

VIA: AIR  
(SPECIFY AIR OR SEA ROUTE)

DISPATCH NO. MON-A-4893

CLASSIFICATION

TO : Chief, Foreign Division M

DATE: 1 February 1951

FROM : Chief of Station, Karlsruhe

SUBJECT: GENERAL— REDBIRD/Operational

SPECIFIC— Transmittal of CAPELIN Reports, dated 18 January 1951

1. Attached hereto are [ ] translations of two CAPELIN reports dated 18 January 1951. Attachment A is a brief account of Miron MATVIYKO's accusation of CAPELIN as an informant of U.S. Intelligence. CAPELIN's state of extreme agitation when visited by case officer on 18 January is easily understandable from a perusal of the report. (It might be noted that several months prior to the incident mentioned in Attachment A, [ ] casually asked [ ] for MATVIYKO's whereabouts. At that time, [ ] declared that he had not the slightest notion of MATVIYKO's whereabouts and the matter was dropped there.) It is case officer's opinion that MATVIYKO's accusation could only have been a gross provocation with the probable intention of sounding out CAPELIN for latter's possible connection with U.S. Intelligence before recruiting him to act as go-between in [ ] discussions with [ ] regarding the compromise as suggested in the homeland mandate. CAPELIN accepted case officer's assurance that the security of his reports and his contacts with us have always been respected.

2. Attachment B is entitled My Conversation with the Former Head of the SB Zch OUB, Miron MATVIYKO, and SB Staff Member, Ivan KASHUBA. The existence of a U.S. State Department Investigative Committee checking on the activities of the SB in Germany, as is reported in this attachment, is unknown to MOB.

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHODS EXEMPTION 3B26  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2005

Distribution:  
3 - FDM w/att  
1 - COS w/att  
2 - MOB w/att  
FORM NO. 51-28 A  
MAR. 1949

CLASSIFICATION

TOP COPY

Attachment A  
to MDM-A-4893

L.S.  
18.1.51

On Friday, 12 January 1951, at 11 a.m. Miron MATVIYKO, former head of the SB ZCh OUN and Ivan KASHUBA visited me in my apartment. During this visit (which lasted until three hours after dinner), MATVIYKO told me, among other things, that the SB had been informed that I had given American counter-intelligence authorities reports on the following:

- a. The arrival of Miron MATVIYKO in Germany from Paris.
- b. The contents of the letters and materials brought by couriers from the Ukraine.
- c. Other internal affairs of the SB and the ZCh OUN.

Naturally I denied all these accusations. He told me how it had happened. An SB worker talked to an American from CIC or some other organization. During the talk, the American asked about Miron MATVIYKO. The SB member said that he did not know that MATVIYKO was in Germany. But when the SB member gave some answers which did not fit in with information the American had, the latter said that the SB member was purposely withholding several facts. The American had learned from a source, a very reliable source, to be exact, from a priest, that the situation was not as the SB member said. Then the American said, or showed, that the priest had worn an Orthodox cross. Thus he showed that he had gotten his information from an orthodox priest. Because the American said that this priest was well informed on the affairs of the UPA, the ZCh OUN and the SP UHVR, the SB man knew that it could only be I. There was also the possibility that this information had come from Rev. Hrinioch GRIMOKHA - also an Orthodox priest, (sic) but he was then in the U.S.A. and could not have told the American. It follows logically that there is only one possible person who could be the source and that is myself.

One must recognize that the SB's logic is correct. In fact the conversation was about me.

I am hereby informing you that if I do not receive a guarantee that my reports will not be exposed to the SB, I shall not be in a position to give information on the SB ZCh OUN.

Attachment B  
to MCM-A-4893

L.S.  
18.1.51

My Conversation with the Former Head of the SB ZCh OUN, Miron MATVIYEKO and SB Staff Member, Ivan KASHUBA:

Ivan KASHUBA and Miron MATVIYEKO, members of the staff of the SB ZCh OUN, visited me in my apartment on Friday, 12 January, and Wednesday, 17 January 1951. Both visits lasted several hours. One point which was repeated throughout these conversations was a warning to me not to repeat any information about the SB ZCh OUN to the Americans or the ZP UHVR. The SB has grounds for suspecting that the Americans are receiving information about the SB ZCh OUN from me.

(See my special report on this subject - Attachment A)

But in spite of these suspicions or, perhaps, because it suspected me of working with the Americans - the SB considers it vital to have contact with me in order to let the Americans know through me how useful it could be in their work. The SB believes the Americans might take some repressive measures towards their organization. They emphasized to me that since I was once a staff member of the SB and knew about some of the liquidations of people which took place under the SB, I would also be brought to account for these deeds if they were brought to light. I would be as responsible for those acts as MATVIYEKO, KASHUBA, KORDUBA, or any other staff member of the SB.

The SB learned that after Peter IABLON, former SB co-worker and editor of the ZCh OUN newspaper "On Guard" ("Na Storozy"), printed a provocative brochure stating that the SB was a Bolshevik tool, the U.S. A. State Department created an investigative committee which spent two months in Europe, mainly in Germany and France, collecting material on the SB and the ZCh OUN. The commission's first obligation was to find out how many persons in the SB had eliminated, and whom and where. It was also assigned the task of discovering whether or not it was true that MATVIYEKO was a Bolshevik agent.

