

CLASSIFICATION SECRET/CONTROL US OFFICIALS ONLY  
SECURITY INFORMATION  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

REPORT NO. [REDACTED] 25X1A

**INFORMATION REPORT**

CD NO.

COUNTRY USSR (Ukrainian SSR)

DATE DISTR. 17 Dec. 1951

SUBJECT Letter of P. Poltava to Emigre OUN Officials  
Concerning Ideological and Political Matters

NO. OF PAGES 12

PLACE ACQUIRED [REDACTED] 25X1A

REASONS  
FOR CRITICAL SECURITY  
THIS REPORT IS NOT TO BE FURTHER  
TRANSMITTED WITHIN THE UNITED  
STATES, OR BEYOND THE BORDERS  
OF THE UNITED STATES, WITHOUT  
THE EXPRESS PERMISSION OF THE  
RELEASING OFFICE. 25X1X

NO. OF ENCLS. (LISTED BELOW) 25X1A

DATE OF INFO. [REDACTED]

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT NO. [REDACTED]

To friends abroad:

1. I would like here to share with my friends some of my ideas about the current, ideological, and future questions of our organization. These ideas do not differ basically from the attitude of the whole of the OUN in the Ukraine. I am sending you my ideas because I think that no unity is possible between the two parts of the organization without a wide exchange of views, nor any real understanding or crystallization of ideological or political beliefs which would be understood by, and acceptable to, all members of the OUN.
2. Holding fast to the resolutions of the NVZ OUN /presumably, the Third Extraordinary Great Congress of the OUN of 1943/ and proving constantly how right they are, the OUN in the Ukraine does not identify itself either with any philosophical ideas or theories nor with idealistic or materialistic eastern philosophical tendencies. A more detailed explanation of such a basically correct attitude is given in the article by O. Hornovy, What Philosophy - Materialistic or Idealistic - Is Binding for the Members of the OUN.
3. Here I would like to point out only the main arguments supporting the attitude described above:
  - a. In the first place, the OUN is a political organization which fights for political aims. Our supreme goal is to build up in the Ukraine an Independent United Ukrainian State. Every Ukrainian patriot can fight for an independent Ukraine without having to subscribe to this or that philosophical theory. It would, therefore, be unwise to condition membership in the OUN to those belonging to one or the other of the philosophical systems and in this way limit the number of members and sympathizers of our organizations.

25X1A

## SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

## CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

- b. The ideological nature of the Ukrainian nationalist revolutionary movement is such that it does not require a philosophical - theoretical justification. Such basic tenets of our ideology as our belief in nation and a national state and our belief in man as the main object of a national process are formed on the basis of an analysis of social or social-political phenomena and do not require support or amplification in one or another branch of philosophical science, which is interested primarily in such questions as which comes first - spirit or matter. Neither solution by philosophical science could have any influence either on our work for the nation and for our national state or even on our belief in man as the main object of an historical process.
- c. The dispute between idealistic and materialistic tendencies in philosophy will remain one forever. It existed from the moment of the establishment of philosophy as a science, it exists now, and it will continue to exist in the future. Preponderance of this or that tendency depends on arguments which, at the given moment, various branches of science may furnish. Each new scientific discovery may strengthen one or the other of these tendencies. Apart from all that, deduction of two totally opposed philosophical tendencies is based on two opposite types of human beings: one half of humanity has always been ready to accept metaphysical explanations, while the other half has been more inclined to adopt a realistic, definite, and precise attitude.
- d. To identify oneself with one or another philosophical system would mean that any political movement entering into this fight within philosophical science would either have to resign itself to constant changes in the principles of ideology or have to make an immutable, immovable dogma of it. Neither the one nor the other would be advantageous in a political movement.
- e. It would be especially futile for us to identify our movement with one or another philosophical tendency at present, when, in connection with the most recent monumental discoveries made by science, philosophy as such is as yet unable to assimilate or fully explain it.
- f. Without identifying ourselves in any direction in the sphere of theoretical philosophy, we are, nevertheless, today, as in the past, definitely in support of practical idealism in subordinating every individual interest to that of the whole community or cause for which the individual fights.
4. We are definitely in favor of the individual being guided throughout his life, not by his own selfish interests, but by idealistic aims; we favor a heroic pattern of life, a qualitatively high individual as the most important factor in human progress, as the deciding factor for victory in this fight; we regard life as a permanent battle in which the victor is the one who is stronger than the others in every respect. This is our philosophy of social life - if you can call it a philosophy, which does not make us into followers of materialistic or idealistic philosophical tendencies. Our own postulates of practical idealism are clearly postulates of a moral order or code and, as such, cannot be identified with any particular doctrine in theoretical philosophy. Having adopted this attitude towards the problem of philosophy as a whole, we certainly do not think it desirable to identify the OUN with the Christian outlook upon the world as it has been advocated by the ZCh OUN (Surma for February-March 1950\*). As I see it, the main belief in the Christian outlook is the idea that the world was created by God, that God directs the world, that there is life beyond the grave, that God rewards the

