

KALNINS '20

DISPATCH		CLASSIFICATION	DISPATCH SYMBOL AND NO.
TO	Chief, SR	SECRET	CGSA-12180
INFO	Chief, WE		
FROM	[redacted]	DATE	12 April 1963
SUBJECT	REXKOD/Subject of Reference	RE "03" - CHECK "X" ONE	
		MARKED FOR INDEXING	
		INDEX	NO INDEXING REQUIRED
ACTION REQUIRED	For Your Information		INDEXING CAN BE JUDGED BY QUALIFIED HQ DESK ONLY

REFERENCES:

A. 3412
 B. CGSA-12180, 26 March 1963
 C. DIR 25820

1. Forwarded herewith is a Contact Report of [redacted] first meeting with Subject. As can be seen from the Report Subject produced a very good first impression, and while it is perhaps premature to make overly optimistic forecasts we feel he is a very good prospect. We predict that his reservations if any will be based on a rather cool analysis of what unpleasant effect cooperation today could have on his future career, rather than on any grounds of pseudo-morality or political hesitancy.

2. Under the circumstances (particularly the postponement of his intended trip) we would prefer not to jump in with both feet at the very start of the relationship, but to work in more gradually. We will continue to keep you posted of Subject's development as it progresses. Our initial impression is that he would give a good cross check on information provided by [redacted] and might eventually become a substitute for TIGAB if the latter should ever pass from the operational scene.

[redacted]

Attachment: HERewith
 Contact Report

11 April 1963

Distribution:
 2 - SR w/att (2 cys)
 2 - WE w/att (1 cy)
 2 - [redacted] att (1 cy)

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
 SOURCE/METHODS EXEMPTION 3B2B
 NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
 DATE 2007

SECRET

REDWOOD

AGREEMENT
OSMA-12232
12 April 1963

CONTACT REPORT:

Subject of [] 3412.

Reisen Restaurant, 1215-1420, 8 April 1963.

Next Meet: After Easter holidays by call.

Security: No adverse factors noted.

1. On 4 April I called Subject at his home number, identifying myself in true name as a member of the Embassy, and saying only that I had heard he had been in the US and would like to discuss his trip. Subject agreed to a lunch on 8 April, and I picked him up at his apartment in the Old Town at 1200. We repaired to the Reisen Restaurant a few blocks away and had a congenial lunch lasting for about two hours, during which we talked over a wide range of subjects encompassing Sweden, the US and the USSR.

2. Personalia. Subject, the son of a Norrköping leather and shoe manufacturer, became interested in the field of Soviet studies after attending the Swedish military language school in 1960. Prior to this (1959-60) he had spent a year at Williams College in New England where he had concentrated on American History and Political Science. After completing his regular military service (Subject is still a member of the reserve and will spend a month during the summer on active duty with an unspecified unit), Subject returned to academic life with courses at Stockholm University and the Stockholm Handelskolan where he has specializations in economics. He hopes to get his doctorate in about two years and currently has the opportunity of attending Harvard Business School, an offer which he tentatively plans to turn down because he is getting roughly the same education in the Handelskolan. Subject lives with his brother Claes, a student at KTH, in a small apartment building (about six or eight one-man flats) in a picturesque section of the Old Town. Subject has politically conservative views, is quietly but apparently very strongly pro-US, anti-Soviet, and anti-Social Democrat, and has a quiet contempt for Swedish efforts to moralize the world along Swedish lines. He is about 5'9", weighs about 150, and is neat and well dressed. He differs only from his photograph in that his face is narrower and the brow is less pronounced. His hair has some premature gray streaks. He is obviously quite intelligent, articulate, and poised for one of his years, and presents a very good first impression. His apartment was quite neat and had a good deal of Russian language literature in the bookcases, ranging from Pushkin to the latest issue of Krokodil. A chess board in the corner was set up and Subject confirmed that this was his hobby, though he had found few worthy opponents here in Sweden.

3. Subject confirmed his membership in the Swedish Banking Association's commission for studying the Soviet economy, describing himself as "the working member". He was enthusiastic about the support he had found during his recent trip to the US, and mentioned specifically the individuals he had contacted at Harvard, as well as Mr. GEEKER. His information was about the same as that listed in GEEKER's memo. When offered unclassified information along the lines which he planned to study Subject was quietly enthusiastic. A slight hint of clandestinity was introduced at this point in the statement that the material could not all be released for publication because of copyright laws,

SECRET

and Subject accepted this with no apparent qualms or excess enthusiasm. The commission's trip to the USSR has been postponed until autumn at the behest of the Soviet authorities. Subject surmised that this was due to the fact that their economic reorganization was not yet firmed up, and they preferred to wait until they were sure of their ground before welcoming foreign visitors.

