

FOREIGN SERVICE DESPATCH

FROM

AMSTERDAM, NETHERLANDS

PRO

TO

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON

March 23, 1954

REF

OUN 2

NR The Only	ACTION	DEPT.
	REC'D	OTHER
	EUR 5	DC/2 OCT 7 P-1 GER 4
	V-6	CIA 7 ARMY 3 NAVY 3 AIR 3

SUBJECT: Peripherals: Realignments Within the Ukrainian and East European Nationalist Wing of the Political Emigration

Enclosed is a report which describes in some detail developments recently taking place within the extreme nationalist or right wing of the Ukrainian and East European political emigration. The report was prepared by Mr. Joseph F. Kendrick, Peripheral Officer of the Consulate General.

In summary, it appears that a serious schism has taken place within the nationalist wing of the East European emigration, delineating that faction which still clings to fascist ideology and organization from the element which would see more democratic concepts employed and a closer collaboration with the Americans. The action is essentially a break by many emigres with the dictatorial and terroristic methods employed by the Banderite Ukrainians. The strong-armed tactics used by Stephan BANDERA in handling what started out as a minor dissent within his ranks has now alienated virtually the entire intelligent and liberal wing of the nationalist camp. The quarrel has split in half one of the largest and most powerful of the Ukrainian emigre parties, ZCHOUN (Units abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists). The controversy has also extended to and resulted in the break up of the original Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), a coalition of East European nationality organizations claiming to represent the peoples subjugated by the Soviet regime. The ABN in the past has been controlled by ZCHOUN. Although the Banderites have taken measures to patch up the remnants of both ZCHOUN and ABN, what remains in both instances is an almost purely fascist organization which has undertones of being anti-American, anti-Semitic and undemocratic. While the seceding groups could scarcely be termed "democratic" in the strict sense of the word, they at least reflect an increasing reliance by the East European emigration on United States leadership in effecting the liberation of their countries from the Soviet regime.

J. F. Kendrick, Jr. :mf

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR COORDINATION WITH

State

The enclosed report was prepared on the basis of CIA reports, press and editorial articles, and personal interviews.

*E. Allan Lightner, Jr.*  
E. Allan Lightner, Jr.  
American Consul General

**Enclosures:**

1. Report on ZC:OUN and ABW (Confidential)
2. Press Articles on ZC:OUN Affair (Unclassified)
  - a. Resolutions Passed at Conference on February 1, 1954 (Summary)
  - b. Communique of Board of Plenipotentiaries of OUN Supreme Command
  - c. Announcement by Board of Plenipotentiaries to S. Bandera
  - d. Letter to OUN Leadership in the Emigration
  - e. Announcement from OUN Leadership in the Emigration (Summary)
3. Press Statement Regarding Withdrawal of Groups from ABW (Unclassified)

**Distribution:**

HICOG, PA, Mehlem  
HICOG, PUB, Mehlem  
HICOG, EAD, Berlin  
HICOG, PA/SRD, Frankfurt  
HICOG, USEP, Frankfurt  
AmEmb, (PR), Paris  
AmEmb, (PR), Vienna  
AmEmb, Moscow  
AmEmb, London  
AmEmb, Rome  
AmConGen, Edinburgh

CONFIDENTIAL

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
From: \_\_\_\_\_

CONFIDENTIAL

Page: \_\_\_\_\_  
Ref: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dep. No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
From: \_\_\_\_\_

Realignments Within ZCHOUN and the Anti-Bolshevik Block of Nations (ABN)

Over the past few weeks there have occurred several significant shifts and developments within ZCHOUN (Zakharivna Chastyny OVR - Units Ahead of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists), the extreme nationalist or right wing of the Ukrainian emigration. In essence, there appears to have taken place a sharp delimitation between the democratic and Fascist wings of the organization. The developments have also affected the ABN (Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations), a coalition of East European nationality organizations claiming to represent the peoples subjugated by the Soviet regime. In the past the ABN has been controlled by the ZCHOUN.

The basic issue is whether organizations committed to resisting the Communist regime are to be founded on democratic concepts, organizationally and ideologically, or are to continue to adhere to the Fuehrer principle. Hence, the struggle which has broken forth is not without a certain sensitive feature, for it is delineating the more liberal and democratic wing of the Ukrainian and East European nationalists from those abiding by the dictatorship principle. More specifically applicable to the Ukrainians the events have marked those who stand for closer cooperation with the Americans from those who defy or reject assistance from the United States on the grounds that its current policy is not clearly committed to the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state.

The details set out below are made tentatively and are subject to certain corrections as checks can be made. Since one is dealing here with what amounts to an underground wing of the emigration, the facts and an objective picture are difficult to come by. It is believed, however, that there is enough evidence at hand to determine the meaning and overall trend of the events. The report is divided into two sections: Part I is devoted to the schism within ZCHOUN and Part II describes the break up of the ABN. Developments within the two organizations are interlocking, however.

CONFIDENTIAL

Doc. No. 123  
Page No. 123  
From: [illegible]

Part I - The Crisis Within ECHOV

Background

In June 1944 a group of Ukrainian partisan leaders met in the Carpathian Mountains and founded the "Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council" (Ukrainska Holoyna Visolna Rada - UHVR). The mission of this organization was to carry out the functions of a supreme government until such time as the independence of the Ukraine is secured and until free elections can be held. The UHVR was to serve as a body above all parties. Although there were several parties represented in the UHVR, the largest and strongest was the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists-Revolutionists (OUN-R). Despite the domination of the UHVR by the OUN-R elements, the UHVR apparently adopted a purely democratic platform as the point of departure of the Ukrainian underground resistance movement. It is significant that Stephan Bandera, the head of the OUN-R, was in a German concentration camp at the time of the UHVR congress and was therefore scarcely in a position to contest the political course laid down by the UHVR.

