

Re Dinner Party at Dr Kl's House on 26 Jan 1965  
Talks with PALAMARCHUK aka Khomych and his Entourage

Source C & S

Date 28 Jan 1965

1. The dinner party of 26 Jan 1965 was formally arranged as a re-visit of PALAMARCHUK to Dr Kl and he was to arrive with his company at 17.00 hrs. In reality, however, the party was to give PALAMARCHUK an opportunity to meet some friends of Dr Kl and "discuss with them relations between emigration and Ukraine". During her visit to PALAMARCHUK on 10 Jan 1965 Dr Kl promised to introduce him at her house to someone who was capable to properly explain demands and complaints of emigration against the Soviet Ukraine. According to Dr Kl till the very dinner party on 26 Jan 1965 she did not tell her Soviet guests who this "someone" would be and limited herself to saying he would be from, or from around, the Round Table Club. C personally does not exclude the possibility that she might have mentioned his name. She knew nothing in advance about S and actually "assumed" that C would come either alone or ~~from~~ with another "Prolog-man".

2. Beside C & S, Dr Kl arranged also a meeting for Rev SOLOVYI <sup>Maletiy</sup> of New York, to see and hand over a memo on Ukrainian Patriarchate to PALAMARCHUK or rather through him to SHELEST, KOLOSSOVA, and PODGORNYYI. "At the last moment" as she put it - after C told her that he will come around 20.00 hrs, Dr Kl persuaded Rev SOLOVYI to write and present personally a paper on Ukrainian Patriarchate, to Palamarchuk at her house same evening before actual beginning of the party. Rev SOLOVYI (Basilian Order) agreed to, of course, "on a strictly private and confidential basis". The paper and the delivery were done by him in no official capacity but

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

"as a few thoughts on the subject presented by a private person".

According to Dr Kl originally she planned to convey the memo herself and decided otherwise only after she was sure that C was not coming at the same time as the Soviet guests. SOLOVYI knew nothing about C and S and left before their arrival.

PALAMARCHUK was completely unaware of SOLOVYI'S coming and was quite surprised when the latter arrived together with Sovs around 19 hrs at Dr Kl's home. As Dr Kl explained she expected PALAMARCHUK at 17.30 hrs and was going to tell him about SOLOVYI then. "Unfortunately", the Soviet guests were late because they had to listen to Stevensog and Dr Kl had no time to notify them about SOLOVYI.

According to Dr Kl, the Soviet guests were quite happy about meeting SOLOVYI. In the beginning PALAMARCHUK was somewhat reserved but after Prof NEDBAYLO showed great interest and respect for the memo and its author the atmosphere became even "warm and friendly", full of mutual respect and goodwill. 3 exemplars of the memo were taken by <sup>CHERNIAVSKI</sup> Cher's wife, and then Prof NEDBAYLO asked for another copy for himself stressing again that SOLOVYI'S approach was very interesting and merited a deeper consideration. PALAMARCHUK restricted himself to generalities and left everything to Prof NEDBAYLO. ~~There was a discussion about the memo and its author.~~

2. Beside PALAMARCHUK, Prof NEDBAYLO Petro Kamefyanovich and CHERNIAVSKI'S wife Margareta Fikhenovna (nee LIUBCHENKO), Soviet group included also CHERNIAVSKIY Victor and DMYTRUK Vira Maksymivna of Pedagogical Institute of Kiev and member of UkrSSR Delegation. The dinner party started after C and S' arrival at 20.40 hrs. Hostesses were Dr Kl and Ev. Two nuns were helping Dr Kl in preparing meals but they did not see ~~xxxxxx~~ C and S nor were aware of their coming.

SECRET

According to Dr Kl, the two nuns, Mother Maria and Sister Artema, Basilians of New York, were also not aware of SOLOVYI'S coming and the latter instructed Dr Kl not to tell them anything either. The nuns left quietly Dr Kl's house after they had finished their job in the kitchen.

The conversation took place mainly at the table. On the Soviet side only PALAMARCHUK and NEDBAYLO participated actively. DMYTRUK was talking little, as were CHERNIAYVSKYI and his wife. Particularly CHERNIAYVSKYI Viktor kept mostly quiet at the table and only listened. At the end of the party he exchanged a few words with S separately. So did NEDBAYLO in the beginning and during the party with C. Otherwise, the conversation went in "a free-for-all-manner" with exception of two "formal toasts" by the hosts and the Minister (for cooperation between Ukraine and emigration and as a praise to Dr Kl's Ukrainian hospitality). The atmosphere was quite friendly and at ease from very beginning though there were also some tense moments on the part of the Soviet guests particularly at the time of "surprizing" them with some data on Shevchenko celebrations in Kiev in 1964, on Conference on Culture of Ukrainian Language in Kiev of 1963, and the arson in Kiev <sup>National</sup> Library in May 1964. The party lasted until 1.45 a.m., there was quite a lot to drink and eat and guests seemed to be quite tired at the end. Among drinks brought by Soviet guests prevailed Ukrainian horilka and cognac.

