

(from magazine)
NO USE

Penkovsky Papers Defended

NOV 19 1965

As the translator of *The Penkovsky Papers*, I would like to make some comments on Victor Zorza's review. I do not want to get involved in polemics with Mr. Zorza, whose previous work I have admired. I know, better than anyone, that the *Papers* are genuine, but I also know that there is no way to prove this to the satisfaction of those determined to degrade Penkovsky's legacy as the Soviets sought to degrade Penkovsky.

I find it surprising that Mr. Zorza has made up his mind that "the Russian manuscript of the Penkovsky memoirs just does not exist" simply because I do not wish to release it in its original form. The published format is as true to Penkovsky's notes as it could be, even though Mr. Gibney and I inevitably had to translate, select, and edit them for publication. I will not, however, reveal how the *Papers* came to me.

Let me cite details from Mr. Zorza's critique. He says that "the English text is prepared with words and phrases no man with Penkovsky's Soviet background would use," i.e. he cites the terms "Soviet Russians" or "Soviets" in describing his countrymen. Mr. Zorza's quotes are in English, thus they are my translations. But Penkovsky clearly distinguished between the Russian people and the Soviet regime. In the *Papers*, Penkovsky used a variety of terms: "Soviet citizens," "the Soviet people," "Russians," etc. In translating I used the term "Soviet Russian" or "Soviet" for purposes of simplicity and consistency.

Penkovsky referred to Marshal Zhukov's removal because of his "Napoleonic characteristics." Mr. Zorza thinks that this should read "Bonapartist tendencies" and concludes that "no translator would depart so far from the original." The exact Russian term used by Penkovsky was "Khrushchev ego ubral za napoleonovskiye zamashki." Col. Penkovsky evidently knew Bonaparte's first name and preferred to use the term "napoleonovskiye zamashki."

Mr. Zorza also finds fault with the expression "Great

China." Obviously, Penkovsky was not writing an editorial for *Pravda*. "Velikiy Kitay" was what he wrote and that's how I translated it.

In Mr. Zorza's opinion no Soviet official would refer to a high party official as an RSFSR Communist Party leader. Colonel Penkovsky was well aware that there is no separate Communist Party of the RSFSR. The Russian original of the line on page 207 is, however, "tak nazyvayemyy partiynyy vozhd RSFSR."

With regard to Penkovsky's statement that several Soviet cosmonauts had lost their lives, I can only repeat that I merely translated what Penkovsky wrote — that some of them lost their lives.

About Marshal Chuykov: Mr. Zorza is correct in saying that Penkovsky was in error when he wrote that Chuykov was relieved of his duties when he took over the Civilian Defense command. However, I have simply translated what he wrote.

With regard to the anti-party group: again I simply translated what Penkovsky wrote. It is the Kremlinologist who is concerned with precision in the matter of dates of ousters; for Penkovsky, as for most Soviet citizens, it was apparently of little importance that Bulganin managed to hang on until 1958.

Mr. Zorza shows a lack of knowledge of the everyday Soviet language when he claims that a "Russian returning to Moscow would speak of a visit to the West, not to Europe." Penkovsky wrote "Yevropa" which means "Europe." Soviet intelligence officers do not normally talk of their travels to European countries as to "the West"; they refer to "Yevropa" or the country which they visited.

As far as the 50-80-100 megaton bomb is concerned, Penkovsky was apparently not in a position to measure the bomb's yield as accurately as Western experts or Mr. Zorza. If Western experts wrote *The Penkovsky Papers*, as Mr. Zorza seems to believe, why did they not use the correct figures?

PETER DERIABIN.
New York City.

NOV 19 1965