

VIA: _____
SPECIFY AIR OR SEA ROUTE

DISPATCH NO. EGMA-14675

SECRET
CLASSIFICATION

IP

TO : Chief, SR
Attn:

DATE:

11. MAR 1955

FROM : Chief of Mission, Frankfurt TPM

INFO: EE, COM

SUBJECT: GENERAL— Operational/REDSOX/CART.

SPECIFIC— Resignation of ^(Rev.) Ivan HRYNIOCH from ZPUHVR

MICROFILMED
MAY 31 1962
DOC. MICRO. SER.

1. Transmitted herewith are two AECAPELIN reports, one dated 13 December, the other 28 December 1954, on Vatican interest in the conflict among emigre Ukrainian nationalists and the withdrawal of Rev. Ivan HRYNIOCH from political life.

2. MOB comment:

a. The report on ^{Ivan} Archbishop BUCHKO's desire to bring the warring nationalist factions together is of interest primarily in that the report gives an accurate picture of the pro-BANDEIRA ZCHOUM's campaign against ZPUHVR on the religious front. There is no evidence, however, that BUCHKO or any other Greek-Catholic dignitary in fact made any serious effort to assuage the conflict. The report in this regard at best portrays the pious wish of some clergy. No effort was made in this regard during a recent visit in Rome by Rev. Ivan HRYNIOCH.

b. AECAPELIN's ruminations in regard to HRYNIOCH's resignation are based on incomplete data and do not appear to reflect accurately either HRYNIOCH's, ZPUHVR's, or Vatican motives in this matter.

[] []

9 March 1955

Attachments:

- A. AECAPELIN report, dated 13 December 1954
- B. AECAPELIN report, dated 28 December 1954

Distribution:

- 1. ~~WASH~~ (DIRECT) w/attachments, in dup. HEREWITH
- 3. COM w/1 copy each of attachments HEREWITH
- 2. MOB w/1 copy each of attachments

COPY ROUTING	
1	3 w/att A+B
2	3
3	3
4	CE-CA/R/w/att A+B

SECRET
CLASSIFICATION

FORM NO. 51-28A
MAR. 1949

75-6-93-2-1709

NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT

EXEMPTIONS Section 3(b)

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

Declassified and Approved for Release
by the Central Intelligence Agency
Date: 2005

SECRET

Attachment A to 11675 4P

EGMA-

SUBJECT : Archbishop Ivan BUCHKO and the Conflict Among Entire Ukrainian Nationalists

DATE OF INFORMATION: 13 December 1954

SOURCE : AECAPELIN from (Dr.) Miroslav SEMCHYSHYN, ~~Assistant Secretary~~ Secretary to the Institute for the Study of Culture and History of the USSR in Munich

MICROFILMED
MAY 31 1962

1. SEMCHYSHYN learned from well-informed Ukrainian circles in England (Father) Aleksander MALINOVSKI, Vicar-General for Ukrainian Catholics in England) that Archbishop Ivan BUCHKO of Rome intends to initiate attempts in the near future to reconcile the wrangling groups of Ukrainian nationalists (ZChOUN/BANDERA, Anti-BANDERA ZCh/OUN and ZPUHVR). It is his desire to reconcile the differences first between the Anti-BANDERA ZChOUN and the pro-BANDERA ZChOUN and, if this is successful, to settle the differences between these two groups with ZPUHVR. BUCHKO's initiative in this regard stems from two sources: Father MALINOVSKI in London and (Father) Peter POLINSKY in Munich. An analogous proposition was forwarded by (Docent) Mikhailo TANIV who, currently, at the request of BUCHKO, is attempting to organize a Christian Movement.

