to abandon its own ancestral homeland.

This is the reason why in the last twenty-five years there is a total lack of increase in the growth rate of the Armenian population of mountainous Karabagh. It should be noted that the above-mentioned made it possible to populate Karabagh with Azerbaidjans.
It can definitely be stated that a chauvinistic, pan-Turk policy is being pursued which is at once inconceivable under and inimical to the circumstances of the Soviet regime, but which evidently is acceptable to the authorities of the Azerbaidjani Republic.

This policy has assumed more abominable forms for the Armenian regions of Shamkhor, Shaumian, Khanlar which are outside the Autonomous region of Karabagh.

The situation is unbearable. Discrimination everywhere and in everything. Our plight at present is more grave than in the conquest period of 1919-1920 effected by the Turks, Mussavats and the British. The same thing is happening now under the guise of friendship and fraternity. We have previously also protested that there is in fact no Autonomous region. We tried to explain the reasons of grievances of the masses, but were subjected to impermissible methods of treatment. For instance, Bagirof had convened a session of the Party Aktiv in Stepanakert in which he declared:

"Whoever is opposed to the annexation of Karabagh to Azerbaidjani SSR is invited to leave the meeting."

Under the circumstances, it is obvious what fate might befall any person disposed to leave the meeting. Another incident occurred just recently. To obtain explanation, only the leaders of the region were approached, and this was done, of all places, in Baku. (Comrade Suchitdinov).

The policy of discrimination and oppression is engendering justifiable hatred against the source of that policy, namely, the Azerbaidjani Republic and the leadership of the Autonomous region. The regrettable fact is that undesirable relationships between the nationalities are developing in consequence.

In these days when we are building up communism, we can not live under such circumstances. It seemed to us that the implementation of such a brutal policy of national chauvinism was incredible and impossible.

But there is no doubt about it. The steps undertaken since early 1962 have fully convinced us.

We request a prompt decision so as to reincorporate mountainous Karabagh and all adjacent Armenian regions into Armenian SSR, or to make them part of RSFSR.

We request the treatment of the Armenians in Karabagh to be attuned only to Lenin's policy of nationalities.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translation from Armenian Review, Vol. 21, No. 3-83 (Autumn 1968), pp. 61-66. Reproduced with permission. In Armenian, this material is printed in Levon Mkrtchian, Hairenakan dzainer, pp. 26-34.
9. A LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

by

E. H. HOVHANNISIAN
MEMBER OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF THE SOVIET UNION

Translated by Dr. Vahakn N. Dadrian,
Wisconsin State University

The central organ of our Party, Pravda, undoubtedly is committed
to the principle of defending justice and truth. Yet, there are among us
"advisers" who are supposed to represent truth and justice and particularly
Pravda, but who, instead of truth, are fostering chicanery and injustice,
double talk and deception. To be more specific, they are blocking the
paths of truth in the matter of erecting shrines to commemorate the martyrs,
who fell victim to the bestialities of Turkish henchmen.

TAKES A PRAVDA EDITOR TO TASK

On November 25, 1964, I sent a letter to the editors of Pravda with
the heading: "It is Impossible to Forget." The editorial adviser handling
this letter was Ikenitzky. He saw fit to argue that the publication of my
letter in Pravda could disrupt the "good neighborly" relations which were
happily unfolding as a result of the visit to the USSR of the Turkish Foreign
Minister. According to the adviser, "it is unnecessary to evoke historical
circumstances which date back 50 years"; such evocation could "inflame
nationalistic dispositions."

The question arises as to why the same adviser is not recommendin
to end the exposure of German henchmen; it is not true that such exposure
is "inflaming anti-Fascist dispositions on a large scale and thereby is
accentuating the inclination of the Germans to acquire nuclear weapons?"
Could it be that the mere mention of the Turkish genocide is arousing
nationalistic passions but the mention of the massacre of the Poles and
the Jews organized by the Germans is promoting only benign tendencies?

LINKS GERMAN ATROCITIES TO TURKISH MASSACRES

Were this type of advisers competent enough to assess the facts,
then it should not be difficult to convince oneself that the idea of whole-
sale extermination of peoples was adopted from the Turks. Hitler himself
admitted to this fact when he proclaimed, for the entire world to know,
that on the eve of his precipitation of World War II, he issued orders to
his armies to kill and annihilate as many people as possible, the responsibility would fall upon Hitler! After all, was it not a fact that the massacres by the Turks were not accounted for and no one seemed to remember them?

The bestiality of the Turks served as an example to the Fascists. Yet, men like Ikenetzky's among us, are preventing even the Armenians from remembering the Turkish atrocities. If, in the wake of World War I, for instance, the perpetrators had received the retribution that was due to them, lesser atrocities might have been committed during World War II. Certain advisers do not seem to grasp this fact. The Turkish criminals cleansed the territory of "infidels," but they were not only not condemned for this act but were even aided and abetted for it; and, following the example of the Turks, the Germans occupied new Lebensraum. Why is it necessary to accuse the Germans but not the Turks?

