

MURDERED BY MOSCOW

PETLURA—KONOVALETS—BANDERA

**Three leaders of the
Ukrainian National Liberation Movement
assassinated at the orders of Stalin
and Khrushchov**

Published by the Ukrainian Publishers Limited

LONDON

1962

F o r e w o r d

Public opinion in the West has been shocked of late by the revelations throwing light on the murder of the outstanding Ukrainian nationalist leader, Stepan Bandera, by a Soviet Russian secret agent in Munich, Germany, on 15th October, 1959. The agent, Bohdan Stashynsky, received the Order of the Red Banner from the hands of the then chief of the Russian security police, Alexander Shelepin, for this crime carried out with the aid of a poison pistol. There is no doubt that, in issuing the order to assassinate Bandera, Shelepin acted with the knowledge and approval of the leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government and its head, Nikita Khrushchov. Thus, Nikita Khrushchov carries direct responsibility for this perfidious murder. Stashynsky has since defected to the West, in August, 1961, and confessed to the murder, for he feared that his masters would try to wipe out the traces of the crime by liquidating him, too.

Two other prominent leaders of the Ukrainian national liberation movement have been murdered in a similar manner by Moscow's agents in recent decades. Seven revolver shots fired by the Russian agent, Schwarzbart, in Paris on May 25th, 1926, killed Symon Petlura, exiled President of the Ukrainian National Republic and Supreme Commander of the Ukrainian Armed Forces during the period of the Liberation War 1917-1921, when Ukraine fought for her national freedom and independence against the overwhelming forces of red and white Russian imperialists. A parcel bomb which exploded in the hands of Ehen Konovalets, the fearless leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, in Rotterdam, Holland, on May 23rd, 1938, was sent to him by Moscow killers through one of their secret agents, Valyukh. At that time, it should be noted, Nikita Khrushchov was First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, i.e. the highest-ranking lieutenant of Stalin in that country.

Murder, cunning, cruelty and deceit characterise the history of Russia from its very beginnings until the present day. Like the Russian Tsars in the past, the modern tyrants ruling the "paradise of workers, peasants and toiling intelligentsia" have been constantly trying to extend their huge dominion by means of treachery, disregard for law and the use of lies, to other countries, and to keep their prison of nations together by means of terror, mass deportations, forced labour, executions and assassinations.

In this respect Russian historical epochs bear close resemblance. The same principle as prevailed at the time of Ivan the Terrible and Catherine II has been valid in the most recent period under Lenin, Stalin and the allegedly liberalising Khrushchov, the hangman of Ukraine, now silyly smiling, now menacingly growling.

This book offers three small, but nevertheless important, segments from current history. The reader, if he so wishes, may be able to get a deeper insight into the events and methods of suppression, practised by the "saviours of the proletariat" and the "liberators of the colonial peoples," in Ukraine from the documentary report entitled "Russian Oppression in Ukraine," which has just been published. Some articles contained in this little book have been taken from that detailed report.

It is hoped that this abridged version will make it easier for the reader to see through the deception manoeuvres of the Soviet lying propaganda in its attempt to veil the guilt of the Moscow accomplices in the murder of Bandera, on the eve of the trial of the actual perpetrator of the crime.

Soviet Russian Political Murders Abroad and Attempts to Camouflage Them

by Stepan Lenkavsky

THREE LEADERS OF THE UKRAINIAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT MURDERED BY MOSCOW

The murder of Stepan Bandera is by no means an individual case in the history of the fight between Ukraine and Russia. During the past forty years three leaders of the Ukrainian national fight for freedom have been the victims of political murder by Communist Moscow.

In 1926 Symon Petlura, the head of the state and government of Ukraine, was murdered in the street in Paris by seven bullets.

In 1938 Colonel Evhen Konovalets, the founder and leader of the revolutionary liberation organization — the Ukrainian Military Organization (UVO) and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) — was killed in the street in Rotterdam by the explosion of a time-bomb.

In 1959 Stepan Bandera, the leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, was murdered in the entrance-hall of the house in which he lived in Munich by a shot fired from a poison-pistol.

We do not intend to mention the countless other victims of Soviet Russian terrorism, who played an important part in the national liberation movement of the Ukrainian people, or in the field of scientific and cultural activity and in ecclesiastical life, and who were murdered by Moscow either openly or secretly. We shall confine ourselves here to mentioning only the leading and most outstanding political personalities of the national liberation movement, whose names enjoyed the highest prestige in Ukraine during the years of the latter's occupation by Russia.

The above-mentioned leaders of the Ukrainian fight for freedom — Petlura, Konovalets, Bandera — were murdered outside Ukraine, in the West European states of France, Holland and Germany, by hired murderers and agents sent there by Moscow.

All three of these murderers were tracked down. Two of them were arrested, — one at the scene of the crime immediately after he had committed it, and the other two years after the murder.

Petlura's murderer, Schwarzbart (alias Walsberger), an out-and-out criminal and a leftist socialist, was arrested at the scene of the crime by the French police and handed over to the judicial authorities. The Paris court acquitted him and morally condemned the murdered victim — Petlura.

The man who murdered Konovalets, an agent of the NKVD known under the alias of Valyukh, pretended to be a courier who had allegedly been sent to Konovalets by a national, revolutionary, anti-Bolshevist organization in Soviet Ukraine. He handed Konovalets not a parcel containing reports and documents on the activity of this underground organization, but a time-bomb and subsequently escaped to the USSR on a Soviet ship.

The agent of the KGB, Stashynsky (alias Lehmann, alias Budeit, alias Krylov), who murdered Stepan Bandera, fled by plane via East Berlin to the Soviet Union after having committed the crime. He remained hidden in the Soviet Union for two years; then he managed to get from Moscow to West Berlin, where he was arrested by the German police.

The choice of the time at which each of these political murders was committed against leading Ukrainian politicians abroad seems to have been determined by the internal political development of events in Ukraine, as well as by the international position of the USSR, and not solely by any favourable opportunity which presented itself for the practical execution of the crime.

The assassination of Petlura was carried out in 1926 after the internal putch in Poland, when Pilsudski again assumed power. In 1920 he and Petlura had undertaken a joint campaign as allies against the Russians. Since it was well aware of Pilsudski's anti-Russian political attitude, Moscow was afraid lest Petlura, with support from Poland, might kindle a national revolution in Ukraine. The internal situation in Ukraine during these latter years of the era of the "New Economic Policy" (NEP) was characterized by a considerable and sudden increase in patriotism. Moreover, with the intensification of the nationalist trends amongst the youth, the intellectuals and the farmers, with the so-called Ukrainization and the defiant attitude of the Ukrainian national Communists at that time in the Communist Party of Ukraine (similar to the revolt of the intellectuals and the youth in Poland in 1956), the situation as regards Ukraine was becoming extremely precarious for Moscow. At this critical time the hopes of the Ukrainian people as a whole were concentrated on the person of Petlura as the highest representative of the national liberation policy. NKVD chief, Dzerzhinsky, was responsible for the liquidations carried out during this period.

There could be no illusions in 1938, the year in which Konovalets was murdered, about the fact that the Western democratic states were not in a position to prevent the three anti-Comintern states, Germany, Italy and Japan, from further acts of territorial expansion by international agreements and pacts. In the Far East Japan assumed the leading role. Italy, who as a result of her war against and her occupation of Abyssinia was in conflict with the measures of the League of Nations, stressed that the resolutions of such an international fiction could not be carried out in practice. The last stage of the civil war in Spain, which lasted for almost three years, revealed not only the weak spot of the Russian world Communist conspiracy, but also the technical perfection of modern German arms.

The incorporation of Austria into Germany, which was indeed a triumph for Hitler, afforded Germany the initial position for the revision of her frontiers and those of Czecho-Slovakia and Poland, and in no time the collision between two opposite imperialistic camps loomed on the horizon: German national socialism, which was intent upon realizing its principle of "greater living space" in the East, and Russian Communism, with its unchangeable plans for a "world revolution of the proletariat," that is to say the creation of a Russian world imperium. The prospect of such a clash between these two powers seemed inevitable. Moscow decided to crush the internal forces of resistance as speedily as possible, since in the event of a conflict they might disintegrate the Soviet Russian imperium from within. Three months after the incorporation of Austria into Germany and soon after they had carried out a large-scale ruthless extermination campaign not only in Ukraine but also in the entire USSR amongst the intelligentsia, in the army, the administration and the Party apparatus, a campaign which has gone down in the annals of history as the "Yezhov purge," the Bolsheviks on May 23, 1938, murdered the leader of the Ukrainian liberation movement, Yevhen Konovalts, who was living abroad.

This wave of terrorism also included those of Stalin's enemies abroad who were dangerous. That same year, i.e. 1938, the Bolsheviks also carried out a number of attacks on the Trotsky-ists who played a leading part in the 4th International. In February 1938, for instance, Leo Trotsky's son Lev Sedov, was murdered in Paris, and on June 13, 1938, the secretary of the 4th International, Rudolf Klement, was abducted from Paris. Two years later (on August 21, 1940) Leo Trotsky was murdered in Coyocan (Mexico). The person responsible for the political murders in 1938 was Yezhov, and for those committed in 1940, Beria.

1959, the year in which Stepan Bandera was murdered, held no foreign political and international complications for the Russians. Times had changed. Moscow now holds the initiative in international politics in its hands, and Moscow alone determines in which parts of the world and at what times unexpected acts of aggression, intrigues and conflicts, either on a small or on a large scale, are to take place. The West tries to defend its *status quo* by means of compromises and complaisance, and when it fails to do so, it endeavours at least to play the part of a belated fire-brigade, a role for which it pays with loss of prestige and more concessions. Hence the choice of time in the case of the murder of Bandera was not a precautionary measure before a storm that threatened to break over Moscow's head in the field of international politics, as had been the case when the other two murders were committed. It was, rather, a preparatory measure, by means of which a favourable starting-point was to be created in the interior of the Soviet Russian colony — that is Ukraine — for Moscow to launch aggressive surprises against the free world (Laos, Berlin). The discontent of the nations subjugated by Russia, in particular of Ukraine, represents an internal obstacle

to Russian world-conquest plans and to subversive propaganda in the underdeveloped countries. One can assume that the Russians were afraid lest their provocations might call forth an unexpected reaction on the part of the West.

HOW DO THE BOLSHEVIKS EXPLAIN THE MURDERS COMMITTED BY THEM?

The Bolsheviks realize only too well that political murder is a two-edged sword. The liquidation of a politician who is a danger to Moscow only serves their purpose if the crime committed evokes no indignation against Moscow in public circles, that is to say in precisely those circles in which the murdered person was regarded as an authority. The Russians have one inalterable principle: Moscow was never guilty and is never guilty of crime. The blame is always thrust on the others, above all on the enemies of Bolshevism, and very often on the victim himself and on those who share his views and ideas. Even if the logical aspect of events objectively reveals incriminating evidence against Moscow, Moscow always invents lies accordingly in order to mislead the public. For every one of its criminal acts it has always invented expedient legends, which are obstinately repeated year after year in its propaganda. In this respect the Bolsheviks rely on the true information, which would expose the real organizers of the murders and the murderers themselves, not getting through the Iron Curtain, and this they seek to prevent by censoring all letters and disturbing the transmission of broadcast programmes. If, however, some information does seep through to the Soviet citizens, then they are promptly misled by Bolshevik dementis, which make the truth appear questionable and less probable.

But who are the "others" whom Soviet Russian propaganda makes out to be the alleged organizers and perpetrators of the assassinations of Ukrainian leaders of the national liberation movement, instead of Moscow?

Jews and Germans!

According to Bolshevik misinformation, the Jews are to blame for the murder of Petlura. And the Germans are to blame for the murder of Konovalts and of Bandera. In the case of the last two murders, the Ukrainian nationalists allegedly assisted the Germans in carrying out these crimes. This, in brief, is the Bolshevik explanation of the murders perpetrated by Russian agents.

On what do the Bolsheviks base their lies and tricks in this respect?

The choice of the person who was to commit the murder has always served as the basis for the invention of lies and legends about the actual murder itself. They have always chosen persons to whom — in the event of their arrest — credible tales about motives other than the orders of the Kremlin, motives of a personal or political character, could be imputed, so as to conceal the fact from the court that the order to murder was issued by Moscow.

In the case of Petlura, a Jew, Schwarzbart, was instructed by Moscow to carry out the murder. He received orders to give himself up of his own accord to the police as a Communist agent, in order to start a political trial in this way. Thus there was a two-fold purpose behind this murder: to murder Petlura who was a danger to the Bolsheviks, and to direct the political trial of this murder in such a way that the person of Petlura and the Ukrainian government which he represented, as well as the national liberation movement, which was a danger to Moscow, could be defamed from the political point of view. It was Schwarzbart's task during this trial to conceal the part played by the Russian GPU in this murder and to pose as a national avenger of the Jewish people for the brutal pogroms committed against them by various anarchist groups, who operated in Ukraine during the years of the revolution, that is from 1919 to 1921, and in the interests of Russia also fought against the Ukrainian state. The blame for the pogroms carried out by these groups was to be imputed to Petlura. By planning the trial in this way the Russians managed to gain a two-fold success. In the first place, they succeeded in winning over most of the Jews in the world for the defence of the Communist agent Schwarzbart and in arousing anti-Ukrainian feelings, which, incidentally, persisted a long time, amongst the Jews, and, secondly, as a result of the unjust verdict of the Paris court, the Russians and other enemies of an independent Ukraine were able to obtain "the objective judgement of an impartial court in an unprejudiced state," which could then be used in anti-Ukrainian propaganda. For years the Russians made use of this judgement in order to defame Petlura in the eyes of the world and to misrepresent the Ukrainian state government which he represented and the Ukrainian liberation movement as an anti-Semitic, destructive and not a constructive state movement, which would be capable of ensuring human democratic freedoms to the national minorities in Ukraine. The jury of the Paris court, who consisted for the most part of supporters of the popular front at that time and of socialist liberals, refused to believe the testimony of the numerous witnesses of various nationalities, which clearly proved that Petlura had neither had any share in the pogroms against the Jews, nor could be held in any way responsible for them. They ignored the actual facts of the murder, and by their acquittal of the murderer rendered Bolshevik Moscow an even greater service than it had expected. Thus Moscow scored two successes. But it did not score a third, for the Paris trial did not help Moscow to change the anti-Russian attitude of the Ukrainians into an anti-Semitic one or to conceal its responsibility for the murder of Petlura from the Ukrainians.

In the case of the murder of Konovalets the Bolsheviks did not attempt to start a trial. On the contrary, the motives for this insidious murder were, in view of the manner in which it was carried out, to remain a mystery in order to maintain for as long as possible doubts as to which political forces that were hostile to Ukraine could have been anxious to liquidate Konovalets. The mystery surrounding this question made it easy for the Russians to arouse political ill-feeling

amongst the Ukrainians against various political forces which the Bolsheviks regarded as undesirable, by circulating different versions of the account of the murder. One of these forces, in particular, was Poland, for under the leadership of Konovalets the revolutionary fight for freedom had assumed an intensified character in the territories of West Ukraine which were occupied by Poland. For several weeks many Ukrainians regarded it as very probable that Konovalets had been murdered by the Poles, until it finally became known that the parcel containing "documents" which had exploded and killed Colonel Konovalets had been handed to him personally by an agent who posed as the courier of the national revolutionary organization in Soviet Ukraine.

It was necessary for the Russians to choose a murderer of Ukrainian nationality for the simple reason that such a person was more likely to gain the confidence of his victim and be able to establish personal contact with him, a fact which made it easier to carry out the murder later on. The very fact that the agent who posed as a courier of a fictitious or real underground organization was of Ukrainian nationality, can be regarded as a negative for a revolutionary organization and as an advantage for Moscow, since in this way the impression could be created that the OUN had no check whatever on the agents who wormed their way into its ranks. Indeed, after Konovalets' death reproaches to this effect were voiced by certain Ukrainian opportunist groups who did not approve of the form of the revolutionary national liberation movement in the underground.

The suspicion that the Poles and not the Russians had murdered Konovalets was short-lived. After a time the Soviet Russians began to circulate a new version with various variations, according to which Konovalets had been murdered by the Germans with the aid of one of his co-workers. The Russians did not even bother about the fact that this new version was contradiction of their previous propagandist lies, according to which Konovalets had been an ally and also an agent and a hireling of Hitler. In this connection we should like to quote a passage from a Bolshevik book published in 1956:

"The first fatal blow was dealt the OUN in 1938; Soviet security organs discovered and destroyed the entire network of its underground cells in Ukraine. That same year Hitler and the Gestapo leaders decided that the OUN ringleader Konovalets knew too many secrets of the German government and that he had so many international contacts that it would in future be difficult to hold their own against him. For this reason they gave instructions that a special "present" was to be sent to Konovalets, who at that time was attending a congress of Ukrainian nationalists in Rotterdam (Holland).

At the entrance of the hall in which the congress was being held, one of Konovalets' co-workers, a trustworthy Gestapo agent, handed him a parcel with the remark that it was intended for him personally. When Konovalets opened it, the bomb inside it exploded and tore him to pieces. Thus Konovalets became the "martyr" of the Ukrainian

“nationalist” movement. High-ranking Nazi personalities later said quite openly and candidly: “After his death Konovalts became more useful to us than he had been during his lifetime.”

Konovalts’ death at the hand of one of his co-workers was no exception.”*)

Here for once the Bolsheviks were right. For the case of such a Bolshevik lie was indeed no exception! It was repeated again in 1961 on the occasion of unsuccessful agitation attempt made by Lippolz (alias Liebholz), who “testified” in East Berlin that Bandera, too, had been murdered by the Germans with the assistance of one of his own co-workers. We shall discuss this amazing lack of imagination and stereotype invention of lies later on. In the first place we should, however, like to rectify two lies of less importance: firstly, no congress of Ukrainian nationalists took place in Rotterdam. Konovalts went to Rotterdam alone, — by plane; secondly, Colonel Konovalts met Valyukh alone in a café as arranged, and for reasons of conspiracy there were no intermediaries and no witnesses with them, since the presence of several persons might have drawn the attention of enemy secret services to their meeting. Nor was the parcel handed to Konovalts by a middleman. After a short conversation Valyukh hurried out of the café and left the parcel which he had brought with him behind. Konovalts left immediately after him with the parcel in his hand and a few minutes later when he was in the street the time-bomb in the parcel exploded and killed him.

In the third case, the insidious murder of Stepan Bandera, the organization and arranging of the circumstances connected with this murder and all the perfidious Bolshevik intrigues will only be revealed in all detail when the trial is held. It is, however, clearly obvious from the data available so far that the attempt on Bandera’s life was planned as a secret murder without bombs, shots or any other traces of external violence or injuries, in order to create the impression of death from natural causes, namely heart-failure, an impression which the Bolsheviks succeeded in creating in the case of the murder of Lev Rebet in 1957. By murdering Bandera the Bolsheviks in the first place wanted to liquidate the leader of the liberation movement, who was a danger to them, and in the second place to create an unhealthy atmosphere of suspicion against all those in any way concerned with his mysterious death and to circulate various misleading versions of what had happened. Several attempts on Bandera’s life were prepared by the Bolsheviks in the years prior to his death but they were always frustrated by the Ukrainian nationalists or by the police. Only one of these plans points to a different manner of carrying out the murder, namely to the same manner in which Petlura was murdered. The crime was to be committed by a fanatical Pole posing as a national avenger (like Schwarzbart) of the wrongs which the Polish people have allegedly suffered at the hands of Bandera’s supporters. But the Bolsheviks

*) V. Byelyayev — M. Rudnytsky: “Under Foreign Banners,” Kyiv, 1956, p. 36.

abandoned this plan and decided in favour of an extremely unsuspecting form of murder so as not to arouse the indignation of the Ukrainian people against themselves and not to destroy their halo as philanthropists amongst the colonial peoples and as humane anti-Stalinists amongst the Western snobs.

