

Soviet group at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

1. Soviet group consists of 27 men and women. According to PROKOPOVICH <sup>Belorussian</sup> there are two kinds of Soviet students: regular teachers of English and those employed somewhere else who want to improve their English. Among the latter are employees of the Intourist, engineers, and general pedagogicians. The majority of students are Russians. There are also 7 Ukrainians, "a few Byelorussians", at least two Uzbeks, at least one Estonian teacher, one Turk and others. According to KOJDU (Estonian lady) the whole group was formed in Moscow. PROKOPOVICH (Byelorussian) claimed that he joined the group first in COPENHAGEN. Some Soviet students ~~know~~ share rooms with their American friends. According to what M was told by American students it was very difficult to find "a rapport" with them. As John WANDERAK put it "they are just too stupid and too blind". Some of them go, however, to private American houses, mostly to Professors and lecturers of the Cornell Univ. visit library, will read "NOVOE RUSSKOE SLOVO", make excursions on weekends etc. Mostly they read, play cards and chess when free of lectures.

2. So far the access to Sov group was easy. There <sup>are</sup> also opportunities to talk tete-a-tete. The majority of them prefers to be accompanied by their colleagues. They "help" each other in that: as soon as M was noticed by someone to be talking to a Soviet without witnesses they soon received company.

3. TSVETKOV and KOSTYLOV seem to be the bosses. Majority avoids political topics but bosses and their helpers do not mind them. Some people are genuinely interested in learning English not only English but also as much as possible about America and the West in general. Some of them were also interested in reading American literature. One Russian lady asked for "Catcher in the Rye" by Salinger. She was given it by M. (Her name was Lina, lnu).

4. M stayed at the University from 16 to 20 July 1963. He promised to visit them again on 6 August 1963 and to help some of them as guide in New York.

See names  
added in  
develop. index & Contacts

Original  
in C  
index in  
SR 16/210

Beside "regular contacts" M arranged a twist-party at the Sage Hall for a group of Soviet students in which also several American students took part and once went with Soviet students ( 3 of them) to a bar in the city. Both "occasions" took place on 17 July 1963.

5. Their daily working "order " is asx follows:

8.00 - 9.00 hrs breakfast at Ivy Room, Cafeteria

9.00 - 11.00 hrs lectures

11 hrs to 13 hrs rest, and lunch at Cafeteria

13.00 to 15.00 or 16.00 hrs lectures

16.00 to 17.00 hrs demonstration of films, record playing etc. for instructional purposes

from 17 hrs on - free.

They spend their time reading at Sage Hall, going to the sea, taking walks in the park aso.

*The course ends on 24 August 1963.*

SUBJECT: \* TSVETKOV, Gleb Nikolaevich

d.o.b. 27 June 22  
P.O.B.

SOURCE : M

DATE : 16-20 July 1963

1. Subject is Prorector of Kiev University, Ukrainian, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, seems to be in charge of the Soviet group at Cornell University. Behaves like a higher KGB officer. Apparent age 40, 5'8, full round face, blond, balding in the front, blue eyes, rather emotional, but not talkative, plays well chess, claims to be particularly interested in the Roosevelt-~~era~~ of American history. Most of his free time likes to spend in library. M had opportunity to talk to him tete -a-tete and in company of other members of the Soviet group on 17,18, and 19 July 1963. Subject was "at once" interested in M's biographic data and "knew how to put questions". Speaks fair English. His Ukrainian is fine but sometimes he uses Russicisms. Selfassured, almost arrogant, in cases "where he was pinned down on the point he simply changed <sup>the</sup> subject and refused to give direct answer".

2. On 18 July 1963 Subject promised M to give a Book of Ukrainian songs. Next day, at 12.15 he apologized that he ~~did not~~ <sup>have it</sup> with him and asked M to stay with him for another evening. Then they would also play Ukrainian records. M thanked as he had to leave for New York in the afternoon.

