

UNCLASSIFIED INTERNAL ONLY CONFIDENTIAL SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

EXTENSION

NO.

SALICAE []

XAAZ 15521

DATE

31 July 63

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

RID/HAD

CKS

Please index into file

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

SALICAE

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

74-124-29/3

ABSTRACT X INDEX X

MAY 2 1963

FORM 3-62

610

USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS

 SECRET CONFIDENTIAL INTERNAL USE ONLY UNCLASSIFIED

XAAZ-15521

SUBJECT: IVANENKO, Viktor Ivanovich 201-337693
Northwestern University, Ill.
Dormitory

SECRET

DATE : 2 May 1963

CITUSA

1. End February 1963 Subject phoned BALABAN, Timotey of 2243 W Rice, Chicago 22, Ill. (Tel. HU 6-8805), engineer (BSc) employed with ARMOUR RESEARCH FOUNDATION of Ill., Institute of Technology, 10 W 35, (Tel. CA 5-9600), Chicago, Ill., and asked him whether he remembered FEDORCHENKO (Ivan Mikhailovich) of Kiev. After BALABAN'S positive reply Subject introduced himself and told B. that he had a book for him from FEDORCHENKO. Subject was ready to bring it to BALABAN and the latter invited him to come to his house. Subject arrived at B's home same evening and brought him "Russian-Ukrainian Technological Dictionary" from FEDORCHENKO. He explained that FEDORCHENKO asked him to present it to B with his compliments and that FEDORCHENKO was his chief at the Academy of Sciences in KIEV. Subject had been in CHICAGO for almost four months but only now when moving to another room he found the book and decided to call BALABAN. The latter's phone number Subject found in telephone directory having tried in the meantime other "Balabans".

BALABAN met FEDORCHENKO I.M., metallurgist, full member of Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, in April 1962 when the latter, together with SEMIONOV, fnu paid a visit to ARMOUR RESEARCH FOUNDATION of Chicago. BALABAN performed then as interpreter on behalf of ARMOUR RESEARCH and spent two or three days in company of FEDORCHENKO. Since B. spoke mostly Ukrainian, FEDORCHENKO had very often to do translating for SEMIONOV from Ukrainian into Russian. BALABAN tried to induce Fedorchenko to get interested in Ukrainian scholarly circles in the States but the latter turned out completely impervious to B's attempts. Once when B. mentioned that there were some metallurgists from KIEV living since the WW II in the States and forming a section of the Ukrainian Scientific Association abroad, FEDORCHENKO became rather angry, flushed, and turned at once to another topic. He simply ignored everything that he was told by B. about emigration. He did not mind on the other hand telling B. about "great achievements" of Ukrainian scientists in KIEV restricting himself obviously only to generalities. When B. mentioned lack of Ukrainian technological terminology and its substitution with the Russian one in the Ukraine, FEDORCHENKO denied B's assertions and promised to send him a Dictionary of Technological Terminology in Ukrainian which had been just published shortly before his visit to the States.

Till now Subject visited BALABAN four times. He also went with B's wife on 13 Apr 1963 to church to watch the ceremony of Easter-food blessing. On 14 Apr 1963 Subject was guest at B's home, together with about another 15 persons, local Ukrainian immigrants. During previous visits BALABAN had the opportunity to talk to Subject tete-a-tete. Mostly they did, however, their talking in presence of B's wife.

On 6 and 15 April 1963 Subject was guest at SURIVKA'S house. The latter's address: SURIVKA, Lubomir of 2154 W. Cortez, Chicago 22, Ill. Tel. HU 9-5385. SURIVKA is a student of civil engineering at Chicago University, Ukrainian, non-party man, but in general politically articulated. SURIVKA supplied Subject with Ukrainian emigre-publications which Subject promised to read with great interest.

SECRET

When Subject was at SURIVKA'S house on 15 Apr 1963 there were at least pther ten people or so and everyone asked him to be his guest^{at} some time in the future. Subject had little chance to say much and mostly had to listen to not always proper assertions and "attempts" to "re-orientate him". The only one who took advantage of Subject's presence there was NAHIRNY, ^{Volodymir} ~~son~~ of New York, N.Y. who had a long talk with him "on the side."