When the post-mortem examination, however, revealed traces of poison in the body of the victim, a whole avalanche of different explanations and versions started moving, all of which were advantageous for Moscow since they cast suspicion on others and diverted it from Moscow.

The version which persisted longest was the one that Bandera had committed suicide for political or personal reasons. A Swiss weekly even published a whole series of freely invented reports about a grim massacre in the national revolutionary underground movement and about unsuccessful insurrections in Ukraine, which had allegedly driven Bandera to despair and to suicide. Another version affirmed that one of the secretaries in Bandera's office, who shortly before his death had been with him in town when he bought in fruit, had given him the poison. Although police investigations ascertained nothing suspicious in this connection, a Ukrainian monthly published in Chicago (USA) stated that a case was being built up against this secretary by the public prosecution, a fact which was however denied by the latter. At the same time rumours were circulated in the USA to the effect that the leading members of the Units Abroad of the OUN had been arrested. The Bolshevik agencies spread rumours that Bandera had been murdered by the Americans; whilst shady sources expressed the opinion that the murder had been committed by the British. In certain circles the suspicion was also voiced that the Germans had had a hand in the poisoning of Bandera. A new version, imported from the USA, circulated amongst the Ukrainians in Europe for a time; according to this version, a leading member of the OUN, who many years previously had been sent to Ukraine by Bandera, had returned to Germany and had been seen in Munich two weeks before the murder. It was alleged that he had met Bandera secretly and had either prepared the murder or else carried it out himself. All these and various other versions, figments of imagination or propaganda lies, which were intended to create an atmosphere of cold war, pursued one single aim: namely to undermine and discredit the firm conviction held by Bandera's adherents since the day of his death that he had been murdered by Soviet agents. With the arrest of Stashynsky this conviction was corroborated and all the rumours and intentional misrepresentations circulated hitherto were refuted for all time.

When the Soviet Russians learnt that the murderer had escaped from their clutches, they staged an unsuccessful "press conference" with Lippolz (alias Liebholz) in East Berlin, after having racked their brains for a month. But in this way they only incriminated and compromised themselves still more. In order to simplify this urgent matter, the Bolsheviks based this new agitation on their old hackneyed

version, according to which attempts on the lives of leading Ukrainian personalities are carried out by the Germans with the assistance of the Ukrainian nationalists. The plan on which the Bolsheviki based their agitation campaign in the case of the murders of Konovalets and Bandera can be summed up in certain identical facts, and if we substitute the name Bandera for that of Konovalets and the word "poison" for "time-bomb," we have in brief the following scheme, as conceived by the Bolsheviki:

<u>Gestapo</u>	decides to liquidate	<u>Konovalets</u>	because
<u>Oberländer</u>		<u>Bandera</u>	
he knows too much about the secrets		of the Reichs government.	
		of his "crimes."	

<u>Gestapo</u>	through one of its trustworthy agents and
<u>Secret service Gehlen</u>	
co-workers of <u>Konovalets</u>	hands him the <u>parcel</u>
<u>Bandera</u>	<u>lunch</u> intended
for him personally.	

When <u>Konovalets</u>	accepted the <u>parcel</u>	he was killed by <u>the bomb.</u>
<u>Bandera</u>	<u>lunch</u>	<u>the poison.</u>

The lower lines of this scheme show only too plainly that in the case of Bandera the Soviet Russians were obliged to quote additional proof in order to emphasize the probability of their lying inventions:

1) that Oberländer had committed some criminal act or other and had let Bandera into this secret;

2) that Bandera ate a poisoned lunch which was handed to him by one of Oberländer's agents and co-workers.

On what did the Bolsheviki base the credibility of their lies? They invented corresponding legends and intrigues on a large scale.

LEGENDS ABOUT THE CRIMES OF OBERLÄNDER, SHUKHEVYCH AND THE UKRAINIAN LEGION

As regards the "crimes" of Oberländer, the Soviet Russians circulated the accusation that the mass-murders of prisoners, who had been arrested by the Bolsheviki and were murdered by them in the prisons of Lviv (Lemberg) prior to their retreat in 1941, were committed by the Ukrainian "Nightingale" battalion of volunteers. The latter, according to the Soviet Russians, were under the command of Shukhevych and Oberländer, who entered the town at the same time as the German forces. The Russians demanded that Oberländer, since he was a "war-criminal," should be removed from his post as Minister in the German Federal government, and, indeed, after a time their request was successful. In their aggressive propaganda

they then continued for some time to quote the testimony of "witnesses" who corroborated these accusations. The political purpose of this lying campaign was obvious: the blame for the crimes committed by Moscow was to be cast on the German Federal Minister as a war-criminal and on the Nazis who had gone into hiding, as well as on Shukhevych and the Ukrainian Legion, as hirelings of Hitler.

In order to investigate these accusations an International Investigatory Committee "Lemberg 1941," which consisted of former members of the resistance movements against the Hitler regime in Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and Switzerland, was formed in The Hague on December 27, 1959. This Committee, consisted of 5 members, heard testimony by 232 witnesses, who made their statements under oath, and carefully investigated the incriminating material and the said testimonies. The Committee ascertained that on June 22, 1941, the Soviet Russian security authorities (NKVD) carried out the arrest of thousands of persons of various nationalities who were regarded as politically untrustworthy. Since it was impossible to transfer the persons who had been arrested to the east territories owing to the collapse of the Soviet transport system, the leaders of the NKVD groups on June 24, 1941, received orders over the radio from Nikita S. Khrushchov personally that all the political prisoners were to be killed and the criminal prisoners to be released. As was unanimously corroborated by all the witnesses who testified before the above-mentioned Committee, these orders were carried out by the NKVD units in the prisons of Lviv and other towns in West and Central Ukraine during the last few days before the Soviet troops retreated. Prior to the entry of the German troops and the Ukrainian Legion under the command of Shukhevych and Oberländer, the latter as liaison officer of the German High Command, the inhabitants of Lviv discovered the corpses of murdered prisoners in the prisons, which were no longer guarded. Many of them recognized their relatives amongst the prisoners who had been murdered, and Shukhevych also found the body of his brother, who had been arrested by the Bolsheviks, there.

The legend of the crimes committed by the Ukrainian Legion against the prisoners proved to be a flagrant lie. Oberländer did not carry out the massacre, nor did he have any opportunity to cooperate with Bandera, for Bandera did not belong to the Ukrainian Legion. Hence, Bandera could not have been initiated into the "secret plans of destruction" of Oberländer. When the Bolsheviks were murdering the prisoners, Bandera was not in Lviv at all but behind the German front lines, and during the entry of the Ukrainian Legion into the town of Lviv Bandera was already under police surveillance in Cracow, where he was neither in a position to escape nor to see the murdered prisoners in Lviv.

These facts which are ignored or overlooked by the Soviet Russians refute their theory that Oberländer intended to liquidate Bandera since he was the only person in the West who was in the know as regards the secret of the alleged crimes committed by Oberländer.

LIPPOLZ' SPECULATIONS ON THE POISONING OF BANDERA

The Lippolz affair was more or less only a continuation of the previous legend. The technical execution of Oberländer's orders to murder Bandera, so it was alleged, was undertaken by the Gehlen secret service, which in any case wanted to settle up with Bandera since he was said to be in contact with the British and refused to collaborate with the Germans. The Gehlen secret service allegedly gave Lippolz orders to poison Bandera, but when Lippolz failed to worm his way into the circles most closely connected with Bandera, the German secret service, at Lippolz' advice, passed on these orders to someone who was closely connected with Bandera, namely Myskiv, who allegedly carried them out and then died five months later.

The political aim of this legend is the same as that of the previous one: to represent someone else as the guilty party instead of Moscow, to foster hostility between the Ukrainians and the Germans, and at the same time to create the suspicion that there are agents of foreign secret services in the leading circles of the OUN.

The Bolshevik agitators were not in the least concerned by the fact that this version was a contradiction of the other versions circulated by their propaganda only a few months earlier, according to which the OUN was to cease collaboration with the British and act as agents for the German secret service. They considered it necessary to impute to the German secret service other motives apart from the less credible motive harboured by Oberländer, namely that he wanted to settle up with Bandera, a tale the validity of which could not be ascertained by readers who were not thoroughly acquainted with Bolshevik propaganda.

The entire legend is based on the testimony of one single person, the old Bolshevik agent Lippolz, whom the Russians sent to Munich and who, during the years 1953 to 1957, was to worm his way into the circles connected with Bandera for the purpose of poisoning him. He was also to collect information about other Ukrainian political groups. But in inventing this legend the Russians committed three fatal errors:

- 1) they overlooked the fact that Lippolz had long since been exposed as a Bolshevik agent by the Ukrainian nationalists and that they were keeping a check on him;

- 2) they imputed the handing of the poison to Bandera in his lunch to the late Myskiv, who at the time of the murder was in Rome. And they completely overlooked the fact that Bandera on the day of his death did not have his lunch in the office canteen but was on his way home for that purpose;

- 3) they accused certain persons of having "murdered" the Bolshevik agent Skob, who in 1956 was recalled to the USSR, and mentioned the names of three Ukrainian nationalists, regardless of

the fact that two of them at the time of his return to the USSR were serving sentences in a German prison, and the third person was in Italy.

BOLSHEVIST DEFAMATION TACTICS

Soviet Russian defamation of the Ukrainian liberation movement, its leading personalities and members, to which method the Russians resort in order to cover up their own crimes, either already committed or planned, is by no means an invention of recent years. Since the Russian-Ukrainian war and the first occupation of Ukraine by Soviet Russia, practically every Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Communist Party of Ukraine decrees measures and directives for the Party and administrative apparatus in order to combat Ukrainian nationalism as a "counter-revolutionary force," as the "enemy" of the "people," which serves the interests of the "capitalistic states." In this propaganda campaign, which has been going on for years, the unscrupulous application of lies, half-lies and the misrepresentation of facts and events has become a firmly established habit with the Bolshevik agitators. Nor do they need to fear any opposition or refutation of their lies, since every opponent is only too well aware that he himself will be branded as an "enemy of the people" if he undertakes such an attempt. There is an old Ukrainian saying — "to lie like a Russian," which participators in meetings and readers of the Bolshevik press undoubtedly repeat to themselves or in confidential circles as soon as the applause has died away and the proclamations of obligations and of homage for the "wise" Party leaders have ceased.

The typical stereotyped methods of Bolshevik lying propaganda, which have been practised for years, and other vile methods resorted to in Ukraine and elsewhere include the following:

- 1) the casting of blame for the failure of thoughtless and impracticable economic plans, drawn up by the Party leaders, onto Party functionaries of lower rank, and the reproach of negligence, damage or even sabotage which is uttered against the proletariat, subjugated by the Bolsheviks;

- 2) compulsory obligations for the workers to carry out higher quotas of work in order to exploit their labour-power, to engage in financial self-taxation to the state in the form of state loans or investment capital out of the income of the industrial concerns, etc., merely for illusory promises that in five years' time, that is to say after the completion of the Five-Year Plan, there will be a considerable improvement in the standard of living;

- 3) the propagation of atheism and contempt of the traditions of the Church, as well as the destruction and desecration of churches;

- 4) the falsification of history and the organizing of mass anniversaries and jubilees for the purpose of singing the praises of Ukrainian political and cultural personalities, whose attitude and whose works are falsely represented as pro-Russian;

5) the constant dissemination of defamations and misinformation regarding the policy, social and economic conditions, and military plans of individual Western and non-Communist states, and, at the same time, the arrogant and exaggerated eulogizing of the military strength and achievements of the "socialist" construction in the USSR and in other Communist states;

6) the concealment of their plans of aggression, war and subversion in foreign states by means of the usual fairytale about defending those who have been deprived of their rights, exploited, attacked or threatened by the capitalists and colonial rulers;

7) the systematic defamation of the Ukrainian national liberation movement and its leading personalities, together with the constantly repeated allegation that Soviet Ukraine, thanks to the help of Soviet Russia, is now an independent and sovereign state.

The following examples will serve to illustrate the manner in which the Bolsheviks seek to defame the Ukrainian national liberation movement.

In the years 1917 to 1921, Lenin was already alarmed lest the advocates of an independent Ukraine should try to break the "brotherly ties" between the Ukrainian and the Russian people. Even in those days Russian Bolshevik propaganda was already accusing the government of Ukraine (the Central Council) in Kyiv of serving German and Austrian interests. The setting up of the Ukrainian Legion in Galicia (the Ukrainian Sich infantry) in 1914 and of Ukrainian military units in 1917, consisting of Ukrainians who had been taken prisoner-of-war by the Austrians and who until then had served in the Russian tsarist army and now wanted to take part as volunteers in the fight for freedom of Ukraine against tsarist Russia (the Grey Division), is to this day still designated by the Bolsheviks as "agents' service" on the part of these Ukrainian patriots. At the same time, however, they take good care to keep silent about the fact that the German secret service enabled Lenin to return to Petersburg and they draw no conclusions regarding any agent's activity, dependence or collaboration on the part of Lenin with the German secret service.

A fierce Russian Bolshevik attack was, incidentally, launched against Hetman Pavlo Skoropadsky in those days, who was alleged to be a German agent simply because he continued to cooperate politically and militarily with the Germans in order to protect Ukraine against Russian Bolshevik annexation. But they also made similar accusations regarding agents' activity for the Germans in the case of Skoropadsky's opponents, who were trying in vain to find allies for Ukraine in England and France. It has become an established and evil habit of the Bolsheviks to brand every Ukrainian politician, who has tried either successfully or unsuccessfully to win friends for Ukraine and for its fight for freedom against Soviet Russia, as an agent in the secret service of the foreign state in question. In the course of time the Russians have also begun to spread accusations and defamations about the Ukrainian politicians who carried on the fight

for freedom in Ukraine against the foreign occupation forces (Poland, Nazi Germany), and have affirmed that they were agents of the secret service of these very occupation powers which were persecuting them, — an allegation which could not be more untrue and illogical.

Forty-eight years have passed since the first world war, when the Ukrainian fighting forces were organized and liberated Ukraine from tsarist Russia. Both Russian monarchist and, later, Russian Bolshevik propagandists have endeavoured up to the present time to defame the soldiers who belonged to the ranks of the Sich infantry (USS), of the "Grey Division" and of the Ukrainian National Republic Army (UNR Army) of the years 1917-1920 and to brand them as "pogrom instigators" or agents of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

True to the Russian stereotyped way of thinking, the Bolsheviks defame the legion commanded by General Shukhevych 21 years ago as a unit which was in the service of the Nazis as an agent, in spite of the fact that this legion was disbanded by the Nazis and then became an insurgent anti-Nazi army under the leadership of General Shukhevych. The Bolsheviks try to thrust the responsibility for the massacres which they themselves committed onto this unit.

For fifty years the Bolsheviks have been repeating the same old hackneyed lies and defamations, which for the past decades have been directed in particular against the Ukrainian patriots in the ranks of the OUN, and since they murdered Stepan Bandera they have been trying to defame the OUN and UPA as hirelings of various Western secret services and as the perpetrators of vile atrocities committed against the Ukrainian people.

Such falsehood and defamations are not unusual in the East.

The same category of thought, the same methods of mendacity and defamation, which have been applied by Russia during the past fifty years, have also served her as a "weapon" for centuries, in particular whenever Russia was discovered red-handed in the act of committing a crime.

Under the volley of defamatory Bolshevik propagandist, which in accordance with the Russian custom is based on falsehoods, the trial against the murderer of Bandera is approaching. During the Paris trial in 1927 the Bolsheviks successfully applied their tactics of defaming the highest representative of the Ukrainian state, Symon Petlura. And the strategic plan of the defence of Schwarzbart was based on these tactics. The attention of the court was diverted from the murderer and from those who had commissioned him to commit this crime and was directed to an account of the atrocities which occurred here and there in Ukraine contrary to Petlura's orders and measures and as a result of the revolutionary chaos in that country. Instead of accusing the murderer and summoning those who had commissioned him to perpetrate the crime, before the court, the plaintiffs representing the widow of the victim, Symon Petlura, were obliged to defend the latter against the defamatory accusations made regarding his responsibility and participation in the said atrocities.

Thirty-six years have elapsed since the murder of Petlura. In 1962 the Bolsheviks will now stand accused before a court of a free Western state a second time on account of a political murder committed abroad. This fact alone is an embarrassing political exposure and disgrace for them before the rest of the world. How do the insidious Russian murderers intend to get out of this difficulty?

By means of a lie, of course. And according to the old watchword: "Moscow is never to blame for a crime. The others are always to blame." Who are "the others"? As usual, — those to blame are their murdered victim and his adherents, or those in whose country the trial is to be held in which the Russian Bolshevik murderers are the accused. This latter manoeuvre is a blackmail manoeuvre, intended as discouragement, to prevent an objective judgement from being pronounced.

The big propaganda campaign of the years 1961-62, the aim of which has been to defame Bandera and his organization regarding the alleged vile atrocities in Ukraine and abroad, indicates that on this occasion, too, the Bolsheviks would like to repeat the strategic plan to which they resorted 25 years ago. Once again the attention of the court is to be diverted from the murder that has been committed. In the Stashynsky trial the plaintiffs are to be occupied in refuting the stories and defamations invented by the Bolsheviks. If this plan does not succeed, then the Western press is to be misled, at least for a short time, by the lies blared forth to the world by agitators such as Lippolz, Verhun and others.

In the course of the 36 years that have elapsed since the Paris trial, the world has become more closely acquainted with Moscow's insidious methods of deception and mendacity than was the case in those days. The documentary reports on the fight of the Ukrainian underground movement supplement this experience by means of facts which are not well known enough in the West but nevertheless suffice to show the world the true character of Bolshevism with the mask off.

* * *

These three murders committed in the West by Soviet agents against three leaders of the Ukrainian liberation movement complete the series of victims and should prompt the leading statesmen of the free world to ponder over the manner in which they can successfully combat Soviet Russian terrorism in their states, even though the victims are only foreigners. The West, lulling itself in its freedom and prosperity, has not drawn adequate conclusions as regards itself from the grim experience of the peoples subjugated by Russia.

In the countries which it occupies Moscow carries out mass and individual murders, either openly and brutally, or under the guise of a sham legality. Conditions are either created which result in a slow death in the places of exile to which people are deported, or else Moscow disposes of the persons whom it considers a danger by means of treacherous murders. The West is aware of these facts but

it keeps silent about them, no doubt because it wrongly assumes that to call Moscow to account before an international tribunal for its cynical and constant violations of the convention of human rights behind the Iron Curtain would be equivalent to an "intervention in the internal affairs" of the Soviet Union. On the other hand, however, Moscow does not fear such reproaches on the part of the West. It uses the slightest unrest and cases of strikes in the West as an opportunity to make hysterical accusations against the West without bothering to consider whether such tactics might perhaps be construed as intervention in foreign affairs or not.

Since "socialist legality" was introduced with considerable publicity there have been no statistics whatever on the rate of mortality of Soviet subjects as a result of sudden "heart attacks." Moscow is in no hurry to announce these figures. But who can guarantee whether the poison pistol invented by the MVD, the existence of which has now by chance become known in the West, is not being turned out in serial production and being used on a large-scale in the Soviet Union, too, against persons whom Moscow considers to be a political danger?

The discovery that this insidious weapon is used by the Bolsheviks provides the West with a unique opportunity to take sides with the enemies of Soviet Russian rule for whom "socialist legality" is no protection against the murders perpetrated by the Soviet state organs.

The cunning form of Soviet Russian terrorism applied in a free state of the West, which has been exposed by Stashynsky's confession, is a further warning to those who are willing to comprehend it. The penalties provided for by law in many of the democratic states are an inadequate deterrent against the Soviet Russian terrorists, agents and spies, together with their accomplices, who undermine public law and order and spy out the state secrets of the free world.