The commission questioned, among various other people, Ivan BYAGRANI of the URDP, and Gennadi KOTOROVICH. The SB figured that several people from the UHVR, among them myself, were also questioned in this investigation.

Another reason for the sending of this investigative committee to Europe was that more than six months ago the former SB member and leader in Mittenwald, Vasily GOGGSHA had been interned on an island in New York because of his denunciation by Ivan IVASHKO, former general secretary of the ABN. GOGGSHA had several organizational reports from the ZCh OUN and the SB with him. In the

course of the interrogations which lasted for many weeks, Vasily GOGOSHA revealed several things about the activities of the SB and the ZCh OUN in Mittenwald. The American investigating authorities copied the harsh methods of the MGB and the Gestapo in their dealings with GOGOSHA, threatening him with repatriation to the U.S.S.R.

The SB still does not know what GOGOSHA said to the Americans, but they know that he did not say much because many CIC agents have already talked with members of the ZCh OUN. Judging from the questions the agents asked the ZCh OUN members, the SB has concluded that the Americans have not learned much from GOGOSHA and that he has kept quiet about the most important affairs.

GOGOSHA's lawyer in the U.S.A. sent a letter to the ZCh OUN in Europe, saying that the affair had only had its beginning in the States and would be continued in Europe. He wanted to warn everyone who had had contact with GOGOSHA to keep this in mind and to go into hiding.

MATVIYEKO is convinced that members of this commission, or someone under its direction, are interested in this question even in France, and are particularly concerned with MATVIYEKO himself. But because the SB has so many people throughout France, MATVIYEKO learned about this in time from several circumstances. For example, while looking for MATVIYEKO, CIC in Munich sent a report about him to Paris. In the report it said that CID was looking for him for passing counterfeit dollars and that he was suspected of being a Soviet agent. The brochure of Peter YABLON, printed in English, about MATVIYEKO's collaboration with the MGB was included. The French police translated this report into French. MATVIYEKO later learned that the Americans insisted that he be arrested and sent to Germany, but the French police refused to do it. MATVIYEKO found out through some SB man, probably an interpreter who read all this evidence and later told MATVIYEKO about it. MATVIYEKO considered it necessary to return to Germany. In addition he received an order from Stefan BANDERA and the ZCh OUN to collect all the information he could about to whom the members of this investigative committee were talking and what material pertaining to the work of the SB or the liquidation of agents they had been able to collect.

In further conversation with MATVIYEKO I learned only that this commission found evidence that many Bolshevik agents had been liquidated, and that it considered that this was incorrect, but that in any case all the enemies of the SB and the ZCh OUN would not attain their objectives.

The most important thing about this investigation was that during it the commission became convinced that Peter YABLON and many of his followers in the U.S.A. were important Bolshevik agents, and one must expect that they will soon be arrested. He hinted that the SB had given the commission reason to believe that Peter YABLON was such an agent. It is interesting that the investigating committee worked only through the governmental authorities and excluded CIC and CID stations in Germany from the investigation. The commission did not even want to make use of the evidence that CIC and CID had pertaining to the

affair. The SB was very pleased by this as only in that way could they have found the objective truth. The SB considered that the "opposition" and the ZP UHVR did not give the Americans objective information.

As a consequence, in its last conversations with representatives of the ZCh OUN and persons in the ZCh OUN, the Americans demanded the information of the SB and, to a great extent, the exclusion of MATVIYKO from the affairs of the ZCh OUN. But as MATVIYKO told me, Stefan BANDERA would under no circumstances permit a reformation of the SB or the exclusion of MATVIYKO from its activities, even if the Americans initiated repressive measures towards the SB.

The SB immediately set itself one task: to prove that all these disagreements between the ZCh OUN and the ZP UHVR were the work of Bolshevik agents. One of those causing the disagreements and helping to bring about a split was Ivan IVASHKO, former secretary of the ABN who later switched to the side of the ZP UHVR. The SB is doing everything in its power to show that he was an MEB agent. He is alleged to have given a letter to the ZP UHVR which said that the ZCh OUN and the SB had issued death sentences to all members of the ZP UHVR and he, IVASHKO, had forged the signature of Stefan BANDERA. This letter brought about a complete split between the ZCh OUN and the ZP UHVR. This letter was the cause of Yaroslav STETZKO's exclusion from the ZP UHVR.

But when I tried to get more detailed information on Ivan IVASHKO's being a Bolshevik agent I could not get a direct answer. MATVIYKO simply reminded me of the following circumstances.

1. The letter to the ZP UHVR mentioned above.
2. That Ivan IVASHKO was a friend of Peter YABLON who was a Bolshevik agent.
3. That IVASHKO is now in contact with editor Gennadia KOTOROVICH who is apparently a Soviet agent.
4. That he gave Gennadia KOTOROVICH various data such as information about the Mittenwald conference of the ZCh OUN, about the various liquidation organs of the SB and about BANDERA's present location. Besides that he worked with the Americans, giving reports on SB activities, and by so doing is aiming for the liquidation of the SB. It is known that the SB liquidates Bolshevik agents and for this reason IVASHKO wants to liquidate the SB.