-2-

Topics discussed with Subject

1. PODGORNY and recent changes in the top-echelons of CP Ukraine

The promotion of PODGORNY to his new position in Moscow - according to Subject - has great significance to the CP Ukraine and Ukrainian people in general. He will be able to do in Moscow a great deal of good, anyway much more than KIRICHENKO. Any allusions that PODGORNY might follow the path of the latter are ridiculous. PODGORNY is a completely different man than KIRICHENKO, both as a human being and as politician.

When M pointed out his recent attacks against "any appearances of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" and a new drive toward Russification, Subject rejected M's assertions as untrue. According to him there is no Russification as official line of policy and at the present one should talk about a revival of Ukrainian culture and literature. There are more Ukrainian publications nowadays than ever before, for instance, soon all works of Franko will be published, preparations for Shevchenko's anniversary in 1964 are something beyond anybody's comprehension: already now 1,000 people are working in KANEV itself making decorations, modifications etc.; more and more people are speaking Ukrainian in the streets of Kiev and other cities, also.

The ~~demotion~~ <sup>demotion</sup> of SHECHERBITSKY was not caused by any political factors and had no political implications. SHECHERBITSKY was ill, he suffered from some liver-ailment and simply could not keep up to his responsibilities. His parents were Russian but he himself felt like a Ukrainian.

2. Bourgeois nationalism.

According to Subject, the attacks of PODGORNYI and others' against Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism are fully justified. There are still in the Ukraine many banderivtsi who refused to change their attitude to the Soviet regime. That's despite the fact that the Soviet system was very magnanimous in its attitude to them.

Since Njkitia Sergeevich came to power many of nationalists were released, given chances to live like all the other Soviet people and many availed themselves of this magnanimous policy. But not all of them. Some ~~of them~~ still continue to poison happy Soviet atmosphere. UPA-bands brought much unhappiness to the Ukrainian people. Their leaders were politically blind, they fought against everybody, and Subject knew pretty well what Bandera and others did. When M indicated that UPA fought for Ukrainian state, for freedom also and not against the Russian people but its imperialists, Subject rejected all that as "nonsense" and changed ~~subject~~ the topic. Asked about political program of Ukrainian Underground he replied that he knew <sup>it</sup> but this did not change his opinion about Ukrainian nationalists. To M'S question what he thought about the Classless society as ~~propounded by~~ presented in the UHWR program Subject replied that he couldn't care less about it and when M tried to explain it to other members of the Soviet group, he interrupted him by exclaiming: "That's all very fine, but what did do ~~the~~ Bandera and others? They helped the German fascists, they are traitors to Ukrainian people, nobody can fool me ...". "After the war they helped American imperialists, they were supported by Americans who parachuted their weapons to the UPA. All these weapons are now in our museums and everybody knows that they were supplied by Americans to Ukrainian bandits..."

Ukrainian nationalists cannot claim that Stalinism was responsible for their lot. Whoever had been in Stalin's position, would have had to fight them. There can be no rehabilitation of UPA bands in the Soviet Union whatsoever.

### 3. Condemnation of Hunger 1933

According to Subject the story about the hunger in the Ukraine in 1933 has been much exaggerated. In the beginning he even claimed that there was no hunger in 1933. Then admitted that it was but was not organized by the party. There is no need to condemn specifically what happened then in the Ukraine because bad features of Stalinism and the cult of personality have

been already condemned summarily.

#### 4. Attacks against young writers, poets and artists

The party is absolutely right in attacking them. This is in their own interest and will put them on the right track. Those who repented will be published again. Only people like DRACH "this stubborn rottenness" will never be printed again. He and those like him want to teach everybody. But in fact they need proper schooling themselves.