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

good and punishes the wicked, and all similar legends from the Bible and the church catechism. All this has nothing in common with the work of scientific cosmogony and disagrees with the teachings of science. It seems that today there are very few political organizations which would be prepared to take up an officially Christian outlook as their own with a duty for all their members to subscribe to it. For the majority of educated people these legends are not acceptable. A political organization which accepts them all as its own outlook upon the world cannot be regarded by educated people as serious.

5. In the case of the OUN there is one more important reason why I think it should not proclaim the acceptance of a Christian cosmogony as its own. As a consequence of Bolshevik upbringing, a large part of the Ukrainian nation in the eastern districts is either completely atheistic or completely indifferent to all religious matters. And we have to reckon with them. A Christian cosmogony in our ideological arsenal will only repulse these people and not attract them to the organization. I emphasize that we should not take into account the other element of those eastern Ukrainian communities which, here and there, are still religiously inclined.
6. The OUN cannot identify itself with Christian ethics. Or rather, we must put to ourselves the following question: which Christian ethics should we adopt as our own? Those which the Christian church has applied in practice throughout her history, or those ideals exposed in the writings of the church fathers or summed up in the church "commandments"? In the first case, the ethics were those of the Inquisition, the ethics of the Jesuits, the ethics of the Papal Court in the days of the Renaissance, and the ethics of more or less rapacious clergy. To accept these ethics and inscribe them on our banners does not mean that we have adopted morality of a very high quality. If we accept the other kind of Christian ethics - the idealistic kind - it would mean rejecting the morality of our Decalogue and all other documents of our moral code which was formed on the battle field against oppression and which formed the necessary corrective to this idealistic Christian morality. Is that in the interest of our revolutionary fight, our revolutionary movement? Has not the Decalogue proved to be right? Can the members of the liberation-revolutionary organization of the enslaved nation be quelled in their fight by the ideals of universal forgiveness and love, etc., without which no Christian ethics could be considered? And what about the principal idealistic and ethical slogan of Ukrainian nationalism: "The Good of the Ukrainian Nation - Our Supreme Command"? Is it necessary to pull down the Ukrainian nation from the pinnacle on which we have placed it? I do not think so. Of course, if we accept Christian ethics as ours, we shall have to do so if we want to be Christians in practice and not only in theory.
7. The OUN in the Ukraine considers religion to be the private concern of its members and of all Ukrainians and supports "freedom of religion and outlook" (Program Resolutions of the Third NVZ OUN, Point 10, letter "a") and, according to these resolutions, supports the "separation of the Church from the State". It is with great astonishment that we read in the official paper of the ZCh OUN (Surma, No. 18-19) that "anti-national and anti-nationalistic fronts in the emigration, beginning with Socialists of all sectors and ending with the Melnyk group, camouflage their destructive work of national outlook and morality by slogans of militant atheism and materialism, that "religion is the private concern of the human conscience", and that the "Church should be separated from the State as a private association of believers". Does not the author of this article know that our organization [the OUN] in the resolutions of the Third NVZ [Extraordinary Great Congress] (and also in the resolutions of the Second

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

25X1A

General Congress) adopted the attitude which he now condemns? Does he not know that the ZCh OUN has officially accepted the resolutions of the Third NVZ? How can the outside public understand and judge such declarations of the official publication of the ZCh OUN? Everyone who wishes it could point to the resolution of the Third NVZ and prove that our organization has also joined this "anti-national and anti-nationalistic front"!

