

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3828
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

SX-4665
3 Aug 65

Re: PAVLENKO, Mikhail Ivanovich
Date: 3 August 1965 in Caracas
Source: R.

AN	REF	
PS	REF	SR/CA
ABSTRACT	X	INDEX

1. *PAVLENKO, Mikhail Ivanovich: nationality Ukrainian, born 1934 Zaporizska obl. married, presented himself as a worker of the Ministry of Culture. Subject is 5'6", 150 lbs. Blond hair, long but sparse. Has a youthful face, with delicate features. Clean shaven, light complexion. Subject is quite friendly, and willing to talk about matters pertaining to Ukrainian nationalism. Said that he is interested in history, and studied same in Kiev. During conversation subject gives the impression that he is willing to listen to other than the official Soviet line on matters pertaining to Ukraine. He is well mannered, dresses modernly, and gives the appearance of being well off.

2. Meeting took place in subject's room in the hotel El Conde. Present were source, subject, KOSTIUCHENKO, and KOSIENKO. KOSIENKO left the room after a few minutes, and in 1/2 hour KOSTIUCHENKO left. Following text is of conversation between source and subject;

3. SUCHASNIST:

Subject pointed out that in the journal SUCHASNIST there were some mistakes in Ukrainian grammar and that the journal wrote the name of the Ukrainian poet KOROTIYCH as Ivan and not Vitaly as should be. Source said that such mistakes occur even in the best journals, and that he could show him worse mistakes in the Soviet Ukrainian publications. Source mentioned the fact that the word ASIMILY is constantly written in Soviet Ukrainian press, while this is a Russian word. Subject did not argue, but turned to SYMONENKO'S poetry and brought out the fact that there was a technical mistake in the title of one of the poems. Source agreed, but said that this is too late to bring up. Subject asked source if SUCHASNIST is being sent to libraries and universities in Ukraine. Source replied that as far as he knows, and imagines, it is. But does not know if it gets there. Subject wondered if the Minister of Culture of the Ukrainian SSR receives his copy, and said that when he gets back to Kiev he will try and check this out. Subject asked if source will write an article in SUCHASNIST about the ensemble in Caracas.

Source replied that he might if he had some spare time. Subject said that if there was to be an article, he would appreciate it if it was written positively, without the usual attacks on Soviet Ukraine. Source did not promise such restrictions, but said that he will write a fair article about the ensemble. Subject asked source not to mention any private conversations he had with dancers, or with him in the article. This source promised to do, adding that the policy of SUCHASNIST is to be discreet. This pleased subject, and he praised SUCHASNIST for this policy.

CS COPY

SX-4665-214

Subject asked if it was true that in Poland, the journal SUCHASNIST can be found in university libraries, and is permitted for general use. Source was not sure, but supposed that this was true. Adding that Poland had advanced much further than the USSR in freedom of the press. Source asked if it was feasible to expect similar changes in Ukraine in the near future. Subject seemed unsure on this point but personally hoped that such exchanges can take place, but adding that such literary exchanges would have to be for higher party officials at the present.

4. CULTURAL EXCHANGE:

Source asked about the trip of a group of Ukrainian cultural leaders under the leadership of KOLLOSOVA to the U.S. recently, and the meaning of such trips. Subject replied that this was the first such attempt on the part of Ukraine to reach a certain understanding with the emigration. Subject evaluated this try as being successful, and hoped that there will be similar groups in the near future. Source then attacked the fact that there is no exchange of literature, saying that the emigration receives most of the Soviet Ukrainian press, literature, and artistic products, while on the other hand, emigre publications, even those without political contents are still forbidden in Ukraine. This cannot be explained in any way, went on source, and said that he saw no reason why Ukrainian emigre scholars cannot visit Ukraine officially, the same went for writers, artists, and students. Subject agreed fully with source, saying that it would be very useful if such a man as SHERECH could visit Ukraine. Subject proposed that when he returns to Kiev, he will ask about these matters and do what he can to help. Subject seemed to be sincere on this matter, saying that he has had an opportunity to read emigre books and articles which should be known in Ukraine.

