DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

19 Dec 61

SUBJECT: Talk with S of 7 Dec 1961

DATE: 17 Dec 1961 (Notes were made during and after the talk)

1. According to his previous promise S commented and criticized the Prologue-publication he had the opportunity to read. With a few exceptions his opinion about them was, in general, positive. Moreover, in comparison with some other emigree-publications he was shown here. In particular S was very critical about "Shlakh peremohy", "Ukrainski Visti" and "Ukrainske slovo" (A Paris-ne-sa-paper whose title S was unable to remember exactly). "Hrystiyanskyi holos" was to him unworthy of any commenting at all. Even its language seemed to be archaic just like its contents.

"Shlakh peremohy" seemed to be an irresponsible example of yellow press in its worst edition. Besides, its political line is out of date, inconsistent and incompatible with political realities both - in the Ukraine and abroad, protective and misinformative. It has nothing but artificial bellicose propaganda and empty phraseology. It is reactionary [illegible] mouthpiece of West-Ukrai[illegible]

[illegible]

greater importance to all concerned.

2. Before discussing "Suchasnist" in detail S agreed to comment on Prolog-pamphlets:

a. "Myth and Reality". S liked best Djilas and Kolakovskyi. Also other authors were not bad with exception of Roepke. The latter does not fit into the whole context at all. Furthermore, his article at the end of the pamphlet implies that the editors consider it as some sort of a "resume", or final conclusion and summary, of all the former presentations. In S"s opinion it was a mistake which devaluated the whole pamphlet. Roepke's tendency is to show that socialism is bad as such and therefore, by is in complete disharmony with all the others who basically stick to one sort or the other of socialism or communism. Consequently, by implication, the editors identified themselves with Ropke's views, to their own detriment.

Ropke's weakness lies not only in his explicitly reactionary liberal capitalistic convictions but also in [redacted] method and style of his criticism of communism and socialis. His criticism is superficial, unscientific, clerical, fragmentary, and one-sided. It is nonsensical to repudiate any sort of collectivism with help of doubtful deliberately arranged "arguments" picked up from the street like Ropke"s pointing out to rich shopwindows, lack of queues etc under capitalism. He lacks completely a historical perspective and has no understand [redacted] way [redacted] more and more from liberalism [redacted] and accept some sort [redacted] greater importance to all concerned.

[redacted] S [redacted] "Suchasnist" [redacted] to

2. Before [redacted] "Suc [redacted]

[redacted] Prko pamp [redacted] etc [redacted]

"Myth nd Reality" [redacted] lok [redacted] and [redacted]

b. "Ukraina - suchasne i maibutnie". The Section on program-
matical stuff of Ukrainian Liberation Movement contains too much
phraseology and demagoguery plus some reactionary tendencies.
The paragraph on " just ,free of any exploitaion social order" (point
6) is meaningless as long as this order has been not concretely
specified and "materially outlined".

The weakest paragraph is the 7th on agricultural policy.
This is a kurkulist-programme. Reservation about eventual introduction
of private ownership in agriculture indicates that the UHVR contam-
plates eventually to re-institute the class of kurkuls. S is inclined
to consider it as a concession to Western capitalists ,in particular
to Americans. He thinks that Americans are going to introduce
capitalism in the Ukraine and the UHVR is afraid to lose Ameri-
can sympathies. Hence all the vague formulations leaving open
the whole program to various interpretations. S has no doubt that
Americans would support the class of kurkuls.

In the sphere of agricultural system there should be no
compromise. The UHVR must say clearly that it is either for
re-institution of kulaks or for collective farms. In the former case
it has nothing to do in the Ukraine.,in the latter - the UHVR must
specify that it is for a genuine realization of the Statutes of
Collective Farm which [illegible] present

b. "Ukraina - suchasne i maibutnie". The Section on program-
matical stuff of Ukrainian Liberation Movement contains too much
phraseology and demagoguery plus some reactionary tendencies.
The paragraph on " just ,free of any exploitaion social order" (point
6) is meaningless as long as this order has been not concretely
specified and "materially outlined".

The weakest paragraph is the 7th on agricultural policy.
This is a kurkulist-programme. Reservation about eventual introduction
of private ownership in agriculture indicates that the UHVR contam-
plates eventually to re-institute the class of kurkuls. S is inclined
to consider it as a concession to Western capitalists ,in particular
to Americans. He thinks that Americans are going to introduce
capitalism in the Ukraine and the UHVR is afraid to lose Ameri-
can sympathies. Hence all the vague formulations leaving open
the whole program to various interpretations. S has no doubt that
Americans would support the class of kurkuls.

