

Subject: D & P

Source : X & C.

Date : 23 Dec 1966

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

1. This is a report on the meeting held at home of Eugene STAKHIV in Forest Hills, Queens, in the evening of 15 Dec 1966. Present were: Ivan DRACH, Dmytro PAVLYCHKO (they came in a chauffeured Mission car, which, according to PAVLYCHKO, left after dropping them off), HOLUBNYCHY, KAMINSKY, CHOMIAK, and STAKHIV. Mrs STAKHIV took part in the talks at intervals between her chores in the kitchen.

The meeting was arranged about a week in advance, as the parting discussion between the poets and the Round Table Club leaders. Kaminsky was just a member of the Club. Very little time was wasted on formalities, therefore, and the participants got to serious discussion almost immediately.

2. HOLUBNYCHY opened the discussion, as president of the Round Table Club. He summarized what he termed was his own and his colleagues' views on the poets' stay in the States. He said plainly, that the various appearances the poets made, outside the United Nations, were in fact arranged by the Club, or its members. For the benefit of future such visits, HOLUBNYCHY suggested to the poets that they let it be known in the Ukraine, so that the Club would not have any difficulties in arranging other appearances and events. At the same time there should be no misunderstanding as to political "profile" of the Club, i.e. the poets as well as their people should have no doubts about the national independist position of the Club and must not confuse it with "progressives" or individuals like Kosach.

HOLUBNYCHY also informed them that it is not wise to visit homes here in company of the UN Mission officials, as Pavlychko and Drach have done it on several occasions, and he rebuked them for inviting two editors of local communist newspapers (TOLOPKO and Dr LEVYTSKY) to the Columbia evening, without first clearing it with the organizers.

216
144-2413-1 ✓

See account book of papers

23 Dec

Here the poets showed some offence. Pavlychko explained that he invited the communist editors, to show them how the academic world in America receives the poets from Kiev, or more simply to impress them. Also to show them that the poetry of young generation finds proper appreciation in the American academic world whereas quite often in Kiev and among progressives this is not the case. Also to show them that "nationalists" have access to the American academic world whereas "progressives" could not even dream of it.

DRACH was offended by Holubnychy's statement about the role of the Club in arranging their appearances. "I don't like it when someone gives you something, and then keeps reminding you of it," he said. This misunderstanding was later clarified, and the evening ended amiably.

In connection with what Holubnychy had said, Pavlychko asked him whether it was also he, who told Hryhori KOSTIUK not to arrange for the poets a farewell party, set for the next evening. HOLUBNYCHY explained that such a party could not be arranged by the president of the Ukrainian writers association in exile, at the time when Ukrainian writers and intellectuals are imprisoned in the Ukraine, and especially after the Foreign Minister BILOKOLOS failed to show up, without any explanation, for a pre-arranged interview with the Round Table Club people.

Pavlychko simply acknowledged the first part, and as for BILOKOLOS, he explained that the new minister is very new at this game, and he probably was simply frightened by the questions submitted in advance. Later on he added that in his opinion it was better to submit different "less sharp" questions and then surprise him with proper ones. This was said by Pavlychko half jokingly.

Summarizing Holubnychy stressed that the Round Table Club was ready to serve as a forum for further development of cultural contacts with the Ukraine provided the other side (in Kiev) would properly behave and not misuse those contacts for other than cultural relations.

Kaminsky added that a further development of those contacts will also depend on positive changes in the Ukraine itself, i.e. on new developments favorable for Ukrainians not only in cultural but in political domain as well.

Without those changes there were no chances that contacts could really develop.

Holubnychy also suggested that for further development of contacts it would be better to establish a regular USA -Ukraine Friendship society, with ethnic American participation. He said that if an initiative for such society were to come from Ukraine, the Club could help establish the American side of it.

