

ANNEXE II

-10-

MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES
ET DES CULTES.
NO. 5545-III.
COMMISSARIAT FOR THE FULFILMENT OF
THE ARMISTICE AGREEMENT.

Sofia, 30.9.1946.
Colonel General BIRIUZOV
Deputy-Chairman of the
Allied Control Commission
in Bulgaria
C i t y.

My dear General,

As a supplement to my letter No. 5198-III, dated September 11, 1946, concerning General Ivan Marinov, Bulgarian Plenipotentiary Minister in Paris, and former Commander-in-Chief of the Bulgarian Army, I have the honour to submit to you a Statement by the Staff of the Army, regarding the activity of General Marinov in his capacity of Commander of the 15th Infantry Division from June 1942 to September 1944, as well as 7 annexes attached to the said Statement.

The Statement mentioned above and the annexes attached to it constitute an incontestable proof of the following:

I. While commanding the 15th Infantry Division, General Marinov never occupied Greek territory. The Southern border of the part of Macedonia, which was occupied by the 15th Infantry Division was the old Yugoslav-Greek border. This is shown by the documents submitted herewith :

a) Copy of Operational Order No. 1534 of July 18, 1944 (annex No. 1), point 3 of which indicated the whereabouts of the 15th Infantry Division units at the beginning of the occupation, before General Marinov took over the command of the division.

b) Copy of Operational Order No. 9552 of August 4, 1941 (annex No. 2). Point "b" in paragraph "A" of this order confirms the same fact and in order to clarify the text, a map for the military-territorial division of the country is submitted, showing the exact limits of the territory occupied by the 15th Infantry Division, comprising districts exclusively of Yugoslav Macedonia, north of the Yugoslav-Greek border.

c) Copy of letter No. II-398 of February 26, 1942, (annex No. 3), together with a map-scheme, submitted to show the area occupied by the 15th Infantry Division after the general dislocation of the Bulgarian forces. This map shows that the area occupied by the 15th Division was reduced, as it was found in June 1942 when General Ivan Marinov took over its command. Until September 1944 the area occupied by the 15th Infantry Division commanded by General Ivan Marinov remained the same without any changes, i.e. it comprised districts of Yugoslav Macedonia only, without spreading over any territory whatsoever of Greek Macedonia.

II. General Marinov never commanded any armies in Greece. By orders of the Army Staff, some units of the 15th Infantry Division took part in one operation only, in the Paliak Mountain but under the command of the German General Fluchat. This is shown by annexes No.4 and No. 5. As already pointed out in my letter No. 5198-III of September 11, 1946, addressed to you, these documents prove that only one unit of his Division was placed under the orders of the German Command in Salonica, by orders of the Ministry of War in Sofia.

Duplicated in I/72

During the time this unit took part in the operation in the Paia-Mountain, against the partisans, i.e. in Greek Macedonia it was under the German Command and General Marinov had absolutely nothing to do with the unit in question and could exercise no authority upon it.

III. The Bulgarian Armies never occupied any territories of Greek Macedonia west of the Vardar River. In support of this statement we submit a copy of Operational Order No. 6101 of April 18, 1941, for the occupation of Macedonia up to the Struma River and a map for reference (annex No. 6.), as well as a copy of Order No. I-257 of July 1943 for the occupation of the territories west of the Struma River and East of the Vardar River (annex No. 7).

I enclose herewith also, a list of the persons sentenced by the 11th Body of the People's Court in Sofia for crimes committed by them during the period 1941-1944 in the Yugoslav and Greek territories occupied by Bulgaria.

I beg you, my dear General, to be kind enough to bring the above and the annexes to the knowledge of the governments represented in the Allied Control Commission in Bulgaria, with the request to forward them, together with their instructions, to the respective delegates in the Commission for War Criminals in London.

Please accept, my dear General, the assurance of my highest consideration.

Annexes:
1 statement by the Army Staff.
7 copies of orders and letters of the Ministry of War
3 maps
1 list

MINISTER OF INDUSTRY AND CRAFTS,
TEMPORARILY IN CHARGE OF THE MINISTRY
OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND CULTS,
COMMISSARY FOR THE FULFILMENT OF THE
ARMISTICE AGREEMENT. Chr. LILKOV.

Yugoslav/Italian case 364

1/71.

29th November 1946.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.

COMMITTEE I.

The following Memorandum, received from Giovanni Sorbi, Silvio Niccoli, Renato Tortorella, Solicitors, and dated 21st November 1946, is circulated to members of Committee I for their information and consideration, at its next Meeting.

CLAIM

For DOC. GASTONE MADORI,
detained at the Jail of Pisa, ITALY.
at disposal of Rome Allied Commission &
Allied Forces Supreme Headquarters Caserta.
(June 1945 - November 1946).

Pisa, ITALY, 21st November, 1946.

The undersigned lawyers, in name and for the interest of DOC. GASTONE MADORI, address to your courtesy and benevolence to claim as follows:

1. DOCTOR MADORI is a former Director of Districtual Offices of EIAR (Italian Broadcasting Corporation) and he is now detained at the Prisons of Pisa, Italy.
2. He was enrolled into the EIAR on May 1937 as Secretary of Florence Board.
3. After four year of bright and successfull career he was appointed, on May 1941, as Manager of Lubjiana Office (Yougosalavy), where he carried out only artistic and administrative duties, the political ones being committed to the Radio News Service Director and to the Special Propaganda and Political Executive Officer charged with those jobs.
4. At the fall of Fascist Government, July 1943, MADORI was sent to Naples to head that Radio Office: later was appointed as Rome Board Deputy Chief on September 1943, ever with functional and not political competence. The policy of the Corporation was still regulated in each District by the Central Director of Boards, being MADORI everywhere a technical and administrative executor.
5. Some time afterwards was created Chief Personnel of the Society and subsequently Manager of Milano and Torino Offices (1944-45), where he stayed up to the Allied Liberation of that town.
6. On 5th May 1945 he spontaneously turned him and his wife into the hands of the arriving American troops not to surrender for their faults, but just to be protected from the bloody events of that time and to be covered from the jeopardizing prejudices raised by the Partisans over every conspicuous rank then vested.
7. On June 1945, innated with other civilians, in a Concentration Camp near Pisa, was questioned by the Italian Police Authorities on the basis of a

general order issued by the Allies to check all the actions perpetrated by the important Officers of the said Radio Organization. On same month was transferred to the Jail of Pisa under the po..... suspect of having collaborated with nazi-fascist authorities, without any commitment he was held for public safety ascertainment collection of most complete informations.

8. A long, careful and thoroughly documentation of litical and administrative background caused the Anti-fascist Pisa to issue a statement of immediate acquittal and release followed, on April 1946, by a similar order given by the Torino.

9. All what had been his activity, his liabilities and his repeated and substantial helps in favour of people persecuted or wanted for political or racial motifs by German and fascist organizations was totally disclosed and brought to the attention of the Judiciary Authorities, so that they could freely and easily take the said favourable decision.

10. However, at the end of 1945 MADORI knew, through a request filed by the Mediterranean Allied Authorities to the Headquarters Allied Commission in Rome and to the Italian Ministry of Interior that he had to stay in Jail at disposal of one, not yet disclosed, United Nation that could casually require him as a criminal of war!

11. Such request was later revealed as suggested by Yugoslave Authorities, possibly for a suspect on his job exploited for two years in Lubiana, together with other seven thousand Italians who were equally hypothetically wanted.

12. Since that time he tried over and over again to clarify his situation with Pisa United States Counter Intelligence Center (C.I.C.), with the representatives of the Allied Commission, with the Italian Anti-fascist and Ordinary Court and State Attorneys and with the Italian Political Police Office: but he could not receive any exact and satisfactory information for the simple fact that none of these Bodies knew the true and right way to be followed, nor the real competence or the necessary action to be undertaken. Such trouble caused a long delay in the handling of his already intricate case: with Rome Allied Commission leaving competence to the Italian Organs and the Italians turning back to the Allies for several times.

He was only indirectly and summarily answered that was at disposal of Rome Allied Commission, Legal and Public Safety Sub-Commission for the interest of the Supreme Allied Forces Headquarters of Mediterranean Theater then located at Caserta. The G-4 Office of these Headquarters was holding him as by request of the purported United Nations War Crimes Commission (UNWCC), referred sitting in London.

13. Perfectly in peace with his conscience, he applied several times the President of Italian Republic, His Holiness Pope Pius XIIth, Head-Admiral Stone, Chief of the Rome Allied Commission: everybody on his part did everything possible to speed up the screening of his situation and of his alleged responsibilities, moving the opportune steps with Caserta Offices; but without any concrete result.

14. It was partially admitted at that time that no charge was pending on him and that his detention in Pisa had yet to last until the said UNWCC would have set up the ordinary rules of procedure: only on which ground the case might be scrutinized and decided.

15. It is to be pointed out too that during all this period (now it is running the 17th month of his imprisonment) he was never questioned nor wanted by any Allied Authority or Office, though he had so many time them to clarify and precisely define his position.

16. The only answer that the Director of Pisa Jail received was that

¶ (Paragraphs 7 & 8. The original document is illegal in certain places. Omissions in document indicated by dots).

MADORI had to wait for a generically said future request by the Allies.

16. In the meanwhile the conditions of his family were seriously aggravated. With no pay from the Company since the day of the apprehension and having sold everything of his belongings, his wife - the daughter of a Hungarian High Court Officer - was early at the hunger. Not much time ago she has delivered a poor baby, who is now dividing the wretched life of his mother in Pisa without any support.

17. The pinnacle of his despair is in the exact and absolute conscience of his innocence and honesty, as he could abundantly and satisfactorily prove through the statements rendered by the same Officers now in charge with the reconstituted Radio Services. Should any Yugoslave or Allied Authority attentively and scrupulously look in his past activities' record, MADORI feels sure that he would immediately be acquitted and released: that is why he ever tried to be submitted, as soon as possible, to a full judgment.

18. Last September he filed another application to the Allied Commission in Rome, bound with copies of discharging papers and statements and supports of Italian Authorities, in order to have the Mediterranean Headquarters interested for the granting of a temporary release, under which ever conditions were to be established to ensure the safety or the control upon him, which could let him provide in the same town to the physical life and to the assistance of his family. The request was substantiated by Italian Police and Jail Officers.

19. Hitherto summarily his long and dramatic story. The long time protracted detention, the absence of any precise information, the miscarriage of the defendant's rights, the excessive length of the announced issue of the United Nations Court procedure, the certainty of his not guiltiness, the poor situation of his family, the apparent and lasting state of abandon of all the case have finally induced his lawyers to send you this claim in order to be taken in favour of their customer the most benevolent, pitious and graceful action, and specifically:

a. to grant him a temporary release, with the enforcement of special public safety measures if necessary, pending the trial:

b. to make a quick examination of the case, by picking up all the possible informations by the Allied and Italian Authorities involved.

c. to take a prompt decision by the Allied Occupying Authorities to be confirmed subsequently by the interested special UNWOC.

20. Law like the "Habeas Corpus" provisions; the sacred respect of personal rights and of human freedom, as well as humanitarian and conscientious considerations on a living being cannot be disregarded or violated.

21. We are appealing to the sense of justice and of humanity and to the good heart of the World Supreme Human Authorities so that a word of peace, of liberty and of rightness be even here pronounced by you on the fate of this calumniated and abandoned man, in whom - let us not forget - a portion, though little it may be, of mankind is notwithstanding reflected: in the order not yet re-established and in the shackles not yet broken.

With respectful regards,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) Avv. GIOVANNI SORBI.

Dott. RENATO TORTORELLA.

GIOVANNI SORBI, Lawyer. RENATO TORTORELLA, Solicitor.
Legal Office, 13 Via Santa Maria,
PISA. ITALY.

For distribution of this Doc
see note with Doc I/75

Greek case 3669

RESTRICTED.
CONFIDENTIAL.

I/72.

11th December, 1946.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.
COMMITTEE I.

The following correspondence and Memorandum concerning General MARINOV, Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary of Bulgaria in Paris, listed by the Commission as a war criminal upon Greek Charge 3669, are circulated to members of Committee I for their information and consideration at its next Meeting.

FOREIGN OFFICE, S.W.I.
2nd December, 1946.

(R 16437/1885/7)
RESTRICTED.

Dear Sir Robert,

General Marinoff.

You will recall that the Bulgarian Minister for Foreign Affairs sent a statement about General Marinoff to our representative in Sofia with the request that it be forwarded to the Commission, and that it was decided, after consultation with the United States State Department, that this statement should not be forwarded on the grounds that it contained offensive accusations against the Greek Government.

The Bulgarian Minister for Foreign Affairs has now sent a supplementary statement which recapitulates in greater detail the facts contained in the first statement without the obnoxious accusations. We have again consulted the State Department who agree that while we should maintain our refusal to transmit the first statement there would be no objection to our forwarding the second one.

I am therefore enclosing herewith a copy of the supplementary statement and I should be grateful if you would kindly submit it to the Commission for its consideration.

(Signed) F.F. GARNER.

The Right Honourable Sir Robert Craigie, G.C.M.G., C.B.,
United Kingdom Representative,
United Nations War Crimes Commission,
Lansdowne House,
Berkeley Square,
W.I.

COPY

Major-General Oxley

Major-General Robertson.

A.C.C.

12 October 1946.

No. 3423.

By order of the Deputy-Chairman of the Allied Control Commission in Bulgaria, Colonel-General Biryusov, I am sending documents from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cults in Bulgaria concerning the Bulgarian Minister Plenipotentiary in Paris, General Marinov.

(SGD) SOUTCHKOV.

Enclosed: Text 24 pages.

COPY

Sofia, le 30.9.46.

MINISTRE DES AFFAIRES
ETRANGERES ET DES CULTES.

No. 5545-III.

COMMISSARIAT FOR THE
FULFILMENT OF THE
ARMISTICE AGREEMENT.

Colonel-General Biriuzov,
Deputy-Chairman of the
Allied Control Commission
in Bulgaria.

C I T Y.

My dear General,

As a supplement to my letter No. 5198-III, dated September 11, 1946, concerning General Ivan Marinov, Bulgarian Plenipotentiary Minister in Paris, and former Commander-in-Chief of the Bulgarian Army, I have the honour to submit to you a Statement by the Staff of the Army regarding the activity of General Marinov in his capacity of Commander of the 15th Infantry Division from June 1942 to September 1944, as well as 7 annexes attached to the said Statement.

The Statement mentioned above and the annexes attached to it constitute an incontestable proof of the following:

I. While commanding the 15th Infantry Division, General Marinov never occupied Greek territory. The Southern border of the part of Macedonia, which was occupied by the 15th Infantry Division was the old Yugoslav-Greek border. This is shown by the documents submitted herewith:

(a) Copy of Operational Order No. 1534 of July 18th 1944 (annex No. 1), point 3 of which indicates the whereabouts of the 15th Infantry Division units at the beginning of the occupation, before General Marinov took over the command of the division.

(b) Copy of Operational Order No. 9552 of August 4, 1941, (annex No. 2), Point "b" in paragraph "A" of this order confirms the same fact and in order to clarify the text, a map for the military-territorial division of the country is submitted, showing the exact limits of the territory occupied by the 15th Infantry Division, comprising districts exclusively of Yugoslav Macedonia, north of the Yugoslav-Greek border.

(c) Copy of letter No. II-398 of February 26, 1942 (annex No. 3), together with a map-scheme, submitted to show the area occupied by the 15th Infantry Division after the general dislocation of the Bulgarian forces. This map shows that the area occupied by the 15th Division was reduced, as it was found in June 1942 when General Ivan Marinov took over its command. Until September 1944, the area occupied by the 15th Infantry Division, commanded by General Ivan Marinov, remained the same without any changes, i.e. it comprised districts of Yugoslav Macedonia only, without spreading over any territory whatsoever of Greek Macedonia.

II. General Marinov never commanded any armies in Greece. By orders of the Army Staff, some units of the 15th Infantry Division took part in one operation only, in the Paliak Mountain, but under the command of the

*The whole of this Doc. sent through the UK Foreign Office.
recd. by the Commission on 4 Dec 47.*

-4-

III. The Bulgarian armies never occupied any territories of Greek Macedonia west of the Vardar River.

I enclose herewith also a list of the persons sentenced by the 11th Body of the People's Court in Sofia for crimes committed by them during the period 1941-1944 in the Yugoslav and Greek territories occupied by Bulgaria.

Please accept, my dear General, the assurance of my highest consideration.

MINISTER OF INDUSTRY AND CRAFTS
TEMPORARILY IN CHARGE OF THE
MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND CULTS
COMMISSARY FOR THE FULFILMENT OF THE
ARMISTICE AGREEMENT:

/Chr. Lilkov/

C O P Y

S T A T E M E N T

regarding the activity of General Marinov in his capacity of Commander of the 15th Infantry Division from June, 1942 to September, 1944.

In connection with General Marinov's commanding of the 15th Infantry Division from June 1942 to September 1944, the following may be said:

1. The southern border of that part of Macedonia which was occupied by the 15th Infantry Division, was the old Yugoslav-Greek border.

General Marinov did not command any armies in Greece. The only operation on Greek territory in which some units of the 15th Infantry Division took part was the operation in the Paiaik mountain under the orders of the German General Fluchat.

2. The Bulgarian armies never occupied Greek Macedonia west of the Varder river. Annex No. 3 shows that the territory which was to be occupied by the 7th Infantry Division was much farther east of the Varder river.

3. From the collected information it is established that General Marinov behaved well towards the population in Yugoslav Macedonia.

//s/ Kinov

Lieutenant-General.

Chief of Army Staff.

MINISTRY OF WAR
GENERAL STAFF.
NO. 1534.
28 July 1941.
Sofia.

Translation.
Appendix No. 1.
Copy.
Top Secret.

Copy:	SKOPYE	- The Commander of the Fifth Army
"	Trace of	- Commander of the Group of Armies
"	SOFIA	- Commander of the First Army
"	TRACE OF	- Commanders of the Second and Fourth Armies.
"	TRACE OF	- Commanders of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th Infantry Divisions.
"	TRACE OF	- Commander of the 2nd Fast Division.
"	XANTHE	- Commander of the Aegean Detachment
"	TRACE OF	- Commander of the 4th Infantry Border Brigade
"	SOFIA, PLOVDIV, SHOUMEN, ROUSSE AND PLEVEN -	The Officers in charge of the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th and 9th Divisional Regions.
"	TRACE OF	- Commander of the 3rd Cavalry Brigade
"	SOFIA	- Commander of H.M. Air Force
"	VARNA	- Commander of H.M. Navy.
"	SOFIA	- Commander of the Labour Troops.
"	SOFIA	- The Director of Civilian Mobilization.
"	SOFIA	- H.M. Palace - Colonel Zhetcheff.
"	SOFIA	- The Inspectors of the Infantry, Artillery, Cavalry, Armaments and Border Guards.
"	SOFIA	- Chief Quartermaster.
"	SOFIA	- Quartermaster to the Staff of the High Command.
"	SOFIA	- Chiefs of Personnel at the War Ministry, the Medical, Veterinary and Remount Service, and the Juridical Service.
"	SOFIA	- Inspector of Motor Transport
"	SOFIA	- Chiefs of 2nd and 3rd Branches, General Staff.
"	SOFIA	- Chief of Intelligence Department, General Staff.
"	SOFIA	- Commander of the Armoured Regiment.
"	PIROT	- Commander of the Pirof Infantry Battalion.

I. On August 1st of this year, the Fifth Army assigned for the occupation of Macedonia and Moravsko remains in the following formation: Headquarters, 14th and 15th Divisions. The same is to be established as follows:

1. Headquarters - in Skopje.

2. 14th Infantry Division:

(a) Headquarters with Quartermaster service, and 1 Cavalry Signal Squadron - in Skopje.

(b) Skopje regiment:

- Headquarters with supply service and a Guards' mounted signal platoon - in Skopje.
- 1st Skopje infantry battalion/Hq., 3 infantry and 1 machinegun companies, and 1 mortar platoon/ - in Skopje.
- 2nd Skopje infantry battalion/Hq., 3 infantry and 1 machinegun companies/ - in Skopje.
- Guards' cavalry battalion - in Skopje.
- Guards' mounted anti-tank platoon - in Skopje.
- Supply squadron - in Skopje.

(c) - Vranya regiment:

- Headquarters with supply service - in Vranya.
- Vranya infantry battalion/Hq., 3 infantry and 1 machinegun companies/ in Vranya.
- Kousanovo infantry battalion/Hq., 3 infantry and 1 machinegun

- companies/ - in Koumanovo.
- Heavy weapons company/1 Signal, 1 mortar and 1 antitank platoons/- in Vranja.
- Supply company - in Vranja.
- (d) 14th Divisional artillery regiment/Hq. with supply service, 1 artillery battalion with 3 batteries and 1 special battery/ - in Skopje.
- (e) 14th Divisional Engineer-Signals Battalion/Hq., 1 bridge-building and 1 signal companies/ - in Skopje.
- (f) 1st Mounted Engineers Squadron - in Skopje.
- (g) 14th Divisional Quartermaster Food Supply Company - in Skopje.
- (h) 14th Divisional Hospital with sanitary platoon - in Skopje.
- (i) Skopje military recruiting office - in Skopje
- (k) Koumanovo military recruiting office - in Koumanovo.

3. 15th Infantry Division:

- (a) Headquarters with Quartermaster service - in Bitolya.
- (b) Bitolya regiment:
 - Hq. with supply service and 2nd mounted signal platoon - in Bitolya.
 - Bitolya infantry battalion/Hq., 3 infantry and 1 mg companies, and 1 mortar platoon/- in Bitolya.
 - 2nd cavalry battalion - in Bitolya
 - 2nd antitank mounted platoon - in Bitolya
 - Supply squadron - in Bitolya.
- (c) Shtip regiment:
 - Hq. with supply service and 1st mounted signal platoon - in Shtip
 - Stroumitsa infantry battalion/Hq., 3 infantry and 1 mg companies, and 1 mortar platoon/- in Stroumitsa.
 - 1st cavalry battalion - in Shtip
 - 1st mounted antitank platoon - in Shtip
 - Supply squadron - in Shtip.
- (d) 15th Divisional artillery regiment/Headquarters with supply service, 1 artillery battalion of 3 batteries and 1 special battery/ - in Prilep.
- (e) 15th Divisional Engineer-Signals Battalion/Hq., 1 bridge-building and 1 signal companies/- Bitolya.
- (f) 15th Divisional Quartermaster Food Supply Company - in Bitolya.
- (g) 15th Divisional hospital with sanitary platoon - in Bitolya.
- (h) Bitolya military recruiting office - in Bitolya.
- (i) Shtip military recruiting office - in Shtip.

4. The 113th Army ~~is~~ stationed at the Skopje airfield, is under the command of the C.O. of the Fifth Army for garrison duties, and operationally - if necessary.

5. The established line dividing the 14th and 15th divisional regions is also the limit between the 14th and 15th divisions.

II. The Fifth Army is assigned the task of maintaining the garrison service and order in the occupied regions of Macedonia and Moravsko, within the following limits: north - the line Gurdelitsa-Strezimirovtsi incl.; west and south - the established line of demarcation between the Bulgarian, German and Italian armies to the mountain peak of Tumba excl.;

and east - the former Bulgarian-Yugoslav frontier, simultaneously repelling every attempt at attack from without.

The region to the north of the Fifth Army is to be guarded by the Pirot infantry regiment, and to the east - by the Aegean detachment.

The Fifth Army remains under the command of the General Staff.

III. The Commander of the Fifth Army should subdivide the occupied regions into sectors, down to battalion inclusively, each having a commanding officer responsible for maintaining the established order.

IV. The Pirot Infantry Battalion/Hq., 3 infantry and 1 mg companies/ is to be established in the town of Shtip, and is assigned the same task as the Fifth Army, within the following limits: north and east - the former Bulgarian-Yugoslav frontier; south - that of the Fifth Army; west - the established line of demarcation between the Bulgarian and German armies.

Operationally, the Pirot infantry battalion remains under the command of the General Staff, and in all other respects - under the command of the 1st divisional region.

V. As of August 1st, 1941, the First Fast Division ceases to exist and its units are to start functioning under their new names.

The files and records of the above concerning the occupation of Macedonia and Moravsko are to be kept as follows:

- the Hq. of the Division - at the 24th inf. division.
- H.M. Guards' Cavalry Regiment - at the Skopje regiment.
- 1st Cavalry Regiment - at the Shtip regiment
- 2nd Cavalry Regiment - at the Bitolya regiment.

The records and files until the occupation of Macedonia and Moravsko and the property are to be handed over as follows:

- Hq. of the Division - to the Inspection of Cavalry.
- H.M. Guards' Cavalry Regiment - to the Guards' Supplementary Squadron
- 1st Cavalry Regiment - to the 1st Supplementary Squadron.
- 2nd Cavalry Regiment - to the 2nd Supplementary Squadron.

VI. The Fifth Army and 1st Fast Division are to release all ranks of the reserve, as well as horses and carts, from the headquarters and their units, which are not supposed to figure in the headquarters sent to the above listed new formations of the Fifth Army. These are to be directed to their respective peacetime garrisons, and immediately released from military service upon their arrival.

/sgd/ H. PETKOFF.
LIEUTENANT GENERAL - Chief of Staff.

/sgd/ Hristoff
Chief of Detachment 50100,
General Staff.

COPY

URGENT.

Appendix No. 2.
Secret.

MINISTRY OF WAR
GENERAL STAFF
No. 9552.
4.7.1941.

Trace of - Commanders of the First, Second, Fourth and Fifth Armies.
Trace of - Commander of the Group of Armies.
Trace of - Commander of the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Infantry Divisions.
SOFIA, PLOVDIV, SLIVEN, SHUMEN, RUSSE, VRATZA, DUPNITZA, ST. SAGORA, PLEVEN, KURDJALI, SKOPIJE, and BITOLJA - Chiefs of the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Divisional Regions.
Trace of - Commanders of the First and Second Fast Divisions.
Copy to: SOFIA - The Inspectors of: the Artillery, Engineering-Signal Corps, and the Cavalry.
" " SOFIA - Chief Quartermaster.
" " SOFIA - Chiefs of the First and Third Branches, General Staff.

In order to produce the regular class of recruits and put on record all ranks of the reserve in the newly liberated territories, the latter are to be temporarily subdivided in military and territorial respect, as follows:

A. MACEDONIA.

(a) Fourteenth divisional region with two military recruiting offices - head offices located in Skopije and Kumanovo. The area of the Skopije military recruiting office is to include the Skopije and Katshani districts. The area of the Kumanovo military recruiting office is to include the Kumanovo, Vranja, Preshovo, Bosilegrad and Kriva-Palance districts.

(b) Fifteenth divisional region with two military recruiting offices, with head offices located at Bitolja and Shtip for their respective districts. In the Bitolja recruiting district should be included the Bitolja, Resen, Ohrid, Krushevo, Brod, Prilep and Veles districts. The Shtip military recruiting district should include the Shtip, Kratovo, St. Nicola, Kotshani, Negotin, Kavadarzi, Strumitza, Berovo, Doiran and Gavgely districts.

B. MORAVSKO.

The districts of: Pirot, Tzaribrod, Luzhmitza, Vladishki han, /Surdolitza/ to be included in the area of the First divisional region - sixth military recruiting office.

C. THRACE.

(a) The districts of: Demir-Hissar, Ser, Ziljahovo (Zilma) to be included in the area of the seventh divisional region - thirty-ninth

military recruiting office.

(b) The districts of Zurnevo, Drama, Cavala, Pravishte, Sari-Shaban and Tasos to be included in the area of the second divisional region, Twentieth-Seventh military recruiting office.

(c) The Xanthe district to be included in the area of the second divisional region - Twenty-first military recruiting office.

(d) The Giumurjina district to be included in the area of the tenth divisional region - Forth-seventh military recruiting office.

(e) The Pedegatsh district to be included in the area of the Tenth divisional region - Forty-fourth military recruiting office.

D. In the area of the Sixth divisional region-Fifteenth military recruiting office to be included in the municipalities which were incorporated in the Kula district.

