

UNCLASSIFIED

INTERNAL USE ONLY

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

### ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

RID/ARD/RETIRED PROJECTS UNIT  
G-E-58

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

*R 10/15*

*md*

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

RETURN TO:

15.

RID/ARD/RETIRED PROJECTS UNIT  
G-E-58 ATTN: *Berny*

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3828  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL

INTERNAL USE ONLY

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

INTERNAL USE

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

### ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

EXTENSION

NO.

SR/CA/E

7168

DATE

30 April 1963

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1.

CSR/CA/E

1 May

PK

2.

CSR/CA

WJ

3.

SR/CA

C J

DC

4.

SR/COOP/SA

5.

Att:

C J

PK

6.

SR/CI/RED

7 JUN 1963

PK

7.

C J

8.

SR/CA/E

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Subject referred to in this document is Oleksander M. PIDUKHA D.O.B. 16 Oct. 1918 P.O.B. Nizhylovychi, Kiev Oblast Occupation: Literary man and teacher Was editor of Dnipro 1953-58

Attached report submitted by AECASSOWARY/29 concerns Subject's contact with 3 AECASSOWARY sympathizers in New York after Subject's arrival from Canada. Subject reportedly departed for London and Paris on 3 April 63.

A copy of this report has gone to RID/AN for indexing of Subject's name

PS  
Jul 1  
70-60/2

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL

INTERNAL USE ONLY

UNCLASSIFIED

XAAZ-14852  
SR/CA/E

SUBJECT: <sup>16 OCT.</sup> PIDSUKHA, Olexandr Mikolaevich

DATE: 15 Apr 1963

~~SECRET~~  
~~SECRET~~  
1918 P.O. Kiev Oblast, USSR  
was editor of DNIPRO - 1953-1958  
occupation: Literary man & teacher  
secret contact of assassination bureau during 1961  
Canada & New York in Spring 1961  
201-252046  
201-28

1. During his sojourn in NEW YORK Subject met on 1 Apr 1963 at 22.15 hrs on corner of 67th St and 3rd Ave KOSTIUK, Mykola; NOVIYSKYI Valentin, and STAKHIV, Eugen (the latter joined them about ten minutes later) and from there they all went in a taxi to NOVIYSKYI'S house where they were treated with drinks and snacks till 05.00 hrs next morning.

On 2 Apr 1963 STAKHIV met Subject as pre-arranged on the corner of 68th St and 3rd Ave and at 13.15hrs both went from there to the Public Library where Subject was introduced to ILNYTSKY, Roman.

At 14.00 hrs Subject and STAKHIV left MYROSLAVA'S house where Subject expected to meet some more Ukrainian emigree writers and poets. The latter were his main object of interest and he was somewhat disappointed after in Myr's house turned out only BOICHUK and ZNAENKO. Subject was also told that he was going to be introduced to KRAVTSIV, Bogdan but the latter did not arrive in time. Subject was in hurry and left Myr's house at 15.30 hrs.

From Myr's house he was brought in Myr's car to 78th St and 3rd Ave. He told Myroslava that he was leaving by plane same evening at 18.00 hrs for LONDON where he was scheduled to stay for one month. Nevertheless, he made some indication in the car that he would postpone his departure from NEW York for another day for the purpose of meeting some more Ukrainian writers and poets but not "politicians".

From LONDON Subject was supposed to go for another month to PARIS and then leave for KIEV.

#  
PIDSUKHA, OLEKSANDER MIKOLAYEVYCH

DOB: 16 OCT 1918

DOB: NIZHYLOVYCHI, KIEV OBLAST, USSR

Aerodynamic

~~SECRET~~: LITERARY man and

Teacher was

editor of DNIPRO from

1953-1958. Secret had

contact with order while

travelling in Canada and

USA in Spring of 1963

Removed from Project  
CS Classification 74-12429/3  
100-62/26  
Box 16 Fold: 1

705 #

MICROFILMED  
MAR 12 1970  
DOC. MICRO. SER.

