



# UKRAINIAN CORRESPONDENCE

1  
UC

Editor in Chief — Yaroslav Bentzal

Published by Ukrainian Publishers in Munich — 8 München 8, Zeppelinstr. 67

No. 2

Karlsruhe, October 10 1962

## THE TRIAL OF BODHAN STASHYNSKY

Two important things emerged from Tuesday's hearing of the Stashynsky trial in Karlsruhe. The first was that the order for the murder of Dr. Lev Rebet came from Moscow - "the man from Moscow" as Stashynsky repeatedly called his special instructor. The second was the two contradictory lines of Stashynsky's defense - "I was a soldier and compelled to carry out orders," and, "I was a victim of the system."

The day started with the President of the Court trying to get from Stashynsky more detail about the various towns in which he alleged he worked under KGB instructions and about the locale of his native village in Western Ukraine. He was asked about Lemberg where he carried out his first "commission" and about the details of his movements in Munich, the scene of his two murders.

He was questioned too in detail about his movement in Essen where he went to familiarize himself with his Lehmann alias. Though sometimes hesitant on the details of his movements, Stashynsky showed no such hesitation when he described his briefings by "Sergei". He described in detail how he was instructed in the use of the murder weapon and on the experiment with a dog.

After describing how he made himself familiar with the habits and movements of Rebet, by the use of rooms opposite to where Rebet lived and worked, he stressed that at this stage he had no idea that he was to be asked to murder Rebet.



2

THE "MAN FROM MOSCOW"

This instruction was given to him on a visit to Berlin where he first met "the man from Moscow", introduced by the inevitable Sergei. Asked about his reaction to the instruction, Stashynsky said he was "shocked" but that he made no protest, either to Sergei or to "the man from Moscow". He also said that at this meeting he was told that the weapon had already been used and that "it was 100 per cent foolproof".

If things went wrong he had a number of things he had thought out to do.

The details of his shadowing of Rebet in Munich had all the ingredients of a Hitchcock film. Though there was some hesitation in some of his answers about his movements, there was no hesitation at all when he described how the murder weapon was concealed and carried. He described the arrangements made for the delivery of the weapon and said that if all else failed "it would be delivered by "Diplomatic Bag" to Munich".

Probably the most important part of Tuesday's hearing was at the end when the moral question of why he agreed to carry out the murder was probed by the President.

He had used the word "traitor" in his several statements. Did not this suggest he knew the moral implications behind the word? Did he think it right to kill Rebet? Did he believe in God?

THE MORAL ISSUES INVOLVED

After some hesitation Stashynsky said "I cannot answer that question" and his answer to the others were evasive. Replying to Mrs. Rebet's Counsel who suggested that it was an Honour for him to be selected for these special task, he said: "It was not an honour".

He repeated several times that he came from a "decent" home with a religious background and therefore had doubts



3

when faced with task that posed moral questions. But he saw that political killings did occur and was convinced of their necessity. He had been taught that the leaders of organisations were dangerous and once disposed of it was simple to deal with the rank and file. When pressed about his thoughts after the killing of Rebet, Stashynsky said that he had weighed it carefully in his mind and had decided that on political grounds, and within the Soviet system, "it was right and lawful".

Throughout the trial, spectators have been struck by Stashynsky's apparent complete lack of emotion. When holding the model murder weapon in his hands and describing the Rebet killing, his voice was firm and clinical -- the expert demonstrating a scientific process.

#### MURDER OF BANDERA A RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT DECISION

It seems that the film of Bandera's Funeral, shown to Stashynsky in November 1959 shocked him profoundly. When he saw Bandera's body and the numerous Ukrainians who came to pay their last homage, doubts began to enter his mind about the killing. The views expressed by his superiors, that the Ukrainian Liberation Movement and its leaders were "traitors", preventing Ukrainians from returning "home" -- this view was shaken after he had seen this film.

A number of important points arise out of Wednesday's hearing.