4. When parting PALAMARCHUK and NEDBAYLO expressed the wish "to have the pleasure to meet again with C and S sometime next week as their (Pal's and Ned's) guests at a restaurant somewhere in New York". They added that they discarded themselves the premises of the Mission as "unsuitable" and would arrange the party in a restaurant, Dr Kl will be the one through whom they will get in contact with C and S. They will phone her on 1 Feb 1965.

SECRET



SECRET

TOPICS DISCUSSED

A. PALAMARCHUK

1. Diplomatic relations between Kiev and the West, the satellites etc.

The topic was touched directly by C who asked "jokingly" when P was going to open his Embassy in Washington, D.C. According to P this depended on Americans. "No one asked us to establish diplomatic relations and we are not going to beg for it". "Another problem if they (diplomatic relations) were useful for us at the present", and in his opinion Ukraine can do very well without them. According to P, the State Department is <sup>2</sup>against the establishment of diplomatic relations with Kiev and in this respect ignores the resolutions of the Congress. He did not want to admit that Farbatstein and Smith's resolutions had not <sup>been</sup> passed even in the Congress and were not binding the Administration and parred it with "but in case of so called debts and the 19th paragraph of the Charter the American Government listens carefully to and follows the advice of the Congress".

P knows positively that the State Department is against the establishment of diplomatic relations with Kiev. He talked with Ambassador KOHLER and with others and only recently the State Department showed ~~xxx~~ its real attitude toward Ukraine. After the Treaty banning nuclear tests had been finally agreed upon and signed by three main contracting parties, the Ukraine expressed the wish to sign it separately too in Washington, D.C. and P personally discussed the problem with Mr STEVENSON. The latter fully supported P's idea and promised to phone him immediately from Washington about the final arrangements. "You know what happened?" - P continued - indeed, I got a phone call from Mr STEVENSON who apologized that he was talking to me without instructions of his State Department, that the matter was not that simple, and that he was sorry to notify me that there was nothing to be done to let Ukrainian Republic sign the treaty.. "Can you imagine something like

SECRET

that ? This is for you only one of examples of real attitude and intentions of the State Department regarding Ukraine."

P talked also with KOHLER about diplomatic relations. A few years ago Ambassador KOHLER was in Kiev. They also met in Moscow on other occasions. KOHLER also is not sincere in his attitude to Ukraine and establishment of diplomatic relations. "He is a gambler and that's it". " And we are not going to ask, to beg them for diplomatic relations, moreover we are not going to pay for them with adjusting our policy according to American tune". Asked why does he (P) identify diplomatic relations with adjusting his foreign policy according to American tune, P began again to complain that the State Department was not sincere towards Ukraine, "they all were gamblers; they wanted to use diplomatic relations for their own purposes, only". "I can assure that no one, not even KOHLER is interested genuinely in establishment of ~~xxxxxx~~ diplomatic relations with Ukraine".

The same applies to Great Britain and he knew very well about the latter's so called proposal of 1947. There was no such proposal actually made because neither Moscow nor Kiev were officially approached by the British on that subject. P studied all the pertinent documents and could assure us that there were only minutes of an informal talk about eventual diplomatic relations between London and Kiev. "But the British were not suggesting, they were only asking about, and I have no doubt that they had no sincere intention to establish diplomatic relations with us".

As to Sudanese initiative- this was also an informal, casual act. The Sudanese Government sent a general appeal to every country in the world that they want to maintain friendly diplomatic and other contacts with ~~xxxx~~ all states. This was immediately after Sudan was admitted to the UN. But there was no specific act, no specific appeal directed to Ukrainian government, and therefore Kiev replied that Ukraine was ready to cultivate friendly relations with Sudan on the forum of United Nations.

5.6

SECRET

"The Sudanese proposal followed their admittance to the UN and they made an appeal to everybody". They did not ask us to establish diplomatic relations, there was no direct request, just only a general appeal" P stressed.