XAAZ-14852 74-124-29/3 10/7/70

A. Topics discussed with, and commented by Subject in N's house

1. The purpose of S's visit to Canada and the States. Subject came to Canada to get familiar with Canadian and above all Ukrainian Canadian literature and its main representatives meaning also University Professors of Slavistics and of Ukrainian in particular. His trip to the States was facultative in the sense that it was dependable on American Visa and was not included in his primary schedule.

Subject was quite satisfied with his trip to Canada and mentioned quite a few persons he met there. He enumerated Prof LUTSKYI, YUZYK, YAR-SLAVUTYCH, RUDNYTSKYI, ANDRUSYSHYN.

In NEW YORK Subject wanted to see among others BARKA, SHEVELOV, LESYCH, MALANIUK. In particular he mentioned several times BARKA and MALANIUK. On the other hand did not show much interest in HUMENNA.

According to Subject he was taking advantage of a UNESCO-grant which provided a study-trip for a Ukrainian writer or poet not older than 46 years. Since Subject will be 46 next year he decided to volunteer "before he get old".

When asked how to explain his completely free behaviour in the West, moreover in comparison with other Sovs incl. for example HONCHAR or VIRSKYI, who were very much restricted in their movements, Subject replied that in latter's (VIRSKYI'S) case probably emigration itself was responsible because there were some demonstration and attacks against the Ensemble. As to HONCHAR and other official delegations, he explained, that their official character (contrary to his own which was private and connected not with a Soviet but UNESCO arrangement) was influential "on their perhaps more cautious attitude". When pressed on this point Subject stressed that he himself enjoyed full freedom, nobody was watching him, and that "old times in this respect completely vanished".

2. Stalinism, thaw, eventual return of old practices. Subject admitted that he had not yet read KHRUSHCHEV'S speech of 8 March 1963 and was somewhat out of touch with latest Soviet press. Nevertheless, he was dead sure that any return of Stalinism, in any form was impossible. The process of destalinization might have some zigzags and will be a long one but there could be no doubt that it will be finally implemented "to the roots".

In Subject's opinion, some so called new phenomena of neo-stalinism as the emigration used to describe them, were completely distorted and one-sidedly judged in the West. The latter, and above all the emigration itself, would like to see in the Soviet press and public opinion only extremely negative criticism of everything what was going on in the Soviet Union. Any positive approach or appraisal of one or another phenomenon in the past or even in the present - was being considered by the West as a portent of a neo-Stalinism. This was, however, not true because freedom of thought and discussion which surely existed now for many years in the Soviet, meant not exclusively criticizing of the Soviet reality but also its defense. In this field freedom must exist for both.

Subject himself was against those who "criticize" for sake of criticizing and always tried to see "both sides". As to Stalinism, he fully admitted its excesses and victims, and the awareness of this past in people's mind was the best guarantee against any Stalinist tendencies at the present and in the future.

3. Vinnytsia and Stalinist Purges. Subject denied in the beginning the fact that in Vinnytsia had been massacred in 1937 Ukrainian peasants. He said he knew that in 1937 there were great purges of Ukrainian communist party, of intelligentsia and of officers corps in the Soviet Army. He also knew that many peasants were deported and therefore he could not believe that they had been also shot. When countered with a convincing argument of N ( a relative of N recognized his father in Vinnytsia-graves) Subject replied: "Well, I didn't know that. 1936-1937 were most tragic years for our Ukrainian nation."

According to Subject Ukrainian emigrees stressed too much in their propaganda the Ukrainian victims of Stalinism. In his opinion one should talk also about Byelorussians, Georgians, Armenians and even Russians. The latter did also suffer from Stalinism, though as he admitted to a much lesser degree than non-Russians.

4. The Future of the Ukraine. To Subject - an assimilation of Ukrainians through amalgamation with Russians - was absolutely non-sensical. He denied the 22-nd Congress of the CPSU pretended to achieve it simultaneously with construction of communism in the Soviet Union. In his opinion, just on the contrary, the 22nd Congress emphasized the necessity of further strengthening of national cultures and economic rights of non-Russian republics.