8. To my mind, the following arguments strongly support the belief that religion should be the private concern of the individual and that the Church should be separated from the State:
  - a. As we propagate the idea of political freedom, we should adopt the attitude of religious freedom as well.
  - b. No Ukrainian political party or Ukrainian government should identify itself with any of the existing churches in the Ukraine, because these are quite numerous and to identify ourselves with any of them would rouse all the others against us. If the State tried to support all churches in equal measure, it would become the object of attack by certain confessional groups, which would suspect and accuse the State of favoritism towards one particular church.
  - c. In some respects we regard the Church as socially beneficial, but not as socially indispensable and the State should, in the first place, support institutions which are socially indispensable. This solution is based on the experience of many nations and parties and we should, in this case, take advantage of such experience.
  - d. It is thus that the great majority of the constitutions of the world resolve this question. It should be pointed out that this solution is based on the experience of many nations and political parties. In this case we should benefit from this experience.
  - e. Such a solution could also bring about a healthier atmosphere within the Church. If today we are conscious of a certain decadence in the Church and also in religion, this is the result, to some extent, of the support received from the State by the Church and through which the Church often loses the sense of her higher mission and becomes merely an institution with worldly ambitions and aims, providing comfortable jobs for the clergy and an additional source of power in the State with all the negative consequences. We can only purify the Church and help her to return to her proper character by allowing her to rely on her own strength.
9. The OUN still formulates her supreme idea and the aim of her struggle in these words: an Independent United Ukrainian State (USSR). But today we realize that such formulation of our principal and supreme political aims is not sufficient. To give an example: It is obvious to the eastern Ukrainians that we nationalists fight for independence and union. They expected something more; they would like to know for what kind of an independent and united Ukraine we struggle, with what political and social-economic system, and what kind of state government. For these people our formula "an Independent United Ukrainian State" is quite obvious and does not explain much.
10. As is known, this formula came into being in particular circumstances. After we lost the election struggle and fought against the Socialist parties in the years 1917 - 1920, who placed the question of social system in the State above the problem of independence, we found it necessary to formulate our supreme ideas and aims concerning independence. This was necessary mainly from the point of view of national education and instruction. We wished to spread understanding and the desire for

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

25X1A

independence among the wide masses of the nation. But a political organization cannot be limited to a formula couched in such general terms. A political organization fighting for that independence must declare quite clearly for what type of State it is fighting - for a democratic republic, for a totalitarian type of State, or perhaps for one or another system of monarchy.