#### 5. Mykola SEREDA

On 18 July 1963 when at Sage lobby at 20.30 hrs discussing again Russification in the Ukraine, M pointed out that he knew about it not only from the press but, for instance, from SEREDA of KIEV who told about <sup>it</sup> at a students' meeting, and who justified his defection with the argument that although he was a communist he was <sup>o</sup>gainst the Russification of Ukrainian nation.

Subject replied that he knew very well about SEREDA. The latter was a cynic. The news about his defection did shock all people in KIEV indeed because nobody could imagine that having had such a good <sup>s</sup>position Sereda would dare leave the Soviet Union. In KIEV he had all chances to make a really fine career. And therefore everybody knew that there must have gone something wrong with him. What he did was not normal. His parents suffered terribly from what he made. His mother became ill, had a nervous breakdown, then <sup>a</sup>stroke and finally died. His father was demoted from his post.

Subject spoke about SEREDA in such a manner as though he particularly wanted to impress M. Also it was M's impression that Subject as though waited for ~~the~~ a question about SEREDA.

M told S that SEREDA, as far he knew, ~~studied~~ finished his studies at Columbia and went now somewhere to work.

#### 6. Emigration

Subject knows that there are too many nationalists abroad. This is the worst human element.

They hate all Soviet. Whatever happens in the Soviet Union they twist it and try to turn ~~it~~ against the Soviet people. They say they love the Ukraine but in reality they hate her. Of course, there are also good people, good Ukrainians. He knows, for instance, LEVYTSKYI, editor of "Hromadsky Holos". The latter is a good Ukrainian.

Asked about the UCC, Subject seemed not know what it was. He heard about "Suchasnist" but did not read it. His friend SLIPAKOV in KIEV is very much interested in emigration, reads emigre papers, and he told Subject about "Suchasnist". Subject refused to comment on "Novoe Russkoe Slovo" which he reads every day in the library of Cornell Univ.

**ix**

#### 7. Preparations for Shevchenko's Anniversary in 1964

The Shevchenko celebrations in 1964 will be a great manifestation of "Ukrainian strength". In 1963 Subject spent early summer in KANIEV vacationing. At that time there was a general rehearsal of all artists' groups for 1964 celebration. Among others there was also KOZLOVSKYI. Altogether there were about 10,000 people. Emigrants will be surprised when they will learn about the Shevchenko ceremonies next year.

Ukrainian Academy of Sciences prepares a special edition of Shevchenko's works. At the Kiev University there will be a Shevchenko-room arranged by Prof ISICHUK under motto: Our University and Shevchenko. Similar arrangements and celebrations will be conducted all over the Ukraine.

#### 8. Russo-Ukrainian Relations

The friendship between Russians and Ukrainians is strong and eternal. Only nationalists are against it. The realization of "amalgamation of nations" will take some time to implement but even then national entity of various peoples will be preserved. He admitted that Ukrainians don't like Russians call them "khityly" but tolerate it when Georgians or other non-Russian do the same.

Subject praised those Ukrainian young literary men who do not find com on language with Evtushenko~~s~~ and his like but look toward "proved experienced elderly colleagues in Russian and in the Ukraine". In particular he praised SEVACHENKO (Z) and KONCHENKO in Kiev.

When M asked ~~subject~~ when Kiev will publish "The History of Ukraine" by HRUSHEVSKY, Subject replied that it never will happen because HRUSHEVSKY'S view are "against the Soviet system". M pointed then to the fact that similar "bourgeois" Russian historian KLUCHEVSKI has been recently published. Subject <sup>did not know what to answer</sup> ~~could not answer~~ and left it without any comment. When another Sov - Nocolai, lnu - tried to "explain" that KLUCHEVSKI was not a bourgeois nationalist, Subject interrupted him by stressing : " O, no, M is right, KLUCHEVSKI was a bourgeois nationalist".



SUBJECT: KOSTYLEV, Vladimir Yureevich (Vova)

SOURCE: M

DATE: 16-19 July 1963

1. Subject is an engineer from KIEV, Ukr SSR, Ukrainian /?/, married, aged 40, 6', brown combed back hair, wears glasses, rough manners, long face, rather unsympathetic, looks like a typical KGB officer of lower rank. Spoke very fine Ukrainian. Sometimes used Russicisms.

