

SECRET

Subject: KOCHURLY. Yum N [ ]

Source : as usual

Date : 21 May 1968

Following is the gist of information obtained from Subject during his visit at Source's house on 20 May 1968, from 20.15 to 24.30 hrs.

1. Subject is leaving for Kiev on 29 May 1968. He goes first to Montreal and then by SS Pushkin to Leningrad, Moscow and Kiev. Shevchenko Sergei is leaving on 29 June 1968. He will be succeeded by \*POLYANYCHKO Mikhail Denisovich, an old hand in the College of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ukr SSR. Polyanychko is well educated, a real diplomat, speaks English. This change is definitely for the better, Pol. will be able to do more and better " as a Ukrainian diplomat" than Shevchenko.

Subject himself will be succeeded by \*BATYUK, Inu. He is already here but will leave soon for Kiev too, to ~~get~~ bring his wife to New York. Bat. is a nice guy and Source should keep in touch with him. Through him and the secretary of the Mission by the name Raisa YAROSHEVYCH (?), Source could send books and publications for Subject. He meant the material necessary for his thesis.

Source should also speak with POLANYCHKO and "influence him". He is an intelligent man.

2. \*SHEVEL Grigori is "another Skaba", even worse than the ~~latter~~. He is also in charge of emigre affairs in the CC CPU. The sooner he goes the better. However, under present circumstances, particularly ~~with~~ in connection with the events in CSSR, his position is ~~stronger~~ stronger. On the whole, due to the new turmoil in the satellites, and indirectly even ~~with~~ to France, people like Skaba and Shevel are raising again their heads. Shevel's man in New York is \*KRAVETS. Incidentally, Shevel relies upon KRAVETS very strongly and Kravets's successes here strengthen Shevel's position in Kiev and Moscow. Thus, a removal of Kravets would help to remove Shevel, and vice versa.

reportedly relied on by Grigori SHEVEL for rapport with emigres

Director of Internat Organ. T-100  
MehRITSA  
UKR MFA  
To Succeed Sergei Shevchenko as  
Head of Soviet Ukrainian Representation  
Belagaten & U.N.

Victor Kharilovich  
See P. 28 for details  
to succeed  
as 1st Sec  
Ukrainian  
Mission  
U.N.

Orig. <sup>mailed</sup> BB/olus  
cc DC/SB/Sov  
SB/CAO

SECRET

74-124-29/3

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 25X2  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

SECRET

Subject indicated that a boycott of Kravets by his emigre acquaintances would definitely "help".

Subject hates Kravets. The latter is a real "canalie". He even "succeeded" in getting no farewell party for Subject.

In Kiev Subject expects some unpleasanties with Shevel. He will have to talk to him. All that trouble had been caused by Kravets.

3. The present attack against HONCHAR Oles for his "Sobor" is Shevel's work. Actually, "Sobor" is only a pretext, the real cause lies in Honchar's support for Shestydesiatniki and restive young people in general. Honchar maintains friendly contacts with the young "rebels" and defends them. In their turn, they respect and support Honchar. SHEVEL and Co do not like it and are using "Sobor" and new tense atmosphere in the socialist block to "reckon" with Honchar.

On the whole, the Honchar affair is rather silly. Recently Honchar celebrated his 50th birthday. There were present TRONKO, OVCHARENKO, BILOKOLOS, and others. They all praised "Sobor". Suddenly SHEVEL and SKABA raised hell about the book, after they "had smelled what wind was blowing from Moscow". Now, most of the party potentates in the literary circles changed their tune accordingly. But in the meantime the book was practically snatched away from the shelves by ~~readers~~ <sup>readers</sup>. Subject knows about it from Shevchenko's daughter who has recently arrived to New York from Kiev.

Some party people are really angry about the book because in it there are quite a few "prototypes" of themselves. Take, for instance, the party bureaucrat who ordered Sobor to be turned down. Who else could ~~be~~ it be than a Skaba? In 1965 Subject went with his father to Poltava. At one place his father pointed out to him that the Sobor which was <sup>still</sup> standing there only one or two years ago, was demolished on order of Skaba.

Subject is very unhappy about the ~~witch~~ <sup>witch</sup>-hunt against Honchar and the new course in Kiev marked by revival of Shevel and Skaba's influence, and in his opinion, it is very harmful to the Soviet system, in the long run.