I. Stashynsky said quite categorically on Wednesday that the killing of Bandera was not ordered by "lesser fry" in the Soviet hierarchy. He stressed again and again that the decision had come through Shelepin, head of the Security Service, and after the question had been decided by the government through the Central Committee. In this regard he instanced that he was told that all responsibility would be taken in the delivery to him of the murder weapon and, if necessary, the "diplomatic bag" would be used to get it to Munich.



2. Stashynsky said that in the case of Bandera the decision had been to use an improved, double-barrelled weapon; (a) because it was important that the attempt should be successful and (b) because the eventuality of Bandera having a "body-guard" with him had to be considered. Though the finding of two bodies apparently dead from "Heart-failure" was too fantastic for anyone to believe, Bandera's liquidation was considered so important by the Russian government that even this risk would be taken.

3. In the instructions about the delivery of the weapon to him, Stashynsky said Moscow took full responsibility. He was instructed on what precautions to take and what to do in any case of difficulty.

4. Stashynsky had been told that the most favourable conditions for carrying out Bandera's murder was when he found him alone and he spoke of one occasion when such an opportunity arose, with Bandera in his garage, but Stashynsky had doubts when he was close to his victim-unaware of how near death he was. Later, when he realised the consequences of failure to himself for not carrying out his instructions, he busied himself with finding duplicate keys. A new weapon was sought from Moscow and the plan for the eventual killing went ahead.

5. The main conclusion from Wednesday is that Stashynsky is the typical 'Soviet man'. His terminology when describing the underground liberation movement, OUN, etc- shows his conditioning to the acceptance of the idea that the OUN committed "crimes" and their aims were interpreted narrowly as purely nationalist. For instance, on the first day he spoke only of local differences between Poles and Ukrainians and said nothing about the wider struggles against the Germans and the Russians. He spoke also of the emigre movement being in league with France, Britain, Germany and the Americans and when asked by Mrs. Bandera's Counsel about his motives for killing Bandera, he said Bandera was the "leader"



of the emigration and of OUN, but said nothing about his significance to the wider liberation movement, especially in Ukraine.

6. Examples of Stashynsky's use of Soviet phraseology are numerous - When the Russians occupied Western Ukraine he said "the country was reunited with Russia" - and the use of these terms supports the Russian Communist line.

7. The strength of Stashynsky's defense that he was "carrying out the orders given him by his superiors" was shown on Wednesday night when the President, quoting from the German Federal Criminal Code suggested that such a defense might prove "extenuating circumstances".

Ukrainian emigres all over the world would be shocked if such a defense was successful in the case of Stashynsky who so far through this trial has proved to be a cold-blooded killer, prepared to do anything to save his own miserable skin.





# UKRAINIAN CORRESPONDENCE

5  
UC

Editor in Chief — Yaroslav Bentzal

Published by Ukrainian Publishers in Munich — 8 München 8, Zeppelinstr. 67

No. 3

Karlsruhe, October 13 1962

## THE TRIAL OF BOHDAN STASHYNSKY

The hearings of the Stashynsky trial on Thursday and Friday confirmed our view that the line of his defense has not changed. The evidence also confirmed that Stashynsky was being trained by the KGB as a professional killer and that his next victim was to be Jaroslav Stetzko, former Ukrainian Prime Minister, Chairman of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), and leading member of OUN.

## OUN THE MAIN TARGET OF KGB

Suggestions from East Berlin sources at the opening of the trial that it is "an anti-Soviet show rigged up by the West German Secret Service" (Berliner Zeitung 8. 10. 62) are disproved by Stashynsky himself. This quotation is a shorter version of a press conference in East Berlin by Werhun, (another Communist Agent) in April 1962 at the time when the Stashynsky trial was first scheduled to begin. These suggestions also show that Russian propaganda can find no better arguments to try to mislead Ukrainian opinion about the murder of Bandera.

Stashynsky is on trial because of his own confession and, during the trial he has shown that he is a KGB Agent, trained especially to deal with emigre Ukrainian liberation organizations and particularly with OUN, of which Bandera was the leader and of which Mr. Stetzko is a prominent member.

