

SECRET

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

Subject: R 1

Date: 4 Aug 1966

1. This is the primary report on Subject's trip to Poland and CSSR, from 20 Jun to 17 Jul, and from 17 Jul to 22 Jul 1966, respectively, based on her debriefing by our man in Paris on 28 Jul 1966, next ~~day~~ after her return to France. On her way home Subject stopped in East and West Germany (2 days in Munich). A detailed chronological report is being written down by Subject and will be submitted later on.

As instructed Subject visited R 2 and R 3. She was to obtain all the available information on recent ~~events~~^(Re-arrests) in Ukraine and their aftermath, in the Soviet Union and the satellite countries, convey pertinent general information and desiderata from abroad, and take with her documents, poetry and other materials from R 2 and R 3. She was to abstain from smuggling out those materials in case she would find out or notice anything suspicious that might have put in ~~trouble~~ her contacts or /and herself.

Whereas Subject brought the obtained information and left \$ 20.- plus NFr 800.- with R 2 to be handed over to the people in the Ukraine, she did not take any materials with her. She also left NFr 100.- with R 3.

2. Subject left Paris, as a tourist, for Poland on 20 Jun 1966, at 14.00hrs. On the train she met an American lady of Polish descent, wife of a GI stationed in Orleans, France, and kept her company. At the border the American lady was asked by Polish customs officers to open her suitcases of which she had quite a few. Subject was not bothered at all after she told the officers that she was a student and had only one suitcase and one bag. Subject noticed that Polish students returning from France had to open their suitcases, many books were found, but nothing was taken away from them. Subject had to fill in a declaration-form on how much money she had but she did not state the whole sum she was bringing in.

SECRET

She was not asked whereto she was travelling or any other details about her trip.

3. Subject arrived in Warsaw, Poland on 21 Jun 1966 at 18.30 hrs. She was helped to the Students Dormitory at Kickiego 9 by a Pole who was ~~meeting~~ at the Railway Station some French student or secretary. The latter introduced Subject to the Pole and both invited Subject to do some sightseeing together.

(Subject was given the address of the Dormitory by C. and she also knew how to find there R 2).

At approx. 20.00 hrs Subject was already at the Dormitory. She was asked whether she had a reservation but she had none. They placed her together with a Polish student who agreed to share her room only after she learned Subject was French. The Polish girl plans to visit France. She gave Subject Zl.300.- and asked ~~her~~ to return it in NFr to her when she comes to Paris.

Next day, at 16.00 hrs Subject contacted R 2 through another Ukrainian student who called him from his room. She told who she was and conveyed greetings from R 4. R 2 did not ask much and they talked mainly about studies in Ukraine and Poland.

R 2 told her that he spent 4 years in the Ukraine, in Kiev and Lvov, knew personally KPUBA Emil and C. Saunier of Bordeaux, France. (N.B. Saunier is another French student of Ukrainistics in Kiev who was sent there by Prof Luciani in 1965. S. seems to be a typical bookworm specializing in translation, with ^{practically} no contacts with local Ukrainians, quite the opposite of Kruba.)

R 2 asked Subject what address she was given by R 4 because the latter had his old address of Rynek Starego Miasta. He told her also that in 1964 he had visited Moscow and Leningrad; in Dec 1964 he was in Leningrad at the same time as R 1 was staying there.

The title of R2's thesis is "The Development of Ukrainian Novel", he is going back to Kiev in Sept 1966, or eventually somewhat later. They discussed general situation in the Ukraine and R 2 was quite optimistic about further developments there despite recent arrests and other setbacks. He also mentioned that in Lvov he felt almost like "at home" while in Kiev the atmosphere was "more Eastern."

4. R 2 brought Subject to BOBERSKI Bogdan of Rynek Starego Miasta, an engineer, Ukrainian, single, aged 40, 5'6, slim, his relatives live in ^{West} Ukraine. BOBERSKI seemed to be a good friend of R 2 and both were telling her about persecutions of Ukrainians in Poland. Ukrainians in Poland were constantly watched by UB and, for instance, Boberski's telephone, he assumed, was bugged. They told her also about a very successful Ukrainian concert of last night in Warsaw in which choirs from different provinces took part. The Polish press did not write a word about ^{it} but nevertheless the concert will ^{definitely} strengthen the morale of Ukrainians.

During another encounter with BOBERSKI, on 26 Jun 1966, the latter told R 1 that he would like to go to China to "establish contact with Chinese communists".