Ukrainization was progressing and Subject was quite optimistic about it. "We fight for it at every step" were his words, "and we have great achievements". " Stalinism made deep negative inroads into our people and the war agglomerated them". He pointed to the fact that immediately after the war the main problem was to sustain economic recovery of the country. The emigrants had no idea of the ruins the war brought about in the Ukraine. When Subject came to POLTAVA with his wife in 1944 the city was one big ruin. (His wife stemmed from POLTAVA). To-day the city is rebuilt and radiates with prosperity. After economic recovery followed "Ukrainization" which gathered momentum after Stalin's death. In 1944-45 Subject when liberating the Ukraine with the Soviet Army met Ukrainian villages called at that time in Russian: Kalinovka, Grechanovka and others. The people were living in dug-outs. "Thus, before changing the names of these villages into Kalynivka and Hrechanivka, we had to get people out of their dug-outs. And we did it, without anybody's help. To-day, the people are living in normal houses and the villages are called Kalynivkas and Hrechanivkas".

When asked to specify who are those people fighting for Ukrainization he replied he meant his colleagues, Ukrainian writers, poets and intelligentsia in general. When asked what about the government of the Ukrainian SSR and the party, he refused to answer it directly and began to talk about lack of proper action for Ukrainization of some Ukrainians. He stressed that nobody forced nowadays Ukrainians to speak Russian but still many "khakhols" prefer to use Russian instead Ukrainian. On the other hand one should not bend over the Ukrainization itself. "Too much Ukrainization at once - could be harmful". He pointed out that at the present he was not controlled by anybody as to what he was doing. And he thought this will remain so. He implied that one had to be careful and modest, this was the best guarantee of further progress.

Russification of the Ukraine was grossly exaggerated by emigration. Ukrainian potential, language, literature and culture are getting stronger and have all chances for further development. At one point, he mentioned, that what Ukrainians lacked, were geniuses - in literature, science, music and all fields of human life. And as soon as they will produce them, nobody and nothing can hold their full emancipation as the nation of the Soviet Union, really only second to the Russians. In his opinion, now is the time to emanate these giants of spirit and he is hopeful that soon they will come.

Russo-Ukrainian relations had been completely distorted by emigrants. Russians helped Ukrainians to re-build the Ukraine after WW II. Thus, the Russian Republic sent to the Ukraine industrial equipment, specialists, skilled workers, and even cattle. Incidentally, this was also an explanation why there were nowadays so many Russians in Ukrainian cities and industrial centers.

Subject rejected any idea of secession of the Ukraine from the Soviet Union. Russia and other republics, but above all Russia, was the only ally of the Ukraine. Russia - in his opinion - saved the Ukrainian people from German genocide and he thought it to be suicidal for Ukrainians to break their ties with Russians. "There is no historical perspective for that at the present and only after the danger of foreign threat will vanish, we can think about separation from the Soviet Union." By foreign threat Subject meant capitalist encirclement and consequently only after construction of communism all over the world such occasion and eventual purposefulness would arise.

According to Subject "they in the Ukraine" are fighting now for re-introduction of Leninist principles into Soviet nationalities policy. If Lenin had lived ten years longer he would never admit what Stalin did. The situation would have been completely different and there had been no talk about Ukrainization or Russification nowadays. Stalin was the greatest Russifier.

The process of Ukrainization was not limited only to intelligentsia. Even working class in such predominantly Russified areas as DONBAS had been deeply touched by it in recent years. As an example, Subject pointed out that only last summer he and his colleagues had 29 recital-evenings of their works in 17 days in ZAPOROZHIA. They were heartily welcomed by workers and many thanked them with tears in their eyes for getting Ukrainian word to their plants. Subject stressed that there was nothing more satisfying than a hand-shake of appreciation of a simple worker who sometimes even used Russian words but thanked for Ukrainian words. Subject experienced that several times himself.

The same could be said about the Soviet Army. It was not to such a degree an instrument of Russification as it had been before. Ukrainians who serve nowadays with the Army are no longer low educated people who would see in Russian something better and higher. Ukrainian youth knows its nationality and is much more impervious to Russification than before WW II.

Last year Subject participated in a group of Ukrainian writers and poets who read their works to Soviet-Army units all over the Ukraine. He travelled with it from Crimea up to Polish-Byelorussian border and they delivered quite a few recitals also to Border-guards. Subject stressed that he and his colleagues read their poems in Ukrainians and met there many Ukrainians who were very grateful for their visits to the army-camps. Subject went as far in the North as BREST LITOVSK.