On 19 or 20 Apr 1963 SURIVKA brought Subject to a Ukrainian woman in Chicago, South, who stemmed from KIEV and her husband from Bukovina. The woman told Subject and SURIVKA about her experiences with Russians in KIEV in 1930's, how her father was shot by communists and she herself was persecuted. Subject was rather upset and dissatisfied with his visit to her and complained afterwards to SURIVKA why did he bring him there.

Since then Subject evidently changed his attitude to SURIVKA, and BALABAN as well. He began to avoid them and rejected all the invitations forthcoming from BALABAN, SURIVKA and others.

On 28 Apr 1963 BALABAN and his wife saw Subject at the Students Fair at Chicago University where he together with three other Soviet students kept their USSR-stand. Subject told BALABANS that he was going to participate in a technological conference in Washington, D.C. on 27 and 28 April 1963 where he was supposed to be taken by some American colleagues from Northwestern University. However, in the last moment he was not allowed to take part in the conference. When asked by BALABAN by whom he replied that by the State Department. Subject added that he was very upset by the rejection and "felt ill for several days". Subject also told BALABAN(S wife that his wife phoned him recently from KIEV and asked whether she should come now to CHICAGO. Allegedly, she had now her Soviet visitor's visa and left it up to Subject to decide. He wondered, however, whether if she should come for such a short time since he was supposed to leave for KIEV in June 1963. BALABANS wanted to come to their house same evening or Monday but Subject politely refused. Finally he agreed to visit them some time in the first half of May. All efforts of BALABAN on 29 and 30 Apr 1963 to get Subject to his house or to meet him at the Dormitory were also in vain. (BALABAN was willing and tried hard to introduce Subject to Carl.) Also B'S invitation to Subject to celebrate B's birthday and the 1st May together at B'S house -did not induce Subject to come to B'S home.

BALABAN promised Carl that as soon as Subject will inform him about his visit he will, in his turn, notify Carl. In case Subject will not do it within the next two weeks, B. will try to contact Subject again. In B's ~~view~~ opinion Subject's recent attitude could be explained by a series of factors: restrictions imposed on him by his "superiors", Subject's dissatisfaction with immigrants he met and his reluctance to go to private houses now, Subject's embarrassment after new course in the Kremlin since before that he used to refute all the attacks and comments on the Soviet reality with emphatical assertions that liberation and democratization of the Soviet Union will continue and any return to so called neo-Stalinism was absolutely impossible. As a proof he liked to point to ^{11/2} ~~EVEUSHENKO, ERENBURG~~ and others "who are respected by the party, government, and the people."

2. Biographic data and characteristics.

A. Subject told BALABAN that he was born in 1928 in a village near POLTAVA, of Ukrainian parents, his father died and mother lived now in KIEV with Subject's wife. His father was allegedly under influence of HRUSHEVSKY and he talked about it in such a manner that one could infer that for that he was persecuted and "purged" in 1930s. On the other occasion Subject stated that shortly after he was born his parents moved to LENINGRAD and then returned to KIEV. S's mother is a lecturer of Ukrainian at the Kiev University. She is a party-member. Subject described her as an ardent Ukrainian patriot who forces his wife and Subject himself to speak only in Ukrainian. Subject, however, speaks with his wife both; Ukrainian and Russian, depending in which language he or she start talking.

During his first visit Subject told B. he was non-party man. During the third visit excused himself for having been lying to his host. Subject is a party-member and did not say the truth in the beginning because he was afraid that this would influence negatively B's attitude toward him. Now he was told in Washington that it was very bad to lie about his party membership and he corrected his mistake.

Subject is an engineer, specializing in automatic control and regulation, he graduated at KIEV POLYTECHNIC, now employed with Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. His salary in KIEV about NRubel 400.--. His scholarship in Chicago about \$ 200.-- At one time he complained for being short of money and did some translating work for a publication house in Chicago. He did not, however, benefit from that very much because he was paid for his translations in books. Subject tried to save some \$\$ because he hoped to buy a new car in KIEV "out of order-queue". He explained that if someone was paying in foreign currency he needed not wait for his turn in waiting list.

