

Subject: Prof. S, his trip to Kiev as member of the French Delegation  
to the 13th World's Poultry Congress

Date : 23 Sept 1966

1. On 13 Aug 1966 Subject left Paris, France together with other members of the French Delegation to the 13th World's Poultry Congress, for Kiev via Moscow. The customs control at Moscow Airport was very superficial, only documents were checked and necessary forms had to be filled. Subject stayed in Moscow overnight and on this occasion visited two ~~off~~ <sup>his</sup> sisters-in-law (both over 70).

His impression from talking with them was that they were still very much under the impact of "the old times". Thus, whenever they talked politics, they whispered and warned him that "here" people continued to spy on each other. They were particularly worried about some fresh revival of Stalinist tendencies. Subject was told that lately the Stalinist group were raising their heads and made strong efforts to enhance their position.

Subject left Moscow on 14 Aug and arrived by plane in Kiev same day. He was accommodated in hotel Ukraina together with other French delegates.

In Kiev Subject stayed until his departure for Paris on 22 Aug 1966. His paper to the Congress he read on 16 Aug 1966 in French.

While in Kiev Subject met almost every day with his sister, aged 65, a pensioned teacher, who came to Kiev for that purpose from HIZOCH, r-n ZDOLBUNIV, Rovenska obl., where she resided prior to, during, and after WW II.

Subject returned to Paris by plane via Moscow. The customs control this time was practically nil, there was no one to take care of the French Delegation and they were left completely on their own. Finally Subject took care of his colleagues and expedited their boarding by simply demanding customs officers to give "a better service" to "official French delegates". Not one suitcase was opened.

74-124-2713  
23 Sept 66

2. The World's Poultry Congress was opened on 15 Aug 1966 in the morning at the October Palace in Kiev with about 3,000 participants - scholars, specialists, official guests, and journalists. After the speeches of the members of the Presidium of the Congress, the delegates were welcomed by KALCHENKO N.F., First Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Ukr SSR, on behalf of Ukrainian Soviet Government, in Ukrainian. In the afternoon after the first plenary session at the October Palace, all participants went to the International Poultry Exhibition itself which was located at Holosiyevo. KALCHENKO spoke again on behalf of Soviet Ukrainian Government. Other Soviet dignitaries present at <sup>the</sup> October Palace and Exhibition were SHELEST Yu.P., MATSKEVICH V.V., SKABA A.D., LOBANOV P.P. Later on, at the opening of the Exhibition itself, they were joined by TROJKO P.F., KOROTCHENKO D.S., SOBOL N.O., ZORIN I.G. and others.

Subject planned to approach ZORIN I.G., Vice Minister of Agriculture, Ukr SSR, whom he knew from the Congress of Trento, Italy of 1964 but failed to do so because the Vice-minister left the Hall as soon as the official ceremonies ended.

After the opening ceremonies there was a <sup>Ukrainian</sup> concert, directed by LURCHAK.

The rest of the day Subject spent with his sister. She stayed with Prof. RYZHUTIN, <sup>mau</sup> specialist on some ecological matters, Academician, Ukrainian, married to Subject's cousin. He saw <sup>several</sup> times Prof RYZHUTIN who treated Subject more like a relative, too. RYZHUTIN suggested also to Subject that he might come to Kiev for some time and do some work for the Academy but did not encourage him to return for good.

RYZHUTINS have a son who has married "some canaille" and now has "family troubles". At least that is what he was told by Ryzhutin, senior.

3. On 16 Aug Subject read his paper. After he had finished it he left the Hall and was met at the door by HRYSHCHENKO Oleksandr Hryhorovych of Kiev, Tel. ~~B~~-4-38-69 whom Subject did not recognize at once.

HRYSHCENKO greeted Subject " as an old good acquaintance" and was surprised the latter could not remember him. Then he explained that he was "the same engineer" who in 1957 or 1958 had brought a letter to Subject from his sister of Mizoch. At that time he paid a visit to Subject's house in Paris.