Asked what was wrong with an eventual Ukrainian initiative, Pal replied that he simply saw no need for it at the present. He has a full folder of "opinions" on his article in "Komunist Ukrainy" in which he has expressed himself against diplomatic relations and he has not changed his mind. In his opinion, separate Ukrainian diplomatic representations were unnecessary since there was only one Soviet policy and that had been properly taken care of by Soviet Embassies. Through the latter Ukraine was adequately represented in the aspect of international politics, and also by its present representations and memberships in various international organizations. "Ukraine takes active part in work of 42 international organizations, councils and commissions" and he began to enumerate them.

Interrupted by C by a question about an extension of Rapacki Plan i.e. his opinion on his eventual suggestion to include Ukraine in a denuclearized zone what C thought to be not only in national interests of Ukr SSR but also would be different from "one Soviet policy", P seemed to be quite surprised, thought for a while and then said: "Well, I think it would be impractical at the present, the Rapacki Plan did not include Ukraine anyway, it would take Ukraine out of Soviet context, yes, no, it would be really impractical..." NEDBAYLO went to help him by murmuring something to the effect that this was not simple, this was difficult also.

Referring to Prof NEDBAYLO as the authority on state (constitutional) and international law, Pal wanted to prove that diplomatic relations were not the attributes of sovereignty, there were states without diplomatic representations or with "partial representations" and Ukraine was one of them. S pointed to practical advantages of diplomatic relations for Kiev under present circumstances. Pal did not deny them but to avoid a direct confirmation

SECRET

starting again with reiteration of international organizations in which Ukraine was represented. To him this was a clearcut proof of Ukrainian sovereignty also in its international aspect. C raised the problem of diplomatic relations from the point of view of how far <sup>indeed</sup> Ukraine was a subject of international law and international politics (and not just <sup>an</sup> object). Pal was not going however to ~~let himself get~~ <sup>himself get</sup> any deeper involved into this kind of discussion and repeated again and again that in his view Ukraine was a subject of international politics and he had no doubt about it.

The conversation switched over to the personnel of P's Ministry. With pride Pal said that TSYBA will go now to Vienna to represent there Ukraine at the Atomic Agency, UDOVYCHENKO will go to Geneva, and one of P's deputies will become ~~ambassador~~ <sup>an envoy</sup> in one of African countries.

Then he started to tell of some of his diplomatic experiences, how he had to negotiate at one time with Italian representative Licheri /?/ and with Spaniards to assure Ukraine's place at <sup>the</sup> Economic and Social Council of the UN and stressed the fact that "we were talking with Spain though we had no diplomatic relations with that country". S suggested that there could be now a way out by establishing diplomatic relations between Kiev and Madrid, thus the Soviet Union would maintain "normal channels of communication" without being "compromised" directly. P and NED thought this was not a bad idea ~~but~~ <sup>it</sup> but received <sup>it</sup> rather as a good "joke".

C mentioned that there was something developing along cultural exchange line, Bolshoi was scheduled to go to Spain, also Kiev Ballet, and others.

DMYTRUK remarked that recently Kiev Ballet was in Paris. C asked what happened to GONTAR that he failed to come. Pal replied that GONTAR was sick at that time, "really sick, he had flu, it was no diplomatic illness". Pal knows Gontar personally but he does not like him. Gontar is very arrogant, egotistic, ruthless, "just like his father-in-law". He has done much for the Ballet but as a human being is no good. "You see - P continued -



SECRET

I am a passionate fisher, so is Gontar, and I judge people by the way they treat fish. Usually they treat human beings same way. I didn't like the way Gontar treated fish and I didn't like ~~xxxxxxx~~ the way he treated people",

2. Soviet Ukrainian Elite. Switching over from "external attributes of sovereignty" to its "internal basis in sociological aspect", C raised the question in how far the selfassertion of Ukrainians is being preserved, along ~~xxxxx~~ what line it is developing, what is the role of Ukrainian intelligentsia also. C concluded with a direct question whether Ukrainian people as such were not on the way to become "some sort of Russian Bavarians", and pointed to some examples of Russification. The reaction of Pal and NEDBAYLO was very strong, particularly of the former. PAL started assuring C and S that Ukraine retained its "internal sovereignty" as well, that Ukrainians will never become Russians, C and emigration in general are doing great injustice to Soviet Ukrainian intelligentsia if they think that their Soviet colleagues don't care about Ukraine, its culture, its people also. "We have great achievements, often they were not easy to obtain, but we are trying to do much and we have many successes". "But we are also internationalists, we don't want to be contained in our national shell only, when we speak Russian this happens only because we respect Russian people, its culture, its help for us, its brotherly friendship..." C interrupted by pointing out that he himself likes and respects Russian culture and is very fond of Russian literature, but what is being observed among Ukrainian Soviet intelligentsia is a neglect of native language and culture at the expense of Russian ones, a lack of selfrespect also. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ This has nothing to do with internationalism moreover when Russians are dizzy today with chauvinism and official Soviet policy is being filled with Russian chauvinistic politics in all fields: politics, culture, language, economy. S added about Russian or rather present Soviet historiography, mentioned POKROVSKYI who is being still reprinted, and pointed out that whereas KLUCHEVSKYI has been reprinted HRUSHEVSKYI

