

SECRET

Attachment B A-11675

EGMA

SUBJECT : Rev. Ivan HRYNIOCH's Resignation from ZPUHVR

DATE OF REPORT: 29 December 1954

MICROFILMED

MAY 31 1962

SOURCE : AECAPELIN

SUB-SOURCES : A. Ukrainian Press: Khrystyanskyi Holos and Suchasna Ukrayina
B. Volodymyr KOZAK - Munich
C. Ivan KASHUBA - Munich
D. Myroslav SEMCHISHYN - Munich
E. Ivan NEBOLA - Munich

Last week the Khrystyanskyi Holos and Suchasna Ukrayina carried the following announcement signed by Rev. Dr. Ivan HRYNIOCH:

"For many years, and especially within recent times, there has been taking place in the emigration a struggle, tumultuous as to form and content, among Ukrainian political centers. My participation in the Ukrainian liberation movement during the German occupation of the Ukraine, and after that execution by me of tasks abroad at the instruction of the leadership of the Ukrainian liberation movement provided an opportunity for the carrying out of a campaign against my person. Aware of the fact that such a campaign because of my profession, can indirectly bring injury to the Ukrainian Catholic Church and further also to the Ukrainian liberation movement, I have decided to withdraw from the Ukrainian emigre political life and to take no part whatsoever in it. Devoting myself to pastoral and scientific work, I shall continue to serve my Church and my people."

Rev. Dr. Ivan HRYNIOCH

Prior to analyzing this announcement, it is necessary to review the background of this matter. In my previous reports concerning my discussions with Ivan KASHUBA, it was learned that the pro-BANDERA ZCHOUN tried to compromise HRYNIOCH in the Ukrayinska-Chas and Shlyakh Pershyi and in other press organs outside of Europe by bringing him to the attention of Archbishop Ivan BUCHKO, apostolic visitor to the Ukrainians in Western Europe, and to the attention of the Congregation of Oriental Churches headed by Cardinal TISSERANT. This action had a dual task:

1. To point out to Roman Church circles that the ZPUHVR, headed by Rev. HRYNIOCH, is a socialist-liberal institution, even a neo-communist movement, and anti-Catholic. Rev. HRYNIOCH was alleged to be a Mason, an American agent, and a person without strong moral convictions who is compromising the Catholic Church.

2. To move to the Roman Church circles that allegedly all the announcements which have been made by the ZPUHVR regarding the Homeland's commitments to BANDERA are only a result of the sentiment of only a segment of the GUN Homeland. Provis, which has become diverted from nationalistic and

SECRET

NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT

EXEMPTIONS Section 3(b)

- (2)(A) Privacy
- (2)(B) Methods/Sources
- (2)(G) Foreign Relations

Classified and Approved for Release
By the Central Intelligence Agency

Date: 2004, 2005

SECRET

idealistic principles and has entered the socialist-materialist camp. However, all other sections of the Homeland OUN (i.e., the "Kray" groups) remain loyal to BANDERA. To prove this, the pro-BANDERA group showed BUCHKO original letters from Myron MATVIYKO.

3. It is clear that these arguments were more convincing to BUCHKO than were those of HRYNIOCH since about a month and a half ago Ivan KASHUBA reported that HRYNIOCH would not only withdraw from political activity but would be forced to publish an "announcement" in the emigre press. During this month and a half period KASHUBA has been reading the press regularly, anticipating HRYNIOCH's "announcement". This indicates that BUCHKO must have given the BANDERA group a definite promise to force HRYNIOCH's withdrawal from ZPUHR. Further, according to Ivan KASHUBA, BUCHKO will take further steps, i.e., he will transfer HRYNIOCH to another European or even a non-European country, where HRYNIOCH will be isolated from Ukrainian political life, and among BUCHKO's plans for the transfer of HRYNIOCH are the following:

- a. As instructor at the Minor Seminary in Leure, France;
- b. As rector at St. Joseph's Seminary in Rome, Italy;
- c. Transfer to Belgium or Holland.

4. What has been the reaction of the Ukrainian emigration to HRYNIOCH's "announcement"? On 29 December 1954, I had a discussion with (Captain) Volodymyr KOZAK, chief of the anti-BANDERA-ZCHOUN intelligence section, during which time I was able to elicit the following:

"The fact that Archbishop BUCHKO is not a politician is well-known to everyone. However, no one expected him to fall completely under the influence of the BANDERAITES and to commit such a harmful act for the Greek Catholic Church as well as for the Ukrainian community, i.e., to force Rev. HRYNIOCH to withdraw from Ukrainian political life. This demonstrates that Archbishop BUCHKO is not only a poor Ukrainian politician but a worse politician when it comes to the Catholic Church. The decision of Archbishop BUCHKO will have important consequences in the Ukraine. The consequences are difficult to foresee, however one thing is certain: The Ukrainian liberation movement, which has been a strong protagonist of the Catholic Church in the Ukraine for which its members risk their lives, will stop their defense of the Church when they learn of Archbishop BUCHKO's decision and later will react more cautiously in terms of the Catholic Church. Rev. HRYNIOCH, as an obedient Catholic priest, submitted to the decision of his superiors. He withdrew from the Ukrainian political scene and now his hands are tied. However, he will be able to foresee that BUCHKO, as well as other influential members of the Vatican, have taken the wrong position, that of the hypocritical BANDERAITES. According to KOZAK, the entire anti-BANDERA-ZCHOUN feeling among the Ukrainians in this situation and in fact, consider it even a greater possibility than the fact that some Catholics (such as YANUSIK and GLEBOVICH) are still maintaining the position of the Greek Catholic Church as the anti-BANDERA-ZCHOUN movement, the Greek Catholic Church in the emigration, however, will probably defend itself as it has until now."