SECRET

4. At least for the next two years nothing good should be expected in internal Soviet policies. The situation <sup>has</sup> changed to the worse and will continue to do so. Moscow became frightened by recent developments in CSSR, ~~moreover~~ <sup>furthermore</sup>, in view of "our <sup>own</sup> troubles inside the Soviet Union".

Subject is afraid that the developments in CSSR might be conducive to some hothead reactions in the Ukraine, and this would be catastrophic. Albeit, he does not believe the Ukraine is ready for anything similar to what is going on in the CSSR and any upheaval would be squashed <sup>in Kiev</sup> within 24 hours.

But what he is afraid of are individual actions that could give additional justification for Shevels to tighten the screws. Ovcharenko might be trying to "mitigate" the whole situation but he is bound to follow "general line".

Sooner or later, however, things will change for the better again. Even today there <sup>are</sup> some very important developments which cannot be ignored. Take, for instance, present meetings and other gatherings of young people, particularly of students. Every one of them, as a rule, lately ends with questions about the right of Ukrainian SSR to leave the Union. Subject was told about <sup>them</sup> in detail ~~about~~ by comrades who had recently arrived from Kiev. "And what are you going to do? You cannot arrest all the students."

Of course, no one is going to raise this problem in CC CPU or some other high party forum. But even there, the nationalities question which for a long time was a "tabu", is being discussed from time to time. Time is working in Ukrainians' favor despite all kind of setbacks. Skrypnyk was in his time the climax of Ukrainian communist development. After him, came Russified careerists, interested only in power. At the present, the trend goes from the latter extreme toward Skrypnykivshchyna and soon it will reach the middle of the road. This will be the synthesis of the contemporary Ukrainian communist development.

SECRET

The pressure inside the Soviet Union will depend nowadays not only on what is going ~~on~~<sup>on</sup> in the Ukraine, Russia, Georgia, and other republics. It will also depend on what is going on "around". The further Czechoslovak communists will go in their "liberalization and democratization" directed against the Soviet Union, the worse repercussions it might engender in the Soviet Union itself. So far, the results of those events were quite negative for internal situation in the Soviet Union. ~~As to the Czechoslovak events, Subject did not think~~, 'all was over.' In his 'private' opinion, there are still great risks that the Soviet Union might be compelled to intervene militarily.

5. What was going on in France Subject described as an evolution. He was convinced that the Soviet Union had nothing to do with <sup>it</sup> and it was China ~~which was~~<sup>which was</sup>  ~~meddling~~ <sup>meddling</sup> into French affairs, trying to exploit some just grievances of French studentry and working class. "I can assure you that this kind of turmoil in France is not in the interest of the Soviet Union". "On the contrary it's quite inconvenient for us".

6. YELCHENKO was removed from his post because of his age. He was too old to head a youth organization. Subject did not think there had been any other reasons, at least he was not aware of. He knew YELCHENKO personally; at the very beginning of Subject's arrival to New York, YELCHENKO ~~visited~~<sup>visited</sup> at the same time ~~the~~ USA as a tourist and they met in New York.

7. Subject could not explain why Chornoval was given only 3 years commuted to 1 1/2. He thought perhaps because he was tried under different paragraph than all the others. Anyway it was not due to writings of Svoboda of New Jersey. Little attention is being paid in Kiev to what Svoboda and its alike are writing.

Of great importance, however, for Kiev is Petro Kravchuk's paper. Kiev listens very carefully to what the "progressives" in Canada are saying. Kravchuk could do a really good job if he ~~would~~ would want to. His publication of the report on CPC Delegation's trip to Ukraine in March/April 1967 was taken very seriously in Kiev and Moscow.

8. Shevel and Co <sup>by taking advantage of the</sup> present "orientation" in Moscow have recently started a quiet smear-campaign against their adversaries. They use to call everyone, they don't like, a nationalist. Thus, even Shelest was called by some people a nationalist. Here, in New York, Subject and Shevchenko are being smeared by Kravets all the time as nationalists.