5. SYMONENKO POETRY:

Asked about his opinion on SYMONENKO poetry and diary, and if he had any comment to make in relation to the contents. Such poetry can not be printed in Ukraine at present said subject, but avoided answering question. Said that most were published in Ukraine. Source disagreed saying that he had seen Soviet edition and found that many words were changed, and lines left out. To illustrate this, source took a copy of the poems and read them out loud to subject. Subject did ^{not} reply to this, instead asked how poems were smuggled to west. Source answered that he had heard from others that Ukrainian communists from Canada who had visited Ukraine brought them back. Adding that even Ukrainian communists from Canada were not so stupid as not to see what is happening in Ukraine at the present. Besides, they have more freedom of movement in Ukraine as tourists, and are not watched as closely. Subject did not comment, instead listened closely. Subject wanted to know when the full edition of SYMONENKO'S poetry and diary will be published. Source could not answer this, but confided in subject that such a book will appear in the near future. Subject in a

few minutes again asked if source would tell him how SYMONENKO'S poetry got to the emmigration. Subject repeated the same story about Ukrainian communists from Canada smuggling poetry into U.S. Source said this in a very conspiratorial manner adding that he did not know the details of this action. At the same time reminding subject that the Ukrainian communists in Canada were not as stupid as they appear.

6. YOUNG POETS:

Asked if there were many other poets in the nature of SYMONENKO who wrote poetry against Russian chauvanism in Ukraine, and how is this poetry passed around in Ukraine. Subject mentioned TELNIUK, STANISLAV, saying that he wrote a poem about Russian chauvanism that "is 10 times stronger in it's attack then SYMONENKO'S Kurdkomy Bratovi". Subject did not want to tell the name of this poem, or the contents. When asked how it was familiar to him, subject said that in Kiev, young poets print up their poems privately and circulate them among their friends. After some time, all of Kiev knows about these poems. There are also private readings in apartments, with poetry passed on from hand to hand. Subject confided that there are many such poets, adding that many are better then SYMONENKO.

When asked if there will be pressure on young poets in relation to the publishing of SYMONENKO in west. Subject did not think so. When asked about SVITLYCNYI and what he is presently doing, subject replied that he writes under another name, but refused to say what it was. Subject said that there was no repression against him.

Asked subject if he could possibly send some of the poems that he mentioned, in particular the one by TELNIUK and those passed from person to person. The proposition was stated thus: The emmigration and Ukraine should inform each other mutually about certain processes now in the making, there should be an exchange of information, and ideas. In addition if a young poet writes a poem that cannot be published in Ukraine due to ideological content he should send it to the emmigration for publication. This is done by the Russian emmigration, why can't Ukrainians do the same. Subject listened to this reasoning carefully, then added that such publications might be harmful to young poets in Ukraine. Subject said that he had no guarantee that if he sent such poems, they would not be printed right away. Source said that SUCHASNIST is a very discreet journal and will not publish anything that might harm a living person. The only reason that SYMONENKO'S poetry and diary were published, was due to the fact that he was dead, and such post-humous publications could not hurt him. But, added source, if the author wished to have his works published he can ask and they will be. Subject went on to say, that if he did send a poem or two, he would not like another article similar to EVEREST PIDMOSTI to appear in one of the newspapers. Source laughed but repeated that discretion is used everywhere. Subject might do what source asks, but stressed the fact the point that it would be very dangerous for him.

Not to mention the fate of the young poets. If the emmigration started to print their poetry at random, this might lead to another strong attack on them, as happened in 1963. When questioned about the attack in 1963, subject said that DRACH and KOSTENKO held out until the end. Subject put some blame on the older writers for not coming to the defense of their younger colleagues, mentioning DMYTERKO in particular. On the topic of DMYTERKO, subject was present last year in Kiev University when DMYTERKO gave a lecture on literature where he attacked young poets very harshly. Since this time subject refuses to read any of his works. Subject told about a poem written by DRACH attacking older poets with a dedication to DMYTERKO. This poem was published, but the dedication was left out. Subject praised DZIUBA for his recent attack on BILODID in a Kiev journal. Saying that he personally was against BILODID'S theory that Ukraine had two native languages, Ukrainian and Russian. Adding that only in Ukraine can such a theory be proclaimed with a minimum of public reaction. This is a false theory, and no nation has two native languages.

7. PROLOG:

Asked about PROLOG and what its connection was with SUCHASNIST ~~was~~, saying that he had read some books put out by PROLOG mentioning VYVID PRAV UKRAINY, and NE DLYA DITEY. Source said that it was quite evident from reading that the political line of the two was similar, that these were two groups that represented the views of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council. Subject praised SHERECH very highly for his book, and said that such a man is needed in Kiev presently, compared SHERECH to KRYZHANIVSKY putting SHERECH above ~~fermer~~ later. Subject wanted to read DOKYMENTU UKRAINSKOHO KOMYNIZMU saying that he was interested in the period of Ukrainianization in the 1920's. Source promised to obtain same for him.

