

Subject: DRACH and PAVLYCHKO, the party given to them by Vitali KEIS and his wife on 8 Nov 1966, in the evening.

Source: Mc

Date: 9 Nov 1966

1. The party took place at KEIS' house at 816 E 179 Street, Bronx, N.Y. 10460 on 8 Nov 1966, in the evening, and lasted until 23.00 hrs or so. Those present beside hosts and the two Soviet guests were : Walter ODAJNYK of Columbia, New York, N.Y.

Bohdan RUBCHAK and his wife , of New York ,N.Y.

Andrei KHRUTSKYI of Newark,N.J.

Roman MAC of New York ,N.Y.

Maria GISYK of New York ,N.Y.

MASLOVYCH,jr, of New York ,N.Y.

Bohdan MYSKO of New York, N.Y.

a Ukrainian couple who visited the Ukraine in 1965 .

TSARYNNYK Marko of Philadelphia, Pa who was supposed to participate , did not come to the party.

2. Source arrived to the party at 20:15 hrs in the middle of a heated debate between PAVLYCHKO and MASLOVYCH on the recent arrests and trials in the Ukraine. PAVLYCHKO defended the KGB's action explaining that the Soviet regime was right in arresting in time "the hotheads" who were going to develop the whole affair into a huge organization of anti-Soviet, subversive character. "Do you realize - PAVLYCHKO shouted - what it meant if they had let them do what they were up to ?". " They were establishing a new underground and if such organization had developed this would have unavoidably led to a real bloodbath!" " Then neither I nor Drach nor anybody else would have been spared". PAVLYCHKO explained that this was an organization in its formative state with worked out political program and plan of action. Their aim was establishment of Ukrainian state as member of a loose confederation or rather commonwealth into which the Soviet Union has to be transformed. "Yes, they wanted

ig - Drach  
1 - Pavlychko  
1 - Mac  
✓ 1 - 74-124-2715  
1 - analysis

to dismember the Soviet Union and imitate the English commonwealth - he shouted - so what <sup>had</sup> you had done as a communist ?"

According to PAVLYCHKO during home searches much literature was found, most of it typed and in manuscripts , some of emigre origin. There was also found a declaration in which there was ~~the~~ appeal for establishment of Ukrainian states and Soviet commonwealth of states.

3. PAVLYCHKO claimed that SVITLYCHNY was his friend and remained such. But he could not forgive SVITLYCHNY that he had been so naive as to receive emigre literature from an American Ukrainian girl, including Eisenhower's speech, and disseminate ~~them~~ <sup>it</sup> among his friends. SVITLYCHNY must have known what he was doing and what <sup>it</sup> meant for himself and those whom he was involving in "such nonsense."

4. PAVLYCHKO felt very offended when someone called Ukrainian writers "naive or calculated marionettes" of the regime. He denied very emphatically that it was so and claimed that he , himself, DRACH and others had a real word to say on many matters. The regime could not discard them as marionettes, on the contrary , it took into account their say. He also denied that writers do whatever the regime pleases and mentioned that at one time his book was also forbidden and withdrawn from circulation.

5. According to PAVLYCHKO the arson in the National Library in Kiev in May 1964 was a private crime of Pegruzhal'sky. The KGB had nothing to do with it because if they wanted they could have done it quietly in one night. During the fire PAVLYCHKO, Lina KOSTENKO and Andrei MALYSHKO stood together nearby and wept. In the fire had most suffered the Shevchenkiyana.

6. In PAVLYCHKO'S view the recent rehabilitation of HRUSHEVSKY, the historian was indeed only partial and insufficient. If he had a say on the matter he would have written clearly all about the historian

and fully rehabilitated him. Of course, the Soviet government itself is the one who finally decides on one or another rehabilitation. DRACH agreed with PAVLYCHKO on HRUSHEVSKY and replying to Source explained that it was a group of Ukrainian intelligentsia who usually initiated rehabilitation. PAVLYCHKO interrupted him and added that this included communist leaders as well.

Dwelling upon the case of Hrushevsky, PAVLYCHKO stressed that there will be many more rehabilitations of past Ukrainian writers, scholar and other cultural workers, because the young generation wants to know all about them and does a lot of research on it own. "You cannot conceal the past of Ukraine nowadays - he continued - because whenever you come you find young people deeply interested in Ukrainian history and literature, and they find many books and materials in private libraries and know how to use them".

According to PAVLYCHKO pretty soon there will be published in the Soviet Ukraine "The History of Ukrainian Literature" by Hrushevsky, and the next people to be rehabilitated are VYNNYCHENKO and KHVYLOVYI.

7. When PAVLYCHKO said something to the effect that at the present there were strong tendencies to increase the sovereignty of the Ukr SSR everyone present attacked him pointing out that just now most of republican ministries were being liquidated.