As to Ukrainian Army Subject thought there was need for a separate one moreover that they all were now for full disarmament and liquidation of all armies.

When Subject said something to the effect that he would like to see the Ukrainian Republic in similar relationship to Russia as Canada was to Great Britain, Subject replied that he was against it because 75% of Canadian resources were being diverted to British national income. N pointed out that the Ukraine were in a even worse position and asked what happened to 22 mil. tons of steel produced in the Ukraine last year taking into consideration that the Ukrainian Republic could have mostly used 5 mil. ton for herself. Subject replied that the Ukraine had to exchange it with other Republics for other products, and as an example he cited the fact that

in exchange for pipes delivered to Russian and other Republics, the Ukraine were receiving oil from Caucasus.

All the time Subject stressed the priority of economic reconstruction of the Ukraine which to him seemed to be a prerequisite for further cultural and political development. He proudly talked about Kiev-Metro which will go over Dniepr-River (and not underneath as originally planned), construction of new buildings, electrification of villages etc. incl. heavy industry.

The Ukraine is a state and emigrants make big mistake by denying it. They deprive themselves of a very important argument against the enemies of the Ukrainian people. On the other hand, in his opinion, there was no need for separate diplomatic representation of the Ukrainian SSR. "We don't want it because the Soviet Union represents all Republics." If Ukrainian Republic would get her separate diplomatic representations then such should be given also to the Russian Federation. When pressed more on this point he simply tried to skip the topic by exclaiming that neither Mongolia nor Bulgaria could be compared with Ukrainian Republic as to the latter's importance in the socialist block.

5. "Fathers and sons". In the beginning Subject refused to admit any existence of such division in the party or in the literature. When pinned to the facts replied that there was only a "natural discussion" of various trends in the party and in the literature which were being again distorted and accentuated by the Western propaganda. He reiterated his old theory about freedom of expression for both: old and young or "conservative" and "liberal". He also stressed that the process of destalinization will be a long one and could not be rushed. It has to be outrooted but it would be a mistake to prevent other trends than "liberal ones" to come to the fore. Emigrants make a grave mistake by identifying "real freedom of expression" with a return to pro-Stalinist course.

Subject was unwilling to specify who were "fathers" and "sons" in the party and instead turned to the literary field. Above all he stressed that in the present Ukrainian literature there were three and not two generations; old, middle, and young. To the old one he counted RYLSKY, TYCHYNA, SOSIURA and their colleagues, to the middle one: himself, DMYTERKO and others of same age-group, to the young: DRACH, VINHRANOVSKYI, KOSTENKO and the rest.

In Subject's opinion it was not true that there were any basic conflicts and misunderstandings between these groups. In this respect there was much misinterpretation on the part of emigration. As an example he cited the fact that "Suchasnist" had written at one time that Subject was the one who <sup>tried</sup> to put obstacles to the young colleagues. But this was not true because just during the time of his chief-editorship in "Dnipro" he introduced many a young author into modern literature.

On the other <sup>hand</sup>, he admitted, some of his younger colleagues went too far in their search for originality and popularity and tried to ~~exalt~~ <sup>exaggerate</sup> themselves by repudiating and neglecting ~~what~~ much of what their more experienced colleagues had achieved. But he would mainly describe it to the youngish over-zeal. This is understood so by old and middle generations and no one is going to harm therefore the youngest. Just on the contrary. They will survive and rise to giants, availing themselves also of the help of their elderly comrades. In Subject's opinion too many people in the Ukraine and in particular abroad paid too much attention to the young generation of Ukrainian poets and writers and as a result perhaps even spoiled them. They did not deserve all the big ado about them. Moreover, that paralyzing ~~extollment~~ <sup>extollment</sup> of young and "neglect" of old

was objectively unjustified and harmful to relationship of different generations.