The ideology of the UHVR is based on what is called the "present-day reality in the Ukraine." Its program and political platform "unites the elements of nationalism and socialism in an organic synthesis with democracy." Although the UHVR stands unqualifiedly for independence of the Ukraine it does believe in a democratic form of government and in free elections and is thereby sharply distinguished from the OUN-R, which continues to be based on one-man rule.

At the end of the German occupation the UHVR established and sent abroad a Foreign Representation of the UHVR (ZP-UHVR). The delegation to the West was headed by Mykola LEBID. He was assisted by Father Ivan HRYNIOCH. Certain leaders of the OUN-R, including Bandera, also made their way to the West at the end of the War.

Whereas Lebid and Hrynioch were the special envoys of the Ukrainian underground government, they were at the same time members of the OUN-R, as already mentioned, the largest political party of the UHVR. For this reason the ZP-UHVR and the OUN-R functioned essentially as one and the same body until about 1948 when a democratic element within OUN-R, headed by Lebid and Hrynioch, began to contest the terrorist and dictatorial practices of OUN-R as set out by Bandera. Lebid insisted that the ZP-UHVR should be

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Page No. 1

Doc. No. 100

From: BANGOR, Maine

essentially independent of the OUN-R and should carry out its own policy. Bandera tried to subordinate the ZP-UHVR to the OUN-R. The crisis came to a head at a party congress in Mittenwald, Germany in August 1948. At that meeting Bandera accused Dr. Hryniach and Lebid of securing the leadership of the ZP-UHVR for personal and private reasons and that it was their aim to split the ZP-UHVR and OUN-R in order to weaken the position of Bandera. Yaroslav STETZKO, Bandera's chief lieutenant, stressed that the purpose of the OUN-R was to make a free, independent Ukrainian state by forming a united, strong party led by one man.

In the rebuttal, Dr. Hryniach explained the political platform of UHVR and gave a brief history of the development of UHVR and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA). He stated that the UHVR is not sanctioned solely by Bandera and the OUN-R but by the people fighting for freedom in the mother country and belonging to all political parties. These fighting people have rejected a one-man government and a one-party system as well as party terrorism and any type of political monopoly. They hope some day to set up a free democratic type of government which is divorced from all dictatorial pressure. They furthermore deny the economic and social system proclaimed by Bandera and Stetsko. These fighting people of the homeland have honored Bandera for what he was, as an ideal of the war of independence, but they are not prepared to accept him as a dictator.

At the end of October, 1948 a number of opposition members, including Lebid and Hryniach, were expelled from the OUN-R. While the Bandera group retained control of an estimated 80% of the Party, the departure of the Lebid faction definitely weakened the OUN-R. Although the seceding group was small it comprised a number of intellectuals whom the Bandera movement could ill afford to lose. It was about this time that the OUN-R changed its name to ZCHOUN.

The proceedings of the Mittenwald Congress are necessarily set out in some detail above because the current conflict is a continuation of the same issues, and is, in fact, the second wave of liberals and intelligentsia detaching themselves from the Bandera Party.

