

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION			TOP AND BOTTOM		
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
<b>OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP</b>					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS		
1	SB/DCAO		[Handwritten initials]		
2	SB/CAO		[Handwritten initials]		
3					
4	[Handwritten mark]				
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
<p><b>Remarks:</b> Here's an account of a rather frank and open discussion with the Soviet Ukrainian MFA. Apparently the Soviets are still pushing the idea of an exchange Society for negotiating exchanges with Soviet Ukrainians.</p> <p>Page 7. Katerina KOLOSSOVA, former head of Soviet Ukr. Society for Cultural Exchanges &amp; Friendship with Foreign Countries, now Vice Minister of Education.</p> <p>Ann: Who's source is [ ]? [Handwritten initials]</p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.					DATE
SB/CAO					10 Jan 68
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	

FORM NO. 237 Use previous editions  
1-67

(40)

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

Subject: The Foreign Minister DMYTRO BILOKOLO5

Source: \*3 C 3

Date: 18 Dec 1967

1. On 16 Dec 1967 Source and her friend had a "conference" with the subject at the mission. Subject was accompanied by KRAVETS, Petro. The meeting lasted from 19.00 to 21.30 hrs. It was pre-arranged "in principle" during source's visit to the Mission on 18 Oct 1967. End-November KRAVETS phoned Source and asked her why she didn't come to the demonstration of a film and party given lately by the Mission. Source was not at home and her friend explained that she could not come just for that purpose from Washington, D.C. and besides Source was still waiting for a meeting with the Minister. KRAVETS replied that actually the Minister was waiting for Source's call but he would check on that immediately. After two days or so the meeting was finally fixed for Dec 16, 1967.

Following is the gist of the "conference".

2. Source explained that she came to talk about two main points: a/ cultural affairs in the Ukraine and cultural exchange between Ukraine and emigration, and b/ some "charitable" or rather "humanitarian" affairs in the Ukraine.

Summarizing the up-to-date development of cultural contacts with Ukraine, Source stressed that the results were completely negative and had no chances for improvement in the future. There were two reasons for that; firstly, the cultural exchange could develop provided the situation in the Ukraine would change to the better, and secondly, other people than those who are in charge of cultural contacts in Kiev at present, would come to the fore. So far, neither has happened. The hopes engendered by the Congress of writers of ~~last~~ <sup>1966</sup> November were completely dashed by the subsequent events, in particular by further arrests and persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals, lack of positive concessions, and, asf. Source stressed in particular the fact that the amnesty "liberated only a few bandits and thieves but left out completely Ukrainian intellectuals and political prisoners" and moreover instead came the trial of CHORNOVIL and new

Orig - BILOKOLO5  
13 C 3  
74-124-2713 ✓

persecutions.

At that point-Source said- she would like to mention the humanitarian matters she was talking about in the beginning. In brief, she would like to ask Subject to induce his Government to at least release those recently arrested and imprisoned Ukrainian intellectuals, and in particular several ladies former members of Ukrainian Red Cross with the UPA. She mentioned such as Maryna ZHAYTSKA, HASIUK and BIDYK. Source explained that she was doing it not only in her own behalf but <sup>also</sup> that she was given those names and asked to intervene on their behalf by other Ukrainian ladies. At that moment KRAVETS wanted to know the patronyms of those mentioned "because there might be many people by such names", but Source replied that she hoped "there were not thousands of political prisoners in your camps with exactly such names"... KRAVETS was rather angry about it but the Minister did not react in any way. Finally Source suggested that the forthcoming anniversary of Soviet Ukrainian State on Dec 25 gave the Soviet Government quite a good occasion to proclaim another amnesty for Ukrainian prisoners. Source was talking for about 30 minutes and Subject did not object or make any comments. He seemed to agree with many points and according to source was obviously upset if not moved by what he was told. KRAVETS was very angry and did not conceal his displeasure.

5. The reply was given by the Subject. Instead of answering source directly he began with denying there was a deliberate Russification in Ukraine. It looked as though he had expected this "accusation" and was in advance prepared for it. In his words, it was not just to criticize Soviet Ukrainian Government and the party for not doing enough for Ukrainization "because we all are as much concerned with preservation and development of Ukrainian language and culture as you are". "We shall not allow that Ukrainian language and culture could vanish..." "But we cannot do it in such a way as SKRYPNYK has done. I personally have a very high esteem for Skrypnyk, I like to read him but his method cannot be applied nowadays. We have to do it differently, more cautiously, slower, but in a more solid manner..." "But I can assure you we shall do the same only our approach will be different." "This is way we actually have rehabilitated Skrypnyk..."