He gave evidence of his "trailing" of Mr. Stetzko, and his familiarity with Mr. Stetzko's background was shown when Mr. Neuwirt asked him: "Who is Dankiw?" (Mr. Stetzko's assumed



name) and without hesitation Stashynsky replied: "That is Stetzko, Prime Minister of Ukrainian Government when the Germans came!"

#### "SOVIET MAN" OR KGB AGENT

The attempt by Stashynsky on Thursday morning to portray himself as a pathetic figure - the "Soviet Man" - a victim of the system and compelled to do things which were repugnant to him, was nullified in the afternoon, particularly when replying to Counsel for Bandera and Rebet. During the morning he spoke about "conflicts", about "my heart being in my throat" when he saw his subsequent victim Bandera. But these "conflicts" were always resolved according to the KGB instruction and, as the President of the Court put it to Stashynsky: "But you never missed."

The pattern of all Stashynsky's "conflicts" were revealed during these last few days. When his own interests did not conflict with those of the KGB, he obeyed the KGB. Earlier in the week he had spoken of being instructed by the KGB that he must become reconciled with his parents - "come to terms with them". When Dr. Neuwirt asked on Thursday afternoon: "Why was this necessary?" Stashynsky shrugged his shoulders: "Because they (the KGB) insisted-"

#### FUTURE FIELDS IN THE WEST

After the killing of Bandera and his return to Moscow, Stashynsky said he was to be trained for other work in the West. He spoke specifically of England and America. He was to study Western culture, literature and language in preparation for this new task. He had read Kanaris' book about the methods used by the Gestapo, had analysed the book and concluded that the methods of the Gestapo were identical with those used by the KGB.

But the KGB were slow to make arrangements for his re-training and his courtship of Inge Pohl had created new "conflicts".



One gathered that had the KGB speeded up their arrangements for Stashynsky's re-education and appointment to another field of operation, plans for his "escape" to the West would never have been made.

It was not until he became aware of some mistrust on the part of his superiors that plans for his "escape" were prepared.

#### STASHYNSKY'S DOUBTS AND CONFLICTS

Stashynsky, while trying to create his sympathetic picture on Thursday morning, said he spoke to Sergei about the "widows and children" of his intended victims. Sergei's reply was: "Some day they will be grateful that a "traitor" was killed!" Dr. Miehr took up this question in cross-examination when he referred to Stashynsky's use of the word "traitor" in his statements. Dr. Miehr said Stashynsky might have used the word in relation to those who were against Russia. But from his family background he must have known of the struggles of the Ukrainian people against the Poles, Germans and Russians, invaders of Ukraine from before 1917 and after and that the word "traitor" had a different connotation for Ukrainians? Stashynsky's reply, arrogantly thrown back at Dr. Miehr was that he was not "a professor of history!"

Dr. Neuwirt also pursued the question of Stashynsky's pretended ignorance of Ukrainian history. The KGB Agent said "No" each time when he was asked did he know about Petlura (Simon Petlura was President of Ukraine in 1918 and was killed in Paris by the Russian Agent Schwartzbart on May 25, 1926.), about Chuprynka (Taras Chuprynka was Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and was killed in action on March 5, 1950, in Bilohorshcha, near Lviv - quite close to Stashynsky's native village.) He said he did not know Halychyn, Dobiansky, Smalstotsky - all prominent Ukrainians in USA. (Halychyn was found dead in 1961 on the stairs of an underground station in New York.)

Such ignorance on the part of a man whose family were intimately involved with the Ukrainian Liberation Movement was too complete to be real.



EXPERT EVIDENCE ON POISON AND STASHYNSKY

Expert witnesses on Friday gave evidence about the poison used to kill Bandera and Rebet and about the neutralising tablets Stashynsky said he had used when about to commit the murders. These showed that the poison was cyanide with some nicotine extract and that this was found in post mortem examinations of both bodies.

The examining officers said Stashynsky showed no signs of being under stress or that he was under any compulsion to make the confession. This was confirmed by Stashynsky's own evidence.

The first examining officer said that at first he was sceptical about Stashynsky's statement but as he went on he found the statements plausible. Stashynsky told him about the two murders he had committed. When speaking of the actual murders his tone of voice was no different from when describing other incidents.