To resolve the dispute of organization and tactics of ZCHOUN, the matter was referred to the executive body of the OUN in the Ukraine. An answer was not received until 1950. The OUN recommended that a board of seven members assume collective leadership of the OUN members abroad. Bandera, however, consistently refused to accept such a decision.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Ref. No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Doc. No. 2140  
From: (U) (S) (C) (R) (A) (D) (E) (F) (G) (H) (I) (J) (K) (L) (M) (N) (O) (P) (Q) (R) (S) (T) (U) (V) (W) (X) (Y) (Z) (AA) (AB) (AC) (AD) (AE) (AF) (AG) (AH) (AI) (AJ) (AK) (AL) (AM) (AN) (AO) (AP) (AQ) (AR) (AS) (AT) (AU) (AV) (AW) (AX) (AY) (AZ) (BA) (BB) (BC) (BD) (BE) (BF) (BG) (BH) (BI) (BJ) (BK) (BL) (BM) (BN) (BO) (BP) (BQ) (BR) (BS) (BT) (BU) (BV) (BW) (BX) (BY) (BZ) (CA) (CB) (CC) (CD) (CE) (CF) (CG) (CH) (CI) (CJ) (CK) (CL) (CM) (CN) (CO) (CP) (CQ) (CR) (CS) (CT) (CU) (CV) (CW) (CX) (CY) (CZ) (DA) (DB) (DC) (DD) (DE) (DF) (DG) (DH) (DI) (DJ) (DK) (DL) (DM) (DN) (DO) (DP) (DQ) (DR) (DS) (DT) (DU) (DV) (DW) (DX) (DY) (DZ) (EA) (EB) (EC) (ED) (EE) (EF) (EG) (EH) (EI) (EJ) (EK) (EL) (EM) (EN) (EO) (EP) (EQ) (ER) (ES) (ET) (EU) (EV) (EW) (EX) (EY) (EZ) (FA) (FB) (FC) (FD) (FE) (FF) (FG) (FH) (FI) (FJ) (FK) (FL) (FM) (FN) (FO) (FP) (FQ) (FR) (FS) (FT) (FU) (FV) (FW) (FX) (FY) (FZ) (GA) (GB) (GC) (GD) (GE) (GF) (GG) (GH) (GI) (GJ) (GK) (GL) (GM) (GN) (GO) (GP) (GQ) (GR) (GS) (GT) (GU) (GV) (GW) (GX) (GY) (GZ) (HA) (HB) (HC) (HD) (HE) (HF) (HG) (HH) (HI) (HJ) (HK) (HL) (HM) (HN) (HO) (HP) (HQ) (HR) (HS) (HT) (HU) (HV) (HW) (HX) (HY) (HZ) (IA) (IB) (IC) (ID) (IE) (IF) (IG) (IH) (II) (IJ) (IK) (IL) (IM) (IN) (IO) (IP) (IQ) (IR) (IS) (IT) (IU) (IV) (IW) (IX) (IY) (IZ) (JA) (JB) (JC) (JD) (JE) (JF) (JG) (JH) (JI) (JJ) (JK) (JL) (JM) (JN) (JO) (JP) (JQ) (JR) (JS) (JT) (JU) (JV) (JW) (JX) (JY) (JZ) (KA) (KB) (KC) (KD) (KE) (KF) (KG) (KH) (KI) (KJ) (KK) (KL) (KM) (KN) (KO) (KP) (KQ) (KR) (KS) (KT) (KU) (KV) (KW) (KX) (KY) (KZ) (LA) (LB) (LC) (LD) (LE) (LF) (LG) (LH) (LI) (LJ) (LK) (LM) (LN) (LO) (LP) (LQ) (LR) (LS) (LT) (LU) (LV) (LW) (LX) (LY) (LZ) (MA) (MB) (MC) (MD) (ME) (MF) (MG) (MH) (MI) (MJ) (MK) (ML) (MN) (MO) (MP) (MQ) (MR) (MS) (MT) (MU) (MV) (MW) (MX) (MY) (MZ) (NA) (NB) (NC) (ND) (NE) (NF) (NG) (NH) (NI) (NJ) (NK) (NL) (NM) (NO) (NP) (NQ) (NR) (NS) (NT) (NU) (NV) (NW) (NX) (NY) (NZ) (OA) (OB) (OC) (OD) (OE) (OF) (OG) (OH) (OI) (OJ) (OK) (OL) (OM) (ON) (OO) (OP) (OQ) (OR) (OS) (OT) (OU) (OV) (OW) (OX) (OY) (OZ) (PA) (PB) (PC) (PD) (PE) (PF) (PG) (PH) (PI) (PJ) (PK) (PL) (PM) (PN) (PO) (PP) (PQ) (PR) (PS) (PT) (PU) (PV) (PW) (PX) (PY) (PZ) (QA) (QB) (QC) (QD) (QE) (QF) (QG) (QH) (QI) (QJ) (QK) (QL) (QM) (QN) (QO) (QP) (QQ) (QR) (QS) (QT) (QU) (QV) (QW) (QX) (QY) (QZ) (RA) (RB) (RC) (RD) (RE) (RF) (RG) (RH) (RI) (RJ) (RK) (RL) (RM) (RN) (RO) (RP) (RQ) (RR) (RS) (RT) (RU) (RV) (RW) (RX) (RY) (RZ) (SA) (SB) (SC) (SD) (SE) (SF) (SG) (SH) (SI) (SJ) (SK) (SL) (SM) (SN) (SO) (SP) (SQ) (SR) (SS) (ST) (SU) (SV) (SW) (SX) (SY) (SZ) (TA) (TB) (TC) (TD) (TE) (TF) (TG) (TH) (TI) (TJ) (TK) (TL) (TM) (TN) (TO) (TP) (TQ) (TR) (TS) (TT) (TU) (TV) (TW) (TX) (TY) (TZ) (UA) (UB) (UC) (UD) (UE) (UF) (UG) (UH) (UI) (UJ) (UK) (UL) (UM) (UN) (UO) (UP) (UQ) (UR) (US) (UT) (UU) (UV) (UW) (UX) (UY) (UZ) (VA) (VB) (VC) (VD) (VE) (VF) (VG) (VH) (VI) (VJ) (VK) (VL) (VM) (VN) (VO) (VP) (VQ) (VR) (VS) (VT) (VU) (VV) (VW) (VX) (VY) (VZ) (WA) (WB) (WC) (WD) (WE) (WF) (WG) (WH) (WI) (WJ) (WK) (WL) (WM) (WN) (WO) (WP) (WQ) (WR) (WS) (WT) (WU) (WV) (WW) (WX) (WY) (WZ) (XA) (XB) (XC) (XD) (XE) (XF) (XG) (XH) (XI) (XJ) (XK) (XL) (XM) (XN) (XO) (XP) (XQ) (XR) (XS) (XT) (XU) (XV) (XW) (XZ) (YA) (YB) (YC) (YD) (YE) (YF) (YG) (YH) (YI) (YJ) (YK) (YL) (YM) (YN) (YO) (YP) (YQ) (YR) (YS) (YT) (YU) (YV) (YW) (YZ) (ZA) (ZB) (ZC) (ZD) (ZE) (ZF) (ZG) (ZH) (ZI) (ZJ) (ZK) (ZL) (ZM) (ZN) (ZO) (ZP) (ZQ) (ZR) (ZS) (ZT) (ZU) (ZV) (ZW) (ZX) (ZY) (ZZ)

### Recent P. Ticholtz and the Split

In 1951 the question was again referred to the Ukraine, the new decision being brought out by courier in the fall of 1953. The principal points of the directive seem to have been: (a) Lebid is confirmed as Foreign Secretary of the UHVR; (b) the major authority of ZCHOUN is to be invested in a collegium composed of Dr. Lev REBET, Zinevy MATLA, and Stephan Bandera (BYILIKH); (c) the organization ZCHOUN is to base itself on democratic principles as laid down by the UHVR congress held in the closing days of the war. There was also covered such points as the attitude and tactics the organization is to take toward the Russian people. Generally speaking, the UHVR has appealed in its underground press not only to Ukrainians, but to the other nationalities to be found in the Ukraine: Russians, Byelorussians, Jews, Poles and the like. Bandera is more openly anti-Russian.

Bandera initially refused to accept the authenticity of the document but eventually recognized it as coming from the Ukraine.

In November Rebet arrived in Germany from the United States, thereby permitting the trieka to begin talks. About December 28 a general agreement was reached. One week later, however, Bandera imposed conditions new and inconsistent with the mandate coming from the Ukraine. Nonetheless, an agreement was finally reached on these first demands of Bandera. But within another week Bandera set forth still new claims, which if granted, would have meant a complete return by ZCHOUN to the Puscarer principle. Throughout these discussions, Rebet and Matla were apparently in agreement and appealing Bandera, even though Matla is a member of Bandera's party. Dr. Rebet is a member of P-UHVR.