-2-

Subject continued with enumeration of "positive changes that took place in the meantime" such as wider usage of Ukrainian language by official people, at the Universities, at schools, etc. According to Subject all conferences, proceedings etc of the Soviet Ukrainian Government are now conducted in Ukrainian, "also in private we speak now in Ukrainian", "our correspondence is also in Ukrainian..."

4. As to cultural contacts, Subject was not so pessimistic in their evaluation as Source was. Finally, quite a few people have already visited emigres, there was BRACH, Pavlychko and others, and it seemed to work ... At this point he was interrupted by KRAVETS who said that this problem belonged to the Society for Cultural Contacts with Ukrainians Abroad and not to the Minister.

Subject added that indeed he did not come "for these matters", he came on different matters. Source replied that she thought cultural contacts was of foreign policy facets, and he cannot ~~eschew~~ eschew the responsibility.

At that moment KRAVETS started almost to shout that this problem must be handled only via Levishchenko's Society.

When Source explained that Levishchenko's Society might be good for "progressives" but not for emigres, KRAVETS became even more aggressive shouting that the Society must be good for both, "progressives" and "nationalists".

Subject was rather upset and confidently asked why indeed the Society could not maintain contacts with emigres. Source explained that "progressives" were communists and just "Levishchenko's tools", and emigres had nothing in common with them. Moreover, all those

"progressives" are usually uneducated primitive people and it seemed Levishchenko's level was just right for them but not for emigres.

KRAVETS wanted again to comment but Subject interrupted him and said that indeed it was difficult to have to do with uneducated people.

KRAVETS let him not finish, however, either and said something to the effect that KOSACH and TARNAVSKY were writing now to the Society and they were no primitives. Source replied that they both were no

representatives of emigres but similarly like "progressives" just communist tools paid by them. Her conclusion therefore is that Kiev is probably not interested in contacts with emigres at all.

Subject denied that this was definitely not so, on the contrary they were very much interested in contacts with emigres.

KRAVETS aded that there should be ,however, some sort of Society here abroad that would maintain contacts with Kiev, He stressed it several times. Source mentioned that so far the Round Table Club functioned quite well as the forum for contacts and she saw no need for anything else. KRAVETS was of different opinion because "those nationalists let not even Zbanatsky to visit them".

5. On the matter of prisoners and amnesti , Subject promised to look into this problem and see what could be done. But he could not understand why Source is interfering with their internal problems , in his opinion it was no business of her. "We have our laws, our judicial proceedings and we act accordingly".

Source said that she was just of an opposite opinion, it was Ukrainian business, and as such of her as well.

Subject seemed not to know much about CHERNOVIL and KRAVETS explained to him that this was " a small journalistic fry out of whom the nationalists had made now a great jou nalist, writer, and who knows what, and who was trying to undermine the Soviet system". " It's the similar story as with Docenko. Just becuase he is now with nationalists they <sup>have</sup> made out of an academy associate, the big chief of the whole department!"

" the same was with the others ( he was referring to imprisoned intellectuals) no one was arrested for defence and usage of Ukrainian language but for attempts to undermine Soviet power". "Moreover , there were actually no writers among them. Even the foreigners had an oppertunity to check on those matters. An editor of the London Times arrived in Kiev and wanted to have an interview about the so called imprisoned writers. The people at the Union of Writers brought the list of all, 800 hundred members of the Union and asked him which one was arrested because as far as they knew everyone of them was free. The editor read the list and then asked what about Dziuba Ivan? he was one of the arrested . Then the people from the Union phoned Dziuba and he arrived in 10 minutes. The editor wanted to know whether he had been at least arrested before and made of course a fool of himself because Dziuba had never been arrested."

"Of course there had been some people arrested and sentenced but not for defence of Ukrainian language or culture or any other cultural activity... they were punished - KRAVETS tried to put emphasis on that - for their anti-governmental, anti-Soviet activity."

6. KRAVETS complained very strongly against the emigres. He called them ~~"nationalists"~~ <sup>hardcore</sup> "people who have no contact with Ukrainian reality", "uncorrectable", "unrealistic" also. "I talk with many of them, also quite often with banderivtsi, and they are all the same. Believe<sup>me</sup> sometime I have to control myself not to punch their noses..." At this point source interrupted him by saying to the Subject that she was simply outraged by "that kind of diplomatic behaviour presented by this young cocky he per of his". Source tried to tone down KRAVETS and the latter indeed began to retreat by pouring out a series of *apologies*.