SECRET

SECRET

5. Ivan KASHUBA stated that the pro-Bandera ZCHOUN has achieved a great triumph in forcing HRYNIOCH from Ukrainian political life. The triumph lays in the following:

a. BANDERA has proved to the emigration that its criticism of ZPUHVR has been right, that Archbishop BUCHKO, the Vatican and Catholic organizations in Germany are siding with BANDERA.

b. When the Ukrainian liberation movement in the Ukraine learns that Vatican circles have condemned ZPUHVR politics and forced HRYNIOCH to withdraw from the political scene, it will be a testimony that the political machinations of a few members of the OUN Provid in the Ukraine have not received the approbation of not only the pro-Bandera ZCHOUN but of the entire Ukrainian emigration and the Vatican. This will be sufficient excuse for BANDERA's refusal to join the anti-BANDERA ZCHOUN and for his continued conflict with ZPUHVR. It will prove to be a strong argument for those factions in the Ukraine who, as a result of their faith and confidence in BANDERA, differed with the Homeland OUN Provid. Ivan KASHUBA assured me (BSCAPALIN) that couriers will be sent into the Ukraine no later than May 1955.

c. That the "played-out" HRYNIOCH cannot be replaced as the leader of the ZPUHVR.

6. According to Myroslav SEMCHISHIN, UNRada circles are pleased with the resignation of HRYNIOCH. Their satisfaction is based on the belief that ZPUHVR has lost authority and will not be held in such high regard as heretofore, thus lowering the prestige of an UNRada competitor. On the other hand, there is the fear that Archbishop BUCHKO, who gave moral and financial support to BANDERA prior to 1950, because he has shown some recognition of ZCHOUN/Bandera will resume financial support of the BANDERA group.

7. Joy is found also in the OUN/MELNYK group. It considers itself the only organization which has contact with the Ukraine as the result of the arrival of the courier during the latter part of 1954. The courier's arrival made such a profound mark on the OUN/M that it made new overtures to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (USCCA) for financial support, on an equal footing with the UNRada and ZPUHVR. Ivan MEBOLA, although he has formally resigned from the OUN/M, still maintains contact with OUN/M personalities. During my discourse with him on 27 December 1954, he stated that HRYNIOCH's resignation is the best gift that the OUN/M could have received during this Christmas season.

8. It is necessary to comment on the effects on the emigration of HRYNIOCH's "announcement", i.e., whether this is equivalent to ZPUHVR's capitulation and whether this will be of profit to the Ukrainian liberation movement and the Greek Catholic Church. I am not aware of the background to HRYNIOCH's "announcement", except for the information contained in paragraphs two and three (above). I don't know the conditions set forth to HRYNIOCH by BUCHKO, except as related to me by Ivan KASHUBA. I find the following quote from Rev. HRYNIOCH's "announcement" to be illogical as being the reason for his withdrawal from emigre political life: "Having realized that this campaign would ultimately injure the Ukrainian Catholic Church as well as the

SECRET

SECRET

liberation movement". I cannot personally understand how this would injure the Church when he furthered the cause of the Church which supports the Ukrainian liberation movement which is the sole defender of the Catholic Church in the Ukraine. On the contrary, it is my belief that a person such as Rev. HRYNIOCH has all the necessary facts at his disposal to represent this movement in the emigration, which, notwithstanding its political characteristics, has drawn within its orbit interests beneficial to the Catholic Church in the Ukraine as well, having therefore become its defender. The campaign against one individual, who is a member of the Catholic Church, is not a campaign against the Catholic Church. In my opinion, the error falls on Dr. HRYNIOCH and on the Vatican. Dr. HRYNIOCH should have taken a stand on this issue, the position of the organization which he represented. Why didn't he follow in the steps of the ten Jesuits and other French "labor" priests? All of them did not pay any attention to their bishops or even the Holy Father. Being convinced of the correctness and suitability of their missionary work among the French workers, but also in Protestant circles, as well as among the sound-thinking Catholic population. The withdrawal of Rev. HRYNIOCH, who didn't look at all the motives behind the intrigue, lends proof that ZPUHR antagonists (the BANDELAITES) were correct in their campaign against ZPUHR. He shouldn't have surrendered his position so easily. Further, I cannot understand Rev. HRYNIOCH when he speaks of the "eventual harm for the Ukrainian liberation movement."

SECRET

7-6-35