As one of examples the transformation of the Ministry of Culture into a union-republican was mentioned to what PAVLYCHKO replied that now as a union ministry it will give the Ukrainian Republic more money for cultural purposes than before. It sounded, however, so strange that even Pavlychko realised that he had ridiculed himself by such argument.

8. DRACH mentioned that he realised by now that there were many different groups in emigration and it was a mistake to put them all into one category. But unfortunately, there were still many influential people in Kiev who thought otherwise and for whom all emigres were alike. This, of course, was not conducive to the development of cultural exchange and contacts between the

Ukraine and the emigration.

9. According to PAVLYCHKO there was only one trial in Lvov. He personally defended SVITLYCHNY and others involved in the arrests. Asked whether BAZHAN and others intervened on the ~~part~~ behalf of the arrested, PAVLYCHKO replied that he did not think they did. However, the trial and the arrests were discussed at ~~the~~ meetings of the Union of Writers of Ukraine. Asked how precisely the Union of Writers intervened on the matter of the arrests and who personally defended the imprisoned, Pavlychko replied that DRACH was better informed about these events and recommended to ask him.

When Source mentioned ~~the~~ YEVTUSHENKO'S declaration in the States on Siniavsky and Daniel and asked Pavlychko whether he would do the same in regards to HORYNS and others, PAVLYCHKO replied that he would have restricted his action only to taking away of literature from the arrested, a strong reprimand for them, and a strong warning not to "play <sup>around</sup> with such things".

10. PAVLYCHKO said that all contacts between Ukraine and China have been broken. At one time cultural exchange with China was quite strong but now all was over. At one time a Chinese student (female) translated some of his poems "but now forget about it". Also other Ukrainian writers were translated into Chinese but what happened to those translations he did not know.

11. PAVLYCHKO stressed that the Ukraine was very eager to develop trade with foreign countries. When it was pointed to him that for that purpose it was not enough to print on Ukrainian goods tags with "made in the Ukraine" but ~~consulates~~ <sup>were needed</sup> of Ukr SSR, he did not comment and did not return to this topic again.

12. Both PAVLYCHKO and DRACH expressed their concern ~~that~~ about the fact that whereas official and private American circles showed so much interest in YEVTUSHENKO no one cared for them. Their conclusion was that the United States did not recognize

the truth that the Ukraine was a separate entity and continued to treat the Soviet Union as "Mother Russia". When someone remarked that this was due to lack of proper work <sup>to be</sup> done in the West by Kiev, PAVLYCHKO replied that this was not so, because there was too much prejudice <sup>on these matters</sup> in the West and too little action on the part of emigration.

13. According to DRACH and PAVLYCHKO, Ukrainian youth is very much interested in foreign literature and as one of the authors particularly asked after in the Ukraine at the present, they mentioned KAFKA. PAVLYCHKO mentioned that there <sup>were</sup> widespread discussions going on among young people - on literature, the future of socialist states, changes in kolhosos, Libermanism. In another words, young people's interest was very wide and deep, and was not limited only to literary problems.

14. When Source mentioned SEREDA Mikola, PAVLYCHKO seemed to be quite interested in what happened to him and what he was doing. Then he said that SEREDA was a Russian, had nothing to do with Ukrainian cause, and his father was demoted but not completely sacked.

15. According to PAVLYCHKO, the KGB is almighty and "they can do whatever they want to". Its personal was not of same kind as before 1939. Now they got there only educated, intelligent people, "not a trace of primitivism of before 1937 has been left". And not all people there are bad.

16. When DRACH mentioned that his wife was very much interested in his poetry, PAVLYCHKO commented that he wished his wife ( PAVLYCHKO's) would be too but unfortunately this was not the case. He made the impression that his marriage was not very happy.

SECRET

-6-

17. At the end of the party RUBCHAK, DRACH, PAVLYCHKO and KEIS recited their poems. DRACH read a poem about "erroneous son" who finally comes to his Mother-Ukraine, with very strong allusions to emigres.

18. DRACH asked Source to find him works by GUMILOVICH and promised to visit him at his shop.

19. During the discussion on present music in the Ukraine Maria Clayk strongly attacked PAVLYCHKO, and DRACH seemed to agree with her. Her contention was that Ukrainian musical efforts today were very poor and provincial in nature.

20. In a discussion on freedom of creation and personality PAVLYCHKO "proclaimed" that every person "is oppressed by his conscience" and there<sup>fore</sup> a complete freedom is impossible. Referring to the discussion in Helsinki at the Youth Festival in 1962 PAVLYCHKO told Source that it could have been more interesting but unfortunately there were some people on the Soviet side who could only bark and not debate.

21. KEIS showed PAVLYCHKO 2 volumes of some "erotic" if not simply pornographic novel and the latter was very much interested in it. He asked whether KEIS could spare it and PAVLYCHKO took it with him. On the whole PAVLYCHKO seems to be very interested in this kind of literature.