An attack against the colonial system and against the subjugation of the peoples in the USSR, as well as the calling to account of the Soviet rulers before the free world for every crime that is exposed would be a more effective means of undermining the power of the enemy and exposing him than the denials and rectifications which the West has practised so far as regards Bolshevik accusations and defamations.

The trial of Stashynsky, the murderer of Bandera, is to be held in the very near future. On this occasion the West will be reminded once more of the fact that Bandera is already the third victim of the Soviet Russian terrorism directed against the most prominent Ukrainian freedom fighters, but, above all, the question will be raised as to why Moscow for decades has felt that it is threatened by the fight for freedom of the Ukrainian people and why Ukraine — a factor of strength which is underestimated by the West — is such a danger to Moscow.

Symon Petlura (1879-1926)

Supreme Commander of the Ukrainian Army
and President of the Ukrainian National Republic

by Dr. Mykola Kovalevsky

CRUCIAL EVENTS

Three significant events in the modern history of Ukraine reveal the dramatic dynamic quality of this nation. About the middle of the 17th century, the Ukrainian national revolt, led by the powerful Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, seriously undermined the regime of the Polish kingdom and of the Muscovite tsardom which had predominated in Eastern Europe up to that time, and set up the state organization of Ukraine in the form of a sovereign Kozak (Cossack) state. In addition to Moscow and Warsaw, Kyiv (Kiev) now also became a political centre, the importance of which lay in the restoration of the national traditions of Ukraine and in the fact that it linked up with the continuity of the principality of Kyiv which came into existence in the 9th century.

At the end of the 18th century, the armies of the Empress Catherine II destroyed the last Ukrainian military base — the Zaporozhian Sich — on the lower Dnipro (Dnieper). Thus, Ukraine's military resistance was finally broken and the last remnants of Ukraine's state autonomy were abolished by a decree issued by the Empress.

In the course of the 19th century, a process of cultural revival among the nationally conscious element of Ukraine took place, and, despite subjection by Russia and the Russification measures which were enforced, the liberation movements came into existence which at various times in the 19th century led to revolutionary insurrections on the part of the Ukrainian people and paved the way for the general revolt of the Ukrainians and the national revolution in 1917. In connection with this latter event the complete independence and sovereignty of the Ukrainian people was proclaimed and the Ukrainian state was restored in the form of the Ukrainian National Republic. The starting-point for this third important period in the history of Ukraine were the ideological principle propagated by the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (RUP), which was founded at the end of the 19th century and from whose ranks came the man whose name is inseparably connected with the National Revolution of Ukraine and with the formation of the Ukrainian National Republic, — Symon Petlura.

Born of a lower middle-class family in 1879, in the old Ukrainian town of Poltava, Symon Petlura at the age of twenty joined the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party and began to play an important part in secret circles. Whilst still a pupil at the priests' seminary in Poltava, that is to say in the 1890's, he had already organized a Ukrainian youth movement to fight for the liberation of Ukraine. For this reason he was persecuted by the school authorities and in the end was forced to leave the seminary.

Even in his youth he realized that the only means by which his fellow-countrymen could attain national freedom were a revolutionary upheaval and the overthrow of the imperial power of tsarist Russia. The fierce insurrections on the part of the Ukrainian peasants, which during the years from 1902 to 1904 assumed the form of a revolution in the province of Poltava and which were directed against the national and social subjection of Ukraine and, in particular, against the exploitation of the Ukrainian people by the Russian tsarist empire, made a deep and lasting impression on the young Petlura. His work in the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party assumed a deeper significance and gave him a sense of moral satisfaction. He became an extremely active organizer; he started new secret circles in the remotest districts of the extensive province of Poltava, and his name was soon well-known in other parts of Ukraine, too. When revolutionary upheavals threatened to undermine the tsarist empire, after Russia lost the war against Japan, and signs of the inevitable downfall of Russia's imperial power became more and more obvious, Petlura moved to Kyiv, which was the centre of all the groups of the Ukrainian liberation movement. Here he began to publish an ideological journal which appeared as the central organ of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party.

The Revolutionary Ukrainian Party founded at the end of the 19th century was a central organization of all national Ukrainian elements, who in an informative publication proclaimed as their aim the independence of Ukraine. As the Ukrainian liberation movement increased in size, differences of political thought began to make themselves felt. Various separate trends were formed, including the social democratic wing which predominated in the RUP. The old revolutionary organization, the RUP, was disbanded and in its stead three political parties were founded, — the Social Democratic Party, the Social Revolutionary Party, and a moderate bourgeois party, the Ukrainian Radical Democratic Party. Despite this differentiation all three parties were in agreement as regards the vital questions of Ukrainian policy; they only differed in their tactics and in their treatment of the social and political problems of Ukraine, but always remained true to the fundamental aim of the liberation movement, — the national independence of Ukraine and the rebirth of the nation, the revival and regeneration of all spheres of cultural, political and economic life, the development of all national forces in connection

with Western culture in general and the progress of mankind, in which respect Ukraine was to represent an important factor in the East. All these aims predominated equally in all three political parties.

PETLURA VERSUS LENIN

The first problem with which Symon Petlura had to deal as a leading member of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party was the question of Ukraine's relations with the Social Democratic Party of Russia, which at that time (1904 to 1905) was divided in two camps (the Bolsheviks led by Lenin and the Mensheviks led by Plekhanov). Both these trends were, however, in agreement as regards the Ukrainian problem; they both opposed the liberation aims of the Ukrainian people on the grounds that the working class should be united and centrally organized in order to fight against tsarist power. It was emphasized that recognition of the national principle in the workers' party and movement might lead to the partition and weakening of the same, especially in view of the fact that the important industrial centres of Ukraine in this case would be outside the sphere of influence of the Russian Social Democratic Party. Lenin and Plekhanov even went so far in their objections as to brand a modest formula of self-government as "pernicious particularism." Petlura resolutely opposed this attitude on the part of the Russian Socialists and in this connection used those famous words, "The social freedom of a nation cannot be achieved without national liberation." In countless articles Petlura, on the other hand, exposed the imperial tendencies of the Russian Socialists who wanted to preserve the imperial unity of Russia after the Revolution. He conducted a fierce fight against this trend and soon succeeded in mobilizing public opinion and, in particular, the working class in Ukraine, and in eliminating the influence of the Russian socialist parties in Ukraine. The ideological principles which he formulated at that time prove beyond all doubt that, in the first place, he considered the complete liberation of the nation to be an indispensable precondition of social progress and that this was his watchword in leading the Ukrainian masses into the political battle against Muscovite imperialism in its tsarist, socialist or liberal democratic form. From his headquarters in Kyiv he toured the industrial areas of Ukraine and organized workers' movements, held lectures and issued instructions. Actually, all the political parties of Russia, irrespective of whether they represented socialist or bourgeois trends, opposed Ukraine's liberation aims and advocated the preservation of the imperial unity of Russia. But in spite of this opposition the activity of the Ukrainian national forces in all spheres of public life continued to increase. Petlura's power and authority was no longer confined to the doctrinaire limits of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party, but was now recognized by other political groups.

At that time, that is to say during the years from 1904 to 1906, he was already acknowledged as the authorized spokesman of the Ukrainian liberation movement. He devoted himself above all to the ideological education and training of the younger generation and the broad masses, i.e. the workers and peasants, for he was of the opinion that the Ukrainian liberation movement required a firm social and political basis and that the strengthening of the national consciousness of the workers and peasants was an essential prerequisite for success in the fight for the freedom of Ukraine. When, in 1910, Russian reprisal measures reached their climax under the rule of the "strong man" of the tsarist empire, Stolypin, Petlura, too, was obliged to leave his native country in order to avoid being arrested. He went to Moscow where he managed to get a small post in the cooperative organization. But here, too, he continued his political activity, and founded the "Kobzar" movement in the large Ukrainian community in Moscow. When all Ukrainian publications were prohibited in Kyiv Petlura began to publish a Ukrainian journal in Russian, the "Ukrainskaya Zhizn"; in a series of brilliant articles which appeared in this journal he and various other leading men of Ukraine voiced their country's claim to state independence and national freedom.

WAR AND REVOLUTION

During the war (1914-1918) Symon Petlura likewise continued his political activity, in particular in those sectors of the fighting front in which thousands of Ukrainian soldiers and officers were being used by the tsarist government in hopeless combat against the Central Powers. It was obvious to everyone that the tsarist empire would not survive this war and that it would be fundamentally destroyed by a revolution. Petlura foresaw the imminent upheaval. He instructed his confidential agents in all sectors of the front lines, which had already come to a standstill, to organize a secret movement of all the Ukrainian soldiers so that Ukraine would not be caught unprepared when matters came to a head. The extent of this organizing activity can be realized if one recalls to mind the fact that the tsarist army included as many as three million Ukrainian soldiers who were stationed in the front fighting lines in various sectors of the extended front. By February 1917, that is on the eve of the big revolution, Petlura had centralized all the groups of the Ukrainian liberation movement in the army. Petlura and his supporters were inspired by the vision of a free Ukraine and an independent state, by the idea of the complete development of the nation and its forces in the sphere of national culture, politics and economy, a development which was to be in keeping with the historical traditions of the country. The fateful turning-point in the East was rapidly approaching...

A convinced democrat and opponent of every form of violence whose convictions and attitude to life and the world in general had to some extent been determined by the atmosphere of idealism which still prevailed at the end of the 19th century, Petlura was a man

with a certain amount of political experience when the revolution broke out at the end of February, 1917, and the tsarist empire collapsed. Objectively and realistically he assessed the situation which ensued after the downfall of the Russian empire. The new men in power in Russia, Prince Lvov, Milyukov, Kerensky, Chernov, and, later on, Trotsky and Lenin — who represented all the political trends in the new Russia, were determined to suppress the Ukrainian liberation movement by force. The only difference between them was their individual conception of the tactical problems involved and in the reasons they gave for their hostile attitude concerning the Ukrainian question. And in this respect Lenin, for instance, resorted to more adaptable tactics than Milyukov or Kerensky.

IN THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENT UKRAINE

In view of Russia's united opposition to Ukraine, Petlura proclaimed the principle of the national consolidation of the Ukrainians with all its subsequent consequences. He devoted himself whole-heartedly to the task of organizing and setting up the first military units of the new Ukrainian fighting forces. Within two months after the February Revolution he became the chief of the so-called General Committee of the army which fulfilled the important function of a general staff. With his **haydamaky** he stormed the arsenal of Kyiv which had been seized by Bolshevik troops and crushed the revolt incited in the town by Lenin. Petlura's speedy action on this occasion proved a decisive step inasmuch as it helped to stabilize the development of the Ukrainian State. Thanks to his untiring activity as the leader of the army, the Central Rada of Ukraine was able to proclaim the historic resolution of the sovereignty and independence of the Ukrainian National Republic at the crucial moment, namely on January 22, 1918. The national popularity and power which Petlura enjoyed at that time was amazing; for instance, a rumour that Petlura was approaching with his troops was enough to destroy the morale and discipline of the Bolshevik units. For this reason Lenin was obliged to send out strong detachments of the Soviet Russian Army from Moscow and Leningrad against the Ukrainian National Republic and to make a formal declaration of war, despite the fact that his government had recognized the independence of Ukraine in a previous proclamation. Lenin's original plan to start a Bolshevik revolution in Ukraine proved impracticable, and the Russian army, under the red flag of Communism, accordingly advanced from the north, crossed the Ukrainian frontier, and proceeded to set up soviets in keeping with the Russian pattern in the occupied territories of Ukraine.

In these troubled times Symon Petlura revealed his outstanding ability and skill as a statesman who succeeded in overcoming all difficulties and leading his fellow-countrymen to national freedom and sovereignty with a firm hand. In December 1917, France and

Great Britain recognized the state independence of Ukraine de facto. Their example was followed by Italy and Roumania. In January 1918, the Central Powers — Germany and Austria-Hungary as well as Bulgaria and Turkey — recognized the independence of Ukraine de jure. The young Ukrainian National Republic now, for the first time, ventured into the field of international politics. Here, too, Symon Petlura proved a far-sighted politician. He was opposed to the idea of a one-sided alliance between Ukraine and any one of the belligerent powers, and, when Lenin created a new situation by sending a peace delegation to Brest Litovsk, he realized that by making separate peace treaties with the Central Powers Ukraine would have a chance to limit the sphere of influence of the Russian Soviet state to the ethnical Russian territories. On the other hand, however, he foresaw considerable difficulties and, by establishing contact with the French and British representatives, sought to neutralize the dangers of a one-sided alliance. In addition, he also carried on important negotiations with the representatives of the non-Russian peoples of the former tsarist empire who, after the October Revolution, had hastened to Kyiv in order to join forces with Ukraine in forming a bloc of democracy and freedom and putting up an effective resistance against the Russian Soviet dictatorship. Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Moslem Turkestan, the Crimean Tatars, Byelorussians, and Cossacks — all these peoples turned to Kyiv and, together with Ukraine, sought to safeguard their rights and their future. Petlura regarded the realization of this idea as the most important task to be achieved by Ukrainian policy. Later on, too, during the bitter years of his exile, he still considered this idea to be the basis for a joint liberation fight against Soviet Russian imperialism.

After the manifesto of April 29, 1918, when General Gröner supported the "assumption of power" by General Skoropadsky, Petlura resigned from active politics. His popularity, however, was so great that the Congress of the Municipal and Regional Administration of Ukraine which was held in Kyiv elected him as its president. At the same time, Skoropadsky had him arrested. But under pressure of public opinion he was released again two months later. When Skoropadsky issued a proclamation in November 1918, to the effect that a federation had been formed with Russia, Petlura as the head of the National Alliance of Ukraine marched to Kyiv with his troops. In an appeal addressed to the Ukrainian people he declared Skoropadsky's proclamation null and void and exhorted all Ukrainians to continue the fight for the freedom and national independence of Ukraine. The National Congress of Ukraine, which convened in Kyiv in January, 1919, confirmed the full power and authority of Petlura as the supreme head of the army (Holovnyy Otaman) and elected him as a member of the Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic, in which capacity he soon assumed the office of President. At the same time, the Congress proclaimed the union of Western Ukraine and the Ukrainian National Republic. By this union practically all

the Ukrainian territories were united into one independent state. The aim which Petlura had set himself in his youth in Poltava was thus achieved — Ukraine was free and independent and all branches of the Ukrainian people were united.

RUSSIAN AGGRESSION IN UKRAINE

But a new danger threatened from the north, from Russia. Soviet Russia once more resumed hostilities against Ukraine. And the Polish divisions which had been supplied with arms by France, on condition that they were only to be used against the Soviets, now began to advance on Western Ukraine. The strategic position of the Ukrainian Army was threatened still more owing to the fact that the Russian White Army under General Denikin, began an offensive in the south, the object of which was to restore the tsarist empire. The Major Powers — England and France — failed to assess the situation rightly and supported Denikin, since they regarded him as the future ruler of Russia.

It was an unequal struggle on three fronts, — in the north against Lenin, in the west against Poland, and in the south against Denikin. Under these circumstances Petlura decided to suggest an armistice to Marshal Pilsudski. At the end of September, he sent a special delegation to Warsaw which after lengthy negotiations signed an armistice with the Polish army command. Exactly seven months later, in April 1920, an alliance was signed by Poland and Ukraine. On the strength of this alliance, the joint Ukrainian and Polish armies advanced as far as the Dniro (Dnieper); but they were unable to check the offensive of Marshal Tukhachevsky's troops and were compelled to retreat to Poland. It was only when Tukhachevsky had almost reached Warsaw that he was eventually repulsed after a fierce combat. The reason for the failure of the Ukrainian and Polish armies lay in the attitude which had been adopted by the Polish generals, headed by Sikorski; they opposed Petlura's order that all Ukrainians of military age should be mobilized, and refused to supply the latter with arms. They were afraid lest the army commanded by Petlura, once it had been reinforced by fresh troops from Ukraine, might be superior in strength and numbers, a fact which might then have certain unfavourable results in Western Ukraine. Poland then terminated its alliance with Ukraine by signing a peace treaty with the Soviet government in Riga in 1921. The political clauses of the Warsaw alliance of April 1920 were thus rendered invalid, a fact which proved of importance as regards the future development of relations between Ukraine and Poland. During the years from 1920 to 1921, Petlura endeavoured to round up and centralize all the numerous active units of insurgents in Ukraine. Advancing from Western Ukraine, an expeditionary corps of his troops broke through the Soviet front and for a whole year carried on operations in the central Ukrainian territories under the command of General

Omelyanovych-Pavlenko. For several more years the Ukrainian insurrections continued. The Soviet government was eventually forced to concentrate large troop units in Ukraine in order to ensure the forcible incorporation of Ukraine with the Soviet Union. In 1928, when the Red Army was reorganized by Tukhachevsky, 34 infantry divisions of this army were stationed in Ukraine. The Soviet military potential was thus tied down in Ukraine, a fact which made all expansion westwards on the part of the Soviet Union impossible.

CHAMPION OF THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE

Long after Symon Petlura had gone into exile and was living in Paris, armed resistance broke out again and again in his name in Ukraine. Indeed, even today his name is still regarded by the Ukrainian masses as the symbol of the fight for freedom, as the principle of a just reorganization of the East, and as a sign of the future regeneration of forty million Ukrainians in the free world. When thirty-six years ago, in May 1926, Symon Petlura was murdered by a Soviet agent in Paris, the rulers of the Kremlin were firmly convinced that his death would mean the end of the Ukrainian liberation movement. But they overlooked the fact that a noble idea cannot be killed even though the original advocate and champion of the idea may die. One of these rulers of the Kremlin, Mikoyan, had every reason to talk about the dangers of "Petlurism" at the 20th Party Congress, in February 1956; for even after thirty-six years the name of Symon Petlura is still, as far as the shaky "collective leadership" of the Soviet Union is concerned, an indication of an imminent revolution which will destroy the dictatorial power of the Soviets in Ukraine.



The Founder of the Revolutionary Liberation Movement

by Dmytro Shtykalo

EVHEN KONOVALETS IN THE WAR

Evhen Konovalets, who for seventeen years led the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement, appeared on the political stage in 1917. Ukraine, divided between the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires, was in the third year of the war. Millions of Ukrainians served in the Austrian and Russian armies. At the outbreak of the First World War Evhen Konovalets (born 1891 at Zashkiv, province of Lviv, in Western Ukraine) was called up and fought, as a lieutenant of the Austrian army, in the front line against the Russians. In April 1915 he was taken prisoner by the Russians. At the time of the outbreak of the March Revolution of 1917, started off by the Volhynian regiment, and after the overthrow of the Tsar, Konovalets was in a prisoner-of-war camp near Tsaritsyn (now known as Volgograd). After the March Revolution a national struggle for liberation flared up in the Russian-occupied part of Ukraine, which aimed at the creation of an independent Ukrainian state. The Ukrainian Central Council (Centralna Rada), the revolutionary parliament and the provisional government of Ukraine took over the leadership of this movement and on the 22nd of January 1918 an independent State was proclaimed in the central and eastern provinces of Ukraine.

After the first news of the revolution and some months before the restoration of the independent Ukrainian State Konovalets fled from the prisoner-of-war camp on the Volga and eventually reached Kyiv where he entered into the service of the newly-created independent State.

His extraordinary organising abilities, which he had already shown at school and university, in community and cultural activities, and most of all in the organisation of paramilitary Ukrainian youth associations, became fully apparent during his stay in Kyiv. Very soon he raised a battalion of West-Ukrainians who had been in Russian captivity as soldiers of the Austrian army, and this unit rapidly grew into an army corps by the enlistment of Ukrainians from the central and eastern provinces. Under the name of 'Sichovi Striltsi' (Sich riflemen) it became the best formation in the armed forces of the young Ukrainian state. Under the command of Colonel Konovalets the brave, well organised and highly disciplined Sich riflemen played a decisive role in the War of Liberation from 1918 to 1920. They distinguished themselves not only through bravery but

through a Ukrainian patriotism which set the welfare of the entire Ukraine — an independent state comprising all Ukrainian regions — above all regional interests. The 'Sichovi Striltsi' corps was the most faithful support of the Symon Petlura government in its fight against the Russian invaders and other enemies of Ukrainian unity and independence.