EMPHASIZES NEED TO REMEMBER GENOCIDE

In the past as well as present, there always emerged in the Soviet Union "advisers" who are operating as apologists for Turkish bestiality and Pantouranism. Naturally, the necessity of waging an inexorable war against the Fascists is granted; the displeasure of the Soviet peoples regarding the decision of the German Federal Government to suspend the prosecution of the Nazi's in 1965 attests to this. It is likewise natural that no one should really advocate the initiation of war against Turkey or Germany. But, should we refrain from citing the atrocities of the Turks who only recently soaked with blood the soil of Cyprus? Should we induce the victimized nation to indulge in self-deception and hypocrisy by compelling her to consign the fact of genocide to oblivion? Should we go one step further and even cynically accuse the victim-nation of complicity? All this, lest the Turks might be offended?

ACCUSES SOVIETS OF TREACHERY AGAINST ARMENIAN COMMUNISTS

On their part, however, the very same Turks resorted to cunning, as evidenced in the well calculated and shrewdly timed visit of the Turkish Foreign Minister to the Soviet Union; this visit helped the advisers of Pravda to recall the tradition of cooperation maintained between Lenin and Ataturk. I personally do well remember the real intent of that cooperation, however. With a single stroke of the pen, Stalin at the time resolved the Armenian Question which was straining the minds and the souls of the politicians of Europe.

To illustrate this crucial point, a brief historical review is called for. Indeed, upon the establishment of the Soviet regime in Azerbaijan, the people of Armenia rebelled against Dashnakzoutium, and on May 9, 1920, the Revcom of Armenia declared the government of Dashnakzoutium as overthrown. In such areas as Kars, Sarikamish, and Alexandropol where 70% of the Dashnakzakan Army had concentrated, the armed units defected and went over to the Soviet camp; the ruling power passed in the hands of the Soviets.
in Zankezour, Karabagh and Nor Bayazid. Consequently, it was necessary to liquidate the Dashnakzakan rule in Yerevan only. Yet Stalin found it necessary to do so. Instead of assisting the workers of Armenia in the task of consolidating the Soviet regime, the 12th Army was dispatched to annex Karabagh, Zankezour and Nakhtchevan to Azerbaidjan.

ACCUSES SOVIETS OF COLLUSION WITH TURKS

Instead of liquidating the Dashnakzaks, their representatives were invited to Moscow—under the pretext of "resolving the territorial disputes between Turkey and Armenia." In the same vein, the Dashnakzaks and Bolsheviks declared through the newspapers that the Russian Bolsheviks were accompanying the Turks in their march to Armenia. Indeed, the Bolshevik agitation brought about the disintegration of the Dashnakzakan Army—as an assist to "brotherly Turkey"; first rate fortresses like Kars and Alexandropole fell without a single instance of firing; of the more than 10,000 Armenian prisoners of war, not a single soldier returned—all were exterminated in Erzerum. In spite of all this, when Stalin at this very same time visited Baku and was informed by Sergo Orsonokidze of the anguish and the plight of the Armenian people, who were in need of dire help, "the friend of the oppressed peoples" calmly replied: "There is no need to hurry!"

It was not known then, in what direction the Turks would move—to Tiflis or to Yerevan? The Turks proceeded towards Karakilise (now Kirovakan); panic started in Tiflis. The people organized a demonstration against the representatives of R.S.F.U. Only when the Turkish onslaught appeared to imperil the capital of the Georgian Mensheviks, did Stalin decide that "it is necessary to rescue Armenia." The Red Army rushed to help and secured a tiny, rocky portion of the Republic involving the territory surrounding Mount Ararat—a territory which Turkey had recognized to belong to the over tormented, tortured and exhausted Armenian working people. At the same time, however, the same Turkey delivered to the sword of Turkish executioners 200,000 additional Armenians from Kars, Ardahan, Alexandropole and other areas. A certain Mikashkov was at that time also advising and instructing "to forget the past, not to return to it and accept the conditions advanced by the Turkish brothers." Thus is the destiny of the Armenian people—deceived by friend and foe alike.

INDICATES SOVIET COMPLICITY IN THE RETRENCHMENT OF THE TERRITORIES OF ARMENIA

The pact arranged between the Dashnakzakan Government and Legran, the representative of R.S.F.U., regarding the determination of the frontiers of Soviet Armenia, proved to be an empty gesture. The blame was entirely placed at the door of the bankrupt Dashnakzakan Armenia. Moreover, only through a miracle could Zankezour be retained in the sphere of Soviet Armenia. This was attributable to the fact that during the signing of the Moscow Treaty in March 1921, the Dashnakzakan leaders were entrenched in Zankezour. Bear in mind that all this happened during the Soviet regime;
Lenin was aware of certain conditions of the plight of the Armenian people. Yet Stalin, and men like Mikashkov, entered the picture and came to "help." As for Lenin, it was impossible for him to reexamine the injustices inflicted upon Armenia.