Subject's wife is Ukrainian, a graduate of the Institute of Foreign Languages, specializing in Arabic. They have no children. Subject wanted her to join him in CHICAGO and had quite an argument about it in the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C. Allegedly, now she got her visa but he wondered if it was prudent to have her here for a rather short period.

In her letters to Subject his wife used to put a hair to check on censorship. He did not elaborate whose censorship he meant, American or Soviet.

According to BALABAN Subject is a convinced communist. Subject described his national feelings as cosmopolitan. Nationality for Subject is a secondary problem, the main thing is the establishment of communism. If Russification was a means to implement communism in linguistic sphere then he justified it. Sooner or later nations will disappear and so will different languages. Subject did not mind which language will be that of communist society: Russian, Chinese, or English. Of course, this was a long process and for the time being Ukrainians, Russians, English, Americans, Chinese will have to exist as separate nations. It did not matter whether the Ukraine joined the Soviet Union voluntarily or forcibly. The main thing—the Ukraine is in the socialist society. Therefore, eventual separation would be harmful to the cause of communism. Subject himself would never vote for separation from the Soviet Union. He thought that only about 1% of Ukrainian population would ~~vote~~^{opt} for secession from USSR. When present communist society is imbued with Russian national content this does not mean that final form of communism will be identical with Russian nationalism. To-day Russian elements in communism are prevailing owing to the objective conditions under which the socialism is developing. In the future it will absorb also other, non-Russian elements and they might change to a very great extent the present form of socialist society.

~~SECRET~~

Subject expressed strong conviction that further liberalization and democratization inside the Soviet Union will continue. These were main prerequisites for building further economic basis of communist society, and with them he also connected future strengthening of ~~Russian~~ non-Russian nationalities in the Soviet Union. When pointed to a contradiction in his statement as to the fact that any strengthening of separate national units would be ~~unavoidably~~ detrimental to the cause of communism, Subject explained, that this would be so in the long run, but for the nearest future general liberalization, economic socialist "boom" and more freedom for non-Russian nationalities - were indispensable and mutually supplementary facets of same general progress towards communism. After that "middle stage" of socialist development will come its final stage in which under an abundance of material wealth will begin to disappear all the linguistic, nationalistic, and other differences.

According to BALABAN, Subject is an intelligent, articulated man, with main interest in his career. He is very sympathetic, a pleasant interlocutor, very moderate in his expressions, somewhat nervous, reserved. B. did not think Subject had a really strong personality but rather showed some weak features with a strong dosis of opportunism. To please - anyone - Subject is able to tell lies and behave like a "petty liar" suffering because of that at the same time. Once he told B. that he sang carols but then felt somewhat embarrassed about his ~~untruthful~~ statement.

Subject likes sentimental Ukrainian music. One evening he sat at B's house till 3a.m. listening to Ukrainian records. Subject smokes pipe, drinks little, likes fishing. Speaks fine Ukrainian. His English is fair. Likes borshch and brown bread.

B. Subject told NAHIRNY, Volodimir of New York, that he had a PhD-degree in mathematics and was employed with Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in KIEV. His elder brother works in a state-farm (radhosp). His mother lectures at the Kiev University. In KIEV at one time he lived in the same house as HORODOVENKO who is now in Canada and remembered his playing with latter's dog. During the German occupation Subject stayed in KIEV. At the Academy of Sciences Subject met SEREDA, M. kola whom he described as son of a bureaucrat who had some personal misunderstandings with superiors and probably therefore defected. Subject speaks fine Ukrainian, has good knowledge of Ukrainian culture and history. He told NAHIRNY that he read in Chicago "Suchasnist'" and liked it. In KIEV he had no access to emigree publications. One he saw a Communist Canadian paper in the library in Kiev.

NAHIRNY described Subject as an intelligent individual, a scholarly type, cynical, making impression of a tired man, communist, with pessimistic view as to the future of Ukrainians in the Soviet Union, and almost pathological attachment to Kiev. Basically - rather sophisticated.