The new recruiting offices are to be established in their respective towns on the tenth of this month, on which day the appointed officers should report. The chiefs of the Sixth, Twentysecond, Forty-Fourth and Fortyseventh recruiting offices to furnish the appointed assistant chiefs of the new recruiting offices with forms as per enclosed list, so as to enable them to start work. For the stationery supplied by the offices mentioned above, the Chief Quartermaster will release the respective credit for reimbursement.

Immediately after establishing themselves, these recruiting offices to start the preparatory work on the 1920 and 1921 classes of recruits. For this purpose the chiefs of the recruiting offices should contact the local mayors in order to prepare the recruiting lists, records, etc., as far as this is possible. The registers of the municipalities and all papers left behind by the Serbian and Greek military authorities should be made use of. The class of recruits is to be produced simultaneously in the whole country from July 25 till August 20 this year for which an order will follow.

The chiefs of the Thirtyninth, Twentyfirst, Fortyseventh and Fortyfourth military recruiting offices should start immediately the preparatory work for the class in the newly incorporated districts, contacting the local mayors for preparing the recruiting lists, etc., as far as possible.

The recruiting lists should be classified per municipalities and districts.

As clerks for the new recruiting offices should be temporarily assigned for a term of two months those mentioned in enclosed statement. The officers in charge of the new recruiting offices should fill-in their staffs of clerks with in the above term with appropriate persons, upon whose appointment, those previously assigned should be returned to their original offices. If any of the assigned clerks desires to remain permanently on service in the new recruiting office the latter may be permitted to do so. In such cases the new recruiting office should duly notify the chief of the respective office in order that the latter may fill in the vacancy.

In place of the assigned clerks should be called up labour

-11-

soldiers in reserve who have previously served in the respective recruiting office, but do not possess a mobilization order in the army.

For the new recruiting offices also one labour soldier in reserve with experience in recruiting offices should be called up from the respective recruiting office which assigns the clerk and together with the clerk be sent to the new recruiting office. ORDER.

Enclosure: 1 List, 1 chart, 1 report.

/sgd/ Kraeff.

Major-General - Acting Chief of the
General Staff.

/sgd/ Christoff

Acting Chief of Detachment 50100 G.S.

True: (initialled).

COPY

Annex No. 3.
Confidential.

MINISTRY OF WAR
Staff of the Army.

No. II 398

February 26, 1942.

S O F I A

Plovdiv, Sliven, Shoumen, Russe,
Vratza, Dupnitsa, Stara-Zagora,
Pleven, Kirdjali, Bitolia and
Skopie - The Chiefs of the 1st,
2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th,
9th, 10th, 14th and 15th divisional
districts.

Herewith enclosed you will find ... copies of the map for
the military-territorial division of the country.

One copy is for the district staff, and the remaining, one
for each military county.

The old maps, which were sent with letter No. 989 of
February 21, 1940, should be destroyed at the district staff and
protocols for destruction should be made.

Inform us upon receipt of the new maps.

ORDER.

Enclosure: copies of the map.

/s/ Savov.

Colonel - Temporary chief of section.

Attested by:

/s/ Christov

Colonel - Temporary Chief of section.

-13-

COPY

Annex No. 4.

CIPHERGRAM No. 3061.

Salonica - Liaison officer, forth-going No. 1143, dated December
31, 1943, Army Staff - R.S. - temp. No. 2, dated January
3, 1944.

I am informing you that the Commander of Salonica - the
Aegean will undertake an operation in the Paia mountain on
January 2.

Please keep reinforced the border line between Doyran and
Kaimak-Chalan until January 10, 1944.

/s/ Mirchev Colonel
Liaison Officer at the
German Command in Salonica.

Attested by: /s/ Mitev.

Lieutenant Colonel.

Unit No. 50200 at the Army Staff.

COPY

Annex No. 5.

MINISTRY OF WAR
Staff of the Army.

Personal

Confidential

No. I-17.

January 11, 1944.

S O F I A

SKOPIE - The Commander of the 5th Army.

PRILEP - The Commander of the 45th Regiment.

BETOLLA - The Commander of the 54th Infantry Regiment.

Copy: SALONICA - The Commander of Salonica - The Aegean.

Map - 1:200,000

I. During the last several months the Greek revolutionary movement, operating in the territory south of the demarcation line and west of the Vardar, considerably increased. During the month of September, a Greek band of about 1,500 men attacked the 3/14th Border sub-station, and in December the 1/15th border sub-station was also attacked.

II. The Germans will undertake an operation called secretly "Wolf" for the clearing of the territory included between the Vardar river to the east, the line passing through the village of Kenali - Armenohorion - the village of Vevi - the village of Panteleymon to the west, and the line: the town of Voden - the village of Gumenissa to the south.

The German General Fluchat will be in charge of the operation and his commanding place will be at the town of Voden.

The operation will begin on January 17, 5 a.m.

III. The operation will be carried out according to Order No. 395 of the German Commander of the region Salonica - the Aegean.

IV. On the Bulgarian side, the following will take part:

Fighting Group "C" - Commander: Colonel....., consisting of:

- 1 battalion of the 45th Infantry Regiment
- 1 battalion of the 54th Infantry Regiment
- a charged battery of the 15th Divisional Artillery Regiment,
-
-

VI. The liaison between the commanding place of the German Commander at Voden and the headquarters of the fighting groups will be maintained by the German Command.

-15-

There will be a German interpreter attached to the Staff of the 54th Infantry Regiment

Daily reports should be submitted to the Army Staff about the development of the operation.

/s/ Ianchulev.
Major-General, Assistant to the
Chief of the Army Staff.

Attested by: /s/ Mitev.
Lieutenant-Colonel, Unit 50200 A.S.

COPY

MINISTRY OF WAR

Annex No. 6.

STAFF OF THE ARMY

Confidential.

..... No. 6101.

To the Commander of the 2nd Army.

April 16, 1941.

Copy: City - The Chief of Section II.
Map 1:200,000

S O F I A

1. After the victories of the German Army against Yugoslavia and Greece, the former capitulated definitely and the troops of the latter are retreating towards the interior of old Greece.

2. Our active forces continue to fulfil their tasks on the Bulgarian south-eastern border.

Our 5th Army will begin tomorrow the occupation of Macedonia.

After seizing Macedonia and Thrace, the German troops continue their advance towards old Greece.

3. The 2nd Army - General G. Markov, including: the 10th Infantry Division, the 2nd Border Brigade (without the 1/7 and the 3/7 Border Companies) and the 1st Supplementary Regiment, is entrusted with the following task:

To advance at 8 o'clock on April 20, 1941 into Thrace and Eastern Macedonia and to occupy them in order to protect the Bulgarian population against the Greek units and bands still wandering and rioting. Limits of the districts to be occupied: from the west - the summit Tumba - the village of Sokolovo - the Butkova river - the Struma river - the port of Chaiasi (all included), and from the east - the village of Kalikoy - the village of Kumarli - the village of Kalikoy - the village of Kaiadji - the summit Ada Tepe (height 561) - the summit Chatel Bair Dag - the village of Edrenishli - the village of Hadjikoy (all included), and from the south - up to the Aegean coast.

4. The units of the 2nd Border Brigade are to occupy Eastern Macedonia and part of Thrace up to the line: Podosem - Kushlar (height 2177) - the Mesta river (included) in the following way:

The Border Company (2/7) should advance from Petrich along the road for Kulata - Demir Hissar and should occupy Demir Hissar. After its concentration in the district of Petrich - Kulata, the 1st Supplementary Regiment should advance along the road for Demir - Hissar, - Serres - Chaiasi and should take the town of Serres, the port of Chaiasi and the town of Kavalla with one separate company for each of these three places. The Staff of the Regiment will have its headquarters at the town of Kavalla, and the 2/7 Border Company, now in Demir Hissar, will also be placed under its command.

The Border Company (1/2) should advance from Nevrokop along the road for Zurnevo and should occupy the district of the latter town.

The Border Company (2/2) will advance along the road for the village of Chevdar - Kalchevo - Liban - for Drama and will occupy the latter town.

The Border Company (3/2) will advance from Rodosem via Arda Bashi and should occupy the district of Buk.

The Staff of the 2nd Border Regiment will have its headquarters at the railway station of Buk.

The Headquarters of the 2nd Border Brigade will be at the town of Drama.

After the release of the other units of the 7th Border Regiment from their former task, they should direct themselves towards the district Demir Hissar - Serres and should place themselves at the disposal of the Brigade Commander.

The assignment of the remaining brigade units and services will be fixed by the Brigade Commander.

5. The 10th Infantry Division should occupy Thrace east of the Mesta river up to the eastern limit of the Army. The districts to be reached by the units of the Division are indicated in the submitted map. The roads to be followed must be indicated by the Commander of the Division. The fixed eastern limit of the Army should absolutely not be passed in order not to cause suspicion on the part of the Turks.

The Division Staff will be at Gumurdjina.

6. The Headquarters of the Army Staff will be at the town of Xanthi after April 23.

7. The 11th Infantry Division and the 2nd Army Artillery Regiment which are to concentrate, should remain in the districts of concentration. Their operational use should be made upon instructions or after permission from the Army Staff.

8. The Army units and services which are not mentioned above should be directed to the district for occupation upon instructions by the Staff of the 2nd Army.

9. To appoint very small posts at the former border which, until further instructions, should not allow any crossing of the border by the civil population on both sides.

10. The advance of the Army units should be carried out with all measures for protection. After the crossing of the border line, the units must keep in mind that in their advance they might meet some of the remaining armed Greek units and bands.

11. The passage through inhabited places should take place only after a previous and detailed reconnaissance has been effected and after the traffic in the streets has been organized. The enthusiasm of the population welcoming the troops should in no way cause a slow-down of the traffic.

12. In case of an eventual encounter with resisting enemy groups, the units should engage themselves immediately in battle and should fight with the greatest determination until the enemy is completely destroyed or captured.

The weak enemy groups or soldiers wandering separately should be first dealt with as soon as possible without engaging more forces or hindering the outlined plan for action.

One must be merciless towards the disturbing elements aiming at disorganizing the rear of the Army or at tormenting the peaceful civil population.

13. The commanders of the units should take all necessary measures in order to avoid accidents which might be caused by explosive materials still undiscovered and placed along the roads, in the communication equipment and in private homes.

14. In case of damaged road and railway equipment, the commanders of the individual groups should proceed with the immediate repair of the caused damages with the only aim to keep up the traffic. For this purpose, one should use the local available means and if necessary the local population.

15. Most strict measures should be taken for the preservation of the State as well as the private property in the occupied regions against any attempt on the part of the remaining Greek elements as well as our soldiers or the local population.

16. No partizans, armed civilians or others, who are not members of the Army should accompany or lead the units and the staffs under any pretext whatsoever. In that respect one should be very strict.

17. Deserters, war prisoners and others should be gathered at places indicated by the Staff of the 2nd Army.

18. The Central Liaison Station of the High Command will be at Sofia.

The Central Liaison Station for the 2nd Army will be at Plovdiv until April 23, 1941 and after that - at Xanthi.

19. Officers, non-commissioned officers and soldiers of the 2nd Army, you have the great honour to occupy Eastern Macedonia and Thrace. With your good and smart appearance, with your iron discipline, with your correct and brotherly conduct towards the Bulgarian population in these Bulgarian lands, you should create a real enthusiasm in this Bulgarian population which has suffered so much and you should prove to be worth of the great and responsible task entrusted to you by the SUPREME LEADER.

ORDER.

Enclosure: 1 map 1:200.000.

/s/ H. Petkov.
Lieutenant-General - Chief of the Army Staff.

Attested by: /s/ Christov.
Temporary Chief of Unit 50100, Army Staff.

C O P Y

Annex No. 7.

MINISTRY OF WAR.

Staff of the Army.

Personal - Confidential.

No. I-257.

July 5, 1943.

S O F I A

Dupnitsa - The Commander of the
7th Inf. Division, Salonica -
The Liaison Officer, attached to
the German Army Group "E" -
Gen. Jilkov.

.....
.....

Map - 1:200.000.

1. The development of the political and strategical situation imposed the extension of the occupational tasks of the Bulgarian Army.
2. In agreement with the German Command in the South-East, part of the Salonica region will be occupied by the 7th Infantry Division.
3. East of the Struma river the Aegean coast will be occupied by the 16th Infantry Division. The Salonica bay will be occupied by the German units.
4. The 7th Inf. Division is entrusted with the following task:
 - to occupy the district indicated in the map attached herewith/the western limit of it excludes Salonica - includes Lagadina - excludes Kukush - the Doyran Lake - for the 7th Infantry Division/.

.....
.....

After its concentration, the Division will be placed under the orders of the German Commander of Salonica - the Aegean, with Headquarters at Salonica.

.....

6. The administration of the occupied district will remain, as up to the present, in German hands. The Greek officials will be placed under the orders of the respective higher German authorities of the military administration. The said Greek officials will be considered as German military administrative employees.

7. The Bulgarian border army units and custom authorities, as well as the Greek ones, in as much as they exist, will keep their present places, their submission and service.

.....

Enclosure: attached only to the letters for the 7th Inf. Division and for General Jilkov.

/s/ Lukash.
Lieutenant-General-Chief of the Army Staff.

Attested by: /s/ Mitev.
Lieutenant-Colonel. Unit 50200, Army Staff.

L I S T

OF THE PERSONS SENTENCED BY THE XITH TRIBUNAL OF THE
PEOPLE IN SOFIA FOR CRIMES COMMITTED IN THE YUGOSLAV
AND GREEK TERRITORIES OCCUPIED BY BULGARIA IN 1941-44.

1. Sentenced to 1 year imprisonment conditionally:

Tzolo Christov Vlutehkov
Radi Jelev Gotchev

2. Sentenced to 1 year imprisonment and deprived of rights for 3 years conditionally:

Zdravko Blagoev Todorov

3. Sentenced to 1 year imprisonment, deprived of rights for 3 years and confiscation of real estate, conditionally:

Tzvetan Stefanov Berkovski
Gueorgui Petrov Spassov
Ivan Nikolov Dimitrov

4. Sentenced to 1 year imprisonment, deprived of rights for ever, deduction of preliminary detention:

Kamen Petrov Spassov
Ratzo Todorov Nestorov
Christo Marinov Bonev

5. Sentenced to 1 year severe imprisonment and deprived of rights for 3 years:

Vanu Mihailov Tzolov
Nedelko Nikolov Ivanov
Ivan Bojinov Tzonev
Nikola Tzvetkov Iotov
Anguel Ferdinandov Milenkov Milev
Alexander Ivanov Tchernov

6. Sentenced to 2 years of severe imprisonment and deprived of rights for 4 years:

Vassil Christov Nankovski

7. Sentenced to 2 years of severe imprisonment and deprived of rights for 5 years:

Kamen Vassilev Gueorguiev
Ilia Vassilev Likov
Ilia Dimov Iliev
Dimitar Mitev Petrov Shopov
Gueorgui Anguelov Nankov
Christo Ivanov Kazakov
Kristu Anguelov Raditchev
Luben Alexandrov Petrov
Maltcho Dimitrov Maltchev
Nentcho Iliev Bogdanov

8. Sentenced to 3 years severe imprisonment and deprived of rights for 5 years:
- Stoyan Todorov Kamenski
Gueorgui Kostadinov Tchitchkov
9. Sentenced to 3 years severe imprisonment and deprived of rights for 6 years:
- Dimiter Shterev Nedev
Kristu Ganey Pouikov
Tihomir Nedev Subtchev
Ivan Gueorguiev Divrov
Marin Vassilev Gueorguiev
Gueorgui Nikolov Semerdjiev
Blagoi Kountchev Marinov
10. Sentenced to 3 years severe imprisonment, deprived of rights for 6 years and fine of leva 100.000 convertible into 6 months of imprisonment:
- Kamen Mitov Tzenov
11. Sentenced to 5 years severe imprisonment and deprived of rights for 10 years:
- Todor Gueorguiev Dervishev
Lazar Iutzkanov Dimitrov
Ilia Nikolov Anguelov
Todor Stoyanov Petrov
Dimiter Nedeltchev Stamatov Koprinkov
Miltcho Vassilev Miltchev
Gueorgui Donev Tenev
Ivan Radev Ivanov
Luben Andreev Shipkov
Michail Gueorguiev Sourtchev
Stoiko Bonev Roussev
Kostadin Stoyanov Djerov
12. Sentenced to 5 years severe imprisonment, deprived of rights for 10 years and fine of leva 200.000 convertible into 6 months imprisonment:
- Assen Filipov Trifonov.
13. Sentenced to 5 years severe imprisonment, deprived of rights for 10 years and confiscation of half of real estate:
- Ivan Bogdanov Stoikov
Stoyan Christov Iordanov
14. Sentenced to 10 years of severe imprisonment and deprived of rights for 15 years:
- Slavtcho Marinov Iovov
Ivan Nedev Moshev
Michail Christov Sapundjiev
Petar Slavov Stoyanov
Ivan Koev Stoyanov
Tzanko Iliev Tzanov

Naiden Kamenov Ivanov
Gueorgui Christov Popouzliski
Nikola Grigorov Voutchkov
Tzvetan Kotzov Naidentchovski.

15. Sentenced to 10 years of severe imprisonment, deprived of rights for 15 years and fine of leva 100,000 convertible into 6 months of imprisonment:

Gueorgui Loultchev Popov
Christo Iliev.

16. Sentenced to 10 years of severe imprisonment, deprived of rights for 15 years, and confiscation of half of real estate.

Gueorgui Stifanov Poushkarov.

17. Sentenced to 10 years of severe imprisonment, deprived of rights for 15 years, fine of leva 100,000 convertible into 6 months of imprisonment and confiscation of half of real estate:

Gueorgui Iliev Mutzov
Mutruz Dimitrov Panzov

18. Sentenced to 10 years of severe imprisonment, deprived of rights for 15 years and confiscation of entire real estate:

Kiril Tzvetkov Danailov

19. Sentenced to 15 years of severe imprisonment and deprived of rights for 20 years:

Petar Kirov Stoilov
Vassil Anastassov Abadjiev
Stefan Petrov Roussanov
Ilia Gueorguiev Vulkanov
Iordan Gantohev Ivanov
Gueorgui Grigorov Iordanov
Tzankov Kolev Christov
Kiril Stefanov Kambourov
Dontcho Kolev Dontchev
Veliko Dobrev Michnev
Stefan Toshkov Stefanov

20. Sentenced to 15 years of severe imprisonment, deprived of rights for 20 years and fine of leva 100,000 convertible into 6 months of imprisonment:

Todor Ioshev.

21. Sentenced to 15 years of severe imprisonment, deprived of rights for 20 years and fine of leva 200,000 convertible into 6 months imprisonment:

Dimiter Rashev Andreevski
Ilia Nikolov Nedkov.

22. Sentenced to 15 years of severe imprisonment, deprived of rights for 20 years and fine of leva 500,000 convertible into 6 months imprisonment:

Luben Parvanov Varbanov

23. Sentenced to 15 years of severe imprisonment, deprived of rights for 20 years, fine of leva 500.000 convertible into 6 months of imprisonment and confiscation of all real estate:

Ivan Todorov Rakitski.

24. Sentenced to severe life imprisonment and deprived of rights for ever:

Petar Vladimirov Minkov

25. Sentenced to severe life imprisonment, deprived of rights for ever, fine leva 500.000 convertible into 6 months of imprisonment and confiscation of half of the real estate:

Deltcho Spassov Deykov
Kosta Stefanov Mavrov

26. Sentenced to severe life imprisonment, deprived of rights for ever, fine of leva 500.000 convertible into 6 months imprisonment and confiscation of entire real estate:

Herovim Panaiotov Arnaudov
Anto Danov Antov
Dimitar Evtimov Klepkov
Boris Nikolov Nenkov
Milotin Filipov Shkolarov
Boris Manolov Nassalevalki.

27. Sentenced to severe life imprisonment, deprived of rights for ever, fine of leva 1.000.000 convertible into 6 months of imprisonment and confiscation of half of real estate:

Dr. Dimitar Nedialkov Raev.

28. Sentenced to severe life imprisonment, deprived of rights for ever, fine of leva 1.000.000 convertible into 6 months of imprisonment and confiscation of entire real estate:

Christo Ivanov Hadji Christov
Andon Popov Tashev.

30. Sentenced to severe life imprisonment, deprived of rights for ever, fine of leva 1.000.000 convertible into 6 months of imprisonment and confiscation of entire real estate:

Denu Stantchev Denev
Michail Djogov
Kiril Malinov
Spas Nikolov Pissanov
Roussi Gelezkov Roussev.

31. Sentenced to severe life imprisonment, deprived of rights for ever, fine of leva 2.000.000 convertible into 6 months of imprisonment and confiscation of entire real estate:

Luben Zachariev Manov.

32. Sentenced to death, deprived of rights for ever, fine of leva 500.000 and confiscation of entire real estate:

Assen Roussev Gueorguiev.

33. Sentenced to death, deprived of rights for ever, fine of leva 1,000,000 and confiscation of entire real estate:

Slaveiko Zachariev Ivanov
Filip Ivanov Sheikovski.

34. Sentenced to death, deprived of rights for ever, fine of leva 1,000,000 and confiscation of entire real estate:

Trifon Petrov Kovatchev
Petko Ivanov Kiriakov.

35. Sentenced to death, deprived of rights for ever, fine of leva 2,000,000 and confiscation of entire real estate:

Petar Nikolov Krastev
Boris Vitkov
Vassil Gueorguiev
Emil Michailov Pantchev.

36. Sentenced to death, deprived of rights for ever, fine of leva 3,000,000 and confiscation of entire real estate:

Alexander Stefanov Dentchev.

37. Sentenced to death, deprived of rights for ever, fine of leva 5,000,000 and confiscation of entire real estate:

Dr. Stefan Ratchev Kletchkov
Vassil Stefanov Kaypakov
Kosta Gueorguiev Deliakov
Vassil Koev
Todor Baykov
Dimitar Christov Shtipliev
Smilen Ivanov Malinov
Ivan Nikolov Piskov
Dobri Iordanov Dombalov
Gueorgui Kotzev Gueorguiev.

38. Sentenced to death, deprived of rights for ever and confiscation of entire real estate:

Dimitar Hadji Dontchev
Dimitar Peytchev
Metodi Trendafilov Pop Velitohkov.

For distribution of this Doc
see note with Doc. I/75 -

RESTRICTED.
CONFIDENTIAL.

I/73.
Supplementary to I/72.

30th December 1946.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.
COMMITTEE I.
GENERAL MARINOV'S CASE.

The following letter No. 5198-III, dated September 11, 1946, addressed by the Bulgarian Government to the United Nations War Crimes Commission through the care of the Allied Control Commission in Sofia is circulated to members of Committee I for their information and consideration at its next Meeting in accordance with the decision taken in the Meeting on 19th December, 1946.

Since march 1946 the Greek press and Radio have started a violent campaign against the Minister Plenipotentiary of Bulgaria in Paris, General Ivan Marinov. This campaign began after the statement made by General Marinov, in which he raised for the first time the question of returning Western Thrace to Bulgaria.

The Greek circles intensified this campaign at the opening of the Peace Conference in Paris, and a few English, French and American newspapers echoed these attacks.

A few days ago an English newspaper reported that General Marinov's name has been placed on the list of war-criminals. The Bulgarian Government has no information whatsoever regarding the veracity of that report or on the foundation and conditions in which that inscription has been made.

General Marinov is being accused of having directed during the war the "campaign of denationalisation" in Greece and in Western Macedonia, of having decreed the massacres of Greeks in these regions, of having supplied money and arms to the "Bulgarian commitadjis" - who have committed atrocities in the same regions etc. These attacks present General Marinov as "the denationaliser of Greece", "head of the Bulgarian commitadjis", "despot and hangman" of Hellenism in Macedonia, "human-monster", etc.

In a letter by M. Cosmetatos, Press Councillor of the Greek Embassy in Paris, addressed to the Editor of the "Continental Daily Mail" and published by that newspaper on September 1, 1946, it is said among other things:

"Verdict No. 307 (1946) of the War Criminals Court (the letter does not state what tribunal) states that General Marinov directed from Monastir the extermination and denationalisation of the Greek population in Western Macedonia. The United Nations War Crimes Commission has examined on the 31st of July the evidence brought by the Greek Government against General Marinov and found them to be a "prima facie" case against him in respect of murder, massacres, systematic terrorism and pillage and has, therefore, placed him upon its lists of war criminals to be tried".

However, it is notoriously known that:

1/ In 1941, after the end of hostilities between the Germans and the Greeks, the Bulgarian troops occupied the territories East of the river Strouma only, in 1943 the occupation - of a purely military character that time - was extended more to the West, including the territories to the river Vardar;

2/ Western Macedonia, south of the Greek-Yugoslave frontier, has not been occupied during the war by Bulgarian troops; this territory was occupied and administered by the Germans and Italians. There were Bulgarian interpreters at some German Kommandantures, and a Bulgarian General Staff at the town of Salonica, in charge of the liaison with the German Command in Greece and in the islands;

3/ General Marinov commanded the 15th Infantry Division on Yugoslave territory (Northern Macedonia) from July 1942 to September 1944, his general Headquarters being established in Bitolia (Monastir). His authority and his command have never been extended to Greek Macedonia, and could possibly not be exercised there because of the here-above indicated reasons; they have never been extended beyond the Greek-Yugoslav frontier which was strictly marked and densely covered with frontier military customs and police posts;

4/ Throughout the war General Marinov has been on Greek territory a single day on the whole, and that during an excursion to the town of Kostour (Kastoria) in which he remained for one or two hours.

5/ During the war no Bulgarian unit has operated on Greek territory under the direct orders of General Marinov. Only once a single unit of his Division was detached, by order of the Ministry of War in Sofia, and was placed under the command of the German Command in Salonica. After having participated in the struggle against the Partisans in Greek Macedonia this unit was returned to its Division; during that time General Marinov did not have any contact with the detached unit and could not have exercised any command over it.

6/ All operations and all persecutions in Greek Western Macedonia are due to the Germans and Italians; Bulgarian troops and Bulgarian authorities have never taken part in these operations and persecutions.

7/ From the questioning of M. Kaltrohev, the Bulgarian interpreter at the German Command at Ierin (Greek Macedonia) during a trial to which Athenes made a most resounding publicity, it became evident that that person had had no service relations whatsoever with General Marinov. However, the Greek Accusations are based on the statements of that interpreter.

Thus it appears that General Marinov has not exercised command on Greek territory and, consequently, has had neither the possibility nor the power to commit any of the acts attributed to him.

General Marinov has therefore absolutely no relation with the events which have taken place in Greece during the war; even less could he have participated in acts of cruelty committed in these regions. He has not done that in Yugoslav Macedonia where for two years, he was invested with the authority conferred to him by his command. The fact

that no demand for pursuits against General Marinov as a war criminal has been made by the Yugoslav Government is very edifying, for if he had really acted as it is reproached on the Greek side, he would have done more on Yugoslav territory; where his own command was situated.

It would be suitable to remind the fact that General Marinov was Commander in Chief of the Bulgarian Army which in 1944 and 1945, at the price of heavy sacrifices, gave its contribution for the defeat of Hitlerite Germany.

Later on, General Marinov was appointed Minister Plenipotentiary of Bulgaria in Paris, where, in that quality he made statements to the Press regarding the return of Thrace to Bulgaria. These statements, made at the eve of the convocation of the Peace Conference, provoked the great dissatisfaction of the Greek Government which started a vehement campaign against him by means of the Press and the Radio.

At the present moment, General Marinov is member of the Bulgarian Delegation at the Paris Conference and in this quality will participate in the work of the Conference.