11. A clear attitude to this question does not mean that a political organization would elevate the problem of internal State constitutions above the independence of the Ukraine. To all nationally conscious people, the question of the independence of their country is a primary concern - above everything else. All this means that, having in the first place understood her state-independent character, as it was necessary to do in those days in circumstances peculiar to the Ukrainian soil, an organization should clearly define the kind of political constitution which it envisaged for the Ukrainian state and this idea of internal constitution should have been propagated together with the idea of independence and union. We have to admit that up to now this has not been done and it is one of the weaknesses in our program. This empty space must be adequately filled. The formula of USSD in the greater part of the Ukraine has fulfilled its educational purpose and our politically ripe organization should now proceed to amplify it. It should be mentioned that, in the Soviet Ukraine, instead of saying: "We stand for USSD", it would be more useful to say: "We stand for the separation of the Ukraine from the USSR". There the complex of "union" with the USSR (because that is what is meant by the so-called all-union complex) is so strong that the need for separation must be emphasized over and over again. The word "independent" or "independence", if it does not directly and clearly emphasize the need for separation from the USSR, completely loses its effect.
12. Today we deplore the idea of the USSD as merely a Ukrainian, independent, united, democratic republic. Today we cannot be indifferent to the future form of the Ukrainian state. We have our own point of view as to what it should be in order to secure the best possible conditions for the Ukrainian nation for general progress. We are definitely opposed to a totalitarian, dictatorial system of government and also to every form of monarchy as a decaying institution. The actions of the world today do not place monarchs on the throne - they kick them out. Of all the State-constituted forms which humanity has created, we accept that of the democratic republic, which, although it has a number of negative points, is the best and most sensible from the point of view of national interests as a whole, much more so than a totalitarian dictatorship or a monarchy.
13. In our struggle we always like to refer to the traditions of the struggle for liberation and the building of the State. I think the best we can do is to accept the name for the Ukrainian state which was accented by the Ukrainian nation in the years 1918 - 1920, namely the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR). This name, on the whole, is in accordance with the character which we would like to give our State - a character of State government by the people. I do not think that this interpretation would, in any way, be contradictory to the idea expressed in the USSD; on the contrary, it merely defines it more exactly and clearly.
14. It is, therefore, comprehensible that I myself and other friends do not agree with the accusation\*\* to the effect that the ZP UHVR, in the declaration concerning the UNR, "has abandoned the principle of the USSD and has replaced it by a State constitutional conception of the UNR". We also do not agree with the ideas of Surma (number mentioned above) that, as our main object is to destroy the reign of an eternal enemy, such "important matters as decisions concerning the form of internal system of the State are at present pointless"; also ".....members and fellow-travellers of revolutionary nationalism are trying to substitute

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

25X1A

the supreme political aim of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists - the State - by the "Ukrainian Peoples' Republic", which was a symbol of class struggle within the Ukrainian nation in 1920 - a symbol of national treachery in these years ....etc." We do not agree because we read in a declaration of the ZP UHVR: "At this time when we want to clarify the position of the UHVR, among others, the attitude towards State constitution, even now the ZP UHVR tries to throw some light on the interpretation of State constitutional conception of the UHVR.....and declares that the real meaning of the ideas behind the Independent United Ukrainian State is best expressed in the name of the Ukrainian Peoples Republic....."

15. Accepting the interpretation of the USSD as a democratic Ukrainian Peoples' Republic, the ZP UHVR does not identify these traditions or ideas with the contemporary UNR in exile in its historical and contemporary composition....etc. To my mind, this statement is clearly concerned with the State-controlled constitution of the future Ukrainian state and not with the policy of the UNR office in the sphere of party politics, social economy, or military forces, and its attitude towards Russians, all of which could not be accepted without reserve. I emphasize that our conception of a democratic republic rests on people; it is not a conception of an aristocratic democratic republic (if such a thing were possible). It is in that direction that we try to define the idea of the USSD at home. And as such an idea inspired the creators of the UNR in the years 1917 - 1920, we, who consider ourselves direct heirs to the lengthy revolutionary struggle of 1917 - 1920, should return to this name. It does not mean that we exalt the traditions of the UNR of 1917 - 1920 or that we wish to continue them entirely with all their mistakes and anti-State moves. We only accept what is positive and healthy in them, and this is the idea of the Ukrainian Democratic Peoples' Republic where all Ukrainians are masters; we reject all that was negative, unhealthy, anti-national, and anti-State.
16. The OUN in the Ukraine approves democracy in the State constitution of the future independent Ukraine.
17. While we approve democracy, we must emphasize that we do not put it on the pedestal of a political fetish; we do not make a God out of it. We are conscious of all its negative sides, those which were manifested in our own history and those which we now observe in the contemporary history of some nations. We accept this idea of democracy because the experience of the past and especially of the past decade has shown that, in spite of its weaknesses, democracy, not only in theory, but also in practice, has proved to be the best system of State government and the least evil form of government. On the one hand we definitely reject the type of democracy which exists today in France or Italy, i.e., anarchic democracy, and on the other hand we reject the type of Bolshevik "peoples" or "Soviet" democracy, which only covers up the reality of a terroristic totalitarian dictatorial regime. Generally speaking, our democracy should, on the one hand, secure free expression of all serious political tendencies in the nation, and should give them the possibility of organizing activities and influencing the policies of the State; on the other hand our democracy must not allow a free development of anti-national forces. This democracy must also provide an energetic government and administration. The State government should be the instrument of the will of the nation. It does not mean that it should become a plaything in the hands of party politicians, of political parties, or that it should entirely depend on continuously changing whims and combinations of these parties. This should not happen. To secure a free expression of the will of the nation and to secure stability, energy, and the strength of the State government - these are the two equally important aims to the realization of which our democracy should devote her strength. The main task of the authors of the future constitution in the Ukrainian state will be to reconcile these two principles.

