

101-781457  
Subject: KAMIL Ivan and his wife Ludmila, their visit to Source's house  
on 30 Nov 1968

Source [ ]  
Date : 3 Dec 1968

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2D  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

1. Subjects arrived at Source's house <sup>on 30 Nov 1968</sup> at 17.00 hrs and left around 25.00 hrs. It happened that unexpectedly at the same time source had another visitor, Daniel Joseph Costello, US Navy Commander, who came to the house shortly before Subject's arrival. Source is doing some writing for Costello and they are good friends. He brought her his PhD thesis on "Planning for War, A History of the General Board of the Navy, 1900-1914" he has done for Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. Costello, born 1929, who just happened to be in New York, did not object to meet a Soviet diplomat and for two hours (Castello left around 19.00) they discussed various international topics such as Vietnam, soviet invasion in the CSSR, overpopulation etc. The Vietnam war Subject described as a policy of expediency on both sides - American and Soviet. Both sides are just pursuing their national interests. In case of the CSSR, there was no guarantee that the liberalization would not spread to the Soviet Union and therefore the Soviets invaded that country. While the USA is pursuing the policy of containing and combating the communism, the Soviet Union leads a policy of preserving the communism. On the matter of overpopulation, Subject stressed that the USA puts too much emphasis on restricting measures such as contraceptives etc instead of concentrating on proper distribution resources on the world scale.

( N.B. No detail account of their conversation is given since it is hoped there will be one by Castello himself.)

2. According to Subject he was POGRUZHASKY'S "supervisor" at the time there was an arson at the National Library of Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, in May 1964. Only one month after the "unhappy event" Subject left the library. He had no doubt that the arson was committed by POGRUZHASKY on "his own volition". Pogrushalsky was a sick man, 3 times divorced, unstable, mean, vengeful. He also was an informer who wrote reports against

evryone around him. After he was fired he comitted this terrible crime out of sheer desire for "revenge". The arson was definitely <sup>not</sup> "politically arranged". Subject's wife added that if "they" had wanted to destroy the library they could have done <sup>it</sup> in many other ways without raising any turmoil. No one would have even known about it.

3. On the matter of ~~the~~ amalgamation of nations in the Soviet Union Subject stressed that <sup>now</sup> the trend is just in the opposite direction, to the farther emancipation of nations. Whatever anybody says, it is a fact that we live in a period of development of nation - identities all over the world and this process is no less stronger in the Soviet Union than in other parts of the globe. One of the best examples, is the contemporary revival of U<sub>k</sub>rainian nation.

On the other hand he has to admit that Ukrainians themselves are to a great extent responsible for russification because, for historical "perhaps", and other reasons, they lack in many cases "proper national backbone".

But things are definitely changing for the better. As an example he mentioned that still a few years ago a scholar would come to the scientific publishing house or to the Academy and say, "I would like to have my thesis or book published but only if in Russian", today more and more people are coming to the same institution and say, "I want my book published but only in U<sub>k</sub>rainian".

Another example produced by Subject: lately there is a very strong pressure of Ukrainian scholars to work out Ukrainian terminology in all kind of disciplines.

And most reassuring in this aspect is Ukrainian youth

In the past Subject worked at The Academy on editing technical and chemical dictionaries, also worked in the library, and knows very well what is going on among the scholars and young intellectuals. Therefore his conclusions are based on "solid facts" and not just some theoretical "conjectures".

4. When Source mentioned to Subject ~~the~~ church affairs and her endeavours in this field, Subject commented that, of course, Moscow decided on those matters but "ours could do much more if they would like to". But here is just another example of the lack of "national backbone"

with many high-positioned people in Kiev who instead of going to Moscow and demand what is rightfully theirs just sit and wait for instruction from the Kremlin. Subject stressed that "general position" of Ukrainian party and people nowadays in the Soviet Union was so strong that Ukrainians could have much more than they have, and Moscow would definitely "shun" to reject their demands.

Subject commented in the same way on Source's saying that she still had no reply on the matter of 3 lady-prisoners - Zarytska, Didyk, and Hasiuk - for whom she spoke and wrote on various occasions in the past.

5. On cultural exchange Subject promised to look into this matter and see what he can do about it. He indicated that people like Source should maintain contacts primarily with writers, scholars, and artists. <sup>on her side</sup> They should avoid any political, hostile to the Soviet Ukraine, affiliations, and it would be a good idea to have some sort of organization for this purpose here, in the States. He laughed at JAREMKO'S suggestion that the best way to maintain cultural exchange was through "commercial contacts". He also criticized KRAVETS'S "concept" to put on the same level "progressive and "national emigres". Of course, the latter should be treated differently. When Source told him that <sup>X</sup>ZYBLIKEVYCH Engen of Lypynsky Institute of Philadelphia, Pa was willing to start an exchange of archival materials with Kiev but nothing came out of it, Subject showed great interest in the idea, and suggested he would go to see Zyblikevych himself. They agreed to visit Zyblikevych together on 13 Dec 1968 in Philadelphia. Subject also mentioned that beside the exchange of materials, some of emigre works could be published in Kiev. Then he added again, that the main thing was to convince "ours" that this cultural exchange was not under "a political control".

Subject promised also to check and then tell Source with whom actually she should discuss "cultural exchange", "on a solid basis".

6. Subject indicated that <sup>he</sup> did not like <sup>la</sup> KRAVETS and did not see eye on everything with <sup>la</sup> BILOROSLOS. He made it quite clear that he rated much higher <sup>la</sup> POLANYCHKO from whom he also expected some new efforts to "publicize" Ukrainian mission in the States. He ~~agreed~~ agreed with Source t

Proposed through Agency exchange of Ukrainian archival materials

*la* Wladimir A. Biloroslos Dec. 1968

*la* Engen Zyblikevych Dec. 1968

*la* Polanychko Dec. 1968

SHEVCHENKO, Polanychko's predecessor did nothing in the field of "public relations" and this was wrong.

7. Subject did not comment on arrests and trials in the Ukraine, he only nodded with his head and listened.

8. Both, subject and his wife, mentioned that their daughter was in summer here in New York and they had "some trouble" with her. Actually, they worried about her also in Kiev, "she is one of those who writes poetry but does not get always published! "Well, what can you do, such is our youth in general". "There are all kind of influences, our daughter is in <sup>her</sup> 3rd year at the University, and as you know, this is a very dangerous age, susceptible to all kind of ideas".

9. On the arrest of a stateless American resident ~~from Cleveland~~ <sup>who went as tourist</sup>, to Soviet Union, Subject commented that such people who have "something on them" like this former policeman, should not go to <sup>the</sup> Soviet Union at all. The Soviet Government is not interested in arresting such people because bad for tourism. But they have to arrest them when <sup>local</sup> people recognize them, denounce ~~them~~ and demand punishment.

10. Subject described his work with the UN as dull. He is in charge of payments for UN publications. The only consolation is that he can travel a lot around.

11. According to Subject CHERNIAVSKY was now at the Institute of History, Academy Of Sciences, U.S.S.R in Kiev.

12. Subject will see if he can get "Kamyanyy Khrest" for Source.

13. Subject is scheduled to return to Kiev in spring 1969.

14. Subject's wife taught in Kiev Ukrainian language and literature at a school, (not University).