5. On 23 Jun, in the morning R 2 invited Subject to his place and introduced to about 8 of his friends, all Ukrainians and Ukrainists, some of them had studied in Kiev like R 2; no names, however, were mentioned. Subject learned that they "kept together", separately from Poles, went often on excursions, also to CSSR. R 2 "explained" that there will be no problem in finding them when someone comes from abroad. They all are interested in modern Ukrainian literature and talked much about it. R 2 acted as their leader.

R 2 showed 25-30 graphic prints from Ukraine, varying thematically from supermodern and abstract to classical, and folkart. Some of these reprints were already reproduced in the "Ukrainsky Kalendar" of 1966 published by Nase Slovo of Warsaw.

-4-

R2 played a tape of poems personally recited by DRACH, KOSTENKO, and KALYNETS. All unpublished as yet.

KALYNETS Ihor is a religious poet, of Lvov.

6. At 18.30 same day Subject met with R 2 again. He took her to a Ukrainian family in Warsaw by the name MYSYK, another friends of R2. MYSYKS have a daughter, aged 30, single. R 2 brought Subject to them to find some old Ukrainian books for her. MYSYKS are a very nice Ukrainian family, they still keep completes of Ukrainian magazines and journals from the period before 1939.

7. The night of 23/24 Jun Subject spent ~~with~~ a Polish family by the name KARBOWSKI and next day did with them sightseeing.

8. On 25 Jun Subject went to the Library and checked on how well there were represented Ukrainistics. Some authors like SKRYPNYK, KHVELOVYI, EFREMOV, KULISH were not available at all. She found "Ukraine-Rus" in English by Polonska published in New York, 1965. (N.B. Probably the one ^{the} Prolog has sent.)

9. On Sunday, 26 Jun, Subject went to the church (Ukrainian catholic) at Miodowa ul. 16. There she met some nuns, Rev. ROMANYK, BOBERSKI, and PANKIV (PANKOW), Wlodzimierz of Pruszkow K/W-wy, ul. Chopina, blok 2, m. 34. A Ukrainian choir was singing and attendance was quite numerous.

10. According to Rev ROMANYK neither the Polish government nor the Polish Catholic Church were in favor of appointing a Ukrainian bishop in Poland. Therefore there were little chances Ukrainians will get one. The Orthodox Church is located at Torgowa ul. and the bulk of the faithful are Ukrainians.

with BOBERSKI

11. After the mass Subject met R 2 and together they went to PANKOW. The latter is married, ^{has} a child aged 1.

-5-

PANKOWS seemed to be a nice young Ukrainian couple. He visited in 1964 or 1965 England and spent there about 3 months. While in London he also visited SUB.

At Pankows they discussed Nasze Slovo and Subject was shown a ^{typewritten} satirical leaflet about Nashe Slovo very critical of this publication. They also discussed the mutual influence and interaction of Eastern and Western Ukraine on each other and R2 mentioned the fact that West Ukrainian students had taught ~~at~~ their colleagues in Kiev many Ukrainian partizan songs/UPA songs/.

From Pankows Subject went with R 2 to her place.

12. When walking R 2 told Subject tete-a-tete the following:

a/ After his return from Ukraine R 2 was interrogated by UB and they asked him whether there was "a circuit" (^{network} sitka) handling over various materials from Ukraine to Ukrainians abroad via Poland and CSSR.

b/SVITLYCHNYI Ivan was accused of having handed over abroad manuscripts by Symonenko Vasyl. "They" assume it was done by Roksolana or R 4. "They" know all about R 4 - with whom and where she met / during her trip to Ukraine/.

SVITLYCHNYI was also accused of acting against party line in literary policy. During the arrest his house was searched, many books published abroad, and those before 1939 in West Ukraine and ~~xxx~~ before 1930 in East Ukraine, were found and confiscated.

R 2 had just received a letter from Ukraine informing him that SVITLYCHNYI was very exhausted and in poor health, jobless, and his friends had organized a financial collection to help him and his family. His wife is working but her earnings ^{are} ~~are~~ very low.

c/ DZIUBA Ivan was arrested and interrogated on denunciation of BELODID Ivan who hated DZIUBA and wanted to liquidate him by all means. DZIUBA was accused, like SVITLYCHNYI, of acting against party line in literary policy and disseminating ~~of~~ publications printed abroad.

SECRET

His wife is working, but like SVITLYCHNYIS, they live in very miserable conditions. "They" simply let not Dziuba earn any money. His health is very poor, too.

In sum, the need for help is very great and urgent.