Subject remembered him then quite well, and HRYSHCHENKO introduced to him "his friend" by the name BAKH,fnu.

HRYSHCENKO is Ukrainian, in 1957/58 stayed in Paris, France together with MIAKUSHKA on the staff of Soviet Embassy. He is approx. 45-50 years of age, 6', of strong built, about 200 lbs, round full face, dark blond, his profession states as TV engineer now employed with the Council of Ministers, Ukr SSR. He said himself that he was interested in all delegates of Slavic origin. BAKH, fnu is probably Ukrainian Jew, 5'6, aged 35, slim, sharp long nose, oval face, greying blond hairs. HRYSHCHENKO introduced him as an employee of the Foreign Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Ukr SSR. From him allegedly HRYSHCHENKO learned that Subject was on the list of Slavic names among French delegates and decided to greet him. BAKH turned out to be familiar even with smallest details about the Congress, its participants aso.

After exchange of usual pleasantries HRYSHCHENKO invited Subject to come later on to BAKH'S room for a drink (he happened to stay one or two floors above Subject's room). Subject accepted his invitation. The suite which BAKH was occupying consisted of two huge rooms connected with glass door. When Subject arrived there both, HRYSHCHENKO and BAKH were already waiting for him, the door to the other room was open, and the table was covered with coldcuts (mainly Ukrainian kovbasa), horilka, wines, and fruit.

After greetings they sat down and HRYSHCHENKO asked at once what SHTUL-ZHDANOVYCH, leader of melnykivtsi was doing or rather - HRYSHCHENKO corrected himself - why he was doing so many stupid things attacking Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Ukrainian government.

Subject replied that he did not know what HRYSHCHENKO had in mind in particular but on the whole he himself knew very little about emigre politics at the present time because his free time he devoted to mainly studying literary and cultural life in the Ukraine.

Subject mentioned that as HRYSHCHENKO probably remembered he had seen himself in Subject's room a lot of Soviet books and papers so probably HRYSHCHENKO was reading more emigre papers and publications than Subject. HRYSHCHENKO replied that indeed he had the opportunity to read emigre press and in his opinion it was very stupid. They began to talk about HRYSHCHENKO's visit in Paris, French habits and customs, then about Ukrainian food and drinks, and on the whole the conversation was very banal. Subject was asked what he already had seen in Kiev, on this occasion HRYSHCHENKO promised to take <sup>him</sup> one day on a sightseeing tour in Kiev. When talking about Paris Subject asked what MIAKUSHKA, Hryshchenko's friend was doing now. HRYSHCHENKO seemed to be rather unhappy about this question and only replied that MIAKUSHKA was all right. He turned at once to some other topic and obviously did not want to talk about Miakushka.

Subject stayed at BAKH'S room for about 2½ to 3 hours but they did not go beyond banal small talk. BAKH took practically no part in the conversation. He listened and made only short comments on one occasion or another which were meaningless. Only at one point he seemed to be more interested and alert than usual namely when Subject asked about MIAKUSHKA. He did not, however, ask any questions on his own. Subject was surprised that no questions pertaining to his political activity were asked. In Subject's opinion HRYSHCHENKO felt somewhat ill at ease in BAKH'S company. The latter was probably HRYSHCHENKO'S superior.

4. On 17 Aug Subject visited BAZHAN at his office. He phoned him first, BAZHAN was glad to meet <sup>him</sup> and wanted to send a car to pick him up. Subject, however, ~~xxx~~thanked and took instead taxi. He arrived at Bazhan's office (URE-building) at approx. 10.30 hrs. Subject handed over to BAZHAN a Shevchenko medalion minted at the French Monetary Mint and he seemed to be quite moved by it. He considered it to be some sort of ceremony, <sup>standing</sup> received the medalion and thanking stressed that it was a great honor ~~for~~ him. He reciprocated with a Soviet Ukrainian medal ~~xxxx~~ commenting that it was not as nice as the one brought by Subject.