These phenomena took place also in Russian literature. Some Russian writers went even so far as to commit deeds incompatible with the moral code of a Soviet writer. As an example he cited PASTERNAK. The latter was a very conceited and presumptuous man who did not even appear at the session at which his work was to be discussed. In his vanity and in drive for cheap foreign popularity PASTERNAK smuggled his "Dr Zhevago" abroad instead of trying to find an alternative Soviet publisher. He was an egotist, and as such did care for nothing but his own "originality". For that he had to suffer. Contrary to PASTERNAK, DUDINTSEV was a different type. He did not give up after the first publisher refused his "Not by Bread alone" and finally it was published in the Soviet Union. Incidentally, Subject was of a low opinion about PASTERNAK as a writer. Subject thought PASTERNAK was above all a poet.

Subject also approved recent critique of EVTUSHENKO. In his opinion EVTUSHENKO was wrong when he did not mention in his "Baby Yar" many Ukrainians and Russians who also perished with Jews. Besides, EVTUSHENKO is one of those who fall in love in themselves and get dizzy from cheap popularity.

6. Ukrainian emigration. According to Subject there are three categories of emigrants. The first one consists of honest and simple people who have landed abroad accidentally, mostly as very young individuals forcibly brought to Germany and then emigrated to Canada and the States. This was the most positive element and one that could supply candidates for return home.

The second category entails people like K,N & St. He thought they were looking for a new approach to the Soviet Ukrainian reality and for maintaining contacts with people at home. He was not going to elaborate too much on that group and switched over to the third one.

The latter included worst elements of the emigration. These were former collaborators of Germans, fascists, fanatic nationalists who could not return home.

7. Ukrainian Professors abroad, Slavistics, and Soviet Ukrainian Literature. Not only mass-emigration but also its intellectual elite has little understanding of processes and events that took place in the Ukraine in recent years and continue to judge Soviet reality by old biased standards and cliches. A better and more objective study of the developments in the Ukraine nowadays is a must for Ukrainian scholars abroad if they want to sustain their pretensions to knowledgeability of Soviet reality.

Subject reproached Ukrainian scholars and writers ~~abroad~~ abroad for discrimination against the Soviet Ukrainian literature. He mentioned the fact that in an anthology of Ukrainian poetry published in Canada they omitted practically Soviet Ukrainian literature and therefore were unwilling to show him this publication. Subject pointed out that Russian emigree scholars and literary men devote proper attention and space to Russian Soviet literature, lecture about it and put it forward in the West. In his opinion Ukrainian emigrees should do the same because it is in the interest of Kiev and the emigration as well. He stressed his pretensions in particular against Ukrainian lecturers at Canadian universities.

Ukrainian emigree scholars pay ~~also~~ too much importance on the other hand to quantity of individual Ukrainian publications in KIEV, in particular to those of young poets and writers. They charged Kiev with small quantities of Ukrainian

publications as contrary to Russian ones appearing in much larger volume. Subject thought this was not true because as soon as a book turned out to be popular next edition appeared according to demand for it. The same practice was with Russian publications.

8. Russification and emigree activities. When Subject was charged with the fact that even Ukrainian films abroad were sent in Russian synchronization, that majority of books and records were sent in Russian and there was an obvious discrimination against Ukrainian, Subject replied that emigrants should do the same they were doing in the Ukraine: protest. The emigration should protest against all kinds of discrimination against Ukrainian and Ukrainians. They should go, for example, to "Four Continents" and demand there more Ukrainian books, write to Kiev about it, write in their press also.

9. Cultural exchange and contacts with emigration. Subject was for cultural exchange and for contacts with emigration. They have, however, to be established on more official and formal basis, otherwise they won't be successful. He meant by that official contacts between universities, scientific and literary institutions, with an approved official status. Discussing "The Round Table" in New York Subject did not think it to be "authoritative" enough to enter into relationship with one or another Ukrainian organization in the Ukraine.

Subject recommended to send all kind of non-political literature to the Union of Ukrainian Writers and to private addresses and assured that it will be delivered. Only evidently anti-Soviet political books and newspapers will be confiscated. When asked to send Soviet literature abroad Subject replied that they all in the Ukraine were very busy with their own problems and the best way was simply to order it in advance through firms like "The Four Continents".

