

SECRET

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 9820
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

18 November 1959

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Contact with AECASSOWARY 2 on 22 and 23 October 1959

A meeting with Subject was held in an SR/10 safehouse in Washington on 22 and 23 October, attended by [] and the undersigned. [] did not attend the meeting on 23 October. The following topics were discussed:

1. The Death of Stefan BANDERA

A. Subject's condolences on the death of BANDERA and flowers were cabled to Karoslaw STETS'KO in Munich. Subject said he had planned to write a letter to STETS'KO suggesting that they work toward unity of the Ukrainian emigration in an all-out effort to break up RIS plans against them. He decided, however, to postpone his letter until after he learns what moves, if any, will be made by OUN/B and what investigations will be conducted regarding BANDERA's death.

B. [] asked Subject whether he thought the BANDERA people would try to retaliate for the death of BANDERA. Subject said he did not think so, that although there were about 100 OUN/B individuals who might be so motivated that there actually is no one at present trained to execute such an act. He expects that "a couple hundred" individuals will leave their posts in emigre nationalistic organizations (especially in the OUN/B) as a result of BANDERA's death because they will fear a similar fate.

C. Subject strongly feels that if the RIS was responsible for BANDERA's death that they will not stop now and that BANDERA probably was only the first to go in an extensive plan for the liquidation of nationalist emigre leaders. He said if there is such a plan, then he fears for the life of AECASSOWARY 3 and other individuals employed by the AECASSOWARY publications in Munich and that plans should be considered for bringing AECASSOWARY 3 to the United States.

D. Subject stated it was a very unpleasant experience for him to see at the requiem service for BANDERA in St. George's in New York the so-called elite of the OUN/B. He and his colleagues, who are among the older former members of the OUN, did not recognize many familiar faces. Among this "elite" are many new people about whom the emigration knows little and who therefore should not be fully trusted. According to Subject, several individuals approached him after the requiem service to discuss a successor to BANDERA and suggested that he take over the leadership of the OUN/B. Subject said he has

SECRET

SECRET

-2-

no interest in this regard. He is under the impression that a complete reorganization and reeducation would be necessary in order to create a really effective organization and he considers the task too enormous for him to undertake at this time.

E. Subject said it was even possible that BANDERA's death might have been accidental. According to reports, when BANDERA left his office to go home for lunch on that fatal day he stopped off at a market place where he purchased 20 pounds of green tomatoes which he carried home with him. Subject stated that it was possible that BANDERA (as Subject did all during the War years) carried a cyanide capsule in his pocket for his own use in case he was picked up by the RIS. When he reached into his pocket for the key the capsule might have broken and if he put the key in his mouth in order to get a better grasp on the sack or basket of tomatoes he was carrying there might have been enough cyanide on the key to poison him.

F. There was some speculation by Subject on the reasons the RIS might have wanted to liquidate BANDERA at this time. He said it would be very significant to him in determining just what the RIS plans for liquidating the emigre nationalist movement are if he knew whether or not BANDERA had any "contacts" with any Western intelligence service and whether or not he was engaged in any bi-lateral operations with the West at this time. Subject said it might be possible that the Germans were collaborating with BANDERA but he didn't pursue this question when he was told by the undersigned that she was not aware of what if any his "contacts" were at the present.

G. Asked how the incident of BANDERA's death could be exploited PP-wise, Subject said a great deal of thought would have to be given this but at present he could not see much opportunity for PP play for the following reasons:

(1) The name of BANDERA in the homeland is so synonymous with the nationalist movement that news of his death by natural causes would cause a depression of spirit, i.e., now that the nationalist's leaders are being lost, there is little hope left for us.

(2) The news that BANDERA's death was the cause of foul play by the RIS would only tend to convince the Ukrainians in the homeland that the "KGB" is so powerful as to be able to carry out any plan they have even in the West--that no one even in the "Free World" can escape their hands--they would be too scared to continue even limited nationalist pressures on Moscow.

2. *Stefan OLYNYK's trip to the Ukraine was discussed and Subject gave the undersigned an additional portion of his written report. He promised to mail the last part of the report which covers OLYNYK's transportation and documentation in detail. Arrangements were made by Subject to have [] introduced to OLYNYK by Subject at lunch in the Orient Restaurant in Washington the same day (23 October). (See separate report in OLYNYK's 201 file.)