The Bulgarian Government fully agrees that the punishment of war criminals should be carried out with firmness. Actually it has been the first to set up the example of severe punishment of war criminals. Thus the People's Courts have tried and condemned: 2850 persons to death penalty of which 2,025 have been executed; 6,018 persons to life imprisonment or to minor penalties. These figures include the criminals who were found guilty of crimes committed in the territories occupied by the Bulgarian Army; among others, Kletchekov, former Director of the department for Western Thrace, and colonel Michailov - both condemned to death and executed. These figures confirm that the Bulgarian Government follows resolutely a policy of repression of war crimes, but if the repression of war crimes is an obligation for every Government, it should by no means become an instrument of achieving political ends in favour of a state. Actually there is every ground to admit that under the pretext of persecuting a war criminal in the person of General Marinov the Greek Government is attempting to achieve political results in connexion with the peace treaty with Bulgaria. As far as the Bulgarian Government is concerned, there is no doubt that by trying to accuse General Marinov as a war criminal, in spite of the fact that he did not have the material possibility to accomplish any of the acts of which he is accused, the Greek Government is trying to achieve the following political results:

1/ The accusation of general Marinov as a war criminal endeavours to discredit in the high functions which he assumed in the past and is still assuming at present, namely: general of the Bulgarian Army, Commander in Chief of the Bulgarian Army in the campaign against Hitlerite Germany and member of the Bulgarian Delegation at the Peace Conference.

2/ In accusing of war crimes Marinov, former Commander in Chief of the Bulgarian Army, which contributed at the price of heavy sacrifices, to the liberation of Greece and Yugoslavia, the Greek Government seeks to minimise the importance of the Bulgarian military contribution. As it is known this fact has been appreciated by the competent circles and the Bulgarian Government has brought it to the attention of the Peace Conference. Is not the effort to discredit as a war criminal the Commander in Chief of the victorious Bulgarian army, an obvious attempt to minimise before the Peace Conference the importance of the Bulgarian participation in the common victory?

Furthermore, is not the Greek Government trying to leave to history the name of a Bulgarian Commander in Chief stained as that of a war criminal?

At last bearing in mind the fact that General Marinov has been honored with the highest Soviet military decoration is it not difficult to conceive that he might be accused of war crimes?

3/ At many occasions the Greek press and the official Greek circles have pretended that there is no difference between present Fatherland Front Bulgaria and Fascist Bulgaria. of the past. The persistence at the present moment to pretend that General Marinov is a war criminal, is a manoeuvre which aims to prove that the Government of the Fatherland Front is continuing the errors of the past and is served by personalities who are still inspired by the conceptions of the rejected past.

The solide consideration of the points here-above exposed is amply sufficient to show how ill-intentioned the Greek proceeding is and that under the cover of worthy aims it pursues unworthy political ends.

Following the present expose, the Bulgarian Government has the honour to request the War Crimes Commission in London to reexamine the case of General Marinov and to decide his radiation from the list of war criminals.

For distribution of this Doc
see note with Doc I/75 -

RESTRICTED.
CONFIDENTIAL.

I/73.
Supplementary to I/72.

30th December 1946.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.
COMMITTEE I.
GENERAL MARINOV'S CASE.

The following letter No. 5198-III, dated September 11, 1946, addressed by the Bulgarian Government to the United Nations War Crimes Commission through the care of the Allied Control Commission in Sofia is circulated to members of Committee I for their information and consideration at its next Meeting in accordance with the decision taken in the Meeting on 19th December, 1946.

Since March 1946 the Greek press and Radio have started a violent campaign against the Minister Plenipotentiary of Bulgaria in Paris, General Ivan Marinov. This campaign began after the statement made by General Marinov, in which he raised for the first time the question of returning Western Thrace to Bulgaria.

The Greek circles intensified this campaign at the opening of the Peace Conference in Paris, and a few English, French and American newspapers echoed these attacks.

A few days ago an English newspaper reported that General Marinov's name has been placed on the list of war-criminals. The Bulgarian Government has no information whatsoever regarding the veracity of that report or on the foundation and conditions in which that inscription has been made.

General Marinov is being accused of having directed during the war the "campaign of denationalisation" in Greece and in Western Macedonia, of having decreed the massacres of Greeks in these regions, of having supplied money and arms to the "Bulgarian commitadjis" - who have committed atrocities in the same regions etc. These attacks present General Marinov as "the denationaliser of Greece", "head of the Bulgarian commitadjis", "despot and hangman" of Hellenism in Macedonia, "human-monster", etc.

In a letter by M. Cosmetatos, Press Councillor of the Greek Embassy in Paris, addressed to the Editor of the "Continental Daily Mail" and published by that newspaper on September 1, 1946, it is said among other things:

"Verdict No. 307 (1946) of the War Criminals Court (the letter does not state what tribunal) states that General Marinov directed from Monastir the extermination and denationalisation of the Greek population in Western Macedonia. The United Nations War Crimes Commission has examined on the 31st of July the evidence brought by the Greek Government against General Marinov and found them to be a "prima facie" case against him in respect of murder, massacres, systematic terrorism and pillage and has, therefore, placed him upon its lists of war criminals to be tried".

However, it is notoriously known that:

1/ In 1941, after the end of hostilities between the Germans and the Greeks, the Bulgarian troops occupied the territories East of the river Strouma only, in 1943 the occupation - of a purely military character that time - was extended more to the West, including the territories to the river Vardar;

2/ Western Macedonia, south of the Greek-Yugoslave frontier, has not been occupied during the war by Bulgarian troops; this territory was occupied and administered by the Germans and Italians. There were Bulgarian interpreters at some German Kommandantures, and a Bulgarian General Staff at the town of Salonica, in charge of the liaison with the German Command in Greece and in the islands;

3/ General Marinov commanded the 15th Infantry Division on Yugoslave territory (Northern Macedonia) from July 1942 to September 1944, his general Headquarters being established in Bitolia (Monastir). His authority and his command have never been extended to Greek Macedonia, and could possibly not be exercised there because of the here-above indicated reasons; they have never been extended beyond the Greek-Yugoslav frontier which was strictly marked and densely covered with frontier military customs and police posts;

4/ Throughout the war General Marinov has been on Greek territory a single day on the whole, and that during an excursion to the town of Kostour (Kastoria) in which he remained for one or two hours.

5/ During the war no Bulgarian unit has operated on Greek territory under the direct orders of General Marinov. Only once a single unit of his Division was detached, by order of the Ministry of War in Sofia, and was placed under the command of the German Command in Salonica. After having participated in the struggle against the Partisans in Greek Macedonia this unit was returned to its Division; during that time General Marinov did not have any contact with the detached unit and could not have exercised any command over it.

6/ All operations and all persecutions in Greek Western Macedonia are due to the Germans and Italians; Bulgarian troops and Bulgarian authorities have never taken part in these operations and persecutions.

7/ From the questioning of M. Kaltchev, the Bulgarian interpreter at the German Command at Lerin (Greek Macedonia) during a trial to which Athenes made a most resounding publicity, it became evident that that person had had no service relations whatsoever with General Marinov. However, the Greek Accusations are based on the statements of that interpreter.

Thus it appears that General Marinov has not exercised command on Greek territory and, consequently, has had neither the possibility nor the power to commit any of the acts attributed to him.

General Marinov has therefore absolutely no relation with the events which have taken place in Greece during the war; even less could he have participated in acts of cruelty committed in these regions. He has not done that in Yugoslav Macedonia where for two years, he was invested with the authority conferred to him by his command. The fact

that no demand for pursuits against General Marinov as a war criminal has been made by the Yugoslav Government is very edifying, for if he had really acted as it is reproached on the Greek side, he would have done more on Yugoslav territory; where his own command was situated.

It would be suitable to remind the fact that General Marinov was Commander in Chief of the Bulgarian Army which in 1944 and 1945, at the price of heavy sacrifices, gave its contribution for the defeat of Hitlerite Germany.

Later on, General Marinov was appointed Minister Plenipotentiary of Bulgaria in Paris, where, in that quality he made statements to the Press regarding the return of Thrace to Bulgaria. These statements, made at the eve of the convocation of the Peace Conference, provoked the great dissatisfaction of the Greek Government which started a vehement campaign against him by means of the Press and the Radio.

At the present moment, General Marinov is member of the Bulgarian Delegation at the Paris Conference and in this quality will participate in the work of the Conference.

The Bulgarian Government fully agrees that the punishment of war criminals should be carried out with firmness. Actually it has been the first to set up the example of severe punishment of war criminals. Thus the People's Courts have tried and condemned: 2850 persons to death penalty of which 2.025 have been executed; 6.018 persons to life imprisonment or to minor penalties. These figures include the criminals who were found guilty of crimes committed in the territories occupied by the Bulgarian Army; among others, Kletchekov, former director of the department for Western Thrace, and colonel Michailov - both condemned to death and executed. These figures confirm that the Bulgarian Government follows resolutely a policy of repression of war crimes, but if the repression of war crimes is an obligation for every Government, it should by no means become an instrument of achieving political ends in favour of a state. Actually there is every ground to admit that under the pretext of persecuting a war criminal in the person of General Marinov the Greek Government is attempting to achieve political results in connexion with the peace treaty with Bulgaria. As far as the Bulgarian Government is concerned, there is no doubt that by trying to accuse General Marinov as a war criminal, in spite of the fact that he did not have the material possibility to accomplish any of the acts of which he is accused, the Greek Government is trying to achieve the following political results:

1/ The accusation of general Marinov as a war criminal endeavours to discredit in the high functions which he assumed in the past and is still assuming at present, namely: general of the Bulgarian Army, Commander in Chief of the Bulgarian Army in the campaign against Hitlerite Germany and member of the Bulgarian Delegation at the Peace Conference.

2/ In accusing of war crimes Marinov, former Commander in Chief of the Bulgarian Army, which contributed at the price of heavy sacrifices, to the liberation of Greece and Yugoslavia, the Greek Government seeks to minimise the importance of the Bulgarian military contribution. As it is known this fact has been appreciated by the competent circles and the Bulgarian Government has brought it to the attention of the Peace Conference. Is not the effort to discredit as a war criminal the Commander in Chief of the victorious Bulgarian army, an obvious attempt to minimise before the Peace Conference the importance of the Bulgarian participation in the common victory?

Furthermore, is not the Greek Government trying to leave to history the name of a Bulgarian Commander in Chief stained as that of a war criminal?

At last bearing in mind the fact that General Marinov has been honored with the highest Soviet military decoration is it not difficult to conceive that he might be accused of war crimes?

3/ At many occasions the Greek press and the official Greek circles have pretendid that there is no difference between present Fatherland Front Bulgaria and Fascist Bulgaria. of the past. The persistance at the present moment to pretend that General Marinov is a war criminal, is a manoeuvre which aims to prove that the Government of the Fatherland Front is continuing the errors of the past and is served by personalities who are still inspired by the conceptions of the rejected past.

The solide consideration of the points here-above exposed is amply sufficient to show how ill-intentioned the Greek proceeding is and that under the oover of worthy aims it pursues unworthy political ends.

Following the present expose, the Bulgarian Government has the honour to request the War Crimes Commission in London to reexamine the case of General Marinov and to decide his radiation from the list of war criminals.

11/0

For distribution of this Doc
see memo W. J/75

RESTRICTED.
CONFIDENTIAL.

I/74.

14th January 1947.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.

COMMITTEE I.

GENERAL MARINOV'S CASE.

The following additional evidence against General MARINOV, submitted by the Greek Representative on the Commission, is circulated to members of Committee I for their information and consideration at its next Meeting:

- I. Decision of the Judicial Committee of the Greek National War Crimes Committee. (Pages 1-19).
- II. Affidavits by G. Ravalli. (Pages 20-23).
- III. Affidavit by A. Oh. Kaltcheff. (Page 24).
- IV. Report by Captain Peters Lolas. (Pages 25-27).
- V. Report by the Secretary of the Florina Department. (Pages 28-30).

I.

Decision of the Judicial Committee of the Greek National War Crimes Committee.

In accordance with art. 6 of Const. Act No. 73/1945, a committee composed of D. KIOUSSOPOULOS, director of the Central Services of the Greek National Bureau for War Criminals and Deputy Prosecutor at the Supreme Court, as president, and M. KALLIMOPOULOS and SP. PAVLOPOULOS, judges in Athens, as members, met on November 11, 1946 in the presence of N. RAPTIS acting as secretary, to discuss the following affair:

IVAN MARINOFF, Bulgarian General etc. have been accused for murders, etc.

In consequence to this accusation, the Director of the Bureau for War Criminals, ordered an investigation from which file No. 307/46 was formed. When the investigation was over, the same Director introduced the affair to the Committee.

The Committee, - having examined the file, having thought according to the law

Decided as follows:

1. An investigation was carried out in order to prove whether war crimes were committed in the regions of Florina and Kastoria (Western Macedonia). The following actual facts resulted from this investigation.

In April 1941, the German Armies and later the Italian ones occupied

the regions of Florina and Kastoria and established themselves there. A regular Bulgarian Army of occupation had reached the neighbouring district of Monastir (Vitolia) where, during the whole occupation the Bulgarian 15th division had established its headquarters, but which had not occupied the above mentioned districts in view of their final annexation which constituted an intermediate aim of the Bulgarian State. This aim was systematically pursued by various means. Thus from the very first days of the German and Bulgarian occupation, Bulgarian interpreters made their appearance at the German and Italian Town Majors. These interpreters were highly educated Bulgarian civilians or officers, such as MLANTENOFF in Florina, DOITCHEFF, professor of the University of Sofia at Kastoria, under the officer ANTON KALITCHEFF, assistant professor of Political Economy at the University of Sofia, a graduate from Germany.

The simple fact that the Bulgarians were highly educated proves that they had undertaken an important mission, which, under cover of the role of the interpreter, should be fulfilled. It is evident that the Bulgarians could have used for interpreters men of lower education as commonly used during the occupation. The important mission of the Bulgarian interpreters served the final views of the annexation by Bulgaria of Western Macedonia and consisted in carrying out a propaganda in favour of the Bulgarian idea, of uprooting Greek national feeling and in modifying the ethnological composition of Western Macedonia. All these facts have been proved from the enquiry and the actual incidents described here below. These incidents prove, irrespective of the evident nature of the conditions, that in order to succeed in this most difficult mission, it was necessary that a person of high education, valour, strength and prestige, occupying an important position in the Bulgarian State machine, should be at its head. This individual should be capable to exploit all conditions, whether of a political nature in the relations between Bulgaria and her allies, Germany and Italy, or of a military nature and relative to the sufficiency or not of the German and Italian troops of occupation, or relative to the supply of provisions and in general to the economic conditions of the Greek people or other such matters. The person should be capable of giving general directives, of synchronising the action of the interpreters and other members, of raising their morale, of obtaining and using various means for the fulfilment of this aim. These means included money, food supplies, clothing, books, arms, reinforcement by sections of the regular Bulgarian army etc. The inquiry carried out proves that such an individual was at the head of the whole organisation nearly all through the occupation and that this person was Colonel (now General) IVAN MARINOFF, commanding 15th Bulgarian Division, quartered during the whole occupation at Monastir. The actual position occupied by MARINOFF as Bulgarian Minister Plenipotentiary in Paris, proves that he possessed all these qualities of a leader. From neighbouring and opportunely located Monastir, he directed the whole affair. It was from there that he sent to various districts his interpreters and local leaders. It was there that he received all those individuals and gave them the directives to follow and the necessary means. It was from Monastir that he himself visited Kastoria with ulterior aims, the success of his mission.

II. Concrete facts relative to the uprooting of Greek national feeling of the inhabitants of the districts of Florina and Kastoria and the modification of their ethnological composition are the following as proved by inquiry:

- 1) Immediately following the establishment of the German troops of occupation in Florina, the Bulgarian officer MLANTENOFF reported to the Town Major as interpreter and managed to create contact with the German Town Major having his meals with him, accompanying him on his tours of inspection, managing to make him issue statements in favour of Bulgarian pretensions that the majority of the population of the district was of Bulgarian descent, taking part in the meetings between the German Town Major

and the Greek prefect of Florina and expressing his own views relative to the replacement of municipal councillors by others belonging to the Bulgarian Committee. In brief, MLANTENOFF managed to move outside the narrow limits of the role of an interpreter. He had his own luxurious car and had abundant means of moving about. He received the pro-Bulgarians at the German Town Major's, at his house and the restaurant "Averoff" in Florina. He organised receptions in honour of other Bulgarian officials. He also organised receptions in honour of the German Town Major in the course of his tours (at Amyntaeon, Ag. Panteleimon, Xyno-Nero etc. for example). In these tours propaganda was carried out in favour of the Bulgarian national idea and against the Greek one and the Bulgarians would declare that in a few days Bulgarian troops would be quartered in this department (for above, see report of the Greek prefect of Florina Mr. Const. Bonis, dated July 18, 1941 and addressed to the Governor General of Macedonia).

2) Immediately following the establishment of the Italian troops of occupation in Kastoria, DOITCHEFF, professor at the University of Sofia, appeared at the Town Major's and reported as an interpreter. Later on the Bulgarian officer ANTON KALITCHEFF arrived in Kastoria. This latter person has already been condemned by the special court for war criminals in Athens. DOITCHEFF methodically organised the Bulgarian Committee (see below) furnished the Italian search troops with supposed interpreters whereas in reality these individuals were terrorists purposely throwing arms into houses of Greeks whom the Italians would subsequently arrest, imprison, torture and or execute. Such terrorists agents of the Bulgarian propaganda were the following: LUCAS DIAMANTIDIS, KOSMAS KYRIAKOPOULOS, BORIS STOYANNIS, etc. (see the testimonies by doctor LEONIDAS TSAMISSIS, mayor of Kastoria during the occupation, MENELAOS TSAKIRIS, Director of the Prefecture of Kastoria during the occupation).

3) The fact that certain few Greek inhabitants of the districts of Florina and Kastoria speak in addition to Greek, a certain regional dialect resembling Bulgarian, constituted the grounds on which Bulgarian propaganda worked profitably. From the very first days the above so-called interpreters VLANTENOFF, DOITCHEFF, KALITCHEFF, helped successively by other collaborators of theirs, contacted the above mentioned Greeks and as time passed managed to modify the opinion in favour of Bulgaria: of a considerable number of them and helped them organise the Bulgarian Committee. This happened at a time when the occupation authorities in Greece were discussing for their use all the riches of Greek National Economy and had imposed on the Greek population the death sentence by hunger or by other privations. They had immobilised the Greek State machine and had made impossible for it to come to the help of the starving population. These most trying conditions of the Greek population were widely exploited by the above so-called interpreters but in reality propagandists, by their collaboration. Many of these latter were Bulgarians, sent from Sofia, a certain number of which bearing their family roots in the districts of Florina and Kastoria, but which they had abandoned many years ago in virtue of an International Treaty for an exchange of populations between Greece and Bulgaria and signed after the war of 1914-1918. As such were the following Bulgarians: a) SPIROS VASILEF, Bank employee or Director of the Popular Bank in Sofia, native from Vassiliades and occupying a prominent position in the Bulgarian Committee, b) JOSEPH MARKOFF, captain of the regular Bulgarian Army and leader of the comitadjis in the district of Kastoria, c) his brother PETER MARKOFF, pensioned school teacher, inhabitant of Sofia and a native as his brother of Vassiliades, d) BAMBOULOFF, lieutenant in the regular Bulgarian Army and Deputy Leader of the Bulgarian Committee of the district of Kastoria, e) MITKOFF, Major in the Bulgarian Army. The above mentioned in collaboration with other Bulgarians, accompanied by officers

and senior officials of the Bulgarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs, carried out a propaganda to the effect that the inhabitants of Western Macedonia who speak the above-mentioned dialect, are of Bulgarian descent, that they were under Greek yoke, that the time had come to break their shackles, that very shortly the Bulgarian Army would occupy Western Macedonia which would be annexed by Bulgaria, for the success of which the above mentioned inhabitants should do their utmost obeying their leaders and the Italians, becoming members of the Bulgarian Committee and working to exterminate the Greek inhabitants. Together with the Italian Occupation Authorities they repeatedly and generously gave to every new member money, food, clothing, boots, etc. sent from Bulgaria via Monastir. In addition to the above and again together with the Italian Authorities, they armed the members of the Committee giving them arms of Italian origin as well as Bulgarian ones sent from Bulgaria via Monastir. Italian officers were placed at the head of these armed comitadjis bands. The fact that the organisation of the comitadjis bands was carried out by the Italian Occupation Authorities has been amply proved by the deposition of the witness JOHN RAVALLI, serving in Kastoria and actually condemned by the Special Court for War Criminals in Athens. The national aims of the Italians and the Bulgarians coincided in their common effort to uproot the Greek national sentiment in Western Macedonia and in modifying its national composition. The Bulgarian Committee was thus formed and armed. The witnesses CHRISTOS GAES, NICOLAS FYLAKTIDIS, CONST. CHRISTOPOULOS, examined in the prison at Salonica where they are serving a penalty imposed on them by Court testify that they were armed members of these bands (see testimonies of the above and especially those of CONST. DONIS, prefect of Florina during all the occupation, NICOLAS TSAKIRIS, Director of the Kastoria prefecture, Doctor LEONIDAS TSAMISSIS, Mayor of Kastoria, STAVROS PETROVAS, Director of the Prefecture, ANDREW PAPADOPOULOS etc).

4) In the summer of 1943, a meeting of all the armed comitadjis was held at "LEVADI" near Koutoropi in the district of Kastoria. Witness GEORGE VASSILIOU was present at this meeting, where the above-mentioned Bulgarian SPIROS VASSILEFF distributed money, salt and rubber boots to these comitadjis (see testimony by GEO. LEOUZIS).

5) In May 1943, a committee composed of DIMITROFF, senior official of the Bulgarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs, SPIROS VASSILEFF, JOSEPH MARKOFF AND SKARTOFF, arrived from Sofia, via Monastir and distributed large quantities of maize, salt, wheat, five hundred suits, fifty pairs of boots and four million levas (4.000.000) to the assembled comitadjis (see report by captain PETER LOLAS of the Gendarmerie, dated March 30, 1946 and addressed to the public prosecutor of the Special Court for War Criminals).

6) In June 1944 approximately 20 Bulgarian reserve officers and Warrant officers arrived in Monastir and from there were sent to lead the armed comitadjis bands and those of the "OHRANA" organisation in the districts of Florina, Kastoria, Edessa, etc. (see above report by Capt. P. LOLAS).

III. The following facts have been proved at the inquiry relative to the role played by Colonel (now General) IVAN MARINOFF in the work of uprooting national sentiment in the districts of Kastoria and Florina and of modifying the ethnological composition of these districts:

1) The above interpreters and other Bulgarian and local leaders as well as other members of the Bulgarian Committee had free passes and often went to Monastir, reported to IVAN MARINOFF about their action and received instructions and orders from him to carry out all sorts of crimes against the Greek population. They also received money, food, clothing, boots, arms etc. from MARINOFF. These items were brought over from Bulgaria to Monastir and

thence were distributed to various districts by MARINOFF. Thus in the spring of 1942 when the Greeks were dying of hunger, IVAN MARINOFF imported in Western Macedonia, large quantities of maize, sugar and other commodities to be distributed by members of the Bulgarian Committee to its other members. MENELAOS GHELES and STAVROS MANGOS were responsible for these distributions in the department of Florina. When the prefect of Florina, Mr. CONST. BONIS refused to allow the distribution by these two individuals, he was told that following MARINOFF's orders the distribution must be made by the two above mentioned individuals (for all these facts see the testimonies by CONST. BONIS, MENEL. TSAKIRIS, Director of the Prefecture, NICOLAS SPANGOS, reporter, Opt. PETER IOLAS of the Gendarmerie, NICOLAS KARADIMOS, priest, JOHN RIZAKIS, CHRISTOS LIVANIDIS, all dated May 2, 1946 etc). The role played by MARINOFF as head of the comitadjis of Florina is amply shown by the deposition of the Bulgarian Officer KAITCHEFF and who definitely states that MARINOFF's visit to Kastoria in May or June 1943 (see below) "aimed at questioning the comitadjis of the Kastoria district, who were asking for help, such as arms, etc. from Sofia" and that IVAN MARINOFF had told them that "he will see that help from Bulgaria be sent to them".

2) IVAN MARINOFF exploiting the pitiful condition on under-nourishment, the deaths from famine of the Greeks and especially those of Greek youth, created in Monastir a Bulgarian centre of education to which 2000 Greek youngsters from Greek Macedonia (Western and Central) were sent and who were fed, etc. and received a monthly sum of money, the major part of which was sent to the parents (see testimony by Mr. CONST. BONIS, prefect of Florina). In May or June 1943 when Col. VENIERI was Town Major of Kastoria, under whose orders JOHN RAVALLI, Officer of the Italian Army was serving and who has actually been condemned by the Special Court for War Criminals in Athens, Colonel MARINOFF arrived unexpectedly from Monastir. He was accompanied by Capt. KOMB of the German Army and Town Major of Florina, Signor CASTELLANI, Italian Consul in Monastir, DIMITROFF, senior official of the Bulgarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and two senior officers from MARINOFF's staff together with an escort of 15 Bulgarian and 5 German soldiers.

Col. VENIERI received MARINOFF and his suite at the Military Club where a banquet was held (see depositions by JOHN RAVALLI, ANTON KAITCHEFF, MENEL, TSAKIRIS etc.). The incidents that occurred following IVAN MARINOFF's arrival were attributed by RAVALLI in his deposition and are as follows: Before the banquet, CASTELLANI, Italian Consul in Monastir, made known to RAVALLI that the reason of MARINOFF's arrival was to ask Col. VENIERI primarily for the Bulgarian Army to undertake the guarding of the region from Lake Prespa to Antartikon with the excuse that this district was insufficiently guarded by the Italian troops. On secondary request, MARINOFF would ask for Bulgarian Officers to lead the comitadjis. RAVALLI hurriedly repeated this conversation to VENIERI.

Effectively in a private discussion held before the banquet between MARINOFF and VENIERI, the former submitted to the latter his two requests. Both were rejected by VENIERI that the number of Italian troops was sufficient. Following this conversation, the banquet was held during which MARINOFF spoke of "eternally Bulgarian Kastoria" (as specifically stated in RAVALLI's deposition). This obliged RAVALLI, by order of VENIERI, to answer to MARINOFF that this information is not correct because the Italians know from official and authentic sources that the inhabitants of Kastoria of Bulgarian descent do not exceed 119 as when the Italians expressed the wish to carry out a census of these inhabitants in order to entrust them with the supplying of the comitadjis, they called on every Bulgarian speaking inhabitant to report and only the above mentioned presented themselves, a few of which reported for fear of reprisals. These inhabitants do not represent more than 10 to 11 families, the majority of which were natives of the villages of the district. This answer, continues RAVALLI, worried MARINOFF who had to excuse

himself, stated that "it seems that the Greek Authorities had carried out a good propaganda and with the help of the schools had managed to hellenize Kastoria". MARINOFF's words made an amusing impression on the Italians who were convinced of the contrary as states RAVALLI. After the meal and following a wish expressed by MARINOFF, he visited, accompanied by all present at the banquet, including RAVALLI, the groups of the Bulgarian Committee at their headquarters in Kastoria. In the presence of the comitadjis, MARINOFF took a commanding position and speaking in Bulgarian told the members of the bands that "they must obey the Italian because they are all soldiers of the Axis fighting against a common foe" (for the above see RAVALLI's deposition) MARINOFF also "recommended the comitadjis that they must help the Axis and that he will see that supplies be sent to them from Bulgaria" as specifically stated by the Bulgarian Officer ANTON KALITCHEFF, who was present at this meeting and who was an interpreter and carried out propaganda in Kastoria, as stated previously. The depositions of RAVALLI and KALITCHEFF who knew MARINOFF personally and who personally followed the above incident, are sufficient to prove: a) that IVAN MARINOFF did visit Kastoria in May or June 1943, b) that he was the leader of the comitadjis of Kastoria and Florina, c) that his visit to Kastoria aimed at quietening the comitadjis as specifically stated by KALITCHEFF and also to have a Bulgarian Army of Occupation in the region of Florina and Kastoria or at least for Bulgarian officers to lead the comitadjis of these districts.

IV. In addition to the above visit by MARINOFF to Kastoria, the inquiry has not fully proved whether MARINOFF had previously travelled from Monastir and visited the districts of Florina and Kastoria. Certain witnesses have stated that such visits by MARINOFF had taken place. This judicial committee, nevertheless, considering that no witness knew MARINOFF personally, and that nearly no witness had a personal knowledge of the incidents he stated as having taken place, judges that another or other Bulgarian officers and not MARINOFF had been seen by the witnesses as having visited the districts and instead of giving their names, willfully or not, the name of IVAN MARINOFF was pronounced due to his prestige which naturally would lift the spirits of the comitadjis.

