

SECRET

Subject: KOROTYCH, Vitali

Source: Dr K

Date: 1 Mar 1967

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

Following is the gist of the information obtained from Subject during his visit to Dr Klachko, in company of CHERNIAVSKY Viktor, on 26 Feb 1967, from 16.00 to 22.00 hrs. The visit was prearranged by CHerniavsky who visited Dr Kl on 23 Feb and asked her to invite "the usual people" to meet with Subject. He promised also to come with his wife and KHMIL. On Cherniavsky's and Subject's arrival on Sunday, the former was going to leave Subject alone with "the usual people" and both were very disappointed when they were told that there was no one else beside Dr Klachko. Only later on Eve joined the company, and in the evening ^{there} came Father SOLOVIY Meletiy and RIZNYK, Olga, both of New York. RIZNYK Olga arrived fully unexpectedly. At Subject's presence Dr Klachko tried to get hold of Ross and Eugen but they did not come excusing themselves with being too tired after a trip they had just returned from.

1. According to Subject DRACH Ivan still has not "recovered" from his trip to the States. He ^{has} changed completely. He became somber, moody, "locked ~~up~~ himself completely" and was unwilling to do anything. "He only sits propping up his chin with hands and thinks! Almost by force Subject dragged him to an Evening of poetry reading at which Subject and DRACH performed. Immediately after that Drach left for countryside to stay with his parents.

In this respect PAVLYCHKO Dmytro is quite different. After his return he spoke at a session of writers about his impressions and experiences and went at once to work. Incidentally, Pavlychko is collecting some material on Church, the Vatican, the Pope etc. " He wants to step into Halan's and Melnychuk's boots".

9 - 201 - 124 - 29/3
1 - 201 - 124 - 29/3
1 - 74 - 124 - 29/3 ✓

SECRET

2. The Writers' Congress of last November has a profound historical meaning. The Party gave "green light" for Ukrainization and now it will depend on Ukrainians themselves what comes out of it.

It is not true that the party was not engaged into the process of Ukrainization. The party was deeply committed to what had been proclaimed at the Congress. Not only by SHELEST who announced the new course but also by the presence of all the other party and government personalities that were seated in the Presidium of the Congress. Besides, the new line was not taken under the spur of the moment but was properly prepared and worked out in advance.

Subject can assure Dr Kl that the party is vitally interested in the success of Ukrainization because its failure would mean a serious setback for the present leadership. Of course, it does not mean that the new course would easily be implemented. There will be many obstacles. The main obstacle Subject saw in the passivism of Ukrainian intelligentsia and particularly its "right wing". By the right wing he meant the Russified loyalists and old timers in general who lacked the courage to think "up to-date". And it was Ukrainian intelligentsia on whom the future of Ukrainization depended. "On them it depends whether Ukrainization will be a success or a fiasco". "Anyway, now it is one of the historical chances".

SHELEST is a "pusher of Ukrainization". But, of course, not all party leaders are alike. SECHERBYTSKYI, for instance, is rather neutral but definitely in favor of Ukrainization, too.

Subject himself wants to be an optimist. It's still too early to talk about tangible changes. But certainly first steps have already been made. He can say, for instance, that just now some works of Vynnychenko, Drai-Khmara and (Source forget the name) are being printed.

Many other things are being planned and prepared. Of course he can speak primarily for his field only, but he is sure that similar trend is prevailing in educational and other domains.

Subject expressed himself against any "forceful Ukrainization". In his opinion there was no need for official decrees on Ukrainization because this would only give additional impetus to Russian chauvinists and "rightists" in their opposition to Ukrainization. Things have to be done carefully and slowly, and above all "naturally" without any forceful measures. The main thing was to awaken and strengthen national dignity of Kharkols and once this had been achieved the doors for fulfilled Ukrainization would be wide open.

In the avantgarde of Ukrainization stands Young Ukrainian intelligentsia. The young generation is no longer afraid of repressions and could not be compared with their fathers whose spine had suffered so much in the period of the cult of personality. But ^{still} it is HONCHAR Oles who leads "the Ukrainization" and he announced the guidelines for it.

3. The recent arrests and trials are sad happenings. Subject made a sad face himself, but was reluctant to elaborate on the topic. "Yes, unfortunately, they are still imprisoned, it's a very unhappy event" - he said. "But what can you do, they were caught redhanded, some of them just at the moment when they were duplicating materials". "You can't imagine how much of this stuff has been brought into Ukraine". "How much better it would have been had it not happened". The Union of Writers could not make any protests at the present or intervene in any other way on behalf of the imprisoned because there were no members of the Union among them.

4. Asked about DZIUBA Ivan, Subject replied that he was now fine. To Dr Kl's suggestion that it would be a good idea to send him to Switzerland or the States for a cure and she would gladly arrange it personally, Subject did not reply. Instead he said that Dziuba's right lung is completely shrunk and would have to be taken out. This was, however, a much too dangerous ^{an} operation. Anyway his ²caveys have well

closed up and he is no longer "positive".

Dziuba is loyal now and it is planned to transfer him from the Biochemical Journal to Radiansky Pysmennyk.

5. Subject has great interest in religion although he is an atheist. Incidentally, he was told that Dr Kl's main concern was religion. This "phenomenon" (religion, faith etc) bothered him for a long time and he wanted to "fathom " it. A few years ago, in 1964 (?) or so he even went to Pachayiv Monastery, put a black sweater on, grew a beard, and lived for a week or so among the monks there. In the beginning he stayed in the Pilgrims' Dormitory, ~~xxxx~~ slept in the church , and then moved to the hotel. He had many discussions with the monks, the pilgrims, and the Archimandrite himself. It was very interesting.