is still banned . He remarked also on PAL'S assertion that they all ~~are~~ i.e. leading Ukrainian intelligentsia use only Ukrainian in institutions and in private. Judging by what S saw in Ukraine the opposite was the truth though he did not want to name the individuals concerned. Pal began again to emphasize that they do care about Ukrainian people , they have great achievements, Ukrainian nation and its culture will never disappear. However, the Ukrainian emigration, those complainers will never acknowledge what Ukrainian Soviet intelligentsia is doing for Ukrainian people, "Svoboda" and those alike will continue to criticize them but they don't care finally because they are making progress and no one is going to stop them.

C replied that it was wrong to describe all emigrants as complainers and that many Ukrainians abroad had much understanding for what Ukrainian intelligentsia was doing at home but this was not enough. S mentioned that not all papers are writing as "Svoboda", there are also magazines like "Suchasnist". C also mentioned that very often those "complainers" were quite right in appraisal and critique of Soviet politics and gave examples.

PAL assured again that they were no worse patriots than the ~~emigrants~~ emigrants , there were of course some opportunists who neglected Ukrainian language and Ukrainian interests, but they were fewer and fewer, and he also wanted to stress that there was no official Russification as such in Ukraine.

3. Shevchenko Celebrations. As an example of how well Ukrainian matters stood at home PAL pointed to Shevchenko celebrations in Kiev, Kanav, and all over Ukraine. DMYTRUK mentioned Shevchenko celebration in Moscow. S remarked that actually in Moscow not even press was invited in time to the unveiling of the monument. PAL replied that he was not sure about that but he could talk about Ukraine. "This was a real national holiday, thousands and thousands of people participated in it". " In Kiev , you know- he continued - after official part of ceremonies ended thousands of people remained in the hall and outside and continued reciting poems , singing

SECRET

"Zapovit' and other songs". " No one wanted to go home, particularly youth was very enthusiastic." That's how we celebrate, not in the way you were doing it here distorting the image about our 'Batko'".

C said that as far as we know there were all kinds of "celebrations" in Kiev and mentioned the broken glass-panel at the Kiev University. S added how about "events" of 22 May 1964 that happened around the Shevchenko monuments

PAL categorically denied that he never heard about something like that. NEDBAYLO added that he was from University and he must had known about it if it should have happened. The same said DMYTRUK. They all were very excited and embarrassed. DMYTRUK and NEDBAYLO continued to deny it.

Then PAL said : " Well, I don't know, this all looks to me very improbable."

"As I see, you have your own informations, and I can assume where it comes from." " But it might be onesided, untruthful, one has better to check on it."

" Maybe we would do both better by not sticking unreservedly to our informations, "Who knows?"

4. PAL mentioned the arson in/ the Kiev Library as an example of what kind of news the emigration puts forward. "Do you really believe our Soviet authorities were behind it ? " - he asked.

After explanations of C and S , PAL and DMYTRUK began to deny any official "conspiracy". NEDBAYLO added that the arsonist wanted even to kill the daughter of Library's Director and she escaped death or injuries only due to the fact that he could not find her at the time of "relapse".

According to PAL, the arsonist was wounded during the war, was mentally ill, and that was a pity Director of the Library did not ~~back~~ sack him years ago but out of compassion for "poor man" continued to employ ~~him~~.

SECRET

SECRET

"What about anti-fire precautions, coverage of Soviet press also?" - Soviet guests were asked. DMYTRUK continued to deny that there was anything wrong, she herself saw how the fire was being put out, hydrants were working perfectly, Kiev papers were writing about it.