3. Holubnych et al. spoke also about Ukraine's diplomatic representation in the USA and Canada. They all agreed that the very desirable establishment of an embassy is out of the question at present, but a consulate would help, and at the very least, it could be expected that a Ukrainian cultural attache be attached to the Soviet embassy. Pavlychko stressed that he was very much in favor of the latter two proposals and will present ~~xx~~^{them} in Kiev. He also said that when he returns he intends to deliver a three-hour talk based on his observations in America, to the CC CPUkraine. On this occasion he was full of praises for ~~xxxxx~~ emigre intellectuals mentioning in particular PRITSAK and the fact that the Noble Committee had asked him for his opinion on various Noble prize candidates. "I got the copy of the letter of the Noble Committee and I will show it to Shelest himself to show him what people there are abroad", he concluded.

4. Replying to Holubnychy's and others' "expose" PAVLYCHKO said that he wanted to begin with what Kaminsky said about basic conditions for future contacts and maintained that things are on a way ~~of~~. He mentioned several cultural advances. Kaminsky broke in with a statement, that culture is not enough, that without political advances, any cultural achievements may be lost overnight. To correct the horrible results of Stalinist nationalities policy and neutralize the present Russification ~~drive~~, an officially different policy is to be proclaimed in form of official government and party decrees. A few such decrees and the opposition still prevailing in Ukraine to things Ukrainian would be stopped at once, he said. PAVLYCHKO replied that the process of Ukrainization can not be decreed because it would engender stronger resistance of Russian chauvinists in the Ukraine. STAKHIV interjected that under the circumstances the Soviet government would have to choose between the Ukrainian people of

36 million and Russian minority in the Ukraine of 7 or 8 million. Pavlychko did not object and said something to the effect that actually sooner or later things will come to a decreed Ukrainization. Then he, and Drach kept referring to the last congress of Ukraine's writer as one indication that Ukrainization is now in progress. Pavlychko said: "Don't think that what was said at the Congress applies only to writers. Our writers carry the word down to the grassroots level. After the Congress, say, a writer comes to a factory, and sees there a sign in Russian. He'll go to the manager, and tell him 'Look man, take this down. Don't you realize this sign is out of place in a Ukrainian plant?'"

DRACH brought up HONCHAR'S statement at the congress of writers, about "national dignity" and said that even three years ago a person would be accused of bourgeois nationalism for mentioning such things, yet HONCHAR did say it this year, proving that Ukrainization was in progress

HOLUBNYCHY raised the question of the "amalgamation of nations" and asserted that this was a simplified unscholarly "theory" concocted to cover up the Russification of non-Russian nations. Neither Pavlychko nor Drach objected.

5. Kaminsky mentioned that even now, after 25 years, trials are being held in Ukraine, of former nationalist underground members, but none of the NKVD members who are very much guilty of crimes committed in the Ukraine during and after the war, also in fight with Ukrainian Underground. He said it is high time that those people were tried. STAKHIV also told them that it was ironical that the German chiftain in Ukraine - Koch - was tried in Poland and not in Ukraine, when most of his crimes were committed there. STAKHIV suggested that the reason Ukraine did not try Koch was to cover up the fact that thousands of Ukrainians died under German occupation because they opposed the regime and the Ukrainian nationalists were in front of this fight against German occupants.

Pavlychko replied that the matter of trials of KGBists was a very delicate one, some of them had already been punished, but admittedly not in the context mentioned by Kaminsky.

" The trouble is - Pavlychko said - that you would have to try not only lieutenants ~~and~~ captains or ordinary members of troikas but those higher above them in the first order. And those are still there, on high positions, and obviously are not going to harm themselves".

6. STAKHIV brought up the problem of Ukrainian minorities in Russian Federalist Republic and in the satellites. He pointed out that when the Rumanians were oppressing the Hungarian minority in Rumania, KADAR spoke up in the Hungarians' defence, but when Ukrainian minorities in Rumania and other satellite countries suffered injustices from the regime of these countries, the Ukrainian government and ~~party~~ party said they could not do anything about it, because this would mean interfering in the internal affairs of these countries.

Pavlychko admitted that this was not right and said something to the effect "you can't do all at once".

7. As throughout their stay here, PAVLYCHKO once again brought up the need for a Ukrainian newspaper in America, which would be neutral, and which would be read by Ukrainian intellectuals here. His main point was that also Ukrainian writers in Ukraine could contribute to it. This would also help to introduce emigre writers and intellectuals to Ukrainian milieu in Ukraine and use emigre elements for Ukrainization.