7. It came to another "skirmish" with KRAVETS when source attacked Kiev for the Seventhenth Volume of Soviet Ukrainian Encyclopedia calling it a trash. Source also complained about non-admittance of various books to the Soviet Ukraine. KRAVETS protested that this was not true, he was not aware of such "practice". Pressed on this matter KRAVETS became very angry and started almost to shout; "because you should send all the books to Levishchenko, and when they in the association read it and find it O.K. then they will be admitted!" "Yes, indeed, they will read these books with magnifying glass and they will do right, I would do exactly the same"- he continued. Source interrupted him by saying that she could easily imagine what books could be admitted to the Soviet Union if indeed Levishchenko was the one to censor them "... Subject interfered then with Kravets and switched to another topic. Source, however, returned to the old topic again and said that she really was shocked by learning from a Ukrainian diplomat that books should not be sent to the Academy of Sciences but first to Levishchenkos for censure..."

Subject felt very embarrassed about Kravets and when Source mentioned as an example of eventual cultural exchange photocopying of ~~some~~ <sup>old historical</sup> ~~Lev~~ archives for the Institute of Byynsky in Philadelphia, he said that indeed this was an interesting idea provided the Institute would ~~xxxx~~ reciprocate. KRAVETS, however, interrupted him at once and said something to the effect that those matters should be first checked, properly considered also. Then he started again to complain against the emigres, reproaching them mainly for "slanderous activities against the Soviet Ukraine". In Source's opinion the implication was quite obvious, "we are not going to give you any historical materials that could be only harmful to us".

8. According to Subject there were no plans to establish separate Ukrainian diplomatic representations abroad. Instead there will be "individual representatives" inside every Soviet Embassy wherever it will be required by "circumstances".

9. Subject and MI VES were interested in Source's research on Ukrainian affairs of 1918-21 and the former suggested that Source should make available those materials to the Academy of Sciences in Kiev, some time in the future and let it not fall "into any other hands". They would be willing to publish Source in the Ukraine if she would agree to. Source asked whether it meant that Levishchenkos would have first to censor it. Kravets "jumped in" and half jokingly half angrily replied, "Yes, every word would have to be in proper form". Subject was not happy about Kravets's reply and added that they would publish even if <sup>she</sup> wouldn't be <sup>as</sup> his colleague had said.

10. Source mentioned Ivan YAREMKO of Philadelphia and asked whether Subject could help him anything with his business, "Yevsaan Zilla". She also was surprised to learn that Yaremko was not given now a Soviet visa. Both, Subject and Kravets did not answer directly, only that YAREMKO should go through proper channels, e. i. Moscow. KRAVETS said something to the effect that the man talking with YAREMKO in Washington, D. C. (Shevchenko Sergei?, too) was O. K. and was not a Jew as Source or rather Yaremko suggested. Besides, it didn't matter anyway.

11. According to Subject the post of the chairman of the Association for Cultural Contacts with Foreign Countries (formerly headed by Kolosova Kateryna) is still vacant. KOLOSSOVA has been appointed to a Viceminister of education. This was not exactly a demotion "since <sup>this</sup> meant ~~we~~ older people are simply making room for younger generation".

12. Subject agreed with Source that it would be quite useful to discuss "all those pertinent problems" also with other people in emigration and he wouldn't mind doing it. Source mentioned that in the past there were such meetings arranged for PALAMARCHUK, for instance, but at her house. Subject became at once somewhat stiff and replied that he could speak only at the Mission. Then he added that "others could have risked it but not me". "I am not going to do that".

13. Subject denied that the decisions and stipulations of the Fifth Congress of Ukrainian Writers of November 1966 "remained on paper". In his opinion, many plans are being implemented, and "I can assure you that the CC in Kiev is thinking all the time about them".

14. When Source was talking about the restoration of Ukrainian Catholic Church in West Ukraine and complained that the Soviet Government had ruined not only Ukrainian Catholic but Orthodox church as well, Subject did not deny but rather nodded with his head that indeed it was so. Later on, in his replies, he did not touch this topic.

15. Subject told Source that he was leaving home on 20 Dec 1967.

16. KRAVEIS said that he knew "quite well" Prof. FISHER of Columbia. He himself was working on his thesis "Technical Development and Its Impact on Sociology". KRAVEIS has already collected all the necessary material but had no time to finish the writing.



17. According to Source, Subject felt rather awkward all the time and particularly was upset and embarrassed by KRAVETS'S behaviour. He was very tense, blushed, and tried <sup>very hard</sup> to control the situation. But it was obvious that KRAVETS and not Subject was the one who called the tune on emigre matters. Subject tried to moderate Krawets's "intransigence" by being more understanding, and concerned with "higher matters". He seemed to be a mellow, "common sense" man but definitely neither brilliant nor witty.

Subject saw Source to the main door and several times apologized for "anything that was not right". KRAVETS joined in that and gave Source two invitations to the party given by Shevchenko at the Mission on 22 Dec 1967 on occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Ukr SSR.

According to Source the appointment must have been a real torture for Subject judging by his attitude and by "the very bad breath he had at the end of conversation".

KRAVETS acted all the time like a "real stinker" attacking emigres, denying Source's arguments, aso.