SECRET

SECRET

-3-

3. Konstantin ZELENKO in London received a letter dated 14 September 1959 from DUBOVENKO (Volodymyr Mikhaïlovych KOTENKO). The letter (translation) reads as follows:

"I am sorry that I did not write to you sooner, but I was so busy after my return from Vienna that there was no time to do anything. I have changed my apartment since my return from Vienna and several days ago I got a new job. My new apartment is larger but it is on the eighth floor. I like my new job much better and am now working in the Ministry of Culture. I am connected with the publishers of Ukrainian translations from foreign literature.

How are you coming along on your master's dissertation? I haven't had time to write to Andrij (Case Officer Comment: Andrij ZALOTOCKYJ, Reading, England) or to send him the Ukrainian sheet music for which he asked. However, I have not forgotten and I do want to send it to him. I have the negatives of the snapshots which I took and as soon as I have prints made I will send them along to you, Andrij and Ivan MAKSYMIVICH (Case Officer Comment: Ivan KOSHELIVETS).

Perhaps this is enough for the first letter. I thank you for myself, my wife and my daughter for the gifts you gave me in Vienna. I told my wife about our meeting and she would very much like to meet you and thank you personally. In short, you must come to Kiev at the first opportunity.

DUBOVENKO
Kiev
Harmashka vul 29/31
kv. 81"

ZELENKO forwarded the letter to Subject who will advise him regarding a reply. Subject stated he had not yet decided how they would pursue this contact as he suspects DUBOVENKO as an RIS agent.

4. A letter was received on 11 October 1959 in Edmonton, Canada, in connection with the package mailing program to the Ukrainian SSR under Project AECUPBOARD. This letter was received in a parcel from a former underground member in the Ukraine. The parcel containing the letter was sent by Mykhailo OLYNYK to his brother Roman OLYNYK. There is a third OLYNYK brother living in Mexico. They are not related to Subject of [] who lives in Washington and has the same last name. The letter was not dated. The writer addressed himself to "Dear Maksym", which is Subject, and reads as follows: (translation)

"I have opportunity to send you another letter. I wanted to send it in the other parcel but I was not sure it would reach you in good condition. I now have news that the parcel containing my first letter is at my brother's and believe that he has given you the letter.

Recently I have had opportunity to have contact and an interesting conversation with one of the individuals to whom you sent greetings in your letter (Case Officer Comment: Subject said that he did not name any particular

SECRET

SECRET

-4-

names in his letter but referred to UPA members in general). I told him about your wishes to receive word from him. He readily agreed that it might be a good idea. He said that you must know him. This man spent seven years in a "kurort" (Case Officer Comment: health resort but actually means prison camp). He traveled and saw much and he told me about his experiences. I asked him to tell you a few words about himself. He cautioned me not to mention his name. He said that you would know who he is anyway. Up until the time of the kurort he was as he states 'in your company.' He also knew Lev REBET and Ivan BUTKOVSKY who wanted him to emigrate. He told about ~~Osyp~~ ^{Osyp} TYUSHKO and the meeting with him in Old Mizun (Near Stanislaw). In 1932-38 he was in charge of the liquidation of YATSKEVYTCH's (phonetical) party, after which he was closely watched by the Polish police and in 1937 was injured by them. He is an interesting individual and has not lost his spirit. You will see this in the letter which I will send you. I will write other details to you via my brother. I wish you good health.

Your brother,
Mykhailo"

The letter which he enclosed was not dated and it reads as follows:
(translation):

"Friends. Is it known to wide circles of the Ukrainian emigration that the Ukrainian National Liberation movement in the homeland has been liquidated? If there are any illusions in the emigration that it still exists and is active, then it is merely an illusion. This illusion must be cast aside and you must look into the situation as it really exists. If we speak only about those who in their days contributed much toward the national liberation, then we must admit that there has been a loss of spirit. First of all there is only a remnant of the national liberation movement left in the homeland. It exists during the period in which we now live and is being conducted by those individuals who while in the prisons fell under the influence of 'old revolutionaries'. Having come out to freedom during the amnesty they began to spread a 'new theory.' As a result of this 'new theory', the liberation movement which cost so many lives is reduced to nothing and is looked upon as a shady adventure. The authors of the 'new theory' put the blame on the Ukrainian political emigres.