16 July 1963 in the evening Subject was introduced to M by RUDENKO who pronounced Subject's last name different than KOSTYLEV. It sounded something like MELNYCHUK. Subject gave him a dirty look and stressed: "Call me Vova, Vova Kostylov". Then he began to ask M in detail what he was doing in Ithaca, why did he come to the Cornell Univ. etc. (M explained that he was taking some exams for the purpose of getting a job here.) Same evening M and Subject sang Ukrainian songs "Bandura" etc. Subject did not know, however, neither "Rushnychok" nor "Marichka" and felt somewhat awkward when M teased him ~~xxx~~ about his Ukrainian origin because of that. In talking Subject was rather rough.

M saw Subject also on 17 July at Cafeteria in the morning (8.30 to 9.00 hrs) and in the evening same day at the party arranged by M. Whereas all other Soviet participants of the party: BURKHANOV, Marius, DOZMUKHAMEDOV, Dohalal, PROKOPOVICH, Edward, Nicolai, Inu, and 3 or 4 others enjoyed M's teaching them to dance twist and cha-cha-cha, Subject watched all the time the others and refused to participate in dances. Then he asked M for a talk "on the side". Tried to get as much as possible about M himself and even asked about the building in which M was taking his exams.

2. Subject told M that he had just received a letter from his wife from KIEV who went together with their son, aged 11, to YALTA on vacations. Also that during the war he was at LEVINGRAD-front and served with the army till 1946. At one time he was stationed in Poland and therefore speaks fair Polish.

Topics discussed with Subject and his assertions

1. Removal of SHCHERBYTSKY from Kiev

SHCHERBYTSKY was sent to DNEPROPETROVSK because of bad health. He suffered from serious liver illness. His parents were Russian and he himself was a Russian too. Recent changes in Kiev on the party-and government top have nothing to do with "politics as such". Simply, it was time to give chances to other people. "We have democracy too".

2. Russification

Subject rejected the idea that the Ukraine was being forcibly Russified. It is true that many people in cities ~~speak~~ speak Russian. But since Stalin's death there has been a great revival of Ukrainian life and it is not going down but up. Subject asked M why does he study Russian and not Ukrainian. After M's reply that he wondered if Ukrainian had any prospects since Subject himself told <sup>him</sup> that it is being used only in the countryside, the latter stressed again that M was wrong and that Ukrainians will never be russified.

3. Attacks against writers and artists

KHRUSHCHEV was absolutely right in criticizing them. They will be not persecuted. On the contrary, the party will take care of them. Those who repented will be published again.

SUBJECT: RUDENKO, Vladimir Semenovych

300 b. 6490 101  
101

SOURCE : M

DATE : 16 - 19 July 1963

1. Subject is an electronics engineer from KIEV, Ukr SSR, Ukrainian, approx. age 40, 5'8, strong, blond receding hair combed back, blue eyes, has oval face, a typical Ukrainian, has a soft voice, rather gay and lively. Married, speaks very fine Ukrainian and fair English.

2. Subject was very much interested in life in the States, was puzzled by earnings of various professions in this country, in particular amazed about ~~the~~ purchases of houses. He was surprised that workers were paid unemployment compensations. Avoided political topics but listened intensively to what M told <sup>him</sup> about Ukrainian emigration in the States and in Canada.

3. Subject refused to comment <sup>\*widely\*</sup> on attacks against young Ukrainian writers and artists. His answer was: "Well, there are conferences and congresses, and various people <sup>exercise</sup> ~~exercise~~ selfcriticism and criticism. But there is much good in these young people too."