To effect Bandera's prearrangements, the leading members of ZCHOUN met on February 1 and requested that the plenipotentiaries take over full authority by February 10. The conference passed a resolution demanding that the Ukrainian mandate be recognized and that there be no deviation from the spirit of the directive. (See Enclosure 2a for a summary text of the resolution.)

Bandera did not attend the February 1 meeting. Four days later, however, he went into action. He defied the other two members of the collegium and attempted to seize complete control of the organization. Throughout he was resisted. His first move in this direction was to expel Dr. Bohdan KORDICK, one of the outspoken critics of Bandera, from ZCHOUN. He next asked for control of the intelligence organs headed by Dr. Bohdan PIDHAYNY. This apparatus

CONFIDENTIAL

Page \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_  
Desp. No. \_\_\_\_\_  
From \_\_\_\_\_

CONFIDENTIAL

Page 1 of \_\_\_\_\_  
Desp. No. 120  
From SAC, NORTH, Munich

would presumably have given him access to the Ukrainian courier service. Dr. Pidhayny refused to relinquish his authority, saying he would turn it over only to the three-man collegium. Failing here, Bandera then attempted to take over the press organs by ordering Dr. Nedest RYPETSKY to relinquish his license of Ukrayinsky Samostiyyak to Bandera's representative. Dr. RYPETSKY refused, claiming that he is responsible only to the three-man board.

On February 9 Matla and Rebet began counter-action against Bandera. They first announced that they, as members of the Board of Plenipotentiaries of the OUN Supreme Command, had assumed duties on February 9 as the highest leadership for all OUN members outside the Ukraine, but that Bandera, the third member, thus far had not joined the Board. (See Enclosure No. 2b.)

On February 11 Rypetsky and the editorial staff of Ukrayinsky Samostiyyak under Zena PELENSKY pledged themselves to the side of Rebet-Matla. All the staff agreed to subordinate themselves to Rebet and Matla except VASKOVITCH, the newspaper's accountant in whose name the newspaper's bank account is held.

On the following day, February 12, Rebet and Matla dissolved the OUN Leadership in the Emigration, which up to that point had been subordinate and responsible to Bandera alone. The two-man Board of Plenipotentiaries announced that they would summon their own Political Council and Executive Committee. (See Enclosures 2c and 2d.) This open break with Bandera was to be announced in a declaration to be printed in the next edition of Ukrayinsky Samostiyyak.

On February 15 Bandera sent out his "Special Squads" to destroy the galleys of the front page of Ukrayinsky Samostiyyak, which contained the Rebet-Matla declaration. The squads forcibly took over the printing plant, destroyed the first page galley and virtually at gun point forced the staff to setup a new first page dictated by Bandera. (See Enclosure No. 2e.) The other pages of the newspaper were not molested for they had no bearing on the current political issue. The Banderites then proceeded to run off an illegal edition of the newspaper, taking care to remove from the masthead, the name of Rypetsky as responsible editor. Their edition did not contain the name of any responsible editor, which, within itself, is a violation of German law.

The opposition immediately appealed to the German police authorities and through lawyers filed a civil case in the courts.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

The German police sent out a squad car on three occasions but, as all appeared peaceful on the premises of the printing plant, they soon departed. In the meantime a silent reign of terror was beginning to spread. At least four men opposed to Bandera were marked for liquidation. An estimated forty men comprising "Special Squads," most of whom were armed with knives and guns, patrolled in groups of three or four these places ordinarily frequented by Ukrainians. The "Special Squads" later took over the editorial offices of Ukrayinsky Samostiynyk, forcing Zenek Pelesny into hiding. Through these actions Bandera was given the credit of having the support of the intelligentsia of ZICHON. Although Pelesny is in hiding, Pelesny wrote and directed the printing of a special edition of Ukrayinsky Samostiynyk which contained the most severe denunciations and which openly defied Bandera. This edition was published on the premises of the Suchasna Ukrayina, the newspaper of the ZP-UKRN. The Korduk-Pelesny faction of ZICHON by this time was working closely with and being given encouragement by the ZP-UKRN, although the members of the latter organization were supposed to stay in the background of the action.

As greater public and official attention was given to developments and tactics being employed at the printing plant held by Bandera, the danger of continued fearful and terroristic acts of the Banderite squads and they began to hesitate about carrying out further rash actions. The opposition, encouraged by this faltering became even more outspoken against Bandera and decided to resolve the question solely by legal machinery, which, they reasoned, if successful would undoubtedly strengthen their cause among ZICHON members, as a means of winning them to join over the entire intelligentsia of the organization.

\* Needless to say, there was ever anxiety in the Consulate General and among other interested American authorities over the possibility of violence and bloodshed being employed once again by the Banderites. In 1931 HICOURT courts sentenced three Banderites to a stiff prison sentence for assault and battery against a rival Ukrainian, General HILAY. The sternness of this sentence has not been forgotten in the Ukrainian emigration nor has it failed to have an effect in curbing strong armed methods of the Ukrainians.

CONFIDENTIAL



Page No. 1

Disp. No. 144

From: ~~SECRET~~ - ~~SECRET~~

It was not until Friday, February 19, that the case finally came before the German courts for a determination of the legal ownership of the newspaper. The court's decision restored the Ukrayinsky Sanastlynyk's license to Dr. Rypetsky and in general ruled against the Bandera faction. Bandera, apparently overwhelmed for the time being by the wave of indignation and opposition against him, did in the end refrain from continuing his terroristic actions and accepted the court decision. As a result of the incident, however, Bandera clearly showed his hand as an open advocate of terrorism and of the dictatorship principle, although in this instance there were restraining factors which prevented him from using such tactics all out.

The theme of cooperation with the Americans was also a major issue during these few days. For example, the Banderites accused the opposition of wishing to bow to the Americans in their general policy and to resort to democratic processes for settling the immediate issue. As a political unit the Banderites are opposed to any cooperation with the United States unless that government is prepared to give unequivocal recognition to, and will work to the end today, for the establishment of a future independent Ukrainian state.