It is necessary to call your attention to the fact that such ideas were being spread earlier. However when the movement which was organized underground was in effect these ideas were discarded completely. The ideas now are being spread among the people. To our great sorrow similar ideas are coming from those who are known here as the 'amnestied.' Do not think that the results are great. No, the results are ~~not~~ great, but unfortunately they do have some effect. We expect that you will understand the danger of this 'new theory' when you consider that it was ^{introduced} ~~forwarded~~ by HORBOVEY (Case Officer Comment: Some information on ~~HORBOVEY~~ is given in Attachment A). He and his friends insisted that the Ukrainian emigration is but a political

SECRET

SECRET

-5-

corpse. The destruction of the emigration lies with Western nations who in their game of politics consider the Ukraine as an object for enslavement. The political emigre readers in Western countries can only assist in the future subjugation of the Ukraine to one of these nations. Therefore it is necessary to create a wide movement among Ukrainians against the leadership of the Ukrainian emigration, pointing them out as traitors to the interests of the Ukrainian people. Those who agree with HORBOVEY have rejected the activities of the political emigration with the idea of developing their own leadership in the homeland.

*While in the camps we didn't think that these ideas reached beyond the barbed wire fences. However, our opinions were changed when we found ourselves back home. The 'new theory' still has some sympathizers. We think that enough has been said in order to reveal the danger to the emigration. It is necessary to rebel against such ideas which reduce all of our previous struggles to mere intrigues and reduce the leadership in the emigration to ordinary adventure seekers. Insofar as possible we strive against these harmful ideas.

The reasons for the laconism of this letter should be understood. There still remain important questions, but the length of this letter and the manner in which it will travel does not permit discussing them further. Glory to the Ukraine."

5. Various details of EGMA-44342, dated 20 August 1959, regarding Vasyl MARKUS were discussed with Subject and he commented as follows:

*MARKUS came to the United States because he was planning to be married but his girl broke off with him two months after his arrival here. He has met a new girl in the United States, Maria HASYUK (phonetic), who works in the offices of Bishop Sheen in New York and probably will be married next spring.

Regarding MARKUS' financial resources before his arrival in the United States, Bishop Ivan BUCHKO of Rome who thought highly of MARKUS and had high hopes for him, had promised to give him financial help for studies in Switzerland and undoubtedly helped him in Paris to some extent. During the time MARKUS was in Paris he received limited sums of money for articles he wrote for UKRAINSKY SAMOSTIYNYK, approximately \$10.00 monthly from Subject for helping to mail the INFORMATION BULLETIN, and \$60.00 monthly from Kubyovych for his editorial activities on the Ukrainian Encyclopedia.

When MARKUS wrote Subject that he was coming to the United States, Subject offered to help pay for his trip. MARKUS told Subject that he would not need any money for the trip because the "Plastuny" (Ukrainian boy scouts) were paying for his transportation as he was going to represent the group in France at a rally in the United States.

Subject feels the fact that the Soviets attacked MARKUS' published doctor's thesis on the ANNEXATION OF THE CARPATHO-UKRAINE TO THE SOVIET UKRAINE

SECRET

SECRET

-6-

is not a valid enough argument against him. The Soviets attacked his book for the same reason they attacked the PROLOGUE magazine which has limited distribution and which also is printed only in one language (English). The Soviets attack anything of an educational nature written by the emigration. When the attack against him appeared, MARKUS told Subject that he was not very much disturbed because he now felt free to write anti-Soviet material under his true name.

MARKUS is disliked by many people in the emigration, although no one seems to have a really valid reason for their dislike. AECASSOWARY-4 and 27 both dislike him intensely, but when asked by Subject why, they have no specific reasons except that they just do not like or trust him. *Ivan KASUBA, according to Subject, was supposed to have said he would like "to completely ruin" MARKUS but that he did not have any really concrete material against him.

