

APPROVED FOR RELEASE 1993  
CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM

3 JAN 1975  
(date)

Review of 201 File on U.S. Citizen

In accordance with the DDO's notice of 9 December 1974,  
I have reviewed the 201 file on Jahson (surname)  
(201 number indicated below), and have determined that it can  
most accurately be categorized as indicated below:

- should be closed.
- witting collaborator. OI Code A1.
- potential witting collaborator; date opened \_\_\_\_\_  
OI Code A2.
- former witting collaborator (relationship terminated).  
OI Code A3.
- potential witting collaborator never contacted (security  
reasons, derogatory information). OI Code A4.
- counterintelligence case (i.e., involving a foreign  
intelligence or security service). OI Code A5.
- all others. OI Code A6.

Signed [Signature] SS/SOG/SS  
(name) (title) (component)

This assignment of category has been entered into STAR.

Signed [Initials] 28 JAN 1975 197\_\_\_\_\_  
(initials) (date)

This document is a permanent part of this file.

201- 102798  
E2 IMPDET  
CL BY 054979

CONTACT REPORT

APPROVED FOR RELEASE 1993  
ON HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM

Meeting with Priscilla Johnson on 11 December 1962

1. Circumstances of Meeting: Priscilla Johnson was selected as a likely candidate to write an article on Yevtushenko in a major U. S. magazine for our campaign. I took advantage of being in Boston on 11 December for the AEWILDFIRE Board meeting to go to the OO Office and inquire about her. She had been an OO source and they had a clearance on her for contact and debriefing. Having talked to them and explained that I was first interested in discussing Soviet literature with her, they agreed to place me in contact. Mr. Butler of the Boston OO Office called Priscilla Johnson who agreed to see me almost immediately. I spent approximately an hour and a half with her in her room at the Brattle Inn, 48 Brattle Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts where she is now living. OO informed me that she is allowed to use the Harvard-Russian Research Center for her own work, mainly the writing of articles and a book, but that she has no other official relationship to the center.

2. Impressions and Assessment: Miss Johnson impressed me as being able, astute and conscientious, qualities that I have noted in the articles of hers that I have read. She is however rather nervous and shy, giving one the impression of a lack of self-confidence, although the evidence of her numerous and important Soviet contacts certainly indicates that she knows how to meet people and how to talk to them. Although concerned about making her articles accurate as to fact and free from any external influence, I think she might be worked around to writing an article in which she genuinely believed, but which would also further our purposes for Yevtushenko. She also has other information that would be well worth getting on several young Soviet writers. The great interest of her life is Soviet literature and primarily its writers. She is personally concerned about many of them and dedicated to the cause of trying to help them out. Toward the end of our interview I told her I would send her a photostatic copy of Taruskiye Stranitsy and also mention to her the forthcoming edition of Grany which will print Feneks.

3. The course of her visit to the USSR she has met a great many of the new writers, some of whom have confided in her significantly. The range of acquaintance extends from Yevtushenko on the side of the notorious to some (names not mentioned) who do not publish at all due to lack of official acceptance. She has had long talks with many persons in Soviet literary circles, including one of the editors of Taruskiye Stranitsy who described to her the manner in which the book was published. He formerly worked on a newspaper in Kaluga, but after the book came out has been working in Moscow. She has talked several times with poet Voznesenskiy and has a copy of Voznesenskiy's little collection of poems, Mozayki, which was published in five thousand copies in Vladimir in a situation very much like that under which Taruskiye Stranitsy was published in Kaluga. The woman who managed to get the Voznesenskiy book published in Vladimir is also now doing something else. Among her closer contacts in better known circles are Kazakov, and Brodskiy and Garbobskiy, who,


17456



I think she said, are considered about the best these days. She said that Voznesenkiy was very pro-American and in conversations with her has been distinctly against the Soviet Regime. Rozhdestvenskiy had lost all the reputation he ever had. He was considered to have completely sold out to the regime and to be its tool in all ways. (She apparently does not know how truly right she is.)