In his opinion the only worth of religion and church is in keeping up ~~of~~ some traditional ethical and artistic values. For that reason, for instance, he often takes his son to a church to draw his attention to ~~artistic~~ ^{artistic} ~~xxxx~~ values and develop his artistic taste.

Certainly, there ~~are~~ many marriages and baptisms being performed now in the church. But it would be mistakenly to identify them with real religious feelings. It is rather a ritual ceremony based on traditions which gives more expression to the event itself.

In Subject's view, even religious people in the Soviet Union, including monks and priests understand faith and church quite differently than the faithful in the West.

6. The conflict with Chinese is a real problem. But he hoped that finally the Chinese will come back to their senses. What, however, surprised him was some ^{perceived} indication that Ukrainians abroad were going to put their hopes on Chinese. It was completely stupid because in case the Chinese would crush the Soviet Union they would eat up not only Soviet Ukrainians but their American compatriots as well. So, any orientation on Chinese was just nonsensical.

7. Subject described his position in the Union of Writers as that

of a secretary . He gave up his medical practice because as a journalist he hoped to better serve Ukraine.

Subject was not happy when Dr Kl asked him halfjokingly what kind of training he underwent before having been sent to the States but he politely replied that he was only told what ~~xxx~~ to do in America to avoid any unpleasanties. All that amounted to how to behave in this country.

8. Subject stressed that the problem of Ukrainian independence is not the subject-matter of his and his colleagues aspirations but rather "national autonomy" in all fields as a result of Ukrainization. Dr Kl referred to national traditions and wanted to know how much Subject and his generation know, for instance, about Ukrainian patriotic figures, songs etc. Does he know, for example, Shche Ne Vmerla (Ukrainian national anthem) ? To that Subject recited the entire first strophe. And what about Ne Pora Ne Pora ? Subject also recited one strophe of that song.

9. Subject expressed the opinion that there was discernible among emigrants some deep apprehension and fright as to consequences of further development of cultural contacts with Ukraine. He said that something similar happened in the Ukraine in late 1950's when many people in the Ukraine were worried about tourists and students coming to the Ukraine from the West. " But later on we realized that this could be only to mutual interest and it 's time the emigration draws same conclusions".

He did not specify what was planned along cultural-exchange -line but mentioned some common publications, help in translations, "exchange of ~~visits~~ ^{visits} etc. In his opinion it was very important the cultural contacts with emigration continue to develop because emigres could help a lot ~~xxxx~~ in implementation of Ukrainization.

" In 1950's some of our people thought that tourists and cultural contacts would disintegrate, undermine us, but it all turned out wrong, so the emigration should not repeat the mistakes of our people who went wrong."

10. CHERNIAVSKY mentioned that lately SHEVCHENKO Sergei, head of Soviet Ukrainian Mission in New York, was awarded Red Banner Order. Dr Kl commented that this was probably for "good work" done by Drach and Pavlychko. Cherniavsky was not happy about her comment and said something to the effect that Shevchenko was right in his complaints against Dr Klachko. In response Dr Kl attacked not only SHEVCHENKO but the whole Mission for ~~not~~ doing ~~nothing~~ ^{nothing} positive for Ukrainian cause, lack of initiative, provincialism etc. She also stressed that Shevchenko must get used here to criticism because this ^{is} not the Soviet Union. In her opinion Shevchenko is no diplomat at all, he knows no languages, his manners are bad, he is a diadia. CHERNIAVSKY tried to defend Shevchenko and the Mission and Subject listened. Then he said that indeed "who was Shevchenko?" implying that he was of no importance. Then he added that actually "we both - you abroad, and we, in the Ukraine - had a shortage of good diplomats".

11. According to Subject, KOLOSSOVA Kateryna was now in hospital because she suffered from some liver illness. She has to keep diet, After a check up it will be decided whether she needs an operation. On that occasion Subject talked again about importance of cultural contacts between the Ukraine and emigration. "We want people to come to us with different views and convictions than ours because only them we could enrich ourselves mutually" was his main line.

12. Father SOLOVIY was talking about his planned trip to POZNAN, Poland and then eventually to Ukraine, in Aug 1967. He mentioned that he was, however, not sure as to Ukraine because he was short of money. CHERNIAVSKY suggested that he could be helped out by Archbishop Aleksey who has funds for such purposes. Father Soloviy would be not the first catholic to go on a trip financed by the orthodox. He would only have to get first a recommendation from Archbishop Yoann of New York. Dr Kl did not seem to be happy with the idea and KOROTYCH added that this could be actually arranged "directly" without Yoann. Anyway he offered his private telephone in Kiev to Father Soloviy and asked him

to pay a visit to his house. He also promised to help him in sight^{ing}
"etc".

13. Subject felt sorry for having been compelled to leave New York. He was going to come back to New York in May 1967. He is scheduled to stay in the States until 1 Jun 1967 but will try to prolong his sojourn in New York, at least until mid-June 1967. Subject and Cherniavsky were very unhappy that no one else came to meet Subject as it used to be in the past. Particularly CHERNIAVSKY felt ill at ease. Once or twice Subject proposed a toast "to those who did not want to come" and on the whole tried to keep his chin up. Source noticed that relations between Subject and Cherniavsky were less comradely than it was the case with Drach and Pavlychko. Cherniavsky showed more respect and reserve for Subject, but on the whole they treated each other as equals.

During a small talk Subject mentioned that he owned a Volga-car.

14. In Source's opinion Subject is the most intelligent, alert, "versatile", elegant and "polished" Soviet she ever met. She puts him on top of all the others. When comparing ^{him} with ^{other} recent visitors she would grade them ~~xxx~~ all up in the following sequence: Drach, Pavlychko, Lutsiv, and on top: Subject.