Dr. Butler, expert on Soviet Affairs, gave a history of Shelepin, the structure of the KGB, about OUN and its activities. Replying to Stashynsky's Counsel, Dr. Butler said that the organisation of Bandera was active in exile and in Ukraine. Dr. Butler also spoke about "the Lippolz story" (Bandera was killed by Myskiw, a close associate, who, in fact was in Rome at the time of Bandera's death.) After Bandera's death and the "explanation" of it put out by Liebholz (alias Lippolz) in East Berlin in October 1961, radio-telegrams to a Russian Agent in the West were intercepted. The "telegrams" asked for informations about press reactions to the "Lippolz story".

Dr. Butler also described the three Liberation organisations OUN (R), Stefan Bandera; OUN (M), Col. Melnyk, and OUN (Z), Dr. Rebet; he stated that in Soviet eyes OUN (R) was regarded as the strongest.



LIBERALISATION IN THE SOVIET UNION

Dr. Butler, replying to a defense question, said that after Stalin's death there had been "some kind" of liberalisation in the Soviet Union. In all serious cases decisions were made only by the highest government authorities.

(That the "satellites" had no control over KGB activities had been shown earlier by Stashynsky's evidence. Orders and instructions to KGB agents in Warsaw or East Berlin came direct from Moscow and were acted on without any consideration of the "satellite" governments, so-called sovereign republics.)

STASHYNSKY FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS ACTIONS

Professor Rauch, psychiatrist, said Stashynsky was well-educated and well-controlled, intelligent and resourceful. He had been trained to control his emotions and in all regards was a well trained agent. He was not given to phantasy, but was a realist. He relied for decisions on authority and even in the "escape", the initiative had come from his wife. He lacked active imagination and could not conceive the results of his activities.

He was, said Prof. Rauch, a product of early training, which had developed only the necessary facets of his character and suppressed others.

Asked by the defense if there was any possibility of an emotional disturbance in early life making a marked impression on Stashynsky's character, Dr. Rauch said there was no reason to suspect this and Stashynsky was fully responsible for what he did.

JAROSLAV STETZKO TO BE THIRD VICTIM ( see p. I)

Born in 1912, Jaroslav Stetzko became a member of the illegal Ukrainian Military Organisation (UVO) while still a youth. As



an Executive Committee member in Western Ukraine he was responsible for ideological and political publications.

In 1934, in Lviv, he was arrested by the Polish police, and in the notorious "Bandera Trial, 1935-36" he was sentenced to five years imprisonment. He was released in 1937 as a result of a general amnesty and resumed his activities in OUN.

After the death of Konovalets (killed by Soviet Agent in Rotterdam in 1937) Mr. Stetzko was given the task of making preparation for the Second OUN Conference.

When Ukrainian Independence was restored on June 30, 1941, Mr. Stetzko became Prime Minister of the Ukrainian Government and when he and Bandera rejected the German ultimatum to recall the proclamation of Ukrainian Independence, he, and Bandera, was arrested. In 1941 he was taken to Berlin and from there went to the concentration camp in Sachsenhausen.

Released in 1944 he again became a leading figure in OUN and was soon elected President of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations. During numerous visits all over the free world he has propagated the liberation of all non-Russian nations from Moscow colonialism.

Mr. Stetzko has just returned from the Congress of the Asian Anti-Communist League (AAPCL) in Japan.

#### BANDERA - THE VICTIM - SPEAKS FOR HIMSELF

Dr. Jagusch, President of the Court, read a biography of Stefan Bandera which showed clearly the role he played in the Ukrainian Liberation Movement throughout his life, both in emigration and in Ukraine. From his account, Bandera's active participation in the struggle for Ukrainian liberation from Moscow was shown.



KHRUSHCHOV, A PARTY TO MURDER

Stashynsky said clearly that the order for the killing of Bandera came from the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the government. He mentioned Sherepin with Alexei Alexeyevitch and Georgy Aksentievich.

The very close relationship between the government, Central Committee and the ministries (including KGB) was clearly elucidated by Dr. Butler. His explanation showed that without doubt the decision to kill Bandera could not have been reached without the active and willing consent of Khrushchov.