Pavlychko was told they should forget about selling this idea, because it would not go. HOLUBNYCHY suggested they arrange such a newspaper with the progressives in Canada. Kaminsky criticized them for a deliberate tendency to eliminate all political in emigres while they themselves stick all the time to their political line. He mentioned some of their public statements and also attacked them for ~~at~~ a tendency to discriminate even inside the New Yorker group. He meant in particular Emma Andiyevska whom they were not going to publish while encouraging others to co-operate with them. They must understand one thing, namely, that for the sake of contacts or being published in the Ukraine no one would discard one's political convictions and it would be ridiculous to think otherwise.

PAVLYCHKO denied that they were not going to print Andiyevska and then corrected himself that actually when they eliminated her from "the others" it was only because her style and modernism in general would be inadmissible in the Ukraine.

DRACH said something to the effect that they had to distinguish between a Koshelivets and a Shevelov, because while the latter was only a scholar, the former was editor of a journal with a distinct political profile.

Pavlychko said that the emigres do have some good journals. He mentioned "Letters to Friends" and Suchasnist, but insisted that a newspaper is needed. CHOMIAK commented that the intellectuals don't need a newspaper, because they have things like the NYTimes, but journals of opinion are something they do read.

8. Kaminsky raised the problem of Russian writers in the Ukraine, referring to KUVNETSOV and NEKRASSOV. Both Drach and Pavlychko spoke unfavorably about them, in particular about NEKRASSOV and USHAKOV. According to DRACH, NEKRASSOV was Jewish and showed little interest in things Ukrainian. USHAKOV and others kept also separately and minded their own business. These people live in the Ukraine, but when their support is needed for some Ukrainian cause, they decline to help. As a rule, in nationality policy, they are Russian chauvinists.

Asked about SOLOUKHIN and the Moscow liberal group, DRACH and PAVLYCHKO said that SOLOUKHIN'S defence of Ukrainian culture and language was an individual case and no one among the liberals supported him. SOLOUKHIN himself is of average caliber. Tvardovsky and Novi Mir do also not go beyond the Russian interests.

Among Jewish writers in the Ukraine, DRACH mentioned HOLOVANIVSKY as the one who had supported shestydesiatnyky, and helped Kostenko Lina.

9. PAVLYCHKO stressed that SHCHERBYTSKY was the man in the party on whom he pinned great hopes. He told the story about his removal for the opposition to Khrushchev. Accordingly, SHCHERBYTSKY refused to ~~accept~~^{deliver} corn -contingents Khrushchev demanded from Ukraine and for that Nikita sent him to Dnepropetrovsk. Talking of BREZHNEV and KOSYGIN, Pavlychko spoke more favorably about the latter, as⁴ a professionalist and reasonable man.

10. According to Pavlychko , KIRICHENKO, at one time heir apparent of Khrushchev, was demoted for his silly remark in Prague about his wish to see soon Czechoslovakia incorporated into the Soviet Union. This created a real turbulence in the Czech Communist Party , and KIRICHENKO had to go.

11. Asked about KOLASKA, Drach said with a grin that he is "an agent of Japanese intelligence". He was also asked who among the writers specilaize in attacking the migres. Drach replied that these are easily distinguished, because as a rule ,they are winners of the Yaroslav Halah Prize. Among the latests was also TSMOKALENKO .