BAZHAN also mentioned that another Shevchenko medallion given at one time in France to P. VIRSKYI was placed in Shevchenko Museum in Kiev. ( Later on Subject went to Shevchenko Museum but could not find it there. This medallion was presented to VIRSKYI by Subject, too.

Pretty soon the conversation turned to literary life in the Ukraine. Subject mentioned Drach's article against KRAVTSIV, Bohdan. BAZHAN replied that in his opinion KRAVTSIV wanted to include DRACH into his nationalist cohorts but he had no right <sup>to do</sup> for that. Subject asked whether this meant that Kravtsiv should have attacked Drach, and whether in general it was better for Ukrainian poets and writers, particularly the young ones, when the emigres attacked them. BAZHAN denied it. He would rather suggest that emigre critics should moderately praise the Soviet Ukrainian authors but not attack them. At the same time he indicated that "too much appreciation" was also bad.

Asked about recent trials and arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals <sup>in Kiev</sup>, BAZHAN replied that the protests of Ukrainian emigration in Canada were unnecessary and out of place because at that time SVITLYCHNY had already been released and DZIUBA had not been arrested at all.

To the question about Lviv-trial BAZHAN gave no definite answer, he confirmed <sup>only</sup> that there was a trial, but he did not know the details.

As to the trial in LUCK (Lutsk) he could assure Subject that this was not a trial of writers but of OUN propagandists. According to BAZHAN the chief defendant was a former UPA-member who had already served his former sentence and released. Now he started again some illegal activities and in particular disseminated some printed papers "for liberation of Ukraine". Together with him there several other defendants who helped him in this work. But as far as Bazhan was aware of, the trial ended quite well, the

court was rather lenient, and on the whole only few people were involved. Furthermore, BAZHAN stressed that this affair should not be exaggerated, in all the arrests and trials only a small group of people were "engulfed", and what was most important, now it was all over and calm again.

Bazhan refused to specify any data or names, he was also reluctant to talk about Kiev demonstrations.

Subject switched over to the article by KOCHUR about French translations in Paris and also mentioned TEN Boris another translator with whom he corresponded. BAZHAN gave Subject KOCHUR'S address but Subject could not take advantage of it because KOCHUR lived in IRPEN, out of town, where Subject was not allowed to go without special permission. At least Subject so thought.

BAZHAN suggested also that he could bring Subject to the Museum where Bilokur's exhibition was just on, but Subject thanked and went there alone, around 12.00 hrs.

BAZHAN told also Subject that he was working now on a 5 volume history of Ukrainian art. He showed him some material, it looked quite promising.

5. On 18 Aug Subject went together with about other 100 delegates to the poultry farm at YAHOTYN, 100 km from Kiev. The farm is actually called a poultry factory, it has 10,000 ducks, very modern, with latest equipment.

Subject was in the bus of the French delegation. Next to him was a photoreporter of Vechirniy Kiev, a dull uninteresting type. On the bus was also V.OMELCHENKO, correspondent of Vechirniy Kiev, Ukrainian, aged 25-28, very polite and friendly. Later on he made a short interview with Subject asking him his opinion on the poultry farm and wrote about it in the issue of 19 Aug.

(The photocopy of the article by Omelchenko is attached)  
OMELCHENKO avoided political topics but from a short discussion about Ukrainian literature and culture Subject inferred that he was a good Ukrainian.

On the same bus was also a correspondent of Radianska Ukraina by the name TOPTSOV. He wanted to know Subject's opinion about Radianska Ukraina. Subject told him that Radianska Ukraina in comparison with French papers was rather dull and uninteresting. Too much space was devoted to collective farms and agriculture and ~~the paper~~ <sup>on the whole</sup> looked more like an organ of the Ministry of Agriculture. Subject suggested they would write more about national, cultural and intellectual life in the Ukraine, and better develop foreign news, sports, and humor sections. TOPTSOV thanked him for his critique and promised to write about it but Subject doubted he would ever do so.

There was also a representative of Kolossova's Society, a middle aged man, who noted Subject's name and address when exchanging a few sentences on importance of cultural contacts between foreign countries and Ukraine.