In the sphere of agricultural system there should be no
compromise. The UHVR must say clearly that it is either for
re-institution of kulaks or for collective farms. In the former case
it has nothing to do in the Ukraine.,in the latter - the UHVR must
specify that it is for a genuine realization of the Statutes of
Collective Farm which [illegible] present

[illegible]lication that private ownership could be re-introduced not even "by people's will". Asked by Carl why S [illegible] so much afraid of this private ownership moreover in view of his statements as to [illegible] a complete lack of social basis for kurkulstvo, S started to expound that this was not completely so because in case of war or revolution the Americans will try to use "potential remnants" of kurkulstvo to liquidate collective farms. And although the majority of peasantry and the working class will be against the re-introduction of private ownership the kurkul-[illegible] minority by its dynamism, intransigence, and enjoyment of American support can be able to force itself through. Kurkul-class should never be underestimated, it has strong re-vitalizing element which was manifested [illegible], for instance, after Germany's arrival in the Ukraine [illegible] during WW II.

Somewhat pressed by Carl on this point from the angle of "people's will" and his unjustified fear for collective farms, if, as in accordance with his statements, the majority of peasantry and the whole people would be against private ownership [illegible], S, simply replied that to him a complete rejection of private ownership is an axiom, that it is absolutely impossible to have both systems - private and collective - exist and function side by side, that liquidation of collective farms is against state's [illegible] should be taken into consideration above all.

[illegible] partial rebirth of private peasantry would [illegible] private ownership could be re-introduced not even [illegible]

[illegible] of kur[illegible]

[illegible] when S is afraid of private ownership in agriculture however small and negligible it would be so only because even these [illegible] would negatively influence the collective system, complicate agricultural policy and eventually lead to liquidation of collective farms. This would mean regress, rebirth and accentuation of new social conflicts and antagonisms, and consequently impediment and undermining of any social progress. In the interest of Ukrainian nation which suffered so much from social antagonisms in the past it is imperative to eliminate anything that could be conducive to their eventual re-appearance.

S doubts whether during a turmoil following revolution or war the people's will could manifest itself indeed. Majority and minority in a democracy are very relative phenomena. Dynamism, power, pressure etc. might benefit minority, and on the other hand majority is not always right.

Referring to democracy, as it is being outlined in the pamphlet, S thinks that it is being treated by the [illegible] as some sort of a [illegible] which an understanding that [illegible] [illegible]. In his mind it would be [illegible] the outset during any sort of transformation it cannot be implemented and moreover not at the expense of a strong viable governmental system. We can't liberate ourselves in a democratic way and [illegible] a [illegible] powerful and orderly state. Probably a dictatorship will be needed. Actually the people do not want democracy in the western sense. What they want is strong authority in their interest, a viable dictatorship of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] must [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] somewhat [illegible] French [illegible] [illegible] resources. The [illegible] should [illegible] strong governmental [illegible]

Another essential point which needs a complete [illegible] is that dealing with industrial and commercial systems. There can be no talking about private ownership, however negligible, in industry and commerce, not even within [illegible] by law framework. Working people are not interested in establishment of private enterprises which again could only exacerbate social relations. The people want elimination of exploiting instrumentum in their places of work and just remuneration. They refuse, however, any sort of capitalism which would eventually mitigate but not remove the exploitation as such.

The respective point in the program seems to be the weakest one. It also is the most negative. There is nothing to be changed in the present theoretical socio-economic system of the USSR which is sound and meets the interests and desires of the working masses. It has only to be put from theory and propaganda into reality.

On the whole there are too many generalities and propagandistic [illegible] in the program. One talks very [illegible] welfare of the people, just order etc. but this is not enough. The people in the Ukraine are used to those slogans propagated to them for 40 years in one form or another. What is needed is a practical [illegible] outline of individual [illegible] which would [illegible] to [illegible] in a direct [illegible] and one has to tell the people what is meant by these words [illegible].

[illegible] has also to be [illegible] in the program [illegible] paragraph against police-system [illegible] against [illegible] police-system against [illegible] against abuses of [illegible] etc. But at the same time we must realize that we shall have to have our own Ukrainian [illegible] and [illegible] imagine a state

without an effective police system. This does not imply that one should write about it in the programme but in such cases it is better to omit the whole problem. Otherwise, someone preaching abolition of political police fighting the enemies of the state, is either a hypocrate or an ignorant in state-affairs.