The name of Colonel Konovalets became familiar in the whole of Ukraine, and even abroad he was esteemed as a chivalrous soldier and as the commanding officer of one of the best military units of Ukraine.

After the failure of the Ukrainian struggle for liberation Colonel Konovalets and his Sich riflemen were interned by the Poles. In the spring of 1920 he succeeded in escaping from the camp and went abroad. He visited all the larger centres of Ukrainian emigration in Czechoslovakia, Austria and Germany. The vast majority of the emigrants were former members of the Ukrainian army who, after many vicissitudes, had gone abroad. Among them were comrades and close collaborators of Colonel Konovalets — members of the so-called Riflemen's Council.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE UVO

On the initiative and under the chairmanship of Colonel Konovalets a meeting of the Riflemen's Council was held at Prague in July 1920, at which he submitted to his comrades a plan for the continued fight for the ideal of a Ukrainian national state, a fight which now had to be carried on under the new conditions of enemy occupation of the country. According to this plan the methods to be employed were revolutionary underground activity and individual armed action. Colonel Konovalets proposed the setting-up of a Ukrainian Military Organisation (Ukrayins'ka Viys'kova Orhanizatsiya — UVO) which was to develop its activity in every region of Ukraine. The Council accepted this proposal.

After the failure of the Ukrainian War of Liberation of 1917-1921 the country was occupied by four neighbouring states: Russia, i.e. the USSR, Poland, Roumania and Czechoslovakia. The major part of Ukrainian territory, however, was occupied by Russia and annexed to it, and a regime of appalling terror was the consequence. Under the three other occupants the life of the Ukrainian people was full of troubles and persecution. However, these three countries, unlike bolshevist Russia, did not have at their disposal sufficient means and manpower which would have enabled them to suppress and exploit the Ukrainian people to the same extent.

The Ukrainian Military Organisation (UVO), led by Colonel Konovalets, began to organize itself in all regions of the quartered Ukraine. It had to adapt its activities to varying local conditions and circumstances. It also encouraged the formation of UVO cells among emigrants and appointed representatives in various countries.

The activity of the UVO gained its strongest impetus and widest expansion in the years 1921-1923 in the western regions of Ukraine which were under Polish occupation. At that time the occupation by Poland had not yet been legalised by the victorious powers. It was only made legal on 15th March, 1923, by the Council of Ambassadors with the proviso that the autonomy of Eastern Galicia should be ensured and the Convention for the protection of national minorities be respected. Eastern Galicia never did become autonomous; and the Convention about minorities was persistently circumvented and in the end unilaterally terminated by Poland on 13th September 1934.

The revolutionary activity of the UVO (armed attacks, acts of sabotage, liquidation of administrative institutions of the occupying power and their exponents, widespread agitation and propaganda) supported and strengthened the spirit of resistance among the broad masses of the Ukrainian people and demonstrated to the world the Ukrainian people's desire for freedom and independence.

At the same time resistance against the Russian-bolshevist occupation also increased and manifested itself in numerous armed risings in which members of the UVO actively participated. The revolutionary struggle of the Ukrainian people weakened and demoralised the enemy and at the same time stimulated the so-called 'organic sector' of Ukrainian life (culture, education, economy) which developed a purely national character.

Colonel Konovalets, the commanding officer of the UVO, had returned to Western Ukraine from abroad in June 1921 in order to take direct charge of the leadership and planning of UVO activities. For political and conspiratorial reasons he left the country again in the autumn and went into exile in the West from where he continued to direct UVO activities. As supreme commander and representative of the UVO, and thus the leader of the Ukrainian liberation struggle after the assassination of Petlura, Colonel Konovalets showed himself as an alert, energetic and versatile man of action.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ACTIVITY ABROAD

An organisation like the UVO had, of course, to provide for the proper administrative and military training of its cadres. Colonel Konovalets directed all his energy to this task and ensured that many Ukrainians, at home as well as abroad, received military instruction. Abroad, he not only supervised military training but took part in it. The trainees formed later on the nucleus of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) which was to play a decisive role in the Second World War.

Konovalets attached great importance to political journalism and propaganda both in Ukraine and on the international forum. Under his editorship appeared 'Surma' (Fanfare), the official UVO publication, secretly printed and distributed, in several tens of thousands of copies. 'Surma' played an important part in the spreading and

strengthening of the revolutionary spirit among the broad masses of the people and particularly among the Ukrainian youth.

Konovalets suggested the publication, in German, of the 'Ost-europäische Korrespondenz' (East-European Correspondence) which was published in 1924 in Berlin by the Committee of Subjugated Nations. The UVO in every way supported this sound publication, which appeared two to four times a month, by financial assistance and contributions from UVO members. The main objective of the 'Korrespondenz' was to supply information to foreign newspapers and political bodies about events in the Ukrainian territories, about the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people and about their history, culture and economy. Beside connections with the appropriate German departments, the 'Osteuropäische Korrespondenz' had contact with the accredited correspondents in Berlin of thirty European and non-European countries, and relations with the English, Lithuanians, Bulgarians and Croats were particularly friendly. Konovalets was also in permanent contact with Ukrainian organisations and newspaper editors in the United States. He also set great store by the publication of various writings on Ukraine and especially of material transmitted from the Ukraine. He took the initiative in organising Ukrainian press agencies in the capitals of some European countries. Apart from issuing its own periodical publications, the UVO stimulated the publications of several larger works.

Konovalets established close and important contact with leading politicians and statesmen of other countries and of the subjugated nations. With regard to their revolutionary underground nature these relations were carried on in secret and were kept confidential. No news of them reached the public and only very few members of the Ukrainian underground knew of them. Later on these contacts became all the more important when it came to the actualization of the Ukrainian struggle for liberation in the international field.

The UVO and Konovalets also kept in touch with leading representatives of the legal life in the Ukrainian homeland. Every initiative, every communal or political enterprise, which might be of advantage to the national struggle, was approved and supported by Konovalets and the UVO. This support was particularly evident during and after the so-called 'pacification' of the Western Ukraine by the Polish rulers in the year 1930. It is due to Konovalets that the world received news of this 'pacification' and that it was discussed at the League of Nations.

It is also due to him that the innumerable Ukrainian exiles in Europe and overseas rallied round the banner of the national liberation movement. In this way it was possible to present the Ukrainian problem to the world and to popularize it. At the same time the movement was given a sound financial basis and the UVO could rely on its own resources and on the generosity of Ukrainians everywhere for the continuation of its struggle. Its financial independence enabled it to ward off alien influences.

BIRTH AND GROWTH OF THE ORGANISATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALISTS (OUN)

During the revolutionary struggle the spiritual and ideological basis and aim of Ukrainian nationalism became more and more definite as years went by. Alien ideologies had no room in the UVO. On the other hand, stimulated by the influence of the UVO, fresh forces arose among Ukrainians at home and abroad and particularly among young people, whose ideology was closely related to that of the UVO. They became active in the many legal or semi-legal youth associations and unions formed by the youths at school and university and inspired by Ukrainian nationalism. It was absolutely essential to combine and coordinate all these forces into a single organisation, under a single leadership. Konovalets readily understood this necessity and was aware of the fact that the centralisation of all Ukrainian nationalist forces could not be fitted within the framework of UVO and would require a new type of organisation. In November 1927, and on the initiative of Konovalets, the First Conference of Ukrainian Nationalists was held at Prague, at which a resolution was passed concerning the formation of a single, centralized organisation of Ukrainian nationalists. At this conference the Leadership of Ukrainian Nationalists (Provid Ukrayins'kykh Natsionalistiv — PUN) was established under the chairmanship of Colonel Konovalets.

The most urgent task of the PUN was the preparation and summoning of the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists. The PUN fulfilled this task and from 29th January to 3rd February 1929 the First Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists met at Vienna, in the course of which the 'Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists' (OUN) was founded. Within a short time all cadres of the UVO and of other nationalist associations and groups were merged in the OUN and Colonel Konovalets was elected president. With the creation of the OUN a new era began in the fight for freedom of the Ukrainian people.

The foundation of the OUN was without doubt the work of Colonel Konovalets and it was owing to his exceptional administrative ability and competent leadership that it rapidly developed and showed itself to the world as the organising force and advance-guard of the Ukrainian nationalist revolution.

The official publication of the OUN was the monthly journal 'Rozbudova Natsiyi' (The Building of a Nation) which was published in Prague, widely distributed, and secretly read also in Ukraine. The purpose of this publication, to which Konovalets contributed, was to make known the ideology and programme of Ukrainian nationalism and to inform the Ukrainian public about the work of the freedom movement. As president of the OUN Konovalets extended and perfected the work of the OUN in the homeland and abroad whereby the OUN eventually gained influence upon all spheres of life of the Ukrainian people. In contrast to the UVO

period, armed action no longer took first place of importance; stress was now laid mainly on the ideological and political mobilisation of the broad masses of the people. This activity aimed at the constant undermining of foreign rule and the systematic preparation of the people for the decisive battle against the occupiers in the war for the final liberation of Ukraine and the creation of an independent state.

In April 1929 Konovalets set out on a four-months' journey to the USA and Canada where he visited the larger centres of Ukrainian emigration. The result of his visits was a further activation of Ukrainian life and its inclusion in the common national front.

Until the foundation of the OUN Konovalets was domiciled in Berlin, but in 1929 he moved to Switzerland. During the next seven years his permanent residence was at Geneva, from where he directed the Ukrainian liberation movement and on his mission travelled widely through European countries. In 1936 he had to leave Switzerland after an attempt on his life was made by bolshevist agents, which was foiled by the Swiss police who arrested the Russian agent, Norman, and his associates. Urged by the Swiss authorities to leave the country, he went to Italy and took up residence in Rome.

Under the leadership of Konovalets the OUN in ten years spread and elaborated its organisation throughout the whole of Ukraine. For tactical reasons it often had to work under cover of legal societies or associations. It fought against the attempts of the enemy either to belittle the Ukrainian problem or to describe it as the 'internal affair' of the respective occupying power.

The structure of OUN organisation depended on the existing possibilities in each region and, therefore, varied in strength. Nevertheless, the OUN became everywhere the mouthpiece and true representative of an independent Ukraine and of the interests of the Ukrainian people.

The central and eastern parts of Ukraine under Russian occupation presented the greatest problem to OUN organisation. Here the conspiracy required a maximum of skill and Konovalets himself dealt with it, often without the knowledge of his closest colleagues.

The numerous proceedings against UVO and OUN members in the Russian-occupied Ukraine and the inflammatory writings in the Soviet press against 'Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists' in general and UVO and OUN in particular, are all proof of Konovalets's success in strengthening the UVO/OUN in Russian-occupied territory.

To this task Konovalets devoted all his energy. In various European towns he met the middlemen and couriers from OUN underground centres in Ukraine. These individual centres were so strong that in 1938 Konovalets planned to visit Ukraine in order to inspect and coordinate the work of the OUN. With growing international tension and the threat of war Konovalets considered such a visit as absolutely necessary.

DEATH BY MOSCOW'S HAND

Moscow saw the danger which threatened in the shape of the Ukrainian nationalist movement and fought it ceaselessly and ruthlessly. In order to deprive the OUN of its leader Moscow had for a long time intended an attempt on the life of Konovalets who had gained such popularity in Ukraine and whose name — after Symon Petlura's death — had become the symbol for the desire for independence of the entire Ukrainian people. For many years, however, the experienced revolutionary managed to escape or foil these cunning attempts.

Faced with the threat of war Moscow increased its reprisals against the Ukrainian people (a concrete example is the murder of thousands of Ukrainian 'anti-social parasites' at Vinnytsia in 1937 and 1938) and at the same time it endeavoured to destroy Colonel Evhen Konovalets, the leader of the resistance.

The Kremlin finally achieved its object in 1938. The GPU had succeeded in smuggling one of its agents into the network of an underground centre in Soviet-Ukraine and this agent, Valyukh, was sent as an alleged confidant and courier of the underground to Konovalets. Meetings with this 'middleman' took place in various towns of western and northern Europe, similar to the meetings with genuine envoys from the underground. The last encounter took place on 23rd May 1938 and ended in the death of Colonel Konovalets.

The investigations carried out by the Netherlands police in co-operation with security departments of other countries showed that the agent Valyukh had arrived at Rotterdam as a passenger on the Soviet merchant vessel 'Menzhinskiy.' He met Konovalets on the 23rd of May at 12 o'clock in the 'Atlanta' café. He handed Konovalets a small package which was supposed to contain cyphers and reports from underground centres in the Ukraine. After a short conversation Valyukh left the café. Konovalets himself left soon after and went towards the near-by 'Grand Central' hotel at which he stayed during his visit to Rotterdam. He stopped in front of the 'Lumière' cinema and at that moment the infernal machine inside the package exploded and tore Konovalets to pieces. Meanwhile, Valyukh succeeded in leaving Rotterdam on the same Soviet vessel that had brought him.

The death of Colonel Konovalets was a severe blow to the Ukrainian revolutionary movement. However, the OUN was able to resist all enemy attacks, which was to become apparent very soon after the death of Konovalets.

The Ukrainian people will always hold in high honour the memory of their great son. The graves of Symon Petlura in Paris, Evhen Konovalets in Rotterdam and Stepan Bandera in Munich are memorials on the steep and thorny path to the liberation of the Ukrainian people.

Stepan Bandera, His Life and Struggle

by Danylo Chaykovsky

When Stepan Bandera was born in Uhryniv Staryy (district of Kalush, West Ukraine) on January 1, 1909, as the son of a Ukrainian Greek-Catholic priest, Andriy Bandera, Ukraine was under the rule of two empires. The eastern regions together with Volhynia, Kholm and Pidlyasha belonged to Russia, whilst the western regions, Galicia, Transcarpathia and Bukovina were part of Austria-Hungary and were administered with the help of the Poles. In spite of this partition, however, the demands of the Ukrainians for national and social liberation in all their territories became more and more insistent. The "Springtide of the Peoples" of 1848 had also spread to Ukraine and the seeds that it had sown germinated and thrived, nurtured in every sphere of life of the Ukrainian people by prominent Ukrainian personalities, politicians, scientists, artists and clergymen. This seed ripened fully in the stormy years of the first world war, when the independent Ukrainian National Republic was established in Kyiv (1917-1918) and the West Ukrainian People's Republic, which three months later became part of the All-Ukrainian State, was founded in the West Ukrainian territories in November 1918. These important events in the history of the Ukrainian people had a decisive influence on the awakening of the national political consciousness of ten-year old Stepan Bandera, as he later stated in his autobiography.

UNDER THE POLISH RULE

But the joy of the Ukrainians at attaining their independence was only short-lived. During the early days of its existence the young state was already obliged to defend its independence against four enemies, the Russians, Poles, Rumanians and Czechs, by armed force. After a year of heavy combat against the Poles, the Ukrainian Galician Army, owing to lack of weapons and equipment, was obliged to retreat across the River Zbruch and abandon the West Ukrainian territories to the Poles. With the army, the army chaplain and deputy of the West Ukrainian parliament, Andriy Bandera, also left his native country, and thus Stepan Bandera at an early age came to know the tragic lot of the homeless after his family fled before the brutality of the Poles.

After the mandate granted by the Entente on June 25, 1919, Poland occupied the West Ukrainian territories and enforced a ruthless occupation regime there. By June 1919 more than 250,000 of the 3½ million Ukrainians in Galicia were confined in Polish prisons and internment camps as prisoners, and this number also

included 1,000 clergymen. The Warsaw paper "Robotnik" stated in its edition of October 16, 1919: "The conditions which prevail in the camps at Modlin and Brest-Litovsk are a disgrace to the Polish state..." Thousands of prisoners-of-war and civilians died, Ukrainian property to the value of milliards was pillaged and destroyed, Ukrainian cultural achievements were annihilated, and the Ukrainian population of Galicia was in danger of being exterminated, — such was the state of affairs at the beginning of Polish rule in the West Ukrainian territories. A year later East Ukraine suffered an even heavier blow under Russian Bolshevik occupation.

But the Ukrainian people did not submit resignedly to their fate. In the central and eastern regions of Ukraine countless insurrections continued to break out for years and the Russian occupants had hard work to crush them. In the West Ukrainian territories, which after the Polish-Russian Treaty in Riga were occupied by Poland, the Ukrainian Military Organization, the UVO, whose nucleus consisted of officers and men of the best detachment of the former Ukrainian army, the Ukrainian Sich infantry, was formed. This Military Organization, under the experienced leadership of the military expert and politician, Colonel Evhen Konovalets, developed a lively underground activity. By means of armed insurrections against representatives of Polish rule, assassinations, destruction of Polish landed property and estates, and the dissemination of propaganda literature, the UVO in an active and concrete manner gave the Ukrainian people moral support in their independence aims, brought about the restriction of Polish interference and atrocities, and, in addition, did its share in informing and warning the rest of the world that this disregard of human rights would lead to a dreadful catastrophe.

Because of its courageous action the UVO won the sympathy and support of Ukrainian youth, who deeply felt the subjugation and humiliation of the Ukrainian people. Young people at school began to organize secret groups and cells, which were based on the ideological principles of the UVO and whose members were trained in the national revolutionary spirit to become fighters and champions of the cause of freedom of Ukraine. At the same time, the purpose of these groups was to appeal to the Ukrainian population to give its active support to the revolutionary underground movement. This support included, amongst other measures, donations for the secret Ukrainian university in Lviv, the circulation of Ukrainian publications printed abroad, which were prohibited by the Poles, the boycotting of Polish societies, as well as the boycotting of the census and the elections for the first Polish Sejm or parliament.

BANDERA'S YOUTH

Stepan Bandera, a pupil in the forth form of the grammar school in Stryy, also joined one of these secret youth groups. In addition to

physically hardening himself in the Boy Scouts and in the Sokil Sports Society, he acquired in this secret nationalist group the moral and ideological principles which were later to have such a decisive influence on his course in life. Because of his exceptional intelligence and talent, his good qualities of character, his spirit of comradeship, sense of duty, and modesty, and his happy disposition, he was outstanding amongst his schoolmates of the same age.

After passing his school-leaving examination in 1927, Stepan Bandera intended to go to Czecho-Slovakia in order to study at the Ukrainian College of Technology and Economics in Podebrady, but the Polish authorities refused to give him a permit to leave the country. It is interesting to note that the Polish authorities in the West Ukrainian territories showed no political farsightedness at all in this respect, a fact which undoubtedly also explains the increasing strength of the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement.

In order to consolidate their rule in the Ukrainian territories and to assimilate the Ukrainian population, the Poles introduced their so-called "borderlands policy," — that is to say, the ruthless extermination of Ukrainian cultural creativeness. And the first victim of this "policy" was the Ukrainian educational system, a fact which is even corroborated by Polish sources.

In his book "The Educational System in Poland from 1929 to 1939," published in 1961, Bronislaw Lugowski states that in Galicia under Polish rule only 5 per cent of the Ukrainian schoolchildren were able to attend schools in which the language of instruction was Ukrainian, whilst in Volhynia, Polissia and Kholm region the percentage was only 0.02. In 1922 there were 2,426 elementary schools in which the language of instruction was Ukrainian in the Polish-occupied Western Ukraine; by 1935 this number had decreased to 457, and by 1938 there were only 214 such schools. Of the 2,205 new students who registered at the various colleges in Lviv in 1938, only 310 were Ukrainians.