6. On 19 Aug , at 11.00 hrs Subject went to the Union of Writers of Ukraine. No one of known writers was there. Everybody was on vacations. Only DMYTERKO was to come at 15.00 hrs, he happened to be in Kiev. Subject was received by the manager of the Building of Literati who did not even introduce himself by the name.

Subject explained to him that he had a "personal" reason to visit the Union, namely he had a present for SOBKO Vadym, Ukrainian writer from someone in France whom the latter met there. ( The "someone in France" was Zhenia GEMAHLLING, employee of the Veterinary School in Paris, aged 4 married to a Frenchman, her father was Jewish, mother - Russian, former member of French Resistance, as such she met SOBKO at the celebration of the 20th anniversary of French Resistance against Germans . SOBKO came to Paris at that time as member of Soviet Partizan or Resistance Delegation.)

The gift ( ties) Subject left with the manager of the House of Literati. The later promised to give it to SOBKO. Prior to that Subject phoned SOBKO from the House of Literati; a young girl, SOBKO'S daughter answered, and explained to him that neither <sup>was</sup> Monsieur Sobko nor Madam Sobko at home", they were on vacations. She spoke French, too.

The manager asked Subject where he was from originally and all of a sudden began to talk about the UPA and its liquidation by Russians in 1940's. In particular he was telling about the fight against UPA in 1948 in the area of Ivano-Frankivsk ( then Stanislav) and Carpathian Mountains. According to the manager in that area there was a secretary of raykom and <sup>chief of</sup> MGB by the name CHUVASH who went without weapon into forests and was caught by the UPA soldiers. The latter wanted him to kill but ~~but~~ he suggested negotiations on the basis of then announced Khrushchev's amnesty for all members of the Underground who would defect. The negotiations started and as a result of them about 100 UPA soldiers left forest and surrendered their weapons. CHUVASH kept his word and no one was arrested or persecuted, otherwise. CHUVASH and other MGB officers who joined him in the meantime in negotiations wanted other UPA men to surrender. The permission to negotiate with UPA was given by the CC CPSU and the MGB in Moscow themselves. At a point of negotiations UPA people suggested to send to them a Soviet propagandist. The Sovs agreed to and <sup>propagandist</sup> ~~the~~ was brought to a pre-arranged spot wherefrom blindfolded he was brought to UPA Hqs. It was a huge bunker, consisting of several rooms, very well equipped, even with rugs <sup>the</sup> on floors. There the <sup>pa</sup> propagandist was introduced even to UPA generals, and treated with a nice dinner. He spoke to UPA men and as a result of his persuasion 500 soldiers surrendered.

Subject did not comment and calmly listened to him until he finished CHUVASH'S story. Then he asked the manager whether it was true that there had been arrests of young intellectuals in the Ukraine as the xxx foreign press was writing about. The manager replied that indeed there were some arrests but they had already ended, now



all was quiet, nothing serious anyway.

Asked about student demonstration in Kiev the manager replied that it was organized by young group at the University, and then corrected himself that actually it was not a demonstration, they just laid their wreaths on Shevchenko Monument at the wrong hour, he meant at ~~the~~ different time than the one that was fixed by authorities. But there were no persecutions because of that.

Subject told him then that foreign press, particularly he referred to the French one, wrote a lot about the demonstrations and in his opinion Ukrainian Soviet papers should also inform their readers in the Ukraine and abroad about such events. Also Ukrainian writers who go abroad, should inform Ukrainian emigration about what was going on in the Ukraine, directly, instead of restricting emigres to foreign sources. The manager seemed to agree with Subject, anyway he did not object.

7. On 20 Aug Subject visited the University and the Academy of Sciences. He also planned to visit the Library but at 11.30 hrs when he arrived there, it was still closed. From outside he could not discover which part was burned down.

At the University students were just taking some exams and he spoke to some of them. Mostly they were from math and humanistics. There was nothing of interest.