When NAHIRNY mentioned something to the effect that Ukrainians missed their chances to get separated from Russia in 1917-20, Subject replied that "we had missed many more chances, for instance like the one at Kmelnitskyi's period".

C. At the University Fair at Chicago University on 28 Apr 1963 Subject wrote in the Kiev-Album presented to a Russian emigree who praised the Soviet Union the following dedication in Russian: "To a good Russian man from Ivanenko".

3. Topics discussed with Subject.

SECRET

a/ Strikes and disturbances in the Soviet Union. Subject told BALABAN that indeed there were some disturbances in the Soviet Union in summer 1962 but not on such a scale as it was asserted in the West. Thus, for instance, when Subject was vacationing in Georgia in late summer 1962 he met ^{there} a gymnastics-instructor from NOVOCHERKASSK who at the time of disturbances stayed at the Metallurgic plant which struck. According to the instructor there were no bloody collisions between the striking population and military units. It is true that there were sent some troops to NOVOCHERKASSK. They did not, however, enter the city, but occupied positions on the outskirts. There were no disturbances or vandalism in the city. The workers gathered at their plants, refused to work and made speeches. After two or three days arrived Frol KOZLOV. Before entering the striking plant he demanded local party bosses and military commander to withdraw the troops. They did as he demanded. Then KOZLOV went to the plant and asked the striking committee to present to him their grievances. He also wanted to address all workers of the plant. KOZLOV conferred with striking committee for 3 days and then they came to an agreement. Norms were lowered, wages increased and workers returned to their jobs. There were no killed, no one was arrested. Only party and KGB officials had some talks with people later on in order to study their grievances. KOZLOV'S performance in NOVOCHERKASSK was very much praised by both; party and KGB officials, and by the populace.

b/ KOZLOV, Frol. Subject did not deny that KOZLOV might succeed KHRUSHCHEV in the near future (this was before former's illness). Actually, he was quite positive about "forthcoming" departure of KHRUSHCHEV and ascendance of KOZLOV whom he described as the representative of the younger generation. Subject was of a very high opinion about KOZLOV. The latter was "an educated man with University degree and will not bump his shoe on the table like "diadia" Nikita! KOZLOV is an engineer, well read, cultured and understood the urgency of further reforms and progressing liberalization of the Soviet system. Subject implied that KHRUSHCHEV was still tinged with Stalinist features and represented ~~the~~ old Bolshevik type. KOZLOV was the embodiment of new communist, educated, sophisticated, and genuinely "democratic".

c/ Changes inside the Soviet Union. According to Subject people in the West, and in particular emigration, did not fully appreciate and comprehend the immense importance of changes introduced since Stalin's death. This applied also to national revival of Ukrainians and Subject mentioned in particular recent rebirth of Ukrainian literature and culture. Of much greater significance to him was general democratization of the Soviet Union which could not be stopped anymore. When countered with some "portents of neo-Stalinism" in the Soviet press Subject tried to explain it as a "another proof of "adjusting things through discussion". The latter meant that all views should be expressed and heard, otherwise there would be no difference between old and new "method of solving the problems". In spite ^{of} what KHRUSHCHEV and other old communists were thinking they will have soon to leave their posts to younger generation and this, the best guarantee of further democratization. EVTUSHENKO, ROZHDESTVENSKY and other young people were the symbol of forthcoming change and KHRUSHCHEV himself as well as his advisers fully take the emergence of new elements in the Soviet society into account. In the next ten years, provided there will be no war, the Soviet Union will make such a progress in democratization that the whole world will be amazed. This will be implemented by people like KOZLOV and his younger colleagues.