Since the percentage of the Ukrainian population in the towns of West Ukraine steadily decreased owing to the constant alien (Polish) influx, the youth of the villages, that is the sons and daughters of village priests, teachers and wealthy farmers, constituted a large percentage of the pupils at the grammar schools, commercial schools and teachers' training colleges. Since these young people after completing their studies at these types of schools were not, however, admitted to the universities and colleges, they were obliged to return to their villages. As they were not used to agricultural work, they usually tried to find employment in other fields, as for instance in the co-operatives, libraries, savings banks, agricultural unions, and in other Ukrainian unions and societies. These young people brought a new revolutionary spirit into the villages and small towns. Hence it was not surprising that within a short time the ranks of the UVO not only included the children of intellectuals but also the children of farmers and workers.

Thus Stepan Bandera, too, withdrew for some time to the village where his father, who had meanwhile returned from East Ukraine, lived and here he took an active part in cultural and educational work. In 1928 he returned to Lviv and began studying in the only faculty of the Technical College open to Ukrainians, the department of agriculture. During his studies he devoted all his spare time and energy to the revolutionary activity, which captivated him more and more. After having become a member of the UVO in the same year, he met a number of former schoolmates and other leading representatives of the Ukrainian liberation movement in Lviv, whose names were later also to become known abroad, as for instance Stepan Okhrymovych, at that time chairman of the Home Executive Committee of the OUN, Ivan Gabrusevych (later perished in the concentration camp at Sachsenhausen), Stepan Lenkavsky, the present chairman of the Units Abroad of the OUN, Jaroslaw Stetzko, who became Prime Minister of the Ukrainian government of 1941 and now is President of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), Roman Shukhevych, later Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army — UPA, and famous under the name of General Taras Chuprynka, Dmytro Hrytsay (General Perebyynis), Chief of Staff of the UPA, and numerous other persons who were later to become prominent. Together with them and other comrades, Stepan Bandera planned the activity of the revolutionary liberation movement.

IN THE RANKS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALISTS

The Ukrainian Military Organization under the leadership of Colonel Evhen Konovalets did not limit its armed action merely to the West Ukrainian territories. Its liaison men also penetrated into the eastern territories of Ukraine, where they set up a network of resistance groups and even won supporters amongst the members of the officers' training school of the Red Army in Kyiv. It was the aim of the UVO to include all classes of the Ukrainian population in its activity in order to carry out a general armed insurrection when the time was ripe. But the organizational structure of the UVO was not large enough to encompass the active participation of the masses. The Ukrainian youth followed the example of the older generation of Ukrainian patriots, who had founded the "Union for the Liberation of Ukraine," the SVU, and now formed the "Union of Ukrainian Youth," the SUM. The discovery of these two underground organizations by the Russians led to mass-arrests and to the liquidation of the elite of the Ukrainian people.

In the meantime the numerous secret nationalist groups and organizations in West Ukraine united and in 1929, at the First Congress of the Ukrainian Nationalists which took place in Vienna, founded the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, the OUN, and elected Colonel Evhen Konovalets, hitherto Head of the UVO, as chairman. The UVO was gradually assimilated in the military section

of the OUN. The OUN owed its development and its strength to its founders, whose names we have mentioned above, and in particular to Stepan Bandera, whose outstanding qualities as an organizer and a leader had a chance to develop to the full during the years 1928 to 1933. Since he was constantly in contact with Colonel Konovalets, who at that time was abroad, Stepan Bandera was able to realize the plan for the development and expansion of the national liberation movement which he and his closest co-workers had drawn up.

The OUN now began to extend its organization network and to increase its cadres in all the Ukrainian territories under Polish rule and abroad; particular importance was attached to the West Ukrainian territories, which were threatened by Communist subversion. In order to consolidate the power of the organization, it now included in its activity the masses of the farming and working classes, who saw in the OUN their protector and champion of the fight for freedom. In training its members the OUN attached especial importance to an ideological-political training, as well as to military training and training in underground tactics, conspiring and reconnaissance, etc. In addition to political propaganda attacks and campaigns within the scope of the organization, the OUN members also developed a new form of activity, namely mass-campaigns on the part of the Ukrainian population. At the initiative and instructions of the OUN the Ukrainian population carried out an anti-monopoly and a school campaign. In order to achieve a moral and political effect, the Ukrainian population, at the initiative of the OUN, boycotted the purchase of goods under the state monopoly. This campaign was a big success, and the Polish state suffered a considerable financial loss.

The school campaign was carried out by the OUN as a retaliation measure against the cultural Polonisation policy and in order to protect the Ukrainian school-system and the national education and training of Ukrainian youth. This campaign consisted in the Ukrainian pupils in all the elementary and secondary schools at an appointed time demanding instructions in the Ukrainian language. As an indication of their protest against the Polish school law, they destroyed the Polish textbooks, tore down the Polish coat-of-arms from the walls of the classrooms, sang Ukrainian songs in unison, and refused to answer questions put by the teachers in Polish and to pray in this language. All the efforts on the part of the Polish school, administrative and police authorities to crush this "children's mutiny" proved unsuccessful. In their counter-actions the Polish authorities made themselves ridiculous in the eyes of the population, for in some cases (as for instance in Sokal district) the police received orders from the authorities to arrest the schoolchildren and bring them before a court. Unbelievable scenes were enacted: incapable of keeping guard over 30 schoolchildren who had been arrested, a Polish policeman, the "guardian of public law and order and safety," tied them together by means of a long chain and led them through the village, — turning his head away in shame and embarrassment before the gaze of passers-by.

ARMED CAMPAIGN OF THE OUN IN WEST UKRAINE

In addition to its revolutionary activity against the Polish oppressors of West Ukraine, the OUN also began a fight for freedom on the second front, — an anti-Bolshevist fight in all the Ukrainian territories. In West Ukraine the OUN conducted its campaigns in two directions, — against the Communist Party of West Ukraine, its propaganda and agents from the USSR, as well as against the diplomatic representatives of Bolshevist Russia and the Sovietophil trend. In a relatively short time the OUN, with the assistance of the masses, succeeded in breaking down Bolshevist diversion manoeuvres in Ukraine. During World War II these territories became the base for the fight of the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement against Russian Bolshevist rule in the central and eastern territories of Ukraine.

By means of attacks on Soviet diplomats (as for instance the famous attack on Maylov in the Soviet consulate in Lviv) and leading Communist functionaries, the OUN demonstrated the unity of the Ukrainian liberation front and the solidarity of the West Ukrainians with the anti-Bolshevist fight in the central and eastern territories. At the same time, these measures were also a protest against the famine which had been artificially created by Moscow in order to force the Ukrainian farmers to accept the system of collectivism. About 6 million Ukrainians died during this artificially created famine. During his trial before the court in Warsaw in 1936, Stepan Bandera defined the fundamental motives of the anti-Bolshevist fight conducted by the OUN and said: "We are fighting Communism not only by means of propaganda but also with armed force, since Communism is fighting Ukrainian nationalism with the aid of a hitherto unheard-of ruthless physical mass-terrorism, namely by mass-executions in the Cheka and GPU prisons, by starving millions of people, and by ceaseless deportations to Siberia. By means of the system of Bolshevism, Moscow has destroyed the Ukrainian state and has subjugated the Ukrainian people" ("Dilo," No. 124, Lviv, June 6, 1936).

In 1933 Stepan Bandera was appointed Chairman of the Executive of the OUN in Ukraine. It was during this period that the OUN reached the height of its development. On December 30, 1933, the Polish journal "Bunt mlodych" published an article entitled "At the Eleventh Hour," which contained the following comments on the OUN:

"...The secret OUN — Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists — is today stronger than all the Ukrainian legal parties together. It rules the youth, it governs public opinion, it is unceasingly active in order to draw the masses into the eddy of a revolution... It is now perfectly obvious that time is against us. Every starosta (Polish district officer) in Little Poland (Galicia) and in Volhynia can enumerate the villages which until a short time ago were passive

and now, stirred up by anti-state campaigns, are ready and eager to fight. The enemy is becoming stronger and stronger, and the Polish state weaker and weaker."

Poland was playing a losing game in spite of the ruthless measures of oppression to which she resorted in dealing with members of the Ukrainian underground. Other Ukrainians, too, who were not members of the OUN were sentenced to 8 to 12 years' imprisonment by the Polish courts if any illegal literature was found in their possession. But all these measures did not deter the Ukrainian youth from taking part in the fight for freedom. In order to prevent the continuation of Polish colonization in the West Ukrainian territories, the OUN carried out a sabotage campaign against the Polish landowners and settlers and set fire to their estates, farms and granaries. By way of retaliation the Polish government resorted to ruthless measures, which became known as "pacification," against the Ukrainian farmers.

The dreadful terrorism of the punitive expeditions of the Polish army and police at that time occupied the headlines in the world press. The "Manchester Guardian" of November 22, 1935, commented at some length on the "pacification" measures and on Pieracki, who under the Skladkowski government (1930) was the police chief responsible for these measures and who later became Minister of the Interior. The same paper pointed out that the Ukrainians had endured the Polish pressure with admirable passivity until extremist groups had finally begun to set fire to the estates of the Polish landowners. By way of retaliation, units of the Polish army and police had then raided Ukrainian villages and had arrested the farmers there at random and beaten them. The "Manchester Guardian" added that these operations had been carried out in secret but that there could now be no doubt whatever that these were the most drastic measures of oppression ever heard of in the history of the civilized world. The said paper emphasized that there was no exact information as to how many farmers had been beaten, but careful estimates assessed the number at about 10,000, all of whom had been innocent. As a result of the ill-treatment they had received, many of the farmers were ill in bed for weeks afterwards and some of them died of the injuries they had received.

On December 3, 1935, the same paper stated that Minister Pieracki had been responsible for the "pacification" carried out in East Galicia in 1930, and that he had likewise been responsible for the "pacification" in the region of Lisko in 1931 and for that in Volhynia and Polissia in 1932, about which the Polish press, at the "Manchester Guardian" pointed out, had not mentioned a word. The paper added that his pacifying speeches were merely intended to conceal the atrocities, for which he and his government were responsible, from the rest of the world.

In reply to the Polish measures of oppression Stepan Bandera organized a counter-campaign including an attempt on the life of the Minister of the Interior Pieracki. This was carried out successfully

by Matseyko*), a member of the OUN, who subsequently fled abroad. The Polish police thereupon carried out mass-arrests amongst the Ukrainian population and in the course of investigations discovered the headquarters of the OUN in the West Ukrainian territories. In 1934 Stepan Bandera was arrested and at the beginning of 1936 he was sentenced to death in Warsaw as being responsible for the entire activity of the UVO and OUN; this sentence was later commuted to imprisonment for life. In the autumn of the same year he was once more sentenced to imprisonment for life in Lviv.

The Ukrainian people and the OUN suffered a number of heavy blows during the years that followed. The OUN chairman for all Ukraine was imprisoned in solitary confinement in the most securely guarded prison in Poland and was completely isolated from the outside world. In 1938 the founder and leader of the OUN, Colonel Evhen Konovalets, was murdered in Rotterdam by a Bolshevist bomb. One might have assumed that the revolutionary movement, whose ranks had been decimated by the Polish mass-arrests, would now cease to exist, or would, at least for a time, limit its activity. But it very soon became obvious that this movement was so deeply rooted in the hearts of the Ukrainian population that it could only be eradicated by exterminating the entire Ukrainian people. In spite of the fact that all the members of the OUN leadership had been arrested, there were still enough other leading members of the OUN who were prepared to continue the uncompromising fight against the enemy. This was only too apparent when the state of Czecho-Slovakia, which had been artificially created in Versailles, under German pressure disintegrated into its natural parts, that is to say, when an independent Carpatho-Ukraine was formed. From the underground fight the Ukrainian people, under the leadership of the OUN, passed to creative state activity.

Contrary to Hitler's plans, Carpatho-Ukraine did not bow to German pressure and refused to submit to the Hungarians without a fight. Fighting on two fronts, namely against the Hungarians and Poles, Carpatho-Ukraine on March 15, 1939, proclaimed its independence. In the foremost ranks of the fighters for the freedom of Carpatho-Ukraine there were OUN members from every district of Ukraine.

The German-Polish war which broke out some months later also brought considerable changes for the Ukrainian people. Russia had occupied Volhynia, Polissia and Galicia, whilst the regions of Lemky, Kholm and Pidlyasha under German occupation became part of the so-called General-Gouvernement. With the change in political conditions, the form of the Ukrainian fight for freedom also changed. The ranks of the OUN swelled anew when countless members were released from Polish prisons and from the concentration camp in Bereza Kartuzka. The reinforced OUN now began to set up combat groups again, which took over the task of protecting the Ukrainian population and setting up ammunition depots for the future fight

*) On June 15th, 1934, in Warsaw.

against Bolshevist Russia. As regards Germany the OUN adopted an attitude of temporization. It was convinced that sooner or later a conflict would ensue between Nazi Germany and Bolshevist Russia. The OUN was of the opinion that such a conflict might provide a chance to re-establish the Ukrainian independent state. Forewarned on the strength of their experience with Hitler with regard to Carpatho-Ukraine, the Ukrainian nationalists refused to believe any tempting promises.

STEPAN BANDERA BECOMES HEAD OF THE ORGANIZATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALISTS

After his liberation from the Polish prison Stepan Bandera managed to get through to Lviv, where, together with members of the Home Executive Committee of the OUN and other leading OUN members, he now elaborated plans for the further activity of the OUN in the Ukrainian territories. In addition, it was also decided to extend the organization network of the OUN in all the Ukrainian territories under Russian rule, to make the necessary preparations for the revolutionary fight in the event of the outbreak of a war, and to take the necessary defense measures against the annihilation of the national forces in West Ukraine which was planned by the Russians. Stepan Bandera wanted to remain in West Ukraine in order to take part in the realization of these plans. But at the express demand of the leading OUN members and at the recommendation of the leadership of the OUN abroad, he in 1939 went to Cracow. From here he then went to Italy to meet the then head of the OUN. After the death of Colonel E. Konovalts, Colonel Andriy Melnyk had assumed the leadership of the OUN. Various differences of opinion now arose between certain influential members of the OUN leadership and the members of the Home Executive Committee of the OUN in Ukraine with regard to fundamental questions pertaining to the liberation movement and internal difficulties.

In 1941 the 2nd Congress of the Ukrainian Nationalists elected Stepan Bandera as the new leader of the entire OUN. The revolutionary OUN under Stepan Bandera now assumed the leadership of the national fight for freedom of the Ukrainian people. A resolution was also passed by the same Congress to the effect that the OUN should continue the fight for freedom of the Ukrainian people with all the means at its disposal and regardless of any political or territorial changes. The OUN now began to enlarge and strengthen the organization network in all the Ukrainian territories under Russian occupation; at the outbreak of the German-Russian war it had at its disposal in these territories over 20,000 organized members who had had a thorough military and ideological training. Since conditions were more favourable in the Ukrainian territories which belonged to the "General-Gouvernement," the OUN occupied itself there with preparations for an armed fight in the event of war.

Within a relatively short time military training courses were organized there for OUN members and, in addition, ideological and propaganda material was prepared for the marching units of the OUN, who were already standing by in readiness. All the members of the OUN in the "General-Gouvernement" (about 6,000) received orders to advance in three separate groups into the Ukrainian territories beyond the San and the Bug immediately after the outbreak of the German-Russian war and to intensify their revolutionary activity there and revive the independent state existence of the Ukrainian people.

In the event of war the OUN planned to re-establish the independent Ukrainian state in the Ukrainian territories once they were liberated of the Russian occupant. For this reason a Ukrainian National Committee, which consisted of leading representatives of Ukrainian political and cultural life, was set up in Cracow in 1941, shortly before the outbreak of the war, at the initiative of the OUN. The task of this committee was to take charge of certain sectors of state life in Ukraine. In this way the OUN was determined to uphold democratic principles when establishing the Ukrainian state again.

A few days before the outbreak of war well equipped marching troops already advanced towards the appointed destinations in Ukraine. Under considerable difficulties (many of the members of the marching units which were overtaken by German troops fell into the hands of the Gestapo) they managed to advance into Ukraine as far as the Don and the Crimea. Amongst these marching units there were numerous leading members of the OUN. At the same time, the Ukrainian Legion, consisting of volunteers, under the command of Roman Shukhevych, also advanced into Ukraine. Upon the arrival of the Ukrainian troops in Lviv, where the Bolshevist NKVD had left behind dreadful traces of their rule, the restoration of the independent Ukrainian State was proclaimed on June 30, 1941, and a provisional government was set up. It consisted of representatives of various political trends and was headed by Jaroslaw Stetzko, a leading member of the OUN. The proclamation of the restoration of the Ukrainian state was an event of national rejoicing; moreover, the two highest dignitaries of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Ukrainian Catholic Church, Bishop Polikarp and Metropolitan Count Andreas Sheptytsky, gave the proclamation their blessing.

But the independent policy of the OUN and its proclamation had crossed Hitler's plans with regard to Ukraine. Consequently mass-arrests were carried out. To begin with, certain circles of the German High Command were in favour of the idea of an independent Ukrainian state, which they thought would be an ally. They were, however, powerless to influence Hitler's policy. Stepan Bandera was at first interned by the Gestapo, but when he refused to deny his participation in the proclamation, he was immediately arrested. The Gestapo took him to Berlin, where they put him into prison; he was later transferred to the concentration camp in Sachsenhausen. In Lviv the Gestapo arrested Jaroslaw Stetzko and various members of his government when they refused to resign and to revoke the

proclamation. On September 15, 1941, the Gestapo arrested over 2,000 Ukrainian nationalists in Ukraine, who had participated in some way or other in setting up the Ukrainian state. The present leader of the Units Abroad of the OUN, Stepan Lenkavsky, and a hundred leading members of the OUN (including Bandera's two brothers) were taken to the concentration camp in Auschwitz, or else put into prison, or shot. Bandera's two brothers were murdered in Auschwitz and his brother-in-law was tortured to death in the prison in Lviv.

The Ukrainian Legion under the command of Roman Shukhevych protested against the terrorism of the Gestapo. It was thereupon withdrawn from the front, and measures were taken to arrest its commanding officers. Roman Shukhevych and many of his comrades, however, managed to escape in time and went into hiding in the underground movement.

And once more it seemed as if the Ukrainian people, wedged in between two power blocks, would have to submit to their fate. With the assistance of the Gestapo, Hitler's governor in the "Reichs Commissariat of Ukraine," Erich Koch, began to depopulate Ukraine by means of mass-deportations of the Ukrainian population to Germany for the purpose of forced labour. Mass-arrests and also a famine ensued.

The members of the OUN once more resorted to underground activity. They already possessed completely worked out plans for the revolutionary fight for freedom and for defense measures. Within a short time they started their counter-action. At the end of 1941 and beginning of 1942 the first defense units were set up and in the course of time they developed into a truly Insurgent Army. Roman Shukhevych, who became famous under the name of General Taras Chuprynka, became the commander-in-chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA). The latter eventually numbered 200,000 well-equipped and trained soldiers, who occupied large areas of Ukraine. The UPA enjoyed the wholehearted support of the Ukrainian people, who regarded it as their protector and defender not only against Nazi terrorism but also against the onslaughts of Bolshevist partisan units. In 1943 a secret conference of the representatives of the peoples who were subjugated by Germany and Russia was held in Ukraine. This conference laid the foundation for the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN). A year later (1944) the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council, UHVR, the revolutionary government of Ukraine, was founded. It consisted of leading representatives of various political trends and played a decisive part in determining the course of the fight for freedom.