4. M saw on 16 July in the evening and next day during lunch time. Both times he was accompanied by STUPAK.

SUBJECT: STUPAK, Nicolai

SOURCE : H

DATE : 16-19 July 1963

1. Subject is teacher of English, from Donbass, Ukrainian, approx. age 40, married, 5'8, square face, phlegmatic, but sombre, slim, brown hair, ~~slim~~, intelligent, speaks slowly, his Ukrainian ~~is devoid of Russicisms~~ has some Russicisms. He avoided political topics and was mainly interested in life in the States. Stressed to M that GOGOL was Ukrainian and not Russian and that among criticized poets and artists in the Soviet Union were also good people.

2. M saw on 16 July in the evening and next day at lunchtime in company of RUDENKO. On 18 M saw him again, they greeted each other but Subject left M immediately. It was M's impression that Subject did not want to be seen in M's company.

28 9-32  
SUBJECT: \*BURKHANOV, Marius

SOURCE : M

DATE : 16-19 July 1963

1. Subject is an employee of the Intourist, Uzbek, at one time studied agriculture but had not finished it, aged 32, 5'6, fat, has a tommy, brown combed straight back hair, round full face, has some Asiatic features but not conspicuous<sup>u</sup>. Speaks Russian, understands Ukrainian, poor English. A gay type, rather vain, of rather low intelligence, mainly interested in good food and comfort. Looks like a low rank KGB-officer.

2. M saw Subject every day during supper at Cafeteria from 16 to 19 inclusive, July, and once during lunchtime on 18 July. Subject was also one of main participants of the twist-party organized by M on 17 July at Sage Hall. In his turn

^ Subject was host to M on 18 June from 20.30 to 1.00 hrs when M was treated with Uzbek meals in the room of Subject and in company of DOSMUKHAMEDOV.

3. Subject and DOSMUKHAMEDOV asked M to be their guide in New York on their way home and were given M's telephone # . (Actually the telephone number of his shop in NYC ). They were planning to spend about two days in New York after 24 August 1963.

4. At the party given to M on 18 July 1963 Subject told him that he was married to a Russian lady, they had two children, S's brother was married to a Ukrainian lady and worked in the Ukraine.

5. M noticed that "relationship" between Subject and DOSMUKHAMEDOV was like between master and his servant and Subject played the former.

Topics discussed with Subject

1. Stalinism

According to Subject Stalin made only some small mistakes and his good deeds prevailed. In particular Uzbekistan has to be grateful to Stalin. When asked what in particular for he replied that Stalin liquidated illiteracy, feudalism, religious prejudices "etc". So, if Stalinism is to be introduced again he doesn't see any evil in it. At one point he stressed rather emotionally: "How, Khrushchev is not going to use Stalin's practices when on the one side you've got crazy China ~~work~~ on the other satellites and American imperialists? He has to do it, I mean he has to be more strict and he is right."

Soviet Chinese relations

2. On another occasion when asked about Soviet-Chinese relations Subject replied that there were no serious differences between the both. At that moment DOSMUKHAMEDOV interfered and said: "O no, wait, wait, there are already some serious ones". Subject seemed to be quite surprised but did not bother to ask more about them.

3. Daulanov-affair

Subject heard about DAULANOV who was simply "a black sheep". He wanted to excite Kazakhs against Russians. This was wrong and he was rightly punished.

4. Bourgeois nationalism

According to Subject there are no differences among various Soviet nationalities. All are equal. Only old people foster still some nationalist prejudices. When reminded of Daulanov he simply replied: "Well, I told you he was a black sheep".

government's most genuine desire to coexist with the West. He stressed that all Soviet peoples were hopeful that present negotiations in Moscow will be fruitful, and that the party and the government wants only one thing: peace, and once more peace. Subject hoped that the negotiations will lead to signing a test-ban and he would be very happy about it. This time Subject also stressed that Chinese People Republic had a very bad policy; the Chinese want the Soviet Union to go to war with the West but the former will never do it.