It is understood that the Bandera forces plan to publish their own newspaper under the title of Shlyakh Peremohi (Road of Victory).

This series of incidents and developments demonstrate that the form of Ukrainian nationalism which approaches fascism is still alive and given the opportunity will exercise itself still again. Fortunately, however, the movement seems to be more and more narrowed, delineated and exposed for what it is. Under the guise of nationalism this wing of the Ukrainian emigration has been able in the past to justify to many of its compatriots acts of terror and force. For many members, however, particularly among the intelligentsia, there is a striving to forego these practices of brute force and to find a way to cooperate with Americans in effecting the liberation of the Ukraine. There is, in essence, a social and political revolution going on in the Ukrainian emigration and these recent events in Munich are a significant step and landmark in that direction. Bandera has lost heavily from his recent moves, but it will likely be months before the issue is fully resolved. There will now follow a bitter struggle for control and orientation of the lower ranks of ZCHOUN. For example, four members of ZCHOUN have left for England to enlist the support of the Ukrainian emigration there against Bandera and his tactics. Robot leaves shortly for the United States where he will pursue the same objectives.

CONFIDENTIAL

The action has incorporated the liberal wing of ZCHOUN, virtually merging it with ZP-SHVR, for the former has virtually adopted the political platform and concepts of the ZP-SHVR. One might now classify this new element as part of the Ukrainian democratic camp, albeit on the right flank. Although there remains a considerable gap between the Ukrainian National Rada and the newly merged ZP-SHVR and Liberal wing of the ZCHOUN, the democratic camp has been widened by the entry of the latter body and in the process the Bandera faction has been reduced to an almost sub-and-out fascist type of organization.

#### Part II - The Break-up of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations

The ABN is composed of the non-Russian nationalities of the USSR and representatives of some of the satellite countries. Conspicuously absent are Russian and Polish representatives. The organization is dominated by the Ukrainians (ZCHOUN), with the Hungarians and Slovaks generally playing the secondary role. Its president is Yaroslav STETZKO, mentioned earlier as one of the principal leaders of ZCHOUN and very close to Bandera.

The ABN claims to have been organized in the Ukraine in the fall of 1943 through the initiative and efforts of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists. The basic idea of the ABN is the union politically of all the non-Russian peoples of Central and Eastern Europe and of Asia against Russian imperialism whatever its shape or line. The ultimate goal of the ABN is the creation of a series of national sovereign states upon the complete and unconditional dissolution of the Soviet Union. In the past the ABN has been the collecting point of the most reactionary elements of all the member nationalities, all united by their extreme nationalist ideology. There have been occasional traces of a democratic and pro-Western element within ABN, but it has consistently been overshadowed and controlled by the more nationalist wing. The right-wing has been able to maintain its hold over such a wide segment of the emigration - a much wider segment than it could lay claim to on strictly political grounds - through its control of the purse strings. Immediately after the war and at a time when nobody had an interest in political emigres from the East, the Bandera Ukrainians, through the medium of the ABN, gave the emigres the desired outlet for political activity by supplying them with the necessary financial means.

CONFIDENTIAL

The financing of ZHOCUN, and hence AEM, is based on the organization's strict discipline over its members. For example, the major share of funds come from regular taxation by the individual members according to their income. It is claimed that certain British circles share in the financing of the organization. On the other hand, there is the claim that AEM receives no financial help from either official or private British circles, but on the contrary that an organization such as the Scottish League for European Freedom, is financed by the Bandurites in order to utilize it as a propaganda outlet and as a mechanism to give AEM status in Western eyes. A modified version of this story is that the Bandurites take care of only the costs incurred in publishing their own journals released through the Scottish League. Other sources of Bandurite income are believed to be private Ukrainian-American quarters and the Vatican. It is emphasized that these stories regarding methods of financing are still speculative and unverified as far as this office is concerned.

Although there are undoubtedly other reasons than financial dependency upon ZHOCUN, this factor has certainly helped hold the AEM together and to influence the several national groups to retain their membership. Even these bindings, however, started to weaken when it began to be evident that AEM leadership had dictatorial tendencies and was aimed primarily at the realization of Ukrainian interests.

By the terms of the AEM Statutes a congress should be convened once a year to elect a presidium, chairman, and a Central Committee. The Central Committee in turn should be convened twice monthly. Under the chairmanship of Yaroslav Stetsko, however, the Statutes were systematically violated. The last congress was held in May, 1948 in Munich. Stetsko and his close supporters consistently avoided convening a congress, despite pressure from the majority of the members of the AEM. In 1952 the Central Committee passed a resolution calling for a congress before the end of the year. But by mid-1955 a congress still had not been called. In protest certain groups withdrew from AEM. These national groups and their respective leaders were:

North Caucasians	(A. MAGOMA)
Azerbaijani	(M. E. RESULZADE)
Serbs	(Colonel BOGDANOVICH)
Albanians	(DIOSI)
Armenians	(Setrak DJALAYAN)

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Another group, led by V. GLASKEV, President of the Russian Consular Representation, hoped to force a change within the existing structure of ABN and to preserve ABN if at all possible. The Glaskev faction demanded a reorganization of ABN so that it would function along democratic lines internally and that its policies and tactics be reoriented to insure closer collaboration with Western countries. They also demanded that Russians and Poles be brought into the organization. (Their Russian candidate was G. ALKINSKY of Paris, a man of a somewhat unsavory political past. Today he advocates the non-Russian peoples' right for national independence.)

It was Glaskev's idea that should the opposition fail to force the above desired changes on Stetske the group would resign en masse from ABN. Since the ABN was not an "Eingetragener Verein" (licensed and registered association) there is no legitimate way to remove its leaders. A complete withdrawal, however, of the dissatisfied elements would reduce ABN to a purely Fascist organization, permitting the seceding wing the opportunity to cooperate with more democratic organizations. Glaskev postponed and timed his break with ABN to coincide with what appeared to be an inevitable crisis coming up with ZCHOUN over the same issue of Banderite control.