SECRET

SECRET

d/ Ambassador DOBRYNIN. Subject praised DOBRYNIN as one of KOZLOV'S generation. He is educated, cultured and knows that further reforms and progress are needed in the Soviet Union. After Subject's arrival in the States all exchange-students were received by DOBRYNIN in Washington, D.C. In his welcome-speech DOBRYNIN stressed several times the point that they (students) should not look frightened and must behave normally. "Don't look like a frightened man here in the West" - he reiterated this sentence again and again. Subject's final conclusion was that the more individuals like DOBRYNIN will come to the fore in the Soviet Union the better for Soviet peoples.

e/ "Forthcoming" changes in the Soviet Union. According to the Subject there could be not a shadow of doubt that The Soviet Union will continue to liberalize. Of course, there were still some Stalinist elements in the party who will try to put obstacles to the new course. But they were powerless, simply, because time was running against them. The departure of old bolsheviks is identical with arrival of new fresh young forces who will never allow a return of old practices. According to Subject, in addition to innovations proclaimed in the new party-program, pretty soon ^{election} two candidates for some party posts will be introduced. Then the same will be tried in administrative field.

Another pending change of great significance is putting kolhosp-peasants on wages like workers. Subject thought this will be implemented soon and is bound to increase living standard in the countryside. Prior to that he admitted that life in villages was rather poor and drab.

f/ Ukrainization. According to Subject majority of population in cities, in particular in KIEV, speaks Russian. Ukrainian is heard mostly at Ukrainian Faculty at Universities, in the Union of Writers, some higher offices, some theaters and some private homes. The countryside speaks also Ukrainian. Subject personally did not pay any importance to what language he or other people were using. Some people were quite sensitive about it and even wanted to force Ukrainization. Sometimes they met strong obstacles. For example, when they began to publish Ukrainian Mathematical Journal in KIEV, pretty soon they discovered that majority of contributors were writing in Russian and it was necessary to translate them in Ukrainian. Also some readers complained that they did not understand Ukrainian terminology, and consequently the Journal became bilingual. Finally, it was transformed into Russian one. Some people by pressing too much with their views about Ukrainization accentuated unnecessarily internal atmosphere inside their organization and in consequence did more harm than good. As an example he mentioned some squabbles in the editorial staff of the Institute of Ukrainian Ethnography in Kiev. A remark as to the future of Ukrainian youth Subject commented that since 1956 no one from his generation was arrested for political reason.

Slow pace of Ukrainization Subject was inclined to explain not only by "neutral" course of the Soviet government but also by lack of proper tactics and "perseverance" of Ukrainians themselves. He meant in particular elderly generation who were still under impact of eventual return of old practices and wanted to be doubly reassured. "Just to be on the safe side" they even preferred to write in Russian as it was the case with above mentioned Mathematical Journal. As to the party itself, Subject thought that leadership of the Ukrainian Communist Party was Ukrainized but "bureaucratic apparatus" continued to speak Russian. Subject also stressed that recently Ukrainian was introduced more intensively in many higher schools and that this was done on pressure from above in Kiev.

g/ STASHYNSKYI. Subject read the article about Stashynskyi in "Life". His comment: the whole story seemed to him fishy. Subject did not think that the KGB could be as clumsy as it looked from STASHYNSKYI'S story. To him it was simply incomprehensible that the KGB could make that many mistakes. He also did not believe that both : REBET and BANDERA were of such importance to the Soviet government that it was necessary to liquidate them. He mentioned also that, for instance, in case of TROTSKY "they" did it so smoothly that even to-day no one could prove anything tangible against Soviet security.

h/ Young Ukrainian writers and poets. Subject praised the new generation and saw in them "the bright future of the Ukrainian literature". When asked whether he read Khrushchev's speech of 8 March 1963 in Moscow, he replied that he did not, and if really there was a new drive against them, then he sympathized with "young people". He seemed somewhat embarrassed about the whole affair.

i/ Russo-Chinese relations. Subject was unwilling to comment on that and only admitted that there were some misunderstandings between the two countries but he hoped that eventually they will be reconciled.

RE : SHEVCHENKO, Valeri
SOURCE : Letter of KOSHELIVETS, Ivan dtd 3 May 1963

In addition to STAKHIV'S letter KOSHELIVETS gives a more detailed and specified description of his first meeting with SHEVCHENKO on 29 Apr 1963, and on the basis of previously observed events, and the last encounter with SHEVCHENKO, makes some conclusions as to the present situation.