The historical and other informative articles in the pamphlet are very good for the people in the Ukraine and much more of such a material should be published.

The article on decentralization seems to be rather superficial and betrays some lack of knowledge. It is also too strongly tinged with propagandistic tendencies.

Very good is the article on "Social Justice" (I.B. No 11,1957 pp.23,24).

On the other hand (such statement as) "State ownership - the main cause of social injustice in the USSR" (pp.24) is nonsensical and simply stupid.

"Sovietske dvorianstvo" is very good and this problem should be expanded wider and deeper. I would recommend not to use the word "sovietskyi" in all cases but substitute it with "radyanskyi". Only when it has to have a pointed derogatory meaning one should use "sovietskyi".

Also some economic articles reflect a superficial treatment of respective materia. It is foolish, for instance, to say that time and not product itself should determine remuneration of a worker. Sometimes a [illegible] to be paid for his production o[illegible] re [illegible] isel for [illegible] nd not for hours of work. [illegible] are

conclusions.

It is also wrong to draw comparisons only with particular figures that are advantageous to a writer or his purpose. Thus, for instance, when writing about living standard in the Soviet Union, the latter is being always compared with that of Canada or the USA. Why there are no comparisons with living standard in Brazil or Spain? Such an attitude smells after demagoguery and prearranged simplification. To improve the living standard one has to have means for that. Production, or better to say, the volume of production, the national product, determines the living standard. If one has no cars and houses one cannot distribute them. 6 thought it was Gomulka who said that he would like to grant every Pole an abundance of food and luxury but he could not do it because simply he didn't have them. The main thing is proper economic development and this sometimes cannot be achieved at once.

Very good is the article on "Podatkovi polevchi [illegible] [illegible]" ("IB" No 11,1957,pp.27,28,29,30).

Also very usefully and positive the stuff on pp.32-33 (from [illegible] Ukrainian history).

Chapter II is in general good but [illegible] could have been [illegible]. He is a representative of pre-revolutionary period and sounds quaint. Too rightist and "too antique" for the present generation. Very good is here [illegible].

Section about "Fakty oro dijsnist'e Ukraini" (pp.[illegible]) is very good. In particular the article about [illegible].

Somewhat weaker is the article on "Halmuyut ukrainski hazety" p.57. It betrays [illegible] lack [illegible] background of press-policy

in the Ukraine. There are no direct impediment to distribution of the Ukrainian press but it's being done in a more subtle and complicated manner.

Very good is the article "De ye ukrainske wijsko ?", p.60.

The article about Russification with reference to the press- on page 61 - is again somewhat superficial and oversimplified. It reflects lack of knowledgebility and an inclination to simplified conclusions. For instance, it would be too dangerous to make a judgment on the progress of Russification in different places by comparing simply such "mechanic data" as oblast or rayon press in Ukrainian and in Russian.

Very good is the article on "Rehabilitatsiya" p.62. and on Kuvylovism.

The article on Ukrainians abroad seems to be too pretensive and too optimistic. Furthermore when it contains at the same time an enumeration of all the political groups abroad. There are absolutely too many of them and it must create the impression that there is something wrong with Ukrainian politics abroad. It substantiates also the Soviet claim that emigrees in quarrel very much among themselves and this is [illegible]

in the Ukraine. There are no direct impediment to distribution
of the Ukrainian press but it's being done in a more subtle and
manner complicated
1.60 [illegible]

It is better to tell the people the truth however [illegible] instead of creating false and unfounded hopes.

"Vidpovid' paskvilantam" is very good particularly two first articles. There was, however, no need to whitewash Ulas Samchuk whose reputation in the Ukraine remained very bad. There is no point in denying that he collaborated with Hitlerites and did dirty jobs.

Good is "The Answer to Smolytch" and not bad "Falshivnyky istorii prava" on page 102.

On the other hand the excerpts from UPA-leaflets are not "on the level" and could have been better. It was wrong to demand from the people at that time to take arms and rise against the Russians because there were no chances to beat them. This understood very well the populace in the Eastern Ukraine and therefore the UPA could mobilize only in the Western Ukraine which had too short an experience with the Soviet system.

c. "Pytannia natsionalnoyi polityky ...", by Markus and Salnetsky. Very good material and more of such stuff is needed.

d) "Na bahrianomu koni revolutsiyi" by Kravtsiv. Very [illegible] excellent. More and more of such stuff should be published.

e. "Kray i chorsylo" by Rakhmannyi. It was probably published for emigration and the Western world in general. There is little [illegible] the people in the Ukraine. Only [illegible] of the articles would be [illegible] at home, like e.g. "Those Soviet [illegible] to tell [illegible] creating [illegible]

[illegible] good particularly [illegible]

[illegible] Samchuk [illegible] The [illegible]

[illegible] Ukr [illegible] rat [illegible] be

on

socialist convictions, probably, in order to ingratiate the UHVR with American capitalists. Poltava put his view in a clear and explicit form whereas Rakhmannyi "roxmasuye".