On November 6, 1953 the Glaskev "democratic opposition," consisting of ten national organizations, issued a statement categorically demanding that a congress be convened before the end of the year. By various devices Stetske managed to postpone a meeting of the Central Committee called first for November 20 and then December 20. All of January passed and still neither the Central Committee nor an ABN congress had been called. In the meantime, it will be recalled, Banderas and Stetske were facing an increasingly difficult position within their own party of ZCHOUN.

As for the attitude of the Stetske wing of ABN regarding the United States the January 31 issue of Backauscyna (The Fatherland), a Byelorussian pro-Abramchik newspaper, accused Mr. Stetske of allying himself with the minority but Fascist faction of ABN which holds that "any efforts of the subjected peoples to reach cooperation with American political circles and any pro-American orientation of these peoples is harmful and undesirable."

CONFIDENTIAL

Finally, on February 5 the Glanov expedition, now consisting of eight organizations but still the majority, issued a statement to the press in which they declared their withdrawal from ANH which meant in effect the collapse of the organization as it was previously constituted. (A translation of the withdrawal is attached as enclosure 3.)

The eight organizations dissociating themselves with ANH were:

- Ukrainian National Committee (Dr. JURKO LILYC and Dr. STEPHAN BUC)
- Latvian National Guard (General BRACH, BRATS, BRASIS and KILONBERG)
- New Union of Fighters for the Independence of Icosi Nrai (Camp SULTAN)
- Estonian National Committee (Dr. REINBERG)
- Czech Federalist and Democratic Movement (Vladimir PERELSKY)
- Rumanian National Committee (General Ion GHEORGHE)
- Byelorussian National Center (General SIMONKI and ABRAMCHIK)

These organizations giving their full support to Stetake were:

- White Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (SPETIYO)
- Bulgarian National Front (General V. STREHEFF, ALIEFF, YILONSKI)
- Slovak Liberation Committee (General POKORNY and General DUCANSKY)

Three other organizations attempted to assume a neutral position. While they do not lend their full support to Stetake they have nonetheless not withdrawn from his organization.

- Kazakh Turkicstan Unity Committee (Veli KAYUM-KHAN, RAJUM KHAN)
- Hungarian Freedom Movement (General Ferenc FARKAS de KIBARNY. General Farkas's representative, Dr. W. von NYEDEL-SZEPESVARALJAY has been set as an opponent of Stetake and has threatened to leave the ANH.)

Lithuanian Rebirth Movement (J. QYIIS/GITIS)

Moreover, Stetko took immediate steps to bolster up the new working ABE. He hastily replaced the groups which had seceded by others composed of the same Nationals and added still others.

Byelorussian Central Council (R. OSTROVSKY/ASTROVSKI)  
former Nazi-sponsored  
administrator of  
Byelorussia)

Georgian National Organization (Prince Niko NAKASHIDZE)  
Cossacks (Ignaty BILIJ/BILYI), at present interned by  
the French in Algiers and charged with  
criminal and political offenses)

Latvians (Alfred BERNIS/BERSINSKI; BERZING; RZING, a  
personal friend of Stetko; co-initiator of  
a Fascist putsch in Latvia in 1935 and  
V. SKAISTLAUKS, a Latvian general)

Estonians (Dr. Oscar LORENTZ/LORITZ)

Czech Movement for Freedom (Jaroslav MYSLIVEC)

Rumanians (Gregoire MANOILESCU, former "Propaganda  
Minister" of the Vichy government of  
Roumania, 1944/45)

Croatian National Liberation Movement

(Dr. Stephan KOKOLJA, who represents  
LUBIC-DRINJAVIN/LIUBORICH-DRINIANKIN, a  
former commander of an Ante Pavelich  
concentration camp in Jasenovac and who  
presently lives in Madrid where he  
publishes the newspaper Drina. Kokolja is  
a priest and spent two years as a patient  
in an insane asylum. Both men presently  
support Pavelich, who is now in Argentina.  
Another representative is Gen. Maj. N. ALABANDA.)

The seceding members of ABE have not yet reorganized themselves into a new center and their course of action is uncertain. They are, however, placing emphasis on a platform based on the following principles: (a) democracy (b) the right of self-determination of nations, and (c) collaboration with the West, in particular the United States.

CONFIDENTIAL

Page \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_  
From \_\_\_\_\_

CONFIDENTIAL

Page \_\_\_\_\_  
Encl. No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Dist. No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Dist. \_\_\_\_\_

The break-up of the old AEN received general attention by the international press, some papers reporting the event factually and in brief, others portraying the matter in terms favoring the seceding opposition. It is understood that the German Foreign Office (Dr. KOSSEL) has termed the AEN as undesirable for Germany, that it is a liability as an undemocratic, anti-Semitic and anti-American organization and that it should by no means be supported. Even the Bureau for Foreign Refugees, headed by Dr. Gerhard Von MENDE, is reported to view the AEN in a negative light and to have been satisfied with the withdrawals of the several organizations.

Since the new members of AEN obviously have a greater affinity for Stetske's views than the seceding groups it is not surprising to find the AEN now prepared to hold a congress, scheduled for March 27. One may expect that Mr. Stetske will emerge as the "democratically-elected" president. Whereas the AEN has always attracted the right-wing emigration, the recent events have reduced the organization to where it is little better than a "Fascist International." Fortunately, most of the organizations associated with it are fictitious national representatives or have few adherents to their cause.

Comments: While one may be hard-pressed to identify the seceding groups of ZOBORON and AEN as "democratic" in the strict sense of the word - many of their leaders do have a questionable past - these recent developments would seem to signify an open and clean break in the fanatical nationalist camp. Significantly enough the break has largely been over the issue of support of the "democratic" as opposed to the "Fuehrer" principle. It does mean, moreover, that this virtually solid anti-American front of the East European emigration has been seriously shattered.

Joseph T. Kendrick, Jr.