2. BUCHKO undertook the mission of pacifying these wrangling groups not because of Ukrainian political reasons but rather because of Ukrainian Catholic interests both in the emigration and the homeland. This is logical when it is taken into consideration that the majority of those participating in the Ukrainian liberation-revolutionary movement in the homeland are Greek Catholics as are the majority of the residents of West Ukraine. Although it is nowhere so designated, this movement nonetheless has strong Catholic overtones. This gains even greater significance since those individuals participating in this revolutionary-liberation movement from Volhynia, Polissya, Bukovina or Carpatho-Ukraine, although they are Orthodox, also defend the interests of the Ukrainian Catholic church and recognize the Church as a warrior against communism because of the Bolshevik attempts to destroy it and because the Orthodox church in the Ukraine has been Russified by the Bolsheviks. Therefore it can be said that the Ukrainian revolutionary-liberation movement, notwithstanding the professed beliefs of its members, is a defender of the Catholic church on Ukrainian soil. This is also evidenced by the fact that the representative of the underground Ukrainian Catholic church is a member of the UHVR. This representative, in the name of the underground church, made an appeal from the Homeland to the Ukrainian emigration. This is an important fact when reduced to day-to-day activities. Furthermore, Vatican circles, which continued to receive direct, truthful and confirmed facts from the Homeland were forced to confirm that the Ukrainian liberation movement is a defender of the Catholic church. Not to recognize this would be to ignore the intentions of the Catholic church in the Eastern countries in general, but specifically the interests of the Vatican in the Ukraine. It is therefore understandable why the Vatican religious-political circles have interested themselves in the Ukrainian liberation movement.

SECRET

14-6-352-10049

SECRET

3. An analogous situation exists here in the emigration. No one will deny that the strongest groups in the emigration are the ZChOUN, ZPUHVR and their followers. The majority of the members of either faction are Catholics, although they do not necessarily underline their Catholicism in practical political activities. The direct or indirect participation of these groups in the activities of the Catholic church in the emigration is not insignificant. Some of these Ukrainian nationalist groups like ZChOUN/Bandera accent their devotion to the Catholic church. This is partially attributable to the fact that ZChOUN/Bandera received considerable financial support from Vatican circles until approximately 1950, i.e., subsidization of the Ukrainsky Samostiynik, Ukrainets-Chas (Paris), and other publications. In 1950 Ivan BUCHKO somewhat revised his position toward ZChOUN/Bandera and decided to cease financial assistance to this group. This resulted partially from the fact that ZChOUN/Bandera became known as a totalitarian, narrow-minded and even immoral organization responsible for mass murders of guilty as well as innocent persons; BUCHKO's personal tactics toward the various emigration groups also changed since he saw no reason to finance this organization when it attacked other organizations which were also Catholic.

4. The position of Vatican circles dealing with Ukrainian emigration affairs also changed radically in February 1951 as a result of the ZChOUN schism. The Vatican favored the position of those Ukrainian organizations which recognized the decision from the homeland. Notwithstanding the many sessions between Yaroslav STETSKO, BANDERA and Yaroslav BENTSAI and Archbishop BUCHKO in Rome, Munich and England, the former were unable to convince BUCHKO that the homeland decision re the OUN Provid was a falsification by ZPUHVR, by VASIL OHRIMOVICH, or even an American provocation. The fact remained that the homeland denied moral support to Stephan BANDERA; this was clear to BUCHKO, who for the time being did not take a personal part in this matter. Activities of ZChOUN/Bandera, however, forced BUCHKO not only to take an interest in these activities but also to make his position clear in this respect. This was precipitated by the following:

a. ZChOUN/Bandera, recognizing their moral inadequacy and their situation vis-a-vis other emigre groups and refusing to cooperate with the anti-Bandera ZChOUN, initiated various activities against the anti-Bandera ZChOUN, against ZPUHVR, and even against the OUN Provid in the Ukraine. These activities assumed not only political undertones but also religious characteristics. ZChOUN/Bandera made attempts to prove that the anti-Bandera ZChOUN was a socialistic-materialistic, liberal-democratic and even an atheistic movement, by no means Christian or Catholic.

b. In proof of their accusations, they brought forth extracts from publications of Ukrainian journalists and writers, extracts of writings made by ZPUHVR and anti-Bandera ZChOUN members. This indiscriminate and continuously reinforced propaganda conducted by ZChOUN/Bandera extended to areas beyond pure nationalistic issues and included activities of Catholic groups. See Catholic CHYNS article "Conception of the Liberation Struggle and Religion" No. 23 and 24 in the Khristianskyi Holos, and the "Declaration of the Ukrainian Catholic Academic Association Obnova" in the 20 June 1951