4. Yevtushenko: Miss Johnson agreed with our evaluation of Yevtushenko, but only up to a point. She said that those in whom she had the greatest faith in the USSR consider Yevtushenko to be still on their side of the line and think of him as a defender of their causes in internal literary matters at any rate. She showed me a recent Yevtushenko article in a Soviet magazine defending "Formalism" in poetic style from heavy attacks which it has been under very recently. She also cited other cases of Yevtushenko's using his reputation to defend the artistic freedom of his less influential confreres. She was, therefore, reluctant to attack him all out. I did not raise the issue of her writing an article at our inspiration, but raised the general problem of whether it would not help to have him attacked here so that he could go back to the USSR and plead for greater freedom in order to continue as a effective propagandist. She got the idea and thought there might be something to it. She said she was going to write a series of articles for the Reporter including one on him and that she thought she must write only the truth, without defining exactly what that was to me.

5. Despite her statements in the paragraph above, I think that Miss Johnson can be encouraged to write pretty much the articles we want. It will require a little more contact and discussion, but I think she could come around. I told her that I would send her a photostatic copy of Taruskiye Stranitsy and urged her to be on the lookout for the next issue of Grany. Basically, if approached with sympathy in the cause she considers most vital, I believe she would be interested in helping us in many ways. It would be important to avoid making her think that she was being used only as a propaganda tool and expected to write what she is told. I don't think she would go along with that idea at all. On the other hand, she is searching for both more information and more understanding of the problem of the Soviet intellectual and is consequently subject to influence.

  
Donald JAMESON  
Chief, SR/CA

~~SECRET~~

APPROVED FOR RELEASE 1993  
CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM

5 February 1964

Memo for the Record

Subject: Meeting with Priscilla Johnson, 30-31 January 1964

1. The meeting was arranged by phone call from Washington to her at her apartment. The meeting ~~was held on 30 January~~ lasted from about 1100 to 1800 ~~on 30 January and 0930 to 1330 on 31 January.~~

on 30 January and 0930 to 1330 on 31 January.

2. She stated right off that she was pleased that the meeting had happened at this time because of a number of things about the ASEEV case which worried her. (This has ~~been~~ been put into a separate, partial, contact report, ~~to~~ to which the following should be added: I suggested the possibility of Kaznecheyev going to see ASEEV to explain to him what he would face if he decided to stay in the States. She was not too happy with this idea, fearing it might frighten him more than anything. I pointed out that it would have to be done, if at all, by having the State Dept ~~man~~ man ask ASEEV if he would like to discuss his situation with Kaz, who has been thru the problem already. She allowed as how this might be all right. I also brought up the idea, suggested by Jameson on the phone, when I called the office to report her initial misgivings, of passing to ASEEV the news clippings of the articles which the Sov who defected in Holland had had to sign when he eventually returned to the USSR. Again she doubted the efficacy of this, *and said she wouldn't want to be involved personally.*)

3. The basic purpose of the ~~meeting~~ meeting was to debrief Johnson on her ~~flaps~~ flaps with the Soviets when she was in the USSR, notably at the time of her last exit. Hopefully this would lead to a

17458

debriefing on her contacts in the Soviet Union--a subject on which she had ~~shown~~ shown some reluctance at the time of our first contact. She had no reluctance about the first half of the subject--security. She recounted at great length ~~the~~ the dates of each of her visits to the USSR and the manifold problems she had had in obtaining visas and extensions thereof. To make a very long story short, she had constant visa extension troubles. She knew a young writer for Soviet Sport, Leonid Inu, whom she had met socially through some Western radio correspondent. Leonid offered to get a friend of his in the Foreign Office to help in the visa problem. The friend turned out to be Boris Borisovich Inu. Boris met her alone in a restaurant to discuss the problem and allowed as how he needed to know more about the western press corps in Moscow. She allowed as how she didn't know much about it and that was all that time. She got a visa extension, which eventually was about to run out. Boris at that point suggested that ~~she~~ he introduce her to his boss, and ~~she~~ cautioned her to be nice to him. The boss, Valeriy Nikolayevich Inu, turned out to be the prosecuting attorney type, very aggressive and reasonably unpleasant. She remembers <sup>his mention</sup> something about his having been in some war crimes trials in Japan. He asked her to prepare a complete curriculum <sup>on herself</sup> vitae, in order for him to work on the visa extension. She thought it over and called him back and refused. The next time he met her he asked her opinion about things such as NATO and whether or not she would be interested in writing articles for Soviet publications; he also asked her about Soviet-American trade, of all things.