12. When HOLEBNIYCHY was giving Drach and Pavlychko one of his books, Kaminsky remarked that judging by the amount of books they (the poets) had received by now, the KGB could easily arrange another two or three trials by taking some of these books away from the poets. Pavlychko denied that he would even give his books for such a purpose and added that as a matter of fact he personally had sewn all the bags with books and saw to it that they arrive in Kiev "undamaged". " I am not a Vitia Korotych - he continued - and I would raise a real hell should only one book disappear". He said that he was going to keep all these books in his library as he had done in the past. Incidentally, he had rozstrilane Vidrodzennia shortly after it had been published and it stood there on his shelf. "But I did not do like the recently sentenced who were reproducing copies and disseminating them among people. First of all, I went to the KGB and I told them: I got this book

SECRET

-8-

and I want to keep it if you have nothing against it. And they agreed I keep it. "

13. Both, Drach and Pavlychko said nothing derogatory about DZIUBA and KOSTENKO but in general were very reluctant to talk about them. At one point Pavlychko said that he did not approve the stand taken by DZIUBA because it was ineffective. Instead of proclaiming his ideas privately DZIUBA should have acquired a position on the CC and try to implement his goals from there.

Both poets stressed that they are very eager to get DZIUBA and KOSTENKO back into "their fold" and straighten out all the misunderstandings. Asked by Kaminsky what was ^{the} meaning of Honchar's remark about "hysterical outcries behind the scenes" in his conclusive speech, Pavlychko and Drach replied ~~that~~ that they knew nothing about it. They did not even read this part of Honchar's speech.

14. The poets said that they were urged to go to Canada before leaving this continent. Pavlychko stressed the trip was being arranged on the highest level -- through SHPEDKO. As to SHPEDKO himself, according to Pavlychko, he was not doing enough for Ukrainians. As to the trip- Globe Tours in Winnipeg is covering the cost of travel. Pavlychko assumed it was Kravchuk's idea they visit Canada.

15. Pavlychko praised KRAVCHUK Petro of Toronto, as "the man who hits the table with his fist when ^{he} comes to Kiev". Also PROKOPCHUK was O.K. On the whole, the Canadian progressives were much better than their American counterpart. By their demands for Ukrainization they helped a lot.

16. Pavlychko was of a rather low opinion about the staff of Ukrainian Mission in New York. He was particularly dissatisfied with SHEVCHENKO, a typical diad'ko who does not even speak any foreign language. "So what can you expect from such a diplomat?"

SECRET

17. On the way home KANDLYUCHY asked PAVLYONKO who the club can expect next to for whom the club should ask as possible visitors. PAVLYONKO suggested that the request be balanced, for example with Kostenko, Vankovskiy, and someone like Bazhan. Altho ga he doubted whether Bazhan would want to come to the club, said PAVLYONKO, and he may not want to get involved.

18. I. V. suggested to the poets that they should meet BAGOV while in Paris, France. PAVLYONKO agreed, but Frank said he was not too anxious, because the "American" and his "like" are more interested in Jews and Russians than in Ukrainians.

19. Several times the poets assured those present that everything they did in the US, and everything they said, was done on their own, and not co-ordinated with anyone of authority. They said they might have trouble over this but they acted as they saw it fit. They also assured those present that all their demands, wishes, and suggestions they will submit to proper people and try ~~make~~ get most of it for Ukrainian notice.

20. Frank said that the poets should talk no more about the sentenced, and that they should make use of the Union of Writers, which is not capable to do it. This strength party of which the poets should have been handled, and Frank, he himself and Frank had participated in various "actions" of the Union of Writers on behalf of the sentenced as either poet or not.

21. Frank said that the poets should not have any rivalry with BAGOV. They were starting out as rivals at one time, and BAGOV could not forgive it. Frank said that in his opinion, the position of Bagov was strong and that the poets should give up his "tapping maneuvers".

22. Reapproached for making statements about "former Gestapo collaborator" among the sentenced, Pavlychko skipped this problem and replied with an expression of his and Drach's apprehension about eventual consequences for them of the publication of their statement on the question of the sentenced in Svoboda. He implied that they could be reprimanded for that by their bosses in Kiev. It was explained to them that those present saw nothing compromising for them (the poets) in their statements and what's more, obviously they must have acted on an understanding with their bosses. Also: such statement as an official confirmation of the arrests was mandatory on their part if they were really going to induce the authorities to release the sentenced. Indirectly, this should help them to exert more pressure on authorities. After ~~that~~ that the topic was dropped.