At the end of 1944, when there was no longer any doubt about the fact that Germany would lose the war, the Gestapo released Stepan Bandera, Jaroslaw Stetzko, Stepan Lenkavsky, and many other members of the OUN from the concentration camps. In this hopeless situation the German politicians made a last attempt to remedy the errors which they committed at the beginning of the war. They tried to convince the Ukrainian nationalists of the necessity of a

collaboration with Germany. But the OUN refused to allow itself to be taken in by the German wishes and promises and, together with the UPA, continued its fight against Bolshevik Russia.

With the help of friends, the members of the OUN who had been liberated from the "protection" of the Gestapo managed to get through to the West and waited there for the war to end.

THE UNABATED FIGHT AGAINST RUSSIA

For Ukraine, which once more fell under Bolshevik rule, the fight did not, however, end with Germany's capitulation. The Ukrainian people and the UPA soldiers continued their fight, which is indeed unparalleled in history, against the Bolshevik oppressors. Without allies, without reinforcements, and without any support at all from the free world, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army for years continued its heroic fight (until 1952) against a Major Power which had seized half Europe and Asia. The proportions which this fight assumed can be seen from the fact that in 1947 Russia was forced to make a pact with Poland and Czecho-Slovakia regarding joint measures to combat the UPA. In the course of this relentless fight, the OUN and the UPA suffered heavy losses. Even after the heroic death of the Commander-in-Chief of the UPA, Roman Shukhevych, on March 5, 1950, the Ukrainian people and the UPA continued their fight for freedom. The UPA was obliged to alter its fighting tactics, however, and had to resort to underground activity once more instead of open fighting.

As a result of the renewed Russian occupation of Ukraine, countless Ukrainians of all social classes were forced to leave their native country and emigrate. As exiles abroad they met many members of the OUN once more, who had been released from concentration camps and prisons. Under the leadership of Stepan Bandera, they united to form the Units Abroad of the OUN (Z. Ch. OUN). The main task of the Units Abroad of the OUN became the general support in every way of fighting Ukraine. The Units Abroad extended their organization network to cover all the countries of the free world in which Ukrainian emigrants had settled. They established constant contact with the leadership of the OUN and the UPA in Ukraine and began an active campaign of support for the underground movement in Ukraine.

In the course of time the Units Abroad of the OUN began to inform and enlighten the peoples of the free world on the Ukrainian fight for freedom and on the threat to the whole free world by Bolshevik Russia.

At the initiative of the Units Abroad of the OUN the activity of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN) was resumed, and 16 peoples of East Europe and Asia, subjugated by Moscow and on friendly terms with Ukraine, joined this organization as members. Jaroslaw Stetzko, the former Prime Minister of the Ukrainian government of 1941, was elected President of the Central Committee

of the ABN. In 15 years' untiring activity he has succeeded in gaining many new friends and supporters for the Ukrainian liberation movement.

In the internal Ukrainian sector of the Ukrainian emigration, the OUN strengthened the anti-Russian and anti-Bolshevist front, exposed the activity of enemy agents and warded off dangerous alien de-nationalization influences. Regardless of social and political differences amongst the Ukrainian emigrants, countless groups have supported the OUN and in this way also the fight for freedom of the Ukrainian people at home. Proof of this support is the liberation fund, which has enabled the OUN to conduct a liberation policy free of all foreign influence during the past 17 years.

The lively activity of the OUN amongst the emigrants and the name of Stepan Bandera, who became the symbol of the fight for freedom, eventually came to be regarded by Moscow as a danger and a threat. In addition to its ruthless extermination of the Ukrainian people, Moscow for 15 years endeavoured to exterminate the spokesman and champion of the Ukrainian independence aspirations, Stepan Bandera, since his name had become the symbol of freedom in every region of the Russian "peoples' prison" from the San to Sakhalin and Kamchatka amongst all classes of the population, in the Red Army and amongst the millions of prisoners in the Russian concentration camps. At the instructions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the KGB (Committee for State Security) tried by every possible means to discredit and destroy the moral greatness of Stepan Bandera, state enemy No. 1, amongst the population. By every means available the NKVD, later the MVD, that is to say the KGB, for years endeavoured to liquidate Stepan Bandera, who lived in Munich under the name of Popel, physically, until finally on October 15, 1959, it succeeded in doing so.

But even with this vile murder Moscow did not succeed in breaking the will to freedom of the Ukrainian people. And the following fact is proof enough: two years after the murder of Stepan Bandera the Bolshevik paper "Lvovskaya Pravda," No. 18, 1961, wrote: "a trial took place recently in which the accused were anti-state criminals and members of the secret organization of the Ukrainian nationalists." The paper reported that one of the accused had been arrested just as he was in the act of affixing Ukrainian nationalist watchwords in the municipal park. The other two accused had been standing nearby, keeping a look-out. The tribunal of the Subcarpathian Military Command sentenced the first mentioned of the accused to death and the other two accused to 15 years' imprisonment.

Information about the Assassination of Bandera

FIRST ANNOUNCEMENT OF BANDERA'S DEATH

On the day of Bandera's assassination the first appeal to Ukrainian Nationalists was published):*

Comrades, Nationalists!

At this tragic moment when cruel death has deprived us for ever of Stepan Bandera, great son of the Ukrainian people and for many years our illustrious leader, we appeal to you to cherish in your sorrow-stricken hearts the belief in the victory of our sacred cause, to remain unshaken in your loyalty to the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and, more determined than ever, to continue the fight.

Paris, Rotterdam, Bilohorshcha**), Munich — these are stains of blood on the road on which our best fighters gave their lives for the freedom of Ukraine. They are examples of the appalling cruelty of Moscow, the arch-enemy of Ukraine, who aims at breaking the organized fighting force of the Ukrainian people by a systematic extermination of its leaders.

But from the sacrifice of these heroes sprang an ideal which inspires fresh fighters in the struggle for an independent and united Ukrainian state. The enemy cannot destroy Stepan Bandera's far-sighted policy or the vast experience gained in OUN cadres under his leadership. His ideals will continue to guide in the future our fight for freedom.

Unity, steadfastness, determination and untiring effort — these must be our answer to the treacherous and murderous plots by which the enemy tries to intimidate and paralyze the leading spirits of the largest of enslaved peoples.

Long live the memory of our heroes!

**The Leadership of Units Abroad
of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists**

15th October, 1959.

*) Special number of "Shlyakh Peremohy," No. 43 of 18 October, 1959.

***) The village and forest near the city of Lviv (Lvov), West Ukraine, where General Roman Shukhevych (Taras Chuprynka), the Supreme Commander of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.) was killed in a combat with Russian security troops on March 5th, 1950.

APPEAL BY THE LEADERSHIP OF OUN UNITS ABROAD TO MEMBERS AND TO THE ENTIRE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE

Comrades, Nationalists!

People of Ukraine!

The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the whole Ukrainian people have again suffered a severe and painful blow. The cruel and unscrupulous men of Moscow have in the most insidious and horrible manner murdered by poison Stepan Bandera, the intrepid fighter for Ukrainian independence and for many years the leader of the OUN and the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement.

This dastardly assassination was part of the intensifying campaign against the Ukrainian nationalist revolutionary movement, which seriously threatens imperialist Moscow and its communist system of enslavement and exploitation of subjugated peoples as well as its plans for conquering the world in order to turn it into a vast prison for all its peoples. In murdering its leader, Moscow was hoping to deal a devastating blow to the Ukrainian national liberation revolution. Once more, however, the enemy failed to achieve his aim; just as he had failed in 1926, 1938 and 1950, when the Commander-in-Chief Symon Petlura, Colonel Evhen Konovalts and General Taras Chuprynka were murdered by the same criminal hands. Nor will he ever succeed in the future. The death of Stepan Bandera is undeniably a grievous shock and a severe loss not only to the OUN but to the whole Ukrainian people and to the entire freedom-loving world. And yet, neither these nor countless other crimes and atrocities perpetrated by barbarous Moscow can destroy the immortal spirit of the nation or check its fight for a great future.

With Stepan Bandera the Ukrainian people have lost a great man who throughout his life toiled and fought for the freedom, glory and greatness of Ukraine, utterly dedicated to the Fatherland and faithful to the last.

Stepan Bandera was the lofty example of an unyielding fighter and revolutionary, ideologist and strategist, theoretician and practitioner of the Ukrainian national revolution, unequalled in his devoted and self-sacrificing service to his people; he was the ideal knight without fear and without reproach, uncompromising when the common weal of the nation was at stake. Fate bestowed on him great gifts, but also

subjected him to hard trials and knocks; but he never wavered. Brave, unflinching and with dignity Stepan Bandera followed the thorny path of his life; serious, but never without a smile, he proudly looked ahead.

A man of kind heart, unshaken faith and firm character, Stepan Bandera confidently and resolutely led the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the revolutionary struggle for an independent Ukraine; and his high ideal of untiring service in the cause of national freedom carried us all with him.

In his 'Words to Ukrainian Nationalists' Stepan Bandera has clearly and positively stated not only the task which the Organization has set itself, but also the tasks which every single member of the OUN has to fulfil as a soldier in the front line of the national fight for a free Ukraine.

"In the tasks before the Organization as such, as well as in the tasks to be fulfilled by individual members, we must always be guided by the same principle, to which we have adhered in the past and which has in the highest degree become imperative in the homeland: the principle of self-sacrificing devotion."

"The Organization must demand of its members that which is indispensable to our fight: to sacrifice everything, if need be. Every member must be prepared to give up his family, his personal plans for the future, his profession, to join the battle under the toughest conditions and — if fate wills it — to sacrifice even his life. This is the fundamental duty of members, the fulfilment of which the Organization can and will demand of every member without exception."

"Our Organization in countries abroad as well as in the homeland has room only for those who possess a sense of responsibility and moral strength and who will dedicate themselves and all they have to the service of our cause. From the basic principle of duty to the cause will derive the directives of the Organization to its members concerning the tasks and the means to fulfil them."

"True self-sacrifice, sincere devotion to the task and disregard for the material things of life must issue from the moral attitude of every genuine member."

Calling for the necessary "thorough examination of the position of OUN Units Abroad and self-examination of each member" the leader stressed that "the certainty of difficulties will not intimidate or detain us in our fight." He closed his 'Words to Ukrainian Nationalists' with the exhortation addressed to us all: "Let us prepare and set about the great deeds, for the great time is near!"

This "great deed" for which we are to prepare and which we, as members of the OUN and the Ukrainian liberation front, are to tackle as Stepan Bandera ordered us, is the Ukrainian national revolution. In countless publications, and particularly in his book 'The Prospects of the Ukrainian National Revolution,' Stepan Bandera

has exhaustively stated the main tasks of the OUN as the advance-guard, leader and originator of this revolution and the advocate of the Ukrainian people; and he has shown the only correct way in which final victory can be won in the gigantic fight to the death against barbarous and imperialist Moscow, the fiercest enemy of Ukraine and of the whole freedom-loving world.

When he spoke of the driving forces of the revolution and discussed the basic and generally valid manner of mobilising the people, i.e. an ideological and political mobilisation, Stepan Bandera heavily underlined the moral aspects, as "the promotion of an idealistic and determined attitude, the readiness to fight in the historic contest of the nation and to sacrifice personal security, possessions and even life."

He declared: "The most important factor in revolutionary education is the living example of heroic deeds in the fight of a revolutionary organization."

From the point of view of an heroic life and a martyr's death, Stepan Bandera is indeed an example worthy of emulation to us all, to every Ukrainian nationalist revolutionary, to every Ukrainian patriot and to the whole Ukrainian people.

The leader Stepan Bandera emphasized that "a sound foundation for revolution can only be found in the native forces of the peoples, subjugated by bolshevism, fighting on their own." He stressed that in order to rouse the people against foreign domination "one must, while negating the existing state of affairs, lift up their own ideals which are based on their own aims and desires and which only require the strength of will and readiness to fight to come into their own again."

Underlying his statements and conclusions was his unshakable faith in the inexhaustible and life-giving forces of the Ukrainian people. He said:

"The ideas of Ukrainian nationalism, which spring from the mind of the Ukrainian people and from its philosophy of life, which express their ideal conception of life and are signposts on the road of history — these are the perpetual motive power behind the Ukrainian nationalist anti-bolshevist revolution."

"The revolutionary Organization, which aims in its work and fight at the realisation of the revolutionary idea, becomes the fundamental and guiding active force in the revolutionary process... In the struggle for a free Ukraine this leading force, the OUN, was born and grew up, until in our day it penetrates with its initiative all forms and branches of the revolutionary movement. Maintenance, strengthening and perfection of the OUN are of fundamental importance for the successful development of the national revolution... The most important thing, however, is that the Organization consistently pursues its work for the eventual realisation of the immutable ideas from which it draws its strength."

These are the basic ideas and guiding principles in which Stepan Bandera firmly believed and according to which he acted. They are the testament which he has left us.

Under his leadership the OUN grew into a strong ideological force and became the advance-guard in the revolutionary fight for freedom of Ukraine, which is a fatal threat to Moscow's rule.

Comrades, Nationalists!

People of Ukraine!

The road taken by our late leader is our road; it must be followed not only by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists but by the entire Ukrainian people. Neither the revolutionaries in the OUN, nor the Ukrainian people will stray from this road, until we have achieved the goal for which Stepan Bandera gave his life. His testament shall be law unto us and guide our fight and our lives.

We shall not give ourselves a moment's rest in the gigantic fight which we have for decades been carrying on against the cruel conqueror of Ukraine, that is Russian imperialism. In answer to the enemy's latest act of terror we shall intensify our fight for a United and Independent Ukrainian State and against the rule of terror and exploitation of our fatherland by an insatiable Moscow. We shall close our ranks yet more firmly under the banner of the national struggle for liberation, under the banner of Stepan Bandera's spirit. We shall increase our vigilance against any designs of the enemy and shall strengthen our internal discipline and readiness for action. We shall exert ourselves in strengthening the positions of the national liberation front in order to make it invulnerable against the enemy's attacks, however severe; and we shall uphold the cause which in the end is to defeat Moscow and to bring freedom and justice to the world.

Eternal glory to Stepan Bandera, the knight of the Ukrainian national revolution, the faithful son of Ukraine!

Long live the OUN, the organizer, leader and advance-guard of the Ukrainian national liberation front, the spokesman of the will of the Ukrainian people!

Long live the United Ukrainian Independent State!

**The Leadership of Units Abroad
of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists**

At Headquarters, October, 1959.

Reaction to the News of Stepan Bandera's Death

The news of Bandera's assassination was learnt in Ukraine through short reports in the Soviet press and wireless. The Ukrainian underground movement received the news through its own channels. At first, the great majority of the Ukrainian people took the Soviet reports for provocation and did not believe the news. In order to convince the population of Bandera's death, the Bolsheviks released for news-reels in the following weeks film fragments of the funeral ceremonies, which were shown in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Eastern Germany, and they reckoned that the Ukrainians living in those countries would inform their relatives and friends in the USSR. Simultaneously, Polish, Czech and Soviet propaganda began to lay the blame for the murder on the Germans. However, reprisals against bolshevist party bosses in the Western Ukraine indicate that these accusations could not deceive the people as to the real culprits.

The Bolsheviks were not content with Bandera's assassination alone. Their aim was, and still is, morally to destroy — by libel and slander — Bandera's work and the Ukrainian freedom movement which he represented, just as they had done at the time of Petlura's death.

Before and after Bandera's assassination the Bolsheviks staged show-trials at which several genuine and fake people were forced to 'confess' that, as members of OUN or UPA, they had about fifteen years ago committed numerous crimes against the Ukrainian population on the orders of the OUN under Bandera's leadership or in collusion with the Nazis. Specially selected witnesses testified to these revelations. However, the people knew better and on the whole were not impressed by this sort of defamation. In order to intensify propaganda attacks against the OUN, the Bolsheviks started a fresh libel campaign in the autumn of 1960 which lasted throughout the year. Under the names of imprisoned nationalists they published statements, which were to convince above all opinion abroad that the freedom movement was unjustified, that its organization no longer existed and that OUN Units Abroad had become a spy ring in the employment of various western secret services and did not care about the fate of Ukraine. The constant repetition of such slanders and the variants in prepared 'evidence' prove that even the Bolsheviks themselves felt that this sort of calumny hardly convinced public opinion.

Among Ukrainians living abroad and in all their political organizations the news of Bandera's murder produced waves of sympathy for the victim and of indignation. Two-months' mourning was proclaimed, and Ukrainians in Western Europe, the USA, Canada, Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela and Australia, flock every year to commemoration ceremonies. Donations to a fund were generously given and represented the answer of Ukrainians to the bolshevist murderers. The donations have secured the livelihood of the victim's family and have made possible the establishment of a fund for the continuation of Bandera's work.

Echo of the Arrest of the Murderer

STATEMENT BY THE LEADERSHIP OF THE OUN AFTER THE DISCOVERY OF THE MURDERER

The first news about the apprehension of the murderer of Bandera and about his confessions was announced on Friday, November 17th, 1961 at noon. On the same day, the Leadership of the OUN Units Abroad issued the following statement in this connection:

The report about the discovery of the murderer of Stepan Bandera, the Leader of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists, tore the mask off the face of the organisers of the assassination.

The Bolshevik agent of the K.G.B. (the Soviet State Security Committee) Bohdan Stashynsky, received the instructions to carry out the assassination directly from the Headquarters of the K.G.B. in Moscow. At that time, Alexander Shelepin was Chairman of the State Security Committee at the Council of Ministers of the USSR. There is no doubt that the plans of the secret murder were known to and approved by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Nikita Khrushchov, to whom the chief of the K.G.B. is subordinated. The fact that Stashynsky was personally presented with an Order of the Red Banner by A. Shelepin in reward for the carrying out of the assassination is a proof that the official Soviet quarters evaluate the carrying out of the political murder of the Leader of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement as deserving merit and assign an award for it.

Before the world the Bolsheviks make an attempt to appear as the protagonists of the liberation of the Asian and African peoples from colonialism. Among the nations occupied by the Russian colonialists, on the other hand, the Bolsheviks suppress by means of the most cruel and cunning methods the slightest strivings of these peoples for liberation.

The Communist Party awarded A. Shelepin for his part in the acceleration of the Russification processes and the deportations of the millions of young non-Russians to the so-called virgin lands of Kazakhstan, Siberia and the Far East by upgrading him from the First Secretary of the Komsomol (the League of the Communist Youth) of the Soviet Union to the supreme chief of State Security Committee.

As a reward for the crushing of the national liberation movements of the nations enslaved by the Red Moscow, and, among other things, for the organizing of the secret murder of the Leader of the liberation movement, Stepan Bandera, the recent 22nd Congress of the CPSU

raised A. Shelepin in rank by electing him Member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, i.e. making him one of the nine supreme dictators of the Soviet Union.

The discovery of those guilty of the murder of Stepan Bandera confirms that:

— Khrushchov's policy with regard to the enslaved peoples is a continuation of Stalin's policy of annihilation of non-Russian nationalities;

— the ideas of national liberation of Ukraine and other peoples enslaved by Russia is such a grave danger to Moscow that she continues to carry out terrorist actions even on the territories of the free countries;

— not only this year's Bolshevik provocations aimed at the take over of Berlin, but also the involvement of official Soviet quarters in the organisation of political murders is a signal of warning for the naive people in the Western world that Bolshevism under the leadership of Khrushchov has not changed and has not ceased to be an imperialistic movement, which tries to bring under its domination the peoples of the Free World by means of violence, terror and cunning.

The Accomplices of Murder in the Soviet Government

by Stepan Mudryk

Two years after the murder of the OUN leader, Stepan Bandera, the crafty assassin, an agent of the Soviet KGB, was found and arrested. He will shortly have to stand trial before a court of the Federal Republic of Germany within whose jurisdiction the crime was committed.

The criminal does not deny his foul deeds instigated by Moscow; he admitted them and disclosed not only the exact details of the planning but also the names of those who plotted and ordered the assassination, trained the murderer and, after the completion of his foul task, decorated their stooge with the high 'Order of the Red Banner.' The chief criminals are the former Head of the KGB*), Alexander Shelepin, and the hangman of Ukraine, Nikita Khrushchov; their tool: Bohdan Stashynsky.