Collections of money are being organized on the spot and R 2 mentioned that prior to the one for Svitlychnyi of which he was informed by the above mentioned letter from Ukraine, there was another one for both, Svitlychny and Dziuba, to enable them to spend some time in Crimea, ^{and} especially for a sanatorium for Dziuba.

R 2 asked to arrange for an international institution or organization to suggest to DZIUBA a cure in Switzerland at its expense.

d/ R 2 asked to convey "to our friends ^{abroad} that they should publish not only works of good people but also of the bad ones as well, in order to deceive the authorities. He mentioned NOVYCHENKO as one example that should be printed abroad, too.

He also asked to avoid any strong polemics and political commenting, particularly ^{concerning political} in favorable sense for good people.

According to R 2 KOSHELIVETS made a mistake by not ~~accepting~~ printing LAHREBELNY Pavlo.

e/ DRACH Ivan works as a scenario writer and is quite independent.

f/ KOROTYCH Vitali is "somewhat outside of the group..." He is different.

g/ R 2 asked that no books or any other published material abroad ~~should~~ be sent to private addresses to Ukraine and Poland. Subject was told that R 2 had much trouble with UB because of the books sent to him by R 4, and anyway he had received only two of them though he knew there were many more.

SECRET

h/ Financial support from abroad is needed. In R2's opinion this could be done by some diplomatic peach to Moscow and then through local contacts to Kiev. He gave the address of R 5 who could be contacted in the future. The recognition signal : "Greetings from Stepan". This contact could be used both ways ; for handling over materials from and to the group.

/ R 6 is a friend of Subject and starting this fall will study for one year in Moscow. Subject suggests to use her for contacting the Kiev group via R 5 /.

i/ SHCHYRBA Mykola and some other "managers" of Nashe Slovo were appointed by the party but they were Ukrainian patriots and not bad. The only trouble with them was their passivism, lack of initiative, inability to push things; "they register instead of moving things forward..." Still, the work being done by Nashe Slovo is tremendous and more important than ~~it~~ done by emigration. Out of 7,000 exemplares of Nashe Slovo , 2,000 of each issue goes to Ukraine , on private addresses (there are no official representatives^{se}) . This figure speaks for itself.

13. On 27 Jun Subject visited Nashe Slovo alone. She was received by HOSHOVSKI (HOSZOWSKI). He asked her about studies, her parents, her interests aso. H. wanted to know what is being read in emigration . Then he called VERBOVY,fnu and his wife (Ukrainian of Kiev whom he married in Kiev while studying there Ukrainistics). At present there are 9 students of Ukrainistics on the first year, 6 are graduating, and 30 have already graduated. Almost all of them studied also on stipends in Kiev. The level of Ukrainistics in Kiev is very high. On this occasion, both VERBOVY and HOSHOVSKI told Subject that all lectures are in Ukrainian except for technical disciplines .

According to VERBOVY the Ukrainian Soviet authorities

do not send many students to Warsaw and furthermore all arrangements are being made "directly" through Moscow. Somehow Kiev is quite reluctant to further student exchange between Poland and Ukraine. A further reduction of stipends ^{in Kiev} for students from Warsaw is to be expected. Still, this autumn there will be going to Kiev about 20-25 students from ~~Warsaw~~ Lignica Pedagogical Ukrainian School.

Nashe Slovo is very popular in the Ukraine.

VERBOVY stressed that Ukrainian clubs (USKT) are organized all over Poland and this was the only possibility for Ukrainians "to ~~hold~~ hold themselves together."

Referring to the visit of General de Gaulle ~~in~~ Kiev on the very same day, VERBOVY told Subject that he and his friends on editorial board ~~had~~ ^{expected} from it a widening of cultural exchange between Ukraine and France. When Subject mentioned that to R 2, the latter replied that these expectations were too optimistic, he personally did not believe anything serious would come out. / According to R 2, VERBOVYI and his wife were good Ukrainians. Verbovy spent four years in Kiev. /

According to VERBOVY, KOSTENKO Lina "and some other people" from Ukraine visited last year Warsaw.

Next day a Ukrainian from Canada, returning from his trip to Ukraine, was scheduled to talk ~~saxxix~~ about Ukrainian emigration in Canada at the USKT, Warsaw. Apparently, he was a "progressive".

VERBOVY stressed that at Warsaw University many theses had been written on Ukrainistics and the interest in this subject was very great.

The afternoon Subject spent with Ukrainian nuns at their premises at Miodowa 16 and the evening with KARBOWSKI-family at their home.