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

25X1A

18. Further detailed ideas on this matter were published in an article of a controversial character under the heading: "Type of Organized Democracy in the Future: Independent Ukrainian State", published here in 1949.
19. Regarding the question of ownership of means of production, our views are identical with those of the Third Extraordinary Great Congress of the OUN. The only change made was in allowing the ownership of small farms. We have made this change for political reasons. We consider that, in view of the existing universal hatred of the Bolshevik kolkhoz system, only such a solution can mobilize the Ukrainian peasants for a fight for an independent Ukraine and also prevent our political adversaries from accusing us before the peasants of being against private ownership of land by them and that our program only talks about land exploitation and that we are against the interests of the peasants. To a lesser degree in this case we also considered the arguments from the social-economic aspect.
20. Why do we advocate national State ownership or communal cooperative ownership of the principal means of production? Speaking of "principal means of production", we mean that, in accordance with the program of the Third Congress, which also represents our present attitude, national and State ownership should definitely predominate over private ownership. This question was extensively dealt with in our various articles which were also known abroad. All arguments taken from other economic theories are also generally known, i.e., Socialist conceptions, and we shall not repeat them here. They are either similar to or even identical with our own conceptions.
21. We admit private ownership in crafts, retail trade, and land ownership in small farms. It would also be possible to admit ownership in light industry; up to now mention had been made about this in our program. The social, national and State, or communal-cooperative area of national economy should definitely predominate over the area of private ownership. Only under such conditions can the social-national character of planned economy be preserved. Without this safeguard the capitalist system of economy would soon predominate with all the negative social and economic consequences. The attitude displayed by some of our friends in the ZCh OUN, which found expression in the above-mentioned article of Surma and other hints in various letters and documents, we consider to be erroneous. The author of the above-mentioned article in Surma simply expresses his support of capitalism when he writes: "...the basic principle of the social-economic order and relations in the State should be the personal and individual social-economic integrity of each person on the basis of ownership of means of production and production as such... etc". This is an open propagation of capitalism, of which the OUN has so far been innocent. We admit that Socialized economy has some negative factors. The State is being handed over a new powerful instrument of pressure on the community but, because of the economic interest of people in State activities in the really democratic nations in which the State economic policy is controlled by the nation, in such conditions the danger of the government's misusing its power for the economic exploitation of the community or trying to exercise undue economic pressure is non-existent. Also, by using the right policy, it would be possible to create economic interest among those who are engaged in production and so create a stimulus which would /next word is illegible/ the country's economy. If one were to strike a balance between the social state system and the capitalist system, taking into consideration all social and economic positive and negative elements, the credit will always remain on the side of the social state system. Anarchy in production, the sharpening of economic differences between the rich and poor, exploitation by one individual of another, unemployment, and a chronic state of crisis - all these are inherent to capitalism and militate against it.