It is also clear to all observers in the Court that Khrushchov is directly implicated in the murder of Bandera.





# UKRAINIAN CORRESPONDENCE

12  
UC

Editor in Chief — Yaroslav Bentzal

Published by Ukrainian Publishers in Munich — 8 München 8, Zeppelinstr. 67

No. 4

Karlsruhe, October 15. 1962

## THE TRIAL OF BOHDAN STASHYNSKY

Monday hearing of the Stashynsky trial began with the accused reminding the Court his motives for murder, threatened by the police he found himself in the ranks of KGB; became a convinced communist to whom the Ukrainian Resistance Movement leaders Bandera and Rebet were "enemies of the people"; acted under the pressure of the orders which were given him by the highest authorities.

## ATTORNEY GENERAL DEMANDS TWO LIFE SENTENCES

Having clearly analysed both the statements of Stashynsky and the corroborating evidence, as well as experts' evidence, the Prosecution considered Stashynsky fully responsible for the double murder he committed on German territory and demanded 3 years imprisonment for spying and two life imprisonments for murder, and that Stashynsky should be deprived of his citizens rights for life.

Very important and well presented were the speeches in Court by the Counsel appearing for <sup>the</sup> victims; Dr. Neuwirth, by comparing and contrasting the types of people in the service of the Russian imperialism, made an analogy of Mr. Khrushchev with the accused. Stashynsky retained outward relations with the Ukrainian people but inside he is Russian, traitor to his people, - renegade.

Well balanced and rather convincing was the speech by Dr. Padoch, and the strongest in words and in its direct indictment of the Russian Communist Government was the speech by Mr. Kersten which we here reproduce in full.



- 2 -

Moving and without hatred for the accused were the speeches by Mrs. Rebet, and in particular, by Miss Natalia Bandera, the daughter of the victim, when she resolutely repudiated the words supposedly said to Stashynsky by Sergei, that the children of the victims would one day be grateful to him, because he murdered the traitors.

SYMPATHY OF THE COURT FOR UKRAINIAN LIBERATION  
MOVEMENT

From all the speeches it was clear, that both victims, Prof. Lev Rebet and S. Bandera, the OUN leader, gave their lives for the freedom of Ukraine, which is linked with the freedom of mankind, and that the main culprit, the real murders, the Russian Communist State, should be brought to justice beside Stashynsky.

The question of the real murderer being not in the person of Stashynsky, was taken up by the Defense, Dr. Seydel, who brilliantly presented the case of his client. He treated the problem of Ukrainian fight for independence with understanding and respect.

STASHYNSKY ADMITS HIS GUILT

Stashynsky recognized his guilt and begged the High Court to be guided by mildness while considering his sentence.



14

Plea of CHARLES J. KERSTEN, former Member of the U. S. Congress (5th Dist. Wisconsin) on behalf of the widow of Stepan Bandera at the murder trial of Bohdan Stashinsky - Federal Court of Germany, Karlsruhe, October 15th, 1962.

MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT:

As a member of the American Bar I appreciate the courtesy granted me to appear in association with my colleagues, Mr. Neuwirth and Mr. Padoch, in behalf of Mrs. Bandera, the widow of one of the victims of the defendant.

The High Court has done the free world a great service particularly by bringing the facts of the Stashinsky case to public attention, in the democratic tradition of Western civilization, especially in its objective questioning.

The Court brought out clearly that any Free World nation could be the hunting ground for the Soviet KGB.

The mystery of the cyanide gun that makes murder look like death from a heart attack has been exposed. Operations of the Russian Communists on foreign soil are not likely to be successful elsewhere.

It was proved that the defendant after killing Mr. Bandera and Mr. Rebet was to have a wider scope of action in the future. Stashinsky was graduated to a lifetime job of high level professional killer of "enemies of the Soviet Union". He was a brilliant product of Russian Communist training. He was to learn English. Eventually, his field would probably be Great Britain and the United States.

If Stashinsky had not defected some stubborn anti-Soviet UN delegate, for example, might one day be found dead in New York, victim of a "heart attack" produced by this masterpiece of Soviet science.