Then PAL "calmed down" DMYTRUK with a move of his hand and said:  
" No, no, no governmental organization was involved in the arson. Believe me I say the truth. But I have to admit that we <sup>have</sup> mishandled the whole matter as far as the press is concerned. We have to admit we were wrong. We should have written about the arsonist, about his trial, we should have given all and full explanations. Yes, we made a mistake in this respect. On the other hand I want also to stress that we shall do all in our power to restore the Library. Actually, it's almost ready now. Restoration-works are practically finished, now we continue with supplementing the damaged books and material. Yes, I don't deny, this was a national tragedy, a great blow to us all, moreover that it was done by a Ukrainian. But I can assure you at the same time that we suffer because of this national tragedy no less than you do."

5. "What you want us to do?" PAL began to complain about a malign attitude of emigration toward Soviet Ukraine, Ukrainian people, its achievements. He emphasized that emigre-activities do much harm to their cause. "You deny us to be representatives of Ukrainian state and nation, you call us agents of a foreign government - Pal continued - you deny even we are Ukrainians!" " And you can't imagine how much you hurt us by your 'attacks' among American public; ~~you~~ <sup>you</sup> put stumbling blocks to our efforts to make Ukraine, Soviet Ukraine, known in the world."

Pal wishes that there <sup>be</sup> ~~were~~ more understanding and goodwill <sup>between</sup> ~~among~~ the Soviet Ukraine and Ukrainian emigration and in spite of all he hopes that recently made contacts between Ukraine and Abroad will develop and bring positive results.

C commented that it was PAL'S and his staff's responsibility for insufficient information on Ukraine in the world. What was doing his press-atache, had he one at all? Where are their bulletins, press conferences, contacts with foreign press also?

And as to further contacts with emigration - those will depend mainly on what they - Ukrainian intelligentsia - will do in the Ukraine. C stressed that emigration was not interested in stepping, for instance, polemics against emigrants or "cultural trips". What was needed was a new policy, a new situation in the Ukraine created by Soviet Ukrainian Government and the party at home. It's their turn to do something really substantial in favor of Ukrainian people.

Pal replied that CHER was his pressattache. He is very thankful for suggestions, and really they will have something to do about it. CHER remarked that he was not sure whether American Government will approve of their bulletins. NEDBAYLO indicated that this was not to the point, bulletins could be issued.

As to other things PAL wanted to know what emigration wanted them to do. C explained: <sup>real</sup> partnership with Russians for Ukrainian communists, De-Russification of Ukraine, also.

Pal replied that they were partners with Russians, there was no Russification. They are trying to improve things and are making progress.

"Why don't you start at least with resolutions of the Conference on the Culture of Ukrainian Language of Feb 1963" - asked C.

"We don't know what you are talking about" - was the answer of all of them. C explained. DMYTRUK denied that there ever was any such conference, she was from the Pedagogical Institute and she never heard about it.

CHER's wife stressed that she was employed with Literary Dept of Kiev University and she also knew nothing about. NEDBAYLO kept silent. PAL knew nothing about the Conference, too.

SECRET

The conversation dwelt upon education, lack of Ukrainian schools in the Russian Republic, Russian schools in Ukraine also. Pal asked finally what were the resolutions of the Conference of Feb 1963. C explained. DMYTRUK continued to deny that such a conference took place. C pointed again to "Nasha Kultura". Then Pal said: "I think we have to check on that, too. There is no point in denying the conference - turning to Dmytruk - it's quite possible we simply have overlooked it. It's better to admit we were wrong." He would like, however, to see "Nasha Kultura" with the resolutions of the Conference. C promised to show him them eventually. Pal and his friends were still puzzled "by such resolutions" in view of the fact that there was no Russification in the Ukraine, no one wanted Ukrainian schools in Russia, also. Pal added that this was a serious matter and they will have to study it.

6. Press-Dialogue. I mentioned that while in Kiev he heard from some people that they would be interested in a dialogue with emigration, meaning an exchange of opinions in a correct way between Soviet and emigre magazines and papers. Pal thought this was a good idea and merited proper consideration. He asked what magazine or paper abroad would enter into such a dialogue. The answer was that "Suchasnist" would do it eventually.

At one moment Pal spread his hands and replied: "I really don't know why should I take all this beating. I wish I had here on my right our Minister of Education and on the left our Minister of Higher School and they should account to you, O boy!"

SECRET

SECRET

B. NEDBAYLO Petro Kamefyanovich.

N.B. These are informations told to C in their <sup>has</sup> tete-a-tete conversation at an interval shortly before the party/ended, and in their conversation at the table.

