Re : General Situation in the Ukraine, summer 1966

<u>Source</u>: Rev. SAVCHAK Yaroslav of 29 Pallisades, Toronto, Ont. and his wife Olena

Date : 3 Mar 1967

The following information was obtained from the Source by C.& Eug on 24 Feb 1967 at his home in Toronto, Ont. The Source arrived from TRUSKAVETS, Lvov oblast, Ukraine in July 1966 to his daughters in Toronto, Ontario and lived since under above address. He was born 1895, Ukrainian, greek catholic priest, first in a village near Przemysl, then in 1947 transferred forcibly from Zakerzonnia to a village near Sambor and fibally from there to TRUSKAVETS. Source belonged to those who in the very beginning "converted" to Orthodoxy. In 1960 he was dismissed from his parochial duties for having permitted his brother-in-law to secretly read mass in his church. Since 1960 Source kept a boarding house for tourists and others in TRUSKAVETS and was very well off. His wife, born 1900, Ukrainian, was the actual manager of their resort house. After their arrival in Toronto, Source was reinstated in his catholic priesthood and given a church to be served.

The Source is of average intelligence, an opportunist by nature, a smart practical priest who knows how to hadle people and things, cautions, inclined to avoid any risks. His relations with the regime were more or less correct and he knew how to make deal with Soviets. Thus, for instance, he was able to bribe even people in the <u>Gorkom</u> to retain his house at Pervomaiska 5, in Truskavets which was going to be "nationalized"

in early 1960's.

to SUMPEN 30 June

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY SOURCES METHODSEXEMPTION 3828 NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT DATE 2007



-2-

§ :

٧į

He paid altogether 19,000 to avoid the expropriation. Reluctantly he mentioned a member of **Mathematics** by the name CHMELOV, fnu who evidently was involved in the deal. Source's memory is quite good as for his age. He is rather reserved, calm, poised.

Source's wife is more emotional, extrovert, talkative. She knew Rugen from the Polish times, and already then showed great interest in all kind of illegal activities. She was not ,however, a member of the Underground at any time. Her education: grammar school (gymnasium).

They had two daughters who went to the West at the end of WW II and live now in Toronto, Ont.

1. TRUSKAVETS has a special administrative status as a resprt of all-Union importance. It is "subordinated" directly to Lvov Obkom. It draws many tourists and convalescents from all over the Ukraine and European Russia. In consequence it lost its Ukrainian character and 50% or more of its populace is Russian. In Miskown (Gorkon) and Miskawa Miskra Eastern Ukrainian and Russian elemnt is prevailing. Recently, however, more and more local Ukrainian elemnt w.s coming to the fore but mainly in secondary positions.

Truskavets has a KGB "plenipotentiory"- <u>upolnomochenny</u> - by the name DENISOV, fnu, aged approx. 35, nationality unknown, speaks perfect Ukrainian.

There two <u>desiatyletkas</u> in Truskavets: one Russian and one Ukrainian.

2. Source kept mostly Ukrainian guests and among them there were many young people, mainly students, from Kiev, Kharkov and other cities. There was a whole group of young people who were in direct contact with those argested in 1965/66 and whose "ideological leaders" were KOSTENKO, Lina; DZIUBAIvan, SWITLYCHNY, Ivan; and DRACH .Ivan.



SEGRET

-3-

Source mentioned two names she could remember:

BILOKIN' Serhiy, aged 19, Ukrainian, student of Ukrainian litearature, son of a professor of biology or botanics, residing at Pankivska 7 (former Khaturina 7) in Kiev;

PAVLYCHKO Yaroslava ,aged approx. 20, native of Stebnyky, West Ukraine , female, student of Ukrainian literature at Kiev University, Ukrainian.

Particularly BILOKIN' spent often his vacations in Truskavets and Source wis in correspondence with him.

Source knew , however, at least a dozen of young students who wers "involved" in this so called "Underground". More or less Source's wife was taken into confidence by them and she was given all kind of manuscripts, photostats , and other literature to be read and hidden. Thus she read some poems of Symonenko, Drach, Kostenko and others which were not published. She also read the document about the Library Arson , some leaflets and similar stuff. In 1964, afetr the Library Fire in Kiev she was given some books to be hidden which were saved by students during the fire. Among them was also an examplar of Hrinchenko's Dictionary.

In their turn, they often asked Source's wife to teach them Ukrainian patriotic songs, get "old books", tell them "about the past". They were paticularly keen on political literature published before 1939, and similar stuff. They wanted to know as much as possible about the UPA and nationalists, and Source's wife used to "enlighten"them¹⁰.

Somitimes Source's wife had the opportunity to listen to various debates and opimions of those young people. On the basis of what she was told asked she would describe their political credo in the following way :

a/ Bolsgeviks and their present descendants perversed communism but the socialist system is basically O.K. It is the most just, advanced, and suitable system for all the mankind but it has to be cleansed of Russian bureacratic and chauvinistic mud.