SECRET

No. 24 issue of the Khristiansky Holos.) All these Catholic groups, more or less, used Stepan BANDERA's arguments against ZPUHVR and indirectly against the Ukrainian liberation-revolutionary movement in the Ukraine. It must be said that BANDERA had success in this respect. It is not to be excluded that this influenced Archbishop BUCHKO in entrusting the organization of the Christian Movement to Mikhaïlo YANIV in Paris. This is evidenced by the fact that ZChOUN/Bandera decided to back this Movement in all parts of Europe, sending that organization's most effective members to various places for this purpose.

c. In conjunction with the press and oral propaganda conducted against ZPUHVR, the anti-Bandera ZChOUN and the OUN Provid in the Ukraine, a series of letters were directed to BUCHKO as well as to the Congregation of Oriental Churches, headed by Cardinal Eugene TISSERANT. These letters, allegedly originating from various individuals but actually instigated by ZChOUN/Bandera, requested that Dr. Ivan HRINOGH be suspended because he was not only the head of the ZPUHVR but also the moral protector of the aforementioned organizations who were engaged in "anti-Christian" and "anti-Catholic" activities.

5. As a result of the above, BUCHKO's position became much more complicated than heretofore. BUCHKO, being acquainted with the actual situation in the homeland as well as BANDERA's conduct toward the homeland decision, knew that BANDERA was wrong; on the other hand, as a Catholic Archbishop and the Apostolic Visitor to Ukrainian Catholics in Europe, he could not underestimate or ignore BANDERA's approach to these matters from the Catholic point of view, (i.e., BANDERA's defense of the Catholic interests). Furthermore, BUCHKO found himself under pressure from Cardinal TISSERANT.

6. For BUCHKO to condemn HRINOGH, ZPUHVR and the anti-Bandera ZChOUN was tantamount to condemning the homeland and simultaneously condemning those singular defendants of the Catholic Church in the Ukraine who saw fit to place their trust in the ZPUHVR and the anti-Bandera ZChOUN. This condemnation would signify declaration of war against the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement and against the Ukrainian underground Catholic church whose representative sits in the OUN Provid and fights together with the OUN against the Bolsheviks.

7. Archbishop BUCHKO, as well as the Congregation of Oriental Churches, could not take this step. However, there had to be a way out of the problem. Therefore, according to SEMCHISHIN's statements, BUCHKO undertook the role of a mediator between these three wrangling organizations. BUCHKO hopes that he will find a way out of the difficulties with a series of compromises; these would be as follows:

a. Convince BANDERA to subordinate the interests of his organization to the decision of the homeland and to join the triumvirate (MATLA, REBET, BANDERA).

b. Persuade the MATLA-REBET group to reach an agreement with BANDERA to offer him a responsible position in the ZChOUN, as well as to tone down their condemnation of BANDERA.

SECRET

c. Insure that either BANDERA or his responsible delegate have influence in the ZPUHR.

8. It is difficult to say whether BUCHKO will meet with any success even though his intentions are commendable. UNRada circles believe that such an agreement is possible. ZChOUN/Bandera recognize that the stature of their organization is low and is continuously shrinking. The Ukrainian emigration is becoming very critical of ZChOUN/Bandera. Although ZPUHR and the anti-Bandera ZChOUN are gaining some success, they nonetheless find it very difficult to conduct any war against ZChOUN/Bandera because the latter organization is full of fanatics who will continue to execute the wishes of the ZChOUN/Bandera even though these directives may be senseless. Albeit, both warring sides respect the authority of Archbishop BUCHKO and recognize him as their highest church dignitary.

9. SEMCHYSHYN affirms that currently the General Secretary of ZChOUN/Bandera is meeting with Father HOLINSKY in Munich. These discussions between Yaroslav BENTSAI and HOLINSKY are believed to deal with a meeting of minds on the above topic.

10. In sounding out KASHUBA on this topic, KASHUBA stated that BUCHKO has been well briefed by the ZChOUN/Bandera Provid on the situation in the homeland. BUCHKO was able to obtain photo-copies of original letters from the homeland which indicate that all the OUN Kray Provids and the organization network are for BANDERA. Not favoring BANDERA is the OUN Homeland Provid alone, or in other words, LEMISH, Vasil OKHRIMOVICH, and several others from their group. Therefore, forwarded KASHUBA, BUCHKO will support BANDERA more than he will ZPUHR in his attempts to effect peace in the emigration.

SECRET