CONFIDENTIAL

WYCIAS, JESSE  
(Classification)

Page 2  
Encl. No. 2  
Disp. No. 520  
BROCKNER, Michael

PRESS ARTICLES ON THE ZCHOUN AFFAIR

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE CONFERENCE OF FEBRUARY 1, 1954  
(Summary)

The participants in the Ukrainian Liberation Movement, consisting of members of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Army (UPA) and of the Ukrainian conference summoned by the OUN Leadership for February 1, 1954, which provided that the participants in the conference unconditionally acknowledge the political and organizational pre-eminence of the liberation revolutionary leadership and of the liberation organizations in the native land, i.e., of the UVR, UPA and OUN.

The participants of the conference appealed to the soldiers of the UPA to immediately carry out the orders and missions of the Presidium and the Secretary General of the UVR; they also appealed to the members of the OUN to accept the authority of the Supreme Command in the Ukraine, as represented by its plenipotentiaries, and to immediately carry out the missions of the Supreme Command. Members of the OUN in the emigration, soldiers of the UPA, and OUN members who were attending the conference, requested the Plenipotentiaries to summon a new conference for February 10, 1954, at which time they could be informed regarding the final legalization of the Board of Plenipotentiaries, and its coming activity. Forty-seven persons were present at the conference.

The resolution was signed by members of the Presidium of the conference, Bohdan Kordyuk, Ivan Butkevski and L. Rikhtitskiy.

Suchasna Ukrayina  
No. 4  
February 21, 1954

UNCLASSIFIED



UNCLASSIFIED

Ref. No.

Date

Classification

UNITY WITH THE UNDERGROUND MOVEMENT IN THE FATHERLAND  
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF PLENIPOTENTIARIES OF OUN SUPREME COMMAND

In conformance with the decision of OUN Supreme Command in the Ukraine taken in the summer of 1953, which reads as follows:

"The Supreme Command of the Ukrainian Nationalistic Organization on the territories of the Ukraine authorizes Lev Rebet, Zinovy Matla and Mylykh (Stepan Bandera) to provisionally take over the leadership of the OUN in the emigration and to reorganize the Emigration Branch in accordance with the positions of the OUN Supreme Command in the Ukraine."

On February 9, 1954, the Board of Plenipotentiaries of the OUN Supreme Command, consisting of Lev Rebet and Zinovy Matla, took over their duties.

Stepan Bandera did not submit to the decision of the OUN Supreme Command, and did not join the Board of Plenipotentiaries.

BOARD OF PLENIPOTENTIARIES

Lev Rebet      Zinovy Matla

Suchasna Ukrayina  
No. 4  
February 21, 1954

UNCLASSIFIED

**ANNOUNCEMENT MADE BY THE BOARD OF PLENIPOTENTIARIES TO  
S. BANDERA AND TO THE OUN LEADERSHIP IN THE EMIGRATION**

The Board of Plenipotentiaries of the OUN Supreme Command sent  
the following letters to Stepan Bandera and to the OUN Leadership:

**Ukrainian Nationalistic Organization in the Emigration  
Board of Plenipotentiaries**

February 12, 1954

to: Mr. Stepan Bandera

Dear Sir:

Considering the fact that the Leadership of the OUN in the  
emigration, headed by you, started an action nonconforming with  
the decisions of the OUN Supreme Command in the Ukraine taken  
in the summer of 1953, as well as with the document of December 28,  
1953 signed by its three plenipotentiaries, by beginning the re-  
organization of the leadership of the OUN in the emigration without  
authorization from L. Rebet and I. Matla, the latter found it neces-  
sary to enter into action on February 9, 1954 as a Board of Plenipo-  
tentiaries, in accordance with the above mentioned decisions of OUN  
Supreme Command in the Ukraine.

The Board of Plenipotentiaries, composed of persons as stated above,  
is at present the highest leadership for all the OUN members outside  
the Ukraine.

We address you for the second time, as we have already done on  
February 1, 1954, with the request that you begin at once executing  
the decisions made by the OUN Supreme Command in the Ukraine, and of  
the document of December 28, 1953 containing the program of work,  
and signed by you, without any additional preliminary conditions  
stipulated by the OUN, or by you personally.

We request that you give us your final answer by return mail,  
informing us whether or not you will join the activity of the  
Board of Plenipotentiaries on the basis stated above (decisions  
of the Supreme Command in the Ukraine and the document of December 28,  
1953).

CONFIDENTIAL  
(Classification)

Doc. No. 100  
Date No. 100  
From: INCOGON, Warsaw

If we do not receive your reply in due time, we shall consider this as a refusal.

Respectfully,

BOARD OF PLENIPOTENTIARIES  
Lev Rebet Zinevvi Matla

Suchasna Ukrayina  
No. 4  
February 21, 1954

\* \* \* \* \*

24

LETTER TO OUN LEADERSHIP IN THE EMIGRATION  
Ukrainian Nationalists Organization in the Emigration  
Board of Plenipotentiaries

February 12, 1954

To: The OUN Leadership in the Emigration

Para: Mr. Stepan Bandera

Considering the fact that the Leadership of OUN in the Emigration headed by S. Bandera started an action nonconforming with the decision of the OUN Supreme Command in the Ukraine taken in the summer of 1953, as well as with the document of December 28, 1953 signed by its three plenipotentiaries, and began reorganizing the OUN Leadership in the Emigration, and other cells of the OUN, without authorization from Lev Rebet and Zinevvi Matla, the latter found it necessary to enter into action on February 9, 1954, as Board of Plenipotentiaries, in accordance with the above mentioned decisions of the OUN Supreme Command in the Ukraine.

The Board of Plenipotentiaries, composed of persons as stated above, is at present the highest leadership for all the OUN members outside of the Ukraine.