1. New Soviet Constitution.

NED was working on the first part of the new Constitution which should be ready in approx. one year. It's almost ready, <sup>not</sup> but some parts need final polishing and correction. The first part deals with the nature of Soviet Union and Union-Republics, <sup>as states</sup> sources of power etc. The Soviet Federalistic System will be retained. The sovereignty of union-republics will be strengthened "but of course practical implementation of those provisions will depend on actual political situation". The role of civic organizations will be increased too. NED did not think the new constitution will mean further step toward unification. Individual provisions do not foresee it. Rather there <sup>is</sup> an opposite trend. The question of official language will be probably omitted altogether.

Any basic changes? NED thought the most important change consisted in adoption of many provisions of the 1919-Ukrainian Soviet Constitution into the new one. Of course, these deal mainly with theoretical problems.

Any indication toward Confederalism in consequence of widening the sovereignty of union-republics? No. According to NED the Soviet federalism will be retained and sustained. Of course, NED can talk only for the part he has been working on. There might come some new changes but he did not think anything basic will change.

2. Soviet Leaders.

BREZHNEV - only grew up in the Ukraine. POLIANSKY is <sup>also</sup> Russian. <sup>who</sup> said he had anything to do with Ukraine and Ukrainians. <sup>?</sup>

SECRET

SECRET

SHELEST is Ukrainian like all from Ukraine, a rather average individual. PODGORNYYI - yes, Ukrainian. According to NED no substantial changes are to be expected in nationality policy. Everything will remain more or less as before. The assertion about "Ukrainian clique" in the Kremlin in the sense of changes in internal politics of the Soviet Union is "a ~~strong~~ exaggeration".

### 3. Prof LAZORENKO

Prof NED knows him personally. For twenty years NED was in West Ukraine, to be more precise in Lviv. He lectured there in 1940/41 and then after WW II. He knows many lawyers, or rather professors of law from Lviv. Prof LAZORENKO was from Eastern Ukraine. He was Rector of <sup>Lviv</sup> the University for 13 years. Then he was to be replaced because he became "too highhanded". NED did not think there were any other reasons for his removal. Anyway he remained at Lviv-University until now.

### 4. General Situation

Having been for twenty years in Lviv, NED understands very well what C and his colleague are talking about. He can only say one thing: Ukraine, even West Ukraine is different than many people abroad would like it to be. Many changes have been implemented. He can assure C that Ukrainians are moving upward and no one will be able to stop them. What was particularly promising was the fact that more and more young intelligentsia are getting sincerely interested in their national affairs, history, language, and this is a massive movement. One should only see Shevchenko celebrations in Kiev and Kaniv.

### 5. Lawyers' Case

C asked NED whether there were some attempts on the part of Ukrainian jurists to widen UkrSSR's sovereignty by applying to the Supreme Soviet and the UN for full implementation of Soviet Constitution. NED replied he heard nothing about it. C did not elaborate.

SECRET



6. Miscellaneous

NED specializes in the theory of law. He likes also constitutional (state) law. Is very proud of the fact that Prof HAZARD is his friend. The latter should have told him that he is only a critic of Soviet law but no enemy of the Soviet Union. In discussion on monopoly of power NED stuck to official Soviet line. Asked to send him c/a Ukrainian Mission works by prof Halachyk, particularly those on sovereignty of Ukr SSR.

C. CHERNIAVSKIY Viktor

In conversation with S :

1. CHER is an admirer of young Ukrainian poets and writers.

He has collections of DRACH, KOSTENKO, VINERANOVSKIY and others.

The attack of "elderly ones" against the young poets and artists had less political and more "human" motivation. Old generation cannot compete with the young one. Whereas there is a great demand for works of the young no one cares for their elder colleagues.

There are great achievements in cultural field in Ukraine.

CHER had no doubts that sooner or later the young generation will come to the fore and then things will change even to the better.

Much work is being now done on rehabilitation of 1920's and 1930's. In 2-3 years KHVYLOVYYI will be also partly rehabilitated. Some people in Kiev are working now on him.

2. Yuri KOSACH was in Ukraine and was planning to come there again. Soon he will go to Paris.

D. DMYTRUK Vira Maksymivna

In general conversation:

1. Widow, her husband died after WW II, she is with Pedagogical Institute in Kiev, has two children - boy and girl - ~~institute~~ aged around 20.

E. CHERNIAVSKA Margarita nee Lubchenko

Mostly kept quite participated only in general conversation, perfect in etiquette, her husband and others usually followed her example at the table, cared for proper supply of alcohol for C and S,  
- typical "new class high echelon Soviet lady".

SECRET

SECRET