4. Soviet Studies Group. Subject confirmed our suspicion that the Soviet Studies group had lost its good name among serious students with the recent shift in personnel. He himself had quit going to meetings because of its changed nature and apparent propagandistic orientation. He was asked his opinion of various individuals in the group or on its periphery, and came up with the following:

a. KALWINS. Subject respects KALWINS for his intellectual honesty and his practice of openly distinguishing facts from his own interpretations and prejudices. Although Subject said he did not always agree with KALWINS' interpretations, he had never found an error in his facts. When asked about the receptivity of scholars to any possible group directed specifically by KALWINS, Subject said most of them would return to KALWINS if the objectionable current leaders were to be removed.

b. MIRDAL. Subject was obviously rather hesitant to speak about MIRDAL, and the impression was given that he personally did not like him. He made an apparently real (and obvious) effort to be objective, however, and said that the man did seem to have the ability to see a large and complex problem in its entirety. He added that the students in Stockholm University had a saying that "MIRDAL read his last book in the 30's".

c. [] I did not mention [] name to Subject but he volunteered it when asked about people around MIRDAL. Subject was obviously loath to discuss [] however, and I got the impression (1) that he did not like [] personally and (2) that he was in possession of some derogatory information concerning him. He said only that there were "some strange stories about []...very strange," and did not elaborate further. (Since I had already pushed him rather far on personality information regarding other Swedes, I felt that it would be better to get into detail on this after our relationship was on a more solid footing.)

d. MILITS, WATTRANG, et al. Subject had no use whatsoever for MILITS as a Soviet scholar, considering him merely a propagandist. WATTRANG he could not pass judgement on as a journalist, but his knowledge of Soviet affairs was obviously superficial. AIZSCHELNWIKS, the aging Latvian "expert" on the Soviet economic system, was considered to be a complete blank by reputable economists. IRZEN Subject characterized as a pleasant individual but with uncertain qualifications in the Soviet field. BORIS was largely an unknown to Subject, but Subject did state that BORIS did not handle the Russian area studies courses as well as KALWINS had before his removal (see below). He added wryly that BORIS' expertise and reputation among Swedes were derived from his study at US universities, a factor which apparently carried more weight than almost any other.

S E C R E T

5. From the above it might appear that Subject is a prima donna who automatically criticizes anyone else in the same field in order to build himself up. This was not at all my impression, and it must be said that in every case where he came out with direct or implied criticism of individuals it was with a certain amount of hesitancy and circumspection. He was quite modest concerning his own achievements and did not beat his own drum at all. He himself pointed out that most of the problems associated with the Russian studies community in Stockholm were the result of academic intrigue and feuding. Specifically, he pointed out that MYREAL had been offered the position as head of the Sovietology section within the overall Slavic department at Stockholm University but had turned it down; KALNINS had then been more or less forced into taking the job, though he knew that with his Baltic refugee background he would be the target of criticism for "non-objectivity". Sure enough this came about, and resulted in dissolution of the study group and the removal of KALNINS from all positions of responsibility except head of the Slavic library. The overall head of the Slavic Department is a philologist with an extremely narrow interest in language derivation and none whatsoever for current politico-economic or historical problems. He could easily be convinced of almost anything which did not touch on his immediate field. Accordingly, when pressure was brought to bear to remove KALNINS he was approached and readily agreed to appoint BORYS to this position; according to Subject the rationale used was the fact that KALNINS was getting on in years and BORYS was a young man with a family to support and needed the money. Whereas before, under KALNINS, there were different lecturers for each of the fields of Sovietology (economics, history, etc.) BORYS had now taken on all of these lectures personally, with a corresponding fall-off in quality throughout.

6. Subject said that he and some other people in the Handelskolan (unspecified) had been thinking of getting together to form a study group specifically directed towards economic problems in the USSR. These plans were still extremely tenuous, but if the group were to be formed it would be made up of hand picked individuals and not thrown open to the public at large. The experience of the former KALNINS group had given them their lesson on this score.

7. Subject had taken one short two-week tourist trip to the USSR last year, an experience which he had not particularly enjoyed. He had been able to talk to the plant officials in one metal chemical plant near Leningrad (the only city other than Moscow which the tour visited), and had received some patently false information in response to his queries. (Specifically he had been told that GOSBANK does not charge interest on short-term loans, something he knew for a fact to be false.) He had come away from the USSR with a bad taste in his mouth from all the propaganda and brainwashing to which everyone was subjected.

8. Aside from the above, the conversation ranged over religion in the USSR, the race problem in the US (Subject said he had gone there with a good deal of anti-US prejudice on this score as the result of prior Swedish conditioning and had come away far more pro-US than he had thought possible), the new Soviet Party and government split between agricultural and industrial sectors, and such new developments as Libermanism. Subject's own view on the last named was that it was a needed reform which was too ideologically radical to be acceptable, yet did not go nearly far enough to solve the USSR's practical economic problems.

S E C R E T

9. All in all Subject produced a very favorable impression. With the pressure off because of the postponement of his Soviet trip there seemed to be no need for pushing the relationship to its utmost. On the other hand it would be well to move it into more clandestine channels fairly rapidly in order to avoid his mentioning it too widely, something which we doubt he would do as a matter of course (he seemed fairly discreet), but which is certainly a possibility. I will call him in the coming week after the Easter holidays and invite him out to the house for a quiet family meal.

S E C R E T