4. On her last visit to the USSR she had gone on assignment for The Reporter, among others apparently. In order to be sure of gathering



sufficient material to justify the trip she planned in advance some 14 articles and had opened files on each subject into which she put whatever might be related. She also had a notebook for each subject. None of this material was particularly sensitive, she believes, and would not have really seriously compromised any of her contacts in the U.S.R. On her way out, via Leningrad, when she passed through customs they opened her suitcases and handbags and took out all her notebooks and files. They said they were sorry she had not shown up earlier because they would have then had time to read the material at the airport and ~~perhaps~~ been able to permit her to take it with her. As it was they would have to keep it and would send it on to her by mail--they carefully got her forwarding address. They did not speak --or read--English and did not appear to be anything more than ordinary customs officers. Certainly not educated and cultured (relatively speaking) types such as interviewed Kathryn FEUER. She protested only mildly and got on the plane and left. Since then she wrote to her former boss, President Kennedy and he apparently designated Pierre Salinger to jibe the Soviet Ambassador about keeping her notebooks--which produced no ~~result~~ result.

5. Throughout this long conversation mention was made of various of her contacts--such as one person who was more or less in charge of tactical maneuvering of the liberal opposition (you submit this to Movv Mir, you there submit that to ~~Interview with Kommissar~~ Voprosy Literaturny) who was subsequently exiled to Tbilisi for one year. However when asked for their names she always backed off. and Therefore no effort was made to attempt to force the issue of a debriefing on her contacts. In parting I remarked that I would ~~be~~ probably be back to see her from time to time to see what she knows about specific persons whose names might come up, and she at least nodded assent to this.

6. Re Victor LOUIS, she met him when she first got to Moscow and was looking for a job to keep her there. He was then a translator for Kaufflin (phonetic) of McGraw Hill and was also writing for NANA. She constantly ran into LOUIS after that, especially when she got a job working for NANA. She in fact tried to get NANA to ~~drop~~ drop LOUIS, attempting to explain to her that he had such a lousy reputation in Moscow that he would eventually contaminate their reputation ~~even~~ even in other countries. NANA would never buy this argument, saying that he ~~was~~ was submitting good articles. When she left Moscow she tried to get NANA to hire Ruth DANILCOV, the wife of another correspondent there, but the Sovs wouldn't accredit her. Eventually NANA hired Dick STEIGER, who was accredited ~~immediately~~ immediately and who has, in her expression, "a left wing past", ~~which~~ ~~is~~

7. Re Frieda LURYE, she said that LURYE had been recommended to her by friends of hers in the USSR whom she trusts. ~~She also noted that when LURYE had appeared at a press conference at Harvard along with ROZOV and KATAYEV, she had been friendly and effective and had made a point of pointing out and recommending liberals in the Soviet Union. For example, when asked what one should read to keep abreast of developments in Soviet culture, she had specifically recommended the liberal Voprosy Literaturny. She thinks LURYE might be related to some LURYES who were purged in Stalin's day.~~

8. She contrasted LURYE with ROMANCOVA, Yelena, whom she thoroughly dislikes and thinks ought to be discredited. She says ROMANCOVA had in effect replaced SURKOV at the Innostraniye Comitsia (?). ~~She~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~


9. She asked several times my opinion about her chances of getting back into the USSR as a correspondent. I tried to point out that they depend in good part on ~~plans~~ plans the Soviet may be hatching about which she, or anyone else, might know ~~nothing~~ nothing. It might be that they would find her useful for some one of their plans and therefore let her in--or just the opposite. In general though, it didn't seem to me that she had been in any serious trouble or done anything especially bad and therefore I didn't think the Sovs would absolutely ~~ban~~ <sup>ban</sup> her.