1. According to KOSHELIVETS he used usually to observe what was going around him realizing since at least two years that he, as editor of "Suchasnist", was of particular interest to the KGB. On 29 Apr 1963 he did some shopping with his wife at 8.00 hrs and neither when he left the house nor at his arrival did he notice anything suspicious. Then when he was living for his office suddenly appeared SHEVCHENKO. KOSHELIVETS'S conclusion is that he must have been hidden in the meantime somewhere nearby in another car and that his house has been surveilled for that purpose for a longer period of time. Incidentally, he remembered that about a year ago he noticed close to his car a car with British plates which usually either followed KOSHELIVETS or "met" him near his office. KOSHELIVETS thought that an Englishman was just using the same route and liked to joke about it. This company, also often at lunch time when the "Englishman" used to outspeed him and then wait for him again in front of K's house, lasted for several days. Then it stopped and KOSH forgot about it. To-day he is inclined to see it in a completely different perspective.

2. When SHEVCHENKO joined KOSH in his car he asked KOSH to give him a lift to the Railroad Station (Hauptbahnhof). SHEVCHENKO proposed at once a meeting in the afternoon stressing that he wanted to talk to KOSH *tete-a-tete* and therefore KOSH should not inform anybody about the meeting. KOSH replied that he hardly could do it. SHEVCHENKO explained that he did not want anybody else to know about their meeting since their (Soviet) people were very severely surveilled. KOSH replied that this was no wonder, in particular after STASHYNSKYI'S case, to what SHEVCHENKO commented "Do you really believe it". After affirmative answer of KOSHELIVETS, SHEVCHENKO remarked that "It will be still some time clarified".

3. KOSHELIVETS gives following appraisal of the situation: SHEVCHENKO came purposefully to see KOSHELIVETS and his plan of action entailed three variants:

a/ to propose to KOSHELIVETS to return to the Ukraine promising at the same time a good bait for him. This was very easy for SHEVCHENKO to do here,

b/ to induce KOSHELIVETS to stop his anti-Soviet activities and under promises and threats to suggest even that he lives "Suchasnist";

c/ in case of resistance to kidnap him and bring him to their Embassy and from there to the Soviet Union.

KOSHELIVETS ^{thought} ~~concluded~~ that SHEVCHENKO completely failed in his mission and since he must have ^{come} to the conclusion that KOSHELIVETS was unwilling to talk to him *tete-a-tete*, the only solution left for the KGB, was KOSH'S physical liquidation.

SECRET

2 May 63

4. SHEVCHENKO told KOSH and STAKHIV that he will be in MUNICH again around 15 May 1963. KOSH asked in very strong ^{terms} ~~ways~~ not to try to meet him at his house but to phone him in the office or to come there directly.

5. On 29 Apr 1963 when KOSH came from his office for lunch at about 13.00 hrs he noticed a suspicious type standing near his car in front of the house who quickly disappeared.

Re : A "WARNING" to "SUCHASNIŠT'S Editorial Staff in Munich

SOURCE: Ltr of TYMKEVICH , Roman dtd 2 may 1963

1. On 2 May 1963 at 09.10 hrs ,when FUTORSKYI went to the Post Office, and TYMKEVICH was alone in the premisses of "Suchasnist" at 8, Karlsplatz, came a man, aged about 50, 6', in coat, without hat, with umbrella in his hand, slim and unshaved , and wanted to see someone from Editorial staff. When inside the Unknown said that he was coming unshaved "because of you" since he wanted to warn the Editorial staff and their friends of forthcoming liquidation planned by the Russians. He refused to tell his name and insisted that now it was irrelevant. The main thing was that he knew from a Soviet officer in Prague where he was recently that they planned a bigger action against emigrants. There is a list of about 250 persons forseen for the action but the Unknown was unable to remember names .Neither was it possible to photocopy the list. As to MUNICH the mentioned action should include also Ukrainian Free University and the Archives about which TYMKEVICH should know more than the Unknown. At this point he asked TYMKEVICH whether the name "BOGDAN" did ring the bell with him. When T. replied that there were many Bogdans ,the Unknown stressed that he meant a Soviet Lieutenant Colonel or Colonel by the same name who previously directed Soviet Espionage in Iran.