The visits mentioned here above are the following:

1) In the summer of 1942, a Bulgarian senior officer arrived by car at Argos Orestikon. He was accompanied by three other persons, including KALITCHEFF. The car stopped in front of the coffee-shop belonging to ANASTASE IVANIDIS and its occupants entered the place and started talking with the proprietor and with GEORGE THEODORIDES, important member of the Bulgarian Committee as well as with the priest PAFALAZAROS APOSTOLOS, condemned to life imprisonment by the Collaborationists Court of Kastoria. The members of the Committee let it made known that the senior officer in question was MARINOFF (see depositions by EVANGELOS HOLITSIS, CHRISTOS LIVANIDES, dated May 2, 1946).

2) In the spring or summer 1943 a Bulgarian senior officer arrived in Argos Orestikon accompanied by STRONTSE, KALITCHEFF or STAVROS HADJIPASHALI, Bulgarian major from Argos Orestikon, KYRLAKOU, surname unknown, school teacher from Lakomata, Kastoria, GEORGE SKARPARLIS, school teacher from Argos Orestikon and actually in Bulgaria, and major BLANTINOFF of the Bulgarian Army. In the suburb of Argos Orestikon called "Patsoura" the above mentioned Bulgarian senior officer made a speech to the Bulgarian speaking inhabitants stating "Do not be afraid, Greece will not return". "The war has already been won by the Germans and the Italians. The war will be won neither by the British, nor by the Russians, nor by the Americans. Macedonia will become Bulgarian and you will be freed. But you must help to exterminate the Greek element. Exterminate Greeks and you will never have

to give account of your actions to anybody". These words were heard by the witness ANDREW CHRISTOS PAPADOPOULOS, who specifically states them in his deposition and were understood by him as well as by the description of other listeners (also see depositions by EVANG. KOLITSIS, CHRISTOS TSAOUSSIS and JOHN RIZAKIS. In this case also it was rumoured that the Bulgarian senior officer who spoke was MARINOFF (see deposition by above mentioned witnesses).

3) In June 1942, a Bulgarian senior officer arrived by car in Kastoria, accompanied by the Bulgarian officer ANTON KALITCHEFF (interpreter in Kastoria) and by JOHN SKOE, bank employee in Sofia and native from Argos Orestikon, and 2nd Lieut. RADOS of the Bulgarian medical corps, a native from Nestorion Kastorias.

The car stopped in front of the coffee-shop belonging to TSIFORAS actually a fugitive. In the shop the witness CHRISTOS LIVANIDES and THOMAS SKOE were seated. The former recognised JOHN SKOE and THOMAS SKOE (brother to JOHN SKOE) recognised RADOS. When the car stopped a one-armed comitadji, probably named ARISTIDE ATHANASLADIS, kissed the tyres of the car, thus expressing his joy and obedience, and started speaking with KALITCHEFF. The occupants of the car entered the coffee-shop where they remained discussing for a quarter of an hour. In this case also it was rumoured that the senior officer was IVAN MARINOFF (see deposition by the witness CHRISTOS LIVANIDES dated July 7, 1946).

4) In the summer 1943 a meeting of the armed Comitadjis of Kastoria was held at a place called Livadi near the village of Kontoropi, Kastoria. The witness GEORGE LEOUZAS was among those present. At this meeting at which a German detachment was present, a Bulgarian senior officer, surrounded by other Bulgarian officers, spoke in German and Bulgarian. In his speech to the comitadjis he stated: "Macedonia is ours (VIZ. Bulgarian) and shortly Bulgarian troops will arrive here who will reinforce the comitadjis in their work". In continuation, he violently attacked the Greek authorities who "were tyrannising you; the Greeks have sucked your blood and are wildly prosecuting you; the time has come for you to break the shackles of slavery. Be assured, you will shortly be freed by the Bulgarian Army". (See deposition by GEORGE LEOUZOS and NICOLAS KARADIMOS, priest).

V. In order to succeed in uprooting the Greek national sentiment of the inhabitants of the Kastoria and Florina districts and in modifying the ethnological composition of these regions, the members of the Bulgarian Committee, carrying out orders of their leader IVAN MARINOFF, executed the most vile crimes against the inhabitants. These crimes can only be explained by racial hatred as developed and by fanatical devotion for the success of the above mentioned difficult task. The following are a few of the crimes committed and proved by subsequent inquiries.

1) In the summer of 1942, a comitadji band murdered Kapetan LAKIS, (NICOLAS DAILAKIS) living in MOROMILLA (see deposition of CH. LIVANIDES dated May 2 1946).

2) During the occupation, a comitadji band plucked the eyes of VASSILIOS KARAKOTSIOS, inhabitant of Argos Orestikon; they then mounted him as if he were a beast and thus led him up to the church of Argos Orestikon. After more tortures, he was executed there (see deposition of CH. LIVANIDES).

3) During the occupation, a comitadji band killed the following in the region of Argos Orestikon, PETER HANOPOULOS KARASANIDES, aged 57, DAMIANOS VOYATZAKIS, LAZARUS ZANGOTSIS, POLIKOS, DEMZTRIUS SGOURIS, PANAYOTIS KARAGEORGIUO, SDRIVAS and others (see above deposition by CH. LIVANIDES).

4) During the occupation a comitadji band burnt 15 houses at Argos Orestikon (see above deposition by JOHN RIZAKIS.)

5) During the occupation, a comitadji band tortured SINA GEORGIADOU inhabitant of Pentavryssos; they threw her in the oven of her house and burnt her alive (see deposition of CH. LIVANIDES).

6) During the occupation a comitadji band murder in Paleon Tsifliki: HADJIMANGAS inhabitant of Aposkepos and GRIVAS inhabitant of Kastoria (see deposition by JOHN RIZAKIS).

7) During the occupation a comitadji band arrested the President of the community of Vysinia, near Kastoria, accusing him of having opposed himself to the arming of the comitadjis of Vysinia. The comitadji gave him over to the Italian who executed him (see deposition by NIC. KARADIMOS priest).

The leader of the Bulgarian Committee IVAN MARINOFF is morally responsible for all the above crimes.

VI. In the middle of September 1943, Italy collapsed and as a result the German Military authorities in Greece lost the cooperation of the Italian Army which guarded the country with a large number of troops and gendarmes. The German position thus became difficult. The increase of the action of National Resistance followed. The German troops of Occupation were not sufficient to guard the country and by moving from place to place, they ran the danger of being attacked by the antartes and thus suffer losses. In this way, the German position became still more difficult. These facts were successfully exploited by MARINOFF to materialise his aims as developed here above: As Officer Commanding 15th Bulgarian Division quartered in Monastir, he reached an agreement in January 1944, with the German authorities of Kastoria and Florina, by which he would send reinforcements to these German Authorities. This allied help consisted of Bulgarian troops from his 15th Division, which together with German troops, would start operations aiming at clearing the district from the antartes (see deposition by ANTON KALTCHIEFF and by CONST. DONIS, Prefect of Florina). By this agreement, IVAN MARINOFF fulfilled his aims, viz. the widening of the Bulgarian occupation over the districts of Florina and Kastoria, his action to uproot the Greek national sentiment of the inhabitants and the modification of the ethnological composition of the districts. In accordance with the above agreement, a German detachment attacked northwards from Kastoria and a Bulgarian detachment from Monastir, under the orders of IVAN MARINOFF, attacked southwards. These facts are specifically stated by the witness ANTON KALTCHIEFF, Bulgarian officer. The Bulgarian attacking force that entered the district of Florina consisted of one regiment perfectly armed and which MARINOFF had placed under the orders of the Bulgarian Lt. Col. TCHANEFF. This regiment entered the district of Kastoria on January 16 1944. From that date up to February 10 1944, this district was laid waste by the invaders, who carried unheard of and inhuman orders against the peace-loving Greek population of this district. These crimes were so terrible that even the German Occupation Authorities were alarmed and ordered the departure from Greek soil of the Bulgarian regiment. The crimes committed by the Bulgarians were not isolated cases of certain soldiers but were innumerable unheard of crimes, systematically carried out and having resulted in loud protests, which were immediately communicated to Lt. Col. TCHANEFF and IVAN MARINOFF, who could not ignore these acts due to the small distance separating Florina and Monastir.

No facts from the inquiries tend to prove that the above two

officers did anything to avoid these crimes. The only reasons explaining the crimes are the racial hatred and fanatical devotion in the attempt at uprooting the Greek national sentiment of the inhabitants of the above mentioned districts and the modification of their ethnological composition.

In the mind of this Judicial Committee, IVAN MARINOFF and TCHANEFF are morally responsible for these crimes. Undoubtedly, the file contains no special letter or deposition of a witness about the contents of IVAN MARINOFF's orders to TCHANEFF and those of this latter to his troops regarding the peace loving Greek population. This lack of documents is self-explanatory. But the reasonable examination of the above mentioned actual facts, as proved by the inquiry, fully replaces any such lack. The facts on which it is reasonable possible to edify a judgement that IVAN MARINOFF and TCHANEFF are morally responsible of these crimes, are the following:

- a) That IVAN MARINOFF issued to TCHANEFF orders relative to operations to be undertaken within Greek territory, both against the antartes, as well as against the peace-loving Greek citizens. MARINOFF's orders to TCHANEFF regarding the action this latter should undertake against the antartes was evidently necessary because MARINOFF had made the above agreement regarding Allied help to the German Occupation Authorities, and which agreement he was executing by dispatching the regiment under TCHANEFF. Parallel to this, MARINOFF's orders to TCHANEFF about his action against the peace-loving Greek inhabitants and their fortunes was equally necessary because as stated above, MARINOFF was leader of the comitadjis, whose main aim was to exterminate the Greek element and at the head of which comitadjis he had previously attempted to place Bulgarian officers, a plan which he now realised by another route.
- b) That TCHANEFF had issued an order of the day to all his troops explaining the orders of his Commanding Officer relative to the position to be adopted by his regiment and regarding the peace-loving Greek population. This fact is a basic law in military discipline which TCHANEFF owed to MARINOFF.
- c) That Lt. Col. TCHANEFF carried out the orders of his chief IVAN MARINOFF relative to the position to be held by the regiment towards the peace-loving Greek population. This is evident from the military discipline of TCHANEFF towards his chief MARINOFF and from the impossibility of the peace-loving Greek population to react against the deeds carried out against it by the TCHANEFF regiment and to counteract them.
- d) That the acts carried out by the TCHANEFF regiment against the peace-loving Greek population constitute the essence of orders issued by TCHANEFF, who in turn had received them from MARINOFF. This is the result of military discipline which all serving in this regiment (officers, warrant-officers and men) owe to their commanding officer TCHANEFF and he, in turn, owed to MARINOFF and because it was impossible for TCHANEFF to allow his subordinates free to carry out acts contrary or different to MARINOFF's orders.
- e) That the crimes committed were immediately made known to TCHANEFF and to MARINOFF, as they were mass crimes of a hideous nature causing violent protests and because the distance between Florina and Monastir MARINOFF's HQ was small.
- f) That there exist no proofs that MARINOFF or TCHANEFF took any measures to avoid these crimes and
- g) That whilst these crimes were carried out both the above

were in awaitance; it was only after a German order was issued that the above mentioned TCHANEFF regt abandoned Greek territory and thus ended its work of extermination. A logical combination of all the above leads naturally to the conclusion that no doubt exists that IVAN MARINOFF ordered TCHANEFF and this latter in turn, his officers, warrant officers and men to carry out all sorts of crimes against the lives and fortunes of the peace-loving population. These crimes were obviously carried out with the aim of up-rooting the Greek national sentiment of the population of Florina and Kastoria districts and in modifying their ethnological composition.

VII. The crimes committed by the TCHANEFF regiment from January 16 1944 to February 10 1944 have been described in numerous reports of Presidents of Committees and civilians and had been submitted to the Florina prefecture. The major part of these reports was destroyed by subsequent incidents (see report of the prefect of Florina No. 681 dated Dec. 30 1945, to the Ministry of the Interior). The reports that were saved and other similar ones submitted to other public authorities as well as the conclusions of inquiries, prove the following crimes committed in the villages of the district. These crimes are but a small part of all those carried out against the peace-loving Greek population.

1. ARMENOHORION. - GREGORY KETENIDIS, inhabitant of the village, was arrested. He was ill in bed and was beaten till he lost conscience. He was then tied in the grange and tortured.
2. ATRAPOS. They arrested and imprisoned for three days for no special military reason, the following citizens: SOTIRIOS VELLIOS, CHRISTOS RIMBAS, ATHANASE ELLAS, GEORGE ANTONIOU, PASHALIS YANNOULIS, forrester, PANAYIOTIS ANTONIOU, JOHN STEPANOU, DEM. PETROS, CONST. LIAKOS.
3. AG. VARTOLEMEOS. They tortured and badly beat up LEONIDAS SEHNIDIS, reserve officer.
4. AG. ATHANASIOS. Department of PELLI. They arrested and inhumanly beat up LUCAS PROTOPAPPAS, school teacher, and PAPA YANNI TZIKA, priest. The former showed after eight days the marks of his wounds.
5. AMMHORION. They inhumanly beat CHRISTOS BOZATZIDIS, forrester and MARIDOPOULOS. They destroyed the archives of the school and threatened the school teacher because he taught in Greek. They obliged the priest PAPANAYIOTI HADZOPOULOS to carry out the Divine Service in Bulgarian but as he ignored the language, they invited the 80 year old pensioned priest PAPAIOANIKION who could barely see and obliged him to carry out the service. The priest interrupted the service, as certain sections were in Bulgarian. The priest PAPANAYIOTOU HADZOPOULOS reported this incident to the bishop of Florina. For this reason the priest was so badly beaten that his body was covered with bruises; they then dragged him in the mud soiling his clerical robes and torturing him. They furthermore robbed him of 650,000 drs.
6. VEVI. They arrested and transported to the Florina prison for no military reason the following inhabitants: ANAST. KOTSOPoulos, former president of the community, CONST. ATH. KOTSOPoulos, CONST. KYR. KOTSOPoulos, CH. MITSOULIS, school teacher, STOYANNIS KOTSOPoulos, STYL. KOTSOPoulos, KYR. KOTSOPoulos, KYR. ZUCOMANIS, MARISIS KOTSOPoulos, HARISSIS. J. KOTSOPoulos, DEM. ROMBIS, STAMATIS MIHALIS, NIC. KOTSOPoulos, BOGLIS, etc.
7. ETHNIKON. They burnt the archives and the library of the school as well as pictures of the heroes of the Greek War of Independence, stealing two table oil-cloths and two curtains.
8. ITLA. They inhumanly beat up MICH. TSIOTSIOS torturing him and telling him: "No Greeks must exist in Macedonia" (see his report and others in Greek stating that this is no Divine Service but a comedy.

dated Feb. 2, 1944 to the prefect of Florina). They also imprisoned for no military reason, SKOUROS NOVAS, forrester and another five inhabitants from ITIA torturing, beating and wounding them. In the house of ELIE PETROPOULOS they requisitioned and pulled down pictures with the Greek flag.

9. KELLI. They arrested the president of the community JOHN ROMAS and the secretary GEO. GELLOS and threatened them because they insisted in remaining Greek. JOHN ROMA was hit on the head with a piece of iron. They obliged the village priest to carry out the Divine Service in Bulgarian, and as he did not know the language, the service was carried out in Bulgarian through a Bulgarian soldier acting as interpreter. They obliged all the inhabitants to follow the service.

10. KALYVIA-FARMAKI, Community of SKOPOS (KALIMAKTCHALAN). They set on fire the summer houses of the inhabitants and houses close to the ravine belonging to the nomad families FARMAKI. Prior to the arson, they pillaged the buildings, removing house-hold ware, clothing, bed-covers etc. They stole 60 cows and imprisoned 10 hostages including CH. FARMAKIS president of the Community.

11. KALYVIA PAPADIAS. They burnt all the houses to the ground.

12. MESOKAMBOS. They imprisoned for no military security reason the forrester STAVROS STAMBOULIDIS.

13. MESOHORI. They arrested and threatened to execute NIC. TSAIDARIS if he refused to work in the future for the Bulgarian national idea. They arrested his brother JOHN TSAIDARIS and JOHN FOTIADIS and beat them inhumanly, the former with a stick and the latter with a piece of iron, till they admitted they were Bulgarians. They arrested and beat inhumanly the brothers MICH. THOMADIS and JOHN THOMADIS torturing them as they tortured TSAIDARIS and FOTIADIS.

14. NECHORAKI. They arrested and wildly beat JOHN KOKKINIDIS and JOHN PAPAGEORGIOU, torturing them. They looted the houses of refugee families and took away all valuables. They also looted the house of JOHN KOKKINIDIS. They attempted to ravish his daughter who saved herself by running away (see report of JOHN KOKKINIDIS to the prefect of Florina, dated Jan. 24 1944).

15. PALAISTRA. They arrested and imprisoned as hostages for no reason of military security, the president of the community MIC. ELIOPOULOS, NIC. VASSILIOU, secretary of the Community, PAUL TRYFON, VLADIMIR BANOTSIOTIS, MIC. TZOUTZOURIS.

16. PAPAYIANNI. They tortured THEODORE TSAFKA, president of the community, and his wife, EVAN. MOUTSAKIS and his wife, and PETER MINOS.

17. TRIPOTAMOS. They wildly and inhumanly beat ST. NOMBA, forrester, GOGOS PAPASOTIRIOU, secretary of the community and his son ARSENE, DEM. ZOUMBOULIS, GEO. ATHANASIADIS, JOHN TRIANTAFYLION, whom they tortured to such an extent that their faces were disfigured to such an extent that even the German Police Commander FISHER was horrified when the prefect of Florina presented them to him.

18. SITARIA. They inhumanly beat and tortured LAZAROS IOANNOU (STOYANTISIS), MYR. IOANNOU, DEM. IOANNOU, PANTELI IOANNOU, PHIL. GLOUFTSIS, TRYF. GLOUFTSIS LAZ. GLOUFTSIS, DEM. GLOUFTSIS, forrester (this last was in such a state that he had to be taken to a hospital) ST. GLOUFTSIS, DEM. GLOUFTSIS, PANT. GLOUFTSIS, THEOD. VASDEKIS, JOAK. ROMBIS, EVANG. DIMOPOULOS, PET FIMOPOULOS, STAVROS SOUMBASIS, GEO. PANTAZIS, ATHAN. TOURANTZAS and CH. PETROS. The ears of these two latter had been slashed

with a knife or a bayonet. They also arrested the school teacher, who was in bed with fever, having just given birth to a child, and forcibly brought her to Lt. GEORGIEFF who taking her by the nose, threw her out of his office.

19. SKOPOS. They killed MICH. PISKATSIS, CHAR. GOLFIS, STAVROS LIAMIS and PANAY STAMKOS.

20. FLORINA. They hit three children in the central square of the town because they were speaking Greek. They also hit CH. ALEXANDROPOULOS who happened to be passing because he was speaking in Greek to a frightened girl. They imprisoned as hostages for no military reason THEOD. TSAFKA, President of the community, PAPAYANNIS, MOUTSAKIS, vice-president, GOMBERIS, secretary, PETER NITSOS, president of the community of KATO HYDROUSSA.

21. TRIANTAFYLLIA. They imprisoned as hostages, for no military reason of security, MICH. DIMITRIOU, secretary of the community, NIC. D. IOANNOU, JOHN D. IOANNOU, DEM. L. PETROS, JOHN CH. NAOUM, BAS. PAPATRIANTAFYLLOU, JOHN MATINIS. These prisoners were told by a Bulgarian officer that they are not Greeks, but Bulgarians and that on their return to their village, they must undertake and lead the campaign in favour of the Bulgarians (see for all items 1-21 report 681 dated Dec. 30, 1945 of the prefect of Florina to the Ministry of the Interior).

22. MELITI. Having asked the inhabitants what language they spoke and receiving the answer that Greek was spoken, they prohibited the use of the Greek language (see report dated Jan. 22, 1944 of the prefect of Florina to the Feldkommandatur, Salonica). In addition they stole a cart belonging to GEO. KOSMIDIS (See report of G. KOSMIDIS to the prefect of Florina).

23. FLAMBOURON. As the peace-loving inhabitants of the village refused to become agents of the Bulgarian propaganda and become members of the criminal organisations, the above mentioned TCHANEFF regiment attacked the village on Feb. 6 1944, and finding four unarmed inhabitants of the village: GABRIEL PROIKOS, DEM. BALASIS, CHRISTOS KATSIS and FILOTAS TACHOS (the other inhabitants having abandoned from fear the village) arrested them and tortures them inhumanly. G. PROIKOS was repeatedly pierced with a bayonet in the abdominal region and the head and his gold teeth were removed. D. BALASIS was repeatedly pierced in the face with a bayonet. CHRISTOS KATSIS showed numerous bayonet thrusts in the abdominal region and the face and FIL. TACHOS had his throat cut in numerous places with a bayonet. These facts were proved when the bodies were discovered completely naked, The Bulgarian having stolen their clothing and shoes. In continuation they arrested SOTIRIOS KAKARATZAS who was looking after his sheep and CHRISTOS and his brother, XENOPHON MITROUSIS. Later on with the excuse of having to search the houses they looted them of all valuable objects, clothing, heirlooms, sheep, other animals etc. In leaving, they took with them CONST. NASSIS, vice-president of the community, NICOLAS ELOVARIS, LAZARUS KALLIOS and GEORGE TZEKAS, forresters. All the above as well as the above mentioned S. KAKATATZAS, CH. MITROUSIS and X. MITROUSIS, were brutally tortured and finally killed. They then buried the corpses near the cemetery of Ammohorion. On Feb. 13 1944, the bodies were exhumed in the presence of Major JOHN SOTIRIOU C.O. Gendarmeris Florina, CH. STYLLADIS, president of the community, ALEXANDER KALCHIK, warrant officer of the German Army and the German special interpreter OSWALD POSICH, these two latter representing the German Occupation Authorities. The examination proved that all clothing had been removed from the body of JOHN NATSIS and that the heads of LAZARUS KALLIOS and GEORGE TZEKAS were disfigured and their bones broken undoubtedly from repeated blows from the butt of a rifle and from other instruments. X. MITROUSIS right eye was destroyed, a sharp organ having entered it, probably

a bayonet, one third of the bones of the posterior and right hand side of the head of NIC. ELOVARIS were missing from blows from sharp and blunt organs (see report No. 681/1945 of the prefect of Florina to the Ministry of the Interior as well as the exhumation protocol).

VIII. The collaboration of the comitadjis with the regular Bulgarian Army in their extermination of the Greek element, having a unity of command in the person of IVAN MARINOFF as has been judged here-above, was developed again in June 1944 when numerous crimes were carried out against whole districts inhabited by peace-loving Greek populations. Thus in June 1944, Bulgarian forces of the regular army together with armed comitadjis under the order of JOSEPH MARKOFF and BAMBOULOFF in collaboration with German armed forces, looted the houses in the district of Tsotyliou, Boion, Kozani, Kastoria and then burnt them to the ground (see depositions by CH. GAIS and NIC. FYLAKTIDIS). IVAN MARINOFF is also responsible for these crimes for the same reasons as for the crimes committed by the TCHANEFF regiment.

In all the above crimes (II-VIII) the accused employed systematic terrorism.

As the above acts constitute a violation of the laws of ordinary Greek penal law and those foreseen by international law and punished by art. 56 §1 and 3, 57, 287, 288, 408 §3, 409 §3, 49-50 of the ordinary penal law and by art. 1. §1, 2 cases A and B number 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 17, 18 and 21 and art. 2 of Constitutional Act 73/45.

As the enquiry which has been carried out has shown sufficient proof on which it is possible to found an accusation in Court, the accused shall be brought up to the special Military Court in Athens, their arrest and preventive detention be ordered up to the time when the accusations against them will be judged.

For these reasons

Having examined art. 6 and 7 of the Constitutional Act 73/45, as well as art. 7 which has been replaced by the unique art. of Constitutional Act 90/45, the Committee

refers before the Special Military Court
in Athens

- 1) IVAN MARINOFF, ex-colonel and during the Occupation divisional commander of the 15th Bulgarian division quartered in Monastir (Vitolia) and actually General of the Bulgarian Army and Bulgarian Minister Plenipotentiary in Paris
- 2) MLANTENOFF, officer of the Bulgarian army and interpreter during the war of the German and Bulgarian Occupation Authorities in Florina
- 3) DOITCHEFF, professor of the University of Sofia and interpreter during the Occupation with the German and Italian Occupation Authorities
- 4) SPIROS VASSILEFF, bank employee in Sofia, native from VASSILIAS, Kastoria,
- 5) JOSEPH MARKOFF, officer (probably captain) of the Bulgarian Army, native from VASSILIAS

- 6) PETROF MERKOFF, pensioned school-teacher, native from VASSILIAS, Kastoria.
- 7) BAMBOULOFF, Officer (probably lieutenant) of the Bulgarian Army,
- 9) MITKOFF, officer (probably Major) of the Bulgarian Army
- 10) DIMITROFF, senior official of the Bulgarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs
- 11) STRONTSE KARTCHEFF or STAVROS HADJIPASHALIS, officer (probably Major) of the Bulgarian army, native from Argos-Orestikon, Kastoria.
- 12) KYRIAZOS, unknown surname, school-teacher, native from Lakomata, Kastoria
- 13) GEORGE SKARPARLIS, school-teacher, native from Argos-Orestikon
- 14) JOHN SKOES, bank employee, native from Argos Orestikon, Kastoria
- 15) RADOS, 2nd Lieutenant, Bulgarian Army, Medical Corps

to be judged as responsible as aliens and Bulgarian subjects, belonging to the Bulgarian armed forces, and the Bulgarian political services, from April 1941 to October 1944 inclusive repeatedly and for more than one deed carried daily in this period in the districts of Florina and Kastoria and moved with a common interest with other Bulgarian subjects, belonging to the Bulgarian armed forces and political services and whose names have not been discovered, deliberately decided to carry out the following crimes for which they recognised mutual assistance.

A/ Personally and directly they attempted to uproot the Greek national sentiment of the inhabitants of the Florina and Kastoria districts and modify the ethnological composition of these districts occupied by the Italian and the German troops, and later by Bulgarian ones, carrying out a propaganda in favour of the Bulgarian national idea and prohibiting the expression of the Greek national idea, serving the German and Italian Occupation Authorities in the quality of so-called interpreters whereas in reality they were propagandists of the national Bulgarian idea, working with all means for the occupation of the above-mentioned districts of Florina and Kastoria by Bulgarian troops and of their annexation to Bulgaria by means developed in the preamble, exploiting the hopeless conditions suffered by the Greeks, who were dying of hunger and of other privations, managing thus to modify the Greek national sentiment in favour of Bulgaria of a certain number of the inhabitants, stating that the time has come to be freed and that very shortly the Bulgarian Army would occupy Western Macedonia, which would be annexed to Bulgaria, that to this effect all the inhabitants should obey them (the accused) and the Italian Occupation Authorities by becoming members of the Bulgarian Committee, and by working to exterminate the Greek inhabitants, they (the accused) having repeatedly and lavishly given to all new adepts, money, food, clothing, boots, etc., arming the members of the committee with Italian and Bulgarian arms, placing at the head of the armed comitadjis, Italian officers. To this effect, IVAN MARINOFF went to Kastoria in May or June 1943 and asked col. VENIERI of the Italian army that the comitadjis band formed by the latter, to fight against the resistance groups, be led by Bulgarian officers. This request was rejected by VENIERI: following this, MARINOFF met the above-mentioned comitadjis and to give them courage, promised them that "he will see that help be sent to them from Bulgaria".