COMPARES THE MISFORTUNES OF ARMENIA WITH THE FORTUNES OF EMERGING NATIONS

Our Party is destined to be the champion of justice, and judiciousness; from its very inception, the Government has been campaigning and still continues to campaign for the bright future of the working peoples, of communism which is the most just ideology. Presently, the foreign imperialist powers one by one are relinquishing territories and their rules of the peoples; and, when never before did they possess it, millions of peoples are nowadays acquiring sovereignty. But, when one turns to the Armenian people, one sees them dispersed all over the world, and the once Armenian territories, with all the towns and villages involved, are left desolate and ruined within the territorial confines of Turkey. Are not the Armenians entitled to remember their victims and to erect memorials for the latter? Were 50 years not enough time to solve the Armenian Question? Let us suppose that it is not possible to peacefully resolve territorial disputes with Turkey—-even though it may be difficult to believe this, since with a proper perspective and the right presentation of the issues, it is entirely feasible to come to terms with the Turks, with justice and without deception.

DEPLORES "BLATANT INJUSTICE" OF ARMENIANS SUBJECTED TO NON-ARMENIAN AUTHORITIES IN U.S.S.R.

But, why is it that those U.S.S.R. regions which for centuries have been inhabited by the Armenians and have been marked as Armenian territories are not being integrated into the Soviet Armenian Republic? Fundamentally speaking, the consolidation of a people into a single territory can function as an impetus to the growth of communism as far as the spheres of economy and culture are concerned. By the same token, unnecessary clashes between fraternal peoples can be eliminated and the prerequisites of a true, and not a false, equality among the peoples of Transcaucasia can be obtained. One can not possibly explain the reasons as to why, without any justification whatsoever, the Armenian people are incorporated into an alien Republic. Why is this injustice, so blatant and naked in its manifestation, not being rectified? Are we supposed to think that our Party and Government are impotent and not in a position to take care of it? When I wrote to Khrushchev on the eve of the 20th Congress of our Party, raising this question, his reply was that the Central Committee presently cannot concern itself with this problem. How long is this lack of concern to continue?
CITES SOVIET PRECEDENTS
OF INTERNAL TERRITORIAL ADJUSTMENTS

The Crimea was ceded to the Ukrainian S.S.R. and the Steppes of Golianaja, which encompass territory twice the size of Armenian S.S.R., were ceded to Uzbekistan etc. The question begs itself as to why the Armenians cannot be reunited with their genuine kinsfolk and compatriots--within their own republican territories.

ASSAILS THE IDEOLOGY OF PANTOURANISM

Notwithstanding the ideology of Pantouranism, the Turkish people are normal people; they can distinguish good from evil, humanism from guilt and barbarism. Indeed, the massacre of the Armenians was organized not by the Turkish people but by the adherents of Pantouranism whose contemporary followers are contaminating the lives of the Turkish workers by promoting illusory dreams. The latter involve such ambitions as a Touranian federation of the ancestral lands and the emancipation from communist yoke of 50 million Moslems etc. Without the obliteration of the ideology of Pantouranism, there can be no friendship and fraternity between the peoples of the U.S.S.R. on the one hand and Turkey on the other. Moreover, the Turks must recognize the fact that all peoples of the world have the same right to live under the sun.

SUGGESTS PEACEFUL SOLUTION AND INVITES SOVIET SUPPORT

The Kemalists not only occupied Western Armenia but imposed upon us the shameful Treaty of Kars, and annexed Kars and Ikdjir. Thus, the Turkish henchmen incurred the historical onus of having forever stained the name of Turkey--by virtue of which the Great Massacre and the attendant monstrous bestialities were perpetrated. These crimes can easily be compared with the guilt and onus of the Hitlerites. The people who have been expelled from their ancestral territories must sooner or later return to their homeland. No bloodshed is necessary for this transfer. In spite of a measure of some pain, all imperialists must remove themselves from the territories which they have conquered.

The Turks cannot constitute an exception. The question could have long been resolved, had the Party and the Government concerned themselves with it. But for reasons that defy comprehension, the suffering and the agony of the Armenian people do not seem to disconcert them.

The problems of many small and subjugated peoples have been solved. The Soviet Government has been bringing her powerful voice to bear upon the issues of justice and in favor of nations suffering at the hands of foreign conquerors. But may one not ask: when her own government will intercede in behalf of the much tortured Armenian people?

When will our government grasp the anticipations of the people and cease to heed the recommendations of "advisers"?
The 50th anniversary of the Great Massacre of the Armenians will be an occasion for the nations of the world to commemorate as an event of infamy in human history. One may surmise that the U.N. too will take notice of this fact. The Turks understand well the significance of this. Yet, it is still beyond our comprehension why our Government and the advisers of Pravda are so concerned with the feelings of the Turkish Government. The Turks buried themselves in an adventure in Cyprus. Now, they are obstructing the commemoration of the Genocide. Lately, the same Turks literally annihilated the Soviet pavilion, organized anti-Soviet mass demonstrations, and all of a sudden a 180 degree turnabout—"the visit of the Minister of Commerce." One does not need to be highly intelligent to realize that this step is a deception, is a clever, political move to gain time—by way of premeditation. The same adroit maneuvers have been applied in the conflict of Cyprus—this time N.A.T.O. was used as a leverage for pressure. Alas! Our government seems to be so easily falling for treacherous diplomacy, and once more, for the nth time in a declaration is guaranteeing "the territorial integrity" of Turkey. In corners as far removed as India and Paraguay, people know that in the most savage way the Turks expelled the Armenians and that the latter must be allowed to return to their homeland. What a contrast between this position and the Soviet willingness to defend Turkish territorial integrity!