When N mentioned that he was proposing at one time to invite eventually Soviet poets and writers to the celebration of Shevchenko anniversary in the States but then discarded the idea as utopian, Subject assured him that this was not unrealistic and that such invitation might have been accepted in Kiev.

On this occasion the discussion switched over to eventual arrangements of cultural contacts in the future and Subject suggested to invite in the future a group of Ukrainian Soviet writers and poets on behalf of Canadian or American Universities and literary organization to visit and to give lectures in those countries. As candidates he mentioned representatives of all three generations of Ukrainian literary men: RYLSKYI from the old, Subject himself <sup>or Malynko</sup> from the middle, and KOSTENKO or somebody else from the young. The best occasion would be Shevchenko's celebrations in 1964 in the States and all above mentioned would surely find time to celebrate this great anniversary together with emigrants.

Subject saw the monuments of Shevchenko in Canada and was of a very low opinion about <sup>them</sup>. According to him the emigration makes always a peasant and old tired man out of the Great Poet. He deserved better and he thought that Shevchenko's monument in KHARKOV was so far the best. Only projected new monument in MOSCOW which will be built soon, could beat the Kharkov-one.

10. Ukrainian literature abroad. Subject thought he was quite familiar with it by now but showed no particular interest in any sort of modernisms. He also thought that there was no need to translate Ukrainian poets and writers (also the Soviet ones) into foreign languages but instead improve the publications in Ukrainian. He ~~also~~ again appealed for closer touch with Soviet literature. He was not very hopeful in this respect about old emigree poets and writers but thought the young generation should be more susceptible to "new orientation towards Homeland".

11. KRUSHCHEV. According to Subject KHRUSHCHEV was not responsible for what had done Stalin. When pressed with facts as to Khrushchev's role in the Ukraine at Stalin's time, Subject commented that "everyone had to save his own life" and switched to another topic. He was unwilling to elaborate on Khrushchev's position in the Kremlin, anti-party group etc. He only reiterated old phrases about peoples' support for Khrushchev and that "Khrushchev listened attentively to CC and the masses!"

12. UPA. "Young Guard". Vershyhora. St. asked Subject why the Soviet Ukrainian government did not rehabilitate those UPA-members who fought against Germans, as it did Polish government with regard to AK. Subject wanted to know on whose side they fought and mentioned "Young Guard". St. pointed out that the latter, or at least many of its members were contemplating joining Ukrainian underground at that time. knew He/also Vershyhora and Subject confirmed that Versh. shortly died. He assured that Versh. had had no trouble because of his contacts with Ukrainian nationalists during the war, some time ago he went to Moldavia and there died. In general Subject was not keen on continuing this topic.

13. Vinnichenko's Archive. When K. mentioned attack of BAZHAN against Vinnichenko Subject did not comment. K. continued to praise Vin. as a great Ukrainian socialist thinker and writer and said that his archives were in ~~Paris~~ France. Subject became suddenly interested and asked why not to send these archives to Kiev instead of making just photocopies of individual documents which would interest his colleagues. K and N explained that, <sup>according</sup> to his wife's testimony these archives could be returned to the Ukraine only if and when a free and objective study of them were granted in that country. In other words, not before the Ukraine becomes really independent and free state.

14. West Ukraine. In Subject's opinion the difference between West and East Ukraine was practically disappearing. He appraised it very positively and saw a mutual interaction of both parts of the Ukraine which should turned out in favour of Ukrainian people in the long run. He did not want to specify what he meant in particular.

15. Foreign affairs. Subject omitted quite keenly international politics. When asked about Chino-Russian relations he skipped the question. Again when asked whether he approved Khrushchev's adventure in Cuba and in particular whether it was in Ukrainian interest to sustain Castro's regime, Subject kept silent. He only murmured something to the effect that this was not that simple.

16. German's reputation in the Ukraine. Subject stressed the fact that in the Ukraine nowadays still the anti-German sentiments were very deep and running high. The Ukrainian people could not forget what Germans did to the Ukraine twice in the 20th century.

17. "Greetings" and "Wishes". K conveyed through Subject his best greetings to his friends in the Ukraine, among them to : KORNIYCHUK, KOPYTSIA ( K. told later N. that in 1937 K. was definitely anti-Russian and anti-~~Russian~~ <sup>Communist</sup>), and others. N. sent his greetings to G. PTYTSIA who he met in Rome during the Olympic Games.