B/ They wilfully incited other individuals of unknown name belonging to the Bulgarian committee to carry out, the following punishable crimes, promising and giving them a salary as under item A., provoking or wilfully using as instrument their hatred and their feelings against Hellenism and the Greek inhabitants:

1. In the summer 1942 they wilfully decided and carried out the murder of Kapetan LAKI (NICOLAS DATLAKIS inhabitant of Koromilia.
2. They tortured BASIL KARAKOTSIOS, inhabitant of Argos-Orestikon, plucking out his eyes and following this act, mounting him as if he were a beast, and obliging him to carry them up to the church of Argos-Orestikon.
3. They wilfully decided and carried out manslaughter on the person of BASIL KARAKOTSIOS outside the church of Argos-Orestikon.
4. They wilfully decided and executed PETER HANOPOULOS, KARASSANIDIS age 57 DAMIANOS VOYATZAKIS, LAZARUS ZANGOTIS, the refugee POLIKOS, DEM SGOURIS, PANAYIOTIS KARAGEORGIOU, SDRIVAS and other inhabitants of the district of Argos Orestikon.
5. They put fire to 15 houses in Argos-Orestikon. The fire was started by the criminals at more than one spot.
6. They tortured SONIA GEORGIADOU, inhabitant of Pentanyssi, throwing her in the oven of her house and thus burning her alive.
7. They wilfully decided and murdered in Palaio Tsifliki, HADJIMANGA, inhabitant of Aposkepos and DRIVA, inhabitant of Kastoria.
8. Together with Italian soldiers, they wilfully decided and executed the president of the Community of Vyssinia.

Refers to the same above mentioned Military Court the following:

1) IVAN MARINOFF, 2) TCHANEFF, officer (probably Lt. Col. in the Bulgarian Army) and 3) GEORGIEFF, officer (probably lieutenant in the Bulgarian Army) for them to be judged as responsible, as aliens, Bulgarian subjects, serving in the Bulgarian Army and political services, of having carried out repeated and numerous acts in the districts of Florina and Kastoria between January 16 1944 and February 10, 1944. Together with other Bulgarian subjects belonging to the Bulgarian Armed Forces and political services (the name of which are unknown) they decided in common to carry out the following crimes and had agreed on mutual help for the fulfilment of their aims. The two former accused IVAN MARINOFF and TCHANEFF, had wilfully incited the latter accused GEORGIEFF and other Bulgarian officers, warrant officers and soldiers of unknown name, MARINOFF as O.C. of the 15th Bulgarian Division quartered in Monastir, ordering and ordaining TCHANEFF (whom he had placed as O.C. of a perfectly armed regiment of the 15th Bulgarian Division quartered in Monastir,) and TCHANEFF in turn ordering the third accused GEORGIEFF and the other officers, warrant officers and soldiers of his regiment to carry out the following punishable crimes in which the accused GEORGIEFF with the officers, warrant officers and men of the TCHANEFF regt:

1. Tortured in Armenohori GREGORY KETENIDIS, arresting him and sick in bed as he was, hit up inhumanly and brutally. KETENIDIS lost conscious and was tied to his barn where they left him.
2. Arrested in Atrapos for no military security reason SOTIRIOS VALLIOS, CHRISTOS RIMBAS, ATHANASE F. ELIAS, GEO. ANTONIOU, PASHALIS YANNOULIS, forrester, PANAYIOTIS A. ANTONIOU, JOHN STEFANOU, DEM. PETROU and CONST. LALIOS.

3. Tortured at Ag. Vartholemeos, LEONIDAS SAHINIDIS, reserve officer, hitting him brutally and inhumanly.
4. Tortured in ^{Ag.} Athanasies (prefecture of Pellis) LOUKAS A. PROPOPATAS, school teacher, hitting him brutally and inhumanly. The priest PAPAYIANNIS TZIKAS was tortured in the same manner.
5. Tortured in Ammohorion CHRISTOS BOYAZIDIS, forrester, and MAVRIDOPOULOS, hitting them brutally and inhumanly.
6. Looted the archives from the school of Ammohorion and destroyed them.
7. Attempted in Ammohorion to uproot the Greek national sentiment of the inhabitants by pressure of the priest PAPAPANAYIOTIS HADJOPOULOS and obliging the 80 year old priest PAPAIO/NIKIOS to carry out the Divine Service.
8. Tortured in Ammohorion the priest PAPAPANAYIOTIS HADJOPOULOS because, ignoring the Bulgarian language, he could not officiate in Bulgarian; they hit the priest brutally and inhumanly that he could not move. Following this act, they dragged him in the mud, soiling his clerical habit.
9. Stole in Ammohorion 650,000 drs. belonging to the priest PAPAPANAYIOTIS HADJOPOULOS.
10. Imprisoned in VEVI for no military security reason ANAST. KOTSOPoulos, ex-president of the community, CONST. A KOTSOPoulos, CONST. KYR. KOTSOPoulos, CHRISTOS MITSOULIS, school teacher, STOYLANNIS KOTSOPoulos, STYL. KOTSOPoulos, KYRLAKOS KOTSOPoulos, KYRLAKOS ZYGOMANIS, HARISSIS KOTSOPoulos, HARISSIS J. KOTSOPoulos, DEM. ROMBIS, STAMATIOS MIHELIS, NIC. KOTSOPoulos, BOGLIS, etc.
11. Wilfully destroyed in Ethnice the archives and the library of the school as well as pictures of the heroes of the Greek Independence War.
12. Stole from Ethnice two oil-cloth table covers and two curtains belonging to the school.
13. Tortured in TTLA, MICHAEL TSIOTSOS, hitting him inhumanly and brutally whilst telling him "No Greeks should live in Macedonia".
14. Attempted in Kelli to uproot Greek national sentiment inhabitants, arresting JOHN ROMAS president of the community and GEORGE GELLOS, secretary. These two were threatened for having insisted that they were Greeks; they obliged the village priest to officiate in Bulgarian and as he ignored the language, the service was carried with a Bulgarian soldier acting as interpreter. They also obliged all the inhabitants of the village to be present at this service.
15. Looted in Kalyvia-Farmaki, community of Skopos (Kainaktshalan) the baggages, cloths, bed-covers etc. of the houses and stole 60 cows.
16. Arrested in Kalyvia-Farmaki for no military security reason, 10 inhabitants including the president of the community CHRISTOS FARMAKIS, whom they kept as hostages.
17. Set fire in Kalyvia-Farmaki to the warehouses of the inhabitants as well as the dwellings of the nomads near the ravine. The fire was started at numerous places and completely burnt down the dwellings.
18. Burnt completely the village of Kalyvia-Papadias. The fire started at more than one point.

20. Tortured in Mesohorion NICOLAS TSAIDARIS, JOHN TSAIDARIS, JOHN FOTIADIS, MICHAEL THOMASIDES and JOHN THOMASIDIS, hitting them brutally and inhumanly with sticks and iron bars.
21. Attempted in Mesohorion to uproot the Greek national sentiment of the inhabitants, arresting NIC. TSAIDARIS and threatening to execute him if in the future, he did not work in favour of the Bulgarian national idea; they also arrested and beat JOHN FOTIADIS with an iron bar till he stated that he was a Bulgarian.
22. Imprisoned in Mesokops for no military security reason, STAVROS STAMBOULIDIS.
23. Tortured in Neohorion JOHN KOKKINIDIS, ex-president of the community, CH. SAPRANIDIS, JOHN PATAGEORGIOU, hitting them brutally and inhumanly.
24. Looted in Neohorion the houses of JOHN KOKKINIDIS, of the refuge settlement.
25. In Neohorion, aiming to rape the daughter of JOHN KOKKINIDIS, they attempted external acts showing at least the beginning of their act VIZ: they attempted to violate her and to this effect tried to catch her, but luckily for reasons independent of their will, they failed in their criminal views the young girl having managed to escape.
26. Imprisoned in Palestra for no military security reason, ELIOPOULOS, president of the community, NIC. VASSILIOU, secretary, PAUL TRYFON, VLADIMIR BANOUTSIOTIS, MICH. TZOUTZOURIS.
27. Tortured in Papayianni, THEOD TSAFKAS, president of the community, his wife, EVA MOUTZAKI, her husband, and PETER MINOS.
28. Tortured in Tripotames ST. NOVAS, forrester, GOGOS PAPASOTIRIOU, secretary of the community and his son ARTEMIOS, DEM. ZOUMBOULIS, GEORGE ATHANASIDIS, JOHN TRIANAFYLLOS, hitting them so unhumanly and brutally that their faces and bodies were completely disfigured which horrified even the G.O. of the German Police named Fischer.
29. Tortured in Sitaria LAZAROS IOANNOU (STOYANNIS) KYRIAKOS IOANNOU, PHILIP GLOUFTSIS, TRYFON GLOUFTSIS, LAZARUS GLOUFTSIS, DEMETRIUS GLOUFTSIS, forrester (who was in such a state that he had to enter a hospital), STAVROS GLOUFTSIS, DEMETRIUS GLOUFTSIS, PANTELIS GLOUFTSIS, THEODORE VASDEKAS, JOACHELM ROMBOS, EVANG. DIMOPOULOS, PETER DIMOPOULOS, STAVROS SOUMBASIS, GEORGE PANIAZIS, ATHANASE TOURATZAS, CHRISTOS PETROU.
30. Tortured in Sitaria TOURANTZA and CH. PETROU peircing their ears with a knife or a bayonet.
31. Tortured in Sitaria the schoolteacher who was in bed with fever having just given birth to a child, obliging her to appear before Lt. GEORGIEFF who taking her by the nose threw her out of his office.
32. Wilfully decided and executed in Skopos, MICH. PISKATIS, CHAR. GOLOFIS, STAVROS LLAMIS and PANAYIOTIS STAMKOS.
33. Attempted in Florina to uproot the Greek national feeling of the inhabitants, hitting three children with the excuse that they were speaking Greek. In addition they hit CH. ALEXANDROPOULOS who happened to be passing by, because he spoke in Greek.

34. Imprisoned in Florina for no military security reason, THEOD. TSAFKAS president of the community, MOUTSAKIS, vice-president, GOUMBERIS, secretary, and PETER NITSOS president of the community of Kato-Hydroussa.

35. Imprisoned in Triantafyllia for no military security reason, MICH. DIMITRIOU, secretary of the community, NICOLAS D. IOANNOU, JOHN D. JOANNOU, DEM. LAZ. PETROU, JOHN CH. NAOUM, BASIL PAPATRIANTAFYLLOU and JOHN MATINIS.

36. Attempted in Triantafyllia to uproot the Greek national sentiment of the inhabitants, stating to the above (names see No. 35) that they are not Greeks but Bulgarians and that on their return to their village, they must undertake the struggle in favour of the Bulgarians and lead this fight.

37. Attempted in Meliti to uproot the feelings of the inhabitants, prohibiting them to speak in Greek.

38. Stole in Meliti a cart belonging to GEO. KOSMIDIS.

39. Tortured in Flamboure GABRIEL PROIKOS stabbing him repeatedly with a bayonet in the abdominal region and in the head and removing his gold teeth, CH. KATSIKIS, stabbing him repeatedly in the abdominal region and in the face and FILOTAS TAHOS, stabbing him with a bayonet repeatedly in the neck.

40. Wilfully decided and deliberately murdered in Flamboure GABRIEL PROIKOS, DEM. BALASIS, CH. KATSIKIS, and FILOTAS TAHOS inhabitants of Flamboure.

41. They removed from the above (see No. 40) their clothing and shoes.

42. Looted all the houses in Flamboure and removed from them all valuables (jewels, clothing, household ware, sheep, other animals, etc.)

43. Tortured in Flamboure SOTIRIOS KARATZAS, CH. MITROUSSIS, XEN. MITROUSSIS, CONST. NAKIS, vice-president of the community, NICOLAS ELOVARIS, LAZARUS KALLIOS and GEO. TZEKAS forresters, hitting them brutally and inhumanly with the butts of their rifles and blunt weapons, disfiguring the heads of LAZAR. KALLIOS and GEO. TZEKAS, breaking their bones and destroying the right eye of XEN. MITROUSSIS by forcing a sharp instrument, possibly a bayonet, into the eye, breaking the bones of the head of NIC. ELOVARIS by a sharp and blunt weapon.

44. Wilfully decided and deliberately carried out manslaughter in Flamboure on the persons of SOTIRIOS KARATZAS, CH. MITROUSSIS, XEN. MITROUSSIS, CONST. NAKIS, vice-president of the community, NIC. ELOVARIS, LAZARUS KALLIOS and GEO. TZEKAS, forresters.

45. Removed in Flamboure the clothing and boots of the above mentioned JOHN NAKIS, vice-president of the community.

Refers to the same Special Military Court, the above mentioned IVAN MARINOFF, JOSEPH MARKOFF and BAMBOULOFF to be judged as culprits that as aliens, in this case Bulgarian subjects, belonging to the Bulgarian armed forces and political services, in June 1944, together with other Bulgarian subjects of the Bulgarian armed forces and political services (names unknown) and in complete agreement with them, they decided to carry out the following crimes and are therefore co-responsible. IVAN MARINOFF wilfully instigated the other two, MARKOFF and BAMBOULOFF and others of unknown names, officers, warrant officers and soldiers of the Bulgarian armed forces, as well as comitadjis, to carry out punishable crimes ordering

(IVAN MARKOFF) and ordaining as leaders of the comitadjis and O.C. of the 15th Bulgarian Division, quartered in Monastir, the execution of the following punishable crimes in which they accused JOSEPH MARKOFF and BAMBOULOFF with others:

- a) Looted the houses in the districts of Tsetyllion, Voion, Kozani, Kastoria removing money, supplies, household ware, animals etc.)
- b) Burnt the houses of the inhabitants of the district of Voion, Kozani, Kastoria. The fire was started simultaneously at more than one spot.

Refers to the same military court all the accused named in the present decree for them to be judged as culprits that as aliens and in this case Bulgarians, belonging to the Bulgarian armed forces and political services, from April 1941 to October 1944 repeatedly carried out criminal acts in the districts of Florina, Kastoria and Kozani, together with other Bulgaria subjects, belonging to the Bulgarian armed forces and political services, but whose names are unknown) decided in common to carry out the following crimes for which they are corresponsable: They systematically terrorised the Greek inhabitants of the above mentioned districts by all the acts mentioned in this decree.

Orders the arrests of the above accused and their preventive imprisonment up to the day they will be judged.

Decided in Athens, November 11, 1946, and published in Athens, November 15, 1946.

THE PRESIDENT.

THE SECRETARY.

II.

SWORN TESTIMONY OF THE WITNESS
RAVALLI.

Athens, June 17, 1946.

Question: Your name

Answer: John Paul Ravalli, born in Monte Rosso, Almo, Sicily, and actually serving a life sentence in the Averoff prisons, age 37, Catholic. I simply know the accused and am not related to him.

The witness was examined according to articles 121 and 124 of the Penal Procedure in case that it may not be possible to examine him in court.

Question - (Questioned adequately).

Answer: In May 1943, the town major of Kastoria, Venieri, received the unexpected visit of the Commander of the 15th Bulgarian Division then Colonel Ivan Marinoff, accompanied by Captain Como, the Italian Consul in Monastir Castellani, Dimitroff, senior employee at the Bulgarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and approximately 15 Bulgarian soldiers. Kaltcheff was with them, having met the group at Florina. This visit which had not been announced beforehand worried Venieri, because he had heard that his predecessor Del Giudice had told him that a similar attempt has been made previously and had been stopped by the commander of the Pinerolo Division, who had prohibited Del Giudice from visiting Monastir. We nevertheless were obliged to receive them and saw them at the Military Club. Previously the Italian consul in Monastir hurried to meet me for me to advise Venieri on the reason of the sudden visit and of Marinoff's intentions. He told me that Marinoff is coming to ask Venieri for the Bulgarian Army to undertake the guarding of the district from the region of FRESPA up to ANTARTIKO, with the excuse that this district was not sufficiently guarded by the Italian troops and that in addition he would ask, if necessary, that Bulgarian officers be sent to lead the comitadjis bands, which we had organized two months previously. The consul therefore asked me to draw the proposal and to refuse the entry to any Bulgarian troops in our district. I hurriedly repeated this conversation to Venieri who had invited his officers to a banquet in honour of Marinoff; he prohibited them to start any military or service conversation with General Marinoff as he (Venieri) alone would manage the whole question. At the banquet that followed, held at the Military Club and after it, Marinoff spoke of the complete Bulgarian spirit of the district of Kastoria. This conversation obliged me by order of Venieri to tell Marinoff that his information is not correct, because we also knew that the population of Kastoria of Bulgarian descent did not number more than 119, stating at the same time that when we wanted to carry a census of these inhabitants and give them the authority to supply the Committee, we called for every Bulgarian-speaking inhabitant to report and only the above number submitted a statement. A few of them made their statement out of fear, altogether

they do not represent more than 10 - 11 families, the majority of which came from villages of the district. My answer worried Marinoff who to excuse himself stated that the Greek authorities had carried out a perfect propaganda and had managed, by the schools, to hellenize Kastoria. These arguments amused us as we were sure of the contrary. Before the banquet at the Club, Marinoff met Venieri at the Town Major's where he told him of his request as previously stated by Castellani. Venieri answered him that this was not a question he could solve by his own initiative, but depended on the High Command in Athens, adding at the same time that he saw no reason, as sufficient Italian troops are stationed in the region. He furthermore asked Marinoff not to insist at the High Command in his demand for Bulgarian officers to lead the comitadjis as such a decision would create disturbances in the district and Venieri would bear the responsibility, as he had insisted that his request be accepted and tried to assure Venieri that his worries were unfounded. Venieri continued to refuse, having in mind the recommendations made by Castellani. After the banquet, Marinoff expressed the wish to visit the bands at the Committee headquarters, where in front of the comitadjis we took a prominent place and started speaking to them in Bulgarian. All this action worried Venieri, especially that Marinoff spoke in Bulgarian to the comitadjis but did not say anything as he was the host. But from information given to us by individuals in our confidence, Marinoff simply told the comitadjis to obey the Italian orders as they are all soldiers of the Axis fighting the same enemy. This was agreed and we all went over to the Committee headquarters.

In my opinion it is incontestable that Marinoff's intention to establish Bulgarian troops in our zone and still more to place Bulgarian officers at the head of the comitadjis bands had one sole object: to reinforce the Bulgarian influence in Kastoria and even his visit had that aim.

The views of the Italian command were contrary and even when we were obliged to organise the comitadjis bands, we did it out of necessity and in any case, we tried for the movement to be exploited in favour of Bulgaria. I have nothing else to add except that through my service I know that the military and civil authorities in Monastir, whilst arresting communists from Bulgaria, acted on the contrary in a friendly manner with the communists in Macedonia and their interest in the slav speaking Macedonians was independent whether they were communists or not. Thus 55 communists soldiers of one regiment of Marinoff's Division were executed as communists.

The testimony was read, its contents approved and signed.

The examiner

D. Kioussopoulos.

The examined

J. Ravalli.

True copy
for service use

Athens, July 25th, 1946.

The secretary
(sgd).

SWORN TESTIMONY.

Athens, in the Callithea prisons, Nov. 17 1946.

Question: Your name

Answer: Giovanni Ravalli, imprisoned in the Callithea prisons, Christian. I am not related to the accused but simply acquainted to him.

Sworn on the Bible in accordance to art. 121 and 124 of the Penal Procedure in case he may not be able to attend Court.

Question:

Answer: In the summer of 1942, I was on leave and was not in Kastoria, I cannot therefore confirm whether a senior Bulgarian officer visited Argos-Orestikon at that time. For the same reason I cannot say whether at the same time he or another senior Bulgarian officer accompanied by KANICHKOFF STAN, bank employee in Sofia and RADOS, 2nd Lieutenant of the Bulgarian Medical Corps, had visited Kastoria. I did not hear anything to the effect that in the spring or the summer of 1943 another Bulgarian officer accompanied by PASHALIS and others visited again Argos-Orestikon. I do not exclude such a possibility as on numerous occasions, without the knowledge of the Italian military services, Bulgarian military or political officials circulated having the evident aim to contact the pro-Bulgarians of the Kastoria region. To this effect, I remember this incident: At that time the Italian Military Command had arrested a Bulgarian moving about in the district without the knowledge of the Italians. It was subsequently discovered that the prisoner was Major TSAKIROFF of the Bulgarian Army, who we later let free following an intervention through Rome of ex-Queen Giovanna of Bulgaria. As stated in my previous deposition, the official Bulgarian officers attached to Italian Military Command as well as all the Bulgarians travelling in the districts of Kastoria and Florina were undoubtedly in direct contact with the military and civilian authorities in Monastir, as the majority of them came from Monastir and reported back there. I knew this as a fact as the Italian Consulate in Monastir often informed us that certain Bulgarians had left Monastir in the probable direction of Kastoria or Florina. This news was confirmed later. Through my position in the Italian Town Major's and my service, I had realised that the Bulgarian Govt. was seriously interested, for more further reasons also, but for immediate ones also, to have the Bulgarian speaking population under its authority. It especially tried to convince them to carry out a pro-Bulgarian policy, aiming at territorial expansion in these districts, I personally have no doubt that MARINOFF due to his personality as well as to his position, was the head of all this policy carried out by the Bulgarian Govt. and that any movement in the districts of Kastoria and Florina was carried out following his inspiration and his orders. In January 1944 I was in Neohorion Arta, and therefore do not know personally what exactly happened in the Florina district when a Bulgarian regiment came down from Monastir to reinforce the Germans. During my trial I heard witnesses state that the Bulgarian regiment behaved inhumanly to the Greeks. If this is true and I repeat I have no direct knowledge, and if I consider that this unit

commanded by a Lt. Colonel arrived from Monastir and belonged to the 15th Bulgarian Division whose O.C. was MARINOFF and still more, if I consider that the brutal treatment of the population was not constituted by isolated incidents but constituted the systematic directive of the unit, I cannot but admit without any doubt whatsoever that these acts were included in the orders and instructions issued by the Divisional Commander. This always happened when Italian troops were on the move, but one must not doubt that this happens with every regular army. An incident which backs my views is that which I personally observed: I know that MARINOFF at his meeting with VENIERI, meeting I spoke of in my last deposition, asked for Bulgarian troops to reinforce the Italian garrison. The Italian Military Command naturally rejected this proposition. DOITCHEFF who in private life was professor of history at the University of Sofia, was placed as interpreter at Kastoria. He stayed 40 days there and then, without our knowledge, toured certain villages of the Kastoria district.

I know nothing else.

This statement was read and approved

The examined

The examiner

The secretary

RAVALLI

D. Kioussopoulos

N. Raptis.

True service copy

Athens Nov.18, 1946.

The Secretary
(sgd).

III.

Affidavit by A.Ch. Kaltcheff.

Question - Your name

Answer: Anthony Christos KALTCEFF, born in SKYRION, KASTORIA and actually serving a sentence of life imprisonment in the Averoff prisons, age 35, Orthodox Christian; I simply know the accused and am not related to him.

Question

Answer: During the enemy occupation of Greece, General Marinoff was colonel commanding the 15th division stationed at Monastir. General Marinoff only once visited Kastoria in May of June 1943. The object of his visit was to quieten the comitadjis of the Kastoria district who were asking for reinforcements to be sent from Sofia as well as arms etc. At a meeting held in Col. Venieri's office with other Italian officers and later at the offices of the Committee in Kastoria, Marinoff recommended to the comitadjis present to obey Italian orders, that they should help the Axis and that he will see that help be sent to them from Bulgaria. I do not know whether Marinoff visited the district of Kastoria another time; I am of the opinion that if this had happened, I would of been advised. I do not know what was discussed in the previous meeting of Marinoff; with Venieri, the German town major of Kastoria named KOMB and other German and Italian officers, as I was not present. Ravalli was present and he could tell you what was discussed. On the same day, Marinoff accompanied by the abovementioned Germans, met at Boglista two Italian Generals from Korytsa, but I do not know what was discussed. Marinoff at that time was considered as friendly to the regime and was used as such. In January 1944 following an agreement between the German and Bulgarian armies it was decided to carry out a common campaign to clear the region of Florina from the antartes. To this effect, a German force attacked northwards from Kastoria and Bulgarian forces belonging to Marinoff advanced South from Monastir. Due to the fact that a Bulgarian detachment of 10 - 12 soldiers had been wiped out at Flamouro, a Bulgarian force entered the village of Flamouro to arrest the murderers who following information lived in Flamouro. The Bulgarians arrested 10 - 12 individuals and took them with them. Barring this act, I do not know of any other act committed by the Bulgarians. The complete destruction of Flamouro was not carried out by Bulgarians, but far later on by the Germans, as reprisals because the antartes had killed a few Germans near Flamouro. A detachment left Amynteon and burnt down the village.

The examiner

D. Kioussopoulos

The examined

A. Ch. Kaltcheff.

Correct copy for service use.

Athens, July 25 1946.

The secretary.

(sgd).

Report by Captain Peter Lolos.

From Captain Peters LOLAS

To The Public Prosecutor of the War Criminals Court.

Subject: Referring to the Bulgarian War criminal, General Marinoff.

I have the honour to advise you that following an inquest carried out by the author of this report, following an order for such a preliminary inquest to be held, issued by the Higher Gendarmerie Command of continental Greece, and relative to the criminal action, in Central and Western Macedonia, of the Axis and Bulgarian propaganda during the four year triple occupation, the following reasons have fully proved that the above mentioned General Marinoff of the Bulgarian Army can be qualified as a war criminal.

- 1) General Marinoff was supreme military and political representative of the pro-axis Bulgarian Govt. in the districts of Servian Macedonia as well as in Greek Central and Western Macedonia from the very first day of the Occupation to the end, as during this whole time he was commanding the 15th Bulgarian Division having its H.Q. at Monastir.
- 2) Bulgarian propaganda and agents of the Bulgarian Govt. and the Bulgarian Committee acted under the orders and following the directives issued by General Marinoff, as all Bulgarian services established in Central and Western Macedonia depended directly from General Marinoff. The propaganda action of all these services was inspired and approved by General Marinoff.
- 3) The written defences of both the war criminals Kaltcheff and Ravalli prove the fact that all agents of the Bulgarian Committee operating in Central and Western Macedonia and which had come from Bulgaria, had previously passed through Monastir and were directed by General Marinoff either towards Greek Macedonia or else towards Sofia and that operations of the Bulgarian propaganda were carried out according to orders given by Gen. Marinoff.
- 4) Kaltcheff testified that the maize, salt, sugar and other commodities and clothing sent to Greek Macedonia for distribution between the pro-Bulgarian elements of the district in order to modify the ethnological Greek composition and to attempt to uproot Greek national feeling, were forwarded from Monastir in accordance to orders issued by the abovementioned Gen. Marinoff.
- 5) Gen. Marinoff having been advised by a personal report of Kaltcheff on the decision of the Italian authorities to arm the comitadjis of Kastoria,

did nothing to hinder the formation of such armed bands, when at the same time Major Mitkoff commanding the Bulgarian Club of Salonica expressed through Kaltcheff his dissatisfaction and his threats for the formation of the comitadji bands of Kastoria which in his opinion would help Italian views.

6) At the time when the criminal action of the Kastoria Comitadjis had reached its zenith (crimes, arson, lootings, etc.) Gen. Marinoff went to Kastoria, accompanied by a) Doctor DIMITROFF, representative in Monastir of the Bulgarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs, b) Kaltcheff, c) two senior officers of Marinoff's staff and d) captain KOMB of the German Army, town major of Florina. The abovementioned were escorted by 15 armed Bulgarian soldiers from Monastir and by 4-5 German soldiers from Florina.

In Kastoria, a) General Marinoff, b) Col. VENIERI, c) DIMITROFF as representative of the Bulgarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and d) Capt. KOMB carried out private talks, the nature of which is unknown. Following these talks, the whole party went to the HQ of the Bulgarian Committee in Kastoria, where 150 armed comitadjis were assembled under the orders of their leaders (MAKRI PANTELI, DIAMANIDI LOUKA, KALIMANI PASCHALI etc) General Marinoff spoke to these men and stated between others that "you must fight honestly the Greek and Yugoslav antartes and I will see that help be sent to you from the Bulgarian Govt".

As Marinoff in his speech did not speak a word about Italy and as the Comitadji complained against the Italians with regard to their food and clothing, Col. VENIERI refused to approve Gen. MARINOFF's wish to visit certain villages from which the Comitadjis came from. For this reason, another meeting was held at BIGLITSA between Gen. Marinoff and two Italian generals from Korytsa. Nothing has been known relative to these talks.