### 7. American way of life

Subject liked America. But there are many things he disapproved of. For instance when they were in a bar in ITHACA together with M on 17 July Subject saw young ladies coming in shorts and drinking. "This was immoral." He also didn't like the high percentage of unemployed in the States. On the other hand Subject had to change his view about persecution of Negroes in America. He did not see any persecution and he was going to tell it his people. On the contrary, he saw Negro and white students and go arm-in-arm and Negroes eating in restaurants together with whites.

### 8. Moscow and provinces

Subject does not disapprove of the fact that Moscow is best in all respects. It is a capital, a capital of all Soviet peoples. So it should be. On the other hand he admitted that non-Russians don't like to be called provinces.



9. Governer Barnett

Subject could not understand how <sup>come</sup> Governer Barnett could oppose President Kennedy. How was it possible at all ? What kind of government you have ? - he wondered. Subject saw only weakness in such a way of governing and he could not imagine something like that happen in the Soviet Union.

10. Cultural exchange

Subject is all for increased cultural exchange. He hoped that if Moscow talks will come to fruition then this might be also conducive to "piercing the Iron Curtain."

Subject: DOSMUKHAMEDOV, Dehalal

Source : M

Date : 16 - 19 July 1963.

1. Subject is a teacher of English, Uzbek, aged 40, 5'7, slim, brown hair, combed back, receding in the front, long face, black eyes, wears no glasses, long nose, wide mouth. Of low intelligence, very gay, conscious of his Uzbek nationality and is proud of it (more than his "master" BURKHANOV). His English is rather poor (moreover as for a teacher of English). Seems to be mainly interested in good food, wine, and girls. His favorable topic - girls and food.

Subject told M that when in New York he wants to buy a "synthetic fur coat" for his wife. One of the most active participants in twist-party organized by M on 18 July 1963 at Sage hall. He really enjoyed twist and cha-cha-cha.

Subject and BURKHANOV eat ~~mostly~~ in their rooms because Subject is cooking most of the time their national dishes for both. M was also treated with Uzbek national dishes prepared by Subject.

2. Subject avoided political discussions, and when finally involved into them, used to repeat meaningless phrases from Soviet propaganda-arsenal. He might have been, however, much more politically articulated than his "master" but simply did not want to show it. Thus, at least on one occasion he corrected BURKHANOV on Soviet-Chinese conflict. Otherwise he used to praise the party and Nikita Sergeevich, even for liquidation of bigamy which was still existing in Uzbekistan.

Subject: \*KOJDU, Loo

Source: M

DATE: 17-19 July 1963

1. Subject is Estonian, female, teacher of English at Technical Institute in TALLIN, Estonian SSR, aged 38, married, has a child aged 2, claimed to be non-party, her husband is an economist in Tallin, intelligent, a type of an opportunist. 5'6, blonde, round face, slightly turned up nose, blue eyes, Baltic type. Subject has a sister in Sweden who is a famous singer. The latter's songs were broadcast at one time on Finnish Radio (Helsinki Station). Subject hopes to visit her next year. In 1961 Subject wanted to go to England as exchange-teacher but received no permit from Soviet authorities. Now, only in May, she was informed about her going to the States. Two days later she was on her way to Moscow. There they had to pass medical and "all kinds" of examinations. She had no special course but all had to read "Encyclopedia Americana". M met her first on 17 July in the Cafeteria at breakfast together with PREDVECHNAYA and KOSTELOV. Next day during lunchtime they spoke tete-a-tete.

2. To M Subject seems to be a genuine Estonian patriot but of a passive opportunistic nature.

3. Subject likes jazz and modern music in general. She visited Ithaca-Museum and saw some modern paintings. She liked the modern ones but disliked the super-abstractionists. On 19 July at noon at Cafeteria M had lunch with Subject and three other teachers (all females). They asked M who <sup>of Russian writers</sup> was most popular nowadays in the States. M mentioned PASTERNAK, BRENDBURG, BENTUSHEVSKO. Subject smiled when M pronounced BRENDBURG and one of the teachers remarked: but they all are politics and not literature". They M was told that nowadays in Russia most popular are HEMINGWAY, T.S. Eliot and SALINGER.