Also on page 108 the latter exaggerates while describing the extent of UPA-activities after WW II. It is perhaps right for propagandistic purpose in the West but it would kill the purpose in the Ukraine where the people know exactly how strong it has been on what territory has acted. Consequently, this would be considered as a lie and could be also used against the Ukrainian liberation movement by the Russians.

3. Powers presented himself as a real coward. S cannot justify his behaviour and so think all the people in the Soviet Union. He is also considered to be a typical representative of Americans who are too fond of their life and comfort. On this occasion the people were mentioning the fact that they (Americans) were beaten at one time even by Germans (at the end of the war) and then by Chinese in Korea. S himself is of a rather low opinion about the courage and perseverence of American soldier. He doesn't think they know how to fight.

About a year before Powers was shot down over Sverdlovsk, American planes like that of Powers, were also flying over Kiev. The same happened also in winter 1961. The Soviet AAs tried to get them but were powerless. On the whole the Kiev AAs (PVO) equipped pretty badly and lack modern armament. The Sverdlovsk AAs was equipped with modern weapon and therefore succeeded in getting Powers down.

4. S does not believe in assertions of American papers that there is concentration of rocket bases in the Ukraine.

This is an American invention to justify destruction of the Ukraine in the future war. There are three reasons for which the American press is being told to fabricate such "image" about the Ukraine:

a) the Ukraine has a highly developed industry of a very great importance for defence;

b) the USA must look for a plausible justification of eventual complete destruction of this defence potential already today;

c) the USA is determined to knock out the Ukraine as a future economic competitor.

The USA is not interested in Ukrainian cause and it is useless to try to do anything to convince the Americans that in this case they are absolutely wrong. They have simply the Ukraine in [illegible] v should. All should be directed to strengthening Ukrainian potential in the Ukraine itself and perhaps then, eventually, also blind Americans will pay us proper attention. But S doubts because the American interests are incompatible with ours.

There are no missile-bases in the Carpathian Mountains. S knows the Carpathians pretty well but he nowhere came across a [illegible] ya zona". He knows what it is like because he [illegible] s with the Army in one of "zapretna zonas". S did not specify was and when, saying only "at one place". He also implied was not a missile-base. Just "ordinary" zapretna zona. [illegible] military [illegible] uncle told S that military equipment [illegible] the Ukraine [illegible] justify destruction [illegible]

[illegible] ure hres of r r ca [illegible] he eabould" to "[illegible]" [illegible] ngabris o Ukrainat [illegible] ove [illegible] ust [illegible] has ehind veloped f ahi [illegible] ne

5. It is a pity Beria did not win in internal struggle for Boer in the Kremlin. He was going to elevate [illegible] national elements in the party and government and his plans were very far-reaching. Although he had a bad reputation as one of Stalin's henchmen, at the same time, he was respected by many people for his brains and courage. Beria was the one who liquidated Yezhov and the only one who dared to stand up to Stalin if necessary. Thus, for instance, even before WWII Beria told publicly that we should not put all the responsibility for mishaps and shortcomings in industry and agriculture only on foreign agents and saboteurs but one had to look deeper into our system of conducting our economic life. Beria would have had it much easier to whitewash himself now, much easier than Khrushchev who had many more crimes on his record.

6. The planned purge in the Ukraine and elsewhere in 19[illegible] after the 19th Party-Congress, was primarily to be directed against Jews but not Ukrainians. Sosiura and Rylskyi were in critical situation in 1949 but they managed to survive.

7. In its propaganda for the Ukraine "Proiog" should concentrate now on material against Russification, informations about the [illegible] Congress and its consequences, mainly on internal disruptions within the socialist block, and on the program of the CPSU itself, including such questions as, e.g., why the rights and welfare of the working people [illegible] dealt there at the very end and now? [illegible] the aims of the program are positive but how is it in reality?

8. I asked Carl whether his people has ever thought about using repatriants from Latin America for political work in the Ukraine. Carl pointed to the difficulties in this [illegible] sphere but