10. I brought up Alex DOLBERG, saying that we had had some doubts about him for a long time and he had appeared to be another of the many cases which exist eternally in limbo. However we are now quite certain that he is working for the Sovs and therefore advise her to be careful in any dealings with him. She didn't seem at all surprised at this; she said that she had wondered about him from the very ~~begin~~ beginning because the first question he ever asked her was: who do you know in the Soviet Union and what's their address. On the other hand, she said, she had developed her understanding of the Soviet machine largely from frequent contact with him when he was at Harvard. He would constantly point out the power play involved in any move the Sovs made--to the point she ~~now understands power as used by the Sovs.~~ <sup>now understands power as used by the Sovs.</sup>

11. Comment: I feel vaguely uncomfortable after this long ~~talk~~ discussion with Johnson. She has an air of naivety and innocence, which is really only a mannerism. She is certainly intelligent and well informed on the Soviet Union. However she is interested in it as an intellectual thing, ~~She is not~~ not because she is out to destroy the Communist system. There were two apparent contradictions: (a) according to Patricia Blake, she has tried for years to convince Johnson that Dolberg is no good, but



Johnson consistently refused to accept this opinion; (b) to the best of my recollection Blake said that Johnson had ~~said on occasion~~ had a very low opinion of Lurye after the Boston press conference. In any event I am reasonably certain that we cannot expect to use Johnson actively in operations. She obviously doesn't want to get involved in deep plots. She is unlikely to be the type of informant who will volunteer information; but she will supply info she has acquired, if asked and if it's not too sensitive, such as the identities of her friends in the USSR.

  
Gary Cuit  
SR/CA

P.S. 1. She mentioned that Boris Sergeyevich NIKIFOROV was at Harvard lecturing from about 22 Oct to 22 Dec. [He is a lawyer who came on tourist trip to U.S.A. with Ume Mamedova, the lawyer Buldyrev et al. in spring 1962.]

~~P.S. 2. When she was in the USSR she did quite a bit of research on Soviet law (I don't know why) & considers herself at least more than an amateur in the subject. Some connection turned to American aspects of it.~~

APPROVED FOR RELEASE 1993  
CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM

23 February 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Telephone Call from Priscilla Johnson

1. Priscilla Johnson called this noon to say that she has very recently heard from two people, totally unrelated as far as she knows, that Alex Dolberg is considering returning to the USSR. Actually, she said, she is not sure whether or not DOLBERG said he is considering returning or whether this is a deduction made by her friends from the information available to them. (She didn't name her two sources and I didn't ask for their identity.) She said she hears that DOLBERG has been living rather strangely lately, in London's demi-monde with homosexuals, drunks, beatniks, etc. He has become terribly paranoid and recently refused to see a friend off at the airport, saying he is being followed everywhere and "they" are after him. He says that he was discriminated against in the USSR because he is Jewish and now it is "the same in the West. She heard also that his mother died about a year ago and his father is living alone and speculates that may have some affect on his desire to return. She also mentioned that someone "recently" (she doesn't know just when but thinks it was probably within the past several weeks) received a letter from DOLBERG postmarked Morocco. She has no confirmation, however, of his having been out of England, permanently or temporarily.

2. She said she reported this because she thinks he could do more harm to followers of Soviet intellectual affairs, both in the West and in the USSR, than anyone else she can think of. I thanked her for calling and said maybe the best thing would be for someone to have a talk with DOLBERG. She agreed and immediately said that if he returned to the USSR he would be squeezed dry and then cast aside.

3. Comment: It seems to me that if it can be confirmed that DOLBERG has reached this state of worry--whether or not he is talking specifically of repatriating--then the time has come for an attempt to make a pitch to him. The obvious basis of the pitch would be: "You are washed up in the West because people have become convinced you are a Soviet agent. You could return to the USSR, but if you do they'll squeeze you and they drop you and you're finished. Even if they didn't send you to Siberia, you couldn't exist in the Soviet system after living

GROUP 1  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

17460

this long in the West. You could be rehabilitated in the West, however, if you will tell all, we would help you and would clear your name. If you're being constrained to work for the Sovs through some hold, perhaps on your family, you should know that returning is not going to help them, nor will it do anything other than perpetuate the system." Such a pitch may not work, certainly, but the circumstances seem exceedingly propitious.

*G Coit*  
Garry Coit  
SR/CA