Subject promised not only to convey their greetings but also tell exactly his friends what were his hosts' wishes, and what he saw & heard abroad.

18. "Ideological" defecton of a Ukrainian nationalist in Canada. Subject mentioned that in Canada he found some Ukrainian nationalists who were quite depressed and pessimistic about their future abroad. As an example he read excerpts from a letter which he claimed was written to him by one of those disappointed in nationalists. The author of the letter allegedly had left the Ukraine when he was 14 years old and thanked Subject for "opening him his eyes" now. He also promised "to do something for the Ukraine together with professors but if he should fail he would not feel now too unhappy because Subject showed him the real way to the Ukraine."

On this occasion Subject also read a poem of his dedicated to a "Mrs Halyna ". In this poem Subject ridiculed petty-bourgeois image of a Ukrainian Canadian woman.

19. Subject took the book "Slovo" with him. The English book " Stalin's Rule in the Ukraine " by K, Subject looked through but didn't want to keep commenting that "who could read English among my friends in Kiev ?".

20. Subject mentioned that LAVRINENKO wrote something against Subject but, as usually, he was not right. He cited it as a proof that emigrants did not know what was actually going on in the Ukraine.

21. Subject said that he knew KYZIA personally and considered him to be Ukrainian. KYZIA finishes now his thesis ( PhD) on ~~history~~ some historical topic. During the war KYZIA served with Behma's partizan-units. When St commented that Kyzia had some difficulty with Ukrainian ~~issues~~ <sup>in 1943</sup> in his speeches in New York, Subject did not answer.

22. Subject criticized very strongly "A Diary" by Lubchenko describing the latter as a slanderer. Subject ~~asserted~~ asserted that Lubchenko wrote such a bad work about the Soviet system because he was not given "all the medals that other had received".

23. When St and K described ILICHEV as a neo-Stalinist, Subject did not deny.

24. The role of Ukrainians in MOSCOW. The influence and role of Ukrainians in the party and higher administration in Moscow is quite significant and this is one of ways to elevate Ukrainian potential in the Ukraine itself. The emigration is not aware of it and cannot appraise it properly. When asked to specify on the topic, Subject replied only: "Don't forget we have also our ministers in Moscow and they are Ukrainians".

B. Topics discussed on 2 Apr 1963.

1. Encounters with emigrants. Subject expressed his dissatisfaction with elderly generation and claimed to be interested from now on in younger people. He was also disappointed he could not meet more writers and poets and instead had met too many politicians. After meeting with ILNYTSKY Subject described the former as "that politicizing librarian". Subject was fed up with politics and complained that wherever he went he met same questions and attacks against Russification, denationalization, discrimination etc.

2. Ukrainian literature. Subject stressed again that there was a great revival of Ukrainian Soviet literature and he himself and his colleagues had full hands to do "writing and creating".

He rejected any idea of eventual persecution of the young group and repeated his old statement that they will grow to giants.

When Z. mentioned DZIUBA, Subject assured that nothing wrong happened to the former, he was only sent for medical cure and now was creating again. DZIUBA'S cure lasted two months

KORNIYCHUK was not granted a premium because he did not write anything worth it. He implied there were no political complications that could have prevented premium-grant to KORNIYCHUK.

Subject described socialist realism as a general framework and goal obligatory for all more or less but stressed that it left great range for individualistic methods.

Subject admitted that Ukrainian dramatic art was now rather weak.

3. Ukrainian language. Subject complained that they had in the Ukraine same problem with Ukrainian as he met it abroad. They have to fight for purity and literariness of Ukrainian. On this occasion he complained about "archaic Ukrainian" used by some Canadian and ~~British~~ American papers.

4. Subject asked St whether St and N were journalists. Subject claimed he did not know neither SHEVCHENKO from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Kiev nor TANKINA.

5. Subject praised very highly DOVZHENKO, in particular his "Enchanted Desna-River". On the way from Myr's house he mentioned that BEICHUK did not like "Enchanted Desna-River" and he himself (Subject) wept the whole night when read it.