At the Academy of Sciences Subject was looking for the Institute of Biochemistry and was directed from the main building to Leontovicha Street 9 to the editorial staff of "Ukrainian Biochemistry Journal". At the Leontovicha 9 a female chemist saw him to the premises<sup>s</sup> of the editorial staff itself, located on 2nd or 3rd floor. It turned out that both, chief editor PALLADIN, Academician and acting editor FERDMAN, were not in. Subject was received by a young editor, aged 25-30 with whom he discussed the publication of his paper in Ukrainskyi Biokhemichnyi Zhurnal. Subject wanted his paper to be printed in Ukrainian and the young editor was ready to arrange for

translation. Subject ,however, preferred to do it himself and promised to send his paper later on from France.

In the meantime the young man told Subject that he was only deputy-technical-editor and his boss was on leave.

After the matter of the paper was settled the young man suddenly asked Subject whether he knew ZHUKOVSKY of Paris. Subject was taken somewhat aback by this question but said that indeed he knew him quite well. In his turn he asked the young man what was his name. DZIUBA - he replied. Subject asked again whether he was the same Dziuba who was involved together with Svitlychny. "Yes, I am the same one, of course " - was the answer and Subject could hardly refrain from embracing him he was<sup>so</sup> excited with surprise and joy. Somehow they began at once to talk in whisper and then went into corridor both understanding that the room might be bugged. In the corridor DZIUBA Ivan ~~gxxx~~ told him the following:

a/ The trials of Ukrainian intellectuals in Kiev and Lvov were closed to the public, and the one in Lutsk was open. From about 50 persons arrested 28 were sentenced to from 3 to 6 years. After the arrests in Kiev<sup>and Lviv</sup> which usually were accompanied by house searches , there was in Kiev a youth demonstration before the Shevchenko Monument vis-a-vis the University. According to DZIUBA it was a **truly** nationalist demonstration, anti-Russian slogans were shouted, and flowers were laid at Shevchenko monument. The demonstrators were dispersed by militia. Some people were arrested in the aftermath but later on released.

The demonstration in Lviv that followed the Lviv-trial was even more massive and powerful than the one in Kiev. The car by which the defendants were brought from the court was ~~thrown on~~ with demonstrators' flowers, a huge crowd shouted " Glory to the sentenced!", " Glory to Ukraine".

The trial in Lutsk was public. Contrary to what Subject

was told by BAZHAN, also writers and students were tried ~~here~~ and sentenced there.

b/ At the present the arrests ceased. But sporadic house searches were still taking place. The situation was still quite tense.

c/ Dziuba wrote a letter to SHELEST and SHCHERBYTSKYI protesting against arrests and trials and the copy of it<sup>he</sup> showed to Subject together with his treatise, 250 pages large, on Soviet nationalities policy entitled "International or Russification". The letter had 2 pages. In it Dziuba and his co-authors demanded to release the arrested and sentenced, and referred to<sup>a</sup> similar demand by STELMAKH, ANTONOV, HUZHVIIY, KOSTENKO (Lina), and DRACH, plus a few other names.

Some of the arrested and sentenced were also mentioned. Subject remembered the names of HORYNS, KOSIV, ZALYVAKHA ( painter or sculptor), and 3 geophysicists : HRYN, RUSYN, MARTYNYENKO.

8. DZIUBA suggested Subject should read his treatise and while he was reading it Dziuba "stood guard" in the corridor. "Internationalism or Russification" is a very serious, scholarly documented and elaborated work with many references to Lenin, Marx, Engels, ~~Garby~~. It criticizes strongly present Soviet nationalities policy and equals it with that of Russian Tsars.

Dziuba had no other smaller documents handy and Subject dared not asking him for a script of 250 pages being afraid it might be found on him at Customs control. Later on he felt very sorry about it because there was virtually no customs control on his departure from Moscow.

9. On Subject's visit to BASHAN, Dziuba commented that " from those people hardly anything good could be expected". He described instead the manager of the House of Literati as " somewhat better".