14. On 28 Jun, in the morning Subject visited REJT Irena, Ukrainian, aged 28, single, who has a sister with Ukrainian nuns in Paris. Irena contributes to Nashe Slovo; she lives together with her mother and brother who is just graduating from grammar

SECRET

-9-

school. Irene is an intelligent person, well read, and active in Ukrainian life in Poland. She teaches Russian at grammar school. For two years studied in Kiev.

In Irene's opinion Ukrainian emigration was not doing enough for their compatriots in the Ukraine. It was not enough to grieve about the people's sufferings; this was useless. A constructive work must be done abroad, primarily aimed at strengthening all positive trends and developments in the Ukraine. Among other things, many more translations from Ukrainian into Western languages should be published abroad, many more students of Ukrainian descent should study Slavistics and relative subjects.

Ukrainian studentry in the Ukraine was full of devotion to Ukrainian cause and did all they could to strengthen Ukrainian national identity. They even forced foreign students to learn Ukrainian.

Irene confirmed that ^{Ukrainian} stipends for students from Poland were reduced and wondered whether new graduates of Ukrainian Philology of Warsaw University would be sent to Kiev.

Irene also mentioned that Nashe Slovo was of great importance for Ukrainian people in the Ukraine. In her opinion similar function could perform KOSACH Yuri with his "Za Synim Okeanom". (The same Subject was told by R 2 and R 3).

In the afternoon Subject went to buy a ticket to GOLDAP where she was going to visit her relatives, and before departure saw again R 2.

15. She was told by R 2 the following:

a/ He left Kiev ^{late} autumn (October or November¹⁹⁶⁵) after the arrests had started. He was forced to leave because he was afraid that "they" might arrest him too.

However, he was summoned by UB in Warsaw after his arrival and since then remained under ~~constant~~ surveillance. ^{has} he feels now somewhat reassured after SVITLYCHNYI conveyed to him that he had not betrayed ~~anybody~~ him nor anybody else. SVITLYCHNY

SECRET

conveyed this message to R 2 ~~after~~ after his release from prison in May 1966.

The KGB tried to recruit R2 to work for them and promised him "a golden life". He refused to collaborate. In his opinion they are waiting now for an opportunity "to pay him in kind". Still, he decided to return to Ukraine. "The life is dangerous but interesting". After his PhD he hopes to get a job at Warsaw University. He would like to visit the West, particularly France, and asked whether LUCIANI or someone else could invite him as his assistant. Subject should not write about it to R 2 directly but via R2E Irena.

b/ On 28 Oct or Nov 1965, shortly before R2's departure from Kiev for Warsaw, there was in Kiev a meeting of Ukrainian cultural elite of the capital with makers of ^{the} Tini Zabutykh Predkiv in the movie theater "Ukraina" ~~at which also the film "Tini" was demonstrated.~~

The meeting turned over into ^{an} antä - Russian, anti-regime demonstration. PARADZANOV spoke very patriotically. Among other things he mentioned that he already had finished another film entitled "Kievski Fresky" but somehow "they let it not out". He also had huge problems with Tini...; he was asked to change many parts of it but he refused to. (R 2 stressed that whereas Tini was shown abroad, in the Ukraine it had ^{been} withdrawn after a short period.)

After PARADZANOV spoke DZIUBA. He praised the film and then solemnly declared: "The new 1930's have started. People are being arrested for their cultural activities; so they arrested Sviylychnyi, Kalynets, Horans..."

A commotion started, the Director of the theater began to protest, and finally Dziuba was forced from the platform. His place took over STUS Vasyi who continued in Dziuba's tune. He stressed that an explanation must be demanded from authorities on what is going on now in our country. It was impermissible that ^{we are doing such} things could happen ~~as had~~ ^{these that} recently occurred.

SECRET

-11-

He asked those present who are for demanding an explanation from authorities to get up. Many people stood up. DRACH Ivan was sitting next to R 2 and got up too.

At this moment a real commotion started. Some provocateurs began to shout about nationalists and their heinous plots, and other took photographs of the public. After a while STUS was removed from the platform and the film was demonstrated.

In the aftermath, the KGB interrogated many of those who stood up at the meeting, and also some people who were not present there at all. The KGB asked them whether they had stood up too?

As far as R2 could remember KOROTYCH was not present at the meeting.

c/ In summer 1965 a Shevchenko Monument was to be erected in IVANO-FRANKIVSK (former Stanislav), West Ukraine. ZALYVAKHA was in charge of preparations. He sent many invitations but at the last moment the unveiling was forbidden. Nevertheless, the people came but were dispersed by militia and plaincloth-agents. It came to some skirmishes. As a result ZALYVAKHA was arrested shortly after the incident.