2. The Action against emigrants should have started on 1 May 1963. The Unknown tried to reach ^{safe people} the Editorial staff of "Suchasnist" Tuesday evening and Wednesday to warn them but there was nobody in the office. To the people with whom the Unknown was working (he implied some sort of institution) all that was known and they even succeeded in photographing two individuals who were supposed to take part in the Action. The Unknown murmured some names, one sounded like PAVEL or Pavenko.

3. In the meantime arrived SLAVKO, the Unknown was somewhat confused but then continued his story. He said that one of the participants or executors of the Action was also a BARANOVSKYI Mikhail who previously surveilled sailors in ODESSA. BARANOVSKY stemmed from LVOV.

4. The Unknown refused to be specific , took some notes ^{out} of his pocket and repeated the old story. Then he said he felt relieved after having been able to warn our people and went away.

5. The Unknown spoke perfect literary German (hochdeutsch).

6. At 12.45 hrs same day the Unknown was seen sitting on a bench at Karlsplatz and observing the windows of the building of "Suchasnist".

Ad 1. TYMKEVICH remembers that the Unknown said also something to the effect that the officer from PRAGUE was saved at one time from the Concentration Camp by the Unknown and that's why the former kept informing the Unknown.

SECRET

RE : SHEVCHENKO ,Valeri

SOURCE : Letter of STAKHIV, Volodymyr of Munich, dtd 1 May 1963

1. On 29 Apr 1963 KOSHELIVETS, Ivan asked STAKHIV on the phone to see him immediately on a very urgent business which he subsequently related to STAKHIV and SKAVKO as follows:

At 08.30 hrs same day (29 Apr 1963) when KOSHELIVETS was getting into his car to drive off to work SHEVCHENKO approached him by knocking on his car-window. After greetings SHEVCHENKO joined KOSHELIVETS in the car and they went to the city. When KOSHELIVETS asked his companion how he managed to get his private address SHEVCHENKO answered casually that in an address-book. SHEVCHENKO proposed a meeting with KOSHELIVETS at 14.00, 15.00 or 16.00 hrs same day (29 Apr 1963), on the spot where KOSHELIVETS parked his car. When the latter replied that it was difficult for him to specify any particular time SHEVCHENKO promised that he will wait at all three times for half an hour.

2. According to the plan agreed upon by all three: KOSHELIVETS, STAKHIV and SLAVKO - KOSHELIVETS went to meet SHEVCHENKO together with STAKHIV and SLAVKO was surveilling them. KOSHELIVETS refused categorically to go alone.

On the way to the meeting place SLAVKO discovered at least two men surveilling KOSHELIVETS, STAKHIV and SLAVKO himself.

SHEVCHENKO was rather dissatisfied and upset when KOSHELIVETS came to the meeting at 15.00 hrs not alone but accompanied by STAKHIV. By a few pointed hints he wanted to get rid of him but STAKHIV stayed.

STAKHIV and KOSHELIVETS suggested to go to their office at Karlsplatz 8 but SHEVCHENKO refused it pointing out that he could not go there as a Soviet diplomat. Later on when STAKHIV asked him whether his chief was still TSYBA and what was the latter's first name and patronym, SHEVCHENKO replied that he could not divulge such things because even they might give some clues as to individual's weaknesses and character. At that, again, as a Soviet diplomat he was bound ~~to~~ not to do.

On KOSHELIVETS'S suggestion they went to "Roter Hahn"-restaurant and there SHEVCHENKO stayed till shortly after 17.00 hrs. He said that he was supposed to catch a train and went to the RRoad Station. There he ate sausages, waited for about 20 minutes, went to the Mars-Strasse and there disappeared in the crowd. KOSHELIVETS and STAKHIV were his host and treated him with cognac and wine. SHEVCHENKO rejected politely dinner pointing out that he just had sausages. He also drank very carefully.

3. SHEVCHENKO told his companions that he ~~arrived~~ left KIEV on 19 April together with three other colleagues. They stayed in the beginning in BONN and since three days he was in MUNICH. His colleagues were also in MUNICH but they left already for BONN again. SHEVCHENKO promised to be in MUNICH again around 15 May 1963.