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

-7-

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

25X1A

22. I do not admit as justifiable the attacks made by Dontsov\*\*\* against the publications at home in which he denies the necessity for considering the existing economic situation in the Ukraine on the grounds that this was created by the enemy occupying power. Such an attitude may be in agreement with the classic theory of revolution, but it does not correspond to the true state of affairs or to the real interest of the Ukrainian liberation movement. For what reason and on what grounds should the Ukrainian government begin to distribute metallurgical, chemical, mechanical, building, and other works and factories in the Ukraine which, since they were taken from the foreign capitalists nearly 30 years ago, have been under public ownership? Why should they be handed over to private ownership? Is it because we must reintroduce capitalism with all its negative factors into the Ukraine? A similar situation exists with regard to smaller enterprises. It would not be difficult to imagine the storm in the community if the government started to distribute all these public goods among private individuals. I consider that we have to reckon seriously with the economic state of affairs created by the thirty years of Bolshevik regime, although in many respects this regime is hateful to us.
23. The society which we are actively engaged in building up and which is based economically on national, State, and communal cooperative ownership of the means of production and politically on democracy in the State constitution is a classless one. We consider classless a society in which there is no division of exploiting and exploited, or small groups of rich and a large mass of poor people, where one man will not exploit another as is the case in capitalist society, nor groups of politically and economically privileged people who are beyond the control of the nation-magnates who politically and economically exploit the masses, as is happening at present in Bolshevik society.
24. The word "class" has various meanings, among others, a difference in financial status of various groups of society, a difference in political or economic spheres of various groups, etc. Recently the word "class" has been used mostly in the negative sense to denote the privileged or oppressed groups. We have recently learned to associate this word "class" with all those social irregularities and social injustices which exist in a capitalist society. When we describe our society as classless, we are emphasizing our desire to build up a social order in which there will be no classes in the negative sense of the word. There will be no division with exploiters and exploited, with rich and poor. Everyone should understand that we obviously do not mean to abolish classes in the sense of describing an occupation, profession, or trade as, for instance, farmers and laborers. Such divisions are a natural outcome of a division of labor among the people and we do not intend to liquidate them in our classless society, as this would be absurd. Such a division will be purely one of different production groups, division of people of the same financial standing with equal rights and equal economic and political standing, but not a division of people according to their property or economic position. Such a division will not be contrary to the idea of social and economic equality of the citizens of the State which is the principal idea of the Ukrainian national movement. Such a division does not lead to class struggle; on the contrary, by destroying financial differences between individuals in society, it excludes the possibility of class warfare and is the only real supposition of unity and solidarity within the nation.
25. While striving after social equality and justice in the Ukraine, we are, at the same time, aware that the ideal of absolute social equality and justice cannot be realized because the material inequality among human beings cannot be remedied. People are different - they are more or less talented, more or less practical, etc. It will also be necessary in social economy to stimulate,

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY



SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

25X1A

in various ways, economic interest of labor in production (inducement to output, premiums, and bonuses). This will also create certain inequalities. It is, therefore, Utopian to think of a classless society as a state of absolute equality. This will, however, be a society in which no group of speculators may exist, no group of social parasites tolerated, a society which will be spared the most glaring inequalities which are today characteristic of the capitalist or Soviet society. It may be that some elements abroad are afraid that the principle of social ownership of the means of production will bring about a new enslavement of the people by the State and to governmental tyranny, in short, to all those phenomena which we observe in the Soviet system.

26. First of all, a guarantee against the enslavement of people by the State, against tyranny of the government over the nation, should be found in a democratic constitution. When the nation, through parliament, will exercise its influence on all State policy, including the economic policy, when the nation controls the administration and exercises its influence on the drawing up of national-economic plans, when the administration itself will be changed periodically, then it would be impossible for the government to tyrannize the nation, to enslave the people by the State, all of which would be very dangerous for the nation.
27. Secondly, we have to resign ourselves to the thought that today order and harmony in society are only possible if the social life is organized and guided by institutions armed with special powers. We all agree that such institutions in the national framework should form their own states and state governments. This guiding and organizing of social life by the State leads to certain limits being imposed upon the liberties and rights of the individual, and the individual today must agree to such limitation of his rights. I think that humanity today is faced with the dilemma of people either resigning themselves to a loss of certain of their existing rights and allowing the State to organize the whole of the fabric of society in the interest of society, or of insisting on all their rights, in which case the State will not be able to exercise sufficient control over the social life, which will develop in a haphazard way and the whole of social activity will develop into a "free for all" fight. The rights of the individual will be safeguarded but the whole nation will perish and with the nation the individual too with all his rights. Let the English liberals fight for the unlimited rights of the individual - there is no known remedy for a second childhood in old age. Perhaps the columns of the Soviet Army marching through London will bring them to their senses. But it will be too late. We should already today take the attitude that it is essential to limit some of the prerogatives of the individual in the name of a healthy national community, in the name of the healthy development of the Ukrainian nation. This should follow as a natural consequence of our national ideology.
28. I consider that a revolution is not an absolute negation of a system against which it has revolted, nor an expression of opposition to old forms and the propagation of something new, which has not previously existed; I consider revolution to mean a synthesis of experience gained through a healthy development into a new whole, in which the various, frequently opposing elements are blended together into one system. Often revolution gives old forms an entirely new meaning. It is not the form that counts but the sense, the content. And if the form is good and the contents reactionary, why reject the form together with the content? In doing so the revolution becomes too theoretical, too dogmatic, and not practical enough. There are many cases in history of revolution having had to march in a different direction.
29. If we look upon revolution from a similar point of view, it becomes clear that some of our friends have drawn wrong conclusions from the methods employed by our own revolution in the Ukraine.