(R 2 pointed out that Nasha Kultura # 3/95/ nevertheless published an article about ZALYVAKHA which was rejected in Kiev.)

d/ The manifestations on 22 May, in Kiev, marking the transfer of Shevchenko's body from Petrograd to the capital of Ukraine, were forbidden but people came nevertheless in 1965 and 1966 and demonstrated. There is a group of very active students who are "moving things"...

e/ The arrests in Kiev, Lvov, Ivano-Frankivs, Lutsk encompassed about 70 persons. The most important among them: HORYNS (two brothers), KALYNETS, KOSIV, ZALYVAKHA, OSADCHYI, SVITLYCHNYI, DZIUBA. ^{elder} The Horyn was sentenced to 4 years.

SECRET

KOSTENKO and DRACH were interrogated. KOSTENKO is jobless and lives miserably.

SHCHERBYTSKYI defended the young group, intervened on their behalf and because of that was suspended or removed for some time from his post. Then he was reinstated again. According to R 2 SHCHERBYTSKYI might be in trouble again, pretty soon. No one knows how long "they" will tolerate him. SHCHERBYTSKYI holds with ZAHREBELNYI Pavlo.

According to R 2 SHELEST was a very dangerous type.

ANTONENKO-DAVYDOVICH and others who had been persecuted in the past supported the young group but the rest of old Literati tried to be neutral. Only such ^{as} NOVICHENKO and his alike attacked the young.

f/ The reaction of international press to the arrests of Ukrainian literati has definitely helped in ~~causing~~ Svitlychnyi's release. On this occasion R2 commented it was a pity there were no Ukrainian embassies abroad and no foreign representations or at least correspondents in Kiev. He asked for making efforts along this line abroad.

g/ R 2 was quite optimistic about the future of Ukrainian elements in the Soviet Union and internal situation in general. Ukrainian young generation was raising their heads and the regime had to reckon with it. There is also a general pressure on ^{the} regime on the part of the people who demand more freedom and more material welfare. The regime has to make concession and in R2's view the release of Svitlychnyi was caused by two factors: the pressure of the people inside as demonstrated in manifestations and interventions on behalf of the arrested, and the reaction of international press.

h/ Moscow lets not Ukrainian young literati go to the west. Any change in this respect would be quite conducive to improving matters in the Ukraine itself.

i/ R2 asked to convey his greetings to R 4, editors of "Suchasnist",

SECRET

-13-

and also some issues of Nasha Kultura and Warmia i Mazury to Prof. HORBATSCH Oleksa of Frankfurt/Main, Germany; and Prof. KUBIYOVICH of Sarcelles, France. The latter has sent a Pole to R2 at one time.

j/ Subject saw in R2's room the Suchasnistwith Prolog's statement on the arrests.

16. From 28 Jun to 17 Jul Subject stayed with her relatives in Goldap, Zielenia Góra, and also visited Gracow and other places. On 17 Jul 1966 she arrived in Prague, CSR and contacted R3. Subject stayed at student Hostel Na Petrins.

17. Following is the summarized information Subject obtained from R2, who herself learned most of it from R7:

a/ The arrests comprised about 30 persons. In addition to those stated by R2, R3 mentioned also MARTYNYENKO who was arrested in Lvov. The arrests took place at the same time in all places: Kiev, Lvov, Ivano-Frankivs, Lutsk. So far 20 people were still in prison. Svitlychny was released in May 1966.

HORYN ^h Rodan and Mykhailo were sentenced for dissemination of literature published abroad. In R3's opinion "all started with publication of "Everest Pidlosti" by Symonenko abroad". In Apr 1966 when HORYNS were brought to the court many people waited for them with flowers. Militia and plainclothesmen tried to disperse the crowd under the pretext they were going to ~~make~~ clean the street with water. Hoses were used against the crowd. The demonstration was organized by young people.

b/ HONCHAR Oles wrote a letter to the CC CPU protesting against the arrests. KOSTENKO Lina collected signatures under a petition demanding the release of ~~the~~ ^{the} arrested. Among those who signed it were two MAIBORODAS, STELMAKH, HONCHAR, PARADZANOV, MALYSHKO, ANTONOV (aircraft-designer), DRACH and others.

c/ Most of those who stood up at the meeting in Uraina theater on STUS' appeal, were in the meantime sacked from their jobs.