7) Kaltcheff himself testifies that following Gen. Marinoff's actions a committee from Sofia arrived via Monastir, at the village of APOSKEROS, near Kastoria. This committee was composed of a) DIMITROFF, representative of the Bulgarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and political adviser of Marinoff, b) VASILEFF SPYRO, director of the Bank of Macedonia in Sofia, c) JOSEPH MARKOFF and d) SKARTOFF. The last two mentioned were pensioned officers and members of the Bulgarian Committee. This party distributed to the Comitadjis and pro-Bulgarian elements, without the Italians, knowing anything on the matter, large quantities of maize, salt and wheat, five hundred (500) suits, five hundred (500) pairs of boots and four millions, (4,000,000) levas.

For future financial aid to the Comitadjis, funds were given to ROUKAS CHRISTOS, who became president of the Bulgarian Committee. From that time onwards, the number of armed Comitadjis increased and arms were furnished to them from Monastir.

8) In June 1944, following General Marinoff's proposal to the Bulgarian General Staff under the orders of General LOUKA, twenty (20) reserve officers and Warrant Officers of the Bulgarian Army arrived at Monastir. In reality these men were organising members of the Bulgarian Committee,

who, directed by Marinoff were sent to command the OCHRANA armed bands in the region of Florina, Edessa and Kastoria.

This OCHRANA organisation had been armed in the beginning of 1944 by Germans following the request of Marinoff, Kalitcheff and others.

The criminal action of these officers (lieutenant DIMITCHEFF, IMITCHEFF, TASKOFF etc) was illimited and their cooperation with Marinoff is evident. At that time the members of the band commanded by IVAN MICHAÏLOFF, leader of B.M.R.O. (Internal Bulgarian Revolution) co-operated with Marinoff and were continuously on the move between Macedonia, Monastir and Sofia. This group commanded the OCHRANA organisation whose armed men numbered over six thousand (6000) and whose main officers, as from the middle of 1944, used to enter the S.N.O.F. organisation and thence were admitted in the ranks of ELAS. They separated from ELAS approximately at the end of the Occupation and formed the autonomistic battalions of Slav-Macedonians in order to help their plans aiming at forming a Federal Macedonian State or of an independant Macedonia, a) With the permission of Gen. Marinoff and following a request by KALITCHEFF, a Bulgarian regiment of the 15th Division under the command of Colonel TZANEFF, entered the district of Florina from Monastir. This movement was taken to rise the spirits of the pro-Bulgarian elements. The regiment helped the armed members of OCHRANA and a small German detachment to clear the PRESPA region of antart movement.

As the inhabitants of FLAMBOURO, although they included a few slavs, refused to enter the OCHRANA organisation, the Bulgarian regiment carried out brutal reprisals and Bulgarian soldiers murdered eleven (11) villagers using for their crime excavating tools. Two or three other villagers were burried alive. This last action provoked even the indignation of their allies the Germans, who, following a request of the Greek Nomarch, Mr. DONIS, ordered the above regiment to abandon the region of Florina. There is no proof that Gen. Marinoff expressed his indignation for the brutal murders of innocent Greeks carried out by his officers and men.

10) Approximately two thousand (2000) schoolboys from Central and Western Macedonia were sent to Monastir by KALITCHEFF. Marinoff received them and issued money, food and clothing. Gen. Marinoff's staff did its best to uproot Greek national feeling from the schoolboys.

11) Finally the preliminary inquest proves that all the pro-Bulgar slavs who returned from Monastir and Sofia to Macedonia in 1944 and were friends of the pro-Axis Bulgarian Govt. and of the Bulgarian Committee under the direction of Gen. Marinoff, have suddenly become its worst enemies and have joined the SNOF forces. Some of these men have become leaders of ELAS in spite of the spirit of the Greek antart movement. Their object was to destroy the Greek element and as members of OILA they executed any Greek desiring a greater Greece. Finally they formed the Slav-Macedonian battalions of GOTCHEFF which following the December incidents, united with the OCHRANA Comitadgis and are actually operating from Jugoslavia against the independance and integrity of Greece, so as to imitate in anti-Greek action that of Gen. MARINOFF, actually Bulgarian Ambassador in Paris.

P. LOLAS.
Gendarmerie Captain.

Exact Copy
Salonica, May 6, 1946.

V.

Report by the Secretary of the Florina Department.

HELLENIC STATE
DEPARTMENT OF FLORINA.
File Reference D.Y.

Florina, February 8, 1944.

REPORT ON THE INCIDENTS
THAT TOOK PLACE AT FLAMBOURO - FLORINA.

On Wednesday evening, February 2, 1944 and at 9 p.m. a band of antartes 120 strong approximately, arrived in Flamouro and forcibly entered the houses of the village, breaking down doors and windows. The members of this band remained in the village up to 10 a.m. on Saturday. During their whole stay in Flamouro, the antartes had posted armed guards on either side of the village prohibiting the inhabitants to leave their homestead.

Following this order, nobody could get out of the village and advise the military and civilian authorities on the incidents that had taken place. The president of the community and a delegation of villagers, who had expressed the opinion of advising the authorities in order to forestall any unpleasant reprisals on the village, were prohibited, threatened by death penalty to leave. The above antartes, during their stay in Flamouro, carried out arrests of numerous personalities of the village. Thus on Friday they arrested the school teachers Gabriel Skandalis, director of the primary school and Andrew Moukas. The postman Andrew Mitroussis was also arrested but was subsequently let free under the condition that he would not refer to the authorities. The school teacher from Kato Hydroussi, Demetrius Paleologos and Stylianos Avasides, teacher at the primary school of Kolhiki, as well as a civilian named Avraam from Kolhiki, whom the antartes had brought with them, were also found imprisoned in the village. On Friday after having forced the male inhabitants, 18-35 years of age, to attend a meeting, one of the antartes made a speech encouraging them to follow the antartes forces. All the young men unanimously stated that they refuse to enrol. Finally the orator confronted by this decisive denial of the young men, threatened them that they would be taken away by force, their names having been taken from the community registers.

The next day, whilst all the inhabitants had been forcibly assembled in the main square of the village and were listened to one of the antartes explaining to them the aims of the organisation so as to persuade the inhabitants to follow them, shots were heard, undoubtedly fired by approaching Bulgarian detachment. The armed guards, immediately answered, so as to draw the attention of their comrades to retire. The panic stricken assembly dissolved itself and both villagers and antartes dispersed themselves in the surrounding woods. This act of the villagers was dictated by their fear of Bulgarian reprisals, and having seen Bulgarian conduct at the other villages of the districts. All the antartes took a pre-arranged direction and met outside the village. Numerous villagers in order to save themselves, took shelter in the nearby villages of Aetos and Ano-Hydroussa. In the meantime, the Bulgarians, having reached Flamouro by the road taken by the fleeing inhabitants started a deadly fire on them

not bothering to examine whether they were firing on antartes or on innocent villagers. Four quiet and law-abiding young men were later found dead at this spot. Gabriel Broikos, Demetrius Bolaksis, Christos Gatsis and Filotas Tahou, all four supporting numerous families were found bearing hideous marks of Bulgarian barbarism. The bodies were found unclothed and without boots. Gabriel Broikos was lying on the ground with his hands uplifted and full of bayonet wounds in the stomach and head. His gold teeth had been removed by the Bulgarians. Christos Gatsis was found bearing numerous bayonet wounds in the stomach and face. As testified by villagers passing close by, the Bulgarians noticing that Gatsis had not been killed outright, returned and finished him off with their bayonets. Filotas Tahos showed numerous wounds from bayonets below his lower jaw and on his neck.

The inhabitants of the village saw all four raise their arms immediately as they saw the Bulgarians who received them with bayonet thrusts and with blows with their rifle butts. The antartes on leaving the village took with them three school teachers who later, at a skirmish between the antartes and a German detachment, managed to escape thanks to the disorder that ensued.

The abovementioned Bulgarian detachment on their way to the village met the shepherd Sotiron Kakarantzias, who was looking after his sheep and goats. Kakarantzias and an old villager named Christos Mitroussides, found by the Bulgarians when entering Flambouro, were captured and their fate is unknown.

Latest information states that both of them were executed by the Bulgars in the village of Ammohori. On the next day, the shepherd's father and mother, as well as Mitroussides' brother set out to find their relatives. Xenophon Mitroussides seems to have been captured on the way and is being tortured by the Bulgarians in Ammohori. Another Bulgarian detachment coming from Cato-Hydroussi, captured on their way, John Styliades, Michael Styliades and Peter Petrios, who were hunting for five missing villagers and who according to the Bulgarian detachment, were lying dead on a near-by hill. The above three inhabitants were taken by the Bulgarian detachment and their fate is unknown. This detachment requisitioned seven animals with their proprietors and left in the direction of the village of Aetos. Their fate is unknown. Half an hour after, the departure of the second detachment, a third one, 120 strong, arrived in the village and stayed there for four hours. All the men were billeted in the houses of the villagers where food was offered to them. After the departure of this third detachment, numerous other ones including a cavalry detachment, passed through the village. This last one displayed all its barbarism and cold-bloodedness, pillaging the houses in the most inhuman way. The president of the community was ordered by this detachment to fill with grass, in half an hour, two carts accompanying the Bulgarians. The Bulgarians also took 20 sheep and a mule. Following this, the men of the detachment started a systematic pillage of the houses. Anything of any value was removed including womens and girls dresses. With this last act the inhabitants of the village, having suffered unheard of barbarism by the Bulgarians will remain without clothes.

The Bulgarians even removed a wrist watch from a child. This detachment having considered the looting as finished, left in the direction of the village of Leptokaryes, taking with them the president of the community, Constantine Nassis, the forrester, Nicholas Elovaris and the

gamekeepers Lazar Galios and George Tsakas. The fate of the above is unknown. As proved by various facts and incidents, all the above Bulgarian brutalities were caused by the Bulgarian inhabitants of the near-by villages, who by treason and blackmail accused the inhabitants of Flamouro of helping the antartes whereas in reality they had no relation with them and thus are not responsible and certainly cannot oppose themselves, unarmed as they are, to fully armed antartes bands.

The above Bulgarian inhabitants of the villages of Leptokaryai, Aete and Cato-Hydroussi, Ammohori etc. nourish a hereditary hatred against Flamoure as well as against every Greek village with the sole excuse that the inhabitants of these latter villages possessed and possess a patriotic sense developed to a very high degree. It was omitted to state that the Bulgarians removed the Greek flag from the community building.

To-day, February 8, 1944, a considerable number of eye-witnesses arrived in Florina from Flamoure, who reported the affair to the department office and from the testimonies of which, the present report has been drawn up.

The Secretary of the Department.

(sgd) Ch. Stefanides.

RESTRICTED
CONFIDENTIAL

I/75.
16th. January 1947.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.

COMMITTEE I.

GENERAL MARINOV'S CASE.

The following letters received from M. Michael PADEV, London Correspondent, Bulgarian Telegraph Agency, together with their annexes are circulated to members of Committee I for their information and consideration at its next Meeting, in connection with General Marinov's case.

I.

5, Lancaster Terrace,
W.2.

Paddington 2534.

9th January, 1947.

The Secretary,
United Nations' War Crimes Commission,
Lansdowne House,
Berkeley Square,
London, W.1.

Dear Sir,

I have been requested urgently by telephone by the Bulgarian Legation in Paris to forward to you the enclosed official information of the Bulgarian Foreign Ministry concerning the case of General Marinov, brought before your Commission by the Greek Government.

Yours truly,

(Signed) MICHAEL PADEV.

(London Correspondent, Bulgarian Telegraph Agency).

"On December 16th, 1946 the Greek Prime Minister, M. Tsaldaris, is reported to have said in New York that the Bulgarian General, Ivan Marinov, former Commander-in-Chief of the Bulgarian Armies in the war against Germany, and at present Bulgarian Minister in Paris, has been proclaimed a war criminal by the Allied Control Commission in Sofia.

The Bulgarian Government has now officially asked the Allied

.....

Control Commission in Sofia for information on the subject. The Allied Control Commission has officially notified the Bulgarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs that the Commission has not proclaimed General Ivan Marinov as a war criminal and that, moreover, the Commission has never even discussed such a case.

The Bulgarian Government think that this official communication on the part of the Allied Control Commission in Sofia, which is the highest Allied authority in Bulgaria, is an appropriate denial of the alleged statement of the Greek Prime Minister, M. Tsaldaris."

Sofia, January 8th, 1947.

II.

5, Lancaster Terrace,
W.2.

Paddington 2534.

13th January, 1947.

The Secretary,
United Nations' War Crimes Commission,
Lansdowne House,
Berkeley Square,
W.I.

Dear Sir,

In addition to the information, received from the Bulgarian Legation in Paris, which I sent you with my letter of 9th January, I have also received the enclosed copies of statements by the Bulgarian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Kimon Georgiev, and the Chief of the Bulgarian General Staff, Lt. Gen. Kinoff. For your convenience I am sending you six copies of the statements.

Yours truly,

(Signed) MICHAEL PADEV.

(London Correspondent, Bulgarian Telegraph Agency).

NOTE.

The Annex to the above letter containing a communication from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cults Commissariat for the Fulfilment of the Armistice Agreement, No. 6787-III, dated Sofia, December 24, 1946, addressed to Colonel-General S.S. Biriusoff, Deputy-President of the Allied Control Commission in Bulgaria is appended hereto as received in the original form: (In Marinov Case - 3669)

To be appended to Doc. I/75
for:

M. de Baer
Sir Robert Craigie
Col. Springer
M. Dimitzas
Dr. Litawski

Copy of letters from Kinon & Kinoff

Docs. I/72, 73, 74, 75, 83

~~First~~ Circulated to

Cont. I { M. de Baer ✓
Sir Robert Craigie ✓
Col. Springer ✓ - 7 extra of
Dr. Fanderlic ✓ I/74
+ I/83

M. Dimitzas ✓

M. Maillard ✓

Dr. Litawski ✓

Dr. Schwelb ✓

Col. Hedingham ✓

Col. Wade ✓

I/76.

20th January 1947.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.

COMMITTEE I.

Submission of Charges by Ethiopia.

Note by Dr. J. Litawski, Legal Officer.

1. The enclosed correspondence concerning the establishment of the War Crimes Commission in Ethiopia, and the submission of charges arising out of the 1935 Italian-Abyssinian War is circulated to members of Committee I for their information and consideration at its next Meeting.

2. On July 31st 1946 in connection with the question raised then in Parliament, the Commission, acting upon the recommendation of Committee III, adopted the following resolution: (Doc. C. 217)

"1. The United Nations War Crimes Commission has, up to the present, only dealt with war crimes (including crimes against peace and crimes against humanity) committed during or connected with, the present war. The Commission can find no evidence that it is the wish of member Governments that the Commission should deal with war crimes committed in any other war.

2. The Commission is not in possession of any evidence to show that it is the opinion of the Governments that any direct connection exists between the Italo-Abyssinian war and the present war".

From the following correspondence it appears that the Ethiopian Government is not aware of the Commission's attitude and policy in this matter.

3. Since the resolution was passed, the Draft Peace Treaty with Italy prepared by the Council of Foreign Ministers for consideration by the Peace Conference in Paris has been published (Command Paper 6892), in which the following provisions regarding Ethiopia, one of the Allied and Associated Powers to this Treaty, are included:

"Section VI. - ETHIOPIA.

Article 27.

Italy recognises and undertakes to respect the sovereignty and independence of the State of Ethiopia.

Article 28.

Italy formally renounces in favour of Ethiopia all property (apart from Normal diplomatic or consular premises), rights, interests and advantages of all kinds acquired at any time in Ethiopia by the Italian State.

Italy also renounces all claim to special interests of influence in Ethiopia.

Article 29.

Italy recognises the legality of all measures which the Government of Ethiopia has taken or may thereafter take in order to annul Italian measures respecting Ethiopia taken after October 3, 1935 and the effects of such measures.

Article 30.

Italian nationals in Ethiopia will enjoy the same juridical status as other foreign nationals, but Italy recognises the legality of all measures of the Ethiopian Government annulling or modifying concessions or special rights granted to Italian nationals, provided such measures are taken within a year from the coming into force of the present Treaty.

Article 31.

Italy will restore all Ethiopian works of art, religious objects and objects of historical value removed from Ethiopia to Italy since October 3, 1935. "

(The final text of the Peace Treaty with Italy is not yet to hand).

4. It is thought that Committee I or Committee III might consider it advisable to examine the above quoted provisions and their bearing, if any, on the Commission's resolution, especially in view of the statement made by the Commission in its Paragraph 2.

Should the Commission's resolution of 31st July 1946 remain in force it is suggested that the decision embodied therein should be brought to the attention of the Ethiopian Government as it would not be advisable to encourage that Government to submit cases arising out of the 1935 War, only to inform them upon receipt of such cases that nothing can be done by this Commission.

(See enclosed correspondence).

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Addis Ababa, December 31st 1946.

No. 3872/50.

Sirs,

With a letter of the 22nd July 1946 I sent to the Secretary General of the United Nations a communication from the Imperial Ethiopian Government concerning the War Crimes Commission established in Ethiopia. He was requested to transmit the communication to the United Nations War Crimes Commission. In reply I got a letter, copy of which is enclosed herewith.

As suggested in that letter I have the honour to send directly to you the communication mentioned above.

May I add, on behalf of the Ethiopian War Crimes Commission, that as concerns Marshal Badoglio's violations of the Laws of War, especially the intensive use of poison gas, and Marshal Graziani's crimes against humanity, especially the great Graziani massacre in February 1937, there are apparently no difficulties at all to get evidence sufficient to justify the trial of these persons. Also as regards some other Italian officials the investigation and recording of evidence can be considered as complete and the cases will as soon as the necessary translations are made be presented to you in the way which you have prescribed.

With the assurance of my very high consideration,

(Signed) AMBAYE WOLDE MARIAM.

Acting Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs, Imperial Ethiopian Government.

United Nations War Crimes Commission,
Lansdowne House,
Berkeley Square,
London, W.I.

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

No. 3843/50

The Imperial Ethiopian Government have the honour to bring to the attention of the United Nations War Crimes Commission the fact that the War Crimes Commission established in Ethiopia by Imperial Order No. 1784 of 20th May 1946, has been granted full authority for and charged with the functions of assembling evidence of war crimes in Ethiopia and of bringing and instituting charges and criminal proceedings against Italian individuals, who have committed major war crimes against Ethiopia and the Ethiopian people.

Referring to the Agreement of London, dated 8th August 1945 and the Charter of the International Military Tribunal to which the Empire of Ethiopia has adhered, the Imperial Ethiopian Government reserve the right to institute legal proceedings against the aforementioned criminals of war, and request the United Nations War Crimes Commission when treating of matters concerning Italian war criminals to take cognizance of the claim of the Imperial Ethiopian Government to institute at the appropriate time and before the appropriate tribunal criminal proceedings against the aforementioned persons.

Addis Ababa 22nd July, 1946.

(Signed) Ambaye Wolde Mariam.

Acting Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs Imperial Ethiopian Government.

Certified Copy. (E.L.)

UNITED NATIONS.

26 August 1946.

In reply refer to: 704-1-1.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 22 July 1946, addressed to the Secretary-General and enclosing a communication from your Government concerning the proceedings against Italian War Criminals which you request him to transmit to the War Crimes Commission.

The Secretary-General regrets that it is not possible for him to comply with your request as the United Nations War Crimes Commission, in spite of its title, is not an Organ of the United Nations. He suggests, therefore, that you approach the Commission direct at its headquarters in London. The address is:

United Nations War Crimes Commission,
Lansdowne House,
Berkeley Square,
London, W.1.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

Signed: Andrew W. Cordier.
Executive Assistant to the
Secretary-General.

His Excellency,
Acting Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Addis Ababa,
Ethiopia.

(Certified copy) E.L.

I/77.

28th January, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.

COMMITTEE I.

DR. MADORI'S CASE.

1. In the Committee Meeting held on 4th December, 1946, (Minutes No. 84), consideration of the Memorandum received from Dr. Madori's solicitors, circulated in Document I/71, was adjourned in order that the National Office might be asked to produce definite evidence, particularly in the form of affidavits, showing Madori's complicity in the burning down of the library; and to establish whether the surrender of Madori has been requested by Yugoslavia.

2. Since then, the following letter from the Yugoslav National Office, explaining the question of Madori's surrender, and a further letter from Madori's solicitors, have been received, and are circulated to members of Committee I for their information and consideration at its next Meeting.

3. No further evidence as to Madori's responsibility as requested by the Committee has been received from the National Office.

I.

(Letter from the Yugoslav National Office).

5th December, 1946.

Dear Dr. Litawski,

With reference to the discussion at yesterday's meeting of Committee I on the case of Dr. Gastone MADORI, raised by his application (reproduced in Doc. I/71) I have the honour to communicate the following:

It is no longer necessary to ask my Government whether or not it is still interested in the surrender of Madori, for my supposition that the Yugoslav authorities have done everything in their power since Madori was entered on the list of war criminals proved to be correct. As soon as I was able, after leaving the meeting, I enquired into the matter in my office, with the following result:

A note from CROWCASS dated February 23, 1946, gives evidence that a Wanted Report for Madori had been filed by us. A further note No. 545 of March 1, 1946, sent by Dr. Zivkovic to the H.Q. Mediterranean Theater of Operations, U.S. Army, contained a

-2-

request for the handing over of Madori to Yugoslavia for trial. On the same day, the Secretary General of the U.N.W.C.C. and CROWCASS were informed of the matter, as you may see from the copies of the correspondence which I am enclosing.

I think that it will be useful, for any further development of the discussion caused at the instance of Madori's solicitors, to state that there was no omission and no delay on the part of the Yugoslav authorities concerned.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) DR. H. MEZULIC.

II.

(Reply to the above).

18th December, 1946.

Dear Dr. Mezulić,

Thank you for your letter of the 5th December, 1946, and enclosures, which by accident has been brought to my attention only today.

I note that your explanation as to the action taken by your Government in order to secure surrender of MADORI covers one of the points referred by Committee I to your Government for information.

As soon as you kindly provide me with additional information showing MADORI's complicity in the burning-down of the library (Committee I Minutes 84 of 4th December, 1946), I shall arrange for the matter to be placed on the Committee's agenda.

I am quite sure you consider this matter as urgent.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) J. LITAWSKI.
Legal Officer.

III.

(Letter from Dr. Madori's Solicitors).

SUBJECT: Doc. Gastone MADORI, imated in the Prisons of Pisa under the supervision of Rome Allied Commission, Supreme Mediterranean Allied Forces Headquarters for the interest of the U.N.W.C.C.

.....

TO: UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION
Lansdowne House - Berkeley Square,
L O N D O N

Re: to your kind letter lately arrived at this Office.

I'm very glad to have heard from you, mostly for the fact that yours is the first answer we have received in the interest of our customer from any Allied Authority.

I strongly hope that our application will have thoroughly clarified the situation of Subject and will induce you into the right consideration of his case. Any way I want to stress you again upon the paras a), b), c) of our petition, covering the following points:

1. a temporary release of the prisoner.
2. a quick examination of the case.
3. a speeded decision under the possible authority of the Rome Allied Commission.

You can imagine that all our hope is bound to the steps that you are going to make in our favour.

Any support may be requested by the Italian Authorities in order to facilitate the disposition of the case will be soon released by our care.

Please keep us informed as soon as possible about any variation in the solution of our pitious and painful question.

Waiting for an answer of yours

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) DOTT. RENATO TORTORELLA.

V

I/78.
27th January 1947.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.

COMMITTEE I.

Proposal for a Historical and Legal Report on the
Activities of Committee I.

By Dr. J. Litawski, Legal Officer.

I. It is the purpose of this paper to submit to Committee I for consideration, and eventually for making appropriate proposals to the Commission, the suggestion as to the preparation, and its publication at a later date, of a Report on "VIOLATIONS OF THE LAWS AND CUSTOMS OF WAR - 1939-1945", which at the same time will cover all the activities of, and the task accomplished by Committee I.

It is submitted that apart from a survey of the Committee's terms of reference, its rules of procedure, and that of the statistical aspect of the work accomplished, the Report should also present and discuss: historical precedents; all legal rulings established by the Committee while considering charges, and deciding upon the responsibility for war crimes; a "Case Book"; and a commentary on the most important cases submitted by the Governments.

Looking at the position as it is at present, the Commission has already listed well over 22,000 war criminals after their cases had been examined by Committee I. There were hundreds of these cases, especially in the first 18 months or so of its work, in which legal issues had had to be discussed and the necessary rulings decided. It is highly desirable that all these rulings and other matters should be recorded and analyses made, not only in order to preserve the value of the work done by that Committee, but also to provide International lawyers and historians with a basic document on war crimes committed during the 1939-1945 war.

II. It is, therefore, proposed that the Report on the activities of Committee I and on all matters relative to its functions should generally be divided into the following sections:

1. Historical precedent:

the 1919 Commission on the Responsibilities of the
Authors of the War and on Enforcement of Penalties;
a concise historical survey insofar as that activities
of that Commission were similar to those of
Committee I.

2. Committee I terms of reference

as conferred upon it by the Commission following the United Nations agreement on the establishment of the United Nations War Crimes Commission.

3. Rules of procedure.

4. Statistical survey.

This would follow the lines adopted in periodical Statistical Progress Reports, already issued in Docs. G. 207 and G. 241.

5. A "Case Book" of all the charges submitted by the Governments and accepted by the Commission.

Such a Case Book, as distinguished from the Lists of War Criminals, could usefully provide not only a most comprehensive summary of the charges on the lines adopted in the Report of the 1919 Commission on the Responsibilities, but also a commentary on the relevant legal points involved in the more important cases, as well as a record, and an analysis of the decisions taken by the Committee and the Commission in the respective cases.

The attached note on Dutch case 3271 (Doc. I/56) may give a general idea of a commentary as suggested above.

6. Committee I Rulings on Substantive Law and their bearing on International Law.

Here considerations and recommendations of the Committee, particularly in the earlier stages of its activities, concerning such controversial legal problems as, e.g. the plea of superior order; the problem of "collective responsibility"; judicial crimes; taking of hostages (mass arrests and illegal arrests); denationalisation; treatment of Quislings and traitors (responsibility for war crimes of Allied Nationals); Axis legislation in occupied countries, etc., etc. could be reported upon.

Under this heading it should simultaneously be shown how these and similar questions were finally decided by the Commission, and, eventually, to what extent its recommendations have influenced the subsequent International Agreements and enactments in the sphere of the retributive action.

7. A general survey of crimes committed in each of the occupied countries together with a short outline of the general policy and aims established by the

enemy authorities against the respective countries would constitute a very useful and complementary addition to the Report if this particular section could be contributed by the Research Department.

8. Any other matters cognate or ancillary to the above which have arisen in the course of the Committee's work, and which the Committee will find useful and relevant to be reported upon.

III. It will be seen that in order to cover fully all the items and matters involved, the Report will have to comprise several hundred pages, and that substantial time is required for selection of material and drafting of such a Report. In this connection it may be mentioned that the Report of 1919 Commission on the Responsibilities, the work of which lasted only just under 2 months, comprise 556 pages (French Edition, La Documentation Internationale, La Paix de Versailles, Vol. 3, Responsabilités des Auteurs de la Guerre et Sanctions)

The most difficult task will be encountered in reconstructing all the decisions and rulings arrived at during the first 15 months when the most important of them were established, as for that period no Minutes or any other records of the Committee's deliberations have, unfortunately, been kept. This would involve once more going through a substantial number of cases in order to find out what legal issues were involved.

IV. At a later date it will have to be decided whether it will be possible or advisable to incorporate such an extensive Report into, and make it a part of, the general report covering all the activities of the Commission, or else to draft separately a summary report for the purpose, which would cover only items 2, 3 and partly items 4 and 6 above, and so leave all the rest for a separate publication.

It is submitted that the Report as envisaged in this paper should be separate from the historical report on the activities of the Commission as such, as in the latter probably only a summary report on the activities of Committee I could be included.

V. It is proposed that the publication should be in English, and that a French edition should also be envisaged.

VI. If the above suggestions are accepted, in principle, by the Committee, and eventually by the Commission, it will be the task of the Legal Officer-Secretary to Committee I, to commence the preparatory work, as well as the drafting of the Report, if practicable, without too much delay.

The Draft Report or separate parts of it will be submitted to the Committee for its consideration as soon as they are ready.