SECRET/CONTROL - U.S. OFFICIALS ONLY

SECRET/CONTROL US OFFICIALS ONLY

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

30. The letter of the leader S. Bilych, for instance, mentions that "it is wrong to attack only the factual and to agree with the ideas." It is necessary to attack the whole system, the ideology and the practice.
31. From the practical point of view this is what it looks like. The Bolsheviks in their propaganda speak of national liberty, independence of all nations, the sovereignty of all national states, the abolishment of exploitation by one man of another, of the cultural and prosperous life of the great national masses, of the liquidation of differences between town and country, between physical and mental work, etc.
32. Can we say that these ideas as ideas are wrong? Can we say that they are anti-national and reactionary? I am sure that every working man will agree that these ideas are right and sane. And so do the masses of the population under the Soviets. If that is so, then we must not attack these ideas or we shall find ourselves opposing the national masses as reactionaries hostile to progress. This does not mean that we should not attack the Bolsheviks who only formally propagate these ideas. They only talk about them but do not practice them; they use these good ideas as a cover to camouflage their radically anti-national policy. That is where we must attack them, and in doing so we attack the Bolshevik practice and not the ideas. Experience proves to us that, so far, we are on the right road; otherwise we should not have a proper ideological basis for fighting the Bolsheviks.
33. It is quite a different thing when we meet with Bolshevik ideological theories which are wrong, as for instance, Stalin's theory of the possibility of building Communism in the country or the theory of the superiority of the Russian nation, etc. In such cases we attack the theory as well.
34. I do not consider that "such an attitude is equivalent to capitulation or weakness." There are no feelings of capitulation, no ideological vacillations or weaknesses amongst our cadres. On the contrary I must affirm here with all authority that our cadres live in a state of such ideological exaltation, in a state of such consciousness of their ideological value and strength, of full consciousness of their ideological superiority over the enemy, as never before in the history of the organization.
35. I do not altogether agree with the statement that only a "categorical, total, and radical negation of the enemy, of his faith, ideology, the whole of his teaching, his theory (as I understand it - it would be necessary to reject all the ideas propagated by the enemy), and his practice will give our revolution a strong ideological basis and will attract the masses by the strength of its faith; it will convince and inspire." I repeat: the negation of the enemy need not be absolute in the sense that it is necessary to reject even the good ideas which the enemy is applying by false methods. Furthermore, this negation need not be extended to certain forms created by the enemy if they are not anti-national in themselves. For instance, we reject Bolshevism but we must acknowledge as right the idea that exploitation of one man by another should be abolished; or again, in rejecting Bolsheviks, we cannot attack the widespread school net in the USSR, since the secondary schools in villages, in themselves, are not anti-national. We can only attack the very special use to which the Bolsheviks subject their school system. We also cannot reject the Bolshevik system of health centers in the villages or free medicines, we could not entirely reject them and yet you could not maintain that such an attitude would not influence the mass of the people or would not "convince them or inspire them."