MARKUS is a peculiar individual. He is very reticent and does not discuss his personal affairs with others. He is clever, ambitious and he seeks flattery. He defends anyone and everyone accused by others of espionage where there is no concrete evidence against the individual. One of his arguments is that certain individuals might have been forced to promise to work with the Soviets but that does not mean that they were sincere in their promise. He told Subject that Dr. Vasyl DANKO, who now works at the Columbia University Library, was forced to sign an agreement to work with the Soviets but that he is extremely anti-Soviet, that DANKO keeps himself practically in hiding, refusing to speak or write under his true name, as he does not want the Soviets to get to him or try to make any use of his position.

Subject said, let us not make the mistake of thinking all Carpatho-Ukrainians are RIS agents because that would be playing right into the hands of the RIS. The RIS would like very much for the emigration to cast aside the talents of such able and intelligent people as MARKUS and Jaroslav PELENSKY.

When Subject added MARKUS to the Prolog staff he did so knowing of the suspicions against him and with the idea in mind that if MARKUS in effect was a Soviet agent he would now be forced to participate in activities against the Soviets and do so in a way in which Subject would direct, or Subject would determine once and for all whether or not MARKUS is a Soviet Agent. Subject studied MARKUS very closely during the period of his employment with Prolog. On one occasion MARKUS suggested that only 100 copies of the IB be mailed into the UkSSR, stating the probabilities of reaching the addressees might be greater. Subject told him that they would do so if MARKUS would accept full responsibility for the results. Subject told him that you can hang 100 people who receive anti-Soviet literature but you cannot hang 4-6,000. MARKUS said he hadn't thought of it in that way and withdrew his recommendation.

MARKUS was interested in a professorship at an American university, and in September 1959 left the full time employ of Prolog to accept an assignment as teacher of French and Russian at Notre Dame.

SECRET

SECRET

-7-

In conclusion Subject stated that if MARKUS is an RIS agent then why would he leave Prolog employ. On the other hand, if he was directed to leave because he wasn't passing enough information to the Soviets (because of the tight compartmentation at Prolog) then Subject has to suspect one of the remaining employees of RIS connections because it is unlikely the Soviets would withdraw an agent who was successful in penetrating Prolog unless they had another one there to take his place. If (as a follow-up move to their liquidation of Bandera) the Soviets are planning "agentura" against Prolog, then they may have removed their agents (MARKUS, and LAVRYNENKO whom Subject has suspected of possible RIS connections and who also left Prolog recently) in order to protect them from harm and such "agentura" can be expected in the very near future. Subject said all these possibilities have occurred to him and have been a source of constant concern by him but that if he continues to put emphasis on all the possibilities then the only thing left for him to do is to close the Prolog offices. This would be making it all too simple for the Soviets. Therefore, he continues Prolog activities using every precaution and means at his disposal to continually study all the personnel with whom he has contact.

[]

SECRET

SECRET

ATTACHMENT A

Yaroslav HOROBOVEY. According to YURKO (Jerzy SZYNAROWSKI [] AECASSOWARY contact in Poland and former underground member), Yaroslav HOROBOVEY was in a Soviet prison in 1956-57. His wife also had made statements via the Soviet press that he was a traitor to the Soviet Ukraine.

HOROBOVEY is a lawyer by profession. He was counsel for the defense of Stefan BANDERA at the trial in Warsaw. At that time HOROBOVEY was a member of the OUN. In 1940-41 HOROBOVEY's brother (fnu) was sent from Krakow to Lvov where he was arrested by the Soviets but was released in about a month after agreeing to become an agent for the NKVD. He confessed to someone in the OUN that he was an agent. Certain individuals from OUN/M informed the Gestapo who arrested him and he died shortly thereafter in a concentration camp.

In 1941 Yaroslav HOROBOVEY was in Krakow as head of the Ukrainian National Committee. The OUN put him in charge of the Lvov area. Until the end of the war he remained in Krakow as prosecutor in a Polish court. Subject had no contact with HOROBOVEY at this time.