*) Komitet Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti (State Security Committee), the latest successor of the Cheka, GPU, NKVD, NKGB, MVD and MGB.

It is common knowledge that after the murder of S. Bandera the Soviet propaganda machine tried for two years to circulate within the Russian empire and in the countries of the free world base and provocative lies and misrepresentations. These were designed to create confusion and to undermine the prestige of the OUN, as well as to shift the blame for the murder away from Moscow.

Moscow had been planning and preparing an attempt on Bandera's life for fifteen years and repeatedly sent trained agents for this purpose. In many cases, however, the OUN was able to intervene and prevent the attacks, so that NKGB-MGB-KGB headquarters were again and again forced to withdraw their agents and to change their tactics.

The law prevailing in the Federal German Republic does not allow for the prevention of the preparation for murder, i.e. the preliminary study and observation of the intended victim and his habits.

The criminal intentions of Moscow are demonstrated by the following facts:

- In 1947, the KGB agent Moroz was ordered to assassinate the OUN leader, S. Bandera, but the plot was foiled by members of the OUN.
- In 1948, a similar attempt was to be made by Stelmashchuk, another KGB agent, who had come to Western Germany with his accomplices.
- In 1950, KGB headquarters at Prague prepared an attempt on Bandera's life.
- In 1952, Moscow dispatched two more agents, Lehmann and Leguda, the first of German and the second of Czech extraction, who had been appointed and trained to murder S. Bandera.
- In 1953, an old KGB agent, Stefan Liebholz (now called Lippolz), was sent to Western Germany on the same murderous project.
- In 1959, KGB agent Winzik came to Munich from Vienna with the intention to murder S. Bandera or kidnap him and his family.
- In the same year the OUN received a hint that the KGB was planning an attempt on Bandera's life, which was to be carried out in the same manner as had been employed against the Ukrainian Head of State, Symon Petlura. The KGB had trained a young Pole from Western Ukraine and wanted to send him to Germany to kill S. Bandera 'in revenge for the murder of his family by followers of Bandera.' (Schwarzbart, the murderer of Symon Petlura, had also asserted that he had 'taken revenge for the Jews.') The KGB then dropped the plan and decided to act surreptitiously. For this purpose Stashynsky received his training.

In its defamatory and mendacious propaganda the Soviet KGB employed other methods as well.

As we know, some OUN members who had been sent to Ukraine in support of revolutionary activity there, fell into the hands of the KGB. After long imprisonment and by the use of inhuman torture the KGB succeeded in demoralizing some OUN members and forced them to defame publicly leading members of the OUN and the freedom movement. These men, who had been robbed of their will by incredible methods of physical and psychological maltreatment and who had been prevented by the enemy to die an honourable death, were now dragged from the dungeons and forced to make statements favourable to the KGB, which were to 'prove' the assertions of the KGB about 'OUN co-operation' in Western espionage and about 'appalling murders of innocent people' perpetrated by members of the OUN. After the retreat of Soviet troops in 1941, the prisons at Lviv (Lvov) and other Ukrainian towns, particularly Vinnytsia, were full of the corpses of political prisoners. There were also the bodies found in the village wells. The KGB tried to lay the blame for the murders in NKVD dungeons on the Ukrainian 'Nightingale' legion and accused OUN members of having killed those whose bodies were found in the wells. It is curious, though, that the corpses in the wells were 'brought to light' as late as fifteen years after the war, that is, when all local witnesses of the crime had been removed by the KGB. In the same manner Moscow tried to incriminate German government circles for the murder of Stepan Bandera and named as an 'accessory' to the murder the leading OUN member Myskiv who in the meantime had died.

Now that the biggest lie of the KGB has been exploded and the murderers (Khrushchov, Shelepin and Stashynsky) have been exposed, we once more want to call attention to the fact that the KGB will continue, more vigorously than ever, to spread false and provocative rumours and to attack and defame OUN members, in order to drown the shouts of protest in the free world and to smother the indignation of Ukrainians in the homeland, as well as to exonerate before the world the bemedalled assassins. At the same time, among the noise of KGB propaganda, fresh murders are being planned against the leaders of the OUN.

We know that all these plots are laid in such a way that the guilt can later be placed on others, or a 'suicide' can be simulated. We therefore warn all Ukrainians in exile and all honest people in the free world to beware of fresh crimes planned by the KGB.

Moscow and its public or secret servants will never succeed in misleading the Ukrainian people or in lulling them into security. Moscow's murderous plans have been exposed and it will not be able to pin its murders on anyone else: for all these murders the responsibility lies with Khrushchov and his myrmidons, Shelepin, and now also Semichastny.*)

*) Semichastny has recently succeeded Shelepin as Head of the KGB (State Security Committee) of the USSR, after Shelepin was appointed Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

Protest Meetings Abroad Against the Bolshevist Terror

The arrest of Bandera's murderer and the disclosure that for the execution of his crime he had received from the highest Soviet authorities a distinguished service medal, caused strong indignation among Ukrainians living in the free world.

In all, 122 protest meetings (5 of which were demonstrations) were held in various countries, i.e. 48 in Great Britain, 38 in Canada, 14 in Germany, 6 in the USA, 5 in France, 4 in Belgium, 3 in Australia, and one each in Holland, Austria, Argentina and Brazil.

In the course of these meetings and demonstrations protest resolutions were passed against the bolshevist terror and against the instigators of the murder, Khrushchov and Shelepin; severe punishment of the culprits was demanded, and an appeal made to several national and international authorities, requesting them to take appropriate measures for the protection of personalities in political and cultural life against the treachery of bolshevist agents. In several places demands were made for greater safeguards for citizens and democratic institutions. Particularly in Canada, resolutions were passed requesting that the activities of communist organizations in the country should be made illegal.

The resolutions passed at the protest meetings were then forwarded to the appropriate ministries, heads of governments, envoys of the Federal German Republic, to the United Nations (Commission for Human Rights) and to embassies of the free world.

The demonstrations which were held in front of the buildings of the Soviet UN Delegation in New York (2 December 1961), the Soviet Embassy in London (25 and 26 November), in Washington (9th December), Ottawa (22 December) and Guelph, Canada (5 December 1961) were to rouse public opinion. At these demonstrations suitably inscribed posters and placards were carried and thousands of leaflets were distributed, which gave information about Moscow's renewed criminal activities. In New York the demonstrators burnt the Soviet flag, an incident on which the Soviet newspaper 'Izvestiya' reported in abusive language without, however, mentioning the reason for the demonstration.

LIST OF PROTEST MEETINGS

against the Soviet Russian instigators of Bandera's murder

Saturday, 18th November, 1961:

Bradford (York's), Great Britain;

Sunday, 19th November, 1961:

Edmonton (Alta), Canada;
 Derby (Derby's), Great Britain;
 Munich (Bavaria), Federal Republic
 of Germany;
 Port Arthur & Port Williams (Ont.),
 Canada;
 Rotterdam, Holland;

Tuesday, 21st November, 1961:

Düsseldorf-Wersten (North Rhine-
 Westphalia), Federal Republic of
 Germany;
 Düsseldorf-Lohausen (North Rhine-
 Westphalia), Federal Republic of
 Germany;
 Wawa (Ont.), Canada;

Thursday, 23rd November, 1961:

Sault Ste. Marie (Ont.), Canada;

Saturday, 25th November, 1961:

Hohne, Federal Rep. of Germany;
 Coventry (Warwick's), Gt. Britain;
 London*), Great Britain;
 Oldham (Lanc's), Great Britain;
 Ottawa (Ont.), Canada;
 Scunthorpe (Linc's), Great Britain;
 Waltham Cross (Essex), Gt. Britain;

Sunday, 26th November, 1961:

Bedford (Bed's), Great Britain;
 Bury (Lanc's), Great Britain;
 Birmingham (Warwick's), Great
 Britain;
 Bolton (Lanc's), Great Britain;
 Carlisle (Cumberland), Gt. Britain;
 Gloucester (Gloucester), Gt. Britain;
 Glossop (Derby's), Great Britain;
 Halifax (W.R., York's), Gt. Britain;
 Hannover (Lower Saxony), Federal
 Republic of Germany;

Huddersfield (York's), Great Britain;
 Ipswich (Suffolk), Great Britain;
 Keighley (York's), Great Britain;
 Leeds (W.R., York's), Great Britain;
 London**), Great Britain;
 Mansfield (Nott's), Great Britain;
 Middleton (Lanc's), Great Britain;
 Montreal (Quebec), Canada;
 Morage, Belgium;
 Münster (North Rhine-Westphalia),
 Federal Republic of Germany;
 Nottingham (Nott's), Great Britain;
 Osnabrück (Lower Saxony), Federal
 Republic of Germany;
 Ottawa (Ont.), Canada;
 Preston (Lanc's), Great Britain;
 Rochdale (Lanc's), Great Britain;
 Slough (Buck's), Great Britain;
 Stuttgart (Baden-Württemberg), Fe-
 deral Republic of Germany;
 Sudbury (Ont.), Canada;
 Wellingborough & Rushden (Nort-
 hant's), Great Britain;
 Wolverhampton (Staff's), Gt. Britain;

Tuesday, 28th November, 1961:

Leicester (Leic's), Great Britain;

Wednesday, 29th November, 1961:

Capuskasing (Ont.), Canada;

Saturday, 2nd December, 1961:

Ashton-under-Lyne (Lanc's), Great
 Britain;
 Bielefeld (North Rhine-Westphalia),
 Federal Republic of Germany;
 Bradford (Ont.), Canada;
 Detroit (Mich.), USA;
 Calgary (Alta), Canada;
 Glasgow (Lanark), Great Britain;
 New York*) (N.Y.), USA;
 Oakville (Ont.), Canada;
 Timmins (Ont.), Canada;

Sunday, 3rd December, 1961:

Charleroi, Belgium;
Dundee (Angus, Scotland), Great Britain;
Edinburgh (Scotland), Great Britain;
Galashiels (Selkirk, Scotland), Great Britain;
Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent (Staff's), Great Britain;
Ingolstadt (Bavaria), Federal Rep. of Germany;
Kirkland Lake (Ont.), Canada;
Kitchener (Ont.), Canada;
La Louvière, Belgium;
Landshut (Bavaria), Federal Rep. of Germany;
Liège, Belgium;
Lincoln (Linc's), Great Britain;
Manchester (Lanc's), Great Britain;
Nuremberg (Bavaria), Federal Rep. of Germany;
Regensburg (Bavaria), Federal Rep. of Germany;
Regina (Sask.), Canada;
Rouyn-Noranda (Quebec), Canada;
Socheaux, France;
Stockport (Cheshire), Great Britain;
Swindon (Wilt's), Great Britain;
Todmorden (Lanc's), Great Britain;
Toronto (Ont.), Canada;
Völkermarkt (Carinthia), Austria;

Tuesday, 5th December, 1961:

Guclph*) (Ont.), Canada;

Thursday, 7th December:

Val d'Or (Quebec), Canada;

Friday, 8th December, 1961:

Newhaven (Sussex), Great Britain;

Saturday, 9th December, 1961:

Washington*) (Wast.), USA;

Sunday, 10th December, 1961:

Brantford (Ont.), Canada;
Doncaster (York's), Great Britain;
Rugby (Warwick's), Great Britain;
Saskatoon (Sask.), Canada;
Welland (Ont.), Canada;
Winnipeg (Man.), Canada;

Thursday, 14th December, 1961:

Kingston (Ont.), Canada;

Friday, 15th December, 1961:

Moose Jaw (Sask.), Canada;

Saturday, 16th December, 1961:

Sheffield (W.R., York's), Gt. Britain;

Sunday, 17th December, 1961:

Blackburn (Lanc's), Great Britain;
Delhi (Ont.), Canada;
Edmonton**) (Alta), Canada;
Guelph**) (Ont.), Canada;
Hamilton (Ont.), Canada;
New Toronto (Ont.), Canada;
Oshawa (Ont.), Canada;
Paderborn (Westphalia), Federal Rep. of Germany;
Portage la Prairie (Man.), Canada;
Sudbury**) (Ont.), Canada;
Vancouver (B.C.), Canada;
Waterford (Ont.), Canada;
Windsor (Ont.), Canada;

Friday, 22nd December, 1961:

Ottawa**) (Ont.), Canada;

Sunday, 24th December, 1961:

Fricourt (Somme), France;

Sunday, 31st December, 1961:

Chicago (Illinois), USA;

Sunday, 14th January, 1962:

San Francisco-Solano, Argentina;

Sunday, 21st January, 1962:

Sydney (Stratfield), Australia;

Sunday, 4th February, 1962:

Jersey City (N.Y.), USA;

Lyon (Rhône), France;

Sunday, 25th February, 1962:

Le Cateau (Nord), France;

Sunday, 4th March, 1962:

Canberra (ACT), Australia;
Curitiba (Parana), Brazil;
Binghamton (N.Y.), USA;
Bury**) (Lanc's), Great Britain;
Roubaix (Nord), France.

*) Places at which demonstrations were staged.

**) Places at which protest meetings were held for the second time.

RESOLUTION OF PROTEST

**by the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN) against the acts
of murder perpetrated by the Moscow government**

The Central Committee of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN) regards it as essential that the attention of the public should be drawn to the following facts:

1. At the instructions of the Soviet state security service, the leader of the Ukrainian revolutionary movement, Stepan BANDERA, the president of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), was murdered in the entrance-hall of the house in which he lived in Munich, on October 15, 1959.

The man who carried out these instructions, Bohdan Stashynsky, an agent of the Soviet security service, who has in the meantime given himself up voluntarily to the authorities of the German Federal Republic because he feared for his life in the Soviet Union on account of his knowledge of this crime, has admitted that he received these orders to murder Stepan Bandera from the then chief of the Soviet state security service, Alexander Shelepin, personally. He also confessed that he had carried out the murder by means of a poison pistol loaded with cyanide, and that he was decorated with the high "Order of the Red Banner" for this deed by Shelepin. The correctness of this statement has already been investigated, and the murderer Stashynsky will be called to account in a trial in the near future before the courts of the Federal Republic of Germany.

2. This same agent of the Soviet secret service, B. Stashynsky, also confessed to having murdered the well-known Ukrainian emigrant politician Dr. Lev Rebet in the entrance-hall of the office in Munich where he worked, in the year 1957, by the same method and at the orders of his chief, the above-mentioned Alexander Shelepin.

3. It has also been learnt from American sources that B. Stashynsky, who committed the two aforesaid murders, finally admitted at his interrogation that he had likewise received orders to murder the former Ukrainian Prime Minister, Jaroslaw STETZKO, another prominent personality of the Ukrainian liberation struggle and the President of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations. This murder was to be carried out in 1960, but it could not be perpetrated for reasons which have as yet not been clarified.

4. The person who issued the orders in all three cases, Alexander Shelepin, on the strength of his office as chief of the Soviet secret service was one of the closest co-workers and right-hand men of the Party Secretary and Prime Minister Nikita Khrushchov. The confidence which Shelepin enjoys was, furthermore, corroborated at the recent 22nd Party Congress in Moscow, when, at Khrushchov's suggestion, he was entrusted with the post of a secretary for security matters in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Since it was a question of liquidating leading personalities of the Ukrainian national movement and thus of important political decisions in each of the murder cases mentioned above, there can be no doubt that these orders were issued with the knowledge and approval of the Soviet government and Party leaders, and were in fact issued directly by the Party and government leader Khrushchov in the first place. This can also be seen from the conferment of a high order on B. Stashynsky for the murders, since application for this conferment had to be made by Stashynsky's superior, Shelepin, to the head of the government, Khrushchov, and adequate reasons for this application had to be given, and, furthermore, the conferment had to be approved by the state presidium.

5. After the agent Stashynsky fled to the West, the Moscow government, since it was afraid of disclosures on his part, tried to escape such exposure by means of a propaganda trick. On October 13, 1961, it arranged a press conference in East Berlin at which another agent of the Soviet secret service, named Stefan Lippolz, appeared in order to make certain "disclosures" regarding the murder of Stepan Bandera. He blamed the murder onto the cashier of Bandera's own organization, Dmytro Myskiy, who has died in the meantime. This diversion manoeuvre, however, was a failure since it is an established fact that the fictitious "murderer" was not in Munich when Bandera was murdered, but was in Rome at the time, where he stayed for several days.

These facts which have already been established are by far more significant than the mere facts of an ordinary trial, in which only the physical perpetrator and executor of these terrorist murders would be called to account. Even if mass-murders have always been a traditional method of the Bolshevist regime and the world seems to have become accustomed to overlooking individual cases of this type as minor offences, the flagrant cases mentioned above and the attendant circumstances force one to draw far-reaching conclusions both of a juridical and of a moral and political nature, precisely because of the proof which they offer:

1. Not only the direct murderer Stashynsky must be accused by the German court as the hired tool for these vile murders, committed at the orders of the highest Soviet authority and carried out in the territory of the German Federal Republic, but the following co-accused should also be tried before a German court, — the person who gave the orders, the chief of the Soviet secret service, Alexander

Shelepin, on account of instigation and aiding and abetting, namely, among other things, by supplying the weapon which had been specially constructed for this purpose; and, further, the Soviet government and Party chief, Nikita Khrushchov, in whose name the orders were issued and who must be regarded as the principal instigator and main guilty party. If the Moscow government now has the audacity to demand the extradition of General Heusinger on account of fictitious war crimes imputed to the latter, then there is no reason why the government of a legal state should not demand the extradition of the accomplices and main accused in a planned murder and bring them to trial, especially as these crimes were committed during peacetimes in the free world.

2. The murders listed above should be used as precedents in order to expose before the whole world the Bolshevik system of murder and the practices of the Party and government chief, Khrushchov, personally, who today makes a great show of his so-called "de-Stalinization" measures and his alleged "socialist legality." In this respect it would suffice to shed light on the atrocities which he committed during his terrorist rule in Ukraine as the first Party Secretary and Prime Minister of that country from 1938 to 1949.

Khrushchov has the mass-murders of thousands of so-called "bourgeois nationalists," who prior to and at the outbreak of World War II bestirred themselves in the cause of Ukrainian independence, on his conscience. Mass-graves containing the bodies of thousands of Ukrainian patriots of those days in Lviv, Vinnytsia, Uman, Lutsk and elsewhere are definite proof of his crimes.

The destruction campaign directed against Ukrainian insurgents after the war was over, a campaign which was carried out by means of dreadful chemical and bacteriological weapons, as well as the mass-deportation of Ukrainian youth to death-camps, was likewise the work of Khrushchov.

And, finally, Khrushchov was responsible for the ruthless persecution and destruction of both the Catholic Uniate Church in West Ukraine and also the Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Kyiv, which refused to subordinate itself to the Moscow Patriarchate. Amongst the martyrs who were victimized by this persecution campaign were the Ukrainian bishops Josephat Kotsylovsky, G. Khomyshyn, N. Budka, and Th. Romzha.

In addition, it is in accordance with the will of Khrushchov that at present mock trials are still being held before courts in Kyiv, Lutsk, Stanyslaviv, Kolomyya, Krasnoarmiysk and other places, in which the accused are Ukrainian patriots, who are accused of being "enemies of the state" and "traitors to Soviet patriotism" and are either hanged or sent to prison as "Banderovtsi," that is supporters of Bandera.

Furthermore, the ruthless suppression of the liberation revolts in the Soviet Occupied Zone of Germany on June 17, 1953, the riots in Poznan in 1956, and, above all, the massacre of Budapest, when the victorious Hungarian liberation revolution, which had already shaken

off the fetters of the Communist regime, was crushed by Russian tanks, were also the result of Khrushchov's "liberalization course."