Taking into consideration the fact that the present OUN Leadership (notwithstanding the decision made at its 4th Conference in June 1953) that the head of all of the OUN is located in the native land, and

ENCLOSURE

DECLASSIFIED

(Classification)

Ref. No. \_\_\_\_\_

Comp. No. \_\_\_\_\_

Procurement No. \_\_\_\_\_

24

notwithstanding the decision made at this conference (Item 47) which pledged the OUN Leadership in the Emigration to accept the decisions of the OUN Supreme Command in the Ukraine concerning the conflict) did not submit to the OUN Supreme Command in the Ukraine, the Board of Plenipotentiaries dissolves the present OUN Leadership in the Emigration as of February 12, 1954. The members of the OUN in the emigration are released from the duty of having to carry out the orders and missions given in the name of the present OUN Leadership in the Emigration.

In accordance with the decision of the Supreme Command in the Ukraine, and in accordance with the plan of activity accepted and undersigned by L. Rebet, Z. Matla and S. Bandera on December 29, 1953, the legal organs of the OUN in the emigration are the Board of Plenipotentiaries, as well as the Political Council and the Executive Committee of the OUN in the emigration, summoned by the Board.

Respectfully,

BOARD OF PLENIPOTENTIARIES

Lev Rebet      Zinevyi Matla

Suchasna Ukrayina

No. 4

February 21, 1954

\*\*\*\*\*

20

ANNOUNCEMENT FROM OUN LEADERSHIP  
IN THE EMIGRATION  
(Summary)

In connection with the declaration published in the Suchasna Ukrayina No. 4 on February 21, 1954, the OUN Leadership in the Emigration wishes to announce the following:

1. The activities of the OUN Leadership and all other leading organs of OUN in the Emigration, elected at the 4th Conference, are proceeding with their work in the normal way.

The action of the so-called Board of Plenipotentiaries, consisting of two persons (Lev Rebet and Zinzen Matla), whereby they took upon themselves the leadership of the OUN Leadership,

DECLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

Ref. No.  
Doc. No.  
From

UNCLASSIFIED

is illegal, and contrary to the intention of the OVN Supreme Command in the Ukraine of settling the conflict.

2. The negotiations between the three plenipotentiaries authorized by the OVN Supreme Command in the Ukraine were broken off through a separatist act of L. Rebet and Z. Matla even before the result of these negotiations could be foreseen.

3. The head of OVN Leadership in the Emigration, elected by the 14th Conference, as one of the Plenipotentiaries authorized by the OVN Supreme Command in the Ukraine, and the OVN Leadership in the emigration are ready and willing to continue the negotiations with the view of settling the conflict if L. Rebet and Z. Matla will drop their separatist actions and turn to the path of normal road negotiations.

4. The OVN Leadership in the Emigration, as well as the entire membership, stand closely united with the OVN in the Ukraine, considering itself an integral part of one and the same organization, and acknowledge the supremacy of the OVN in the Fatherland.

5. The OVN body in the emigration, being an integral part of the OVN as a whole, has the duty and the right to insist on respect toward the authority of the Board of the Three Plenipotentiaries chosen at the Conference of the Leadership in the Emigration and recognized by OVN Supreme Command in the Ukraine.

6. In connection with the situation which arose as a result of the broken off negotiations, the Leadership in the Emigration considers it necessary to summon a conference as soon as possible for the purpose of settlement of all matters in connection with the negotiations.

7. The Leadership appeals to its membership to continue preserving the organizational order which alone can guarantee the proper solution of the conflict, in accordance with the instructions of the OVN Supreme Command in the Ukraine, and make it impossible for outside factors to meddle in the internal affairs of the Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists. For the sake of unity in the revolutionary-liberation movement in the emigration, the Leadership in the Emigration appeals to L. Rebet and Z. Matla to forsake the false road of separate acts.

UNCLASSIFIED

Appreciating the need of settling the conflict within the ranks of the revolutionary liberating movement in the emigration, and for continuing the efforts in this direction, the OUN leadership in the Emigration stand on the principle that unity cannot be achieved at the price of idealistic or political deviation or instability in the organization and activity.

6. The OUN Leadership consistently asserts the ideological position of the Ukrainian nationalist revolutionary-liberating movement, and defends the independence of the OUN units in the emigration, having the moral, political and material support of the Ukrainian community.

Ukrainskiy Samostiynik (Published by Bandera supporters)  
February 21, 1954

UNCLASSIFIED

Doc  
Disp No  
From

UNCLASSIFIED  
(Classification)

Page  
Date  
Disp No  
From

Munich  
February 5, 1954

**PRESS DECLARATION**

The Presidium of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), known the world over, has recently grossly disregarded the democratic principles of its Statutes, and has acted in a totalitarian manner.

The central organs of ABN were elected in May 1948 for the period of one year; thus, the new elections should have been held in 1949. In order to avoid eventual changes in the Presidium, the latter has been postponing from one year to another the summoning of the Congress which was to hold the new elections, in spite of the clear and unequivocal decisions of the Central Committee of ABN.

When the democratic majority of the nationality delegates of ABN demanded an end to this unbearable state and/or the summoning of the Congress of ABN, in accordance with Par. 22, Item 7, of the Statutes, not later than January 31, 1954, thus demanding new elections, the Presidium, which in the meantime had decreased from eight to three members and therefore became illegal, did not respond to the repeated and justified demands, and adopted totalitarian and dictatorial methods. They declared that these representatives of several nationality delegations were expelled.

The undersigned Nationality Delegations cannot any longer tolerate these gross violations of democratic principles, and can in no case identify themselves with the methods of the present leaders of ABN, which they have been applying for a long time. The democratic majority of the ABN feels compelled to withdraw from the present organization of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN).

The democratic majority of the Nationality Delegations has always uncompromisingly professed democratic principles, e. e., the sovereign rights of peoples, and their right to the restoration of their own free, sovereign and democratic states. This majority also professed cooperation with all the democratic peoples of the West, and despised any application of totalitarian and dictatorial methods, which can be of use only in a Communist regime, and have nothing in common with the real struggle against this regime.

National Delegations of  
Cossacks, Creations, Latvians, Peoples  
of Idel-Ural, Estonians, Czechs,  
Rumanians, Byelorussians.

UNCLASSIFIED