ENCLOSURE: DOC. I/66.

I/66.
1st July 1946.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.

COMMITTEE I.

Note on Dutch Case 3271. (Means of Deception).
By Dr. J. Litawski. Legal Officer.

I. The Dutch Government charges two members of the German armed forces with violating the "International rules of land warfare" in that one of the accused, an officer, gave orders to the second accused, a soldier, to disguise himself as a member of the Royal Mounted Police. The second accused obeyed these orders and both of them, aided by four other German soldiers, were instrumental in taking a Dutch railway bridge on the German-Dutch frontier on the day Germany invaded Holland (10th May 1945), by removing the explosive charges placed there, to forestall a German crossing.

II. The act committed by the accused is an example of the application by a belligerent party of means of deception known in International Law as ruses of war or stratagems. These are deceptions employed in the interest of military operations for the purpose of misleading the enemy. Such deceit is of great importance in war and the belligerent parties are allowed to employ to a large extent different sorts of ruses. This contention finds confirmation in Article 24 of the Hague Regulations which says that "Ruses of war and the employment of measures necessary for obtaining information about the enemy and the country are considered permissible".

III. To means of deception belongs inter alia the use of the national flag, the military ensigns and the uniforms of the enemy. As regards this kind of ruses, according to Oppenheim's International Law, theory and practice are unanimous in prohibiting the use of such stratagems during actual attack and defence, since the principle is considered inviolable that during actual fighting belligerent forces ought to be certain who is friend and who is foe.

As to the relevant provision of International Law, in this respect reference is being made to Article 23 (f) of the Hague Regulations which reads as follows:- "In addition to the prohibitions provided by special Conventions, it is particularly forbidden -..... to make improper use of a flag of truce, of the national flag, or of the military insignia and uniform of the enemy, as well as of the distinctive signs of the Geneva Convention". This provision should be, of course, read in conjunction with Article 22 which says that "Belligerents have not got an unlimited right as to the choice of means of injuring the enemy".

Commenting on Article 23 (f), the already quoted authority on International Law stresses that this provision does not prohibit the use of these means of deception without qualification, but only their improper use, thus leaving the question open what uses are proper and what are not.

With regard to this particular aspect, it is to be pointed out that the use of Dutch uniform by the accused was effected at the time when Dutch territory was being invaded and actual fighting was going on, thus qualifying the accused's action as improper.

The impropriety of this act is aggravated by the fact that at the material time Holland was attacked by Germany treacherously without any declaration of war, a circumstance which places the act of the accused on the border of perfidy. Such perfidy, as distinguished from stratagems (ruses, means of deception) is prohibited as constituting a breach of good faith.

From the foregoing it would appear as not controversial that the act

/committed

committed by the accused, constitutes a violation of the customary and conventional rule of the laws and usages of war as laid down in Article 23(f) of the Hague Regulations.

IV. There remains the question whether a violation of the laws and usages of war such as alleged in the present case should be considered as a war crime.

In support of a positive answer it may be mentioned that Oppenheim's International Law distinguishes four different kinds of war crimes on account of the essentially different character of the acts, one of them being "Violations of recognised rules regarding warfare committed by individuals who are members of the enemy armed forces".

It is also to be recalled that the Royal Warrant of June 14th, 1945, by which Regulations for the trial of war criminals were issued, expressly provides that "'War crime' means a violation of the laws and usages of war...".

Exactly the same definition has been provided by the Charter of the International Military Tribunal in Article 6 (b) which reads as follows: "The following acts, or any of them, are crimes coming within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal for which there shall be individual responsibility:- war crimes: namely, violation of the laws or customs of war. Such violations shall include, but not be limited to, murder, ill-treatment or deportation to slave labour, or for any other purpose, of civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war or persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity".

From the latter part of this article it further on follows that not only crimes of the "murder type" but also violations of any other law or custom of war should be considered as a war crime, even though such a violation might constitute a purely technical offence only, which is not exactly the case with regard to this particular charge submitted by the Dutch Government.

CONFIDENTIAL
RESTRICTED

*Copies sent to
Craigie
Springer
de Baer
Neumann
Garner - F.O.*

1/79.
1 February 1947.

Copy of Cable received 31 January, 1947.

(General Marinov's Case.)

LZFTAN TW.

C W SOFIA 47 205 30 1950

ELT RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD WRIGHT OF DURLEY
CHAIRMAN UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION
LANDSOWNE HOUSE BERKELEY SQUARE LONDON W1.

GREEK GOVERNMENT SUBMITTED WAR CRIMES COMMISSION LONDON WRITTEN CHARGES AGAINST BULGARIAN GENERAL IVAN MARINOFF WHO IS AT PRESENT BULGARIAN PLENIPOTENTIARY MINISTER PARIS STOP GENERAL MARINOFF WAS FORMERLY WAR MINISTER AND IN THIS CAPACITY CONTRIBUTED VERY MUCH FOR CHANGE WHICH TOOK PLACE BULGARIA NINTH SEPTEMBER 1944. STOP FURTHERMORE COMMA HIS EXCEPTIONAL SERVICES AS CHIEF IN COMMAND BULGARIAN ARMED FORCES IN WAR COMMA WHICH BULGARIA CARRIED ON AFTER THIS DATE AGAINST HITLERITE GERMANY FOR OVER EIGHT MONTHS COMMA WERE DULY RECOGNISED ALINEA SINCE NEITHER BULGARIAN GOVERNMENT NOR GENERAL MARINOFF HAVE BEEN SUPPLIED WITH COPIES OF SAID GREEK CHARGES COMMA BULGARIAN GOVERNMENT FEEL THEY HAVE RIGHT EXPECT FROM SECRETARIATE WAR CRIMES COMMISSION SUBMISSION COPIES SAID GREEK CHARGES AND OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED SUBSEQUENTLY BY GREEKS STOP AS SOON AS BULGARIAN GOVERNMENT GET ACQUAINTED WITH SAID DOCUMENTS COMMA THEY WILL IMMEDIATELY FORWARD STATEMENT TO COMMISSION ON THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN YET ELUCIDATED ON THEIR PART ALINEA IN VIEW OF ABOVE COMMA BULGARIAN GOVERNMENT WOULD ~~FOR~~ REQUEST YOU HAVE REQUIRED COPIES FORWARDED BULGARIAN LEGATION PARIS COMMA WHICH WILL HAVE THEM TRANSMITTED SOFIA

KOMON GHEORGHIEFF VICEPRESIDENT

COUNCIL MINISTERS MINISTER FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND CULTS.

Superseded by I/81

I/80.

10th February, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.

COMMITTEE I.

Submission of Cases by Ethiopia.

Commission's Jurisdiction over Crimes committed in
Ethiopia.

Note by Dr. J. Litawski, Legal Officer.

I.

1. Since Document I/76 was circulated, the final text of the Peace Treaty with Italy has been published (Command Paper 7022). Simultaneously an official Commentary on this Treaty has also been made public (Command Paper 7026).

As compared with the Draft Peace Treaty, the final text contains a new and additional provision concerning Ethiopia which has an important bearing on the question of crimes committed against that country.

The relevant article, 38, reads as follows:-

"The date from which the provisions of the present Treaty shall become applicable as regards all measures and acts of any kind whatsoever entailing the responsibility of Italy or of Italian nationals towards Ethiopia, shall be held to be October 3, 1935".

The full text of all the final provisions regarding Ethiopia as contained in the Treaty is enclosed herewith in the Annex.

2. The provisions dealing with Italy's obligations regarding the apprehension and surrender of war criminals in general are set forth in Article 45 which reads:-

"1. Italy shall take all necessary steps to ensure the apprehension and surrender for trial of:

(a) Persons accused of having committed, ordered or abetted war crimes and crimes against peace or humanity;

(b) Nationals of ~~any~~ Allied or Associated Power accused of having violated their national law by treason or collaboration with the enemy during the war.

2. At the request of the United Nations Government concerned, Italy shall likewise make available as witnesses persons within its jurisdiction, whose evidence is required for the trial of the persons

referred to in paragraph I of this Article.

3. Any disagreement concerning the application of the provisions of paragraphs I and 2 of this Article shall be referred by any of the Governments concerned to the Ambassadors in Rome of the Soviet Union, of the United Kingdom, of the United States of America, and of France, who will reach agreement with regard to the difficulty".

3. In view of the fact that Article 38 speaks of "all measures and acts of any kind whatsoever" it is clear that also the measures dealing with war criminals (Article 45) must necessarily belong to those measures entailing the responsibility of Italy or of Italian nationals.

Since Ethiopia is one of the Allied and Associated Powers to that Treaty and Article 45 does not contain any reservation or restriction as to those of the Allied and Associated Powers or of the United Nations which will be entitled to request from Italy the apprehension and surrender of war criminals, it follows that Ethiopia will have the right to demand extradition of any Italian "accused of having committed, ordered or abetted war crimes and crimes against peace or humanity" in Ethiopia during the 1935-1936 war.

II.

4. In the Meeting of Committee I held on 30th January 1947, the question arose whether Article 38 read in conjunction with Article 45 does not require the Commission to modify its resolution of 31st July 1946 on the question of the Commission's jurisdiction over war crimes committed in Ethiopia during the 1935-36 Italo-Abyssinian War (Document C.217), (reproduced in Document I/76).

The Commission's resolution is based on the assumption that no direct connection exists between the Italo-Abyssinian War and the present War.

5. The above question of direct connection between the two Wars has already been discussed at some length in Document III/50 of 23rd July 1946, i.e. at the time when the Commission was called upon for the first time to consider the question of its jurisdiction over crimes committed in Ethiopia in 1935-1936.

It has been pointed out therein that before 1939 it was generally understood that the Italo-Abyssinian War had been concluded by the debellatio of Ethiopia (see also Oppenheim-Lauterpacht, Volume II; page 468); that the annexation of Ethiopia by Italy was recognised by most Governments de jure and by all the Governments de facto; and that the later events (the recognition of Ethiopia as a free and independent state by the United Kingdom Government in 1942) did not amount to a reversal of the position brought about in 1936, and are therefore not irreconcilable with the proposition that the 1935-1936 War between Italy and Ethiopia was a war different from the Second World War.

6. The question now arises whether this proposition has in any way been affected by the present Peace Treaty with Italy in view of the fact that its provisions entailing the responsibility of Italy and their nationals towards Ethiopia become applicable as from October 3, 1935. In other words, the

question is - which war is ended by this Treaty?

In the preamble to the Treaty, it is stated that "Italy under the Fascist régime became a party to the Tripartite Pact with Germany and Japan, undertook a war of aggression and thereby provoked a state of war with all the Allied and Associated Powers and with other United Nations, and bears her share of responsibility for the war".

From the above declaration looked upon in connection with the fact that the Tripartite Pact between Germany, Italy and Japan was formally concluded in 1939, and also in view of the fact that for the rest, the preamble rehearses the main events of Italy's war career since 1939 only, it would appear that the Treaty with Italy will end only the present War, and not any other War in addition, and that therefore there is no direct connection between the two Wars.

In support of this view, it may also be mentioned that the Commentary on the Treaty, while commenting on the territorial clauses, explains that Italy's frontiers in Europe will, with some exceptions, remain the same as before the outbreak of war. This, taken together with the fact that the relevant provisions speak of the frontiers as they existed formerly 1, 1938, indicates that the war with which the present Treaty is concerned is the war which broke out in 1939.

7. The question why Ethiopia is then a party to the present Peace Treaty with Italy is to be explained by the following reasons.

Since a treaty of peace is considered a final settlement of war, its aims lies not only in a restoration of conditions of peace and in a resumption of peaceful intercourse between the former belligerents, but also in the disposal of territorial possessions of the vanquished, as desired by the victor, and in the settlement of all other questions outstanding between the parties at the time of the conclusion of the treaty.

Thus, the Treaty with Italy is also concerned with the settlement of all questions still outstanding as a result of the events brought about since 1939 ("will settle questions still outstanding as a result of the events hereinbefore recited", the Preamble, paragraph 4).

To the questions still outstanding as a result of the events brought about since 1939 belongs also the case of Ethiopia. Since her subjugation and annexation by Italy in 1936, a new situation occurred during the present war: in 1942 she has regained her freedom and independence, has been recognised as a free and independent state by the United Kingdom Government; and concluded with the latter a Military Convention in which she agreed to certain provisions "in order as an Ally to contribute to the effective prosecution of the War".

This new situation required that Ethiopia should be formally recognised as a sovereign and independent state also by Italy as her former conqueror, and this will be put into effect by the provision embodied in Article 33 by which "Italy recognises and undertakes to respect the sovereignty and independence of the state of Ethiopia".

Consequently, the main concern of the other Treaty provisions regarding Ethiopia is thus only "the extinction of rights acquired by Italy as a result of her aggression in Ethiopia" (see the Commentary), and her

subsequent subjugation and annexation. It is also quite clear that such provisions must at the same time entail certain obligations on the part of Italy and Italian nationals towards Ethiopia. To this type of provisions belongs also the special political clause contained in Article 38. The fact that this article puts back the date from which the provisions should be applicable to a time substantially preceding the outbreak of the present war is not an isolated one, and cannot be construed to the effect that thereby the present Treaty will also end the 1935-1936 War. There are many more similar cases in the Treaty in regard to other matters such as for instance the extinction of rights acquired by Italy from her position as one of the principal Allied and Associated Powers at the last Peace Settlement, i.e., concluded after the First World War, or in the case of special interests of China in which case the Treaty goes even as far back as September 7, 1901.

III.

8. From the foregoing it appears that the question whether or not the terms of reference of the Commission are to be construed to the effect that they only cover war crimes committed during the present war, still remains to be not a question of law, but that of policy.

In the official Commentary to the Peace Treaty, the following is said regarding the provisions dealing with war criminals in general as they have been embodied in Article 45:

"The United Nations have concluded certain agreements between themselves for the bringing to justice of war criminals. Italy, once the Peace Treaty comes into force, would be under no obligation to assist in this matter. Provision is thus made in Article 45 that she should assist in the apprehension and surrender both of war criminals and Quislings".

The "certain agreements" which the United Nations have concluded between themselves are probably the London Agreement of 8th August, 1945; the Agreement establishing the United Nations War Crimes Commission, of 20th October, 1943; and the Declarations and Agreements regarding the administration of Germany and Austria, including such documents as the Control Council Law No. 10.

At the same time, by special provision laid down in Article 38 the general provisions of Article 45 have been made applicable with retrospective effect to war crimes, crimes against peace, crimes against humanity, committed during the Italo-Abyssinian War of 1935-1936.

According to Article 45 "all the Powers and the United Nations concerned can avail themselves of the rights accorded to them in respect of war criminals by direct action towards the Italian Government, and only in cases of disagreement concerning the application of the provisions of this article the matter must be referred to the Ambassadors in Rome of the 4 Powers, who will reach agreement with regard to the difficulty.

But, it is submitted, the terms of reference of the 4

Ambassadors are limited only to disagreements which might arise over the apprehension and surrender for trial of persons wanted, i.e. only over the technical question of extradition, and not over all other questions which might be involved. Thus a very important issue as to who will decide on the question which of the persons wanted should be regarded as war criminals and which not, has been left open in the Treaty.

From this point of view, a two-fold important discrimination between Ethiopia and all other nations concerned will at once occur. Firstly, all nations, except Ethiopia, while submitting to the Italian Government their requests for extradition, will have not only Article 45 behind them, but also the moral support of the United Nations War Crimes Commission as an international body with which they are listing Italian war criminals. Secondly, the Ethiopian Government will acquire a privileged position as against all other nations, as it will be calling upon the Italian Government to act only upon ex parte statements, a possibility which undoubtedly will not be in the interest of the international community.

9. As the original terms of reference of the Commission agreed upon on 20th October 1943 do not contain any express limitation to the effect that war crimes committed prior to the beginning of the present War should be excluded from the Commission's jurisdiction, it appears that the question of its jurisdiction over war crimes committed in Ethiopia in 1935-1936 is still open for decision by the member Governments of the Commission.

P.T.O.

ANNEX.

Final text of the provisions of the Peace Treaty with Italy
regarding Ethiopia.

SECTION VII. ETHIOPIA.

Article 33

Italy recognises and undertakes to respect the sovereignty and independence of the State of Ethiopia.

Article 34

Italy formally renounces in favour of Ethiopia all property (apart from normal diplomatic or consular premises), rights, interests and advantages of all kinds acquired at any time in Ethiopia by the Italian State, as well as all para-statal property as defined in paragraph I of Annex XIV of the present Treaty.

Italy also renounces all claims to special interests or influence in Ethiopia.

Article 35

Italy recognises the legality of all measures which the Government of Ethiopia has taken or may hereafter take in order to annul Italian measures respecting Ethiopia taken after October 3, 1935, and the effects of such measures.

Article 36

Italian nationals in Ethiopia will enjoy the same juridical status as other foreign nationals, but Italy recognises the legality of all measures of the Ethiopian Government annulling or modifying concessions or special rights granted to Italian nationals, provided such measures are taken within a year from the coming into force of the present Treaty.

Article 37

Within eighteen months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, Italy shall restore all works of art, religious objects, archives and objects of historical value belonging to Ethiopia or its nationals and removed from Ethiopia to Italy since October 3, 1935.

Article 38

The date from which the provisions of the present Treaty shall become applicable as regards all measures and acts of any kind whatsoever entailing the responsibility of Italy or of Italian nationals towards Ethiopia, shall be held to be October 3, 1935.

The present Document supersedes Document I/80
issued on 10th February,
1947.

I/81.
13th February, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.

COMMITTEE I.

Submission of Charges by Ethiopia.

Commission's Jurisdiction over Crimes committed in
Ethiopia.

Note by Dr. J. Litawski, Legal Officer.

(Revised).

I.

1. Since Document I/76 was circulated, the final text of the Peace Treaty with Italy has been published (Command Paper 7022). Simultaneously an official Commentary on this Treaty has also been made public (Command Paper 7026).

As compared with the Draft Peace Treaty, the final text of that instrument contains a new and additional provision concerning Ethiopia, which has an important bearing on the question of Ethiopia's right to prosecute Italian nationals responsible for war crimes committed in that country during the 1935-36 war.

The relevant provision, Article 38, reads as follows:-

"The date from which the provisions of the present Treaty shall become applicable as regards all measures and acts of any kind whatsoever entailing the responsibility of Italy or of Italian nationals towards Ethiopia, shall be held to be October 3, 1935".

The full text of the provisional provisions regarding Ethiopia, as contained in the Treaty, is reproduced in the Annex.

2. The provisions dealing with Italy's obligations regarding the apprehension and surrender of war criminals in general are set forth in Article 45 of the Treaty which reads:-

"1. Italy shall take all necessary steps to ensure the

apprehension and surrender for trial of:

(a) Persons accused of having committed, ordered or abetted war crimes and crimes against peace or humanity;

(b) Nationals of any Allied or Associated Power accused of having violated their national law by treason or collaboration with the enemy during the war.

"2. At the request of the United Nations Government concerned, Italy shall likewise make available as witnesses persons within its jurisdiction, whose evidence is required for the trial of the persons referred to in paragraph I of this Article.

"3. Any disagreement concerning the application of the provisions of paragraphs I and 2 of this Article shall be referred by any of the Governments concerned to the Ambassadors in Rome of the Soviet Union, of the United Kingdom, of the United States of America, and of France, who will reach agreement with regard to the difficulty".

3. In view of the fact that Article 38 speaks of "all measures and acts of any kind whatsoever" it is clear that also the provisions dealing with war criminals in general (Article 45) are necessarily included among the measures entailing the responsibility of Italy or of Italian nationals.

Since Ethiopia is one of the Allied and Associated Powers, parties to the Treaty, and since Article 45 does not contain any reservation or limitation as to those of the Allied and Associated Powers or of the United Nations which will be entitled to request from Italy the apprehension and surrender of war criminals, it follows that Ethiopia will have the right to demand the extradition of any Italian "accused of having committed, ordered or abetted war crimes and crimes against peace or humanity" in Ethiopia during the 1935-36 Italo-Abyssinian War.

II.

4. In the Meeting of Committee I held on 30th January, 1947, the question arose whether Article 38 thus read in conjunction with Article 45, does not require the Commission to modify its resolution of 31st July 1946 on the question of the Commission's jurisdiction over war crimes committed in Ethiopia during the 1935-36 Italo-Abyssinian War (Document C.217), (reproduced in Document I/76).

As the Commission's resolution was based on the assumption

that no direct connection exists between the Italo-Abyssinian War and the present War, it is necessary to examine first the question whether the present Treaty has any bearing on that proposition.

5. This question had already been discussed at some length in Document III/50 of 23rd July, 1946, at the time when the Commission was called upon for the first time to consider the question of its jurisdiction over crimes committed in Ethiopia in 1935-36.

It was pointed out in that Document that, prior to 1939, it was generally understood that the Italo-Abyssinian War had been concluded by the debellatio of Ethiopia (see also Oppenheim-Lauterpacht, Volume II; page 468); that the annexation of Ethiopia by Italy was recognised by most Governments de jure and by all the Governments de facto; and that the subsequent events (the recognition of Ethiopia as a free and independent state by the United Kingdom Government in 1942, etc.) did not amount to a complete and unqualified reversal, with retrospective effect, of the position brought about in 1936, and are therefore not irreconcilable with the proposition that the 1935-36 War between Italy and Ethiopia was a war different from the Second World War.

6. The question now arises whether this proposition has been in any way affected by the present Peace Treaty with Italy in view of the fact that its provisions entailing the responsibility of Italy and their nationals towards Ethiopia will become applicable as from October 3, 1935. In other words, the question is - which is the war that is terminated by this Treaty?

In the Preamble to the Treaty, it is stated as follows:
"Whereas Italy under the Fascist régime became a party to the Tripartite Pact with Germany and Japan, undertook a war of aggression and thereby provoked a state of war with all the Allied and Associated Powers and with other United Nations, and bears her share of responsibility for the war ..."

From the above declaration taken in conjunction with the fact that the Tripartite Pact between Germany, Italy and Japan was formally concluded in 1939, and also in view of the fact that for the rest, the Preamble rehearses the main events of Italy's war career since 1939 only, it would appear that the parties have agreed that the Treaty with Italy will terminate the present War only, and not any other War in addition.

In support of this view, it may also be mentioned that the Commentary on the Treaty, while commenting on the territorial clauses, explains that Italy's frontiers in Europe will, with some exceptions, remain the same as before the outbreak of war. This comment, taken in conjunction with the fact that the relevant provisions speak of the frontiers as they existed on January 1, 1938, also indicates that the war with which the present Treaty is concerned is the war which broke out in 1939.

7. The question why in these circumstances Ethiopia is a party to the present Peace Treaty with Italy is to be explained by the following reasons.

Since a treaty of peace is considered as the final settlement of a war, its aims comprise not only the restoration of conditions of peace and the resumption of peaceful intercourse between the former belligerents, but also the settlement of territorial questions and of all other questions outstanding between the parties at the time of the conclusion of the treaty.

Accordingly, the Treaty with Italy is also concerned with the settlement of all questions still outstanding as a result of the events brought about since 1939. (The Preamble states in paragraph 4 that the Parties "will settle questions still outstanding as a result of the events hereinbefore recited").

The questions still outstanding as a result of the events brought about since 1939 include also that of Ethiopia. Since her subjugation and annexation by Italy in 1936, a new situation had been created during the present war: in 1942 Ethiopia regained her freedom and independence, and has agreed as an Ally to contribute to the effective prosecution of the war.

This new situation required that Ethiopia should be formally recognised as a sovereign and independent state also by Italy as her former conqueror, and this requirement will be satisfied by the provision in Article 33 by which "Italy recognises and undertakes to respect the sovereignty and independence of the State of Ethiopia".

Consequently, the main concern of the other Treaty provisions regarding Ethiopia is "the extinction of rights acquired by Italy as a result of her aggression in Ethiopia" and of her subsequent subjugation and annexation. It is manifest that such provisions must, at the same time, entail, with retrospective effect, certain obligations and responsibilities on the part of Italy and Italian nationals towards Ethiopia. The mere fact, however, that Article 38 puts back the date from which these obligations will be effective to a time substantially preceding the actual outbreak of the present war cannot be interpreted to the effect that thereby a direct connection between the two wars has unambiguously been established.

III.

8. From the foregoing it appears that the question of the Commission's jurisdiction over war crimes committed in Ethiopia during the 1935-36 Italo-Abyssinian War, viz. the question whether or not the terms of reference of the Commission are to be construed to the effect that they only cover war crimes committed during the present war, continues to be not so much a question of law as that of policy.

In the official Commentary to the Peace Treaty, the following is stated regarding the provisions dealing with war criminals, in general, as embodied in Article 45:

"The United Nations have concluded certain agreements between themselves for the bringing to justice of war criminals. Italy, once the Peace Treaty comes into force, would be under no obligation to assist in this matter. Provision is thus made in Article 45 that she should assist in the apprehension and surrender both of war criminals and Quislings".

The "certain agreements" which the United Nations have concluded between themselves are probably the London Agreement of 8th August, 1945; the Agreement establishing the United Nations War Crimes Commission, of 20th October, 1943; and the Declarations and Agreements regarding the administration of Germany and Austria, including such documents as the Control Council Law No. 10.

At the same time, by a general clause inserted in Article 38, the general provisions of Article 45 have been made applicable, with retrospective effect, to war crimes, crimes against peace and crimes against humanity, committed during the Italo-Abyssinian War of 1935-36.

According to Article 45 all the Powers and the United Nations concerned can avail themselves of the rights accorded to them in respect of war criminals by direct action towards the Italian Government, and only in cases of disagreement concerning the application of the provisions of this article, the matter must be referred to the Ambassadors in Rome of the Four Powers, who "will reach agreement with regard to the difficulty".

But, it is submitted, the terms of reference of the Four Ambassadors are limited to disagreements which might arise in regard to the apprehension and surrender for trial of wanted persons, i.e. they apply only to technical questions of extradition, and not to all other matters which might be involved. Thus, a very important question as to who will decide which of the persons wanted should, or should not, be regarded as war criminals, has been left open.

In respect of this particular question an important two-fold discrimination between Ethiopia and all other nations concerned is at once apparent. On the one hand, all the nations concerned, except Ethiopia, when submitting to the Italian Government their requests for extradition, will have behind them not only Article 45, but also the moral support of the United Nations War Crimes Commission, as an international body, which is called upon to investigate and decide in each individual case whether a prima facie case of a war crime has been established by the Government concerned, and with which body these nations have been listing, inter alia, Italian war criminals. On the other hand, the Ethiopian Government will acquire a privileged position as compared with all the other nations, for it will be calling upon the Italian Government to act solely upon ex parte statements.

9. As the original terms of reference of the Commission agreed upon on 20th October, 1943, (see Document III/50), do not contain any express limitation to the effect that war crimes committed prior to the beginning of the present War should be excluded from the Commission's jurisdiction, it appears that the question of its jurisdiction over war crimes committed in Ethiopia in 1935-36 is still open for decision by the member Governments of the Commission.

(See page 6 for the Annex).

Final text of the provisions of the Peace Treaty with Italy regarding Ethiopia.

(Political Clauses).

SECTION VII. ETHIOPIA.

Article 33.

Italy recognises and undertakes to respect the sovereignty and independence of the State of Ethiopia.

Article 34.

Italy formally renounces in favour of Ethiopia all property (apart from normal diplomatic or consular premises), rights, interests and advantages of all kinds acquired at any time in Ethiopia by the Italian State, as well as all para-statal property as defined in paragraph I of Annex XIV of the present Treaty.

Italy also renounces all claims to special interests or influence in Ethiopia.

Article 35.

Italy recognises the legality of all measures which the Government of Ethiopia has taken or may hereafter take in order to annul Italian measures respecting Ethiopia taken after October 3, 1935, and the effects of such measures.

Article 36.

Italian nationals in Ethiopia will enjoy the same juridical status as other foreign nationals, but Italy recognises the legality of all measures of the Ethiopian Government annulling or modifying concessions or special rights granted to Italian nationals, provided such measures are taken within a year from the coming into force of the present Treaty.

Article 37.