4. During the conversation SHEVCHENKO complained that STAKHIV attacked him as Moscow's servant in his articles after the Vienna Festival. Some pretensions - according to SHEVCHENKO - had also PALAMARCHUK, Luka (Foreign Minister of the Ukrainian SSR) who already read STAKHIV'S "reply" to Palamarchuk's article in "The Communist of the Ukraine" of March 1963, in "Suchasnist'" of Apr 1963. *

As it turned out later on SHEVCHENKO was familiar with contents of the two last issues of "Suchasnist'". Among other things, he mentioned KOSHELIVETS'S article on EVTUSHENKO and said that in many points he shared K'S view about " this hanger-on" but he could not approve the ideological content of his article. SHEVCHENKO also said that "they" meaning himself and PALAMARCHUK received already pamphlets about STASHYNSKYI and "his" reply" to PALAMARCHUK from "Suchasnist'" which were sent to them by STAKHIV.

Further on SHEVCHENKO complained that some papers abroad were still writing about hunger and partizan activities in the Ukraine and pointed to "Shlakh peremohy". On this occasion he mentioned that life in the Ukraine much improved although there was still some shortage of meat and butter.

He also stressed that when "Shlakh peremohy" was writing about KUK commanding the partizan units in the Ukraine, the latter (KUK) - as he stated ~~was~~ ^{later} himself sat already in prison, (in KIEV).

SHEVCHENKO asked about "Ukrainskyi Samostinyk" and wanted to know which exactly political group was publishing it.

With him SHEVCHENKO had "Khrystiyansky Holos" which he allegedly bought at the Rail Road Station.

5. SHEVCHENKO avoided any discussion about recent drive against the young generation of Ukrainian and other writers, poets and artists in the Soviet Union, except for a short comment on EVTUSHENKO (as above).

6. SHEVCHENKO told STAKHIV that he read his pamphlet about STASHYNSKYI'S trial and it was quite remarkable that even the court doubted STASHYNSKYI'S confessions. As SHEVCHENKO understood, STAKHIV was also doubtful as to the genuineness of the whole story. When STAKHIV pointed out that the court proved definitely that all was true, SHEVCHENKO remarked: "Still, it's rather difficult to imagine all that, moreover REBET was an adversary of BANDERA, so why to kill him. I hope some time in the future this problem will be clarified." SHEVCHENKO did not want to elaborate anymore on that topic.

7. SHEVCHENKO stated that he did not know MATVIEYKO and switched at once to another subject.

8. When asked about O. MAZURKEVITCH'S book against "Falsifications of Ukrainian literature" SHEVCHENKO promised to send this book since as he was told by KOSHELIVETS it cannot be obtained through bookshop in Munich.

In his turn, SHEVCHENKO asked K and ST to send him to KIEV "Ukrainian Encyclopedia".

SHEVCHENKO asked for "exact address" because when he sent three years ago three volumes of a linguistic publication to MAKONECHENA (after they met at Youth Festival in Vienna), the parcel was returned as the address was wrong. He was told to send MAZURKEVICH'S book to our office at Karlsplatz.

9. SHEVCHENKO was rather nervous when talking to K and S in "Roter Hahn". Though no smoker he had two cigarettes.

10. About the new chairman of "Society for Cultural Contacts with Abroad" in KIEV - A. KOLOSOVA - SHEVCHENKO said that till now she was chief of Education Department in the CC of the CP Ukraine.

* Both articles by STAKHIV: about Stashynskyi's trial and Response to Palamarchuk were printed additionally in the form of pamphlet, and sent to the Ukraine.

SECRET

11. On 2 May 1963 STAKHIV and KOSHELIVETS reported this case to local police.

12. 29 and 30 Apr 1963 KOSHELIVETS noticed that his house was surveilled by some individual.

13. In STAKHIV'S opinion the KGB might plan a kidnapping of KOSHELIVETS and in general he and K felt rather uneasy about the whole story.

SECRET