All of these circumstances are sufficient, as MATVIYKO pointed out, to prove that IVASHKO is a Bolshevik agent.

My Remarks:

I have begun to check all this information and learned the following:

1. The ZP UHVR does not have and has not had any letters which are signed by Stefan BANDERA and which could have been falsified by Ivan IVASHKO. All letters from Stefan BANDERA to the ZP UHVR are personally delivered by Yaroslav STETZKO, Stefan LENKAVSKI, Stefan BANDERA himself, or by some other leader of the ZCh OUN. No occasion would arise on which BANDERA's signature could be forged.
2. The ZP UHVR does not have any letters with IVASHKO's signature saying that the ZCh OUN has sentenced its entire opposition to death.
3. The truth is that at the Mittenwald conference Ivan IVASHKO said orally to the people of the ZP UHVR that he had learned that the ZCh OUN wanted to liquidate its "opposition". Even then Ivan IVASHKO revealed the source of this information. He said that he had learned it from Peter YABLON and another member of the SB, KHARKEVITCH. One must note that KHARCHEVITCH is still a member of the SB today. I do not understand how IVASHKO could know that Peter YABLON was a Bolshevik agent than when it has not been established yet. But so far as I can judge from YABLON's reports and activities one can assume that he is an agent.
4. It is true that after the Mittenwald conference, Ivan IVASHKO signed a letter to the ZP UHVR in which he said that in his time Yaroslav STETZKO had very severely criticised the ZP UHVR in spite of the fact that he was then a member of that organization. What STETZKO said was that the SB had liquidated HRINIOCH and STACHIV there would be peace with the opposition.

Then he gave proof of this statement by STETZKO. IVASHKO even said that he was ready to submit this to the organization's court. He reaffirmed it to Damian KORDUBA, who as a member of the SB, asked him about that matter. IVASHKO said that it was no secret. He said that the ZP UHVR could show this letter to Yaroslav STETZKO. The letter, plus a host of other circumstances, was the reason for STETZKO's expulsion from the ZP UHVR.

5. It is a fact that IVASHKO had contacts with Gemadia KOTOROVICH. But he denies that he gave KOTOROVICH any written information about the Mittenwald conference or about BANDERA. It is possible that he could have said something in conversation, but he did not know that KOTOROVICH is a Bolshevik agent.

If we consider all this information we could come to one conclusion only: the possibility that IVASHKO like KOTOROVICH was a Bolshevik agent, but it is still impossible to call them agents on the basis of this meager information. That the SB may have further proof is another matter.

In any case the SB considers that with the help of its connections with the Americans it can prove that IVASHKO and KOTOROVICH are doing the work of Bolshevik agents. For that reason the SB is relying heavily on its American contacts and believes that it can convince them that in liquidating various people they were guarding the ZCh OUN from Bolshevik influences, that they can answer for all these murders and that they can even succeed in legalizing Mirona MATVIYKO in Germany.

One must emphasize here that Ivan KASHUBA, as he himself stated, has no connections with CIC in Augsburg. He has no ties with Mr. SIDORUK or SIDORCHUK or with any other such person. CIC agent SIDORCHUK, as he said to MATVIYKO, is a complete fool, and no intelligence agent, he reveals the sources of his information and does other such foolish things. Even MODRYK, head of SB in Augsburg does not want to have anything to do with SIDORCHUK. KASHUBA states that he had only been at CIC in Augsburg once and then only because he had been summoned.

That is the truth according to KASHUBA, and I do not know whether Ivan IVASHKO or Benadii KOTOROVICH is telling the truth. In any case, either Mr. IVASHKO or MODRIK contacted CIC in Augsburg since they talk that way about Mr. SIDORCHUK.

I asked MATVIYKO why Stefan BANDERA had published a letter in "Surma" reporting his suspicion that the UHVR "couriers" had brought back false information about the death of General CHUPRIKA and even his suspicion that this pouch had been forged by the MGB and that the couriers of the ZP UHVR were themselves Bolshevik agents. MATVIYKO answered that these were trifling perplexities. The couriers to the ZCh OUN were delayed for several days in Poland. But in the letter written to the ZCh OUN they said that "all is well and we have a pouch from General CHUPRIKA." But the couriers had not yet arrived. Because such a letter was known to the ZCh OUN, the ZP UHVR reported, and even publicised, that General CHUPRIKA had been killed, S. BANDERA wrote this letter saying that in a few days he would receive the real story. The ZCh OUN couriers themselves did not know what kind of a pouch they had received or from whom they had received it. They were convinced that the pouch was from General CHUPRIKA. BANDERA was forced to write this letter because the ZP UHVR refused to be kept waiting for this information for several days or until the arrival of the couriers themselves from Poland. The couriers of the ZCh OUN were supposed to receive a pouch from the OUN in Poland and were therefore detained.