In 1943 or 1944 HOROBOVEY met Subject in Lvov and told him that he wanted to join the underground. Subject was not in charge at this time so he presented the case to his UPA leader but also stated his opposition to having HOROBOVEY accepted into the UPA. HOROBOVEY was not supplied with an underground contact and Subject lost track of him for some time. In 1946 Subject traveled across the border from Rome to Innsbruck, Austria to meet BANDERA and other members of the OUN. BANDERA told Subject at that time that HOROBOVEY was a guest in his home. HOROBOVEY told BANDERA that he had come from ORLAN in the Peremysl area where he had worked with ORLAN's group and that he had been assigned by ORLAN as liaison officer to the foreign embassies in Warsaw and specifically liaison to Polish underground representatives. He also stated that ORLAN had sent him out as foreign representative of the underground. Subject asked BANDERA to arrange for HOROBOVEY to meet with him so that he could check out his bona fides. When they met HOROBOVEY did not mention to Subject that he was sent as foreign representative. Subject told HOROBOVEY that he understood he was liaison officer to Poland, that he accepted this fact and told him to go the following day with one of his men to the border where he would meet certain Polish representatives from London. HOROBOVEY had no passport but he agreed to go. He returned with Subject's courier (Subject said he thinks it was Evhen STAKHIV) and talked to BANDERA who called Subject to tell him that HOROBOVEY was back and that he asked to be permitted to go to Czechoslovakia as soon as possible. He didn't say why but only that HOROBOVEY had changed his mind and wanted to go. Contrary to HOROBOVEY's wishes, Subject met him again one day to inquire about his trip. HOROBOVEY relayed to Subject some news items which he picked up from other couriers but offered no new information.

SECRET

SECRET

-2-

HOROBOVEY was married to a Czech or Polish woman, Subject could not remember, but he hadn't been living with his wife and after the Warsaw trial, he married another woman, PAVENSKA, whose husband also was a legal counsel at the trial. Since Subject could not persuade HOROBOVEY to remain, even after promising him the assignment as ZP secretary to Poland, Subject gave HOROBOVEY some money to buy a few things for his children and told him to go. HOROBOVEY lived in Innsbruck with a DP lawyer for several months, after which time he disappeared. Nothing was heard from him until years later when the Soviet press printed news of his arrest ca. 1955-56.

SECRET

Київ, 14.9.1959 року

Пановині **Константине Петровичу!**

Мому просити у Вас пробачення, що не дотримався свого слова і не написав дещо раніше. Але Ви можете мені повірити, після повернення з Відня у мене, як кажуть, не було часу згору глянути. Щоправда, турботи, що лягли на мої плечі, були досить приємні, вірніші, корисні для мене.

Почалося з того, що зразу ж після повернення я переїздив до нової квартири, а дещо пізніше влаштувався на нову роботу. Квартира у мене зараз краща, вільніша, погано лише, що аж на восьмому поверсі. Робота мені теж більше подобається, перейшов працювати до міністерства культури, де маю відношення до видавництва іноземної літератури на Україні.

Як же Ваші справи, як просувається вперед праця над дисертацією?

Ніяк не можу зібратись з часом, щоб виконати прохання Андрія і переслати йому обіцяні нотки до українських вісень. Мабуть він там думає, що й на цей раз все виявилось пустими обіцянками. Все ж таки постаравсь не дати йому підстав для таких висновків. Чи бачитеся Ви з ним, чи листуєтесь? Якщо так, то втайні його від мене.

Від наших хлопців теж не маю ніяких вістей, хоч і домовились, що будемо переписуватись. Я від Андрія маю його адресу, то думаю якось написати, бо ж у нього є багато спільних віденських знімків. До речі, ті знімки, що я робив, вийшли порівняно вдало, але я їх ще не відкопіював, іншим листом вишлю Вам, Андрієві й Івану Максимовичу.

Мабуть для першого разу досить. Прийміть, будь ласка, подяку моєї дружини й доньки за подарунки. Я розповідав дружині про нашу зустріч, вона б дуже хотіла познайомитись з Вами та віддячити за Вашу увагу. Коротко кажучи, Ви мусите обов'язково приїхати при першій нагоді до Києва.

До побачення, з повагою,

В. Ротшиль

Р.С. Пишати мені на мою нову адресу: Київ, бул. Серпанашка, 29/31 кв. 81. В. Ротшиль