Enumerates Armenian Claims and Demands
Immediate Action

Departing from the preceding considerations and in the name of the ideals of Marxism-Leninism, I propose that:

1. The Armenian regions of Shamchor, Dashkesan, Chanlar, Shaoumian and Mountainous Karabagh be incorporated into Soviet Armenia. This step is long overdue; its realization is aimlessly being procrastinated. This, I submit is a big blot on the reputation of our regime with respect to its nationality policy. This question does not require any reviewing or examination but calls for immediate action.

2. With a provision for an outlet to the sea, the provinces of Kars and Ardahan which recklessly have been wrested away from Dashnakzakan Armenia, be annexed to Soviet Armenia. This question could have been resolved peacefully a long time ago, had our Government concerned itself with it.

3. In our age, illuminated by the ideals of the Great October Revolution and marked by the liquidation of regimes of colonialism and exploitation of peoples, the Armenians, dispersed all over the world, be allowed to return to their fatherland; they be granted their territories, within the political organization of the Armenian S.S.R. Until the year 1915, there lived in Turkey 3 million Armenians. In 1917, the population of Turkey was 12.5 million. On the basis of this ratio, of the total 767,000 km² of the entire Turkish territory, approximately 200,000 km² accrues to
Armenia, whereas historical Armenia embraced up to 360,000 km. Upon repatriating to Soviet Armenia, the Armenians in the diaspora should be ceded territories covering at least 70,000–90,000 km$^2$ and including the areas of Van, Moush and Trabzon. 3.5 million Armenians are living in the U.S.S.R. It is imperative that our Government comes to the defense of this people—not only as a Socialist State but also as a member of the U.N. as well as a Government championing the rights of a small nation. The U.N. affords the means for such an enterprise.

4. There are no, and cannot be, any limitations regarding the necessity of exposure of the savage policies of the Nazi's. By the same token, we cannot tolerate the imposition of limitations regarding the exposure and condemnation of the Turks involved. It is a fact that all the Germans know about the crimes of the Nazi perpetrators; yet, neither the Turks nor the other peoples of the world are aware of the atrocities committed by the bearers of Pantourkism.

Shrines are being erected to the memory of Turkish henchmen such as Talaat Pasha. Through the publication of false documents, attempts are being made to exonerate them. It is absolutely necessary therefore to dispense with advisers such as Ikenitzky's who are blocking the paths of truth, and to allow the publication in a limited number of those documents which reveal the savage policies and acts of exponents of Pantouranism. Pravda and other publications must offer space for such articles. Finally, for the victims of savage policies, memorials are needed—lest new bestialities be perpetrated!

E. H. Hovhannissian
Apartment 4
15 Miasenikian Street
Yerevan, Armenian S.S.R.
Tel: 6-85-54

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translation from Armenian Review, Vol. 20, No. 1-77 (Spring 1967), pp. 64-71. The date of the document is not given, from the contents it appears to be sometime between November 25, 1964, and April 24, 1965, probably closer to the former. Reproduced with permission. In Armenian the material has been printed in Levon Mkrtchian, Hairenakandzainer, pp. 47-56.

The dramatic appeal of the Armenians of Artsakh [Karabagh] to the "People, the Government, the Central Committee and social organizations of Armenia" is unique because, as far as is known, never before or since the appeal, have the Armenians of Artsakh made such a move to the Armenians of Armenia (at least no such documents exist). They have appealed to the authorities of Azerbaidjan and especially to the All-Union authorities in Moscow, but they have always been met by a cold ambiguity or by indifference. But in the present instance, the Armenians of Artsakh, pushed to the brink of despair and disaster, had nowhere else to turn, except to their mother country and their people.

The appeal was probably prepared in 1967, the date on which it was made public in the Diaspora. It was published in the following papers: Haratch (Paris) on September 1, 1967; Alik (Tehran) on September 13, 1967. A Russian translation was published in the Frankfurt/Main (West Germany) weekly Posev on September 20, 1967. We have used, for our purpose, the text published by Alik. (Introductory note by Levon Mkrtchian.)

To the People

To the Government, the Central Committee of the Party

To the Social Organizations of Armenia:

Precious Compatriots:

This letter is written to you by the unhappy people of Karabagh whose present state is more serious than it ever was, even at the time of the despotic Khans and the Moussavatists.

None of us, when he sets off from home in the morning, is sure of returning in the evening. We are dishonored, our rights and self-respect are violated. No one lends an ear to our protestations, no one listens to our petitions. We have sent hundreds of petitions to the Central Government in Moscow, to the leaders of Azerbaidzhan and the answer has been either a stony silence or a fanatical persecution directed at us and our children. At present, scores of young Karabaghites have been unjustly jailed or thrown out of work. We have reached a point when we are forced to abandon our ancient land and become a homeless, exiled mass of people. Our children are being cut to pieces while the perpetrators, not satisfied by that, are profanating even their corpses, obliging us to resort to guilty acts.
We shall give only a few examples out of the many so that you may visualize what is taking place in Karabagh.