9. Subject puts great hope on further development of <sup>the</sup> Ukrainian cultural center in Prešov, CSSR. He hopes Ukrainians will resist Slovaks' pressure, and there will be no "drastic change" in Czechoslovak situation in general. The revival of catholic Ukrainian church in Prešov area could be instrumental in ~~xxxx~~ a restoration of Ukrainian catholic church in West Ukraine. In his opinion, Cardinal Slipyi should write now a memorandum to the Soviet Ukrainian Government and ask for restoration of his church. But his memo should not be composed in maximalistic terms like the last one in which he had demanded all at once - return of monasteries, of real estates, cathedrals, etc. Cardinal should start with the minimal because only then he has chances to get something. He should follow the suit of the ~~xxx~~ 35 professors of Ukrainian descent from this country who had sent a memo to the highest Soviet authorities on the matter of general situation of Ukrainians in the Soviet Union. Of course, they won't get a direct reply but their memo was "properly discussed" at highest forums.

Subject could not understand there was so little "unity" between the Cardinal and other Ukrainian catholic hierarchs.

SECRET

He seemed to be quite well informed about the recent developments in this field and had no difficulty in naming individual bishops and metropolitans.

In Subject's opinion the Cardinal should strive to unite somehow all the hierarchy around his person as this would profoundly strengthen his position vis-a-vis Kiev and Moscow.

The Cardinal should also ask through the Soviet Embassy in Rome for the return of his works confiscated at one time by Soviet authorities.

10. Subject did not recommend to go now to Kiev ~~for~~ for the purpose of <sup>negotiations</sup> further development of cultural exchange ~~with~~ between emigrants <sup>and Kiev</sup>. No one in Kiev will have the courage to commit himself to anything substantial under the circumstances. Consequently, Source and her friends should wait for another year or so until the situation gets more "stabilized". Source should have gone to Kiev on a revisit to Kolosova, ~~and~~ <sup>then</sup> was a propitious moment for ~~doing~~ something tangible in Kiev.

It would be, however, completely wrong to break contacts, even those casual ones of the present, completely. One has to be patient and wait ~~for~~ while avoiding anything that would give new weapon ~~into~~ against contacts into hands of their enemies in Kiev, and here.

11. Subject knew about the present visit of YAREMKO Ivan to the Soviet Union and his plans to get some <sup>Ukrainian</sup> artists to this country. He remarked that he was not sure Yaremko will be fully successful since there were people in Kiev and Moscow who did not want to do anything to "anger Hurok".

SECRET

SECRET

12. TRONKO is for cultural contacts with emigration. CHERNIAVSKY is on friendly terms with SHEVEL but at the same time he <sup>has</sup> supported all the time Source's "line". The 5 years, Source spent on contacts with her Soviet Ukrainian friends have done a great job as she and her <sup>circle</sup> friends succeeded in influencing visitors from Ukraine. Source cannot even imagine how much she has done along this line. Due to her and others' work a new way of thinking has developed in the sphere of Ukrainian question, "in Kiev and elsewhere".

13. Subject does not look at American reality from propagandistic, one-sided point of view as most of his friends are doing. He sees many positive aspects in American life, not only as far as "materialistic" culture is concerned but also in American politics. Many of those things would be useful for Soviet society if adapted. But, unfortunately, not all of them could be "absorbed" by Soviet reality. For instance, a two-party system is O.K. but not practicable in the Soviet Union for the time being, at least. The most <sup>what</sup> would be desired and applied at the present (and he hoped it will materialize in the years to come), was a two-candidates-system for every position in the party and government. This would engender a basis for real criticism and ~~what~~ alternatives in the Soviet society.

14. SMOLYCH and LEVISHCHENKO are no policy makers and one should not bother too much with them. DMYTRUK is of different category and worth "maintaining contacts with her".

15. Subject doubted <sup>female</sup> the <sup>asked</sup> prisoners Source ~~about them~~, would be released at the present.

16. Subject switched <sup>over</sup> from Arabic economics into poetry and his thesis (next year) <sup>he</sup> will defend at Moscow University.

Ukr SSR, at Expo 1967 in Montreal, Canada  
- <sup>interpreter</sup> translator and assistant of P. Tronko, Vicepresident,

Geneva 1965

- Adviser of the Ukrainian Delegation to the  
49th Session, International Labor Conference,  
- Second Secretary, Foreign Ministry, Ukr SSR

НАУК ВІКТОР НАВІДОВИЧ

Foreign Ministry, Ukr SSR  
- Member of the Soviet Ukrainian Delegation to the  
18th and 19th U.N. General Assembly  
- Government Delegate of Ukr SSR to the International  
Labor Conference, 49th Session, Geneva 1965

ПОЛАНКОМКО МІХАЙЛО ДЕНІСОВИЧ, born 1921 in Mohytska  
- Director of the International Organizations Branch,

N.B.