-4-

b/ Not the comminism as such but its Russian perversed variety filled up with Russian chauvinism was responsible for enslavement and misery of Ukrainian and other peoples. Ukraine has to be either a sovereign socialist nation like Poland, Bulgaria, or rather satellites but within: a c real confederation of endit states, or fully independent. In both cases a feturn to capitalism was undesirable. Some students paid less attention to prove socioeconomical problems and stressed the political independence of Ukraine in itself. Others were inclined to emphasize the socialist contents of the future system. Others again were interested primarily in cultural and literary problems and expressed the view that by drengthening Ukrainian cultural potential the Ukraine will enter the road of full emancipation. In all cases, however, an independent Ukraine was their fine goal.

c/ Use of terror in fight against the regime was rejected but at the same time it was said that some sort of communication and synchronization among "the people involved" was necessary. The fight at presel should be directed at the restoration of socialist principles in the Soviet nationalities policy and based on A Leminist directives and constitutional prerogatives. The struggle should be conducted above all for Ukrainian language, culture, against discrimination etc.

d/ There should be at least two parties in the state. Any kind of monoparty was wrong but under emergency circEmstances a dictatorship was justified.

The "too-many parties" was bad and on **xxxe** occasions as a rule Ukrainian emigration was criticized for "too-many -splittism".

e/ In the center of "foreign orientation" stood Red China. Lit le hope was put on the West. As **the** an argument against the USA and the West in general the experience with Hungarian Uprisong was pointed at.

SEC.

In brief : only Red China could press Russial to the wall and at least indirectly help Ukrainians and others.

-5-

f/ The attitude to the UPA and 1940's in general was quite
positive . "Anyway more positive than among some people of 'middle'
generation who saw the last phase of the UPA". Source explained that
in the last phase of the UPA-liquidation, the Underground was practically
without any leadership and many excesses had been committed which only
compromised it.

Source's wife was asked many times to tell the young people about the heroic deeds of the UPA, teack them UPA songs, and "explain whet they were fighting for". She also knew that some poems she had read (including one by Kostenko Lina) was about and/or devoted to people who died in the fight against Russians in 1940 and 1950's. The respective poem by Kostenko was about an eagle which in young students' interpretation was identified with a leader of the Underground.

3. According to Source's wife, she was told by a female teacher, a participant of Sheshory Incident, that at the ceremony several thousands people had gathered, among them delegations from Kiev, Lvov, Priashiv (CSR), Wharkov and other places. The ceremony turned into an anti-Russian demostration at which even Ukrainian national flags and tridents had appeared.

4. In Source's opinion the sympathy of population in West Ukraine is on the side Chinese. This is so for a simple reason that people are sympathetic to anybody who causes troubles to the regime. In 1965 Source had had as a guest a party member of Ukrainian nationality from Kiev who told Source that "recently Chinese had taken a few oblasts from us and we could do nothing about it". Even she (it ws a female) seemed to be quite satisfied with China's pressure on Moscow.



SEGRET

-6-

 $f_{\rm ext}$

5. The <u>diumvirat</u> of Brezhnev and Kosygin is being compared with that of Bulganin and Khrushchev. In **pepte** people's opinion pretty soon either Brezhnev or Kosygin will have to step down, and one of them will be <u>the</u> chief.

6. The Occumenical Council was quite conducive to farther reconciliation between the "converted" clergy, the population, and former priests who remained catholic in private. Only a part of illegal catholic clergy took a hostile position and decided even to severe contact with the Vativan. There appeared a group of "secret" catholic priests who condemned the dialogue with the "Devil" and announced that the katkar Devil has "twisted" the Pope himself. Only they, as true uncompromising representatives of God's will, constitute today the body of Catholic Church and they have to expiate for the Pope and the whole hierarchy who have been cheated by the devil. They call themselves "expiators", in Ukrainian <u>Pokutnyky</u> (from the word <u>pokuta</u>). One of them, a Rev. POTOCHNIAK, fnu from Boryslav-area even proclaimed himself a Ukrainian Catholic Pope.

According to Source the "converted church" was used as means of Ryssification and at one time the clergy was encouraged, for instance, to use Russian in correspondence with their col eagues from "other oblasts". As a rule, priests corresponded in Ukrainian but bishops and their chancelleries among themselves and with superiors did so only in Russian.

In Source's estimate more than 50% of theology students at the sominars in the Ukraine were Ukrainian and a lot of them from West Ukraine.

The Lvov Archbishop Nikolai (former Yurik Evhen) as other Archbishops and Bishops has only divine authority and very few administrative competences. Thus in 1960 when Source was deprived of his priesthood it was done not by

the Bishop but by an <u>upolnomochAey</u> for church affairs who sat in Bishop's chancellery at St George Cathedral. After his arrival at Lvov, Source saw first the Archbishop Nikolai who told him that he will pray for him but the final decision will be made by the upolnomochenny.





 ${\cal A}_{i}^{k}$

-7-

In Source's opinion there is little room in the Orthodox Church for further development of theology as such. Thus, for instance, there was no attempt on the part of the Orthodox Church to use for its own purpose the intellectual capacity of Ukrainian Catholic Church. On the contrary, Source assumes, that there is a deliberate policy to hold **Orthodox** theology on a rather low level.