Two years ago, a young man, Avanessian, was murdered in broad daylight in the center of Azdam. The criminal Azerbaidzhani, when asked why he had shot an innocent passer-by, gave the following impertinent answer: "I aimed at the robin, I missed and I shot him. I can pay the fine, whatever it is."

A year and a half ago, two Azerbaidzhanis, standing in front of the headquarters of the Party District Committee of Shoushi, stopped an Armenian communist agronomist and told him: "We have decided to kill an Armenian this very instant, and we have met you . . ." The man was killed on the spot. The murderer has not been punished, as yet, because he is a blood-relative of the district prosecutor of Azerbaidzhan and brother of Bailarov, vice-President of the Workers' Committee of the Regional Soviet of Karabagh.

Krisha Soghomonian, chief of Mardoun Sovkhoz, was murdered and his body thrown in the street. Two young night-shift tractor drivers of Horashed were shot dead.

The perpetrators of all these crimes have not been "identified" because they were Azerbaidzhanis.

The 10 year old son of the chief of Sovkhoz of Mardoun district, Penik Movsisian, was killed, savagely mauld, and his body abused. This time also the criminals would not have been discovered if the patience of people had not run out and if the parents of the victim had not set about finding the trace of the killers.

From the first day of the arrest of the murderers, the relatives of the latter began going about in the streets of the city, in the yard of the Courthouse and the Office of the District Committee, declaring the prisoners innocent and vowing to use money to silence the judges. For their part, the relatives of the victim sent appeals by letters, telegrams and by mouth to the District Committee, to all the responsible people in Baku and Moscow explaining that the principal evil-doer should be condemned to death by shooting, otherwise they would take the law into their own hands. This gave rise to a few incidents in the Hall and Courtyard of the Tribunal. The leaders in Baku and in the District turned a deaf ear to all this and mounted an organized campaign of provocation. Then the bribed judge, in order to hide his corruption, turned the sentence from the Court over to the street corners and read it out aloud, in a heated atmosphere, to a public whose judgement and clear mind had been clouded as a result of the affair's being dragged-out so long. And so, the organizers of the criminal act, the object of the hatred and ire of the entire District, got off with ten years' imprisonment and five years' suspended judgement.

At this point, the fire-engine turned its hoses on the enraged crowd and dowsed it with sewage-water while the guards opened fire on the father of the victim as he ran to-and-fro, carried away by his impotent
anger. When relatives pushed to the help of the wounded father, they too were shot at and 12 of them were mortally wounded. Till now their whereabouts are unknown. It was only after all this provocation that the crowd, boiling with rage, attacked the criminals, killed them, and burned their bodies.

The chauvinist leaders of Azerbaidzhan who had planned all this then intervened and added the finishing touches. The President of the Council of Ministers, Alikhanov, who had his own account to settle with Mountainous Karabagh, arrived in Stepanakert and met with all the leaders of the region. He declared that an anti-Soviet, nationalist organization existed in the District; that it had set up the murder of their Azerbaidzhan compatriots; and, that these nationalist feelings were encouraged from Soviet Armenia. After the victims were buried with full religious rites and national mourning, he left the District. Hard on his heels, arrived the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party, Akhundov, who was astute enough to realize that Alikhanov had given away the game!! Why talk of Armenian nationalism when the people who would come from Moscow would understand perfectly well where nationalism came from? "There is no nationalism here," declared Akhundov before the District Party Council. "This is a feud between two families." Later on, shaking his fist at the meeting, he warned them by saying, "Forget your request to join Armenia. Remember, Mountainous Karabagh has been, is, and will remain an integral part of Azerbaidzhazhan."

No one was rash enough to stand up and argue with him. Immediately after Akhundov's departure things became very hard and it marked the beginning of difficult days for the District and in particular for Stepanakert, reminding one of those terrible times in 1918-1920.

The center of the District has been crammed and surrounded by the Police and the Muslim soldiers charged with State Security who never stop humiliating the inhabitants by constant interrogations and persecutions. Every day, kind-hearted people and men with guts are thrown into jail. All those who protest such arbitrary measures lose their jobs and are in their turn persecuted. All sorts of renegades and traitors old and new are appointed to positions of command over our destinies. We cannot see the end of the tunnel. What we see, in fact, is the end of all that is Armenian, all that which has been preserved until today through the life and death struggle of the Armenian people.

This is the day the chauvinist leaders of Azerbaidzhan and their stooges have been dreaming of. Hand in hand, these two are bent on destroying the spirit of the Armenians. They are trampling in the mud our noble and just Cause, hoping that it will never be possible for us to get back on our feet in the future.

