

CARBOHYDRATE/CARBOHYDRATE CONTACT REPORT

8 Feb 55

Date, Time, And Place of Meeting: 7 Feb 55, 1900-2200, CARBOHYDRATE's Apt.

Present: a. CARBOHYDRATE b. []

1. CARBOHYDRATE delivered the following written material:

re Vogel meeting on 11/9/54.

a. Copy of contact report/written by Wels and kept by him in Frau Vogel's safe for security reasons. Report notes Vogel had been offered a job with A.A. ("in der unmittelbaren Umgebung des Staatssekretärs") to begin 1 Oct. Vogel requested advice as to what to do. She was advised to take the job (which ~~would give her a substantial raise in pay~~) Wels noted that Vogel was poised and balanced ("erschient innerlich durchaus gefestigt"). Her brother has been in jail for some time for political reasons and has received some small sums from [] To be copied and returned.

b. File on MA "Seeburg", as requested by Elmer. The MA is a housewife. [] has name, other personalia. For CART.

c. Typed Fragebogen on Salter. (This had earlier been furnished in handwritten form and returned to be typed).

d. Lengthy handwritten report re the Frankfurt divorce action started by Mrs. CARCARANA as previously requested by [] Attached are ~~some~~ a number of letters from the Frankfurt lawyers to Simoni, Simoni's letter to C, C's reply to Simoni (refusing to sign affidavit), and from Simoni to the Frankfurt lawyers. ~~The letter from the Frankfurt lawyers to Simoni (26/Jan) notes:~~

1. That CARCARANA's mother had refused to sign an affidavit that her son had engaged in espionage for an occupying power, ~~and urged~~ Simoni to get such an affidavit from her.
2. That Simoni should see C, who had acted as a witness for Mrs. CARCARANA during her refugee screening in Berlin and explained at that time why she had to flee from the DDR. (C reported that he had used CADROTT's resistance activities to cover KUBARK espionage only at the express insistence of his case officers).
3. That if Simoni cannot get the affidavits in question it will be necessary to send the file to the appropriate DDR court so that CARCARANA can testify re his espionage activities.

The ~~affidavit~~ affidavit required by the Frankfurt lawyers is as follows:

" I assert for the benefit of the court that I have established contact with the appropriate office (i.e., the occupation power for whom CARCARANA conducted espionage) and have thereby determined that ~~KUBARK~~ CARCARANA was in contact with that office, and that that contact led to his sentence, or contributed substantially to the sentence"

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY []
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B []
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2006

Simoni's reply to the Frankfurt lawyer (after discussion with C) makes the following points:

Espionage is not good ground for divorce in this case since, contrary to Mrs. CARCARANA's present statements, she was thoroughly familiar with and concurred in CARCARANA's espionage activities and is therefore an accessory.

CARCARANA, so far as Simoni knows, did not engage in espionage, but engaged in resistance activity. (The courts distinguish between the two, the latter being no grounds for divorce).

All parties concerned want to get the divorce, however, and will cooperate to this end.

Simoni has spoken with C, who cannot give the requested affidavit. C had at Simoni's request gotten in touch with his office ("mit seiner Dienststelle in Verbindung gesetzt") and the result had been C's refusal to go beyond the statements that he had earlier made during Mrs. CARCARANA's refugee processing. Anything more would be very dangerous.

The Frankfurt lawyers should not send the file to the DDR, since this would end CARCARANA's chances for lessening of his sentence. Simoni would oppose this move in the Frankfurt court, ~~however, if the DDR office would also oppose this move.~~ Simoni hints that ~~the~~ West German office would also oppose this move.

e. Also included are two letters from Mrs. CARCARANA to her mother-in-law in Berlin, asking the latter not to discuss the affair with C. The mother-in-law gave the letters to C. The letters are difficult to understand in some points, since Mrs. CARCARANA acts as though she expects the mother-in-law's full sympathy in getting divorced from CARCARANA after spending his money and taking the mother-in-law's furniture. Mrs. CARCARANA also so says that she has discussed the divorce affair in all details with "the Americans" who consider her course correct. (C says this is a lie). Mrs. CARCARANA says she has gotten a good lawyer from the Americans, who has good connection with the East. (Simoni?). She says that she had to tell the court the truth, with the approval of higher authorities ("mit Genehmigung hoherer Dienststellen.")

Mrs.

2. Further re/CARCARANA's divorce action: ~~Simoni's opinion is that~~ C felt that if the espionage could not be proved before the court, that the divorce action would fail. Would it not be possible to start another action on other grounds than, since both parties agree to get a divorce? C felt sure there would be difficulties here; the court would raise eyebrows at the sudden change in story. But would it not be possible for CARCARANA to start an action for divorce on grounds of Ehebruch (wife running around with the American, BOB). C was not sure, would discuss this possibility with SIMONI. PEPIN noted that it was not absolutely necessary that she get a "Schuldlose Ehescheidung", since what the American authorities were no doubt interested in was the lack of moral turpitude requirement. It should be possible for a divorced woman (Ehebruch) to gain entry to America.

3. C reported re a list of arrestees (taken from ZIPPER sources) earlier given him that one had previously been reported on by CAIROIT as an MA, and that a number of others had been connected with other organizations. This latter info came from [] reports in a number of instances. C credited one to ZIPPER, probably incorrectly. COMMENT: The main purpose of this exercise was to see whether any of the persons on the ZIPPER list had been CAIROIT connected, and let C know that [] ~~has other sources of info re arrests in the zone.~~

4. C reported re Kurt Z that a MA had reported:

Z. is busy in the DIA Chemis offices, is about 40 years old, SED but only a Mitläufer, merchant, lives in Potsdam. This came from Hansen, who said that he knew no more of Z.

5. C relayed a message from Henard concerning Prof. Dr. HED, a former East MA now in W. Berlin who had been refused a job with RIAS due to relatives (parents) in the zone. Would it be possible to do something? [] made no commitments, Henard would also like to get some help in getting Hansen reestablished at RIAS. [] said he would look into the possibilities, but was pessimistic about the manner extent to which anything could be done in this regard in the near future.

6. The rest of the meeting was spent in a discussion of German law--role played by case law, comparisons with American law, Nürnberg trials, etc.

7. Next Meeting: 10 Feb 55, 1900, same place.

[]

[]