23. Asked why the poets did not go to the PEN Club, Pavlychko replied that they simply were not keen on going there because they did not want to put themselves into an embarrassing position. The Soviets demand 15 seats for all the Republican Unions of Writers and the PEN Club is not willing to agree to it. The main point, however, is, that the poets could be asked various pertinent questions as to their eventual membership with the PEN and "we have practically nothing to tell them". "We have no instructions".

Subject: D

Source: C.

Date: 23 Dec 1966

1. This is a report on the tete-a-tete conversation Source had with D. at SPAZHIVS on 15 Dec 1966. On the side at the table, on the way to the subway, and in the subway Source had opportunity to talk with Subject separately. Following are the main points of their conversations.

2. Asked about Anatoli SHEVCHUK, subject confirmed that he was one of the sentenced. His trial took place in ZHITOMIR at about same time as other trials - in Lvov, Ivanofrankivsk, Kiev. Subject did not know who else was tried in Zhitomir. Anatoli is in his twenties, a student, and writes some poetry. His brother is Valeri SHEVCHUK.

3. As far as Subject was aware of, SVIRLYCHNY was not sentenced, he was still under investigation when released. The sentenced are in Hordevska ASSR, at the station Pot'ma.

4. After the arrests there were some squabbles inside the party and the KGB. Some people wanted to build up the whole affair to OUN-like proportions and use ^{it} for a general crack on Ukrainian intelligentsia. The others wanted to use ^{it} for getting more concessions for Ukrainian cause, and in Subject's opinion, the latter prevailed.

5. Looking at the information published in a Ukrainian paper on the arrested and sentenced, Subject said that all the data are more or less correct. (N.B. The data were from Prolog- bulletin)

6. Asked what could be done if theoretically there would be some relatives of Horyn abroad who would like to help his family, Subject interrupted Source that he knew of what relatives he "theoretically" was talking, and ⁱⁿ his opinion any attempt to help through him would only harm Subject and Horyn's family in the Ukraine. Subject saw Horyn's wife in the spring 1966.

7. The process of the announced Ukrainization won't be easy. There are still too many russified elements on high positions who will obstruct the Ukrainizations.

8. Subject said he was somewhat skeptical about the effectiveness of attacks against s.o.b.s in the Ukraine such as BELOBID because this also helped them in the eyes of highest authorities. Attacks of enigres could be quite useful for such types.

9. From those involved in Shevchenko-stain-glass-panel -affair ZALYVAKHA is at Pot'ma , SENYKINA was left in peace during the arrests, MORSKA was interrogated.

10. Asked about his grudge he had against C., Subject replied "let's forget about it". He was still interested in books and C. promised to send them through Ross.

~~SECRET~~

Subject: BILOBORODKO, Vitaliy Lvovich of Odessa Ukrainian S.S.R.

Source: Y.

Date: 22 Dec. 1966

1. Subject was born 1934 in the Paltava region of Ukraine, during the Stalinist era his parents moved to Odessa, where he grew up, and now considers Odessa his home. He is of medium height, well built, has Mongolian facial features, brown hair. Subject is married and has one son. He speaks Ukrainian well, but has a tendency to use Russian words. He is a historian by profession, and studied history while attending Georgetown University during the winter of 1965 and Spring of 1966.

2. While attending Georgetown University Subject adjusted rapidly to his new surroundings, he was the captain of the volleyball team in the International House where he lived, and quickly picked up American mannerisms and dress. Politically Subject avoided controversial topics of discussion and when cornered changed the theme of the conversation to banal matters. When asked to say a few words on the occasion of the signing of a renewal of the cultural exchange program by the Soviet and American governments, by the Voice of America radio program he refused. Subject often visited the Soviet embassy in Washington to "receive his allotment of whisky" as he put it.

3. He was not interested in Ukrainian affairs, and when asked if he as a historian was interested in Khmelnytsky, he replied that he was not, but added that he knew of students in Odessa University, who studied Khmelnytsky and his era. Furthermore these students spoke only Ukrainian among themselves, this fact was not understandable to Subject. While in Washington, Subject was working on a paper entitled "Russian Alaska", he did research in the library of Congress copying and photographing documents from the "Manuscript Division".

~~SECRET~~