Armenian People, behold! One part of you, a part that has always held high your name and has preserved its identity intact, is threatened by a deadly danger!
This land, Mountainous Karabagh, already rendered helpless and feeble, has lost all means of protecting itself. We appeal to you, our motherly people, wherever you may be! You are our hope and our refuge. You have your own Government, your own Central Committee, and their voices cannot be ignored. The names of your illustrious sons have reached the stars; your sons sit in council with the mighty of the world and deal with the destinies of the peoples of the globe. It is not possible that their voices cannot reach the Kremlin. It is not possible that the leaders of our country ignore the great tragedy of tiny Karabagh.

The Armenians of Karabagh, thrown into the jaws of the chauvinistic Azerbaidzhanis by the very hands of its renegade leaders are waiting to hear your voice, the voice of salvation, O Armenian People, O our Mother People . . . .

---

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translated from Armenian. Source is Levon Mkrtchian, Hairenakan dzainer, pp. 91-96. Reproduced with permission.
A LETTER - DOCUMENT ON THE CONDITIONS OF THE ARMENIANS OF ARTSAKH

On 27 November, 1972, the daily newspaper Azdak, appearing in Beirut, published a document that looked very much like a correspondent's report, entitled: "The Grave, Desperate State of the Armenians of Karabagh." The document was accompanied by the following explanation: "The document reached our colleague 'Hairenik' via France. It gives a dramatic picture of the actual life of the Armenians of Karabagh and reflects the state of mind under the harsh conditions imposed by the Azerbaidzhani authorities." This document is, in fact, a supplementary evidence regarding the true situation prevailing in that part of the land which is separated from the mother country.

In this connection, it would be appropriate to review a few facts concerning the higher leadership of the Autonomous District of Mountainous Karabagh. Perhaps the dates of the changes in the leadership may have a determining influence in guessing the successive phases in regard to the policy followed by the rulers of Karabagh. Of course, a change in leadership does not always signify a radical change in policy. But experience has shown such to be the case very often in the Soviet Union.


It is well known that Mountainous Karabagh and, to a greater degree, the surrounding Armenian region have been isolated in all respects from Armenia and from Armenian life, as well as from the rest of the world. The few newspapers that appear in the region cannot circulate freely in other places, while no information whatsoever about the life of the Armenians living there is allowed to infiltrate to the Armenian or other presses in the world. This is true for books, also. Long researches through devious sources are thus required to extract the most ordinary facts from the region and even then, one cannot be certain of the authenticity of the information gathered (Introductory Note by Levon Mkrtchian).
The Situation in Armenian Karabagh is Grave and Desperate

Artsakh, Lesser Suni, Mountainous Karabagh--these are old and ancient names; they are the soil of Armenia, Armenia itself! But it came to pass that that land was shorn apart, detached from Mother Armenia. It was an injustice carried out after the victory of justice... but, nevertheless, hope remained; people believed that the severed part, the Armenian Karabagh would some time be joined to the whole, to Mother Armenia. The hope was there and the people of Karabagh waited in that hope... Many atrocities were committed to wrest this hope away from the Karabaghites. When the reins of power in the Republic of Azerbaidzhan were in the hands of Bagirov of sad memory, the Karabaghite could not even claim to be an Armenian, a son of the land of Armenia. All such men were publicly condemned and the word "nationalist" was branded on their valiant brows as they were taken to a place from where only a miracle could bring them back.

This state of affairs in Karabagh has become an open jaw that has swallowed all those who rightly objected to the artificial division...

After waiting for a long time, more propitious days eventually dawned. The atmosphere became lighter, the terror was dissipated, the heaviness weighing on people's hearts seemed to have disappeared. The Karabaghite began to feel more solidly rooted in his ancestral lands; he began to think more freely and express more freely his desires regarding Mother Armenia. Movement to-and-fro became easier and more frequent. There was no longer danger in showing one's Armenian identity, in expressing one's national pride. He also dared present his just demands to Stepanakert, the District center of Mountainous Karabagh, a city that for years had lain low, deprived of the strength or the possibility of raising its head above the ground. And now, all at once, it raised and opened its arms, launched into an activity of construction, grew larger and more beautiful. Soon intellectuals flocked to it and their numbers grew; they could now speak in the name of the Armenians of the District, present their thoughts and needs. Mountainous Karabagh now had its writers, its actors, its singers, its men of science and its cultural centers. Armenian social life became more lively and progressed. But, in spite of all this, the Armenians of the District were not happy with their lot because they were still severed, divided from Mother Armenia.

The new leaders of Azerbaidzhan were well aware of this and did not want to abandon the mentality and evil designs of the predecessors. They felt that the times had changed and those who protested against their anti-Armenian policies could no longer be sent to prison or to exile. Therefore, they had to find other methods of action, new ways of exonerating the one-time "criminals." They found those ways. It became easy to find excuses for dismissing people from work, for damaging and punishing party members, while such economic pressures were put on the District that people began to long for the days of Bagirov. Soon ideologists of fanatical Azerbaidzhanian nationalism appeared on the scene and filled their press and their books with the most varied absurdities. One of these stated
that the Armenians were poor newcomers on their lands; according to another, those same Armenians were not even Armenians but forcibly Armenized Azeris or Turks. Yet a third "welcomed" the so-called 40th Anniversary of autonomy of Karabagh by the following dotage: "There has been a Shoushi and there has been an Azdam, but the city of Stepanakert that has fallen in between them has never been..."