8. UKRAINIAN NATIONALISM:

Subject asked about the different Ukrainian political groups presently in the emmigration, what were the main differences, and their political programs. Source explained that there were two main groups, they had their differences, mainly on the question of tactics and evaluation of Soviet Ukraine. Subject went on to say that in conversations with B. and source in Caracas, and MAC in New York, he was impressed, and pleased with their ideas and positions. He had learned from those conversations that the Ukrainian emmigration is not a bandit movement as he was previously told, but the emmigration does love Ukraine and is trying to help the situation somehow. When asked if had any ideas on how ~~to~~ the emmigration should act, subject replied that it should teach the truth about Ukraine. When questioned deeper about this, and ~~wheater~~ if the emmigration should teach Soviet reality based on only Soviet sources, subject did not comment, but said that source knew what he meant. Subject asked about the murder of REBET and BANDERA and the trial

of CHAPURNY, asking at the same time if source could explain the murder to him. Source gave a short rundown of the actual murders, and the trial of the accused. Subject did not seem convinced, but asked if there was a copy of the trial proceedings available. Source confirmed him that there were, and would try to get him a copy. Subject did not believe that political murder was still practised in the 20th century. Source named some of the more famous Soviet political assassinations, Trotsky, Petlura, Konovalets. Subject did not argue this and changed the topic, but first asked about the circumstances of Konovalets' death, which source explained. Subject asked if source was familiar with KUK Vacyl, a former nationalist leader who repented his views and is presently working in Ukraine. Source was familiar with the name, and said that he had read KUK'S articles, but doubted that they were written by him. Source argued that if KUK had fallen into the hands of the MGB he would be forced to write anything. Subject only smiled and did not pursue the topic. Source mentioned that such matters are very complicated, mentioning KOSACH Yuri for example, who at first was a super-patriotic nationalist, then turned communist, while presently no one respects him at all, and his journal ZA SYNIM OKEANOM has stopped coming out 2 years ago.

Subject told of an incident where in Argentina a emigrant (did not specify nationality when questioned) tried to bribe a dancer into doing anti-soviet deeds in Ukraine.

9. STAINED GLASS WINDOW IN KIEV UNIVERSITY:

At this moment source gave subject a small INFORMATION BULLETIN where there was a photograph of the stained glass window that was destroyed by the authorities in Kiev University. Subject had heard of this incident and confirmed the fact that HORSKA, the author of the window, was thrown out of the Association of Artists of Ukraine. This, according to the subject, was a big mistake and was handled by incompetent people. When questioned deeper about the motives for the destruction of the window, subject said that it was destroyed due to the inscription on it. Source attacked this as an act of official vandalism which showed how the regime looks upon Shevchenko in reality. Subject did not answer the charges and remained silent. When source asked if this policy in regard to works of art, graphics, etc. is widely practised in Ukraine, subject commented that there have been cases where certain works of art were forbidden to be shown due to nationalist deviations.

10. UKRAINIAN MINISTRY OF CULTURE:

Source asked subject if he thinks that the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine is doing all that is possible for Ukrainian culture. Subject said that he believes the work in the villages is not at all satisfactory, there are not enough clubs or cultural groups. But subject was optimistic and believed that in a few years it will be up to par.

11. REMOVAL OF KHRUSHCHEV:

Source asked subject about the overthrow of the Khrushchev government, and how it came about. Subject said that the source probably had heard of the role that SHELEST played in the overthrow. Source replied that he was not aware of it, and subject related the story of how Khrushchev asked SHELEST produce more bread, and when SHELEST did not have any more and told this to Khrushchev, Khrushchev became angry. When Khrushchev went on vacation to Sochi, SHELEST went before the central committee and explained his position. Khrushchev was summoned to Moscow, put in a chair, and told to sign his resignation. When Khrushchev reached for the phone to call the KGB, the line was cut. Subject told this story very cautiously and asked source not to relate it to anyone. Source questioned subject about the role of SAMBEPIN in the overthrow, and subject confirmed this, but declined to give any concrete examples.

12. LITERATURE GIVEN SUBJECT:

At the end of the conversation source asked subject what other books would interest him. Subject said that he would like to have another copy of ISTORIA UKRAINY by Hryshovskiy. When asked why, subject said "You wouldn't believe me if I said that BRACH wants to have a copy for himself". Source just laughed, but said that he would do what he can. Source gave subject the following books:

NA NOVOMY ETAPI, SUCHASNIST #6/65, and PRAVDA KOBEARNA.

13: DEFECTORS:

Source asked if there were any defectors from the ensemble in Chile or other countries in South America. Subject said no.