Topics discussed with Subject

1. New Soviet Constitution

Subject knew that a new constitution was being prepared. At one time people talked that it will give more rights and wider competences to republics. Still, such domains as finances, defence and similar will be centralized in Moscow. Also ~~inter~~ foreign commerce should remain centralized as all-union. M's impression was that Subject was not very happy about the new constitution.

2. Present situation in Estonia

Subject stressed that Estonians are now much better off than at Stalin's time. Ten years ago all orders and instructions were coming from Moscow. Now it all changed. The Estonian government enjoys wide autonomous competences and Estonia will never become a province of Russia.

95% of population speaks Estonian. Schools are Estonian and Russian is taught only in primary and secondary schools. At higher schools only at Philology faculties Russian is obligatory. Most people learn instead of Russian-English.

Estonians do care for their culture and language. They never resign from using their native tongue. Amalgamation of nations does not mean a liquidation of individual nations and their cultures. "At least we Estonians are not going to think so".

Estonia continues to be a discussion club. Thus many an Estonian scientist rejects Lysenko's theory. Just at the present time there is a discussion going on as to best methods of instruction at schools. "We are not going to copy completely from Moscow".

The attacks against liberal writers were much milder in Estonia than in the rest of the Soviet Union. "We are discussing things and not quarrelling".

3. Soviet Rumanian relations

Subject didn't think that relations between Rumania and Moscow were as bad as M told her. "All we knew in Estonia was that the chief of CP Rumania was not in Berlin".

Subject: PREDVECHNAYA, Leniana

SOURCE: M

DATE : 17-19 July 1963

1. Subject is Docent of English at the Institute of Foreign Languages in MOSCOW. Female, Russian, 45-50, 5'5, blonde, longish face, normal built wears no glasses, party-member, intelligent, uses reasonable arguments, ~~normal dark~~ sympathetic. Her husband is a scientist. She reads "Novoe Russkoe Slovo" at the Cornell Library.

2. Subject avoided in general controversial political topics. She was very much interested in American way of life, American literature, and asked M for a book about "American realism". M gave her "Carpetbeggars".

SUBJECT: \* PROKOPOVICH, Edward Mikhailovich

d. o. b. Q  
P. O. No.

SOURCE : M

DATE : 16-19 July 1963

1. Subject is a teacher of English from MINSK, Byelorussian SSR. He is Byelorussian, aged 25-27, 5'7, slim, blond, combed straight back, wears glasses, blue eyes, oval face, phlegmatic, of average intelligence; speaks Russian with Byelorussian accent. He told M that for 4 years he studied English in MINSK and then taught for one year (also, <sup>in</sup> MINSK). Conscious of his Byelorussian nationality. Speaks also Polish: he told M that till his ~~12~~ age of 12 he spoke mostly Polish. Married. Likes girls, in particular American girls, and also showed some inclinations towards homosexuality. This was noticed by M in Subject's attitude towards a young American student who <sup>had</sup> ~~was~~ the car with the plate: N 1011 Q Ohio 1963. Subject wanted to go with the student to New York, N.Y. on a weekend.

Subject likes ~~and does dancing, including modern dances~~ dancing and does it well, including modern dances. Also likes beer. He participated in the twist-party organized by M and then went together with others to a bar in the city.

Topics discussed with Subject

1. New Soviet Constitution

Subject knew that it was being just now prepared. They also prepare a new national ~~hymn~~ anthem. As to <sup>the</sup> constitution Subject did not expect many new changes. First there will be a project which will be natio-wide<sup>d</sup> discussed by the people. All kinds of questionnaires are being now prepared which will be send all over the Soviet Union. Soviet press will also devote special room for the Constitution-discussion. The direct question as to what individual republics have to expect from the future constitution Subject <sup>answered</sup> ~~replied~~ that its contents "will depend on people's discusskon, and on course, on the project". He refused to say anything more about it.