As if it is only in the last 40 years that the Armenian city has existed, fallen in between the two Azerbaidzhani cities. The glorious section of Shoushi which had been Armenian was destroyed in 1920, while recently even the ruins have been cleared away so as not to leave any evidence of their misdeeds. And now, they are proclaiming in broad daylight that the Armenian cemeteries of Shoushi should be done away with.

So that, a new campaign against the Armenians of Karabagh has started, very cautious at first but later on becoming open and unrestrained. At first, they were only talking, then they started to act, using firearms, daggers, and any other lethal means they could find. Armenians were killed in various parts of Karabagh. One day a young boy of 8 was killed, no, he was tortured, torn to pieces. The criminals were found, three Azerbaidzhanis, one of whom was the very Principal of the school where the boy was studying. The criminals were tried and the sentence was pronounced in an open-air meeting. It was a rather mild, unjust sentence and the people, whose patience was at an end, burst out in anger, lost its head and took the law into its own hands. The three criminals were burned to death. This was followed by terrible reprisals which have lasted 6 years and there is no sign of a let up yet. The prisons were filled with Armenian Karabaghites, many of whom perished in the prisons under torture. Terror spread everywhere and in different regions of the District, people were killed. In the village of Krasni, in the region of Stepanakert, a young Armenian peasant girl was slaughtered by Azerbaidzhani soldiers who remained unpunished. The entire family of a guardian in the kolkhoz at Martakert was wiped out but to this day, the criminals have not been "discovered," like those who killed by night the two Armenian tractor-drivers in the fields of Norashen. While there is no need even to talk of Shoushi where an Armenian is killed every month by knife, by gunshot, or by poison.

One of the most promising methods that the chauvinistic Azerbaidzhani leaders have found to overcome the people of Karabagh is to organize persecutions of the out-spoken and intelligent intellectuals of the District. Such a state of mind reigns in the District, such a ring of fire has been created around those intellectuals who speak out in the name of justice and are rebellious that they have left their families, their ancestral land, and their homes in search of refuge in other places. In their wake, the skilled craftsmen and the technicians are leaving Karabagh. They find no other solution to a situation that the anti-Armenian leaders of Azerbaidzhan and the weak bureaucrats of the District who live under their threat have created for the defenseless Armenian population of Karabagh. In order to make it clear as to what measures are being taken for the Azerbaidzhanianization of Karabagh, it is enough to quote the unfortunate example of the pedagogical Institute at Stepanakert.
For years on end the Karabaghites had been demanding the opening of some kind of Institute in their District. At long last, four years ago, their demands were satisfied, but in such a deceitful manner that they themselves asked that the Institute should not be given to them. Why? Because a Pedagogical Institute was set up in Stepanakert, one half of which was destined for Azerbaidzhan and for Azerbaidzhanis, those Azerbaidzhanis who didn't even live in Karabagh. But what can an Azerbaidzhan section do in Stepanakert? It became clear that it had a great deal to do, by being a unique blow that went straight into the heart of Armenian Karabagh . . .

And now, that element which has taken control of the administrative posts and functions is multiplying daily. Suffice it to mention those employed in the city police force (the Militia) who are all Azerbaidzhanis. And these are the people who will "defend" the rights of the Armenian laborers.

Armenian Karabagh is living grave, desperate days. The people of Karabagh have protested many times, they have revolted to defend their just rights, but they have always remained without protection. And why, till when . . . ? In no other republic is there so much talk of brotherhood as in Azerbaidzhan, but where is that brotherhood? Where are the brothers of the Armenians of Karabagh?

If the hearts of others don't bleed for Karabagh, if such are those who have become its brothers, then what are the feelings of its brothers of the same blood, its Armenian brothers?

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translated from Armenian. Source is Levon Mkrtchian, Hairenakan dzainer, pp. 104-110. Reproduced with permission.
Very Esteemed Leonid Ilyich:

In the 1975 plenum of the Party of Karabagh Autonomous Region everything was done to reduce to mud the accomplishments and strides of socialist Armenia. The situation has deteriorated to such a point that Taleat Pasha, the fierce enemy of the then infant Soviet Russia, the destroyer of millions of Armenians, Russians, Greeks, Bulgarians, and Syrians, was characterized in our Soviet press, i.e., Sovietakan Karabagh, merely as a disagreeable person. Such was the evaluation of the man who proved the executioner of many peoples, and who conceived and implemented the genocide of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. Deeply disturbed and hurt in their human and national feelings, a large number of representatives of Soviet Armenia at the same time personally addressed themselves to you and to other authorities strongly urging that the activities of the leadership of the Autonomous Region of Karabagh be condemned and the responsible agents be sanctioned. As we subsequently learned, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union proceeded to reprimand the party organization of the Autonomous Region for its transgressions.