The Court has inquired about the motives for his killings.

The motive of killing Bandera told the defendant by his KGB masters was that Bandera used terror to prevent the return of immigrants from Germany to the Soviet Union. In this respect the smear of Bandera was a complete fraud. The widow of Bandera, to save the good name of the deceased, for which she has the legal right, desires to remove this fraudulent smear.

The killing of Mrs. Bandera's husband was no ordinary murder perpetrated by an individual. It was not just a gang killing.

The evidence shows that the murder of Bandera was decreed by the government of the Soviet Union. Soviet Russian science was enlisted to fabricate a new weapon for which the West did not have a defense. The perpetrator was put through a long period of government training. He was assisted in the careful preparation for the crime by a large section of the KGB. The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet awarded the perpetrator with the Order of the Red Banner.

The reason the Soviet government, headed by Khrushchov, decided to kill him was because Stepan Bandera was the leader of the widespread underground resistance in Ukraine to Russian Communist Occupation. Bandera was a symbol of the struggle for a free and independent Ukraine, a non-Russian nation of 45 million people with their own traditions, culture, language and civilization.

Ukrainian national resistance to every foreign occupation - particularly Russian Communist occupation - has been proven over and over again.

Russian Communist methods of suppressing Ukraine's never-ending struggle for freedom are as ruthless as any in the recorded history of tyranny. In the years 1932-33 the Russian Communists removed all the food and seed produced in the country, creating a man-made famine that took the lives of over 5 million people. In the vicinity of Vinnytsia some 10,000 Ukrainian prisoners were murdered by the NKVD during



the years 1938-40, at the time when Khrushchev was the first secretary of the Communist Party in Ukraine, i. e., the Russian Governor in Ukraine.

At about the time when Khrushchev was meeting with President Eisenhower in Geneva in 1956 his tanks were crushing the bodies of over 500 Ukrainian women - political prisoners - into the ground when to protect them from NKVD they had formed a ring around their men in a concentration camp in Kingir.

As Soviet Russian secret service killed Bandera in 1959 and Rebet in 1957, so they killed the Ukrainian leaders, Petlura in Paris 1926 and Col. Konovalets in Rotterdam in 1938. It was their plan to take the life of Mr. Stetzko, President of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN) and former Prime Minister of Ukraine.

On this occasion I would like to point out that the American Committee on Communist Aggression of the U. S. House of Representatives issued the Special Report of the Congress entitled, Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine. This Report was submitted to the House of Representatives on Dec. 31st, 1954 by the Committee on Communist Aggression, of which it was my honor to be chairman. Massive Ukrainian national resistance to Communist rule is described on page 31 and elsewhere in this Report. The accused testified to this resistance during the trial.

Our Committee held extensive hearings - the sworn testimony of hundreds of witnesses - in the United States and Europe, including Germany, in 1953-54 with regard to all the Captive Nations. The Committee issued 26 Reports on the Captive Nations. It was our conclusion that the internal resistance of the enslaved nations to Russian Communism was the greatest deterrent to war.



Not until resistance to Communist occupation is finally liquidated can the Soviet Russian imperialists safely launch military operations for world conquest.

The escape of Stashinsky was a shock felt at the Russian Communist summit. Stashinsky held state secret involving criminal action in the free world by the highest echelons of the Soviet Government.

Communist propaganda spread the false story that an Ukrainian, Myskiv, had poisoned Bandera at the direction of federal Minister Oberländer under the orders from General Gehlen.

Also in connection with this trial, the press services of the Satellites made the same false charges, spreading the story that the German intelligence, of which the expert has given testimony here, organized the murder. Unbelievable, but true, there were assertions in this false propaganda that the highest Court of the German Federal Republic is acting according to instruction. To all these false charges I can say as an American that this trial was held in the highest traditions of democracy and justice.

I was deeply impressed by the objective and human way in which every opportunity was given to the accused during the Court trial proceedings.