It was likewise under Khrushchov's rule that during the years 1953 to 1956 revolts were crushed in the mass-concentration camps of Vorkuta, Norilsk, Magadan, Mordovia, Karaganda, Taishet, Kolyma and Kingir, where thousands of internees, the majority of them Ukrainian women, were, according to eyewitness testimony, mown down by tanks. The same fate also befell the young people in the concentration camp in Temir Tau who revolted in the cause of freedom in 1959.

3. The terrorist murders of political emigrants in the free world, which we mentioned in the foregoing, are by no means individual cases. It is an established fact that there have been numerous victims of cases of this type not only in Munich and in the Federal Republic of Germany but also amongst the active freedom fighters and representatives of the political emigrants of Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Georgia, Hungary, Slovakia, and Rumania, etc., who were found murdered or were abducted. In practically all these cases of murder, abduction and attempts to assassinate persons by laying explosives, which have been directed against emigrants and have obviously been carried out by agents of Moscow and its puppet governments, the competent authorities and the press of the country in which the emigrants resided quite plainly endeavoured to protect the persons who had issued the orders, to make light of these crimes, and to explain away the deaths of the victims either as "suicide," or as the result of "internal differences" amongst the emigrants. Protests have also been voiced against the activity of the emigrants, which has frequently been designated as "questionable" and stamped as a disturbance of law and order, or even as a danger to the country in which they reside.

Such an attitude on the part of the public of the country in which the political refugees from the Bolshevik-ruled countries have sought asylum, is, in our opinion, a distortion of the idea of asylum and degrades the political emigrants to the rank of an undesirable, or, at best, an inevitable evil. Such an attitude towards the victims of Russian Bolshevik alien rule, whose duty it is, as representatives in the free world of their oppressed peoples to demand freedom and justice for the latter, is indeed reprehensible, and, moreover, strikes us as particularly strange since some of the countries in which the emigrants have sought asylum, as for instance Germany, are themselves in part already languishing under the same alien rule, or are themselves seriously threatened by the Bolshevik world danger. It is a strange paradox that the once so sacred right of asylum, even for the spokesmen of hostile ideologies and political trends, nowadays does not even include the protection of the fundamental rights of life of the natural allies of the West in the fight against the common Russian Bolshevik world danger.

In view of all these alarming and significant facts, the Central Committee of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations regards it as its duty to appeal to the competent authorities, institutions and organizations of the free world with the following petition, namely that:

1. THE JURIDICAL AUTHORITIES OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, in whose territory the murders by poison mentioned above were committed and attempts to murder were carried out at the orders of members of the Soviet Russian government, should demand the extradition of the accomplices of the murderers, regardless of their rank and person, and should sentence such persons, if necessary in their absence, as accessories to crime.

2. We propose the setting up of an INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL to deal with the Bolshevik mass-murders committed since Stalin's day and in which the victims were non-Communists, and to call the present rulers of the Kremlin to account for their crimes against humanity.

3. We demand that THE COMMISSION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS in the United Nations Organization should apply the statutes of its own Charter, in connection with the murders in Munich of spokesmen of the Ukrainian fight for freedom, should take legal proceedings as regards all the mass-murders perpetrated by the Moscow government, to which reference has been made in this petition, and should publicly condemn the perpetrators.

4. We demand that THE COURT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS of the European Council should take proceedings as regards the above-mentioned murders and should sentence the Moscow government on account of these vile crimes committed at its orders.

5. We appeal to THE INTERNATIONAL JURISTS' COMMISSION, which has set itself the task of protecting legal, state principles and combatting the system of injustice, to take proceedings as regards these vile violations of the fundamental rights and protective measures for the life of the political refugees from the Bolshevik-ruled countries and their subjugated peoples, and to condemn these violations by issuing appropriate resolutions and declarations.

6. We exhort the PUBLIC OF THE WEST to see to it that the confused attitude which prevails to a large extent in the press and broadcasting services of the free world as regards the political emigrants from the Bolshevik sphere of influence is rectified and the sacred right of asylum is restored; and in doing so, to recognize the fact that it is imperative that there should be absolute solidarity between the free world and the subjugated peoples and the refugees of the latter, in the joint and decisive fight against Moscow's despotism.

7. We demand that THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE FREE WORLD should launch a large-scale counter-offensive on a moral and political level against the criminal Moscow government and its bloodthirsty

dictator, Nikita Khrushchov, who, in view of the countless atrocities and intentional mass-murders that he has committed, should be exposed in his role as "anti-Stalinist," in the interests of the free world.

8. And, finally, we trust that THE POLITICAL AUTHORITIES IN THE WEST will draw the logical conclusions, necessary for the psychological and political war against Moscow's despotic rule, from the terrorist murders perpetrated against the spokesmen of the national fight for freedom of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The atrocious murders prove more convincingly than anything else that the main threat to the preservation of the Russian Bolshevist despotic rule lies in the activation of the NATIONAL LIBERATION IDEA, and also reveal the enormous potential of this idea in Moscow's opinion. It would be irresponsible of the West to fail to interpret this omen rightly and to continue not only to ignore the national political emigrants, but also to adopt an indifferent attitude towards the physical liquidation of their leading representatives.

**The Central Committee
of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN)**

Munich, December 1961.

RESOLUTION

OF PROTEST AGAINST MOSCOW MURDERS ADOPTED BY CHICAGO RALLY OF AMERICAN UKRAINIANS

WE AMERICANS OF UKRAINIAN DESCENT, assembled at a political rally on December 31, 1961 at the American Ukrainian Youth Assn. Auditorium in Chicago, Illinois, protesting against the brutal Russian Communist terror, the assassination of Ukrainian state and political leaders and leaders of other Captive Nations, resolved:

Whereas, the Ukrainian people continue in their struggle, in their native land against the Russian Communist occupation and regime and whereas their struggle presents a deadly menace to the Soviet colonial empire;

Whereas, both the Tsarist and now the Communist Russian Empire has been engaged in a criminal conspiracy against the Ukrainian state and political leaders, victims of which were leaders exiled in the West, to wit: in the past 25 years the Soviets have assassinated the President of the Ukrainian National Republic, Symon Petlura (assassinated in Paris in 1926); Leader of the Ukrainian Nationalists, Col. Evhen Konovalts (assassinated in Rotterdam in 1938); a noted Ukrainian journalist, Dr. Lev Rebet (assassinated in Munich in 1957), and lastly the Leader of the Ukrainian Nationalist Movement, Stepan Bandera (assassinated in Munich in 1959), and whereas these assassina-

tions were perpetrated by Soviet agents in the free world upon direct orders of Joseph Stalin and later Nikita Khrushchov as was proved recently by the confession of KGB agent Bohdan Stashynsky to German authorities who released his confession wherein he admitted murdering Dr. Lev Rebet and Stepan Bandera;

Whereas, the Soviets have perfected a new murder weapon, that is a cyanide spray pistol, which is being used for political assassinations and leaves no evidence of crime, and it appears to be a perfect substitute for clock bombs and pistols used previously;

THEREFORE:

We appeal to the United Nations and the Governments of the free world for the support of their free voice for the cause of freedom and genuine liberation of the Ukrainian people and other Captive Nations from the inhuman Russian Communist oppression;

We ask the United Nations to challenge the members of the Russian Communist regime and to put them before the International Tribunal to answer for the crime and murders committed, for the recent murder of Stepan Bandera and other Ukrainian state and political leaders, and leaders of other Captive Nations;

We appeal to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer to have the West German Court hold a public trial in the case of the murder of Stepan Bandera, and we further ask that correspondents, lawyers and experts on international criminal law be permitted to be present at this trial, and that the Ukrainian exiled political emigrés and the family of the late Stepan Bandera be permitted to be represented by legal counsel of their choice;

We appeal to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Chairman of the United Nations Committee on Human Rights to warn the free world of the newly adopted murder weapon which is used by the Soviets to liquidate state leaders of the Captive Nations, and further that Russia be put before the panel of world public opinion to answer for the international crimes and inhumanities that the members of her government have perpetrated.



RESOLUTION

OF THE UKRAINIAN PROTEST MEETING IN LONDON

We, participants in the Ukrainian Meeting and Demonstration held on the 26th of November, 1961, at Speakers' Corner, Hyde Park, London, against Moscow Bolshevik terror and enslavement of Ukraine, against the ignominious destruction of the leaders of the Ukrainian Nation, as confirmed by the revelations of the Moscow-hired murderer of Stepan Bandera, a leader of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement, affirm;

1. That the liberation fight of the Ukrainian nation against Moscow, which is still being waged in Ukraine, is a deadly danger to Russian imperialism.
2. That to hold Ukraine under its power, to maintain the entire Bolshevik empire and to strengthen its internal position with the aim of furthering its opportunities, to annexe countries that are still free, Bolshevik Moscow adopts physical destruction, and Russification of Ukraine and its incorporation in the land of the so-called USSR; and also in the countries of the Free World where Ukrainian political emigrees live and act, Moscow adopts political murder as a weapon against the defenders of political and national rights for the Ukrainian nation.
3. That the declarations of N. Khrushchov about the peaceful policy of Moscow's Government, his condemnation of Stalin's terror and his wishes to co-exist peacefully with the Western World are cynical lies by which he tries to hide his Government's aggressive intentions to capture through Communism the countries of the Free World.
4. That despite the proofless declarations of Nikita Khrushchov the policy of Moscow is still unchanged and that in the territories of the enslaved nations, which make up the so-called USSR, Khrushchov continues the criminal traditions of Stalin including genocide and the trampling on the rights and dignity of free men.
5. That the murder of Stepan Bandera, the leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, by an agent of K.G.B., one B. Stashynsky, is the deed of the Moscow Government and that the organiser of the murder was according to the confession of the agent, Alexander Shelepin the then Chief of the Committee of Government Security of the USSR and at present a member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CPSU and who was directly subordinate to N. Khrushchov, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR; and further that the agent Stashynsky for his part in the murder of Stepan Bandera was awarded the Order of the Red Banner thus making ultimate responsibility due with Nikita Khrushchov, Alexander Shelepin, the CPSU, and the Moscow Government.

We, condemn these criminal methods of the Moscow Bolsheviks as adopted by N. Khrushchov, A. Shelepin and their accomplices in the Central Committee of the CPSU against the Ukrainian nation and its leaders, and demand;

1. That N. Khrushchov, A. Shelepin, the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Government of the USSR should be put on trial before a tribunal of the Free World and should bear the responsibility for their criminal and political acts as adopted against the Ukrainian and other enslaved nations within the USSR.
2. That their bloody crime committed against Stepan Bandera should be condemned by all institutions for the Defence of Rights of Mankind and by the voiced opinion of the whole of the Free World.
3. That the murderer of Stepan Bandera the agent of K.G.B., Stashynsky must stand trial and accept the consequences for this and other foul deeds, which were directed not only against Ukrainian political leaders but also in the main against the entire Ukrainian nation.
4. That because the murder took place on German Federal territory, the Government apply the appropriate diplomatic sanctions against the Moscow Government in order to guarantee in future to political emigré leaders a safe sojourn in the country.

We appeal to all Governments of the Free World;

1. To direct their attention to the fate of the enslaved nations within the USSR and to help them in their struggle for liberation.
2. To discontinue their false hopes for a change in Moscow Bolshevism and to continue by all possible means the break up of Moscow's tyrannical empire.
3. To mobilise all spiritual and material forces for the victory of the Free World over the tyranny of Russian imperialism.

The freedom loving people of Ukraine that since 1918 has led a continuous fight against Moscow's Bolshevik imperialism, the biggest enemy of Christianity and freedom loving national states, is the best and most useful ally of the Free World. By fighting for its own independence the Ukrainian nation is at the same time defending the freedom and rights of other enslaved nations in the USSR and those which are still free but threatened by Russian imperialism.

All this gives the Ukrainian nation the moral right to approach other nations in the Free World for help to regain its independence which in time will help to destroy Moscow's empire and so ensure a lasting and true peace throughout the world.

For and on behalf of the Meeting,

M. Zacharchuk
Chairman

M. Povrozyk
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE RALLY

of the Association of Ukrainians former Combatants in Great Britain

We, former Ukrainian soldiers, participants in our annual Rally, having learned about the arrest in Germany of Bohdan Stashynsky, an agent of the Soviet K.G.B., the murderer of the Leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, Stepan Bandera, and of Dr. Lev Rebet, declare together with the members of the Ukrainian community which gathered at the Rally, that:

1. In its struggle against the aspirations of the Ukrainian people, Moscow, throughout its history, has used the most cruel and base methods for the preservation of its dominant and imperialist positions.
2. With this aim in view, many prominent leaders of the Ukrainian people have been liquidated, most recently the leader of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement, Stepan Bandera, by means of a shameful method, unheard of in the civilised world.
3. The organiser of the murder was Alexander Shelepin, the Chairman of the Committee of State Security at the Council of Ministers of the USSR, which is subordinated to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Nikita Khrushchov. Hence the Russian Government and the Central Committee of the CPSU are responsible for this new despicable crime and they ought to be condemned by a tribunal of the Free World and the general public opinion.
4. The perpetrator of this crime, the K.G.B. agent Bohdan Stashynsky, must be put on trial before a criminal court and made responsible for the murders directed not only against the Ukrainian political figures, but mainly against the entire Ukrainian people.
5. The commission of these crimes and the awarding of the "Order of the Red Banner" to the murderer are one more proof that the Muscovite empire is ruled by criminals and this fact must be a warning to the entire Free World.
6. In view of the fact that the above crimes were committed on the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, we ask her Government to apply appropriate diplomatic sanctions with regard to Moscow and to guarantee the political emigré leaders the safety of sojourn in future.
7. The recent discovery of the murderer consolidates us all in the desire — in reply to the murders of Symon Petlura, Evhen Konovalts, Roman Shukhevych and Stepan Bandera — to

intensify our activities and to prepare for action to erect a magnificent monument to their glorious memory in the form of an INDEPENDENT UNITED UKRAINIAN STATE.

The participants in the Rally
of the Association of Ukrainians
former Combatants in Great Britain.

For and on behalf of the Rally,

M. Bilyj-Karpy nec, Cpt/Rtd.
Chairman

Dr. S. M. Fostun
Secretary

Bradford, Yorks., 18th November, 1961.

**A Statement by the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League,
Republic of China, in protest against the assassination of
Mr. Stepan Bandera, the overseas Ukrainian anti-Communist leader,
by Russian secret agents**

We were deeply saddened at the assassination of Mr. Stepan Bandera, the overseas Ukrainian anti-Communist leader, which thus deprived the Ukrainian people of a heroic comrade in their struggle for national freedom and independence, and we wish to voice hereby our resentment at the shameless murder carried out by secret agents under the criminal directives of the Soviet Russian Communist imperialists.

Now that the murderer will soon be brought to trial in West Germany, it is our confidence that his crime will be squarely punished by the law. On this most unfortunate incident, we should like to make public our view as in the following:

First, we must unanimously denounce the atrocity of the Soviet Russian Communist imperialists in sending throughout the free world their secret agents to carry out their premeditated murders.

Second, we wish to point to the fact that the Soviet Russian Communist imperialists are dispatching numerous secret agents to every corner of the free world to carry out, at the same time, their intrigues of infiltration, division and subversion. Hence, we of the free world should heighten our vigilance by adopting every possible precautionary measure.

Third, we urge that all democratic nations extend warm sympathy and active support to Communist-enslaved peoples in their fight for freedom, so as to enable them to overthrow the Communist tyrannical rule and thereby regain their national freedom and independence.

Taipei, April 16th, 1962.

Ku Cheng-kang
President of the APACLROC

EXTRACTS FROM PROTEST RESOLUTIONS

The highest officials in the Communist Party and in the Government of the Soviet Union, particularly the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Nikita Khrushchov, and the former chairman of the State Security Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, now member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR, Alexander Shelepin, are personally responsible for the planning, support and execution of the political murder of Stepan Bandera, a responsibility underlined by the fact that the murderer was decorated with the 'Order of the Red Banner.'

Contrary to the wordy protestations of the Russian dictators, the character and the methods of Muscovite communism have remained unchanged and the Khrushchov regime systematically continues the criminal traditions of the Stalin era.

*An extract from the Resolution of Protest adopted
at a meeting in Munich, Germany.*

*

Together with the assassin Stashynsky should be put in the dock Shelepin as instigator of the murder and Khrushchov as an accessory to the crime.

The German Court should proceed against Stashynsky for murder, Shelepin for instigation to murder, and Khrushchov for abetting the murder... The Federal German government should institute stern diplomatic measures against the Soviet government.

Ingolstadt, Germany.

*

We request the German government to admit a Ukrainian lawyer to the trial of Bohdan Stashynsky for murder and to indict for this crime also Khrushchov, Shelepin and the Soviet government.

Canberra and Queanbeyan, Australia.

*

At its General Meeting on 19th November 1961, the Association of Ukrainians in Holland took notice with extreme indignation of the fact that the Soviet citizen Stashynsky, who was arrested in the Federal German Republic, murdered on orders from the KGB in Moscow the Ukrainian freedom-fighter Stepan Bandera and Lev Rebet.

The General Meeting registers its strong protest against these terroristic acts of the Soviet government and requests the governments of the free world to call the Soviet government to account, before the competent international authority, for this violent infringement of human rights.

General Meeting of Ukrainians in Holland

This resolution was forwarded by telegram to the Prime Minister of the Netherlands and to all ambassadors accredited to Holland.

C O N T E N T S

FOREWORD	3
<i>Stepan Lenkavsky: SOVIET RUSSIAN POLITICAL MURDERS ABROAD AND ATTEMPTS TO CAMOUFLAGED THEM</i>	5
Three Leaders of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement Murdered by Moscow	5
How Do the Bolsheviks Explain the Murders Committed by Them?	8
Legends about the Crimes of Oberländer, Shukhevych and the Ukrainian Legion	13
Lippolz's Speculations on the Poisoning of Bandera	15
Bolshevist Defamation Tactics	19
<i>Dr. Mykola Kovalevsky: SYMON PETLURA (1879-1926), Supreme Commander of the Ukrainian Army and President of the Ukrainian National Republic</i>	21
Crucial Events	21
Petlura versus Lenin	23
War and Revolution	24
In the Struggle for Independent Ukraine	25
Russian Aggression in Ukraine	27
Champion of the Struggle for Freedom and Independence	28
<i>Dmytro Shtykalo: THE FOUNDER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY LIBERATION MOVEMENT</i>	29
Evhen Konovalts in the War	29
The Foundation of UVO	30
The Development of Activity Abroad	31
Birth and Growth of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN)	33
Death by Moscow's Hand	35
<i>Danylo Chaykovsky: STEPAN BANDERA, HIS LIFE AND STRUGGLE</i>	36
Under the Polish Rule	36
Bandera's Youth	37
In the Ranks of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists	39
Armed Campaign of the OUN in West Ukraine	41
Stepan Bandera Becomes Head of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists	44
The Unabated Fight against Russia	47
INFORMATION ABOUT THE ASSASSINATION OF BANDERA	49
First Announcement of Bandera's Death	49
Appeal of the Leadership of OUN Units Abroad to Members and to the Entire Ukrainian People	50
Reaction to the News of Stepan Bandera's Death	54

ECHO OF THE ARREST OF THE MURDERER	55
Statement by the Leadership of the OUN after the Discovery of the Murderer	55
The Accomplices of Murder in the Soviet Government (by Stepan Mudryk)	56
Protest Meetings Abroad against the Bolshevist Terror	59
List of Protest Meetings against the Soviet Russian Instigators of Bandera's Murder	60
Resolution of Protest by the A.B.N.	62
Resolution of Protest by Chicago Rally	67
Resolution of Protest by London Rally	69
Resolution of the Rally of the Association of Ukrainians former Combatants in Great Britain	71
Statement by the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, Republic of China	72
Extracts from Protest Resolutions	73