SECRET/CONTROL US OFFICIALS ONLY

SECRET/CONTROL US OFFICIALS ONLY

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

36. In these letters a view was expressed that we should avoid in our propaganda literature the use of Bolshevik terminology, such as nationalization of the means and reserves of production, classless society, etc. I consider that in most cases it is impossible to do so. To oppose the enemy even in the sphere of lexicology is simply beyond our power. How would one change and find a substitute for such Ukrainian expressions as "Znaryaddia" [not translatable], "Zasovy" [means of production], and "Virobnit" [manufacturing], a Ukrainian word for production and private property or communal property - (State-national or cooperative), which the Ukrainian lexicologists expressed by a word "Ususpilnennya" [socialization]. And as we Ukrainians from Galicia have to learn the Ukrainian language from the eastern Ukrainians also, why should we look for other expressions of the same idea? and how to express this idea in a different way? We have to make use of such lexicons as are already in existence and not worry about creating a new terminology. Apart from this, we write and compose our publications with a view to reaching the Eastern Ukrainian public brought up in the Soviet school in the Eastern Ukraine, or, if you prefer it, Bolshevik terminology, and we have to write in such a way as to be understood by them.
37. I do not consider right the point of view expressed by Ivanov [unidentified pseudonym] in one of his articles in which he states that our organization up to 1941 was "no more than a camp of active battle against the occupying powers," that the organization was "not a political party in the right sense of the word, but rather an all-embracing resistance movement, etc." Our organization, from the moment of its inception, had clear political aims and was always a political organization; it had its weak spots as a political body but that is a different matter and it does not deny the political character of the organization. I consider it wrong to talk of our organization as merely "a camp of active battle" and to deny it any political character before 1941.
38. I also consider wrong the statement made by M. Prokop [a member of the ZP UHVR] in the article Ideological and Program Questions of the Ukrainian Independence Movement, to the effect that, up to the year 1941, the OUN did not properly value the role of the masses engaged in the struggle. The cult of heroes in the OUN, the emphasis on quality in selecting the cadres, and the endeavor to develop high-quality characters have nothing in common with the conception of the Russian popular idea of "heroes" and "mob." The OUN rightly understands the value and meaning of advance-guard in the revolutionary liberation fight. The masses will rise in the struggle if they are led by carefully trained and organized advance-guards. The liberation movement will be victorious if the revolutionary advance-guards are followed by the national masses. Such are the mechanics of the liberating revolution and the OUN has fully understood this.
39. D. Kamyanski [an unidentified pseudonym] in his letter said a few bitter words about the low political ideas of the cadres in the Ukraine. He said the same about our publications and used the proverb "not good in writing, not good in the head" (this was addressed to the authors of the publications at home).
40. It is not for us to correct these charges. We have accepted them. But, as we are critical of ourselves, so we have the right to criticize others. In my opinion the proverb "no good in writing, no good in the head" is true, not with regard to certain people only, but it is generally true and concerns friend Kamyanski also. It is true that I only know friend Kamyanski from his letter but even so this proverb may be extended to this letter....
41. With this I wish to end. I am aware that in the whole of this letter I have not said anything new, have often repeated what has been stated long ago or what was mentioned in other documents enclosed in this mail. But, as with letters from our friend abroad, although written on the same subjects, yet always bringing something new, I also hope it will be possible to find something new between these lines and to share some peaceful thoughts of which we are in such great need. That is why I have decided to burden our mail by these additional sheets of paper.

SECRET/CONTROL US OFFICIALS ONLY

SECRET/CONTROL US OFFICIALS ONLY

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

25X1A

42. I send you revolutionary greetings and wishes for best success in the work for the good of the cause which is so dear to us.

Glory to the Ukraine!

August 1950

P. Foltava

25X1A

**Comments:**

\*Surma is one of the emigre publications of the ZCh OUN under Bandera.

\*\*Contained in a letter from S. Biylich, a pseudonym of Stefan Bandera.

\*\*\*Dymytro Dontsov, presently in Canada, was one of the ideologists of nationalism and revolution whose theories were popular among the OUN members in Galicia up to 1943. Dontsov's brand of nationalism resembled German nationalism and therefore fell into disfavor along with the Germans.