Within eighteen months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, Italy shall restore all works of art, religious objects, archives and objects of historical value belonging to Ethiopia or its nationals and removed from Ethiopia to Italy since October 3, 1935.

Article 38.

The date from which the provisions of the present Treaty shall become applicable as regards all measures and acts of any kind whatsoever entailing the responsibility of Italy or of Italian nationals towards Ethiopia, shall be held to be October 3, 1935.

I/82.

24th February, 1947.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION.

COMMITTEE I.

Deliberate Bombardment of Undefended Places.

Note by Dr. J. Litawski,
Legal Officer.

In connection with the request received from the Far Eastern and Pacific Sub-Commission concerning the war crime of "deliberate bombardment of undefended places" (see Document III/77), and in particular with the question under (c) contained in the above request, the following material as to

- 1) charges filed with the Commission and alleging the above mentioned crime,

and

- 2) decisions and rulings of Committee I in the respective cases -

is circulated for information of, and consideration by, Committee III, in conjunction with Document III/78.

It is to be noted that Committee I has not had the opportunity to give its authorisation to the formulation of its rulings relating to the matter under consideration, as attempted in Section II of this Document.

I.

The following is a compilation of material information as contained in the cases submitted by the National Offices.

FRENCH CASES.

437. In July 1944, a Wehrmacht artillery detachment bombarded by way of reprisal a French village, because a F.F.I. unit refused to hand over some German prisoners captured by them.

The accused have also been charged with wanton destruction and pillage.

The case was accepted on 10.1.45.

498. This case is identical with case 437.

The case was accepted on 31.1.45.

1177. In September, 1944, a French town was bombarded by German artillery by way of reprisal because three German soldiers had been disarmed by members of a F.F.I. unit. Considerable damage was caused and 23 persons killed and wounded.

The case was accepted on 1.8.45.

1351. In June 1944 a French village was bombed by German air force by way of reprisal for an attack by a F.F.I. unit on a car with a German interpreter.

20% of the houses were destroyed, 40% damaged, and 10 persons killed.

The accused have also been charged with wanton destruction of property, pillage and deportation of civilians.

The case was accepted on 29.8.45.

1946. In September 1944, a French village was bombarded by German artillery by way of reprisal, because 7 German soldiers had been taken prisoner by a F.F.I. unit.

The accused have also been charged with wanton destruction of property, pillage, and torture.

The case was accepted on 6.12.45.

1956. In July 1944, a French hameau was bombarded by German artillery by way of reprisal for an attack on German soldiers by a partisan unit.

Small damage was caused and one person killed.

The case was accepted on 6.12.45.,.

2078. In June, 1944, a German artillery unit bombarded a French château in which a maquis detachment was stationed.

The case as regards this particular charge was not accepted.

2259. In August 1944 in view of the approaching Allied forces a German C.O. decided to defend a French town to the last. After the actual contact between the two forces had been established, and also during the subsequent siege he issued orders to destroy large parts of the town. This was carried out by way of heavy artillery bombardment from a nearby fortress.. Considerable destruction was caused, part of which was effected during a suspension of arms and was not necessitated by military reasons. Buildings dedicated to public worship, historic monuments etc. were not spared.

The case was accepted on 28.2.46. with the reservation

498. This case is identical with case 437.

The case was accepted on 31.1.45.

1177. In September, 1944, a French town was bombed by German artillery by way of reprisal because three German soldiers had been disarmed by members of a F.F.I. unit.

Considerable damage was caused and 23 persons killed and wounded.

The case was accepted on 1.8.45.

1351. In June 1944 a French village was bombed by German air force by way of reprisal for an attack by a F.F.I. unit on a car with a German interpreter.

20% of the houses were destroyed, 40% damaged, and 10 persons killed.

The accused have also been charged with wanton destruction of property, pillage and deportation of civilians.

The case was accepted on 29.8.45.

1946. In September 1944, a French village was bombed by German artillery by way of reprisal, because 7 German soldiers had been taken prisoner by a F.F.I. unit.

The accused have also been charged with wanton destruction of property, pillage, and torture.

The case was accepted on 6.12.45.

1956. In July 1944, a French hamlet was bombed by German artillery by way of reprisal for an attack on German soldiers by a partisan unit.

Small damage was caused and one person killed.

The case was accepted on 6.12.45.

2078. In June, 1944, a German artillery unit bombarded a French chateau in which a maquis detachment was stationed.

The case as regards this particular charge was not accepted.

2259. In August 1944 in view of the approaching Allied forces a German C.O. decided to defend a French town to the last. After the actual contact between the two forces had been established, and also during the subsequent siege he issued orders to destroy large parts of the town. This was carried out by way of heavy artillery bombardment from a nearby fortress. Considerable destruction was caused, part of which was effected during a suspension of arms and was not necessitated by military reasons. Buildings dedicated to public worship, historic monuments etc. were not spared.

The case was accepted on 28.2.46. with the reservation

that the Committee consider as criminal only those instructions issued by the C.O. which resulted in wanton destruction of buildings, not necessitated by the defence of the town.

3489. In September, 1944, during a combat between a F.F.I. unit and a German detachment the latter opened artillery fire on a village.

The case was not accepted.

4000. As the charge of deliberate bombardment was not substantiated by any particulars the case in regard to this count was not accepted.

4226. This case as far as it deals with deliberate bombardment was not accepted for the same reason as case 4000.

4293. This case concerns, inter alia, an aerial bombardment, carried out by the Germans during a large scale military operation against the Maquis.

The case with regard to this charge was not accepted.

YUGOSLAV CASES.

1003. In May, 1943, an Italian artillery unit opened fire on a Yugoslav village as they suspected that some partisan units were stationed there. "This suspicion was incorrect". The village suffered extensive damage, several persons were killed and seriously wounded.

The accused have also been charged with murder and systematic terrorism.

The case was accepted on 11.7.45.

1010. In July, 1942, an Italian unit of frontier guard shelled a Yugoslav village during a massacre carried out against its inhabitants. No particulars available.

The accused have also been charged with a number of other crimes.

The case was accepted on 11.7.45.

1145. In September and December, 1943, the Italian air force bombed three Yugoslav villages. There were no military objectives in any of the villages, nor were any units of the National Liberation Army present therein. The bombing resulted in the death of 2 persons and in the destruction of several houses.

The accused have also been charged with murder and systematic terrorism.

The case was accepted on 1.8.45.

1161. In June to July, 1942, several Yugoslav villages were completely wiped out, inter alia, by aerial bombardment. This was carried out by the Italian air force during the so-called systematic "liquidation" action directed against a number of inhabited places in the mountains.

The accused have also been charged with murder, systematic terrorism and wanton destruction of property.

The case was accepted on 1.8.45.

3118. In July, 1943, "an Italian squadron bombed the undefended village of Sosici, in Slovenia, and completely destroyed several buildings and damaged others. 16 bombs of 12 kg and 4 bombs of 50 kg were dropped. They fired 600 rounds of machine gun ammunition at the inhabitants in order to terrorise them, in spite of the fact that the village was undefended and on occupied territory."

In order to substantiate the above statement, the Yugoslav National Office submitted a certificate issued by the Operative Department, H.Q., IV Army, Democratic Federative Yugoslavia, stating that there was no concentration of troops in the localities on the days specified, nor were there any military objectives in the villages or their neighbourhood.

The case was accepted on 26.9.46, but it was decided to list the accused for murder and not for deliberate bombardment, as submitted by the National Office.

The reasons for which Committee I has changed the original legal qualification have not been recorded.

3120.) These cases are similar to the preceding case 3118.

3121.)

3123.)

3127.)

Same decision as in case 3118 taken on the same day.

3546. In March, 1942, an Italian unit bombarded a Yugoslav village by artillery fire. No other particulars to substantiate this charge have been given.

The case in regard to this count was not accepted as from other particulars of the case it appeared that the bombardment was presumably carried out during military operations against the partisan units.

TO SECTION II.

II.

From the foregoing it appears that only a small number of cases alleging deliberate bombardment of undefended places has been submitted to the Commission by the National Offices. All this material is limited only to: a) bombardment of places during the military operations on land, and b) aerial bombardment. No cases alleging deliberate naval bombardment of undefended places have been notified to the Commission.

Although the instances of the bombardment referred to in Section I occurred during the military operations, it is, however, to be noted that all of them, except that recorded under 2259, were carried out not as a part of a real war in the technical sense of the term, but only after one of the belligerents had succeeded in occupying the territory of the other belligerent, and after the occupation of the latter's territory had been fully effected.

While acting upon the individual charges, Committee I made a distinction between two types of cases:

- a). Cases where the alleged bombardment was carried out during the military operations directed either against the authorised irregular forces, or the partisan or guerilla units of the occupied country; or against the buildings occupied by such forces or units.

Cases of this type were not accepted on the ground that the bombardment was directed against places containing military objectives, be it, as they were, the armed forces consisting of the inhabitants of the occupied country.

- b). Cases where the alleged bombardment was carried out against apparently peaceful civilian population and constituted an act of reprisal for the acts of warfare committed by members of the armed forces indicated sub a), a reprisal to which the occupying power resorted to in an illegitimate and indiscriminate application of the measure of collective responsibility, or which was carried out for the purpose of terrorising the population.

Cases of this type were accepted, on the ground that the bombardment was deliberate and directed against places containing no military objectives, and thus constituted a violation of the laws and customs of war.

See Note with Doc 75

for distribution
of this Doc.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED
CONFIDENTIAL

I/83
25th February 1947.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION

COMMITTEE I

GENERAL MARINOV'S CASE

The following further evidence against General MARINOV, submitted by the Greek Representative on the Commission, is circulated to members of Committee I for their information and consideration at its next Meeting:

- I. Copy of Document AP/3325/A1/1 issued by the Greek General Staff.
- II. Examination on Oath of witness Elias Alexopoulos Major of the Greek General Staff.
- III. Examination on Oath of witness Ivan Ivanof Gologanof, Colonel of the Bulgarian Army.
- IV. Examination of Oath of Major of Gendarmorie LOLA Peters.
- V. Statement on the examination under Oath of witness Const. Bonia.
- VI. Sworn-in statement of witness Demou Evanghellou.
- VII. Sworn-in statement of witness Olga Nasis.

I

Copy of Document AP/3325/A1/1 issued by the Greek General Staff, - 12-2-47.

Subject: Chief of 15th Bulgarian Division MARINOFF.

General Army Staff/
SECRET.

To: Hellenic National Bureau for War Crimes.

GAS/AP.3325/A1/1

CONFIDENTIAL

In reply to your document under No. 172 current year, we have the honour to bring to your knowledge the following:

1) On your first question, being: "Whether, from order No. 1-17 dated the 11-1-1944 of the Bulgarian Army Staff, it derives that the Chief of the 15th Bulgarian Division MARINOFF had been alienated completely from the Command of the Detachments of his Division who in conjunction with German Detachments executed the war enterprise specified in said Order."

That the Bulgarian Ministry of War - Army Staff - having ordered as they did for the use of Units of the 15th Bulgarian Division by the German Command, it is impossible not to have communicated this Order to the Commander of this Division. The assumption that this Order to the Commander of the 15th Division has purposely disappeared from the records of Orders of this Division which have been deposited cannot be excluded, or it may be that, in the communicated copy of the Ministry's Order as above, the 15th Division has been purposely omitted as a receiver of the Order. We therefore consider the Commander of this Division as a receiver of the Order to use his troops, and consequently as being in knowledge of this Order. We base this on the fact that it is not possible for the Commander of the Division to remain unmoved at the departure of his Detachments without these latter reporting to him, when all events the Commander of the Division should have received knowledge of the Order by which his Detachments remove, at the moment of their departure.

2) On your second question, being: "Whether it is possible and militarily understandable for the Commander of a Division to be ignorant of the activities of his Division troops in the execution of a Military Order entrusted to him, and thus for him to be irresponsible for the acts committed by his the Detachments belonging to his Division, by violating the international laws of Military warfare".

That the Commander of the 15th Division is responsible for the activities of the detached troops of his Division, as all the Military Regulations and the very logical sequence impose that the Commander of a Division keeps the material and moral liaison of the detached troops of his Division even go when it is question of military war enterprises notwithstanding the fact that these detachments are under foreign Command. It is not understandable that a Commander of a Division is indifferent for the life of his soldiers who continue to be under his Command for Administrative matters even more of ethical ones. Therefore, the Commander did receive or in any case had received knowledge of the activities on the whole ^{and} of the life in general of his temporarily detached troops. Hence the responsibility for the activities on the whole of his such troops. If he did not act as above, he should not be considered as a worthy Commander of a Division in which case he may have shown any indifference he liked to his men.

THE
DIRECTOR AI/G. A. S.

Seal (Signature)

A TRUE SERVICE COPY

Athens the 13th of February 1947.

The Secretary of the Hellenic National Bureau for War Crimes.

31/

II

Examination on Oath of witness Elias Alexopoulos, Major of the Greek General Staff.

Athens: February 10, 1947.

Question: What's your name etc.

Answer: ALEXOPOULOS, Elias, son of Christo, Major of Artillery, I was born at Calavryta and I am living in Athens, 12 ~~Valaoritou~~ Str. I am aged 39 and I am an Orthodox Christian.

Question: Do you know and are you a relative of

Answer:

Here, the witness under examination swore on the Holy Bible in accordance with and in virtue of article 124 of the Penal Procedure in case of his being prevented from appearing before the court.

Before the witness was laid the order of the War Office (Gen. Staff of the Bulgarian Army) under No. 1-17 of the 11th January 1944, and was asked if it appears from this order that the C.O. of the 15th Bulgarian Division MARINOV had entirely given up the Commandment of the Detachments of his region, which in cooperation of similar German detachments executed the military operation fixed by this order.

Answer: From this order it is clearly apparent, that after previous arrangement with the Highest German Command, in this case the German Commandant of the Salonica and Aegean Area and the High Bulgarian Command, i.e. the General Staff of the Bulgarian Army, it was decided to execute a military operation the objective of which was to clear up a certain area of Greek Macedonia from the Greek partisans. According to agreement the operation was entrusted to two military detachments, one of German and one of Bulgarian troops. The direction of the operations was entrusted to the German General Fluschat. The powers of the Command of the German General, over the two detachments according to the accepted international Military rules was restricted to the preparation of the plan of operation and its execution. For all other matters the detachments under the a.m. General, continue to keep also during the operations their own commanding hierarchy and dependence. A consequence of the above principle is that anything which is outside the execution of the plan of operations

concerns exclusively and only the Command of the detachment and the chiefs of hierarchical order of each detachment, with the additional explanation that even the contravention of the military order as far as control and sanctions are concerned, belong to the hierarchical chiefs as any contravention of the Military Laws and rules. In the order of the Bulgarian General Staff, we have in view, the composition of the group of the Bulgarian Forces which took part in the operations/fixed. All the detachments of the Bulgarian Army which compose this group conventionally called "X" belong to the organisation of the 15th Division to which, it appears, this order was not communicated, neither is it otherwise apparent, how the Artillery Regiment of the 15th Division could be order or advised that one of its Batteries was to be at the disposal of group "X". Also this order which was communicated to the Commanding Officers of the 45th and 54th Infantry Regiments and the C.O. of the 5th Army in between the C.O. of the 15th Division is omitted, this order does not appear to have been communicated to him. All the above are not only militarily unadmissible but also logically it cannot be upheld, for the reason that any movement of any detachment of a Division is not militarily comprehensible without the knowledge of the C.O. of the Division, but it is not clear who was responsible for the transmission of this order of the Bulgarian General Staff to the Artillery Regiment of the 15th Division. These only prove that the order we have in view is probably defective (in copying) or counterfeited. Anyway from the whole spirit of the order it appears without the slightest doubt, that this order has been duly communicated to the C.O. of the 15th Division and he, according the right military perception, is the man responsible to the Bulgarian General Staff for the execution of this order, which in fact concerns detachments of his own Division only. The Bulgarian General Staff orders, by their order we have in view, the daily submission of reports relating to the progress of the operations. In this order the manner of submission of these reports is not settled, and that because, according to the military rules, the submission of reports follows the hierarchical degrees. In certain cases it is possible to infringe the hierarchy, but this must be mentioned without fail in the order. In this instance the hierarchy is: the C.O. of the 15th Division - C.O. of the 5th Army - Bulgarian General Staff. Consequently the C.O. of the 15th Division was receiving daily reports from the officer at the head of the Group "X" Colonel Tzanef relative to the evolution and progress of the operations and facts generally.

The C.O. of the 15th Division having completed those reports according to his lights submitted them to the C.O. of the 5th Army.

Question: Since this is the meaning contained in the order of the Bulgarian General Staff, placed before us, is it militarily possible for the C.O. of the 15th Division to be in ignorance of the doings of the detachments of his Division, in the execution of the military order entrusted to him, and thus be held not responsible for the doings, in transgression of the internationally lawful execution of military operations, of the detachments belonging to his Division?

Answer: The answer to your question has been given immediately and quite clearly in answering the first question. But since you put me this question explicitly I am obliged to report that the C.O. of the 15th Division, has not stopped even for a moment to exercise the command on the detachments of his Division, composing Group "X". Consequently he had to, and he surely followed his above detachments in their every movement and was informed at every moment of the state of his detachments, with regard to the discipline, supplies, state of health and wants generally. Moreover he was obliged and surely he must have organized a system of transmission of information of the general state of these detachments and the evolution and progress of the operations. Surely every contravention of the international law and military rules would be brought to the notice of the C.O. of the Division and he would have exercised the proper control and imposed the due sanctions for every deviation, if he were doing his duty scrupulously. Resuming my reply to your above question, I answer that it is not militarily comprehensible that the C.O. of the Division has not been informed of the accidental transgressions of the international law and consequently if such acts have been committed, and the C.O. of the Division omitted to impose the due sanctions, he has failed in his military duty. I have nothing to add, Read and confirmed,

The Witness

The Examining Magistrate

The Secretary.

A TRUE SERVICE COPY
ATHENS, FEBRUARY 14, 1947, The Secretary,
N. RAPTIS.

III

Examination on Oath of witness Iven Ivanof Gologanof, Colonel of the Bulgarian Army.

In Piraeus and in Hadji Kyria Keion Prison the 5th February 1947.

Question: Your name etc.

The witness declared here that he does not speak Greek but speaks Bulgarian, following which we appointed as interpreter Anastasios Anastasiou, Lieutenant of the Greek General Staff who, taking the oath on the Holy Bible according to the law swore that he would faithfully translate the Bulgarian text into Greek and vice versa.

Reply. Ivan Ivanof Gologanof, I was born in Acro-Sochori of Siderocastron (Krovassovon) and live in Sofia. I am 48 years of age, an orthodox Christian, Colonel of Army Justice.

Herewith the witness swore on the Holy Bible, according to article 124 of the Penal Procedure, in the event of his non-appearance in the courts.

Question: Do you know if etc. (he was accordingly asked)

Answer: I was obliged to cross the Greek frontier from Bulgaria because after the Communists dominated my country I was in danger of my life, not for any other reason but that of contrary political opinion. Together with many other military and civilians after the domination of the Communists in Bulgaria we were forced to take to the mountains where we remained 16 months and in the end on the 3rd November 1946 I was forced to cross the Greek frontier, as stated above, and the following day, on the 4th November, I gave myself up to the police. During the war I served as Legal Advisor of Civil Mobilization with Sofia as headquarters. During the course of the war I went twice to Monastir and Skopia, travelling on leave in October 1942 and August 1943. At Monastir I met the then C.O. of the 15th Division, well known and friend of mine, General Marinof (Lt. General) Ivan. I met him simply and as was natural we did not discuss service or general political matters, and even if we did discuss them I do not remember now because I paid no attention to the discussions. General Marinof when the Government of Moravief was formed in Bulgaria on the 2nd September 1944, took over the Ministry of War; after the fall of Moravief and the taking over by Georgiev, who also declared war against Germany, General Marinof took over the Command of the Bulgarian army up to approximately June 1945, when he took over the General inspection of the army after that was posted as Ambassador in Paris. So far as I know before and during the war, officers, of the Bulgarian army did not belong to particular political parties, with the Governments of Moravief and then Georgiev however the greater part were attached to particular political parties. I am not aware personally or from official communications or documents whether the Bulgarian Government was practising propaganda in Western Macedonia (Greek Macedonia) for political aims. I cannot however conceal that the opinion was spread that Bulgaria was seeking the annexation of Western Macedonia to Bulgaria and it followed naturally enough that she used appropriate means of propaganda necessary for the success of this purpose. I know that in Marinof's Division at Monastir, Colonel Tsanef (also personally known to me) was serving under his orders, but I do not know if at the beginning of 1944 Tsanef, together with his regiment, was ordered to enter the Florina area which, at the time, was held by the Germans. Colonel Tsanef is a very educated officer and he was considered competent to bring discipline to his regiment. Consequently, if Tsanef's regiment during his stay in Florina area, took to successive and continued acts of violence burning villages, killing people etc. things which I am unable to ascertain, since I do not know of them, I must admit that these acts took place, with the knowledge of Tsanef, because it is not possible for me to refute that when Tsanef first had knowledge of them he would not be able to stop them and establish discipline in his regiment. As I imagine, in every army, so it is in the Bulgarian, when one section of the army is ordered either by the Ministry of War or the General Staff to act independently or to be attached to another military unit, the General Staff will issue orders to the General in Command. Further, this last General in Command will give detailed orders to the officer at the head of the unit which is detached which general and detailed orders the officer in command is bound to conform. What orders the

Ministry of War or the General Staff gave to Marinof for Tsanef's regiment I am not able to say. Moreover I do not know what further detailed orders

Marinof gave to Tsanef. I cannot however deny that if Tsanef's regiment in the Florina area in January 1944 committed cruelties and that in consequence of these even the Germans asked for his recall. I must admit that these cruelties if they were not committed on Tsanef's express orders they were done with his toleration and that Tsanef showing such toleration must have been carrying out Marinof's orders because he too had received them from Headquarters. In any case, knowing Marinof, his character was a good one and a mild one. Replying to your question, I must state that when I was informed that Marinof was posted as Ambassador of Bulgaria in Paris it astonished me how he, a military man, managed to become an Ambassador. My astonishment is justified by the following - Before being made Ambassador he was Inspector General of the Army, which post in Bulgaria is considered more decorative than sought after and honourable. However, Marinof during the Boris regime was considered a royalist and not an anti-royalist like General Stoitsef, who was posted as Ambassador in Washington. Stoitsef from 1935 was retired with the rank of Lieut. Colonel for his anti-royalist views. Consequently my astonishment is justified as to how Marinof was able to obtain a so sought after post. I therefore think, though I am not able to ascertain this, that he must have joined the SVENO party.

I have no more to state.

This had been read and certified.

IV

Examination on Oath of Major of Gendarmerie LOLA Petros.

Athens, 4th February 1947.

Question: Name etc.

Answer: LOLAS Petros, son of Antonios. I was born in Actos of Messinia and I live in Athens, Bucharest Street 19, Age 40. Major of Gendarmerie, unmarried and Christian, Orthodox.

He took the oath on the Holy Bible according to articles Nos. 121 and 121 of the Penal Procedure in the event of his non-appearance in court.

Question: What events and incidents led you to the conclusion that General Marinof is a war criminal, since the 15th Bulgarian Infantry Division of which the C.O. was the aforementioned General, did not occupy Greek soil?

(The first paragraph of Document No. 5545-III-30-9-46 of the Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs was read).

Answer: It was shown from every side that the General in question is a war criminal because:

a) From the time when he was established in Monastir the aforementioned General Marinof became the brains and superintendent of the other secret army of Bulgaria which, for four years, committed the most frightful atrocities against the unarmed Greek population and the national armed Greek resistance against the conquerors in Greek (especially Western) Macedonia.

The other army of Bulgaria in question is as is known, the agent and the organ (Komitadjis and Ochranives) of the Bulgarian Komitate (V.M.R.O.) i.e. Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation - conspirators of the terrifying organisation of Ivan Michailof...

The fact that General Marinof was the representative of the Bulgarian Komitate, is made clearly manifest, not from the written orders of the General Army Staff of Bulgaria, because the II secret Bureau of this Staff would not make known attempted plans etc. but is based on certain events and incidents which, in short, I state hereunder:-

-6-

-/ comprised of 1,400 pro Bulgarian Komitadjis,
-// while General Marinoff personally proceeding to Kastoria

1) The official organs of the Bulgarian Komitate, which appeared from the Spring of 1941 in Western and Central Macedonia, as Lieutenant Kaltsef Captain and Professor of the University of Sophia Doutsos, Lieut. Kostoff, Flight-Lieut. Blantrenoff and hundreds of others, ceased their incursions into Salonica, and rarely from the end of 1942 and after, those of Western Macedonia worked together with Major Mitkoff, Nirtseff etc. of the Bulgarian Club in Salonica, because they all each week visited Marinoff in Monastir -

2) The pro-Bulgarian Greek subjects - inhabitants of Western Macedonia (Kastoria, Florina etc) as, Geles Memelaos, Toubidis Stavros, Makris Panbelis, Damianides Loukas, Gannvrollas Pantelis, Lelios Anastasios, Pazarongas Georgios, Sioupis Antonios and hundreds of others from the various villages also lessened their weekly incursions into Salonica and their collaboration with the Bulgarian Club, because these they realised in the direction of Monastir.

3) The economic suppliers of Sofia of the Bulgarian Komitate and the carriers from there to Western Macedonia of maize, salt, clothing, Bulgarian leaflets, books and money (levies) with the purpose of changing the ethnological composition and uprooting of Greek national feeling, as the suppliers Basilef Spiro, Markoff, Roukoff Christos, Stournaboff Basileios etc. always worked together with General Marinoff and with his diplomatic Counsellor D. Dimitrov sent to Monastir by the Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

4) The proven criminal agents of the Bulgarian Komitate in murdering Greeks - as Salamboutis, Terposki etc. murderers of the Macedonian Captain Dailaki, were given fugitive shelter by Kalsterf at Monastir, where they received highly honoured awards by the services of Marinoff and thus avoided their capture by Greek Justice.

B) It is shown that the aforementioned General Marinoff was the representative of the Bulgarian Komitate by the fact also that, while Major Nitkoff, director of the Bulgarian Club in Salonica, opposed the offers of Kaltseff, concerning the formation and arming by the Italians of the formed, in March 1943, Axis-Bulgarian Komitate - the said Kaltseff personally received the approval of General Marinoff and in Kastoria took place the arming of 1,400 irregular armed bands on the part of the Italians and about a further 800, by arms secretly sent from Monastir in the care of Kaltseff and Marinoff.

C) Also from the fact that, no other Bulgarian general or superior officer worked with, reinforced or came into contact with Komitadjis of Kastoria - in the summer of 1943 warmly advised, and publicly the gathered 150 Komitadjis "to fight honestly by the side of the Italians against the Greek andartes" and that, furthermore, he declared that "I will personally see that help is sent to you from Sofia" (see also affidavits by Raveli and Kaltsef) and that, without doubt, did not tend to be realised by the distribution of 500 suits of clothes, food (4,000,000) levas etc. only to the armed Komitadjis, taking place in the village of Aposkepos of Kastoria about the middle of June 1943.

D) Also from the fact ~~that~~ of the despatch from Monastir to Greek Macedonia of about 80 reserve and regular Bulgarians (officers and sub-officers), who were placed in the spring of 1944 at the head of the formed armed bands (Voluntary Axis-Bulgarian Security Corps) to wit, of the organisation OCHRANA, consisting of a force of 6,500 men from pro-Bulgarian inhabitants, strengthened by the S.S. of the German General Sionana, for the war against the Greek andartes and against the British Intelligence.

Those at the head of the OCHRANA had two, and two people only as their protectors and whom they worshipped and these were Marinoff and Kalsteff, whose names and faces electrified the criminal Ochramitas in their atrocities against the Greek population and,

E) By this same way was proved the representation of the Bulgarian Komitadjis (V.M.R.O.) by General Marinoff in regard to the criminal actions of the Bulgarians generally in Greek Macedonia, and from the fact of the, unheard of in psychological life, gathering of over 3,000 students and girl students, Greek subjects and Greek in soul and spirit up to 1942 when the Bulgarian Komitadji, through the minds of Marinoff and Kaltseff wiped out