6. Subject stressed that he wanted to see SHEVELOV and when asked whether he knew SHEVCHENKO wanted to know which one. He was told about Igor SHEVCHENKO whom he seemed not to know of.

7. Subject seemed to be very tired and was much less enthusiastic than on previous day. As to eventual return of Stalinism, drive against "young generation" etc. he repeated his old statements and begged not to talk about politics with which he simply felt fed up.

8. Subject took no books but looked through some of them he saw in the ~~book~~ book-case. He said that many books he received from emigrants he had already sent home.

C. Biographic data.

1. In talks with ST, K, N, M and others in NEW YORK, Subject stated that he was born in 1918 in Kiev-oblast, his father was a poor blacksmith who died from small pox when Subject was 1 year old, 1937 Subject graduated from Mining Engineering Institute in STALINO, married, his wife stemmed from POLTAVA, two children, during the war served with the Army but had nothing to do with partizans, was awarded several medals but did not specify what and for what, took part in battles on the South-Eastern Ukrainian Front. In 1950's worked as editor of "DNIPRO"-magazine, gave it up in 1958 in order to have more time for his poetry, VYSHNIA was the writer who had the greatest impact on Subject and whom he considered "his formative and directing light". Subject described himself as poet, editor, literary man and teacher.

2. According to Canadian Ukrainian paper "Ukrainian Word" of 27 Feb 1963 Subject was born on 16 October 1918 in NIZHYLOVYCHI, Kiev-oblast, graduated from Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages in KHARKOV, 1939-1941 worked as lecturer at Industrial Institute in DONETSK, 1941-1945 served with Soviet Army and was awarded orders and medals. After demobilization worked as lecturer at Pedagogical Institute in KIEV. 1953-1958 employed as editor of "Dnipro"-journal in KIEV.

1948 appeared his first book of poetry. His work "Poliska Trylogia" could be considered as autobiographic.

The purpose of Subject's visit to Canada was to get familiar and study present Canadian poetry in English, French and Ukrainian, meet Canadian poets in TORONTO, VINNIPEG, SASKATON, EDMONTON, VANCOUVER, CALGARY, REGINA, MONTREAL, QUEBEC and HALIFAX and collect materials for Anthology of Canadian poets which will be published in the Soviet Union, more precisely in the Ukraine. Subject came to Canada on a cultural exchange scheme of UNESCO.

3. According to our Sources in NEW YORK Subject is a dynamic, energetic individual, "a man of European culture", self-controlled, well poised, very observant and alert, self-assured but not arrogant. Well read in Western literature. Subject knows how to skip "unpleasant questions" and hold initiative in his hand. Of average intelligence but skilled in dialectics.

Subject behaved demonstratively freely, stressed lack of any control as to his movements, and presented it as the proof of new atmosphere in Soviet Ukraine.

Politically - Ukrainian communist, great patriot of Ukrainian culture and language, ready and willing to fight for his people, but at the same time identifying the interests of his nation with that of communist Soviet system and consequently orientated pro-Russian. In brief; national communist in culture, and loyal Soviet in politics. At least this is what he pretends to be.

In the present set-up of colliding ideological tendencies his political profile could be construed as middle of the road with preference for revised and tempered moderate "conservatism".

One of Subject's methods to escape embarrassing questions seemed to be getting somewhat emotional and recite his own poems. Thus when pressed on the status of Ukrainian language in the Soviet Union, Subject finally started to read his own rather patriotic poem "Language". The same happened when Subject was asked some unpleasant questions about Lenin's nationalities policy. He replied with his poem about ~~Ilich~~ Volodimir Ilich.

D. VERETENCHENKO of Detroit. When in Canada Subject expressed the wish to see eventually his friend or good acquaintance VERETENCHENKO. Our Source visited VERETENCHENKO who claimed to know little about Subject and remembered only his first anthology from war-period. Ver. did not know about Subject's sojourn in Canada and the news about Subject's willingness to see him received rather coldly.

Ver. himself is little interested in Ukrainian activities. Only his wife <sup>a</sup> teaches in Ukrainian School in Detroit.