SECRET

SECRET

-14-

d/ DRACH was said to have refused to write an article against Ukrainian nationalists. The pressure on him was very intense.

e/ DMYTERKO, SOBKO, VORONKO, ZBANATSKYI, NOVYCHENKO ~~are~~ ^{are} literary nihilists but they wield the power and use it against the young group and their supporters. Also BILODID is very much against the young and bends himself backward to please the authorities as former Petlurivets.

f/ SHELEST is not too bad. Actually he is in favor of Ukrainian economic autonomy. During one of his trips to Carpatho-Ukraine he demanded to put all signs and inscriptions in Ukrainian. SKABA denounced him for that to Moscow.

g/ The treatise on Soviet nationality policy by DZIUBA Ivas was entitled "Internationalism or Russification". R 3 told Subject the same about it as was stated in R 7's report.

h/ More than a year ago R 3 visited Ukraine. At that ^{time} she met there many young literati; among them VINHRANOVSKY. Already ~~at that~~ ^{then} ~~time~~ VINHRANOVSKYI was being summoned by KGB. At one of the interrogations - as he told it himself to R 3 - ^{he discovered that} ~~everything he had ever written~~ was noted in KGB's file.

i/ While in Kiev R 3 was present at one of the meetings at the Union of Writers of Ukraine at which a recent Evening devoted to Symonenko's anniversary was discussed. R 3 learned that at this commemoration some unpublished works by Symonenko were read. NOVYCHENKO attacked strongly the organizers of the Evening and threatened he would take proper measures to stop "such nonsense". SVITLYCHNY was one of those who defended the organizers.

j/ Interesting professors in Kiev are ZHYLKO and KYRYLUK. The latter is ~~removed~~ ²⁰⁰¹ though not very courageous. In Lvov: LAZARENKO (removed from his post) and ISHCHUK.

SECRET

k/ As a rule Soviet authorities let not young Ukrainian literati visit the West or even the satellites. The Czech translator of DRACH Ivan invited him to come to Prague but to no avail. The Czechoslovak Union of Writers invited at one time 10 Ukrainian writers and poets. No one of those invited arrived. Instead Kiev sent a completely different group, among them a SLUTSKYYI, hardly known to anybody. On another, similar occasion Kiev sent again only older writers and poets, and among them MONCHAR Oles.

l/ The Anthology of Ukrainian young poets in Czech and other publications on Ukrainian affairs in CSSR aroused dissatisfaction in Moscow. The Soviet Embassy has expressed their concern about it. Nevertheless, the interest in Ukrainian literary and even political affairs is steadily increasing in intellectual Czechoslovak circles who do not conceal their sympathetic attitude to Ukrainian people and their political ambitions.

m/ Presov became a very important Ukrainian center. "Dukla" is being sent to Ukraine on private addresses. Most interesting people in Presov: MATSYNSKY, MURASHKO Pavlo, SHYLYPETS (lecturer), BACH Yuri. R 3 recommended Subject to visit them. There are also quite a few young poets in Presov.

Ukrainian grammar school has approx. 200 students.

At the University following books are being now prepared:

"Dialects of Presov-area", "Checho-Ukrainian Dictionary", "Ukrainian Grammar" (in Czech).

Efforts to get an official representative for Dukla in Ukraine were rejected by Kiev or rather Moscow.

n/ As a rule all foreign books get delivered in CSSR. Of course, there are always some exceptions. On the other hand, specialists get all books they need. Suchasnist, however, is not let in but sometimes gets through.

R 3 receives books and presscuttings from abroad but hardly any journals. There is a strict control on books and other publications at the ~~border~~ CSSR-Soviet Union border.

SECRET

5 Jul 1966

1. Following is the address of the "janitor" of Red Chinese Trade Mission in Rome who actually acts more like an unofficial "secretary" of the Mission:

BARTUCCELLI, Inu
Via Cassia Antica 34,
tel. 500638

2. Ad forthcoming report:

- R 1 - Olga ROMANZUK (Romanzuk) of Paris, France
- R 2 - Stepan MOZAK, aged 29, 5'7 to 5'8, a scar on right cheek, blue eyes, dark blond, likes to wear casual (sport) suits.
- R 3 - Zina Denyk-Berezovska
- R 4 - Vira Vovk
- R 5 - L. SKYRDA, Kiev, ul. Krasnoarmeiskaya 2/2
- R 6 - Christiane Mennissier, French girl student of Paris, France
- R 7 - Wolfram Burghardt

SECRET