2. Sino-Soviet conflict

Subject felt vory unhappy about the conflict. When drunk he stressed that it was obvious that only America will benefit from it. "Of course, only ~~if~~ she will know how to benefit from". Subject was disgusted with <sup>them</sup> Chinese. He called ~~ir~~irresponsible and crazy. Therefore he supports fully the Russians.

3. Ukrainians in the Soviet Union

According to Subject Ukrainians are the most nationalistically minded nation of the Soviet Union. There were 42 millions of them and no wonder they are to be counted with. Podgorny's elevation to Moscow-post was for him just logical consequence of the role of Ukrainians on the all -union scale in general.

4. Kazakhstan

Subject rejected the idea that all non-Russian nationalities are

there forcibly russified. According to what he was told by the people who were in Kazakhstan recently all nationalities have their own schools, even publish their local newspapers, and have their own libraries. Much "native literature" is also being sent from native republics. Of course, Russian is predominant but he knew that there were whole new villages without one single Russian.

5. Russification of Byelorussia

Subject admitted that many Byelorussians are getting russified "but on the other hand there are still Byelorussian schools, writers, intelligentsia aso". He was sure that Byelorussians will retain their separate national entity.

6. Jews

Subject stressed that he was not anti-semitic. He <sup>stressed</sup> ~~stressed~~, however, that Jews "live even better than Russians or anybody else". "They simply know how to do it". He meant that they infiltrate all commercial organizations and make big profits.



SUBJECT: TSTIVANIUK, Galina

18 Aug 1963

SOURCE : M

DATE : 17-19 July 1963

1. Subject is a lecturer in Physics at ROSTOV-INSTITUTE, Ukrainian, aged 45, 5'4, fat, blonde, blue eyes, round full face, large breast. Party-member, ~~author~~, speaks Russian and only fair Ukrainian. Her husband is a "scientist" too. Complained about American food and therefore preferred to stick to their ~~own~~ own cans they brought from the Soviet Union. Avoided political discussions and when involved in them repeated propaganda phrases.

2. Subject is author of a book on physics in English, and was very proud of it.

3. Subject has a daughter 18 years old and asked M to visit their house in ROSTOV. When asked about the address she refused to give it and told him to come directly to the Institute.

SUBJECT: ln & fmu , a teacher from MOSCOW

SOURCE : M

DATE : 17-19 July 1963

1. Subject is a teacher of English from MOSCOW, she was guest of Prof FAIRBANKS of Cornell University and went with his American friends to a picnic. Aged 30, 5'7, brown hair, solid, brown eyes, has an intelligent face, married, has a son aged 9, likes classic and jazz music, at home listened to "the NEWS of the USA".

She told M that after her return to Moscow she will ~~start~~ teaching her class to play baseball . Asked him also where she could get "Children's Lotto". When in company of others M mentioned the case of GOLNITSYN she was very interested in it and wanted M to tell her all about. She also told him that she would like to read "Doktor Zhivago".

SUBJECT: Nicolai, lnu

d.o.b.  
P.O.B

SOURCE : M

DATE : 16-19 July 1963

1. Subject claimed to be a teacher from VOLGOGRAD, Russian, aged 35, 5'5, bald, round face, slightly turned up nose, solid, looks like a KGB officer of middle rank. Defended Stalinism, attacked bourgeois nationalists abroad and "their remnants" in the Soviet Union. Told M that he read a book by Parson about American beatniks. Young liberal writers he was going to classify as specific kind of Soviet beatniks. In his definition: Soviet beatniks are young people, children of hardy working parents, who refuse to work and therefore are being now "transferred" to far away places in Siberia.