The passions had abated particularly after the initiative of the Communist Party of Soviet Armenia, which conducted explanatory sessions with the party organizations of the Region thus averting all sorts of incidents. I personally interceded and set to work with the leaders of Soviet Azerbaidzhan and of Autonomous Karabagh after that plenum. The chief objective of my mission was to prevent the occurrence of all kinds of undesirable reactions which were anticipated in that inflamed climate. We all were led to think that nothing of the sort will recur again in Autonomous Karabagh itself, or in relation to it. But, how great was our nation-wide dismay when once more the issue of Karabagh was rekindled and insults were hurled to the address of Soviet Armenia on behalf of the authorities of the Autonomous Region. This happened in the recent issue of Problems of Peace and Socialism (Problemy mira i soltsialisma, No. 6, 1977), which is regarded as the theoretical and informational organ of the communists and workers' organizations of the entire world, with a circulation extending to 145 countries and covering 32 languages. To the natural question as to "Why Mountainous Karabagh is part of Soviet Azerbaidzhan and not of Soviet Armenia, from which it is but separated by a narrow strip of land?" they are quick to reply that though the Armenian Autonomous Region (Karabagh) is geographically close to the Soviet Armenian Republic, that nevertheless the Armenians are supposedly separated by high peaks. Such a contention, permit me to declare, is not only absurd but untrue as well.

Throughout centuries, the historically Armenian region of Karabagh was not separated from the Armenian fatherland by so-called high peaks. High peaks are ubiquitous in the Caucasus. But that is not the main point. The more important question that is posed is "Have the Armenians accepted the separation of the historically Armenian Karabagh from Mother Armenia,
and its incorporation into the newly created Soviet Azerbaidzhan?" Their answer is "There are Armenians who declare 'Though conditions of life may be dire there, we prefer to be an integral part of Armenia.'" What is so unusual about such a declaration? If we substitute the word fatherland for that of Armenia, I believe that every Russian, Czech, Slovak, or Frenchman who is imbued with a sense of pride and love for his or her mother country would have declared the same. Every person can proudly proclaim that even though one has no choice in inheriting one's mother country, one is willing to be accommodative provided one is not detached from one's fatherland. But the fact of the matter is that such Armenians are labelled as "backward" and "ignorant" by the authorities of Karabagh. Up to a point, we may overlook such disparagements; after all, different people have diverse conceptions regarding one's love for country and fatherland. More serious is the disparagement of Soviet Armenia as a whole where conditions are portrayed to be "dire"; an impression is created and promoted favoring conditions of life in Azerbaidzhan and castigating those in Soviet Armenia. This distortion is accentuated by the fact that it follows your own exaltation of the rebirth and efflorescence of Soviet Armenia, which you, esteemed Leonid Ilyich, described as follows: "The people, the communists and non-communists, the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia of Soviet Armenia are marvelously blending their spirit of patriotism with another and no lesser spirit which is so distinct of the Soviet man, namely with that of internationalism."

I am firmly convinced that the editorial staff of the above-mentioned monthly, which comprises the communist representatives of 53 countries as well as the authors of the article which ironically bears the title "We Witnessed the Brotherhood of Nations," have been duped, and this on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Soviet regime! One principal thing remains unaccounted for: whose interests are served by the blatant propagation of such panislamic ideals which are so alien to our regime and country? Indeed, how can one dare to disseminate the idea that "The Armenian people of Karabagh have acquired statehood within the confines of Soviet Azerbaidzhan and have accepted that status voluntarily" in 32 languages and throughout 145 countries, and at a time coinciding with the inauguration of the new Soviet Constitution? This is a crude distortion of historical facts—a double falsification. First of all, it is inexcusable to refer in a Marxist monthly to "the people of Karabagh" as a detached entity. Karabagh was the area where 280 years ago, for the first time in history, the rudiments of the Russian orientation of the Armenians were created. The concept of "Armenian people" is indivisible and total, in the same way one refers to the Russian people, or the Ukrainian people. Second, the Armenian population of Karabagh has never voluntarily accepted its present status, which the authorities venture to call its present "fortunes." These Armenians are in fact detached and separated from their mother country. Therefore, that status is in itself an instance of injustice which calls for liquidation. As the great Lenin had proclaimed: "Nothing is more disruptive for the development and consolidation of a proletarian class harmony than national injustice."
Esteemed Leonid Ilyich, this is not the first time that the unresolved issue of Karabagh is disturbing the friendship obtaining between the two peoples (Armenians and Azerbaidzhanis). All hope is centered on you as the person who can resolve a dispute and a thorny issue which for more than half a century constitutes the embodiment of injustice. The purely Armenian Region of Karabagh, which is part of the frontiers of our mighty state, with its 80% Armenian schools, with its claim for Armenian as the national language, must be incorporated within Soviet Socialist Armenia. The just solution of this problem is bound to be appreciated by other nations as a new accomplishment of the Leninist nationality policy.

Sincerely and respectfully,

Cero Khanzadian
Member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union since 1943, and Member of the Executive Committee of the Writers' Union of the USSR

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTE: Translation courtesy of Professor Vahakn N. Dadrian, Department of Sociology, New York State University College, Geneseo, N.Y. Reproduced with his permission.
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