10. Subject was given by DZIUBA the address of the Institute of Endocrinology where Subject was going to look for Dr HERMANIUK. The latter is from Volyhnia and had been a student of Subject's sister at one time. Subject wanted to discuss with him the ~~matter~~ publication of his article in "Ukrainian Biochemistry Journal". HERMANIUK was very glad to see Subject, they exchanged their articles read at the Congress, and HERMANIUK promised to expedite the publication of Subject's article. They also promised to write to each other.

11. Physical description of DZIUBA Ivan: appar. age 25-30, 5'9, slim, dark brown hair, <sup>combed straight back,</sup> pink cheeks indicating his TB, oval face, wears glasses.

12. When parting DZIUBA greeted Subject very friendly and warmly, <sup>became</sup> quite emotional, and as Subject put it "we parted as brothers", Subject with tears in his eyes.

13. In the evening there was a reception at the <sup>House of</sup> "Friendship of Nations" ~~House of~~ organized by Kolossova's Society. <sup>He</sup> First spoke the chairman of <sup>the</sup> Evening whom Subject thought to be SMOLYCH Yuri. He spoke in French. Referring to various periods of Ukrainian history he stressed particularly the "common origin" of Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians, and the friendship among them. Later on asked by a French scholar whether there was much difference between Ukrainian and Russians, the chairman replied that actually not, and gave a few examples in which just one or two vocals changed. Asked again whether the Ukraine was independent, the chairman lost control over himself, did not know what to answer, replied something to the effect that such question was preposterous and finally said nothing. Anyway this spoiled his mood for the whole evening.

After the chairman the floor was taken by HLUSHCHENKO, Ukrainian painter, who at one time studied in Berlin, Germany and

Subject knew him from there. HLUSHCHENKO spoke similarly as SMOLYCH stressing all the time the co-influence and co-operation between Russian and Ukrainian artists.

14. On 21 Aug 1966 HRYSHCHENKO took Subject and his sister for sightseeing in Kiev. He was without BAKH, accompanied only by a driver. At the VAtutin Monument HRYSHCHENKO told Subject that VAtUTIN had been killed by UPA. Passing by Lenin Museum HRYSHCHENKO pointed at it and said that this had been the building of Tsentralna Rada (Ukrainian Parliament in 1917-20).

When they stopped at Khmelnitsky Monument HRYSHCHENKO told Subject the following joke: When Khmelnytsky returned from Zhovti Vody to Kiev he greeted the welcoming crowd with "Zdorovi buly Kiyane!" The crowd replied: "Zdrastvite". Khmelnytsky was so angry about that that he stretched his hand to the north, toward Russia and shouted: Then go away to Moscow! He was so shocked by this experience with his own people that he turned to stone and so he remained until now.

HRYSHCHENKO took Subject also to Pecherska Lavra, Andriyivsky sobor, Shevchenko Museum and other spots. All the time he was very friendly and did not go beyond his role as an amicable guide. He did not mention any political topics.

15. RYZHUTIN promised Subject to find out who were HRYSHCHENKO and BAKH.

16. On 22 Aug 1966 Subject left for Paris via Moscow and arrived same day at Orly, Paris.

17. Miscellaneous.

a/ When in Kiev Subject asked an elderly man why he was talking in Ukrainian, the latter was very angry with him and almost hit him. He told Subject that when he is asking about Ukrainian Theatre he should do so in Ukrainian and at least not to demand from him

to answer ~~him~~ in Russian, Subject "explained" the misunderstanding and said that he was very happy to find such a reaction on the part of his interlocutor.

The people Subject met spoke about 60% Russian and 40% Ukrainian.

b/ French delegates were very positively impressed by Kiev and some of them compared it with Paris. On the contrary- Moscow - many considered " a huge wild village".

c/ From talking to various people in Kiev Subject inferred that intellectuals in the Ukraine paid much attention to what emigration was doing and many Ukrainian intellectuals were actually afraid of getting bad reputation abroad. This applied to such people as Bazhan in particular. They don't want to be praised publicly by emigres but they get worried when emigres attack them too strongly and treat them badly.