The Communist felt safe in thus trying to smear Oberländer, General Gehlen and the German government by using Myskiv's name because Myskiv had died in the meantime. But this story exploded when it turned out that Myskiv was in Rome on the day when Bandera was murdered and was seen there by many people.

The stark facts of Stashinsky's revelations were confirmed in every respect by overwhelming documentary and other evidence, in the trial before this Court - even to the Communist radio's frantic efforts to locate Stashinsky after he fled, admitting,



thereby, that Stashinsky was their agent. This was a very painful affair for the Communists. It involved Shelepin - and more.

This much must be said for Stashinsky. He was formed in the de-humanizing mold of Communist training from youth, so well described by the Communist theoretician, Lunacharsky,

"We hate Christianity and Christians. Even the best of them must be looked upon as our worst enemies. They preach the love of our neighbors and mercy, which is contrary to our principles. Christian love is an obstacle to the development of the revolution. Down with the love of our neighbors. What we want is hatred. We must learn to hate and it is only then that we shall conquer the world."

This was the milieu in which Stashinsky was trained. But even then he fled and brought to the West the facts with which to unmask Soviet Russian Government criminal action that is more deadly than the assault of a rattle snake which, at least, warns before it strikes.

Stashinsky, as a member of the KGB consciously carried out the orders of the Soviet Council of Ministers. Mrs. Bandera does not seek vengeance but justice for Stashinsky, recognizing that he was not arrested in the course of his crimes, but fled to the west and voluntarily told the full story of the Soviet Government crimes and his part in it. This has helped the free world and he should be given credit for it.

Mrs. Bandera points to Voroshilov's signature to the Order of the Red Banner awarded to the perpetrator as a signed confession of first degree murder of her husband by the Soviet Government itself.

Mrs. Bandera seeks justice against the real murderers of her husband.



Surely this is not the forum in which Mrs. Bandera may sue for financial <sup>damages</sup> against the guilty Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union. But it is our intention, in the proper tribunal to seek judgment in her behalf for actual and punitive damages against the Soviet Government.

It is also true that this Court cannot impose a criminal punishment upon the real culprits. But the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Shelepin and Mr. Khrushchev should be hailed before an international tribunal for this murder and for any other crimes.

They have ruthlessly destroyed her husband and her family life and they should be made to pay. If any money is ever collected from the Soviet Government either by attaching their property in the Free World or otherwise, it is Mrs. Bandera's wish to turn it over to the Ukrainian Red Cross.

But, more important to Mrs. Bandera is to ask this Court's judgment and declaration that it was the Soviet Government that is guilty of the murder of her husband.

I have said that this was not a gang murder. But in a very real sense it is a gang murder. The Soviet Council of Ministers entered into a criminal conspiracy to take the life of Stepan Bandera on foreign soil and ordered Stashinsky to carry out their mission.

This was the conspiracy of a gang to commit a crime.

It may be said that this Court's judgment holding the Soviet Government guilty of the murder of Stepan Bandera in Munich, Germany on the 15th of October, 1959 - three years ago today - would be without adequate precedent.

But the heart attack weapon used in this case is without precedent. Awarding the highest State honors for perpetrating murder is without precedent. Training agents for clandestine



killing on foreign soil in peace time is without precedent. A government using murder as an instrument of policy is without precedent.

I believe the judicial process of this Court is not powerless to protect the sovereignty of its own government from such contemptuous and flagrant acts. The West must develop unprecedented means to cope with unprecedented dangers.

The Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, in this case, has been proved guilty of murder in the first degree. This Court may not be able to prescribe the punishment for the real culprit. But it can render an historic judgment and declaration finding the Soviet Government guilty of murder, a judgment that will hearten a large part of mankind that is afflicted with the Russian Communist Conspiracy.

This Court's judgment that the Bolshevist government in this case to be a conspiracy to commit murder, will be heard around the world.

Such a judgment will be like the sword of St. Michael the Arch Angel to help unmask the Soviet Russian leaders to show them before mankind for what they really are. It will reduce their power to hold nations in slavery and their power to make war.

If this becomes the result of the Stashinsky trial then the cause of Freedom and Peace has been advanced and Stepan Bandera has not died in vain.